

GERMANY'S MAIN POLITICAL PARTIES' STANCES TOWARDS
TURKEY IN THE CONTEXT OF EU ENLARGEMENT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

AYSEL ÖNEM

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EUROPEAN STUDIES

JANUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŐIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip YALMAN
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Atilla ERALP
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman (METU,ADM)

Prof. Dr. Atilla Eralp (METU,IR)

Assist. Prof. Dr.  zgehan Őenyuva (METU,IR)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

GERMANY'S MAIN POLITICAL PARTIES' STANCES TOWARDS TURKEY IN THE CONTEXT OF EU ENLARGEMENT

Önem, Aysel

M.S., Department of European Studies

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Atilla Eralp

January 2013, 133 pages

This study explores how the European Union Enlargement policy of Germany as represented by her main political parties, being the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (Social Democratic Party-SPD) and the Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (Christian Democratic Union-CDU), has evolved after 1990 towards the case of Turkey. These two parties have been analysed because they have clear and different stances towards Turkey's EU Accession process and they have witnessed and shaped watershed events of this process. The study does focus on the incumbencies of Helmut Kohl, Gerhard Schröder and Angela Merkel. Thereby it relies on both a thorough literature review and also on the screening of plenty of official documents. This study attempts to scrutinize the differences between the stance of the SPD and CDU towards Turkey's EU Accession process. In this vein, it explores the interplay of political reforms and concepts of common culture, identity and history as variables in the altering attitudes of SPD and CDU. Further, this study rests on the ground that there have been breaking points in German support for EU Enlargement first emerged by the end of the Cold War and the concomitant new political climax and second with Turkey's EU

Accession process. Ultimately, this study sets on the ground that there has been a shift in Germany's overt support for EU Enlargement which has been triggered by Turkey's entrenched and problematic EU Accession Process.

Keywords: SPD, CDU, Turkey, EU Enlargement

ÖZ

ALMANYA'NIN TEMEL SİYASİ PARTİLERİ'NİN AB GENİŞLEMESİ KAPSAMINDA TÜRKİYE'YE YÖNELİK TUTUMLARI

Önem, Aysel

Yüksek Lisans, Avrupa Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Atilla Eralp

Ocak 2013, 133 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, Almanya'nın en önemli siyasi partileri olan Sosyal Demokrat Parti (SPD) ile Hıristiyan Demokrat Parti'nin (CDU) Avrupa Birliği Genişlemesi kapsamında, 1990 yılından sonra Türkiye'nin AB üyelik sürecine yönelik tutumlarının nasıl bir dönüşüme uğradığını incelemektedir. Partiler, Türkiye'nin AB üyelik sürecine yönelik belirgin ve farklı tutum sergiledikleri ve bu sürecin çok önemli gelişmelerine tanıklık ettikleri için seçilmiştir. Çalışma, özellikle Helmut Kohl, Gerhard Schröder ve Angela Merkel'in görev süreleri üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır. Bu çerçevede kapsamlı bir literatür taraması yapılmış ve çok sayıda resmi doküman incelenmiştir. Çalışma, Türkiye'nin AB üyelik sürecine yönelik SPD ve CDU arasındaki tutum farklılıklarını ortaya koymayı da amaçlamıştır. Bu itibarla; siyasi reformlar ile ortak kültür, kimlik ve tarih kavramları, SPD ve CDU'nun tutumlarını belirleyen değişkenler olarak kabul edilmiş, Almanya'nın AB Genişlemesi'ni destekleyici politikasında kırılma noktaları belirlenmiştir. Bu kapsamda, bunlardan ilkinin Soğuk Savaş'ın bitimiyle filizlendiği, ikincinin ise Türkiye'nin uzun ve zorlu AB üyelik süreci tarafından tetiklendiği tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak bu çalışmada Almanya'nın genel anlamda

AB Geniřlemesi'ne verdiđi desteđin sona erdiđi sonucuna varılmıř ve bunun da en önemli sebebinin Túrkiye'nin uzun ve sorunlu AB üyelik süreci olduđu tespit edilmiřtir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: SPD, CDU, Túrkiye, AB Geniřlemesi

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp for his advice, criticism and encouragements throughout the research.

I would also like to thank to my committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman and Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva for their valuable suggestions and comments throughout the research.

Additionally, I would like to express my special thanks to my family and my fiancé for their support and patience.

Last but not the least; I would like to thank my friend Duygu Özkan, with whom we spent sleepless months while preparing our theses, for her friendship and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| PLAGIARISM..... | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| ÖZ..... | vi |
| DEDICATION | viii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | ix |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | x |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT | 8 |
| 2.1. Theoretical Background..... | 10 |
| 2.1.1. Germany in the European Union: Basic Features..... | 10 |
| 2.1.2. Germany and European Union Enlargement: Two Different Positions | 16 |
| 2.2. Historical Context | 20 |
| 2.2.1. The Engine of Europe: German Stance towards European Union Enlargement until 1990..... | 20 |
| 2.2.2. Loss of Enthusiasm? German Stance towards European Union Enlargement after 1990..... | 24 |
| 2.2.3. Historical Overview of Turkey’s EU Journey: A German View..... | 28 |
| 3. THE SPD AND EUROPEAN UNION ENLARGEMENT | 36 |
| 3.1. Introduction..... | 36 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3.2. The Historical Evolution of the SPD Stance towards European Union Enlargement..... | 38 |
| 3.3. Gerhard Schröder and Turkey’s EU Accession Process: Good Times for Turkey | 47 |
| 3.3.1. Policy Change from Helsinki to Copenhagen and Brussels | 48 |
| 3.3.2. Effects of SPD Support for Turkey’s EU Accession Process..... | 54 |
| 3.4. Conclusion..... | 60 |
| 4. THE CDU AND EUROPEAN UNION ENLARGEMENT..... | 62 |
| 4.1. Introduction | 62 |
| 4.2. Historical Evolution of the CDU Stance towards European Union Enlargement..... | 64 |
| 4.3. Helmut Kohl and Turkey’s EU Accession Process: Strained Relations..... | 67 |
| 4.4. Angela Merkel and Turkey’s EU Accession Process..... | 83 |
| 4.4.1. Stalemate in Relations | 83 |
| 4.4.2. Privileged Partnership as Alternative?..... | 89 |
| 4.5. The Reasons of CDU Opposition to Turkey’s EU Membership..... | 97 |
| 4.6. The Way Ahead: Continual Problems and Future Challenges | 103 |
| 4.7. Conclusion..... | 106 |
| 5. CONCLUSION..... | 108 |
| REFERENCES..... | 113 |
| APPENDIX..... | 133 |

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1 Enlargement Rounds of the European Union, Ruling Parties and Chancellors in Germany..... | 17 |
| Table 2 List of German Chancellors and Ministers for Foreign Affairs after the Second World War..... | 22 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to answer how the European Union Enlargement policy of Germany, as represented by her main political parties, being the **Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands** (Social Democratic Party-SPD) and the **Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands** (Christian Democratic Union-CDU), has evolved after 1990 towards the case of Turkey.

The most important political parties in Germany, being the SPD and CDU are engaged in Germany's consolidated position towards EU Enlargement from the very inception of the EU and therefore are taken within the concept of this study.

The study will focus on how the Chancellors Helmut Kohl, Gerhard Schröder and Angela Merkel respectively constituted the stance of their parties towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. Further, this study attempts to affirm that there are distinctive differences between the EU Enlargement policy of the SPD and CDU and farther, these disparities have been excelled in the case of Turkey's membership bid.

Ultimately, this study sets on the ground that there has been a shift in Germany's overt support for EU Enlargement and farther will explore to what extend this shift has been triggered by the entrenched and problematic EU accession process of Turkey.

This study accepts that Germany supported Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement due to its **general support for EU Enlargement**. Therefore it is discerned that the overt support for EU Enlargement of Germany has waned and it is questioned to what extent this owes to the problematic membership process of Turkey.

Also, bearing in mind that there was a change of the stance of both parties towards Turkey entrenched in history, this study attempts to answer what the **breaking points** of German support for EU Enlargement have been. For this sake, this study does focus on the watershed events roughly after 1990.

Furthermore, this study discerns that both the SPD and CDU do focus on different aspects on Turkey's membership process and attempts to analyse to what extent culture and identity on the one, and democratic credentials of Turkey on the other, do play a role in that.

Germany with its attributed "engine" role within the EU has a special place in European history and specifically within the formation of the EU. This owes much to the fact that after the destruction of the Second World War, the basic notion behind a peaceful European integration was to embed Germany strictly within multilateral institutional structures and thereby manage to degrade German power. Concomitantly, after the Second World War, the German state and society entered a period of recovery and transformation. The burden of inducing both World Wars had a wholesome implication on Germany's post Second World War foreign policy. Memory of horrors of war and destruction deeply affected political and also social development. Germany incrementally began to define her foreign policy in concordance with those of Europe and became one of the most vocal supporters of European Integration. Moreover, Germany pursued an overtly wholesome positive policy towards European Integration which was also mirrored in her support for the Enlargement of the European Union. The latter was perceived as the ramification of peace and stability for the whole European continent.

However, with the end of the Cold War and the reunification of the two German states in 1990, the immediate question of how the foreign policy of Germany would evolve came up and speculations were provoked as to how this would affect her place within the European Union¹. Germany was presaged to

¹ See Peter Katzenstein (ed.) (1997), *Tamed Power. Germany in Europe*, Cornell University

pursue a more active and aggressive foreign policy and to distort from its accustomed multilateral foreign policy and consolidative role within the EU. Corollary of the collapse of the Soviet Bloc new independent states in Central and Eastern Europe which constituted significance for both the EU and Germany emerged. This also appealed to Germany's historical role to embrace those states within the European Union.

Nevertheless, Germany's support for EU Enlargement in the early 1990's endured, albeit losing pace with the 2000's. This has been also the time when the problematic EU journey of Turkey ascended on the top of the EU Enlargement agenda.

The relation of Turkey with the European Union has been as unique and outstanding as that of Germany. With the establishment of the modern Turkish Republic, Turkey engaged in an in-depth process of alignment with the West. As a result of this mentality, Turkey joined international organizations and thereby also set on to join the nascent European Union. The period until 1990 has to be understood in the context of the Cold War. Geopolitical, security and economic reasons mainly dominated the thrust for alignment. Turkey has been also special for Germany because of the labour movement to Germany in the 1960's. The context of relations after 1990 has been completely different. EU Accession

Press: Ithaca. Simon Bulmer, Charlie Jeffery and William Paterson (2000), *Germany's European Diplomacy. Shaping the Regional Milieu* (Manchester University Press, Manchester. Jeffrey J. Anderson, 'Hard Interests, Soft Power, and Germany's Changing Role in Europe', in Katzenstein (ed.), *Tamed Power*, pp.80–107. Simon J. Bulmer, 'Shaping the Rules? The Constitutive Politics of the European Union and German Power', in Katzenstein (ed.), *Tamed Power*, pp.49–79; and

Jeffrey J. Anderson and John B. Goodman, 'Mars or Minerva? A United Germany, in a Post-Cold War Europe', in Robert O. Keohane, Joseph S. Nye and Stanley Hoffmann (eds.), *After the Cold War. International Institutions and State Strategies in Europe, 1989–1991* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), Gunther Hellman (1997), "The Sirens of Power and German Foreign Policy: Who is Listening?" *German Politics*, Vol.6, No.2 (August 1997), pp.29-57.

Process rather entered a stalemate as evident from the current state of play of the accession negotiations².

To understand the change in the stances of German SPD and CDU it has to be discerned that after 1990 the international climax irrevocably altered and in the context of EU Enlargement, left both Germany and Turkey with new challenges. Therewithal, this study discerns that the end of the Cold War has been a turning point in the history of the EU and this also had ramifications for the change in attitudes of the EU Enlargement policy of the SPD and CDU.

In the years after 1990; first, Germany has found itself in a position of assertion in Europe; second, the European integration itself underwent changes and EU Enlargement has incrementally been bound to distinctive conditions and third Turkey's relations to the EU and its membership bid gained more sincerity in this time period.

The rationale behind why the CDU and SPD have been chosen is 1) on the one hand that they are "Volksparteien" so to say catch-all parties which are the most important political actors in Germany representing a wide electorate 2) on the other hand, they are involved in Germany's European integration engagement from the very inception of European integration in the immediate after war years, albeit with distinctive stances at the beginning which makes their comparative analysis that interesting and 3) third they have quite different attitudes towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement.

² 13 out of 35 chapters have been opened, of which only one, Science and Research has been provisionally closed. Due to Turkey's not applying the Additional Protocol and thereby opening Turkish airports and harbors to Cyprus, 8 Chapters have been blocked upon a decision by the Council of the European Union in 2006. These chapters are Free Movement of Goods, Right of Establishment and Freedom to Provide Services, Financial Services, Agriculture and Rural Development, Fisheries, Transport Policy, Customs Union, External Relations. Further, 5 chapters have been blocked by France: Agriculture and Rural Development, Economic and Monetary Policy, Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Funds, Financial and Budgetary Provisions, Institutions. Further the Greek Cypriot Administration blocked 6 chapters on grounds of Turkey's failure to implement the Additional Protocol: Education and Culture, Energy, Judiciary and Fundamental Rights, Foreign Security and Defense Policy, Justice Freedom and Security, Freedom of Movement for Workers

This study does follow an interpretative-textual methodology and falls back on a thorough literature review and on first hand official documents of the SPD and CDU. Moreover, some interwies and discussions made with German politicians and officials have enabled to gain a thorough overview of the subject. Official party documents such as party programmes, party declarations, party reports and party papers have been analysed. Official Bundestagsitzungen (German Parliamentary Sessions) since 1990 have been screened. Complementarily various German newspapers have been scrutinized and the websites of the SPD near Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and the CDU near Konrad Adenauer Stiftung have been used especially at the inception of this study to gain succinct overview into the subject.

Against this background, the second chapter of this study provides for a narrative character, establishing a framework for deeper analysis in further chapters. Here, the general character of Germany's place within Europe and the main approach towards European Union Enlargement will be summarized. This chapter mainly provides for the delineation and conglomeration of the most attractive connotations of German European policy. To complement this and enable o smooth transition to the deeper analysis on SPD and CDU, a historical background divided into two main periods and structured on the breaking points of German support for EU Enlargement will be made. This chapter also provides a succinct background of Turkey's engagement in the European Union until 1990 from a German viewpoint.

The third chapter will proceed with a deeper analysis of the stance of the SPD towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. The analysis of the SPD starts with a succinct introduction to the historical formation of the party. The chapter will explore the transformation of the EU Enlargement policy of the SPD by focusing mainly on the incumbency of Gerhard Schröder. After this the chapter will focus on the Turkish case in EU Enlargement and the effect of the SPD on it. The interplay between changes in government both in Turkey and Germany and how they have affected the pace of Turkey's accession bid will be explored. The

Chapter does finally attempt to explore to what extent developments in democratic reforms in Turkey have shaped the attitude of Germany towards Turkey's EU membership bid and to what extent the support of the SPD has improved Turkey's relations with the EU.

The fourth Chapter will scrutinize the stance of the CDU towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. The party has concrete visions of the European Union and has different positions towards EU Enlargement in general and Turkey in specific. The CDU stance towards Turkey has altered and deteriorated in history, in parallel with the transformation of the EU to a more complex and farther political Union. The international environment after 1990 and also domestic challenges with plenty of milestone events have resulted in an overt negative stance of the CDU towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. The incumbencies of Helmut Kohl and Angela Merkel have witnessed watershed events having ramifications for Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. The chapter will try to affirm that the traditional pro-EU stance of the CDU has undergone significant changes since German Unification in 1990. This change has been especially outstanding in EU Enlargement and this chapter seeks to find an answer to the question of whether the once vociferous support to EU Enlargement of the CDU has come to a halt. The CDU response to Turkey is rendered especially distinctive and interesting to analyse as they defend a clear opposition position which is also evident in alternative suggestions to full membership like the privileged partnership proposal. The chapter will further scrutinize the breaking points of 1990 and the entrenched and problematic EU accession process of Turkey. The Chapter does finally attempt to explore to what extent concepts of identity, religion, common culture and history have shaped the attitude of CDU towards Turkey's EU membership bid.

Against the background of the abovementioned questions and issues this study attempts to affirm that there have been breaking points in the stance of Germany towards EU Enlargement after the end of the Cold War. This break has been caused first by the end of the Cold War and the transformation of the context

of the European Union and second by the protracted and problematic EU accession bid of Turkey.

Finally, the aim of this study is to provide a thorough analysis of the German view of Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. By doing this, this study explores to what extent and in which issues have the SPD and CDU affected Turkey's membership bid. Thereby this study attempts to finally find out what the historical evolution of the SPD and CDU stance towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement has been and how the stances after the watershed events around 1990 have affected the trajectory of the last twenty years.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The destruction of the Second World War has irrevocably changed Europe. The strong polarization between states, loss of millions of human life and commitments of vicious war crimes have deeply marked the whole continent. With the Nazi Regime and Hitler coming to power in 1939 in Germany an inexpugnably era of devastation whose effects are prevalent in contemporary world politics broke in. Looking from the perspective of international relations theories it can be postulated that Realism had found its perfect case study. The triangle of aggressive Germany, Italy and Japan provided unique examples of state power maximization and aggression. But the end of the war brought the destruction and desperation to light. In this vein, the reestablishment and construction of a peaceful Europe was the priority by preventing German aggression and restricting the German state. The basic notion behind a peaceful European integration was to embed the German state strictly within multilateral structures. The formulation of a supranational construction was aimed at degrading German power and making the German state dependant on supranational structures.

When realists attempt to explain the post-war and post-unification Germany, they are faced by myriad dilemmas. The reason for this is simply that Germany sought to embed itself in multilateralism. The articulations of German stance in the 1990 Gulf-War and the sole declaration of the Czech Republic and Slovenia without awaiting the co-decision of the European states remain marginal examples that do not exert much influence on the general pro-European stance of Germany. On the other hand, Germany's post-war and especially post-unification foreign policy was analyzed form the constructivist perspective by many studies.

Due to its limited scope, this study does not seek to provide a deeper analysis of International Relations Theory nor does it seek to ground this study on the predicaments of any of them. Anyhow, literature review during the inception of this study has shown that Constructivism has been often used to explain Germany's place in Europe and her approach towards EU Enlargement. The relevance of Constructivism is uttered right here for the simple reason of the results of plenty of literature review that take Constructivism as a theoretical background of analysis for post-unification Germany. In literature review, it has been seen that many studies refer to Constructivism by pledging that overtly Realist assumptions proved to be insufficient for the post-unification analysis of Germany. Studies that use Constructivism to explain German European policy after Unification in 1990³ discern some of its peculiarities like Germany's break of overall consensus on European Union policy, its foreign policy anchored in multilateralism and also its emphasis on historical past and German national and European identity. Germany's support for EU Enlargement does also mirror those imprints.

In this narrative chapter the analysis of the basic features of Germany's European policy and stance towards EU Enlargement will be made. Moreover, for the sake of complementing the background, a succinct section has been spared for the historical entrenchment of Turkey's engagement in the European Union until 1990. This has been done by incorporating the German viewpoint.

The main questions addressed in this chapter are: What are the basic tenets of German European policy and approach towards EU Enlargement? Has the overt consensus over European Union and support for EU Enlargement reached a halt in Germany? What is the historical context and background that has shaped German EU Enlargement Policy? What is the historical context and background of Turkey's EU engagement and the German role in that? In answering these

questions, this chapter serves as a narrative introduction to the further analysis of the cases of the SPD and CDU.

2.1. Theoretical Background

2.1.1. Germany in the European Union: Basic Features

German presence within the European Union after 1990 has been subject to many studies and also inquiries in the context of International Relations Theory. A basic assumption is, according to myriad academic studies on post-unification Germany, that international relations theory had found an interesting testing case with Germany's post-unification attitude. In this context, German response to the 1990 Gulf War, the solely recognition of Slovakia and Czech Republic and the Middle East policy of George W. Bush and the Balkan Crisis have provoked the interest of Realists. One assumption put forward is that Germany's place in the international political arena especially after unification in 1990 has been tried to be explained from various theories among them realism and also constructivism. Here, the essential point is the concept of identity that is neglected by classical theories like Realism and Liberalism. It would not be false to postulate the concept of identity as an essential concept of Germany's embedment in European Union. Given that in constructivism "normative and ideational structures are just as important as material structures....constructivists argue that system of shared ideas, beliefs and values..... exert a powerful influence on social and political action⁴".

Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier apply constructivism to the analysis of European Union Enlargement⁵. They hold the view that the issue of EU enlargement had been neglected in international relations theory. Drawing a

⁴ Christian Reus-Smith (2005), "Constructivism" in, Andrew Linklater, R. Devetak, J. Donnelly, M. Paterson, C. Reus-Smith and J. True (eds), *Theories of International Relations*, NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan, p.136.

⁵ Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (2002), "Theorizing EU Enlargement: Research Focus, Hypotheses and the State of Research", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.9,No.4, pp. 500-528.

link between their analysis of Constructivism and Germany's approach to enlargement affirms the application of Constructivism on the explanation on Germany's place in Europe.

There are some basic connotations attributed to Germany's post-Unification European policy. These basic concepts will be provided here for the sake of providing a wholesome picture of Germany's EU vocation.

The first concept is the notion of Germany's **historical past** and the interlinked '**normalization**' of Foreign and European policy after Unification. The normalization is so to say a corollary of Germany coming to terms with its history. It is purported by some scholars⁶ that Germany's history and the burden of having caused two world wars overtly imprinted on Germany's quest for multilateral embedment. This has been outstanding in the rhetoric of Chancellor Kohl which was replete with references to the past and his espouse of the European integration being "a question of war and peace" and European unity representing "two sides of the same coin"⁷. Berger argues by applying Constructivism to his analysis that Germany after Unification has begun to act as a normal actor⁸ but notwithstanding concludes that Germany does not depart from the broad multilateral approach and thereby challenges the realist assumptions of a more aggressive German foreign policy. Langendorf differentiates between three types of historical legacy being the Holocaust memory, German suffering after the Second World War and finally the period of division during the Cold

⁶ See Thomas Banchoff (1997), "German Policy towards the European Union: The Effects of Historical Memory", *German Politics*, Vol.6, No.1, pp. 60-76; Thomas U. Berger (1997), "The past in the present: Historical memory and German national security policy", *German Politics*, Vol.6, No.1, pp.39-59; Eric Langenbacher (2010), "The Mastered Past? Collective Memory Trends in Germany since Unification", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 94, Vol.28, No.1, pp. 42-68.

⁷ Banchoff (1997), op.cit. p.61.

⁸ Berger (1997), op.cit. p.41.

War⁹. He further argues that Germany after roughly the first ten years of Unification has shifted from its unmasterable past to come to terms with its history and achieves a ‘mastered past’. German foreign policy is rendered to normalize since after the first decade from Unification. At the eve of German unification, Germany’s role in Europe was attributed to be “man-Mountain” or “Semi-Gulliver”¹⁰ referring to Germany’s domestic and international constraints. The metaphor was changed to Germany being a “Gentle Giant” or “Emergent Leader”¹¹. Bulmer and Paterson explain this by referring to Katzenstein’s renowned metaphor of Germany as ‘tamed power’. They argue that the ‘tamed power’ characterization of Germany’s position no longer holds for Germany and that its European diplomacy has become more assertive¹². They take the Constitutional Debate, developments in the policy of justice and home affairs and the eurocrisis as case studies and conclude that beginning from the incumbency of Schröder and especially with Merkel, German EU policy has become more critical. Chancellor Merkel’s tough management of the eurocrisis is labelled as being a rare case of Germany’s *Alleingang* in European policy¹³. Paterson attributes elsewhere the role of a “Reluctant Hegemon”¹⁴ to Germany and

⁹ Eric Langenbacher (2010), “The Mastered Past? Collective Memory Trends in Germany since Unification”, *German Politics and Society*, Issue 94, Vol. 28, No.1, p.43. For further studies of Langenbacher see Eric Langenbacher (2003), “Changing Memory Regimes in Contemporary Germany?”, *German Politics and Society*, Vol.21, No.2, pp. 46-68, Eric Langenbacher (2005), “Moralpolitik versus Moralpolitik: Recent Struggles over the Construction of Cultural Memory in Germany”, *German Politics and Society*, Vol.23, No.3, pp.106-134.

¹⁰ Simon Bulmer and William Paterson (1989), “West Germany’s Role in Europe: ‘Man-Mountain’ or ‘Semi-Gulliver’?”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.28, No.2, pp.95-116.

¹¹ William Paterson and Simon Bulmer (1996), “Germany in the European Union. Gentle Giant of emergent Leader”, *International Affairs*, Vol.72, No.1, pp.9-32.

¹² Simon Bulmer and William Paterson (2010), “Germany and the European Union: From ‘Tamed Power’ to Normalized Power?”, *International Affairs*, Vol.86, No.5, p.1052.

¹³ *Ibid*, pp.1065-1071.

¹⁴ William Paterson (2010a), “The Reluctant Hegemon? Germany Moves Centre Stage in the European Union”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.49, Annual Review, pp.57-75.

challenges Germany's European vocation¹⁵ under Chancellor Merkel. Although a certain swift to a more assertive European policy can be observed, having concocted since the incumbency of Chancellor Schröder and unfolding with Chancellor Merkel it must anyhow noted that Germany's overt appraisal of multilateral engagement in Europe is prevalent. Early predictions of an aggressive German hegemony in Europe¹⁶ have so far proved not to be true. Although Germany's EU policy altered and its enthusiasm has weakened, its normative power keeps on and as put by Beverly Crawford, "continuity characterizes both vision and practice¹⁷".

Another important characteristic of Germany is the general **cross-party consensus** on European integration and also EU Enlargement. The main political parties, within also the SPD and the CDU which constitute the focus of this study have a general supportive stance towards the EU and EU Enlargement. This is prevalent for both deepening and widening of the Union. Szczerbiak and Taggart in their study on Eurosceptic parties in Europe, differentiate between hard and soft Euroscepticism. Hard Euroscepticism is defined as "a principled opposition to the EU and European integration and therefore can be seen in parties who think that their counties should withdraw from membership, or whose policies towards the EU are tantamount to being opposed to the whole Project of European integration as it is currently conceived" whereas soft Euroscepticism is defined as "where there is not a principled objection to European integration or EU membership but where concerns on one (or a number) of policy areas lead to the expression of qualified opposition to the EU, or where there is a sense that 'national interest' is currently

¹⁵ William Paterson (2010b), "Does Germany Still Have a European Vocation?", *German Politics*, Vol.19, No.1, pp.41-52.

¹⁶ See John J. Mearsheimer (1990), "Back to the future: instability in Europe after the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.15, No.1, pp. 5-56.

¹⁷ Beverly Crawford (2010), "The Normative Power of a Normal State: Power and Revolutionary Vision in Germany's Post Wall Foreign Policy", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 95, Vol.28, No.2, pp.165-184.

at odds with the EU's trajectory¹⁸ ". Based on this distinction, the two Volksparteien of SPD and CDU are classified by the study as soft Eurosceptic.

In the same study, Charles Lees further elaborates the tenets of Euroscepticism in Germany's political parties. He alludes to the discrepancy between elite and public opinion on European integration but concludes that Germany is not a wholesome Eurosceptic country. Nonetheless, he points to the SPD's initial objection to the nascent European integration in the 1950's and reassured that the stance of the SPD has always been more pragmatic than idealistic on European integration. Contrary, the CDU is delineated as a much more vocal supporter of European integration and one of the historical architects of the European integration¹⁹.

Notwithstanding Germany's insignificant party-based Euroscepticism, Busch and Knelangen argue that the wholesome shift in the Europe approach of political elites and society is prevalent. Perceptions of European integration have shifted twice in Germany. Once after the first Eurosclerosis of the 70's, the second after unification of the two German states with the monetary union and enlargement.²⁰ Rather than party-based Euroscepticism, Germany is a more convenient research candidate for critical public opinion towards EU related issues. Again, monetary union and enlargement, as they are directly relevant with material concerns of ordinary people are on the top of the agenda of polls. It has to be noted that the cross-party consensus on European integration of the big parties remains but has become more fragmented within them. The more

¹⁸ Paul Taggart and Aleks Szcerbiak, "Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe" in Paul Taggart and Aleks Szverbiak (eds.) (2008), *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism: Case Studies and Country Surveys Vol.1*, Oxford University Press: UK.

¹⁹ Charles Lees, "The Limits of Party-Based Euroscepticism in Germany", in Paul Taggart and Aleks Szverbiak (eds.) (2008), *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism: Case Studies and Country Surveys Vol.1*, Oxford University Press: UK.

²⁰ Klaus Busch and Wilhelm Knelangen, "German Euroscepticism" in Robert Harmsen and Menno Spiering (eds) (2004), *Euroscepticism: Party Politics, National Identity and European Integration*, European Studies:New York, pp.83-98.

pragmatics and tough steering of Angela Merkel of the eurocrisis is emblematic here²¹.

To complement, Germany's historical **bilateral relations with France and Britain** constitute one of her pillars of European policy. To note here, Franco-German relationship deserves much more attention with respect to European integration. Within the trajectory of European integration Franco-German relationship has been highly interdependent with many ups and downs. The push for deeper relations constituted a quintessential element of Adenauer's foreign policy. The failures of the European Defence Community (EDC) due to opposition of the French parliament and the empty-chair crisis of 1965-66 have been emblematic for downs²². The signature of the 1963 Elysee Treaty was an important step in German-French reconciliation. The bilateral relations of Kohl and Mitterrand during the speeding of EMU and the Maastricht Treaty²³ and the relations between Sarkozy and Merkel prove emblematic for Franco-German relations. However the Hollande-Merkel couple does not seem that much in concert as the "Merkozy" couple. It is also important that roughly with Schröder a certain change of generations altered the thrust for relations²⁴. Distinctive is also the initial deviation of Gerhard Schröder from the conventional Franco-German core line. Schröder did not establish that close links with Jaque Chirac but rather

²¹ Der Spiegel, (14.12.2012), Severin Weiland und Carsten Volkery: "Merkel und die EU Krise: Die Europameisterin", Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/kanzlerin-merkel-setzt-sich-in-europa-durch-a-872951.html> (accessed 15.12.2012).

²² Douglas Webber, "Introduction" in Douglas Webber(ed.) (1999), *The Franco-German Relationship in the European Union*, Routledge: UK, p.4.

²³ See Georges Saunier "A Special Relationship: Franco-German Relations at the Time of Francois Mitterrand and Helmut Kohl" in Carine Germond and Henning Türk (eds.) (2008), *A History of Franco-German Relations in Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

²⁴ Brigitte Sauzay (2003), "Deutschland-Frankreich: Die Herausforderungen für die gemeinsame Zukunft", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 03-04, p.4. For further reading on Franco-German relationship see the special volume of *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 03-04, pp.1-46.

coupled with British Prime Minister Tony Blair resulting in the mutual Third Way paper²⁵ of them.

2.1.2. Germany and European Union Enlargement: Two Different Positions

The support of European Union enlargement of Germany can be succinctly conglomerated within two factors: economic benefits, geopolitical and security consideration on the one side and norms, identity and common culture on the other. The assumption here is that although both of these concepts explain German support for the CEEC's, the second one also provides one quintessential reason of rejection of Turkish membership. Not to omit, the difference in attitudes of different political parties within the German political spectrum. The role and attitude of the SPD and CDU will be further elaborated in following chapters. To provide an overview, the concepts of economic benefits, geopolitical and security considerations and cultural proximity as evident from the literature will be succinctly explained.

Norms, identity and common cultural values provide an important factor of German preference of enlargement. The renowned article of Helene Sjursen provides herefore a good basis. Sjursen makes two questions the focal point of her study: The questions of which are the reasons why the European Union enlarges and why it does make prioritization between aspirant states.²⁶ Broadly summarizing, Sjursen suggests that the support for the CEEC's derive to a great extent of a kind of "kinship-based duty" which was decisive for CEEC's but absent for Turkey²⁷. This can explain why Germany dedicated in support for the CEEC's as evident in the discourse of common culture and history with them. The case of Poland is distinctive for Germany. Whereas that kind of cultural

²⁵ For further information see Ralf Dahrendorf (1999), "The Third Way and Liberty: An Authoritarian Streak in Europe's New Center", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, Issue 5, September/October 1999.

²⁶ Helene Sjursen(2002), "Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU's Enlargement Policy", *Journal for Common Market Studies*, Volume 40, Number 3, pp. 491-513.

²⁷ Sjursen (2002), op.cit. p.504.

commonality is absent for Turkey which constitutes one of the basic arguments of the CDU against Turkey. Schimmelfennig argues the importance of norms and says that economic and geopolitical interests are not the main reason of enlargement. Rather he explains that the enduring enlargement thrive of the European Union is a result of ‘rhetorical entrapment’ resulting from the EU’s constant declarations of commitment to embrace Eastern European states and creating a unified Europe²⁸. At this point, Saatçioğlu in an interesting article argues why the “rhetorical entrapment” hypothesis has not worked for Turkey²⁹.

Table 1 Enlargement Rounds of the European Union, Ruling Parties and Chancellors in Germany

| Enlargement Rounds | Acceding States | Ruling Party and Chancellor in Germany |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 1973 | United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark | SPD-Willy Brandt |
| 1981 | Greece | SPD-Helmut Schmidt |
| 1986 | Spain and Portugal | CDU- Helmut Kohl |
| 1995 | Austria, Sweden, Finland | CDU- Helmut Kohl |

²⁸ See Frank Schimmelfennig,(2001),“The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union,” *International Organization*, Vol.55, No.1, Winter 2001, pp. 47-80.

²⁹ Beken Saatçioğlu (2012), “The EU’s ‘Rhetorical Entrapment’ in Enlargement Reconsidered: Why Hasn’t It Worked for Turkey?”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.3,pp.159-176.

Table 1 (continued)

| | | |
|------|--|----------------------|
| 2004 | Malta, Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary | SPD-Gerhard Schröder |
| 2007 | Romania and Bulgaria | CDU- Angela Merkel |

Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier in a further study³⁰ built upon the essence of Constructivism and pledge that culture and norms are decisive in the EU Enlargement discourse. Therefore it can be inferred that cultural commonalities and norm compliance³¹ are important. In a further study, Schimmelfennig applies his entrapment hypothesis to the enlargement case of Turkey and says that Turkey's different identity and culture constitutes one of the reasons of opposition to its membership³². Whereas Turkey has been always perceived as the other of Europe³³ the eastern European states were welcomed as the "lost brothers" of Europe. A peculiar issue for Germany is also the perceived threat of a migration flow from Turkey to Germany.³⁴ The argument of cultural differences constitutes

³⁰ Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, (2002), op.cit., pp. 500–528.

³¹ Sonia Piedrafita (2012), "Instrumental Action and Norm Compliance in EU Enlargement Negotiations, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 277-295

³² Frank Schimmelfennig (2008), "Entrapped Again: The Way to EU Membership Negotiations with Turkey", *UCD Dublin European Institute Working Paper*, 08-8, pp.1-2. Available online at http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/wp_08-8_schimmelfennig.pdf

³³ Bülent Küçük (2011), "Europe and the Other Turkey: Fantasies of Identity in the Enlarged Europe", *Eurosphere Working Paper Series*, Online Working Paper No. 34. Available on <http://eurospheres.org/publications/working-papers>

³⁴ See İbrahim Sirkeci (2003), "Migration from Turkey to Germany: An Ethnic Approach", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Spring-Fall, 28-29, pp. 189-207. Ayhan Kaya and Ferhat Kentel (2005), "Euro-Turks A Bridge Or A Breach Between Turkey And The European Union? A Comparative Study of German-Turks and French-Turks", *The Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS)*, CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers No. 14.

one of the main reasons of CDU opposition and elaborated in the chapter on the enlargement policy of the CDU.

The second concept is the one of economic and geopolitical benefits of EU Enlargement, which is indeed essential to Germany. This is broadly analyzed by Moravcsik and Vachudova who deem Constructivism insufficient and stress the importance of national interests and material benefits of national states in EU Enlargement³⁵. Highlighting economic benefits of enlargement they give the example of Germany who is predicted to benefit the most from enlargement in the long term³⁶. In a further study Vachudova states that Germany with its high unemployment and proximity to labour from the East will in the long term have the highest overall permanent net increase in GDP from enlargement³⁷ and presents the insistence on leverage of transition periods to free labour circulation on the CEEC's by Germany as emblematic to economic and domestic concerns³⁸. A further enlargement explanation based on geopolitical and security considerations puts forward that threat and geopolitical considerations affect a state's decision to favour enlargement to Eastern countries and offers that this is prevalent for Germany as its shared borders, economic interaction and fear of migration has been one reason of support for enlargement³⁹.

German stance towards EU Enlargement can be explained from various aspects. None of the abovementioned factors are solely sufficient for explanation. Conclusionary to this part and also introductory to the separate chapters on EU

³⁵ Andrew Moravcsik and Milada Anna Vachudova (2003), "National Interests, State Power, and EU Enlargement", *East European Politics & Societies*, Vol.17, No.1, p.45.

³⁶ Ibid, p.12.

³⁷ Milada Anna Vachudova (2000), "EU Enlargement: An Overview", *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol.9, No.4, p.66.

³⁸ See Milada Anna Vachudova (2001), "The Trump Card of Domestic Politics: Bargaining Over EU Enlargement", *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol.10, No.3&4.

³⁹ Lars S. Skalnes, "Geopolitics and Eastern Enlargement of the European Union" In Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.) (2005), *The Politics of European Union Enlargement: Theoretical Approaches*, Routledge: New York. pp.214-215.

enlargement of the SPD and the CDU it can however carefully be put forward that culture and common historical denominators have played and do play a bigger role for the CDU. Not to forget here of course, the role of democratic norms that play a decisive role in the SPD.

2.2. Historical Context

2.2.1. The Engine of Europe: German Stance towards European Union Enlargement until 1990

A devastating War-World War-II constituted the genesis of the European Union. Much enthusiasm has been arisen for European Integration. It was seen as a civilization and peace project and the bearer of hope for a better future. The beginning as an economical integration model, soon evolved to a much more tight and complex system of interdependence. The European continent had faced the fiercest wars. What has been definitely achieved was –to a large content peace in the European Continent. When analyzing the roots of European Integration soon the question arises as to why and how European Integration was aspired. What was the driving force behind the whole project? To analyze this, one has to decompose the European Union and recognise that what is perceived as a whole unity is composed of independent rational states. The analysis of the roots of the drift of European Integration leads one to Germany. It won't be too bold to say that the latent or better to say the main reason behind the European Integration is the special case of post-war Germany. Germany's past as an aggressive nationalistic state, having caused both World Wars and the immediate concern about Germany to become again radical urged the other states to find a stable solution for Europe. From this viewpoint on, it can be said that Germany's perception in Europe was that it defined itself from 1862 to 1945 by asserting itself internationally, often through war⁴⁰.

⁴⁰ John Bendix (2007), "Germany" in Colin Hayand Anand Menon (eds.), *European Politics*, Oxford University Press: USA, p.5.

After World War II, Europe faced immense infrastructural problems, political instability, mistrust among neighbours and above all an urging fear of another war. A solution for rebuilding Europe by avoiding same mistakes done after World War I was searched. Here, the seeds of European Integration were sown. The German state and society were sought to be embedded into new, strong European structures.

After World War-II in 1945 Germany surrendered and was occupied and divided into two parts by 1949. The Four-Power regime composed of the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union steered German foreign policy and committed to German reconstruction by demilitarization, denazification and democratization⁴¹. In 1949, Konrad Adenauer became Chancellor and the Christian Democrats became the the ruling party. Soon, Adenauer dedicated himself to European integration by soon realizing that this was the only way for Germany to be bound to European structures. German foreign policy in the early 1950's was dominated by the challenges of rearmament and reunification⁴². The antagonism with France and the problem of the Ruhr and Saar region eventually gave birth to the Monnet Plan and Schuman Declaration in 1950. The aim of Schumann was to "make war not only unthinkable but materially impossible". The declaration paved the way for the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) that was established in 1951. The establishment of the ECSC soon was followed in 1957 by the forming of the European Economic Community (EEC) and European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) in 1957 with the Rome Treaty. Economy and military sensitive issues were the starting point of restraint Germany whereas enabling it to find its way to democracy. In 1967, the three institutions were merged to the European Communities. It can be said here, that at the time of the 1960's and following 1970's Germany gradually evolved to pro-

⁴¹ Thomas Banchoff (1999), "The German Problem Transformed: Institutions, Politics and Foreign Policy 1945-1995", University of Michigan Press: USA, p.31.

⁴² Ibid. p. 28.

integrationist European state soon becoming one of the engines of the process. Here, the unique role of Konrad Adenauer has to be acknowledged, who from 1949 to 1963 lead the German state. It was largely to Adenauer's efforts that Germany transformed from a radical nationalist state having caused two world wars to a pro-European state. Here to note that Adenauer also applied historical narrative to Germany's post-war role⁴³. Reconciliation with France by signing the 1963 Elysee Treaty and being founding member of the European Communities is the main reference point today's CDU politicians take when pledging for a European Germany. However it has to be noted here that the initial pace for European integration was not concerted among all political parties in the young FRG. The stance of the SPD under the leadership of Kurt Schumacher was rather critical towards the structure of the nascent European integration⁴⁴. It was not until the death of Schumacher and the 1959 Bad Godesberg Programme of the SPD, when the party adopted a more positive attitude. This marked also the beginning of the overt cross-party consensus in Germany on European Integration.

Table 2 - List of German Chancellors and Ministers for Foreign Affairs after the Second World War

| Party | Chancellor | Minister for Foreign Affairs |
|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
| CDU | Konrad Adenauer (1949–1963) | Heinrich von Brentano, 1955-1961, (CDU) |
| CDU | Ludwig Erhard (1963–1966) | Gerhard Schröder 1961-1966, (CDU) |

⁴³ See Thomas Banchoff (1996), "Historical Memory and German Foreign Policy: The Case of Adenauer and Brandt", *German Politics and Society*, Vol.14, No.2, pp.36-53.

⁴⁴ Banchoff (1999), *op.cit.*, pp. 36-45.

Table 2 (continued)

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| CDU | Kurt Georg Kiesinger (1966–1969) | Willy Brandt 1966-1969, (SPD) |
| SPD | Willy Brandt (1969–1974) | Walter Scheel 1969-1974 (FDP) |
| SPD | Helmut Schmidt (1974–1982) | Hans Dietrich Genscher 1974-1982, (FDP) |
| CDU | Helmut Kohl (1982–1998) | Hans Dietrich Genscher, 1982-1992 (FDP) Klaus Kinkel, 1992-1998 (FDP) |
| SPD | Gerhard Schröder (1998–2005) | Joschka Fischer (Die Grünen) |
| CDU | Angela Merkel (2005-...) | Frank Walter Steinmeier, 2005-2009 (SPD) Guido Westerwelle, 2009-..., (FDP) |

In the following years Germany consolidated its European vocation by also realizing the “German Miracle” that is to say that Germany became the economic engine of Europe. Following the decisions of the 1969 Hague Summit, steps towards deepened economic integration is also explained in terms of the effect of Germany. An interesting evaluation of the Summit reports is made by Andreas Staab. He summarizes the conclusions of the summit as decisions on deepening, widening and completing. Here, he explains in what context deepening was understood:

“Deepening” investigated the possibility of cooperation in more than just economic fields, for instance, in foreign policy. More important, deepening referred specifically to West Germany; given this country’s economic might, the European leaders agreed to look further into the possibility of an economic and monetary union, including a single European currency that could integrate the German economy more effectively into a wider European setting. The goal was to prevent the West German government and the monetary policies of

its independent central bank, the Bundesbank, from having detrimental consequences for other countries”⁴⁵

In the 1970's, International economic problems triggered by the collapse of the Bretton Woods system and hiking oil prices caused European states to lose appetite on more integration. In 1969, with the government of Willy Brandt and the SPD, Germany faced a more pragmatic foreign policy that approached the East⁴⁶. Brandt's Ostpolitik⁴⁷ was revolutionary. Only the 1980's put new impetus on integration with debates on the completion of the single market. The 1980's were also an expecting decade for Germany. In 1984, Helmut Kohl became Chancellor. After Adenauer once again, Kohl personified the pro-integrationist and embracing European leader always linking German interests with those of Europe. This decade also lead to the collapse of communism, change of borders and turning the international political scene upside down. The happenings in Germany in 1989 lead to mountainous political, economic and also societal changes⁴⁸.

2.2.2. Loss of Enthusiasm? German Stance towards European Union Enlargement after 1990

The new decade of the 1990's started with mountainous transformations in the international political scene. The collapse of the Soviet Bloc left the Western

⁴⁵ Andrear Staab (2011), *The European Union Explained*, Indiana University Press: USA, p.13.

⁴⁶ Andreas Wirsching(2001), *Deutsche Geschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*, C.H. Verlag: München, pp.40-41.

⁴⁷ Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik mainly signified a departure from the CDU's western integration policy and Hallstein Doctrine of 1955. Germany under Brandt signed the Treaty of Moscow in 1970 with the Soviet Union which recognized existing European borders; the Treaty of Warsaw in 1970 with Poland which recognized the People's Republic of Poland and the Oder-Neisse Line as border; the Four Power Agreement (also known as the Quadripartite Agreement) of September 1971 and the Treaty of Prague in 1973. In 1972, the Basic Treaty with East Germany was signed which established formal relations between the two German states and consisted therefore a repeal of the Hallstein Doctrine.

⁴⁸ For further elaboration on the domestic and international context and changes of 1989 see Konrad H. Jarausch, "Germany 1989: A New Type of Revolution?", in Marc Silberman (ed.) (2011), *The German Wall, Fallout in Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York. pp.11-35

world without the familiar enemy which controversially provided a strained but stable system. The turnover at the beginning of the 1990's had explicit effects on the European Integration. The problem of embedding the new emerging post-communist states into the European Framework emerged as a primer challenge. In this unsettled environment political changes in Germany beard the most important changes to the European continent. Being a divided state since 1949, Germany found the way to the awaited unification. The birth of the united Germany generated both euphoria and also scepticism. The Two Plus Four Treaty⁴⁹ was important and internal debates were about the economic and social challenges that had to be tackled to balance the two parts. The architect of unification, Helmut Kohl was confident in handling the problems of unification promising the German society 'blossoming landscapes⁵⁰'. Chancellor Kohl dedicated himself to achieving German unification and also deepening European integration and embedding Germany into it. His visions for a unified Germany and the steps that he was going to take on this way were summarized in his "10 Points Programme for Germany Policy⁵¹" which he announced in a speech at the Bundestag in 1989. The programme entailed not only concrete steps towards the economic and social convergence of the two Germany's but also manifested the European vocation of

⁴⁹ See "Vertrag vom 12. September 1990 über die Abschliessende Regelung in Bezug auf Deutschland, 2+4-Vertrag", Politisches Archiv des Auswaertigen Amts, MUTL-781, Available on <http://www.auswaertigesamt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/372800/publicationFile/153322/ZweiPlusVierVertrag.pdf>

⁵⁰ Helmut Kohl (1990), "Fernsehansprache von Bundeskanzler Kohl Anlässlich des Inkrafttretens der Währungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialunion", Available on <http://helmutkohl.kas.de/index.php?msg=555>. The "blossoming landscapes" metaphor was uttered by Helmut Kohl on a television address on 1st July 1990. It was used with reference to German unification and the restructuring of East Germany. The metaphor was used to promise a better future for the people in East Germany with prosperity, economic wealth and social well-being. Upon the difficulties faced in the restructuring of East Germany, the metaphor was repeatedly used by critics.

⁵¹ Helmut Kohl (1989), "Erklärung vor dem Deutschen Bundestag: Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Deutschlandpolitik, 28. November 1989", Available on <http://helmutkohl.kas.de/index.php?msg=627>

a unified Germany. The initial years of unification were marked with economic and societal difficulties of accommodation of the two parts of the country⁵².

At this time it is also worth to shortly mention the relationship between then French President Mitterrand and Kohl who ignited once again further deepening of European Integration by the achievement of the Maastricht Treaty and the consolidation of the way to monetary union. Although they had close relationships and displayed good friendship, the concerns of Mitterrand were those of embedding Germany deeper in European structures in order to prevent an alone walk of Germany. He feared German unification and this explains also the strong support of France for the IGC's on political and monetary union that would result in a more interdependent European integration model in which Germany would have little space for sole maneuver⁵³.

Until 1998, German unification and the consolidation of the European integration process were prioritized by Germany. In 1998, after 16 years of Kohl's incumbency the Social democrats came to power⁵⁴. German unconditional quest for deeper European integration was slightly challenged during the Chancellorship of Gerhard Schröder. Nevertheless Schröder espoused also a policy of "Neue Mitte⁵⁵". Anyhow with the achievements of the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty and 2001 Nice Treaty Germany preserved its pro-EU attitude. The 1997 published "Agenda 2000⁵⁶" manifested also the EU's enlargement principles. Though, different from Kohl, Schröder developed good relations with Russia and put more emphasis on

⁵² See Jeffrey Anderson (1999), *German Unification and the Union of Europe: The Domestic Politics of Integration Policy*, Cambridge University Press: UK, pp.23-55.

⁵³ Mark F. Gilbert (2003), *Surpassing Realism: The Politics of European Integration since 1945*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: UK, p.199.

⁵⁴ See Russel J. Dalton (1998), "A Celebration of Democracy: the 1998 Bundestag Election", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 49, Vol.16, No.4, pp.1-6.

⁵⁵ See Gerard Braunthal (1999), "The 1998 German Election: Gerhard Schröder and the Politics of the New Middle", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 50, Vol.17, No.1, pp.32-54.

⁵⁶ European Commission (1997), "Agenda 2000: For a Stronger and Wider Union", Bulletin of the European Union, Supplement 5/97.

German national interests. After nearly two decades of Christian Democratic ruling and the not very glorious end of Kohl's incumbency, the election of Schröder signalled a change. Though, his election brought about the aftertaste of domestic economic problems. Internal party problems resonated in the media soon after his election.⁵⁷

New reform presses within the EU culminated in the EU Constitution of 2004 that was rejected in referenda held in France and the Netherlands. The rejection of founding members was a deep shock for the EU. This was also the case for Germany as France was perceived as the closest ally in driving the further integration in the EU. The new government of Angela Merkel and the CDU took office in 2005. Initially sticking to the traditional foreign and European integration policy of Helmut Kohl, Merkel engaged in active engagement within the EU. Though, Merkel altered the CDU⁵⁸.

The Constitutional Crisis, the election of Angela Merkel coincided with a more assertive German leadership in Europe. In 2007 with the signature and later ratification of the Lisbon Treaty a huge hurdle was taken. The Council Presidency of Germany in the first half of 2007 agitated for the success of the Treaty as another failure would cause a sharp halt in the integration. The work programme of Germany's Council Presidency articulated its strong support for the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe⁵⁹. The emergence of the Euro-crisis challenged Europe again with many problems and attributed Germany a more responsible role in dealing with it⁶⁰. The gloomy economic situation of many European states-foremost Greece- urged Germany as a strong anchor to take the

⁵⁷ Der Spiegel, (26.10.1998) "Rückkehr in die Wirklichkeit", Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-8026528.html>, accessed on 12.12.2012

⁵⁸ See Clay Clemens (2009), "Modernisation or Disorientation? Policy Change in Merkel's CDU", *German Politics*, Vol.18, No.2, pp.121-139.

⁵⁹2007 German Council Presidency Work Programme, Available on http://www.eu2007.de/includes/Downloads/Praesidentschaftsprogramm/EU_Presidency_Programme_final.pdf

brunt of pilotaging the EU through the crisis. The tough austerity policy of Angela Merkel caused a great outcry especially in Greece.

2.2.3. Historical Overview of Turkey's EU Journey: A German View

Since the proclamation of the modern Republic of Turkey in 1923, Turkey as part of her modernization process has chosen to pursue a Western aligned foreign policy⁶¹. In accordance with that, Turkey became member of the OECD in 1948, Council of Europe in 1949 and NATO in 1952. Complementary, the engagement with Europe and the struggle to become a part of the creeping European integration has been viewed as inevitable and inexorable for Turkey's foreign policy. For political and economic reasons, Turkey sought the alignment with Europe⁶². As a corollary of that Turkey also tried to restore relationship to Germany which had been strained with the World War II⁶³. As Kramer states, "within the context of the Cold War, Germany evolved as the preferential and special partner of Turkey."⁶⁴

Çamyar and Tagma provide in interesting analysis of why Turkey seeks European Union membership by providing a historical institutional analysis⁶⁵.

Marking the start of Turkey's entrenched relations with the EU, in July 1959, two months after Greece, Turkey applied for Associate Membership to the

⁶¹ See Feroz Ahmad, "Historical Background of Turkey's Foreign Policy", in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis (eds.) (2004), *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy*, Cambridge: USA, pp.9-37.

⁶² For further information on the relations between Turkey and the European Community with focus on economic development see Atila Eralp, "The Politics of Turkish Development Strategies", in Andrew Finkel and Nükhet Sirman (1990), *Turkish State, Turkish Society*, Routledge: UK, pp.219-259.

⁶³ Yücel Güçlü (2000), "Turkish-German relations on the eve of World War Two, *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp. 73-94.

⁶⁴ See Heinz Kramer (2008), "Die Türkische Republik und Europa", in M. Reinkowski (ed.), *Die Türkei und Europa: Eine wechselhafte Beziehungsgeschichte*, Kohlhammer: Stuttgart.p.141.

⁶⁵ Isa Camyar & Halit Mustafa Tagma (2010): "Why Does Turkey Seek European Union Membership? A Historical Institutional Approach", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 371-386.

European Economic Community. Germany, under the rule of Adenauer welcomed this application as evident from statements of German delegate Van Scherpenberg for Turkey's application for membership in official meetings⁶⁶. In this vein, German support was grounded on the Cold War Context and the threat of the Soviet Union. Thus, Turkey's importance was uttered with respect to geopolitical and security considerations. In this vein, German military and defense assistance to Turkey started⁶⁷.

The reasons of Turkey for the application were, as Müftüler-Baç argues the "culmination of the Turkish orientation to the West, gaining free access for Turkish exports to the European market; and providing a stimulus for economic growth." Moreover the application of Greece also strengthened Turkey's efforts to find a place in the European integration⁶⁸. It would not be false to purport that the initial period of Turkey's accession process was marked by the rivalry with Greece⁶⁹. At that point, Çakır provides an interesting contribution to the historical evolution of Turkey's accession bid to the European Union by arguing that Turkey has always had rivals in its relations with the EU. He says that Turkey had competed with some of them for membership but also with others for whom

⁶⁶ Mehmet Ali Birand, *Türkiye'nin Büyük Avrupa Kavgası*, Doğan Kitap: İstanbul, pp.54-60.

⁶⁷Kramer (2008),op.cit.,p.141.

⁶⁸ Meltem Müftüler-Baç (1997), *Europe in Change: Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*, Manchester University Press: UK, p.54.

⁶⁹ For further information on the relations between Greece and Turkey in the context of the European Union see Ziya Önis (2001), "Greek-Turkish Relations and the European Union: A Critical Perspective", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 6, No.3, pp. 31-45., Serhat Güvenç (1998-99) "Turkey's Changing Perceptions of Greece's Membership in the European Union: 1981-1998", *Turkish Review of Balkan Studies*, Vol. 4, pp.103-30. Heinz Kramer (1997) "The Cyprus Problem and the European Security", *Survival* 39/3 (Autumn), pp.16-32. Lauren McLaren (2000) "Turkey's Eventual Membership of the EU: Turkish Elite Perspectives on the Issue", *Journal of Common Market Studies* Vol. 38, No.1, pp.117-29. Neill Nugent (2000), "EU Enlargement and the Cyprus Problem", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No.1, pp.131-50.

membership was not possible technically⁷⁰. Indeed the period up to the accession of Greece has been marked by the continuous race between Turkey and Greece⁷¹. At that point, different positions of the then original six member states on Turkey and Greece are also interesting. Emblematic to that is the opposition of later German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt to the accession of Greece⁷².

Çakır also comments that although Germany refrained from explicitly favouring Turkey's membership over that of Greece, she nevertheless supported it. Furthermore, Germany exerted efforts to ensure that the Community would maintain its relations with Turkey during the 1980's coup⁷³.

The relations of Turkey with the European Union were strained with the Military Coup on May 27, 1960 which brought also myriad domestic and foreign policy turmoil⁷⁴. The following years, Turkey struggled to the restoration of democratic ruling and the relations to the European Economic Community.

On September, 12 1963, The Ankara Agreement was signed between Turkey and the European Community. German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the German Commission President Walter Hallstein, both members of the CDU, supported the signature of the agreement. The statement of Walter Hallstein is explicitly interesting with respect to Turkey. Hallstein declared that Turkey is "a part of Europe and belongs to Europe"⁷⁵. Bearing in mind prospective declarations

⁷⁰ Armağan Emre Çakır, "Political dimension: always in the list of 'also rans': Turkey's rivals in EU-Turkey relations" in Armağan Emre Çakır (eds.) (2011), *Fifty Years of EU-Turkey Relations: A Sisyphian story*, Routledge: UK, p.15.

⁷¹ For further information see J. Redmond and G. Rosenthal (eds.) (1998), *The Expanding European Union: The Past, Present and the Future*, Lynne Rienner: London and New York, pp.2-3.

⁷² Çakır (2011), op.cit., p.17.

⁷³ Ibid., p.20.

⁷⁴ For further information on Turkey's problems during that time see Nuri Eren (1961) "Turkey: Problems, Politics, Parties", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.40, Issue 1, pp.95-104; Aydın Yalçın (1967), "Turkey: Emerging Democracy", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 45, Issue 4, pp. 706-714.

⁷⁵ Rede von Walter Hallstein anlässlich der Unterzeichnung des Assoziationsabkommens zwischen der EWG und der Türkei (Ankara, 12. September 1963), Available online at http://www.cvce.eu/obj/rede_von_walter_hallstein_anlasslich_der_unterzeichnung_des_assoziatio

of CDU politicians on Turkey's belonging to Europe; this statement also shows how the stance of the CDU has altered in time with the development of character of the European integration itself. Kramer comments that the signature of the Association Agreement had different background reasons in Germany and Turkey. Germany viewed this Agreement rather in the broader concept of geopolitical and security considerations. Further he says that European Identity was at that time used as exclusion of the Soviet Union rather than Islamism⁷⁶.

The Agreement prescribed three stages envisaged to result in the mutual Customs Union: preparatory stage, transition stage and final stage. On November 23, 1970 the Additional Protocol was signed and entered into force in 1973 thereby marking the start of the transition stage. In addition to problems arising from the implementation of the Additional Protocol, external factors like the enlargement of the Community in 1973 (including Britain, Ireland and) the oil crisis in 1973 and the 1974 Cyprus crisis contributed to the deterioration of relations⁷⁷. Öniş provides an analysis of the reasons why Turkey in the late 1970's failed to react upon the application of full membership of Greece and adds that these years have been marked by watershed events and missed opportunity by Turkey⁷⁸. Also turning things more difficult for Turkey, in the 1970's, Spain and Portugal emerged as rivals for Turkey. As Eralp states: "The shift in European emphasis on democracy, seized upon by the Greek, Spanish and the Portuguese in their speedy bid for membership, was an opportunity that could not be taken

nsabkommens.zwischen.der.ewg.und.der.turkei.ankara.12.september.1963-de-c79fccb6-6c2e-4d9d-86aa-5e830da3ac9e.html (accessed on 02.02.2013).

⁷⁶ Kramer (2008), op.cit., p. 156.

⁷⁷ Meltem Müftüleri-Baç (1997), *Europe in Change: Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*, Manchester University Press: UK, p. 61.

⁷⁸ Ziya Öniş (2001) "An Awkward Partnership: Turkey–EU Relations in Comparative-Historical Perspective", *Journal of European Integration History*, Vol 7, Issue 3, pp.105–19.

advantage of by the Turkish governing elite⁷⁹”. Worse still, Germany ostensibly supported the membership bid of Spain⁸⁰ and Portugal⁸¹ but the SPD government clearly differentiated its policy with emphasizing the lack of democratic consolidation in Turkey.

As a result of the military intervention in September 12, 1980 all relations with the Community were frozen. Relations began to normalize towards the end of the 1980’s. The years after 1980 were also marked by domestic events in Turkey and also the farther intensification of the European Integration to a “Union”. Turkey’s continuous difficulties in sustaining democratic governance and respect for human rights constituted also the Störfaktor (disturbing factor) of the ‘fruitful relations’ relations between Turkey and Germany⁸².

Turkey transformed its heavily protected and inward-oriented economy to a much more outward-economy during the 1980’s and 1990’s. Furthermore as Öniş explains, “on the political front, the military interlude between 1980 and 1983 was followed by a stage-by-stage return to democratic government, a natural corollary of which was a marked improvement in relations with Europe. In order to capitalise on this favourable environment, Turkey, under the premiership of Turgut Özal, applied for full-membership of the European Community⁸³.” Turkey, under the leadership of Prime Minister Turgut Özal submitted a formal application for full membership on April, 14 1987. Europe was startled by this

⁷⁹ Atilla Eralp, “Forging New Identities Along Old Lines: Turkey and the European Community in the Changing Post-War International System, Marx Haller and Rudolph Richt(eds.) (1994), *Towards a European Nation?*, Serharpe: New York. pp.202.

⁸⁰ See Birgit Aschmann (2001), “The Reliable Ally: Germany Supports Spain's European Integration Efforts 1957-67”, *Journal for European Integration History*, Vol.7, No.1, pp. 37-51.

⁸¹ Nicolau, Andresen-Leitão (2001), “Portugal's European Integration Policy 1947-72”, *Journal for European Integration History*, Vol.7, No.1, pp. 25-35

⁸² Curd-Torsten Weick (2001), *Die Schwierige Balance: Kontinuitaeten und Brüche deutscher Türkeipolitik*, LIT Verlag: Münster, Hamburg, London, p.375.

⁸³ Öniş (2001), op.cit. p.113.

application and Germany was especially challenged because of the traditional German-Turkish friendship⁸⁴. Furthermore, as Dağı explains: “Özal believed that Turkey’s relations and cooperation with the West should not be exclusively centred on a common defence strategy. He wanted to have closer economic ties which were considered to be essential in order to integrate Turkey into Europe structurally”⁸⁵. The negative opinion of the Commission let Turkey wait for two years and came in 1989. Refocusing the relations between Turkey and the EU, “what the decision prompted, in effect, was a public debate on Turkey’s Europeanism for the first time since Turkey had declared its aspirations toward Westernization”⁸⁶. Furthermore, the abovementioned developments coincided with the election of Helmut Kohl, who vehemently supported European integration and EU Enlargement but not Turkey’s accession.

Against the above provided background, the relations of Turkey and the European Union up until 1990 have to be evaluated in the context of the Cold War. Strategic and security relevant considerations have prevailed over the concerns of democratic credentials and identity of Turkey. This explains also the overt support of Adenauer and also Hallstein to the accession of Turkey. Moreover the relations were marked by the rivalry with Greece. With political turmoil in Turkey and also the problems in the European Communities itself the stance towards Turkey altered. The accession of Greece in 1981 and Spain and Portugal in 1986 contributed to this alteration. Furthermore with respect to the German stance, the 1980’s coincided with the incumbency of Helmut Kohl and his more concrete visions of Europe and European Enlargement where Turkey could hardly find a place. As the developments after 1990’s will be elaborated in subsequent chapters, this section will be summed up with the argumentation that

⁸⁴ Die Zeit (24.04.1987), “Heikler Antrag: Die Türkei in die Europäische Gemeinschaft?”, Available online at <http://www.zeit.de/1987/18/heikler-antrag> (accessed 08.02.2013).

⁸⁵ İhsan Dağı (2001), “Human Rights, Democratization and the European Community in Turkish Politics: The Özal Years, 1983-87”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 37, Issue 1, p. 18. pp. 17-40

⁸⁶ Eralp (1994), op.cit. p.206.

German stance towards EU Enlargement of Turkey during the Cold War years has been mainly marked by geopolitical, security and economic considerations. The next sections will show that factors like democratic credentials and identity have proven decisive just after 1990. These have been also corollary to the transformation of the EC to the EU from an overt economic integration to a much more intertwined and complex integration with political predicaments.

Conclusionary Remarks

This chapter has discerned the main features of German European policy as evident from analysis of literature. Among them are the references to Germany's past and **historical memory** which is delineated to be deeply rooted in the legacy of the Second World War; **multilateral alignment** and **normalization** of its foreign policy, **cross-party consensus** on European Integration and the **Franco-German Relationship**. This has shown that Germany's place within the EU is highly imprinted by multilateralism.

Furthermore, this chapter has provided a **succinct and narrative historical overview** of the main developments relevant to Germany's acting with respect to EU Enlargement after the Second World War. Thereby it has been seen that German stance towards EU Enlargement has underwent major transformation. There have been breaking points in German stance towards EU Enlargement. The first one has started in the 1970's with internal crisis in the then European Community and was acuminated with the end of the Cold War. The second one was mainly triggered by the problematic EU Accession process of Turkey and lead to an overt halt in support for EU Enlargement.

Further, the analysis has discerned cleavages of **two viewpoints** of Germany's stance towards EU Enlargement. One point draws more attention on **cultural commonalities and historical responsibility towards Enlargement**. This is rendered to be prevalent for the case of the CDU with respect to enlargement to the CEEC's and the exclusion of Turkey and thus, has been incorporated into the following chapter on the CDU. The other viewpoint does

refer more to **economic benefits and security related geopolitical considerations**. The second one had prevailed in the context of the Cold War. On the contrary, influence of identity and also democratic credentials have increased.

Complementary, to establish the coherence of the context of this study, in a separate and succinct section, **Turkey's engagement with the European Union** has been analysed. This has been done by providing the German effect on the historical entrenchment of Turkey's EU Accession process. The aim of that was to picture the entrenchment of important developments leading to the dividing line of the watershed events around 1990's. Thereby it has been found that the international climax of the Cold War placed Turkey in a much more critical position with respect to geopolitical and security considerations. On the contrary, after 1990 with the end of the Cold War, the context of Turkey's EU Accession bid entered a completely different stage and therefore triggered different priorities in the relations.

CHAPTER 3

THE SPD AND EUROPEAN UNION ENLARGEMENT

3.1. Introduction

The Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD – Social Democratic Party) is one of the key political parties in Germany. Its history predates World War I and is deeply rooted in the labour movement in Germany. It was established in 1875 with the merge of the Social Democratic Worker's Party of Germany (Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands-SDAP) and the General German Worker's Union (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein). Besides the CDU, it is one of Germany's Volksparteien (catch-all party). The party contributed to the construction of Germany's post Second World War European policy. Albeit with a much more critical stance than the CDU, in the late 1950's, the SPD incrementally joined the basic consensus on support for European integration. The SPD has been also an important actor shaping Germany's stance towards EU Enlargement. Here it is important to discern that compared to the CDU, the SPD has enjoyed fewer years in government. This enabled it to develop a more critical policy towards EU Enlargement. Besides this, the SPD has had different priorities, deriving from the very ideology of the party. Thus, emphasize on social aspects and democratic credentials are much more evident in the stance of the SPD.

Against this background, the rational why this study takes the SPD as actor to analyze is that is one of the most important political parties in Germany, representing a good test case under the incumbency of Gerhard Schröder with respect to EU Enlargement. The SPD is also highly interesting for Turkey as the years of 1998-2005 provide a time span in which relations between Turkey and

the EU and Turkey and Germany were more positive than those preceding the Kohl era and the subsequent Merkel incumbency.

The analysis of the SPD starts with a succinct introduction to the historical formation of the party with a view on its reference to European Union and EU Enlargement. The aim is to provide wholesome background information prior to further case analysis. The analysis will benefit from an overview of the official documents of the party and their references to EU enlargement. The official documents are analysed by scrutinizing their German originals. This will provide a narrative framework for further analysis. After that, the chapter will focus on the stance towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement.

The SPD is crucial for the EU Accession process of Turkey as Turkey enjoyed great support of Gerhard Schröder and the SPD during the period 1999-2005 which resulted also in flourishing relations between Turkey and the EU. This support also helped Turkey to manage the implementation of many democratic reforms which approximated her to the ultimate membership to the EU. This is closely interlinked with the fact that the SPD has emphasized different conditions for membership than the CDU. The analysis of this time span is also interesting as it the SPD with Gerhard Schröder enjoyed being in government. This has also made the policy formulation towards Turkey's EU Accession process more sensitive.

Against this background this chapter will address the following questions: How did the SPD's policy towards European Integration evolve? Was the SPD supportive of European integration from its very beginning? How did the party's official stance towards European Integration and EU Enlargement evolve? How did the stance towards Turkey change after 1990? What was the role of Germany under SPD and Gerhard Schröder in the period 1998-2005? How did the government change from CDU to SPD in 1998 change the attitudes towards Turkey's EU membership bid? What were the reasons of their support in 1999 Helsinki, 2002 Copenhagen and 2004 Brussels Summits? How did the changes in government in Turkey in 1999 and 2002 affect the stance of Germany? Did the

SPD and Gerhard Schröder apply exclusionary policy towards Turkey on grounds of cultural differences? Did Germany under SPD and Gerhard Schröder adopt different attitudes towards the CEEC's and Turkey? What were the effects of improved relations between Turkey and the EU and Germany in the incumbency of SPD and Schröder?

3.2. The Historical Evolution of the SPD Stance towards European Union Enlargement

As the general trajectory of the SPD support for European History, the stance of the party towards EU Enlargement just ameliorated in time. This is also evident when early party documents are analysed.

Preceding occurrences in the history of the SPD have culminated in the Eisenacher Programm 1863 and the Gothaer Programm 1875. The rapid expansion of the Social Democrats urged Chancellor Otto von Bismarck to pass a law on the dangerous activities of the Social Democrats. After the First World War, the SPD with Friedrich Ebert becoming the first Reich President became effective in the period of 1919-1925. In this period the SPD adopted two programmes: Görlitzer Programm 1921 and the Heidelberger Programm 1925. The Heidelberg Programm of 1925 for example called for a United States of Europe and committed the party to the transition to socialism and condemned exploitation in any form whether be they race, class, gender or nationality⁸⁷. In 1933 the SPD was banned by the National Socialists. After the Nazi period and the Second World War, the SPD re-established itself in West Germany and joined national elections in 1946. The eastern part of the SPD was compelled to be merged with the Communist Party (Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands-KPD) to the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED)).

⁸⁷ William Smaldone (2009), *Confronting Hitler-German Social Democrats in Defense of the Weimar Republic, 1929–1933*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: UK, p.10.

After the Second World War, Kurt Schumacher was the leader of the party during 1945-1952. Schumacher urged more on national interests of Germany rather than unconditionally supporting Adenauer's alignment policy with the West. Schumacher prioritized German reunification over Western European integration⁸⁸. Upon the failure of the European Defence Community and the death of Schumacher, the SPD revised its critical stance on the nascent European integration. The SPD underwent significant changes during the 1950's and transformed itself from a cadre party to a Volkspartei. The Bad Godesberg Party Conference was a break with the SPD's Marxist credentials. The party programme adopted at Bad Godesberg articulated also the embedding of a reunited Germany in the European security system⁸⁹. The programme ascertained the dedication to a re-unification of Germany and its positioning in the European security system. The program also vocalized its support of an economic cooperation of European states whereby stressing the economic and social progress of the states and alludes to the fact that regional cooperation should not end in exclusion of others⁹⁰. Important here, this last sentence alludes to the widening of European Integration. In 1969 with the election of Willy Brandt, the SPD became the ruling party. 1969-1974 with the incumbency of Willy Brandt and 1974-1982 with Helmut Schmidt the SPD shaped German policy. Willy Brandt initiated his renowned "Ostpolitik"⁹¹ and favoured a more loose European integration but supports. SPD

⁸⁸ Richard Moeller, "The German Social Democrats", in John Gaffney (1996), *Political Parties and the European Union*, Routledge: London. p. 34.

⁸⁹ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD), Bad Godesberg Programm, p.18. Available from http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1816/data/godesberger_programm.pdf

⁹⁰ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD), Bad Godesberg Programm 1959, p.18. Available from http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1816/data/godesberger_programm.pdf

⁹¹ Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik mainly signified a departure from the CDU's western integration policy and Hallstein Doctrine of 1955. Germany under Brandt signed the treaty of Moscow in 1970 recognizing European Borders; Treaty of Warsaw 1970, that recognized People's Republic of Poland and the Oder-Neisse Line as border. Four Power Agreement (also known as the Quadripartite Agreement) of September 1971. Treaty of Prague 1973 was also signed. In 1972, the Basic Treaty with East Germany was signed which established formal relations between the two German states.

in the incumbency of Brandt also supported the enlargement to Britain. Later, Chancellor Schmidt supported the enlargement to Portugal and Spain after the end of their dictatorships. However, he preserved a more critical attitude towards the inclusion of Greece. But in general, the coincidence of the incumbency of Schmidt with global economic problems of the 1970's evolved a more pragmatic approach to European integration. Schmidt, together with French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing is the architect of the European Monetary System. The years between 1982 -1998 were marked by the opposition position of the SPD. In this period, the SPD mainly pressed for institutional reforms within the European Union. Reforms of the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and a more engagement of the public to European decision-making were urged by the SPD⁹².

The "Berlin Programm" of 1989 that was altered in 1998 provides more insight into the altered stance towards EU Enlargement. The programme interlinks European integration with peace in the European continent and attributes a historical role to the European Union by stating that it is an actor of economic, industrial, technical and scientific progress for intact environment and sustainable development for the Third World⁹³. The "Berlin Programm" also directly refers to Germany's and the European Union's role for Eastern European states and the surmounting of the division in Europe by indicating that the EU should be willing to accept all democracies of Europe as members and offer forms of cooperation to Eastern European states⁹⁴. Here to note, this last sentence is a direct indication of a preference of further Enlargement. The Programme further reiterates the support of the SPD for a United States of Europe and welcomes the positive developments in democratization in East, Central and South Europe as a hope for Europe⁹⁵.

⁹² Moeller (1996), op.cit., p.42

⁹³ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD), Berliner Programm 1989, p.16. Available from http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1812/data/berliner_programm.pdf

⁹⁴ Ibid., p.17.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

The end of the Cold War and the reunification of Germany left the SPD in a challenging domestic and international context. In this vein, Sloam has made an extensive study on the EU policy the SPD. He analyses the post-unification European policy of the SPD and mainly divides the period into four: the first period at the beginning of the 1990's that was marked by strategic and programmatic pluralism. The second period in the mid 1990's was marked by a more diffused European policy. The period from 1996-1998 that faced a more organized European policy affected by national interests and finally the fourth complex period from 1998 onwards when the SPD with Gerhard Schröder was the ruling party⁹⁶. The difference between early 1990's and 1998 election of Schröder are also reflected on the difference in policy making when being in the position of opposition or government. This is elucidated by William Paterson, who differentiates between political parties in opposition, political parties government in waiting and finally political parties in government⁹⁷. Based on Paterson's description, Sloam suggests that the SPD in opposition in early 1990's was much more freer in policy formulation and even sometimes using European subjects for populist purposes than in government after 1998 when Gerhard Schröder became Chancellor⁹⁸. Sloam divides the European policy of the SPD basically in three terms, the first being the time in opposition in the early to mid-1990s, when the party leadership moved from a total acceptance of the cross-party consensus on European policy to questioning aspects of European integration that were not considered to be in Germany's best interests. The second phase, from 1996 to 1998, marked the SPD's transition to a government in waiting (seen as a potential government by the electorate), when the party produced a more credible and

⁹⁶ James Sloam (2005), *The European Policy of the German Social Democrats Interpreting a Changing World*, Palgrave MacMillan: New York, p.2.

⁹⁷ William Paterson,(1981), "Political Parties and the Making of Foreign Policy- the Case of the Federal Republic", *Review of International Studies*, Vol.7, p. 232.

⁹⁸ Sloam (2005), op. cit, pp. 54-55.

coherent EU policy strongly linked to national political themes. The third phase is the term when the party has been in government and had to adapt to a altered context placing far greater emphasis on European interests in a highly interdependent EU⁹⁹.

In this vein, the **SPD Programm für die Bundestagswahl 1998** (SPD Programme for National elections in 1998)¹⁰⁰ and the **Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN 1998** (Coalition agreement between the SPD and the Bündnis 90/Die Grünen of 1998)¹⁰¹ express their support for EU enlargement by emphasizing democratic reforms in the acceding states. The effect of the GRÜNEN is discernible in the utterance of ecologic and environmental concerns. This is also prevalent in the **Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN 2002** (Coalition agreement of 2002 between the SPD and Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN)¹⁰² that emphasizes both deepening and widening of the EU. The **Europamanifest der SPD 2003** (SPD manifesto for European elections in 2003) ascertained the SPD's support for enlargement, though here only explicitly naming the 10 CEEC's and Romania and

⁹⁹ James Sloam (2003) “ ‘Responsibility for Europe’: the EU Policy of the German Social Democrats since Unification”, *German Politics*, Vol.12, No.1, p.61.

¹⁰⁰ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1998), “Arbeit, Innovation und Gerechtigkeit-SPD Programm für die Bundestagswahl 1998”, Beschluß des außerordentlichen Parteitages der SPD am 17. April 1998 in Leipzig. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bibliothek/retro-scans/a98-04467.pdf>

¹⁰¹ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1998), “Aufbruch und Erneuerung - Deutschlands Weg ins 21. Jahrhundert”, Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN”, Bonn, 20. Oktober 1998. Available online at http://www.boell.de/downloads/stiftung/1998_koalitionsvertrag.pdf

¹⁰² Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2002), Erneuerung – Gerechtigkeit – Nachhaltigkeit, Für ein wirtschaftlich starkes, soziales und ökologisches Deutschland. Für eine lebendige Demokratie.” Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN, Berlin, den 16. Oktober 2002. Available online at http://www.boell.de/downloads/stiftung/2002_Koalitionsvertrag.pdf

Bulgaria.¹⁰³ The **Regierungsprogramm 2002-2006** (Government Programme of 2002-2006) also indicated the continuous support for enlargement by indicating mainly the reciprocal economic benefits of an enlargement and its contribution to unifying Europe and establishing peace. However it has to be noted that the government programme also inserted the support for 7 year's transition periods for the accession countries¹⁰⁴.

The **Hamburger Programm** of 2007 again lays the principles of the SPD comprehension of the European Union. The SPD attributes the EU the role of a peace project that combined with social democracy constitutes a tolerant Europe that accepts different nations, religions and cultures as enrichment¹⁰⁵. The programme ascertains the support for a democratic, federal and social Europe that acts as peace power. The programme also spares one explicit and direct paragraph on the enlargement of the European Union by also alluding to Turkey:

The enlargement of the union has created peace, stability and wealth. We engage in fulfilling promises that have been given to states being granted accession perspectives and fulfil the criteria. This holds also for Turkey. A Turkey being dedicated to European values can be an important bridge to another Islam states. This is also in the interests of Germany and Europe¹⁰⁶.

The SPD, contrary to the CDU felt also freer to define European Union policy more on German interests. Although the SPD does not break with the traditional cross-party consensus on European Integration it must be said that the SPD has adopted a more pragmatic approach to European Union integration. This can be also viewed in the broad context of a normalisation of German politics as

¹⁰³ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2003), "Europamanifest der SPD", Europadelegiertenkonferenz am 16. November 2003. Available at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/netzquelle/02088.pdf>

¹⁰⁴ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2002), "Erneuerung und Zusammenhalt –Wir in Deutschland, Regierungsprogramm 2002 –2006". Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bibliothek/retro-scans/a02-03539.pdf>

¹⁰⁵ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2007), Hamburger Programm, p.26. Available at http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1778/data/hamburger_programm.pdf

¹⁰⁶ Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD)(2007), op.cit. p.30.

alleged by many scholars and politicians. The SPD's post-unification European Union policy is labelled by Sloam as "pragmatic multilateralism"¹⁰⁷ that is an expression of responsiveness to its policy environment and climate changes which are defined as the German unification, the Mittellage of Germany (Germany's post Cold War geographical central position in Europe), the penetration and rise of European integration and the effects of globalisation¹⁰⁸.

Succinctly it can be said that the SPD favoured European Union Enlargement but adopted a more pragmatic approach than the CDU. The SPD pursued the continuity of German support for EU Enlargement but with a new government style¹⁰⁹. This can be explained with the party being a longer time in opposition and its initial critical EU stance. The SPD in the incumbency of Gerhard Schröder adopted the traditional pro-EU rhetoric of Germany but claims a more assertive role in defining German interests within German European policy.

The clear favour of enlargement and inclusion of Turkey is important and different than the stance of the Christian Democrats. Also to note here is the emphasis of democratic values rather than religious or common cultural and historical values excluding Turkey.

The official speeches of SPD politicians as Gerhard Schröder in government and Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul in opposition period in the Kohl incumbency and Sigmar Gabriel and Peer Steinbrück in the Merkel incumbency reveal insights into the SPD stance towards EU enlargement and Turkey. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, in Bundestag speeches in the 1990's continuously pressed for democratic reforms in Turkey and the Kurdish problem and also indicated clearly that at given conditions a membership of Turkey was not possible. Contrarily Gerhard Schröder can be rendered the most supportive

¹⁰⁷ Sloam (2005), op.cit., p.29.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. p.33.

¹⁰⁹ Martin Jerabek (2011), *Deutschland und die Osterweiterung der EU*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: Morlenbach, Deutschland, p.123.

politician in Germany of Turkish membership. He was also labelled the “Chancellor of the Turks”. It is important to note that after the SPD became ruling party in 1998, it adopted a vocal support position towards European enlargement with Gerhard Schröder. The insistence on democratic reforms in early 1990’s made room for more engaged policy making in asserting SPD’s role in the historic enlargement of 2004. In a speech of 2001 to Germany’s EU policy, Schröder speaks of a Europe that is not solely geographically defined but includes cultural security and especially economic aspects.¹¹⁰ In a Bundestag debate prior to the Copenhagen Summit of 2002 Schröder addresses the enlargement policy and the prospective decision on Turkey by stating that the case of Turkey should not be taken as a problem abused at election campaigns. Schröder states that he will act together with Jaques Chirac at the Summit and refers to some speeches of CDU politicians Helmut Kohl, Michael Glos and CSU politician Christian Schmidt pointing to the Turkish case. Schröder reassures its stance to be taken at the summit and accuses the CDU of abusing the case of Turkey and continuity of German foreign policy¹¹¹. Schröder reassures his support for the opening of accession negotiations with Turkey if Turkey fulfils the Copenhagen criteria and expressed his support for continuation of democratic reforms in Turkey and says that the “European Union has to be true to its word”¹¹². He points to the positive security aspects of Turkey’s accession and “conciliation between Islamic belief and western democratic ideals”¹¹³. In 2005 after the commencement of accession

¹¹⁰ Rede von Gerhard Schröder zur Europapolitik Deutschlands (20 November 2001) . Available on http://www.cvce.eu/obj/rede_von_gerhard_schroder_zur_europapolitik_deutschlands_20_november_2001-de-4677ec97-7782-4c5e-a7a2-aff3304da633.html (accessed on 12.08.2012).

¹¹¹ Bundestag (2002), Stenographischer Bericht, 13.Sitzung, 4. Dezember 2002.

¹¹² Gerhard Schröder (2004), Rede des Bundeskanzlers am 23. Februar in Ankara, Available on <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/adrien.barbaresi/corpora/BR/t/616.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

¹¹³ Gerhard Schröder (2004), Rede des Bundeskanzlers am 15.04.2004 an der Erasmus Universität "World Leader Cycle", Available on <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/adrien.barbaresi/corpora/BR/t/639.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012).

negotiations on a visit to Turkey, Schröder reassures “that the only objective is full membership and nothing else” and indicates that “Europe is not the addition of geographical and historical data but a political project for a common future in peace and democracy, economic wealth, social participation and cultural and religious plurality”¹¹⁴. In his speeches after his incumbency as Chancellor, Schröder expressed his continuous support for Turkish membership and reiterates its important role in the conciliation between democracy and Islam¹¹⁵. SPD Party Chairmen since 2009, Sigmar Gabriel also expresses his support for Turkish membership and Turkey’s conciliatory role between Islam and Western Democracy¹¹⁶. Gabriel does also address migration and reiterates the importance on integration¹¹⁷.

It is obvious from official publications and speeches of the SPD that the party has a general pro EU and pro enlargement attitude. The SPD also manifests its commitment to promises made to candidate states.

Before proceeding with deeper analysis one important complementary question needs to be further answered with respect to the enlargement policy of SPD. Although there are derivations, wholesomely it can be said that the SPD pursued a more uniform enlargement policy towards the CEEC’s and Turkey

¹¹⁴ Gerhard Schröder (2005), Rede von Bundeskanzler Gerhard Schröder am 12. Oktober 2005 in Istanbul. Available on <http://archiv.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Archiv16/Rede/2005/10/2005-10-12-rede-von-bundeskanzler-gerhard-schroeder-am-12-oktober-2005-in-istanbul.html?nn=273438> (accessed on 12.08.2012).

¹¹⁵ Das Abendblatt, (28.10.2010), Schröder will große EU-Erweiterung: Ex-Kanzler wünscht sich Aufnahme der Türkei und Freihandelszone mit Russland. Available on <http://www.abendblatt.de/politik/deutschland/article1677334/Schroeder-will-grosse-EU-Erweiterung.html> (accessed on 15.08.2012).

¹¹⁶ Focus, (03.11.2010), “Türkei-Politik: Gabriel wirft Merkel „Spielchen“ vor”, Available on http://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/tuerkei-politik-gabriel-wirft-merkel-spielchen-vor_aid_568443.html (accessed on 16.08.2012)

¹¹⁷ Die Welt, (07.10.2011), “Sigmar Gabriel auf Integrationstour”, Available on http://www.welt.de/print/die_welt/hamburg/article13646352/Sigmar-Gabriel-auf-Integrationstour.html (accessed on 18.11.2012).

when compared to Turkey. This assumption is based on the evidence of SPD pursuing a much more pragmatic enlargement policy which does not exclude Turkey on identity or cultural grounds. Rather, enlargement is seen by the SPD in a more pragmatic and realist way drawing attention on economic and security benefits and considerations.

3.3. Gerhard Schröder and Turkey's EU Accession Process: Good Times for Turkey

This section will focus on the SPD policy towards Turkish EU accession. The focus will be the incumbency of Chancellor Schröder. The stance of the SPD is evaluated by focusing on Chancellor Schröder. Although the focus is taken as being the SPD, it should not be omitted that Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Schröder Cabinet, Joschka Fischer also represents a supportive figure towards Turkish accession. Moreover the framework of analysis is restricted to overtly take the stance as being represented by main figures of the party.

The questions that will be tried first to answer here is how the SPD with Schröder has altered its position towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement. Here it is important to discern the entrenched transformation of the SPD stance from the early 1990's during the incumbency of Gerhard Schröder and how this has been protracted until 2012. Further it is important to ask whether the SPD under Gerhard Schröder adopted different attitudes towards the CEEC's and Turkey and what the reasons of support for Turkish membership are? By challenging the last question it will be ascertained that Turkey's democratic reforms after the candidate status in 1999 and the dedication of the 2002 elected AKP government to European Union membership constitute the main reasons for support of the SPD but also the main effects of the improving relations between Turkey-Germany-EU triangles. The personal interest of Gerhard Schröder in sustaining strong close relations with Turkey is also another reason. Schröder personally rendered Turkey important with referring to economic benefits and geopolitical and security related considerations. The section will begin with an

analysis of the decisions on the Helsinki Summit of 1999, the Copenhagen Summit of 2002 and the Brussels Summit of 2004. By analysing these summits, the role of Germany under SPD and Gerhard Schröder rule will be elucidated. The section will further analyse the effects of this support. Thereby it is purported that the enabling environment of 1999-2005 created the pace of democratic reforms in Turkey.

So this section tries to answer the question of how did the change in government in Germany affect Turkey' EU membership bid? Why did the new government of Schröder support Turkey's membership bid? How did the change in governments in 1999 and 2002 in Turkey affect this? What were the effects in Turkey of the improvement of relations with the EU and Germany's involvement in it?

3.3.1. Policy Change from Helsinki to Copenhagen and Brussels

After the disappointing decision not to grant Turkey candidacy status at the Luxembourg Summit in 1997, relations between Turkey and the European Union deteriorated. This went so far as to declarations of then Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz for suspension of the political dialogue with the EU and accusing Germany and Helmut Kohl of pursuing Hitler's Lebensraum policy. Yılmaz having educational and familial ties to Germany was deeply offended by Kohl's contribution to the decision taken at Luxembourg¹¹⁸. Therefore, it is interesting to analyse what for reasons paved the way for the decision at the Helsinki Summit of 1999 to grant candidacy status to Turkey. The letter exchanges between Turkish Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and the German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder¹¹⁹ and Turkish reassurance of dedication of the fulfilling of the Copenhagen Criteria

¹¹⁸ The Economist, (12.03.1998), "Mesut Yılmaz, ambivalent Turk", Available on <http://www.economist.com/node/371347> (accessed on 23.12.2012).

¹¹⁹ Hürriyet, Tarihi Mektuplar, available online at <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=-83722>

facilitated the positive outcome at the Helsinki Summit¹²⁰ which acknowledged that “Turkey is a candidate state destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States”¹²¹.

The first reason of change of attitudes was the change in government in Germany. The new SPD/Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN government had a more positive and pragmatic account of Turkey’s EU membership bid. They did not reject Turkish membership on cultural grounds as done by the CDU, rather the SPD clings the progress of membership perspective to improvements in the democratic credentials of Turkey. Schröder had declared already prior to the Helsinki Summit that he would press for the declaration of candidacy for Turkey by saying that he wants a European Turkey and therefore have to open a credible European perspective to Turkey¹²². Whereas the decision of Helsinki was backed up by his party the SPD, it was criticized by the CDU and CSU¹²³.

It is important to note that in the 1998 federal elections, the Social Democrats after 16 years of opposition came to power with Gerhard Schröder as Chancellor. This change brought hope for Turkey after the negative stance of Kohl and the CDU. It has to be noted that it was much to Schröder’s person in himself who vehemently supported Turkey and the Commissioner for Enlargement Günther Verheugen himself being a German Social Democrat. Not to forget here the role the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Joschka Fischer, being a politician of the Bündnis 90/Die Grünen. Fischer also supported Turkey’s

¹²⁰ Şahin Alpay (2006), “EU’s ‘Soft Power’: The Case of Turkey”, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Fokus Türkei 03/2006, p.3. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/tuerkei/04799.pdf>

¹²¹ Presidency Conclusion, the Helsinki European Council, 10 and 11 December 1999. Available online at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/hel1_en.htm

¹²² Der Spiegel (03.12.1999), “Auf nach Europa: Schröder will die Türkei integrieren”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/auf-nach-europa-schroeder-will-die-tuerkei-integrieren-a-55030.html> (Accessed on 09.12.2012).

¹²³ Der Spiegel (10.12.1999), “Christdemokraten Ausweitung auf zwölf EU-Kandidaten ‘falscher Weg’”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/christdemokraten-ausweitung-auf-zwoelf-eu-kandidaten-falscher-weg-a-55988.html> (Accessed on 09.12.2012)

membership by taking stock and referring to her democratic reforms¹²⁴. Contrarily, in the early 1990's the SPD, due to Turkey's poor human rights record defended a much more critical stance towards Turkey. The speeches of Heidemarie Wiczorek-Zeul in the Bundestag have been emblematic for that. But Schröder's perception of Turkey was one of attributing Turkey a conciliatory role between Islam and western democratic values. Complementarily the SPD supported Turkey and dual citizenship in Germany due to the more than 3 millions of Turkish migrants in Germany. The accession of Turkey was seen by the SPD as a way to grant a more smooth integration of that part. The Turkish migrant population in Germany is also more inclined to vote for the SPD which has been also a fact of the support of the SPD and the mistrust of the CDU¹²⁵. The SPD's perception of multicultural enrichment concomitantly with Turkey's reform pace was important to understand the support of the party. Here the views of Verheugen are important who contrarily to the CDU's cultural and identity based rejection of Turkey's membership acknowledges Turkey as being a part of Europe to whom the EU has made unbreakable promises¹²⁶. In April 1999, with the new coalition government of Bülent Ecevit democratic reforms were slightly initiated which also contributed in the long term to the change in attitude of the SPD and the concomitant positive decision at Helsinki. The reform period beginning in 1999 has been analysed in terms of Europeanization of Turkey and EU conditionality. The details on the reform process will be elucidated in the next section.

Further reasons of a positive decision at Helsinki as argued by Font are conglomerated in five dynamics that have lead to the favourable decision for

¹²⁴ Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (22.01.2004), "EU-Erweiterung-Türkei-Beitritt wichtiger als ein Raketenabwehrsystem", Available on <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/eu-erweiterung-tuerkei-beitritt-wichtiger-als-ein-raketenabwehrsystem-1143364.html> (Accessed on 23.12.2012).

¹²⁵ Ziya Öniş (2000), "Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards an Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations", *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 35, Issue.4, p.471.

¹²⁶ Günther Verheugen, Interview, 18.09.2012.

Turkey: 1999 Kosovo crisis that prioritized again international security and EU's quest for stability with neighbours; the social democratic political rise in Europe, here especially to note the rise of the SPD in Germany as mentioned above; the rising interest of Turkish political elite and civil society for the EU process; the government of Bülent Ecevit elected in 1999 that was more willing to adopt reforms for EU accession; the earthquake in 1999 that led to rapprochement between Greece and Turkey and general empathy for Turkey in the EU¹²⁷. Müftüler Baç and Mc Laren also summarize the reasons of support in terms of change in government in Germany and the rapprochement with Greece in change in government both in Turkey and in Greece (in Greece Theo Pangalos was succeeded by George Papandreou who was more moderate in his approach to Turkey)¹²⁸. They also refer to Germany and her patron responsibility explicitly pursued towards Poland and adds that Turkey was deprived of such a support and was rather challenged with the opposite of the Kohl government and the problems with Greece¹²⁹.

Öniş adds, to the awareness of Turkey's importance with respect to the abovementioned economic and security dynamic and the rise of social democrats in Europe, the importance of the United States as supporter of Turkish accession¹³⁰.

The initial euphoria in 1999 Helsinki supported Turkey's reform process but on the EU side no clear support as in the case of the CEEC's was visible. The election of the AKP in November 2002 raised fears of Turkey's drifting to Islamism. But paradoxically the new elected government of Erdoğan dedicated

¹²⁷ Nuria Font(2006), "Why the European Union Gave Turkey the Green Light", *Journal for Contemporary European Studies*, Vol.14,No.2, p.206.

¹²⁸ Meltem Müftüler Baç and Lauren Mc Laren (2003), "Enlargement Preferences and Policy-Making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol.25,No.1, pp.23-26.

¹²⁹ Ibid, p.22.

¹³⁰ Ziya Öniş (2000), op.cit. p. 474.

itself to getting a date of start of accession negotiations. As explained by Avcı, “The AKP’s leader Erdoğan moved quickly to assure the West that he did not have an Islamic agenda and was committed to the secular principles that govern Muslim Turkey. Erdoğan also promised support for Turkey’s bid to join the European Union after the first unofficial election results. Once the government was sworn into office in late November, Erdoğan embarked upon a series of trips to visit European Union leaders¹³¹. One of these visits was also paid to German Chancellor Schröder who expressed his support for Turkish membership and accused the policy of the CDU as being populist¹³². So the election of the AKP government did not cause a change in Turkey’s membership bid.

The 2002 Copenhagen Summit declared that “if the European Council in December 2004...decides that Turkey fulfils the Copenhagen political criteria, the European Union will open accession negotiations with Turkey without delay¹³³”. So the Copenhagen summit provided Turkey with a “date for a date of starting negotiations”. The decision to postpone a clear date for Turkey is explained by Keyman and Öniş in the context of core EU members like Germany that were not definitely satisfied with Turkey’s democratic reforms and demanded more encouragement and the EU states were suspicious about the AKP’s EU credentials and wanted to pass more time¹³⁴. The postponement of getting a date for the commencement of negotiations caused also disappointment in Turkey and revealed the clash in different perceptions of Social Democrats and Christian

¹³¹ Gamze Avcı, “Turkey’s EU Politics. Consolidating Democracy through Enlargement?” in Helene Sjursen (ed.)(2006), *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*, Routledge: New York, p.71.

¹³² Der Spiegel (02.09.2003), “Schröder bezeichnet Türkei-Kritik der Union als billige Polemik”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/erdogan-besuch-schroeder-bezeichnet-tuerkei-kritik-der-union-als-billige-polemik-a-264073.html> (Accessed 22.12.2012)

¹³³ Presidency Conclusions, Copenhagen, 12 and 13 December 2002. Available online at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf

¹³⁴ Fuat Keyman and Ziya Öniş (2005), “Helsinki, Copenhagen and beyond-Challenges to the New Europe and the Turkish State” in Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe, *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, Routledge: New York, p.188.

Democrats on Turkey again¹³⁵. Whereas the decision caused certain dismay in Turkey it was assured by the German Foreign Minister from the Bündnis90/Die GRÜNEN as breakthrough and the British Prime Minister Tony Blair assuaged Turkey by saying that the accession negotiations would start without delay¹³⁶.

Major reforms have been undertaken in Turkey in 2003 and 2004 with the aim of getting a definite date at the December Brussels Summit in 2004. During this period, Turkey was assured of the support of Germany as evident from an article by Joschka Fischer: “The German Government has time and again expressed its unrelenting support for accession negotiations if Turkey meets the Copenhagen political criteria. Our optimism regarding the European Commission’s next progress report is based on the continuing efforts of the Turkish Government to comply with the political criteria”¹³⁷. These reform efforts of Turkey will be provided in the succeeding section. This period has been delineated by Narbone and Tocci as being the “highest intensity years of the reform process¹³⁸” due to the engagement of the AKP who, by commitment to the EU consolidated its party legitimization and tried to get rid off domestic and international suspicions of its alleged Islamist agenda¹³⁹. At the Brussels Summit on 16-17 December 2004, Turkey was finally provided with a date of 3rd October 2005¹⁴⁰ to start accession negotiations. The bargaining at the summit was firm and

¹³⁵ Keyman and Öniş (2005), op.cit., p.189.

¹³⁶The Guardian (14.12.2002), “EU embraces 10 new members-and opens the door to Turkey”, Available on <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/dec/14/eu.politics3> (own translation) (accessed on 09.12.2012).

¹³⁷ Joschka Fischer (2004), “Turkey’s European Perspective: The German View”, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 3, p.2.

¹³⁸ Luigi Carbone and Natalie Tocci (2007), “Running around in Circles? The cyclical relationship between Turkey and the European Union”, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9, No.3, p. 235

¹³⁹ Ibid, p.239.

¹⁴⁰ Presidency Conclusions, Brussels 16 and 17 December 2004. Available online at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf

Erdogan commented that the result was the reward of the 41 years long waiting, referring to the 1963 Ankara Agreement and the promise of Walter Hallstein of the accession of Turkey¹⁴¹. Not to omit, with Federal elections in Germany held in September 2005 CDU and Angela Merkel were elected. Although this immediate change did not reverse the previously at the Brussels Summit taken decision in 2004 to commence negotiations on 3 October 2005, it nevertheless brought about a different and strained era of relations between Turkey, Germany and the European Union.

3.3.2. Effects of SPD Support for Turkey's EU Accession Process

The preceding section focused on the reasons of SPD and Gerhard Schröder support to Turkey and how these lead to decisions of declaration of candidacy status of Turkey and providing date for the commencement of accession negotiations. It is purported that the upper analysis would be incomplete without incorporating the effects of this support on Turkey. Hereby the overtly improvement in relations are taken as basis. It is purported that the general support of Germany, as leading state within the EU supporting EU enlargement by including Turkey, facilitated wholesome democratic reforms. This section does not aim to elucidate as did by Tocci, to what extent the European Union has triggered democratic reforms and to what extent domestic actors have just used prospective accession as anchor for reforms¹⁴². Democratic reforms are rather rendered as developments coinciding with improvement of relations with the EU. The role of Germany is acknowledged as distinctive. It is purported that Germany under Schröder supported Turkey's reforms because of the prospect of enlargement of Turkey. Schröder acknowledged Turkey's economic role and its

¹⁴¹ Der Spiegel(17.12.2004), "EU-Gipfel zur Türkei Erdogans Rache", Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/eu-gipfel-zur-tuerkei-erdogans-rache-a-333402.html>, (own translation) (accessed on 09.12.2012).

¹⁴² Natalie Tocci (2005), "Europeanization in Turkey: Trigger or Anchor for Reform", *South European Society&Politics*, Vol.10, No.1, pp.73-83.

geopolitical positions as opportunities for Germany and the European Union. Schröder's acknowledgement of democratic reforms in Turkey is important¹⁴³. Complementary, the SPD pursued an inclusionary stance towards Turkey, by emphasizing Turkey's competence in democratic reforms. This section states that the positive climate in Europe and especially Germany combined with the coalition government of Bülent Ecevit and the subsequent government of the AKP mutually contributed to the evolving of relations and Turkey recording substantial progress on the way to membership.

This section mainly deals with the pace of democratic reforms undertaken in Turkey between the years of 1999-2005 which coincide with the improvement of relations between the European Union and Germany under Chancellor Schröder on the one side and Turkey on the other. Thereby this section puts forward that this international environment mainly facilitated democratic reforms in Turkey and that Turkey was much encouraged during this time by the support of Germany.

The 1998 election of Gerhard Schröder and the SPD was soon followed by the formation of the coalition government of the Democratic Left Party (Demokratik Sol Parti-DSP), the Nationalist Movement Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi-MHP) and the Motherland Party (Anavatan Partisi-ANAP). It can be mainly said that Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and Minister for Foreign Affairs İsmail Cem were more positive of the accession to the European Union after the Helsinki Summit in 1999. This section will first provide the major changes in the constitution and laws. These were also made in the context of the documents framing Turkey's Accession. Upon the declaration of Turkey as candidate country, on 8 March 2001 the Accession Partnership Document¹⁴⁴ was adopted by

¹⁴³ Berliner Zeitung (23.02.2004), "Kanzler wirbt für Reformen", Bettina Westring, Available on <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/archiv/kanzler-wirbt-fuer-reformen.10810590.10153960.html> (Accessed on 23.12.2012)

¹⁴⁴ Council of the European Union (2001), "Council Decision of 8 March 2001 on the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with the Republic of Turkey", Official Journal of the European Communities. Available online at

the Council of the European Union which was revised in 2003, 2006 and 2008. The Accession Partnership Document laid down the framework of the required steps Turkey needs to take on the road to EU membership. In response to the Accession Partnership Document, Turkey adopted its National Programme for the Adoption of the Aquis on 24 March 2001 which was revised in 2003 and 2006. These documents combined with the Negotiation Framework of 2005 are the basic documents conceptualizing the conditionality of the EU and the commitment of Turkey.

Turkey adopted eight Harmonization Packages during the period 6 February 2002 – 14 July 2004. The ninth reform package was adopted on 12 April 2008. In October 2001 with 34 constitutional amendments comprehensive changes were made to individual rights and freedoms, especially to freedom of thought and expression and equality between man and woman. The statute of the National Security Council (Milli Güvenlik Kurulu-MGK) was changed to “advisory”. With the entry into force of the new Civil Code in January 2002 many improvements were achieved on the fields of equality between man and women, protection of children and on the statute of associations and foundations. With the First Harmonization Package in February 2002 many amendments were made to the Penal Code, the Law on the Fight against Terrorism and the Law on the State Security Courts. With the Second Harmonization Package adopted on 26 March 2002 amendments were made to the Law on Political Parties, Law on Press, Law on Associations, Law on Meetings and Demonstrations. With the Third Harmonization Package adopted on 3 August 2002, death penalty was repealed with the exception of times of war; broadcasting in languages other than Turkish was allowed and the retrial for all cases that the European Court of Human Rights finds to be in violation of the European Convention of Human

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!CELEXnumdoc&numdoc=32001D0235&lg=en

Rights was introduced¹⁴⁵. With the Fourth Harmonization Package adopted on 2nd January 2003, the Fifth Harmonization Package adopted on 23rd January 2003, the Sixth Harmonization Package adopted on 15 July 2003 and the Seventh Harmonization Package adopted on 30 July 2003, many previous amendments were strengthened and new ones were introduced as regards torture and ill-treatment, the constraining of treatment of civil persons by military courts. The Protocol 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights was also adopted. All death sentences were also converted to life imprisonment. Turkey adopted also the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of the United Nations in 2003. In January 2004, Turkey also signed Protocol 13 to the ECHR that abolishes the death penalty in all circumstances. Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law was also repealed which had been used for the imprisonment of journalists and publishers for crimes against the indivisible unity of the Turkish Republic¹⁴⁶. The Eight Harmonization Package adopted on 14 July 2004 made ten major amendments to the Constitution, providing constitutional safeguard to the freedom of press, giving priority to the international treaties ratified by the Turkish Parliament over the Constitutional Court, Article 90 of the Constitution. This package also removed the Chief of Staff's representative form the Higher Education Board (Yükseköğretim Kurulu-YÖK) and adopted measures to increase governmental transparency¹⁴⁷. In September 2004, the new Penal Code was also adopted.

Against this background of factual description of the reforms made between 1999-2005 there is the need to complement this with the relevant literature. As these democratic reforms were to some extent path-breaking there

¹⁴⁵ Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği (2007), "Avrupa Birliği Uyum Yasa Paketleri". Available online at <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/pub/abuyp.pdf>

¹⁴⁶ Meltem Müftüler Baç (2005), "Turkey's Political Reforms and the Impact of the European Union", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.10, No.1, p.26.

¹⁴⁷ Müftüler Baç (2005), *op. cit.* p.27.

exists also a huge amount of literature. A comprehensive literature does exist on Turkey's democratic reforms during the period 1999-2005. The literature does also focus on Turkey's Europeanization during that time and the EU's effects by applying conditionality. This period coincides with the incumbency of the SPD under Gerhard Schröder and the coalition government of Bülent Ecevit and the succeeding government of the AKP. Thereinafter, the argument is again that the combination of those actors facilitated democratic reforms.

Aydın and Açıkmeşe argue that with 2001, Turkish foreign policy has been shaped according to the effects of the European Union and its conditionality¹⁴⁸. The reform has been sustained by the AKP government after 2002. There are arguments that the AKP has used the anchor to the EU to secure the very establishment of the party and to use it against a 'suppression' of religion in Turkey.¹⁴⁹ Jonathan Sugden in his study analyses the changes in reform for human rights during these years¹⁵⁰. In a special issue of the South European Society and Politics Journal, the 'transformative power'¹⁵¹.of the European Union on Turkey is analyzed¹⁵². In this study Hale acknowledges the positive effect of the European Union in democratic reforms for human rights in Turkey. He

¹⁴⁸ Mustafa Aydın and Sinem A. Açıkmeşe (2007), "Europeanization through EU Conditionality: Understanding the New Era of Turkish Foreign Policy", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9, No.3, pp. 263-274.

¹⁴⁹ Gamze Avı, "Turkey's EU Politics. Consolidating Democracy through Enlargement?" in Helene Sjursen(ed.) (2006), "Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity", Routledge: USA, p.65. Müftüler Baç (2005), op.cit. p.42.

¹⁵⁰ Jonathan Sugden, "Leverage in Theory and Practice: Human Rights and Turkey's EU Candidacy", in Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe (eds.)(2004), *Turkey and European Integration. Prospects and Issues in the Post-Helsinki Era*, Taylor and Francis Group: USA. pp.241-263.

¹⁵¹ Gamze Avcı and Ali Çarkoğlu (2011), "Introduction: Taking Stock of Dynamics that Shape EU Reforms in Turkey", *South European society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp.209-219.

¹⁵² For further reading in this special issue of the South European Society and Politics Journal see, Antoaneta Dimitrova(2011), "Speeding up or Slowing Down? Lessons from the Last Enlargement on the Dynamics of Enlargement driven Reform", Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 221-233; Kamil Yılmaz (2011), "The EU-Turkey Customs Union Fifteen Years Later: Better, Yet Not the Best Alternative", Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.235-249; Meltem Müftüler Baç (2011), "Turkish Foreign Policy, its Domestic Determinants and the Role of the European Union", Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.279-291.

explains that this effect was high between 2001 and 2005 and concludes that the reforms process slackened after 2005. As a reason to this he provides the negative discourse in France and Germany¹⁵³. Oğuzlu complements in a study that after 2005 Europeanization has lost its zeal but nevertheless states that it will continue¹⁵⁴.

Democratic reforms and Europeanization of Turkey is also interlinked with the role of the military in Turkey. Here, Alpay provides a historical insight into the role of the military and says that the military entered a dilemma with the European perspective¹⁵⁵ and Gürsoy provides an overview of this by articulating that civil

military relations have entered a new phase since 1999¹⁵⁶. Further, Aydınlı puts forward that with democratic reforms, Turkey has left behind a coup era¹⁵⁷.

The time period of 1999-2005 also facilitated steps taken in the Cyprus question and the Kurdish issue. However, the short prospering time span of high speed democratic reforms, as well as internal and external factors were insufficient to provide a solution to those problems. Therefore they continue to remain a problem. Deeper peculiarities of these problems are not to the focus of this study. They are rather provided to complement the picture of developments after Helsinki.

¹⁵³ William Hale (2011), "Human Rights and Turkey's EU Accession Process: Internal and External Dynamics, 2005-10", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, p.323.

¹⁵⁴ H. Tarık Oğuzlu (2012), "Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization without Membership", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, pp.229-243.

¹⁵⁵ Şahin Alpay(2009), "Die politische Rolle des Militärs in der Türkei", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Vol.39-40, p.12.

¹⁵⁶ Yaprak Gürsoy (2011), "The Impact of EU-Driven Reforms on the Political Autonomy of the Turkish Military", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, p.293-308.

¹⁵⁷ Ersel Aydınli (2009), "A Paradigmatic Shift for the Turkish Generals and an End to the Coup Era in Turkey", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol.63, No.4, pp. 581-596.

3.4. Conclusion

The SPD's party establishment as a social and values based party being inclusionary to different cultures, its emphasis on social justice and equality shaped also its policy towards the European Union and EU Enlargement. Although the SPD in principle joins the cross-party consensus on pro-European attitude of Germany it is evident that it has, to some extent, a more pragmatic approach. The SPD is rendered pragmatic compared to the CDU in the sense that its approach towards EU Enlargement is not basically driven by the notion of cultural proximity and common history with the aspirant states towards the EU. Rather, the SPD does emphasis the democratic credentials of aspirant states and changes this attitude in concordance with democratic improvements in those states. This is also the case for Turkey's membership process.

The SPD in the early 1990's, when in opposition was freer to criticize Turkey and had a negative stance towards Turkey's EU Accession Process. This altered with the SPD coming to power in 1998. The Schröder government was strained by being in government and pursued a more positive policy towards Turkey's EU Accession process.

This chapter on the SPD discerned that democratic reforms in Turkey and the interplay between Germany/SPD and Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement are the most important factor in relations. The mutual interdependence, expression of good will and progress of democratic reforms in Turkey paved the way for good improvements in Turkey's EU Accession Process in the period of 1999-2005 and milestone decisions taken at Helsinki, Copenhagen and Brussels.

The SPD government of 1998 adopted a more positive approach towards EU enlargement of Turkey. It improved its stance in tandem with democratic reforms in Turkey. Generally, the SPD although pursuing Germany's traditional supportive role of states like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic treated the CEEC's and Turkey on a more equal basis than the CDU. The party evaluated Turkey and her EU Membership Bid from the perspective of democratic reforms.

The change in government in Germany coincided first with the change in 1999 to the Ecevit government and then in 2002 to the AKP government. But in general relations were good in both terms and the change to AKP did not prove to be a turn in Turkey's EU perspective. The involvement of Gerhard Schröder constituted a special opportunity for Turkey in the period from Helsinki until commencement of negotiations.

However, as will be elucidated in the following chapter, the incumbency of Angela Merkel and the CDU since 2005 and the entangled problems of the last years will again provide the so-called litmus test for Europe and Germany. Cautiously it can be purported that Germany's overt support to continued EU enlargement has come to a halt. The confrontation of CDU and Turkey's special case contributed much to this. Against this background, Germany will hold national elections in 2013. In case the Chancellor candidate of the SPD, Peer Steinbrück will be chosen, the question will be if and how the SPD-Schröder line will be traced by him. The debate on the election campaign of the new Chancellor has been initiated. There are critical views about the compatibility of Peer Steinbrück as Chancellor. The solid presence of Angela Merkel and her CDU is said to alienate the SPD. Even Angela Merkel is said to be without any alternative¹⁵⁸. The weak left in Germany and the possibility of a SPD Chancellor can also be evaluated comparatively in the light of the political situation of Turkey. The left to be mainly represented by the CHP in Turkey has been also rather weak since the election of the AKP government. Prospective scenarios of the continuing CDU-AKP duo or novel SPD-AKP, SPD-CHP or even CDU-CHP duos will have to be proven. However the immediate scenario of CDU-SPD coalition and the relations to EU Enlargement and Turkey needs to be tested yet.

¹⁵⁸ For a evaluation on the political compatibility of Peer Steinbrück see Albrecht von Lucke (2012), "Peer Steinbrück umd die Nulloption", *Blaetter für Deutsche und Internationale Politik*", November 2012. Available online at <http://www.blaetter.de/archiv/jahrgaenge/2012/november>

CHAPTER 4

THE CDU AND EUROPEAN UNION ENLARGEMENT

Turkey is part of Europe. That is really the ultimate meaning of what we are doing today. It confirms in incomparably topical form a truth which is more than the summary expression of a geographical concept or of a historical fact that holds good for several centuries.

(Walter Hallstein, President of the Commission of the European Economic Community and member of the CDU, speech on the occasion of the signature of the Association Agreement with Turkey, on 12. September 1963)

4.1. Introduction

The above issued statement of a renowned German CDU politician has been engraved in the minds of many people in Turkey who are directly or indirectly involved in Turkey's EU Accession process. It serves as one of the main foundations used for defending Turkey's belonging to the European Union. It provides also a good reference when analysing the change in the CDU towards Turkey's EU Accession and the stance towards Turkey's belonging to the EU.

The Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (Christian Democratic Union - CDU) is one of the most important political parties in Germany. With the SPD it constitutes one of Germany's *Volksparteien*. So to say a catch-all party, the CDU encompasses mainly the conservative middle-class electorate in Germany.

The CDU is the solid representative of Germany's classical pro-European Union policy since the very inception in the 1950's. In this vein, the CDU traditionally has also supported EU Enlargement. Although having been traditionally supportive of EU Enlargement, in time, CDU stance towards EU

Enlargement has grown more critical. In this respect, it is distinctive to analyse the CDU stance towards Turkey. The CDU stance towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement has altered in time. This owes much to the end of the Cold War and also the very transformation of the European Union itself.

The CDU has enjoyed long years in government and has witnessed many milestone events in Turkey's EU Accession process. Explicitly the time after 1990 has entrenched along important developments and the interplay between changing governments of CDU and SPD and therefore is attractive to analyse.

It is also for the sake of the coherence of this study to comparatively analyse the commonalties and differences of the incumbencies of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Chancellor Angela Merkel with respect to the above indicated focus points. To the days of Kohl, European Integration was chalked with much euphoria. This was also accompanied by immense political, social and also emotional changes triggered by the end of the Cold War and the unification of Germany. Contrary, in the times of Angela Merkel, both political elite and especially the society has grown much more critical towards further European integration. The Euro-Crisis and mounting domestic unease have created a new more EU-critical Germany. This new environment also had direct effects on Germany's stance towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement.

Against this background this chapter continues with what has already been explored in the first chapter on the background of Germany's stance towards EU Enlargement. With the end of the Cold War the climax of the European Union altered. This also had implications on EU Enlargement. As a corollary of that the accession process of Turkey became more complex and this brought a break in the overall support of the CDU for EU Enlargement.

Against this background this chapter will address the following questions: How did the CDU's policy towards European Integration evolve? How did the party's official stance towards European Integration and EU Enlargement evolve? Does the CDU still protract its traditional pro-EU policy? What are the differences between Helmut Kohl and Angela Merkel with respect to EU policy and European

Union enlargement? How did the stance of the CDU towards Turkey's membership bid change after 1990? What was the role of Germany under CDU and Helmut Kohl in the period 1990-1998 and Angela Merkel from 2005 until today in Turkey's accession process? How did the government change from SPD to CDU in 2005 change the attitudes towards Turkey's EU membership bid? On what grounds did the CDU and Helmut Kohl/Angela Merkel apply exclusionary policy towards Turkey? Did Germany under CDU and Helmut Kohl and Angela Merkel adopt different attitudes towards the CEEC's and Turkey? What were the effects of deteriorated relations between Turkey and the EU and Germany in the incumbency of CDU and Kohl/Merkel on Turkey? How are the prospects for the trajectory of future relations?

4.2. Historical Evolution of the CDU Stance towards European Union Enlargement

The CDU is one of the most important political actors of German political life. Founded in 1945 it was immediately coined by the disgust of the Nazi Era and the World War-II legacy. In the incumbency of Konrad Adenauer covering the years 1949-1963, the CDU traced Germany's immediate after-war years. Adenauer's strong character, his commitment to the European reconstruction, good relations with France and constitution of Germany in multilateral structures enabled Germany to straighten itself up in a relative short time-span. The conditions of after war period and the pressing issue of German reassertion makes it clear why the Christian Democrats dedicated themselves to embedding German into the nascent European Integration.

It was also the case that after the Second World War that in many European states, Christian democracy recorded great success in elections and dominated political life. This can be attributed to the historical roots of Christian democracy, the happenings and ideas before and after 1914, 1933 and 1939,

results of racial and radical based nationalism, the fear of communism¹⁵⁹ and the fact that European liberals and conservatives put greater emphasis on the nation state which was not really popular at that time and the Social Democrats being more internationalists and intergovernmentalists did not focus solely on the European continent and were suspicious of an elite-driven supranational integration project¹⁶⁰. This was also the case in Germany and explains the success of Adenauer.

The inaugural appeals of the CDU were the **Berliner Gründungsaufwurf**¹⁶¹-the call for the establishment of the party and appeal to the people to join it, the **Kölner Leitsätze**¹⁶² and the **Frankfurter Leitsätze**, establishing the principles of the party and the 1948 **Ahlener Programm**¹⁶³ which manifests the economic credentials of the Christian Democrats by abstaining from both Capitalism and Marxism. These documents were essentially based on the after war reestablishment of German Society and economy and did not entail direct references to a broader European political perspective. Concomitant to the creeping developments in European Integration with the Treaty of Paris in 1951 establishing the European Coal and Steel Community, the proposed European Defence Community and European Political Community the CDU made a united Europe a focus of its 1953 Hamburger Programme. The programme manifested

¹⁵⁹ Peter Pulzer, "Nationalism and Internationalism in European Christian Democracy" in Michael Gehler and Wolfram Kaiser (ed)(2005), *Christian democracy in Europe since 1945*, Routledge: London, p.17.

¹⁶⁰ Pulzer (2005), op.cit. p.18.

¹⁶¹ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1945), "Berliner Gründungsaufwurf der CDU: "Deutsches Volk", 1945. Online available on <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

¹⁶² Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1945), "Kölner Leitsätze: Vorläufiger Entwurf zu einem Programm der Christlich Demokratischen Union Deutschlands". Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

¹⁶³ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1947), "Ahlener Programm: CDU überwindet Kapitalismus und Marxismus". Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

the dedication of the CDU to both economic and political unification of Europe¹⁶⁴. Intrinsically, as European Union Enlargement was not on the agenda yet, the programme did not entail any details about enlargement but the emphasis on a United Europe gives as the clue for the later support to enlargement by the CDU. In the incumbency of Adenauer, foreign policy was for him, primary concern determined at achieving Germany's sovereignty and coined by the disgust of communism¹⁶⁵, the prioritization of Westpolitik to Ostpolitik¹⁶⁶ and the importance of Franco-German reconciliation¹⁶⁷.

The 1968 **Berlin Programm** refers directly to a Europe Policy and for the first time to enlargement by stipulating that the Community should be widened with eligible aspirant states¹⁶⁸. The 1978 **Ludwigshafener Programm** further elaborates the principles of European policy by stressing the unification of the European continent and the consolidation of the European integration process by political cooperation. The programme clearly commits itself to a Federal Europe and articulates an Ostpolitik by acknowledging the Eastern European states as inherent to the unity of the European continent¹⁶⁹. The party programmes of 1994 under Helmut Kohl and 2007 under Angela Merkel will be scrutinized in following sections as they are important in that they entail more concrete addressing of EU Enlargement and the special case of Turkey. It should be added at this point, that none of the abovementioned party programmes entailed any

¹⁶⁴ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1953), *Hamburger Programm: Sozialer Rechtsstaat im geeinten Europa*. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

¹⁶⁵ Ronald Irving (2002), *Profiles in Power: Adenauer*, Pearson Education Limited, Pearson Education Limited: United Kingdom, London, p.89

¹⁶⁶ Irving (2002), op.cit. p.90.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. p108

¹⁶⁸ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1968), *Berliner Programm*, pp.3-4. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

¹⁶⁹ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1978), *Ludwigshafener Programm*, pp.53-62. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

special reference to the case of Turkey which can be explained by the enlargement of the European Union being not that much politicized at those times and the case of Turkey not being pinnacle that much. The general after-war trend in European Christian democratic parties was the support for integration in the European Continent.

4.3. Helmut Kohl and Turkey's EU Accession Process: Strained Relations

Helmut Kohl traced the German foreign policy discourse that was initiated by Konrad Adenauer. It will not be too bold to say that Helmut Kohl was with Konrad Adenauer the most enthusiastic Chancellor of Germany with respect to the European Union Integration. This can be attributed to domestic and international challenges of his incumbency. Apart from his engagement for European Integration, Kohl also pushed for the reunification for the two German states¹⁷⁰. Cole divides the 16 years long incumbency of Kohl into three stages being 1982-89: The Awkward Chancellor, 1989-90: Kohl and German Unification and finally 1990-97: The Unification Chancellor¹⁷¹. Dyson says that “as a strategist, Kohl was motivated by German interests but defined those interests in terms of a vision of Europe¹⁷². Farther, Cole defines Kohl's characteristics of Helmut as a political personality being “his status as a Catholic, bourgeois provincial outsider, to some extent in opposition with the Bonn political establishment; the pursuance of limited, but consistent goals (notably in relation to

¹⁷⁰ For a deeper analysis on Kohl policy towards the German reunification see Karl-Rudolf Korte (1998), “The Art of Power: The ‘Kohl System’, Leadership and Deutschlandpolitik”, *German Politics*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp. 64-90. For space considerations and context of this study, deeper inquiry of Kohl's policy towards German reunification haven't been included. Anyhow, it has to be noted that Kohl vehemently pushed for reunification of Germany which also enabled his reelection until 1997.

¹⁷¹ Alistair Cole (1998): Political leadership in Western Europe: Helmut Kohl in comparative context, *German Politics*, Vol.7, Issue, 1, pp. 120-142

¹⁷² Kenneth Dyson (1998), “Chancellor Kohl as Strategic Leader: The Case of Economic and Monetary Union”, *German Politics*, Vol.7, Issue 1, pp. 38 37-63.

European integration and foreign policy); and his past as a party manager rather than a policy expert”¹⁷³.

Watershed events in the wake of Germany’s Unification and the challenges that the European continent was exposed to mainly shaped Chancellor Kohl’s policy formulation. The general comment on Germany’s foreign policy being overtly affected by its history is especially prevalent for Kohl. Kohl reacted to the changes with the collapse of the Cold War and dedicated himself to strengthen and deepen the complex web of international institutions that had anchored West Germany for the past 40 years. Moreover, German unification gave new impetus to European Integration ¹⁷⁴. Kohl pushed both for EU Enlargement to the CEEC’s and also the completion of Economic and Monetary Union. The latter, he believed was a farther step for embedding Germany deeper into European structures. As Van Esch argues: “ the actions and shifting positions of the Kohl government were rooted in the inherent clash between Euro patriotism and a concern for Sound Economics in European economic and monetary policy making”¹⁷⁵. Kohl’s policy formulation to the European Union referred to two concepts, being the link between European integration and European peace and second one being the link between German unification and European unity¹⁷⁶. That German unity had provided impetus for further European unity was also important in understanding - as perceived by Kohl-the role of Germany to embrace the East and Central European states. As for Kohl, Germany had the

¹⁷³ Cole (1998), op. cit, p. 128-129.

¹⁷⁴ Berger (1997), op.cit., p.52.

¹⁷⁵ Femke Van Esch (2012), “Why Germany Wanted EMU: The Role of Helmut Kohl's Belief System and the Fall of the Berlin Wall, German Politics, Volume 21, Issue 1, p.44. 34-52 van Esch further argues in this article that the overt support of Kohl for EMU was corollary of Kohl’s general perception of deeper European integration and his pre-existing pro-European convictions on the 1989 revolution ins Eastern Europe.

¹⁷⁶ Banchoff (1997), op. cit, p.61.

responsibility to assist those states in the accession process to the European Union¹⁷⁷.

In analysing Kohl's stance towards European Union and EU enlargement, the following points are basic:

- 1) Kohl found himself in unique domestic and international political circumstances that provided him with great public support.
- 2) Kohl was always inclined to define German interests in the context of European interests.
- 3) Kohl was mainly the impetus behind the formulation of Economic and Monetary Union and the Maastricht Treaty, thereby mainly contributed to the structure of the European Union of today.
- 4) Although Kohl was a general supporter of all aspects of European Integration, he overtly favoured deepening to widening.

To provide for a basic background of Kohl's stance of EU Enlargement towards Turkey, party programmes, speeches and official documents in their German originals are first-hand information.

To take the incumbency of Kohl at the wake of German Unification and the collapse of the Soviet Bloc, the "**10 Punkte Plan**", the ten-point plan of Chancellor Kohl, declared on 28 November 1989 manifested the CDU's and therefore Germany's European policy in post-Unification Germany. The plan clearly consolidated Kohl's vision and architecture of the European Integration and Germany's place within it. The importance and the references to Germany's broader place in the European sphere had been previously elucidated in this study. As can be read from the programme Kohl manifested his support for enlargement by stating that "the European Community as the essential of European concert must be open to the reform oriented states of Middle, East and Southeast

¹⁷⁷ Banchoff (1997), op. cit, p.66.

European states¹⁷⁸.” The Party Programme of 1994 further consolidated the CDU’s European manifestation by uttering explicit references to European Union Enlargement.

The landslide events around 1990 apparently altered the pace of Turkey’s EU Accession bid and Germany’s response to it. The incumbency of Kohl witnessed turbulent times of Turkey-EU relations. The **Copenhagen Criteria of 1993**, the **Customs Union in 1996** and the **Luxembourg Decision on 1997** are milestone events altering the fate of Turkey’s EU Journey. As a corollary of the very transformation of the European Community to the European Union, the context of EU Enlargement also became more complex and multifaceted. As Müftüler-Baç argues, Turkey’s EU candidacy and its negotiations for accession have been affected by the following four factors: the Copenhagen Criteria, the EU’s institutional set up, member state preferences and public opinion within the EU¹⁷⁹. These factors have been outstanding especially after 1990.

With the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992, the European Community was transformed to the European Union. The Treaty consolidated the political character of the integration process and had thereby also ramifications for EU Enlargement. In 1993 at the Copenhagen European Council, the so-called Copenhagen Criteria were adopted. These criteria settled a definite context of the accession eligibility of aspirant states. As stated in the Presidency Conclusions:

Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities, the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union. The Union's capacity to absorb new

¹⁷⁸ Helmut Kohl (1989), “Erklärung vor dem Deutschen Bundestag: Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Deutschlandpolitik, 28. November 1989”, Available on <http://helmut-kohl.kas.de/index.php?msg=627>

¹⁷⁹ Meltem Müftüler-Baç (2002), “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.7, No.2, pp.79-95.

members, while maintaining the momentum of European integration, is also an important consideration in the general interest of both the Union and the candidate countries¹⁸⁰.

With this declaration, membership to the European Union had been bound to specific criteria which gave birth to the EU Conditionality¹⁸¹. Concomitant to the poor human rights record of Turkey, the consolidation of EU Conditionality made Turkey's accession process indeed much more difficult¹⁸². An interesting study has been made by Saatçioğlu who examines to what extent the terms of conditionality reflect the EU's preoccupation with candidates' fulfilment of the Copenhagen conditions versus their costs of EU "absorption?"¹⁸³. Plenty of research has been also made by Sedelmeier, Schimmelfennig¹⁸⁴, Smith on EU Conditionality in general and specifically on Turkey.

With the creeping gravity of conditionality in the EU accession process of Turkey it can be said that Germany during the incumbency of Kohl

¹⁸⁰ Council of the European Union, European Council in Copenhagen, 21–22 June 1993, Conclusions of the Presidency (Copenhagen: Council of the European Union, 1993), p. 13. Available online at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_DOC-93-3_en.htm

¹⁸¹ For further information on EU Conditionality see Heather Grabbe (2006), *The EU's Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

¹⁸² For further information on Turkey's developments with the incentive of prospective EU membership see Ali Çarkoğlu and Barry Rubin (eds.), (2003), *Turkey and the European Union: Domestic Politics, Economic Integration, and International Dynamics*, Frank Cass London and Portland. Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe (eds.) (2004), *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, Routledge: London and New York. Paul Kubicek (2011), "Political conditionality and European Union's Cultivation of Democracy in Turkey", *Democratization*, Vol.18, No.4, pp. 910-931. For a deeper inquiry of whether conditionality has changed after the 2004 Enlargement, see Frank Schimmelfennig (2008): EU political accession conditionality after the 2004 enlargement: consistency and effectiveness," *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.15, No.6, pp. 918-937.

¹⁸³ Beken Saatçioğlu (2009): How Closely Does the European Union's Membership Conditionality Reflect the Copenhagen Criteria? Insights from Turkey, *Turkish Studies*, Vol.10, No.4, pp. 559-576.

¹⁸⁴ Frank Schimmelfennig, Stefan Engert, Heiko Knobe (2006), *International Socialization in Europe: European Organizations, Political Conditionality and Democratic Change*, Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire and New York.

evidently referred to Turkey's being not ready for membership by starting to make use of EU conditionality as represented by the Copenhagen criteria.

Although Helmut Kohl vehemently supported the EU Enlargement towards the Central and Eastern European states, he rather entrenched his clinic attitude towards Turkey. Not seeing Turkey in the family picture of the European Union he rather pushed for the establishment of the Customs Union and thereby sustaining relations with Turkey in that context

The CDU Grundsatzprogramm of 1994 was based on the principles of Freedom and Responsibility and the basic concept of acting of the CDU was anchored in Christian values¹⁸⁵. The party programme clearly sets the responsibility of Germany after Unification for the European continent by assuring that German Unification is complementary to the adhesion of the European continent and adding that Germany, being in the middle of Europe also has duty in assisting the nascent young Democracies¹⁸⁶. Section two of the fifth chapter of the programme has been devoted to the European Union. The importance of the European unity is stressed and the challenge of the new states emerging after the collapse of the Cold War is issued. Thereby, the establishment of a European peace order is referred to as being a historical obligation. Europe is affected by the unity within diversity. Common traditions and ideas and ideological fundamentals do bind the nations of the European continent. An immediate point to discern here is the articulation of Europe, being a community based on common culture and values that shares a common history, present day and future¹⁸⁷. The European Union is referred as to have to fulfil responsibility towards the Central, Eastern and Southern European states and setting that the

¹⁸⁵ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1994), "Hamburger Grundsatzprogramm: Freiheit in Verantwortung", p.419. Available online at <http://www.grundsatzprogramm.cdu.de/doc/grundsatzprogramm.pdf>

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. p.423.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p.465.

Union should be open to new members on condition that aspirant states fulfil the accession criteria¹⁸⁸. The programme further pledges that the objective of the CDU is the accomplishment of the European Union. The reiteration of a common European identity¹⁸⁹ enrooted in common history of the states of the European continent is important. The scrutiny of the party programme helps to discern the general perception of Germany's role within Europe. German Unification and further European Integration are seen as complementary and European integration is traced to commonalities of ideas, belief and history. Overt reference is made to the post-Soviet Bloc States and the parlance of a historical responsibility towards them is prevalent. This analysis confirms Helene Sjursen's argument of the kinship based duty¹⁹⁰ when the European Union enlarges.

To complement the narrative of Germany's stance towards EU enlargement in the Kohl era, some speeches of the chancellor will be analysed. Here, the addresses of CDU politicians, especially Helmut Kohl and Minister for Foreign Affairs Klaus Kinkel at the Bundestag during the years 1992-1998 are taken.

At the Bundestagsitzung (session of the German parliament) held in October 1992, the importance of the Maastricht Treaty was vehemently elucidated in that it consolidates the European integration process. Moreover, the role of Germany, together with France is reiterated as being the motor of European integration. Minister for Foreign Affairs, Klaus Kinkel says that Germany does not want a Europe of two speeds and has to fulfil its responsibility towards the fledgling new democracies in Eastern Europe¹⁹¹. In a study focused also on this period, Paterson, refers to Kohl's visionary policy formulation, which after the

¹⁸⁸ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1994), op.cit. p.466

¹⁸⁹ Ibid,p.466.

¹⁹⁰ Helene Sjursen (2002), op.cit., pp.491-513.

¹⁹¹ Deutscher Bundestag, Stenographischer Bericht, 12. Wahlperiode 110. Sitzung, 8. October, 1992, p. 9317

reunification of Germany became also visible with respect to his 'driver' role assigned to economic and monetary union and the need to avoid the perpetuation of European division by encouraging eastern enlargement of the European Union”¹⁹².

At the same session then Minister of Finance Theodor Waigel praised the Maastricht Treaty from an economic perspective. At a session held in April 1994 one focus were the relations towards Turkey. Main CDU politicians like Minister for Foreign Affairs Klaus Kinkel, Michael Glos and Karl Lamers evaluated the relationship with Turkey and deemed them as close friendship. However, the focus was the unrest with Kurds the gloomy human rights situation in Turkey and the situation of the Christian minority. Kinkel acknowledges the special relationship to Turkey and said that the close cooperation with Turkey is not a sole desire of Germany, rather a mutual one of NATO and the European Union. Furthermore he acknowledges Turkey's function as a bridge between Europe and Asia and its character as a stabilization anchor in the Islamic world¹⁹³. One appealing comment were recorded by Karl Lamers who also published together with Wolfgang Schäuble a parliamentary group paper on Turkey. In saying that Turkey should be offered more honesty he pledged that “we should not pretend as if the relationship of Turkey and the European Union could ever be the same as it is for Spain and the European Union. I do not want to say it more clearly because this is not the right occasion but we should be clear on what objectives we have for the relationship with Turkey”. Lamers further says that there are many references to a strategic partnership with Turkey and that this strategic partnership should be taken as the essence of relations with Turkey not only in geopolitical terms but also on broader terms¹⁹⁴.

¹⁹² William E. Paterson (1998), “Helmut Kohl, ‘The Vision Thing’ and Escaping the Semi-Sovereignty Trap”, *German Politics*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, p.27. pp. 17-36

¹⁹³ Deutscher Bundestag,12.Wahlperiode,218.Sitzung, 13 April 1994,p.1864.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid. p.1881.

In 1994 Lamers and Wolfgang Schäuble published the abovementioned CDU/CSU parliamentary group paper on the future of Europe that entailed important observations¹⁹⁵. The paper defined the problems of the European Union which among other things entailed clues about the growing European Integration in the context of enlargement and the rise of nationalism in member states. These are issues still argued in the European Union but this paper provides evidence for initial enlargement critics. We can read from the paper that one of the main problems the European Union has to deal with is “a fragmented perception of external responsibilities of the Union reaching from the North Cape to the Gibraltar but especially external responsibilities with respect to Maghreb and Eastern Europe”¹⁹⁶. The paper continues by articulating concerns about the rise of nationalism in member states and on the encompassing of the middle and eastern European states¹⁹⁷. Concerns about the structural and institutional capacity of the European Union have been already mentioned in this paper. These concerns have been then evolved to today’s debates on enlargement fatigue and overexpansion of the EU. The paper overtly articulates German interests in widening the European Union to Eastern European countries by concluding that without embedding those countries in the structures of the EU, the European Union would not be complete¹⁹⁸. It can be therefore taken as a principle document to frame Germany’s approach towards European Union Enlargement. The collapse of the Soviet Bloc gave rise to concerns about the drifting away of eastern European states. In 1994, with Germany’s EU Presidency, Germany vehemently engaged in embracing the Eastern European countries in the EU. Searching for references to Turkey in this document we find the articulation of a development of a strategic

¹⁹⁵ Phillip Lamers and Wolfgang Schaeuble (1994), “Überlegungen zur Europäischen Politik” Available online at <http://www.cdusu.de/upload/schaeublelamers94.PDF>

¹⁹⁶ Lamers and Schaeuble (1994), op.cit. p.9.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., p.1

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., p.10

partnership with Turkey within the Common Foreign and Security Policy. This phrase provides us with a complementary background for further concepts of alternative cooperation models later to be developed under Angela Merkel's CDU. Germany under Kohl was a vehement supporter of European Integration, both in terms of deepening as well as widening. But Germany's immediate interests were the Central and Eastern European Countries¹⁹⁹. The passionate quest to embed them in the EU structures was not reflected in the relations with Turkey.

On the Bundestagssitzung in May 1994, Chancellor Kohl addressed the prospective enlargement of the European Union to Austria, Sweden, Finland and Norway-of whom Norway later rejected the accession in a referendum. Kohl welcomed the acceding states and responds that "there have been critical voices abroad that accused Germany has encouraged herself too much to the enlargement to those states, but it complies with our common policy to support the enlargement of the Union"²⁰⁰. Kohl anchors Germany's place in Europe by saying that "the embedding of Germany in the European Community was the essential foundation for the re-establishment of German unity in peace and freedom"²⁰¹ and "Germany and France have essentially contribute to the successful European integration"²⁰². It is important in Kohl's address at this session that he emphasizes the role of Germany in European integration and also he speaks of German interest in the stabilization of the neighbours in central, east and south Europe. Kohl says that those states were offered, on the initiation of Germany a clear accession perspective at the Council meeting in Copenhagen. He further adds that this perspective needs now to be consolidated²⁰³. It is interesting to note here that

¹⁹⁹ Lamers and Schaeuble (1994), op.cit., p.10.

²⁰⁰ Deutscher Bundestag, 12. Wahlperiode, 231. Sitzung, 27.Mai,1994, p.20121

²⁰¹Ibid, p.20122.

²⁰²Ibid, p.20123.

²⁰³Deutscher Bundestag, 12. Wahlperiode, 231. Sitzung, 27.Mai,1994, p.20124.

no reference is made to Turkey in the contest of a possible accession. Distinctively, relations with Turkey are handled in a separate session mentioned above that proceeds under the general framework of bilateral relations between Germany and Turkey. In parliamentary debates, it is witnessed that Chancellor Kohl, in his speeches often refers to Germany's historical role in European integration by pledging that the "core of Germany's foreign and European policy is the continuation of European integration²⁰⁴" and "European integration is the greatest success story of the European continent²⁰⁵ and finally that" European integration is quintessential for Europe and Germany and a question of war and peace²⁰⁶". Kohl refers to the preparation for the Agenda 2000 and lists the main points to be addressed. One of these is the preparation for the accession of the central and east European states. To read from the speech of Kohl: "the accession of the young democracies in central and east Europe must be complemented with close partnership to neighbouring regions of the European Union. I name here Russia, Ukraine, Turkey and Israel.²⁰⁷" It must be discerned here that Kohl welcomes the accession aspiration of the Central and East European states and renders them as a complementary factor to the progress in European integration. But at the same time, a type of strategic partnership is attributed to Turkey together with states like Russia and Israel that don't have any aspiration towards accession. To read his engaged support for the Central and Eastern European states: "I want to clearly declare in the name of the government that we want the enlargement of the European Union to central and southeast Europe. It is definitely unacceptable for us that the western border of Poland remains as the eastern border of Europe. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic-to name just a

²⁰⁴ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 77. Sitzung, 7 December 1995, p. 6711

²⁰⁵ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 77. Sitzung, 7 December 1995, p. 6711

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 6712.

few are part of Europe and constitute European culture just as France, Italy, Germany or Spain”²⁰⁸. Kohl further links enlargement to the unification of Europe by saying that “Our aim is to make European integration irreversible”²⁰⁹. The only reference by the CDU to Turkey at this debate is made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs Klaus Kinkel who makes reference to the completion of the Customs Union between Turkey and the European Union. Kinkel says that Germany should do everything to assist a positive decision on this at the European parliament.²¹⁰ This is important to discern as reference to Turkey is not made within the framework of European Union enlargement.

As evident from the abovementioned speech of Kinkel, Kohl pushed for a positive decision for the completion of the Customs Union between Turkey and the EU²¹¹. Prime Minister of that time, Tansu Çiller from the DYP (Doğru Yol Partisi-True Path Part) ascertained Turkey’s reform efforts and pledged that Europe should not discriminate Turkey²¹².

With the Association Council decision 1/95²¹³ of 22.12.1995, the Customs Union between the European Union and Turkey was completed. Thereby the final stage of the process commenced with the Ankara Agreement on 12.09.1963 and its Additional Protocol signed on 23.11.1970 was completed.

²⁰⁸ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 77. Sitzung, 7 December 1995, p.6715.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. p.6716.

²¹⁰ Ibid .p.6728.

²¹¹ Berliner Zeitung (06.12. 1995), Kohl und Scharping sichern Unterstützung zu. Für EU-Zollunion mit Türkei. Available online at <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/archiv/kohl-und-scharping-sichern-unterstuetzung-zu-fuer-eu-zollunion-mit-tuerkei,10810590,9048888.html> (accessed on 08.02.2013)

²¹² Der Spiegel (31.07.1995), Interview: Tansu Çiller, Grenzt uns nicht aus! Ministerpräsidentin Tansu Ciller über ihre Demokratie-Bemühungen. Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-9206291.html> (accessed on 08.02.2013).

²¹³ Decision No 1/95 of the EC-Turkey Association Council of 22 December 1995 on implementing the final phase of the Customs Union. Available online at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21996D0213%2801%29:EN:HTML>

Further evidence for that can be found in another parliamentary debate in which Kinkel again attributes great importance to the enlargement of the EU to the CEEC's by linking it historically to the fact that "Germany knows what separation and division means. We remain, in memory of this fact a reliable advocate for our eastern neighbours and their wish to no longer remain excluded²¹⁴". Kinkel speaks of a "return of our east neighbours and friends to Europe"²¹⁵ when talking of the accession of those states and of a "common fortune that is shared between west and east Europe,²¹⁶" and the "immediate enlargement is a duty with historical dimension"²¹⁷ thereby stating that the well-being of the western part of Europe depends on the wellbeing of the eastern part of Europe. "Immediately knotted on these statements on the CEEC's Kinkel, speaks of the "concretizing of the Mediterranean concept for the promotion of political, social and economic stability in the Mediterranean region which is very important for the EU. The Maghreb, the peace process in the Middle East conflict and eastern Mediterranean with Turkey and Cyprus do constitute the gravity centres"²¹⁸. This again elucidates the differentiation of Turkey by deeming it in the concept of good relations with Mediterranean states. Furthermore in an interview, Kinkel says that Turkey is not ready to access the EU because of her poor human rights record, the Kurdish problem and the tenuous relationship to Turkey²¹⁹.

²¹⁴ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode,44.Sitzung, 22 July 1995.p.3543.

²¹⁵ Ibid. p.3543.

²¹⁶ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode,128.Sitzung,10 October 1996, p.11421.

²¹⁷ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode,180..Sitzung, 11 June 1997,p.11421.

²¹⁸ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode,44.Sitzung, 22 July 1995.p.3543.

²¹⁹ Focus(24.03.1997), "Interview: Klaus Kinkel.Deutschland: Türken Müssen Waehlen Dürfen" Available online at http://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/deutschland-tuerken-muessen-waehlen-duerfen_aid_165233.html (accessed 08.02.2013)

The historical narrative implied by Thomas Banchoff is prevalent in Kohl's speeches. A pattern of continuous emphasis on historical obligations is discernible in his addresses. The concurrent parlance of historical obligation is visible in his saying "it would be a betrayal of European ideals if we would now tell the central and east European states that we have to first solve over problems prior to provide the chance of accession"²²⁰.

To confirm Helene Sjusen's kinship based duty concept, the parlance of Poland is representative in that Kohl says that "it is for us the Germans and also for the Poles unimaginable that Poland will not be a part of the European Union"²²¹ It is a perfect affirmation of Helmut Kohl's concurrent reference to historical memory to revive the Oder-Neisse Border of a border remaining in Europe.

The references to Turkey as indicated are rather in the context of the Customs Union and human rights. At a parliamentary debate in 1997²²² an interesting representative of that was the question addressed by SPD politician Gernot Erler to State Secretary in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs Helmut Schaefer on the Turkish course of action in Northern Iraq and the Kurdish issue. Here it is interesting that the SPD challenges the German government's approach to human rights violations. It is interesting to provide a basis of the shift in the SPD's stance towards Turkey in the face of Turkey's improving human rights record that will be elucidated in a following chapter.

To provide final insights within this section, the last parliamentary debate before the European Council meeting in Luxembourg 1997, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Klaus Kinkel chalked on the Eastern Enlargement of the EU. Kinkel, by reiterating Germany's continuous support for enlargement nevertheless speaks of a not over lasting of the EU and lists the elements of the upcoming

²²⁰ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 44. Sitzung, 12 December 1996, p. 1333.

²²¹ Ibid. p. 1334.

²²² Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 180. Sitzung, 11 June 1997, pp. 16189-16192.

enlargement.²²³ Kinkel speaks of five points that entail among others the equal treatment of all aspirant states and the fulfilment of accession criteria. He further adds “a word” on Turkey by saying that “Turkey is our traditional partner and friend. The chancellor has told Minister President Yılmaz that we will support a later membership of Turkey”. Kinkel also adds that “Turkey belongs to the European family” but has to “overcome problems of human rights situation and the Kurdish question”²²⁴. Interestingly Heidemarie Wiecek-Zeul from the SPD criticized the enlargement policy of the CDU government as being unplanned and ineffective and also said that the accession of Turkey at this point was inconvenient. To read from her words: “The inclusion into the European Conference where the central and east European states participate is not proper for Turkey. The EU should better consolidate bilateral relations to Turkey and stress the Association Agreement and the Customs Union. An inclusion to the European Conference should only be possible if Turkey guarantees to secure human rights and the question of Cyprus.”²²⁵ These statements of a SPD politician are important to analyse given the fact that the SPD under Gerhard Schröder will be paving the way for Turkey’s declaration of candidacy status. This is also emblematic to apprehend the shift within the SPD.

Eralp defined some alternatives for the future of EU-Turkey relations, prior to the decision at the Luxembourg Summit in 1997 which were the possibility of the exclusion of Turkey from the enlargement process and clinging on the customs union as a basic mechanism to improve relations between Turkey and the EU; providing an alternative to full membership and the giving of a special status to Turkey without promising full membership which was debated but not welcomed by Turkey; granting special status to Turkey, but with a prospect of full membership (this gained upper hand during negotiations) and

²²³ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 210. Sitzung, 11 December 1997, p. 19111.

²²⁴ Ibid. p. 19112.

²²⁵ Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, 210. Sitzung, 11 December 1997, p. 19117.

finally the possibility of treating Turkey on equal footing with all other applicants in terms of full membership (this had not much chance of success)²²⁶. The result of the Luxembourg Summit was in conformity with the third alternative Eralp provided and which was also backed especially by Germany. Much to the resentment of Turkey, the Luxembourg Summit in 1997 did not acknowledge the candidate status to Turkey but rather contended with declaring that:

The Council confirms Turkey's eligibility for accession to the European Union. Turkey will be judged on the basis of the same criteria as the other applicant States. While the political and economic conditions allowing accession negotiations to be envisaged are not satisfied, the European Council considers that it is nevertheless important for a strategy to be drawn up to prepare Turkey for accession by bringing it closer to the European Union in every field²²⁷.

The decision taken at the Luxembourg Council in 1997, caused deep resentment and demotivation in Turkey and triggered Eurosceptic voices. The reaction of Turkish political elites was anger which led to the declaration of the suspension of the political dialogue. In an interview, then Deputy Prime Minister Ecevit stated how Turkey was disappointed of the stance of Germany and Helmut Kohl²²⁸.

It was not until the long awaited declaration of candidate status that relations between Turkey and the EU started to normalize. The developments and reasons leading to the decision on granting Turkey candidate status at the Helsinki Summit in 1999 have been examined under the chapter on the SPD and thereby won't be repeated here.

To conclude this section it should be answered to what extent the assumptions at the introduction to this section have proven right. Viewing

²²⁶ Atila Eralp, "Turkey and the European Union", in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis (eds.) (2004), "The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy", Cambridge: USA, pp.63-83.

²²⁷ Council of the European Union, 1997 Luxembourg Presidency Conclusions.

²²⁸ Der Spiegel (29.12.1997), Interview: "Bülent Ecevit: Europa Hat Uns Betrogen". Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-13944702.html> (accessed on 08.02.2013).

especially the parliamentary debates and the speeches addressed specially by Kohl and his Minister for Foreign Affairs Klaus Kinkel, three conclusions can be drawn:

- 1) After unification Germany found itself in a unique domestic and international environment that paved the way for the CDU and Helmut Kohl to trigger European Integration. But it has been confirmed that deepening of the EU has been a much greater priority than widening.
- 2) Kohl and his CDU clearly fall back on historical discourse. The emphasis on historical and moral obligation towards the CEEC's is frequently reiterated. Kohl regards the enlargement policy towards Eastern Europe as a historical chance to further consolidate European Integration. Special importance is attributed to Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.
- 3) Turkey and the CEEC's are approached rather differently. The CEEC's are approached as prospective member states whereas definitions towards Turkey are rather vague and refer frequently to good and strategic relationship and traditional friendship.

In 1998 with the internal donation affair of the CDU, Helmut Kohl resigned from party chair and the SPD and Gerhard Schröder were elected to government.

Helmut Kohl and Turkey's EU Accession: Strained Relations

4.4. Angela Merkel and Turkey's EU Accession Process

4.4.1. Stalemate in Relations

The CDU under Angela Merkel provides an explicit case to analyse. Merkel took office in 2005. Her election within the CDU as party chief and also as Chancellor came as a surprise due to her being a woman, protestant and coming from East Germany²²⁹. Her commencement of government followed the

²²⁹ For further information on Angela Merkel's political career and coming to power see Mark R. Thompson and Ludmilla Lennartz (2006), "The Making of Chancellor Merkel", *German Politics*, Vol. 15, Issue 1, pp. 99-110. Sarah Elise Wiliarty (2008), "Angela Merkel's Path to Power: The Role of Internal Party Dynamics and Leadership", *German Politics*, Vol. 17, Issue 1, pp. 81-96.

accession of the 10 states in 2004 and the start of accession negotiations with Turkey. Furthermore it witnessed the Constitutional Crisis of the EU and the ongoing Euro-Crisis. Farther, with Merkel, the CDU also underwent significant changes within the party structure itself²³⁰. All these factors have a causal link to the more straightforward and critical policy towards EU and especially EU Enlargement.

Therefore, it is for the sake of proper analysis to find some basic answers to questions as follows: Is there an equal approximation of the enlargement case of Turkey and other aspirant states in the incumbency of Angela Merkel? Has there been any change in the attitude of the CDU from shifting from opposition to government in 2005? How did recent developments in the EU affect the EU policy of the CDU under Angela Merkel?

The recent party programme of the CDU is the **Grundsatzprogramm of 2007** adopted at the 21st Party Congress held on 3-4 December 2007 in Hannover. The Grundsatzprogramm of 2007 offers some important reference points for the party's policy towards European integration. First of all the party manifests itself as a public party of the middle way that embraces all people from any group and status of the society. Thereby the party is based on the Christian comprehension of people and the responsibility to God²³¹. There, it is quite obvious that the party understands itself with religious sympathy and adopts this as a political and social identity. However, at least as one can infer from the programme, the party is also open to each kind of belief and does not use its Christian identity as a

²³⁰ For further information on the changes the CDU underwent with the leadership of Angela Merkel see Clay Clemens (2009), "Modernisation or Disorientation? Policy Change in Merkel's CDU", *German Politics*, Vol. 18, Issue 2, pp. 121-139.

²³¹ Christlich Demokratische Union (2007), *Freiheit und Sicherheit, Grundsätze für Deutschland, Grundsatzprogramm: Hannover*, p.4. Available online at <http://www.grundsatzprogramm.cdu.de/doc/071203-beschluss-grundsatzprogramm-6-navigierbar.pdf>

discriminatory political tool²³². In the preamble of the party programme the very principles of the party are stated as follows:

“The CDU is the Volkspartei of the middle way. The political flows are present which had created it after 1945: Christian-social, liberal and the value-based conservative. We do orientate our self on the Christian kind of humanity and its sacrosanct dignity and the basic values of Freedom, solidarity and Justice²³³.”

The contribution the CDU has made to the unification in 1990 is definitely the Chancellorship of Helmut Kohl who as a passionate pro-European Integrationist has largely shaped the structure of the European Union of today. About Germany’s place in Europe the party programme reveals us that “the CDU is the German European Party²³⁴ and that “the European Union is a community of culture and values that unites its residents in a European Identity²³⁵“. The programme reiterates the commitment to Christian values and acknowledges the European kind of humanity that is influenced by Christianity, Judaism, Antiquity and Enlightenment²³⁶.

The key assumptions to be find in the programme relevant to EU Enlargement and a clear reference to Turkey’s membership quest can be read as follows from article 328:

The previous enlargements of the European Union have broadened the zone of stability and brought political and economic advantages to Germany. For many people in western Balkan and eastern Europe, European Union provides a model of open society, peaceful interaction of nations and thereby a source of hope for their political and economic future. The European Union must take responsibility towards the nations of these European regions.

Full-membership to the European Union cannot be the sole solution for this in each case. Not only the compliance to accession criteria is the benchmark for accession of new

²³² Christlich Demokratische Union (2007), op. cit, p.5.

²³³ Ibid, p.2.

²³⁴ Ibid, p.97.

²³⁵ Ibid, p.97.

²³⁶ Ibid.

members but also the also the absorption capacity of the European Union itself. We believe that a privileged partnership for Turkey with the European Union is the right solution²³⁷.

The privileged partnership mentioned in this article has been elaborated and offered as a report but vehemently rejected by Turkey. The details of the report and the very essence of the proposed partnership will be given in details in the following section.

Moreover, complementary to the stance towards enlargement the Programme entails also key standpoints towards migration and integration in Germany that is not to be seen only as a domestic issue for Germany but also to be understood in the context of the enlargement of the European Union to Turkey as most migrants in Germany are Turks²³⁸.

Comparing the Party Programmes of 1994 and 2007 it can be said that the first one was more enthusiastic towards Germany's contribution to the European Union. The first one does not entail any direct reference to problems of Enlargement and especially with Turkey, whereas the second one explicitly saves one paragraph about the essence of Enlargement and the trajectory of relations with Turkey.

The Coalition Agreement of 11 May 2005 between CDU, CSU and SPD and the Coalition Agreement of 26 October 2009 between the CDU, CSU and FDP refer to Germany's role in the EU and perceptions of EU Enlargement. The German-French cooperation and the special responsibility towards Poland are repetitively manifested in both agreements²³⁹. The agreement of 2005

²³⁷ CDU (2007), op.cit, p.101.

²³⁸ Ibid. pp.94-96.

²³⁹ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (2009a), *Wachstum. Bildung. Zusammenhalt. Koalitionsvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und FDP*. Beschlossen und unterzeichnet am 26. Oktober 2009, p.114 Available online at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/091026-koalitionsvertrag-cducsu-fdp.pdf> and CDU (2005a), "Gemeinsam für Deutschland – mit Mut und Menschlichkeit - *Koalitionsvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und SPD*, Beschlossen und unterzeichnet am 11. November 2005, p.125. Available online at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/05_11_11_Koalitionsvertrag.pdf

acknowledges Germany's previous commitments with respect to EU Enlargement, welcomes the completion of accession negotiations with Bulgaria and Romania, the commencement of accession negotiations with Croatia and reiterates the accession perspective for the western Balkan²⁴⁰. With respect to Turkey a much vaguer parlance without any enthusiasm is discernible. It is stated that Germany has a special interest in a consolidation of relations with Turkey and a binding of it to the European Union²⁴¹. The following articulation is quiet discouraging from the viewpoint of Turkey:

The start of accession negotiations on 3rd October 2005 with the objective of accession are an open-ended process which do not constitute an automatism and the result of which cannot be guaranteed. They do pose economic, demographic and cultural challenges. In this respect we welcome the reform efforts of Turkey... the absorption capacity must be strictly abided. The compliance with the Copenhagen Criteria and fundamental rights and freedoms as well as freedom of religion is part of this. If the EU will not be able to absorb or Turkey not be able to abide by its obligations, Turkey needs to be bound to European structures in the closest way."²⁴²

The agreement of 2009 basically contents itself with a repetition of the wording of the agreement of 2005 but by adopting a more clinical parlance. That Turkey should "in a way develop its privileged relationship to the EU"²⁴³ is a further evidence for the sticking on the privileged partnership proposal.

The reference to open-ended negotiations is also prevalent in the Negotiation Framework for Turkey adopted by the Council of the European Union on 12 October 2005. Although it is manifested that "the shared objective of the negotiations is accession"²⁴⁴ notwithstanding it is also articulated that "these negotiations are an open-ended process, the outcome of which cannot be

²⁴⁰ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (2005a), op.cit., p.129.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (2009a), op.cit., p.117.

²⁴⁴ European Commission, Negotiating Framework, Luxembourg, 3 October 2005, available from http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/turkey/st20002_05_tr_framedoc_en.pdf, p.5.

guaranteed beforehand”²⁴⁵. The overlapping of the official parlance of the EU and the German declarations is clear. The reference to alternatives that should anchor Turkey into European structures through strongest possible bonds leads to the alternative of a privileged partnership insisted on especially by Germany and France.

Further emblematic references to Turkey can be found in official publications of the CDU under Angela Merkel that pledge that “the adherence to full membership negotiations with Turkey against the backdrop of the will of the public not adequate”²⁴⁶ and “the concept of privileged partnership with states like Turkey meets the interests of parties more than an over expanded EU²⁴⁷.” The programme of the CDU to the elections of the European Parliament manifests the priority of consolidation of European Integration and reiterates the commitment to alternatives for Turkey²⁴⁸.

The analysis reveals that Angela Merkel, by tracing Germany’s pro-European stance, adopts a much more critical attitude. This is especially evident since the Euro-Crisis of the European Union. Deepening is as it was the case for Kohl prioritized over widening. But a difference from Kohl is that Merkel adopts a more wholesome distanced attitude to Enlargement Policy. The accession of Romania and Bulgaria and the commencement of accession negotiations with Croatia are deemed as unavoidable. Contrary, the picture for Turkey is rather gloomy. The Christian Democrats under Merkel officially distance themselves

²⁴⁵ European Commission (2005), op.cit., p.5.

²⁴⁶ Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (2005b), *Beschluss des CDU-Bundesfachausschusses Europapolitik unter dem Vorsitz von Elmar Brok MdEP, Europa muss man richtig machen: Wie Deutschland auf die Krise der Europäischen Union reagieren muss*, p.1. Available online at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/05_07_01_Beschluss_BFA_Europapolitik.pdf

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p.3

²⁴⁸ CDU(2009b), *Starkes Europa-Sichere Zukunft-Programm der Christlichen Demoratischen Union Deutschlands zur Europawahl 2009*, pp.23-26. Available online at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/090421-cdu-europamanifest-2009.pdf>

from accession negotiations leading to full membership and instead advocate the Privileged Partnership alternative.

4.4.2. Privileged Partnership as Alternative?

The introduction of Privileged Partnership as an alternative to accession dilutes the importance and influence of the accession process on the Europeanization of Turkey and there is the issue of the credibility of the EU and its enlargement process.²⁴⁹ After providing an overview of the privileged partnership concept it is questioned to what extent it has found resonance in the relationship between Turkey and the EU and how it affected the relations between Turkey and Germany.

The reasons of a suggestion of a Privileged Partnership can be summarized in five points following Erhan İçener's article which is among few studies on privileged partnership. According to İçener the reasons for a Privileged Partnership are as follows:

- 1) Turkey being an explicit candidate is perceived as a threat to the balance of deepening and widening of the EU.
- 2) The emergent negative public opinion on Turkish EU membership.
- 3) Privileged partnership is envisaged as to provide for an alternative that binds Turkey to European structures in case of a failure of accession negotiations.
- 4) Turkey's eligibility in terms of democratic credentials and cultural commonalities with Europe are questioned.
- 5) Privileged partnership has been tried to convince Turkey of being a better alternative.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁹Erhan İçener (2007), "Privileged Partnership: An Alternative Final Destination for Turkey's Integration with the European Union?", *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 8, No. 4, p415.

²⁵⁰ Ibid. pp.422-424.

A report prepared by Karl Theodor zu Guttenberg the later Minister of Defence of the second Merkel cabinet, entails definitions and proposals for a possible privileged partnership between EU and Turkey. In this report, it is emphasized that Germany and Turkey are bound with a longstanding relationship and furthermore Turkey and Europe have common interests. But after a short introductory text, it is highlighted that “Turkey’s full membership overburdens Europe²⁵¹”. Guttenberg reiterates that every enlargement round is a special challenge involving the harmonization of structures, economic adjustment and the approximation of political cultures. Furthermore he notes that the acceptance of small states is comparatively much easier than the adoption of larger states like Turkey. An important point is this statement that traditional common European history is not a deliberate art of procedure but they provide the EU with a stable fundament.²⁵² This phrase is important as today; one of the direct arguments of the CDU is the historical and cultural commonalities or better said discrepancies between Turkey and EU states. The report calls for a new European enlargement doctrine²⁵³ as the present one doesn’t meet the needs of enlargement and integration. The clear definition of an enlargement perspective and Europe’s foreign policy objectives, combined with the difficult status of Turkey, as to Guttenberg, leads the EU to develop and offer a privileged partnership perspective for Turkey.

The report and the developed privileged partnership model are based on three fundamentals being:

- 1) *Institutional cooperation among EU and Turkey* should be enhanced, new structures should be developed and established in order to enable a more

²⁵¹ Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (2004), “Die Beziehungen zwischen der Türkei und der EU-Eine Privilegierte Partnerschaft”, Akademie für Politik und Zeitgeschehen, Hans-Seidel Stiftung e.V., München., p.5. Available online at http://www.hss.de/downloads/aa33_internet.pdf

²⁵² zu Guttenberg (2004), op.cit., p.5.

²⁵³ Ibid.

effective cooperation (a possible inclusion in the European Economic Area, the establishment of new common commission and working groups etc.)²⁵⁴

- 2) *Possible cooperation in specific policy fields* is purported as suggestions for the free movement of persons-services-capital and goods. For each of these freedoms the report gives the current status, possible amendments and improvements and facts not possible for concession. Possible policy fields for a full accession are competition, statistics, employment and social affairs, energy, industrial policy and SMEs, research and technological development, vocational education, culture, protection of the environment, trade policy and financial control. Policy areas like agriculture, justice and home affairs, monetary union, regional policy and cohesion are deemed more complex and rendered to require special arrangements.²⁵⁵
- 3) The report reserves a distinct part for the *EU's European Foreign, Security and Defence policy and Turkey's involvement in it*. This policy is rendered as the closest cooperation opportunity for Turkey and the EU. Here, Turkey's already participation in meetings and commissions is reiterated and due to NATO-EU relationship and Turkey's in between, this policy area is handled carefully. An important statement is that for closer participation to this policy, an equal representation and voting authorization should be granted to Turkey.²⁵⁶

How attractive it is tried to be presented, Privileged Partnership expulses the perspective of full membership. Therefore in case of some scenarios as put

²⁵⁴ zu Guttenberg (2004), op.cit., p.6.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., p.5.

forward by Martin Wissmann²⁵⁷, the privileged partnership option would be introduced as an alternative. The possible scenarios are a deadlock in the Cyprus-question, the non-option for the adoption of accession talks and vetoes employed by national parliaments. Time has rendered the second scenario invalid as accession negotiations have started on 3rd October 2005 following the decision taken at the 2004 Brussels summit. On the other hand, attention must be paid to the third option as states like France pledge for national referenda for the accession of new member states, especially for Turkey. Against this background, CDU politicians justify the necessity of an alternative membership perspective as being vital, in order to compensate for a break of negotiations or the possibility of rejective outcomes of national referenda held in some EU members and to firmly bind Turkey to the EU.

Elements of a Privileged Partnership similar to those proposed by Guttenberg include the mutation of the economic cooperation to an enhanced free economic trade zone, more assistance to financial assistance programs and Turkey's equal participation to EU's foreign, security and defence policy.²⁵⁸

Flexibility is one of the alleged advantages of the Privileged Partnership model as its context could be tailored for each aspirant state. Negative points are its unattractiveness, the perception of "second class membership" and the deprivation of equal voting rights. But due to the harsh rejection on the Turkish side, the concept of privileged partnership is almost outdated.

As its initial design didn't include much attractiveness for Turkey, many other alternative concepts for Turkey were pondered. Among these is Extended Associate Membership which envisages elements of economic integration and a

²⁵⁷ Matthias Wissmann (2004), "Europapolitik: Beitrittsverhandlungen Mit der Türkei Nicht Nur Ergebnisoffen, Sondern Auch Optionsoffen Führen, Available at http://www.cdu.de/archiv/2370_6040.htm (accessed 20.04.2012)

²⁵⁸ Matthias Wissman, Pressegespräch – 22. Januar 2004, Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für die Angelegenheiten der Europäischen Union des Deutschen Bundestages

touch of political cooperation providing for more opportunities and concession in certain policy areas²⁵⁹. Gradual Integration as developed by Cemal Karakas envisages both economic and political cooperation.²⁶⁰ The concept of Privileged Partnership has myriads shortcomings. Except for some working documents and press releases there are no comprehensive studies conducted to elucidate the concept and provide a fully-fledged offer. It remains mainly in the speeches of European political elites. Austrian foreign minister Ursula Plassnik had declared at the eve of commencement of accession negotiations that Austria preferred a specific alternative to membership²⁶¹. Austrian Prime Minister Wolfgang Schüssel was also determined at vetoing opening of accession negotiations until the very last minute. The deeply historical reference to Turkish possible EU accession made Austria the most vehement obstructor.²⁶² Even before the concrete addressing of the concept of privileged partnership, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, chairman of the convention on the European Union's future, known for his vehement opposition to Turkey, declared that it would be the end of Europe to permit Turkey into the EU²⁶³.

As much as it has been supported by mainly Christian Democrats in Europe that much vehemently it has been rejected by Turkish political elites.

²⁵⁹ Wolfgang Quaisser and Steve Wood (2004), "EU Member Turkey? Preconditions, Consequences and Integration Alternatives", *Forschungsverbund Ost- und Südosteuropa Arbeitspapier No. 25*, pp.51.

Available online at http://www.forost.lmu.de/fo_library/forost_Arbeitspapier_25.pdf

²⁶⁰ Cemal Karakas (2005), "Für eine Abgestufte Integration. Zur Debatte um den EU-Beitritt der Türkei", *HSEK (Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung) Standpunkte 4/2005*.

Available online at [http://www.hsfk.de/downloads/Standpunkte-4-2005_\(druckfrei\).pdf](http://www.hsfk.de/downloads/Standpunkte-4-2005_(druckfrei).pdf) (accessed 22.04.2012).

²⁶¹ EU Observer (31.08.2005), "Austria moots alternative to Turkish membership", Available at <http://euobserver.com/enlargement/19752> (accessed on 20 April 2012).

²⁶² The Guardian (05.10.2005), "Splendid Isolation", Available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/oct/05/worlddispatch.turkey> (Accessed on 15 May 2012).

²⁶³ The Economist (14.11.2002), "Too big for Europe?The Turks at the Gate of Europe", Available at <http://www.economist.com/node/1442045> (accessed on 15 May 2012).

Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan insisted that privileged partnership is unacceptable²⁶⁴ and Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator called privileged partnership even an insult.²⁶⁵

The concept as far as it is offered is also criticized for its content in that to a large extent it simply doesn't offer satisfying terms and no special new arrangements than the already existing structure. The establishment of a privileged partnership excludes many of the key policy areas like agriculture and regional policy. Moreover the offer doesn't entail proper participation for Turkey in decision making and leaves it still in a mere 'adopt and implement' position. The cooperative structure would have to require not only a say in decision shaping but also a vote in decision making. Therefore if Turkey is assumed to adopt the Aquis Communataire and implement it voting rights should be granted.²⁶⁶

In a speech in 2004²⁶⁷, Angela Merkel then only head of the CDU, evaluated EU-Turkey Germany relations. After an introduction in her speech elucidating the special relationship between the parts, Turkey's significant role in European politics (especially foreign and security policy) she gradually and slightly touched upon Turkey's role in the European Union. By providing a description of the difficulties Germany has been facing since unification and being on the eve of the accession of the ten new members, she opens the way for her views on Turkish prospective membership. In her speech, Merkel clearly espouses the notion of privileged partnership and also the policy areas that won't

²⁶⁴ Hürriyet (17.02.2004), "Erdoğan: İmtiyazlı Ortaklık Asla Olmaz". Available at <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/ShowNew.aspx?id=203221> (accessed on 15 May 2012).

²⁶⁵ Euractiv (08.10.2009), "Turkey's chief negotiator: 'Privileged partnership' is an insult", Available at <http://www.euractiv.com/enlargement/turkey-chief-negotiator-privileged-partnership-insult/article-186179> (accessed on 15 May 2012).

²⁶⁶ İçener (2007), op.cit., p.13

²⁶⁷ Angela Merkel (2004a) The Future of Europe, Speech given in 46.Discussion Forum organized by Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Ankara Office and Turkish Democracy Foundation, 16 February [own translation] Available at http://www.kas.de/proj/home/home/44/12/webseite_id-2515/index.html (accessed 22 April 2012)

be included in such a partnership. These policies, as also reflected in the report prepared by Guttenberg are agriculture, regional policy and cohesion and free movement of workers. Summing up, Merkel clearly defends her favouring of a privileged partnership. Merkel used this concept also for the membership perspective of the western Balkan where she prioritized the deepening of the EU²⁶⁸. In speeches in the German Bundestag, Schäuble²⁶⁹ and Merkel²⁷⁰ take a clear stance with respect to the prospective commencement of accession negotiations with Turkey and vehemently criticize the Schröder government for enabling this. Moreover they indicate that integration and deepening of the EU wouldn't properly function once Turkey acceded. They question Turkey's being part of Europe as her borders reach to Syria and Iraq and refer to her role as being a bridge and thereby indicating that a bridge doesn't belong to one side. Reflected both in these and other speeches of Merkel and other CDU politicians, the automatic accession process (Beitrittsautomation) is rendered obsolete for the case of Turkey.²⁷¹

It is also overtly accepted by CDU politicians that the concept of privileged partnership has been obscured. In a personal conversation with the CDU politician Michael Stübgen the question was addressed as to whether Germany, under Angela Merkel is growing more critical towards Turkey and waiting-within the EU structure- that Turkey by virtue herself will abandon the

²⁶⁸ EUObserver (17.03.2005), "Merkel moots privileged partnership for Western Balkans, Available at <http://euobserver.com/enlargement/21163> (accessed on 20 April 2012).

²⁶⁹ Wolfgang Schäuble, (2004) "Die privilegierte Partnerschaft ist die richtige Lösung", Rede des stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden der CDU/CSU-Bundestagsfraktion, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble MdB, in der Türkei-debatte des Bundestages am 28.10.2004 (own translation). Available at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/10_28_04_Schaeuble_Rede_St_Bericht.pdf (accessed 22 April 2012)

²⁷⁰ Angela Merkel (2004b), „Für ein glaubwürdiges Angebot der EU an die Türkei, Speech given in the plenary session of German Bundestag on 16 December 2004“, (own translation). Available at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/12_16_04_Rede_Merkel_Tuerkei_St_Bericht.pdf (accessed on 22 April 2012)

²⁷¹ Official petition to the German Bundestag by the CDU fraction on 19.10.2004, (own translation) Available at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/1503949.pdf>

EU accession process. The fairly clinical and firm response of Stübgen, constitutes one of the most critical stances within the CDU. Stübgen defends the view that the Turkish society has a completely different mentality than Europe. Therefore it is not rational to offer Turkey a clear membership perspective. He listed the regions and countries being offered membership perspective. The region he mentioned was the Western Balkan. He intentionally excludes Turkey even though Turkey already has a membership perspective and membership negotiations are going on. By evaluating Turkey's membership process he also denoted that the Turkish state society have lost the zeal for membership but disclaimed that Germany and the EU are awaiting of a one-sided abandonment of the process by Turkey²⁷²

The concept of privileged partnership is not much expressed in recent times. Anyhow the enlargement policy towards Turkey and the negotiations are not much under discussion. What dominate the agenda are the economic crisis and the deteriorating situation of Greece. Little can be heard in recent times about the situation of Turkey.

It is also interesting to discern the discrepancy between the EU policy of Angela Merkel and Helmut Kohl. In 2011, Kohl expressed some concerns and critics against the EU policy of Merkel. The phrase "She ruins my Europe"²⁷³ displays a before never heard critic on Merkel's policy whereupon Merkel and Kohl had been always good partners. In the same harsh tone Merkel responds that she acknowledges the achievements of Kohl but adding that he doesn't understand the challenges of today's Europe²⁷⁴

²⁷² Michael Stübgen, Personal Interview, 22.09.2012.

²⁷³ Der Spiegel (17.07.2011), "Schuldenkrise: Helmut Kohl rechnet mit Merkels Europapolitik ab", Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/schuldenkrise-helmut-kohl-rechnet-mit-merkels-europapolitik-ab-a-774875.html> (accessed on 11.12.2012)

²⁷⁴ Der Spiegel (25.08.2011), "Rüge des Altkanzlers: Merkel lässt Kohls Kritik abprallen", Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/ruege-des-altkanzlers-merkel-laesst-kohls-kritik-abprallen-a-782283.html>, (accessed on 11.12.2012)

4.5. The Reasons of CDU Opposition to Turkey's EU Membership

Germany and Turkey have a long lasting relationship that underwent many changes. The most salient incident was witnessed after World War-II and the end of the Cold War. The coming forth of The European Union constituted the most important variable of the bilateral relations. Changes in government in Germany adversely affected the relations with Turkey. This owes much to the fact that Germany's post-second World War foreign policy manifests itself in multilateral institutions, especially the European Union.

It is purported in this section that, given the time restriction of after 1990, changes of government in Germany have direct effects on the European Union quest of Turkey. Elucidating the German Christian Democrats stance, it is put forward that Germany under CDU has adopted an essential critical stance towards Turkey. Also it is to be said that there are differences in the incumbencies of Kohl and Merkel. Helmut Kohl, by being a much more vocal supporter of European Union reflected this support also towards EU Enlargement whereas Angela Merkel can be deemed as distinctively more critical towards European Union enlargement which is distinctive in her attitudes towards Turkey. A general right-wing opposition to Turkey's membership is discernible. The main dividing line in oppositional discourse towards Turkey is said to be the left-right division in the political spectrum.²⁷⁵ The German CDU, French Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) and Austrian People's Party are the most prominent representatives.

Against this background this section attempts to answer why the CDU opposes Turkish EU membership. For that, it is purported that perceived cultural differences and the concept of identity constitutes the main reason for a rejection of Turkish membership.

²⁷⁵ Hakan Yılmaz (2007), "Turkish Identity on the road to the EU: basic elements of French and German Oppositional Discourses", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9, No:3, p.294.

Culture and Identity as Obstacles to Turkey's EU-Membership

Cultural differences and the concept of European identity are important in that they reflect an integral part of CDU opposition of Turkish membership. When analyzing the perceived costs of a Turkish membership they can be summarized as being the concern on whether Turkey is capable to adapt to EU membership conditionality as defined in the 1993 Copenhagen summit, Turkey's economic underdevelopment and size (whereas it has to be noted here that the good economic performance of Turkey in the last years dilutes this argument) and lastly the fact that Turkey is not being seen as European²⁷⁶. This last argument is distinctive in that it constitutes the basic reason of opposition for the German CDU. German fear of a Turkish membership include high unemployment coinciding with a worker flow from Turkey to Germany in a case of membership, Turkish membership posing weight on the EU budget (bearing in mind that Germany rests among the net payers to the EU) and the fear of the Christian Democrats that Turkey will weaken the Christian inheritance and identity of the European Union.²⁷⁷

Turkey has been perceived as the "Other" of Europe and has contributed to the representation, validation and performance of European identity²⁷⁸. The application of constructivism can be discerned in some studies. Rumelili explains that constructivism acknowledges the link between European and Turkish identity that can be re-constructed in a way as to make the justification of Turkish membership desirable from an identity viewpoint.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁶Neill Nugent(2007), "The EU's Response to Turkey's Membership Application: Not Just a Weighing of Costs and Benefits", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 29, No. 4,pp.485-487.

²⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 489.

²⁷⁸ Bahar Rumelili (2011), "Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy and Socialization in a Post-Enlargement Europe, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp:238-239.

²⁷⁹ Bahar Rumelili (2008), "Negotiating Europe: EU-Turkey Relations from an Identity Perspective", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No:1, p.98.

One of the constitutive elements of cultural based opposition to Turkey is Islam. Inherently Islam was perceived with suspicion and Turkey represents the Islamic Other of Europe. Turkey is seen as a symbol of European identity crisis with its Muslim identity challenging the religious and cultural identity of Europe²⁸⁰ and the Turkish protracted accession process to the EU has turned into the challenge of whether EU will accept Islam or not²⁸¹ and to the claim that the EU is neutral towards any religion but dedicated to the principle of pluralism²⁸². The terrorist attacks of September 2001 and the following bombings in Madrid (2004) and London (2005) fed on the antagonism towards Islam.

A further reason is the absence of a kinship based duty with respect to Turkey's membership process. Whereas the CEEC's accession process was perceived as the reuniting of the European continent, Turkey was left aside. Member states preferences play an important role as it was the case with German support for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic²⁸³. This is prevalent when comparing the rhetoric on Turkey's application compared with Romania²⁸⁴ and Poland²⁸⁵. Emblematic is that Romania's European cultural identity has not been challenged as those of Turkey's which confirms that culture and identity

²⁸⁰ Effie Fokas (2008), "Islam in the framework of Turkey-EU relations: situations in flux and moving targets", *Global Change, Peace and Security*, Vol.20, No:1, p.98.

²⁸¹ Fokas (2008), *op.cit.* p.88.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, p.91.

²⁸³ Erhan İçener, David Phinnemore and Dimitris Papadimitriou (2010), "Continuity and Change in the European Union's Approach to Enlargement: Turkey and Central and Eastern Europe Compared", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol.10, No.2, p.211.

²⁸⁴ Asa Lundgren "The Case of Turkey: Are some Candidates more 'European' than others?" in Helene Sjursen (ed.) (2006), *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*, Routledge: New York, p.121.

²⁸⁵ Ziya Öniş (2004), "Diverse but Converging Paths to European Union Membership: Poland and Turkey in Comparative Perspective", *East European Politics and Society*, Vol.18, No.3, pp-481-512.

constitute a factor of EU enlargement²⁸⁶. The case of Poland is exclusively distinct in the context of German attitude as Poland benefitted from great support from Germany. The rapprochement between Germany and Poland was perceived as a historical obligation and Poland benefitted from an ownership by Germany whereas Turkey was deprived of any substantial support of that kind²⁸⁷. Nevertheless there are also studies questioning and analysing the European Identity of the CEEC's²⁸⁸

Identity based opposition towards Turkey's membership is closely interlinked with public opinion on Turkey's EU accession which significantly deteriorated in recent years. Some studies take the fear of Islam and mass migration as variables for what they label Turcoscepticism²⁸⁹ and others cluster linguistic repertoires, religion-politics nexus and popular culture as units of analysis²⁹⁰. A further study on the discourse in Germany on Turkish accession define three distinctive discourses: **multiculturalism** favours Turkey's accession and acknowledges the bridge function of it between different cultures; **European consolidation** discourse excludes Turkey from further development of the EU and finally **cultural incompatibility** which as purported in this section refers to the incompatibility of German (and broader seen European) and Turkish culture which asserts that Islam and democracy are incompatible²⁹¹. A study on quality

²⁸⁶ Asa Lundgren (2006), op.cit., p.122.

²⁸⁷ Öniş (2004), op.cit. p.508.

²⁸⁸ Dieter Fuchs and Hans-Dieter Klingemann(2002), "Eastward Enlargement of the European Union and the Identity of Europe", *West European Politics*, Vol.25, No.2, pp.19-54.

²⁸⁹Ebru Ş. And Canan Sokullu(2011), "Turcoscepticism and Threat Perception: European Public Opinion on Turkey's Protracted EU Membership", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.3,pp. 483-497.

²⁹⁰ John A. Scherpereel (2010), "European Culture and the European Union's 'Turkey Question'", *West European Politics*, Vol.33, No.3, pp.810-829.

²⁹¹ Bernard Steunenbergh, Simay Petek and Christiane R uth (2011) "Between Reason and Emotion: Popular Discourse on Turkey's Membership of EU", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.3, p. 454.

press in Germany, France and Britain reveal that taking the cases of Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (conservative and/or economic liberal) and Süddeutsche Zeitung (progressive and/or social liberal), discourse on Turkey's membership concentrates on the widening-deepening conflict and the culture and identity conflict²⁹². Here the distinctive factor is the cleavage between the two newspapers in that they differentiate substantially on the issue of Turkey's cultural compatibility whereas they both acknowledge the difficulties arising from enlargement per se²⁹³. A further study does focus on the German perception of Turkish candidacy for EU-membership and detects diverging positions in the media, in the government and opposition parties and in civil society²⁹⁴.

A special Eurobarometer Survey conducted by the European Commission in 2011²⁹⁵ focused on European identity. The constitutive elements of a common European identity were indicated as the Euro (%36) democratic values (%32), geography (%22), common culture (%22), common history (%17) and common religious heritage (%5). For 38% of Germans the Euro was placed at the first place. In a survey in 2002²⁹⁶, %66 of Germans believed that they had a moral duty to re-unite Europe after the Cold-War and 68% believed that the new countries joining the European Union are historically and geographically natural and therefore justified. Nevertheless it has to be noted here that the high support of

²⁹² Andreas Wimmel (2009), "Beyond the Bosphorus? Comparing public discourse on Turkey's EU application in the German, French and British quality press", *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.223-243.

²⁹³ Wimmel (2010), op. cit., pp. 229-231.

²⁹⁴ Katrin Böttger and Eva-Maria Maggi, "German Perceptions" in Sait Akşit, Özgehan Şenyuva and Çiğdem Üstün (Turkey Watch: EU Member States' Perceptions on Turkey's Accession to the EU", publication of the Center for European Studies, Middle East Technical University, pp. 32-46. Available online at http://sinan.ces.metu.edu.tr/dosya/turkey_watch_en.pdf

²⁹⁵ European Commission (2011), "Special Eurobarometer 346 / Wave 73.3 : New Europeans". Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_346_en.pdf

²⁹⁶ European Commission(2002), "Flash Eurobarometer 132/1: Enlargement of the European Union.", Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl132_en.pdf

Germany was rather directed towards the CEEC's and not to Turkey. However it is interesting to note that those states are attributed historical and geographical importance. In a survey in 2006²⁹⁷, 73% of German respondents indicated that enlargement of the EU enriches Europe's cultural diversity. Upon the question of what the challenges are facing Turkey (and the West Balkans) on their road to the European Union is, 47% of Germans indicated respect for human and minority rights, 35% reconciliation/cooperation with neighbouring countries and 36% democracy. 48% of the respondents oppose an accession of Turkey whereas to note here that Germany with %69 has the highest opposition rate excelled only by Austria with %81. In a further survey²⁹⁸, only 40% of Germans believe that Turkey is part of the European history, 74% indicate that cultural differences are an obstacle to membership, 78% fear of mass migration and 93% believe that Turkey has to undertake more democratic reforms. Complementary to this gloomy picture, the results of a Transatlantic Trends Survey in 2006²⁹⁹ demonstrate that in a range of affection rate between 1-100, Germany only felt 43 percent of affection for Turkey. . The latest survey of Transatlantic Trends³⁰⁰ reveals that 40% of Germans have a 'somewhat unfavourable opinion of Turkey and 43% a 'somewhat unfavourable opinion' of Turkey.

Cultural connotations are omnipresent in Valery Giscard d'Estaing's much cited interview to the French newspaper *Le Monde*, where he clearly challenges Turkey's European credentials and alludes to Turkey's Muslim character: "Turkey

²⁹⁷ European Commission (2006), "Special Eurobarometer 255 / Wave 65.2: Attitudes towards European Union Enlargement." Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_255_en.pdf

²⁹⁸ European Commission (2006), "Standard Eurobarometer 66 / Herbst Nationaler Bericht Deutschland." (own translation) Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb66/eb66_de_nat.pdf

²⁹⁹ Transatlantic Trends (2006), Top Line Data. Available online at http://trends.gmfus.org/files/archived/doc/2006_english_top.pdf

³⁰⁰ Transatlantic Trends (2012), Top Line Data. Available online at: <http://trends.gmfus.org/files/2012/09/TT-2012-Topline-Data.pdf>

is a country that is close to Europe, an important country ... but it is not a European country... its capital is not in Europe, 95% of its population are outside”³⁰¹. From Germany, the leader of the CSU, the sister party of CDU Edmund Stoiber utters harsh critics on Turkey in saying that Turkey has “great ideological and cultural differences to European values³⁰².” Some studies on the future scenarios for Turkey EU relations also ponder that the debate on identity will shape future shape of relations between EU and Turkey, thereby adding that this causes also the threat of lost of credibility of the EU.³⁰³

4.6. The Way Ahead: Continual Problems and Future Challenges

As a conclusion to the analysis of the enlargement policy of the CDU and the focus on Turkey this section will provide a succinct evaluation of some protracted problems in Turkey-EU relations by embracing the variable of Germany. Secondly the future challenges for Turkey-EU relations will be issued on the possibility of the cooperation between the German CDU and the AKP in Turkey.

The Cyprus problem and the Kurdish question are among the endless questions affecting the accession process of Turkey. For space concerns only a short overview will be provided.

The impasse of the Cyprus problem entered a different stage after the accession of Southern Cyprus in the name of the whole island to the European Union in 2004 despite their rejection of the Annan Plan. This caused deep senses of disappointment and betrayal on Turkey and the Turkish part of the island. Cyprus is said to be emblematic in how Europeanization altered key policy issues

³⁰¹ The Guardian (09.11.2002), “Turkey must be kept out of the Union, Giscard says”, Available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/nov/09/turkey.eu> (Accessed on 02.12.2012).

³⁰² Focus (20.09.2006), “Religionsstreit: Stoiber attackiert Türkei” (own translation) Available online at http://www.focus.de/politik/ausland/papst/religionsstreit_aid_115919.html

³⁰³ Aylin Güney (2005), “The future of Turkey in the European Union”, *Futures*, Vol. 37, Issue 4, May 2005, p.312.

as the problem was with the Helsinki summit in 1999 included directly as conditionality of the accession process of Turkey³⁰⁴. The rejection of the Annan Plan by South Cyprus and Turkey's later declaration that the signing of the Additional Protocol on the adaptation of the Ankara agreement does not mean the recognition of Cyprus again strained relations. The subsequent Council decision³⁰⁵ on the full implementation of the Additional Protocol was followed by the decision on the suspension of eight negotiation chapters at the 2006 Brussels Summit³⁰⁶ and the tenacity on the Turkish side to wait the fulfilling of the EU's obligations promised to Northern Cyprus after the failed Annan Plan. Not much progress has been recorded since except for reciprocal accusations. The Council Presidency of South Cyprus during the second half of 2012 has not arisen that much tension so far. The declarations of Chancellor Merkel during a visit to the President of South Cyprus Christophias as of Turkey should engage more in a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus conflict³⁰⁷ caused again tensions with Turkey and annoyed statements of Turkish premier minister Erdoğan³⁰⁸

An important comment is that Europeanization effect on the Cyprus conflict has rather been limited so far and the EU has not found a solution to the

³⁰⁴ Kivanç Ulusoy (2008), "The Europeanization of Turkey and its impact on the Cyprus problem", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.10, No.3, pp.313-314.

³⁰⁵ Council decision on the principles, priorities and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with Turkey, Official Journal of the European Union, L22/34, 26 January 2006.

³⁰⁶ As regards the Council Meeting of General Affairs and External Relations on 11 December 2006 in Brussels 8 chapters have been blocked. The adoption of the Additional Protocol is the prerequisite for the following chapters: Free Movement of Goods, Right of Establishment and Freedom to Provide Services, Financial Services, Agriculture and Rural Development, Fisheries, Transport Policy, Customs Union, External Relations. The signature of the Additional Protocol constitutes closing benchmark for all chapters.

³⁰⁷ Der Spiegel (11.01.2011), "Merkel appelliert an die Türkei im Zypern Streit", (own translation) Online available at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/geteilte-insel-merkel-appelliert-an-die-tuerkei-im-zypern-streit-a-738987.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

³⁰⁸ Der Spiegel (14.01.2011), "Zypern Streit: Erdoğan attackiert Merkel", (own translation) Online available at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/zypern-streit-erdogan-attackiert-merkel-a-739620.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

problem but rather transformed it³⁰⁹. The EU's failure to deal with the Cyprus problem on an equitable basis was perceived as another double standard by Turkish political elites and public³¹⁰.

The EU's soft power and transformation effect has also rather been limited in the case of the Kurdish issue³¹¹ which - after fast-tracked reforms in the period of 1999-2005, with the rise of Kurdish violence after 2004 and the concomitant negative stance of EU countries – remains rather unsolved and gets new environment with the conflict in Syria.

Another problem is the loss of the Europeanization zeal of the AKP and the question of the context of its future politics³¹². The acumination of bilateral relations between Chancellor Merkel and Prime Minister Erdoğan is distinctive. Erdoğan demands Turkish high schools whereas Merkel pledges for more engaged integration of Turks in Germany. The attained confidence of Turkish leaders is discernible in sometimes even harsh demeanour of Turkish leaders. The tough parlance of Prime Minister Erdoğan is said to cause irritation in the German public³¹³. At the same time palpable frustration on the Turkish side is also a

³⁰⁹ Ulusoy (2008), op.cit., p.309.

³¹⁰ Ziya Öniş (2008), "Turkey-EU Relations: Beyond the Current Stalemate", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.4, p.42.

³¹¹ Kemal Kirişçi (2011), "The Kurdish Issue in Turkey: Limits of European Reform", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp.335-349.

³¹² For a study on the future politics of AKP see, Ümit Cizre (2011), "Turkey at the Crossroads: From 'Change with Politics as Usual' to Politics with Change as Usual", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.13, No.4, pp.83-105.

³¹³ This view has been expressed in personal conversations made with officials of the German Foreign Ministry in September 2012. The officials indicated that they support Turkish membership but wish a more conciliatory attitude from Turkey. Farther, they emphasized that they perceive some speeches and declarations of Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan as offending and irrational. They wish Turkey to further stick to the Europeanization process and the Accession process. Moreover, they think that more initiatives should be started with respect to cooperation between the societies of Germany and Turkey. This is especially important with respect to the huge population of Turkish migrants living in Germany.

problem whereas the challenges of 2012 are listed as the new positive agenda, the issue of visa liberalization, the relaunch of reforms and the Cyprus issue³¹⁴.

Generally it can be said that after French and Dutch vetoes and the constitutional crisis in 2005 and the emergence of the Euro crisis in 2009 created the emergence of a period of internal consolidation, the so-called deepening of the Union. Germany's and Angela Merkel's demanding steering role through both crises has distracted the attention from enlargement. Furthermore, in the crisis environment the specific case of Turkey is rendered cumbersome. The change in government in France has split the "Merkozy" duo that together presented the main obstacle of Turkey's membership. New French President Hollande, a socialist, seems to have a more pragmatic stance not driven solely by the cultural discourse. The prospective national elections in Germany with possible changes in government and the tackling of the Eurocrisis could again provide impetus to relations.

4.7. Conclusion

The CDU since its establishment after the Second World War has showed an overt pro-European integration stance which has been also prevalent in the support for EU Enlargement. However it is a fact that the CDU both under Helmut Kohl and Angela Merkel prioritized deepening over widening.

.The EU Enlargement to the CEEC's has been rendered as historical unification of Europe by Helmut Kohl and was much supported on grounds of common historical past and cultural commonalities.

Notwithstanding, it has been discerned that Germany's support for EU Enlargement has come to an end with Angela Merkel. The more negative stance of Merkel owes much to the principle opposition to Turkey's membership bid. Thereby it has been detected that the overt supportive stance of the CDU towards

³¹⁴Amanda Paul (2012), Turkey's EU Journey: What Next?", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.25-33.

EU Enlargement has been challenged with the protracted and problematic accession process of Turkey.

This chapter has further come to the conclusion that the CDU has adopted an exclusionary stance of Turkey on grounds of lack of common culture and identity. The negative public opinion in Germany towards Turkey's EU membership also contributed to that.

The CDU vision of the EU, has unfolded with the European Union expanding to states that were rendered as historical parts of Europe. This has consolidated the CDU perception of the EU as not a mere economic community. Therefore, from the perspective of the CDU, Turkey does not fit within.

It is also distinctive that the case of Turkey in the incumbency of Helmut Kohl has been rather evaluated in terms of economic and strategic partnership as institutionalized with the Customs Union, rather than with a clear perspective of membership. But in the incumbency of Merkel we face a rather different case. Merkel's CDU represents a sharp shift from the supportive stance of the SPD for Turkey's EU Accession process. Moreover, despite the initiatives of Privileged Partnership, which is vehemently rejected by Turkey, the commencement of accession negotiations could not be hindered.

Looking at protracted problems like the Kurdish Issue and the Cyprus Problem, we see that the combination of a critical Merkel and CDU government towards EU Enlargement and an exhausted Turkey contributed to the stalemate in Turkey's accession process. It has also be noted that whereas Helmut Kohl was adamant to EU Enlargement of the CEEC's and just by case excluded Turkey, Angela Merkel has ended, because of the vehement opposition to Turkey's membership, in a wholesome rejective position of any EU Enlargement round. At the given state of play of relations it will be further be interesting to test two scenarios after elections: A further CDU-Merkel government and its policy towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement and a CDU under Merkel acting in opposition with probably the SPD in government. This remains yet to be tested.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to analyse how Germany's main political parties stances, namely the CDU and the SPD have evolved towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement since 1990.

The reason why Germany has been chosen for this study rests on three main reasons: 1) The special engagement of Germany in the European Union and EU Enlargement, its engine role for further and deeper European Integration, the appealing change this role has underwent and the gnawing question whether this supportive role has waned 2) The selected German political parties have a general supportive stance towards EU and EU Enlargement, albeit with different priorities. Therewithal they have clear and comparable stances towards Turkey's EU Accession Process which are attractive to analyse 3) ability to reach first-hand information in German that has enabled a thorough insight into the subject.

The study has set on to discern and analyse the breaking points of Germany's support for EU Enlargement and thereby has asked, whether the protracted and problematic accession process of Turkey to the European Union constitutes the main reason for this break.

This study has affirmed that there are distinctive differences between the EU Enlargement stance of the SPD and CDU which have been excelled in the case of Turkey's membership bid. Thereby this study has seen that cultural, identity, religious and historical commonalities do play a more decisive role for the CDU whereas the SPD does focus more on democratic credentials of Turkey and her improvement in this field.

This study has shown that Germany had supported Turkey's EU Accession process because of her general support for EU Enlargement. Farther it has been

determined that although Germany does preserve her supportive role for EU integration, her support for EU Enlargement has come to an end.

Within this causality, two breaking points of the German stance towards EU Enlargement were determined. The first one has been triggered by the end of the Cold War and the transformation of the European Union from a mere economic integration to a more complex and political union. Germany has supported the unproblematic accession of Sweden, Austria and Finland and also the CEEC's. But, concerns of democratic credibility and capacity of the EU itself have started to play a more effective role.

The second breaking point has been the protracted and problematic EU accession process of Turkey. This has been coined by internal problems of the EU like the Constitutional Crisis and the Eurocrisis and the incumbency of Angela Merkel.

Comparative analysis of the SPD and CDU stance towards EU Enlargement has shown that;

The SPD's initial stance towards European Integration in principle was rather critical and just ameliorated with internal party changes. Notwithstanding, the SPD soon joined the CDU in its pro-EU stance and constructed thereby the overt cross-party consensus on EU affairs in Germany. However, it has remained discernible that the SPD preserves a more sober attitude towards especially EU Enlargement when compared to the initial euphoria of the CDU.

One of the main findings of this study has been the fact that the SPD's stance towards Turkey's accession process has improved concomitant to developments in democratic reforms in Turkey. At the beginning of the 1990's the SPD had a rejective stance towards Turkey in this context, based on reasons of Turkey's poor human rights record and lack of democratic credentials. At that point, another finding has been that the SPD, when in opposition, felt freer to both criticize the ruling government and also Turkey herself for failing to comply with democratic compatibility. This stance significantly altered with the Schröder government taking up office in 1998.

The support of the Schröder government has triggered democratic reforms in Turkey whereas those reforms enabled the sustainability of the support of the Schröder government for Turkey's accession process to the EU. This study affirms that the positive attitude and support of the SPD led by Schröder enabled the declaration of Turkey's candidacy status in 1999 and the achievements during the so-called 'golden age of democratic reforms' during 1999-2005 in Turkey. That support also paved the way for the commencement of accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU in October 2005. The study has also discerned that the incumbency of Gerhard Schröder pursued a more balanced approach towards the CEEC's and Turkey's EU Accession Process.

However, the inquiry of the SPD has been left with an open question in this study with respect to the prospective response of the SPD towards the altered context of EU Enlargement. If and how the SPD will preserve its supportive stance towards Turkey in the case of the election of Peer Steinbrück as Chancellor needs yet to be tested. The Federal Elections within 2013 will probably provide an answer to it.

Turning to the CDU, it has been found that the CDU's enthusiastic support for EU Enlargement has waned. Further, this deterioration owes much to Turkey's problematic EU Accession process. The CDU stance towards Turkey's EU Accession has grown more negative in history, in parallel with the EU gaining more features of a political union. Thus, cultural and identity relevant disparities between Turkey and the EU have gained more importance.

In this study, difference between the stance of Helmut Kohl and Angela Merkel towards Turkey in the context of EU Enlargement has also been analysed. At the time of Kohl, EU Enlargement towards the fledgling democracies of the Central and Eastern European States was perceived as historical opportunity and obligation. Common cultural and historical ties towards those states constituted the backbone of the support of Kohl. On the contrary, Turkey's accession bid was extenuated and rather perceived in the context of the Customs Union. Further, Turkey's incompatibility to meet the Copenhagen Criteria rather provided

justified reasons of not including Turkey in the same group as the CEEC's. On the contrary, the incumbency of Angela Merkel was first left with the difficulties of the 2004 Enlargement to 10 new member states and the concomitant enlargement fatigue and second with a total different and irrevocable context of relations with Turkey following the commencement of Accession Negotiations in 2005. The Constitutional Crisis in 2005 and the Euro crisis have also provided additional reason of decline of the support of Merkel. This has urged the CDU to develop alternatives to full membership of Turkey. These intentions have been then conceptualized in the Privileged Partnership alternative offered by Angela Merkel and the CDU. But this offer has been rather weakened by the vehement rejection of Turkey and lack of legal foundation in EU legislation.

It has been further detected that perennial issues of Cyprus and the Kurdish problem are among the most important and enduring barriers to Turkey's membership to the EU. As in the case of the SPD, the analysis of the CDU has been left with the open question of if and how the CDU stance towards Turkey's EU Accession process will transform in case of the CDU being in opposition after Federal elections in 2013.

Finally, the study has come to the conclusion that the SPD in principle does support Turkey's membership by depending on the democratization of Turkey as the most important variable in relations. On the other side, the CDU has been discerned to be less reactive towards democratic reforms in Turkey. Rather the CDU has witnessed a growing rejective attitude based on exclusionary grounds such as the lack of common identity, culture, history and religion.

The possibility to access and investigate official documents of the political parties, plenary protocols of the Bundestag, academic articles and newspaper articles in their originals in German has enabled to enrich the narrative analysis of the historical development of the party stances towards the European Union and EU Enlargement. Farther, during the preparation of this study, I have attended a programme in Germany where I had the chance to make discussions with Günther Verheugen (SPD, former Commissioner for Enlargement), Michael Stübgen

(Member of parliament, CDU politician) and officials of the German Auswärtiges Amt (Ministry for Foreign Affairs). Their comments helped me to establish a thorough viewpoint.

In this study, ideas for further and more comprehensive investigations have arisen. The position of the Christian Democrats towards Turkish Accession process have been found more interesting and are rendered to provide for more concepts to analyse. Relevantly, one of the most appealing of these has been the desire to conduct a deeper analysis of the composition of culture, identity, common history and religion as factors affecting Turkey's membership bid and the role Germany does play in it. Such an encompassing analysis would also offer the opportunity to apply the theory of Constructivism. During literature review for this study, It has been discerned that many studies on Germany's EU and EU Enlargement policy have been grounded on Constructivism. The predicaments of Constructivism that are based among others on norms, identity and culture have piqued up curiosity. Though, due to the limited context of this study it was not able to incorporate such an analysis in this study. The aim of such a prospective analysis would then be to thoroughly analyse to what extent Germany's European Union policy is driven by the notions of culture, history, identity and religion. Concomitantly, by analysing Turkey's EU Membership in this context, more emphasis could be laid on the historical evolution and peculiarities of bilateral relations between Turkey and Germany. Further attractive issue would be to combine all of these possibilities in an analysis of the Christian Democracy in Germany and its role in Turkey's Accession process by focusing on culture, identity and religion.

REFERENCES

Books and Articles

Avcı, Gamze, “Turkey’s EU Politics. Consolidating Democracy through Enlargement?” in Helene Sjursen (ed.) (2006), *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*, Routledge: USA.

Avcı, Gamze and Ali Çarkoğlu (2011), “Introduction: Taking Stock of Dynamics that Shape EU Reforms in Turkey”, *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp.209-219.

Anderson, Jeffrey (1999), *German Unification and the Union of Europe: The Domestic Politics of Integration Policy*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Alpay, Şahin (2009), “Die politische Rolle des Militärs in der Türkei”, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Vol.39-40.

Aschmann, Birgit (2001), “The Reliable Ally: Germany Supports Spain's European Integration Efforts 1957-67”, *Journal for European Integration History*, Vol.7, No.1, pp. 37-51.

Andresen-Leitão, Nicolau (2001), “Portugal's European Integration Policy 1947-72”, *Journal for European Integration History*, Vol.7, No.1, pp. 25-35.

Aydın, Mustafa and Sinem A. Açıkmeşe (2007), “Europeanization through EU Conditionality: Understanding the New Era of Turkish Foreign Policy”, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9, No.3, pp. 263-274.

Aydınlı, Ersel (2009), “A Paradigmatic Shift for the Turkish Generals and an End to the Coup Era in Turkey”, *The Middle East Journal*, Vol.63, No.4, pp. 581-596.

Banchoff, Thomas (1996), “Historical Memory and German Foreign Policy: The Case of Adenauer and Brandt”, *German Politics and Society*, Vol.14, No.2. pp.36-54.

Banchoff, Thomas (1997), “German Policy towards the European Union: The Effects of Historical Memory”, *German Politics*, Vol 6, No.1, pp. 60-76.

Banchoff, Thomas (1999), *The German Problem Transformed: Institutions, Politics and Foreign Policy 1945-1995*, University of Michigan Press: USA.

Bendix, John, "Germany" in Colin Hayand Anand Menon (eds.) (2007), "European Politics", Oxford University Press: USA.

Berger, Thomas (1997), The past in the present: Historical memory and German national security policy", *German Politics*, Vol.6,No.1, pp.39-59.

Bernard Steunenber, Simay Petek and Christiane R uth (2011), "Between Reason and Emotion: Popular Discourse on Turkey's Membership of EU", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16. Issue 3, pp. 449-468.

Bulmer, Simon and William Paterson(1989), "West Germany's Role in Europe: 'Man-Mountain' or 'Semi-Gulliver'?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.28,No.2, pp.95-116.

Busch, Klaus and Wilhelm Knelangen "German Euroscepticism" in Robert Harmsen and Menno Spiering(eds) (2004) "Euroscepticism: Party Politics, National Identity and European Integration" , European Studies: New York, pp.83-98.

B ttger Katrin and Eva-Maria Maggi, "German Perceptions" in Sait Ak it,  zgehan  enyuva and  i dem  st n, *Turkey Watch: EU Member States' Perceptions on Turkey's Accession to the EU*, Publication of the Center for European Studies, Middle East Technical University, pp. 32-46. Available online at http://sinan.ces.metu.edu.tr/dosya/turkey_watch_en.pdf

Braunthal, Gerard (1999), "The 1998 German Election: Gerhard Schr der and the Politics of the New Middle", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 50,Vol.17,No.1. pp.32-55.

Carbone, Luigi and Natalie Tocci (2007), "Running around in Circles? The cyclical Relationship between Turkey and the European Union", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9,No.3, pp.233-245.

 arko lu, Ali and Barry Rubin (eds.), (2003), *Turkey and the European Union: Domestic Politics, Economic Integration, and International Dynamics*, Frank Cass London and Portland.

Clemens, Clay (2009), "Modernisation or Disorientation? Policy Change in Merkel's CDU", *German Politics*, Vol.18, No.2,pp. 121-139.

Cizre,  mit (2011), "Turkey at the Crossroads: From 'Change with Politics as Usual' to Politics with Change as Usual", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.13,No.4,pp.83-105.

Cole, Alistair (1998), "Political leadership in Western Europe: Helmut Kohl in Comparative Context", *German Politics*, Vol.7, Issue, 1, pp. 120-142.

Crawford, Beverly (2010), "The Normative Power of a Normal State: Power and Revolutionary Vision in Germany's Post Wall Foreign Policy", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 95, Vol.28, No.2, pp.165-184.

Dağı, İhsan (2001), "Human Rights, Democratization and the European Community in Turkish Politics: The Özal Years, 1983-87", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 37, Issue 1, pp. 17-40.

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1999), "The Third Way and Liberty: An Authoritarian Streak in Europe's New Center", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, Issue 5, September/October 1999.

Dalton, Russel J. (1998), "A Celebration of Democracy: the 1998 Bundestag Election", *German Politics and Society*, Issue 49, Vol.16, No.4. pp.1-6.

Dimitrova, Antoaneta (2011), "Speeding up or Slowing Down? Lessons from the Last Enlargement on the Dynamics of Enlargement driven Reform", *South European Society & Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp. 221-233.

Dyson, Kenneth (1998), "Chancellor Kohl as Strategic Leader: The Case of Economic and Monetary Union", *German Politics*, Vol.7, Issue 1, pp.37-63.

Ebru Ş. Canan-Sokullu (2011), "Turcoscepticism and Threat Perception: European Public Opinion on Turkey's Protracted EU Membership", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.3, pp.483-497.

Eralp, Atilla "Forging New Identities Along Old Lines: Turkey and the European Community in the Changing Post-War International System, Marx Haller and Rudolph Richt(eds.) (1994), *Towards a European Nation?* , Serharpe: New York.

Eralp, Atila, "Turkey and the European Union", in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis (eds.) (2004), "The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy", Cambridge: New York .

Eren, Nuri (1961), "Turkey: Problems, Politics, Parties", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.40, Issue 1, pp.95-104.

Fischer, Joschka (2004), "Turkey's European Perspective: The German View", *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 3.

Fokas, Effie (2008), "Islam in the framework of Turkey-EU relations: situations in flux and moving targets", *Global Change, Peace and Security*, Vol.20, No:1.

Font, Nuria (2006), "Why the European Union Gave Turkey the Green Light", *Journal for Contemporary European Studies*, Vol.14, No.2.

Fuchs, Dieter and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (2002), "Eastward Enlargement of the European Union and the Identity of Europe", *West European Politics*, Vol.25, No.2, pp.19-54.

Gilbert, Mark F. (2003), *Surpassing Realism: The Politics of European Integration since 1945*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: USA.

Güçlü, Yücel (2000), "Turkish-German relations on the eve of World War Two", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp. 73-94.

Gürsoy, Yaprak (2011), "The Impact of EU-Driven Reforms on the Political Autonomy of the Turkish Military", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp.293-308.

Güney, Aylin (2005), "The future of Turkey in the European Union", *Futures*, Vol. 37, Issue 4, pp. 303-316.

Grabbe, Heather (2006), *The EU's Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Hale, William (2011), "Human Rights and Turkey's EU Accession Process: Internal and External Dynamics, 2005-10", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16,No.2, p.323-333.

Tarık, Oğuzlu H. (2012), "Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization without Membership", *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, pp.229-243.

Irving, Ronald (2002), *Profiles in Power: Adenauer*, Pearson Education Limited, United Kingdom.

İçener, Erhan, David Phinnemore and Dimitris Papadimitriou (2010), "Continuity and change in the European Union's Approach to Enlargement: Turkey and Central and Eastern Europe Compared", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol.10, No.2.pp. 207-223.

İçener, Erhan (2007), "Privileged partnership: An alternative Final Destination for

Turkey's Integration with the European Union?, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol.8, Issue 4, pp. 415-438.

Jarausch, Konrad H. ,“Germany 1989: A New Type of Revolution?”, in Marc Silberman (ed.) (2011), *The German Wall, Fallout in Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, pp.11-35.

Jerabek, Martin (2011), *Deutschland und die Osterweiterung der EU*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: Morlenbach, Deutschland.

Yılmaz, Kamil (2011), “The EU-Turkey Customs Union Fifteen Years Later: Better, Yet Not the Best Alternative”, *South European Society & Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp. 235-249.

Karakas, Cemal (2005), “Für eine Abgestufte Integration. Zur Debatte um den EU-Beitritt der Türkei“, HSFK-Standpunkte 4/2005.

Available at <http://www.hsfk.de/downloads/Standpunkte-4-2005> (druckfrei).pdf. (accessed 22.04.2012).

Kaya, Ayhan and Ferhat Kentel (2005), Euro-Turks A Bridge Or A Breach Between Turkey And The European Union? A Comparative Study of German-Turks and French-Turks”, The Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers No. 14.

Keyman, Fuat and Ziya Öniş, “Helsinki, Copenhagen and Beyond-Challenges to the New Europe and the Turkish state” in Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe (2005), *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, Routledge: New York.

Kirişçi, Kemal (2011), “The Kurdish Issue in Turkey: Limits of European Reform”, *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.16, No.2, pp. 335-349.

Korte, Karl-Rudolf (1998), “The Art of Power: The ‘Kohl System’, Leadership and Deutschlandpolitik”, *German Politics*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp. 64-90.

Kubicek, Paul (2011), “Political conditionality and European Union's Cultivation of Democracy in Turkey”, *Democratization*, Vol.18, No.4, pp. 910-931.

Küçük, Bülent (2011), “Europe and the Other Turkey: Fantasies of Identity in the Enlarged Europe”, *Eurosphere Working Paper Series, Online Working Paper No. 34*. Available on <http://eurospheres.org/publications/working-papers>

Langenbacher, Eric (2010), “The Mastered Past? Collective Memory Trends in Germany since Unification”, *German Politics and Society*, Issue 94, Vol. 28, No.1, pp. 42-68.

Langenbacher, Eric (2003), "Changing Memory Regimes in Contemporary Germany?", *German Politics and Society*, Vol.21, No.2, pp. 46-68.

Langenbacher, Eric (2005), "Moralpolitik versus Moralpolitik: Recent Struggles over the Construction of Cultural Memory in Germany", *German Politics and Society*, Vol.23, No.3, pp.106-134.

Lees, Charles, "The Limits of Party-Based Euroscepticism in Germany", in Paul Taggart and Aleks Szverbiak (eds.) (2008) "Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism: Case Studies and Country Surveys Vol.1", Oxford University Press: UK.

Lucke, Albrecht Von (2012), "Peer Steinbrück und die Nulloption", *Blaetter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, November 2012. Available online at <http://www.blaetter.de/archiv/jahrgaenge/2012/november>

Lundgren, Asa (2006), "The Case of Turkey: Are some Candidates more 'European' than others?" in Helene Sjursen (ed.) (2006), *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*, Routledge: New York.

Mearsheimer, John (1990), "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.15, No.1, pp. 5-56

Moravcsik, Andrew and Milada Anna Vachudova (2003), "National Interests, State Power, and EU Enlargement", *East European Politics & Societies*, Vol.17, No.1, pp.42-57.

Moeller, Richard, "The German Social Democrats" in John Gaffney (1996), *Political Parties and the European Union*, Routledge: London.

Müftüler-Baç, Meltem (1997), *Europe in Change: Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*, Manchester University Press: UK

Müftüler-Baç, Meltem (2002), "Turkey in the EU's Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges", *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.7, No.2, pp.79-95.

Müftüler Baç, Meltem and Lauren Mc Laren (2003), "Enlargement Preferences and Policy-Making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey", *Journal of European Integration*, Vol.25, No.1, pp.17-30.

Müftüler Baç, Meltem (2005), "Turkey's Political Reforms and the Impact of the European Union", *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.10, No.1, pp. 17-31.

Müftüle Baç, Meltem (2011), “Turkish Foreign Policy, its Domestic Determinants and the Role of the European Union”, *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 279-291.

Nugent, Neill (2007), “The EU’s Response to Turkey’s Membership Application: Not Just a Weighing of Costs and Benefits”, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 29, Issue 4, p. 481-502.

Oğuzlu, Tarık H. (2012), “Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization without Membership”, *Turkish Studies*, Vol.13, No.2, pp.229-243.

Öniş, Ziya (2000), “Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards an Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations”, *Government and Opposition*, Vol.35, Issue 4, pp. 463–483.

Öniş, Ziya (2001) “An Awkward Partnership: Turkey–EU Relations in Comparative-Historical Perspective”, *Journal of European Integration History*, Vol 7, Issue 3, pp.105–19.

Öniş, Ziya (2004), “Diverse but Converging Paths to European Union Membership: Poland and Turkey in Comparative Perspective”, *East European Politics and Society*, Vol.18, No.3, pp. 481-512.

Öniş, Ziya (2008), “Turkey-EU Relations: Beyond the Current Stalemate”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No.4.

Paul, Amanda (2012), “Turkey’s EU Journey: What Next?”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.25-33.

Paterson, William (1981), “Political parties and the making of foreign policy – the Case of the Federal Republic” *Review of International Studies*, Vol.7, pp. 227–35.

Piedrafita, Sonia (2012): Instrumental Action and Norm Compliance in EU Enlargement Negotiations, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 34, Issue 3, pp. 277-295.

Paterson, William and Simon Bulmer (1996), “Germany in the European Union. Gentle Giant or Emergent Leader”, *International Affairs*, Vol.72, No.1, pp.9-32.

Paterson, William (1998), “Helmut Kohl, ‘The Vision Thing’ and Escaping the Semi-Sovereignty Trap”, *German Politics*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, p.27. pp. 17-36.

Paterson, William (2010b), “The Reluctant Hegemon? Germany Moves Centre Stage in the European Union”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.49, Annual Review, pp.57-75.

Paterson, William (2010c), “Does Germany Still Have a European Vocation?”, *German Politics*, Vol.19, No.1, pp.41-52.

Pulzer, Peter “Nationalism and Internationalism in European Christian Democracy” in Michael Gehler and Wolfram Kaiser (eds.) (2005), *Christian Democracy in Europe since 1945*, Routledge: London.

Rumelili, Bahar (2008), “Negotiating Europe: EU-Turkey Relations from an Identity Perspective”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.10, No:1, pp. 97-110.

Rumelili, Bahar (2011), “Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy and Socialization in a Post-Enlargement Europe”, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol.33, Issue:2, pp. 238-239.

Saunier, Georges, “A Special Relationship: Franco-German Relations at the Time of Francois Mitterrand and Helmut Kohl” in Carine Germond and Henning Türk (eds.) (2008), *A History of Franco-German Relations in Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Saatçioğlu, Beken (2009): How Closely Does the European Union’s Membership Conditionality Reflect the Copenhagen Criteria? Insights from Turkey, *Turkish Studies*, Vol.10, No.4, pp. 559-576.

Saatçioğlu, Beken (2012), “The EU’s ‘Rhetorical Entrapment’ in Enlargement Reconsidered: Why Hasn’t It Worked for Turkey?”, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.14, No.3, pp. 159-176.

Sauzay, Brigitte (2003), “Deutschland-Frankreich: Die Herausforderungen für die Gemeinsame Zukunft”, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 03-04, pp.1-46.

Scherpereel, John A. (2010), “European Culture and the European Union’s ‘Turkey Question’”, *West European Politics*, Vol.33, No.3, pp.810-829.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier,(2002), “Theorizing EU Enlargement: Research Focus, Hypotheses and the State of Research”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.9, No.4, pp.500–528.

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2001),“The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union,” *International Organization*, Vol.55. Issue 1, Winter 2001, pp.47-80.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Stefan Engert, Heiko Knobe (2006), *International Socialization in Europe: European Organizations, Political Conditionality and Democratic Change*, Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire and New York.

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2008a), "Entrapped Again: The Way to EU Membership Negotiations with Turkey", *UCD Dublin European Institute Working Paper 08-8*. Available online at http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/wp_08-8_schimmelfennig.pdf

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2008b): EU Political Accession Conditionality after the 2004 Enlargement: Consistency and Effectiveness," *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.15, No.6, pp. 918-937.

S.Skalnes, Lars, "Geopolitics and Eastern Enlargement of the European Union", in Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.) (2005), "The Politics of European Union Enlargement: Theoretical Approaches", Routledge: USA, pp.214-215.

Sirkeci, Ibrahim (2003), "Migration from Turkey to Germany: An Ethnic Approach", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Spring-Fall, 28-29, pp. 189-207.

Sjursen, Helene (2002), "Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU's Enlargement Policy", *Journal for Common Market Studies*, Volume 40, No.3, pp.491-513.

Sloam, James (2003), "'Responsibility for Europe': the EU Policy of the German Social Democrats since Unification", *German Politics*, Vol.12, No.1. pp. 59-78.

Sloam, James (2005), *The European Policy of the German Social Democrats Interpreting a Changing World*, Palgrave MacMillan: New York.

Smaldone, William (2009), *Confronting Hitler-German Social Democrats in Defense of the Weimar Republic, 1929-1933*, Lexington Books, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: UK.

Staab, Andreas (2011), *The European Union Explained*, Indiana University Press: USA.

Sugden, Jonathan, "Leverage in Theory and Practice: Human Rights and Turkey's EU Candidacy", in Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe (eds.) (2004), *Turkey and European Integration. Prospects and Issues in the Post-Helsinki Era*, Taylor and Francis Group: USA.

Taggart, Paul and Aleks Szcerbiak, "Introduction: Opposing Europe? The Politics of Euroscepticism in Europe" in Paul Taggart and Aleks Szverbiak (eds.) (2008) *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism: Case Studies and Country Surveys Vol.1*, Oxford University Press: UK.

Thompson, Mark R and Ludmilla Lennartz (2006), “The Making of Chancellor Merkel”, *German Politics*, Vol. 15, Issue 1, pp. 99-110.

Tocci, Natalie (2005), “Europeanization in Turkey: Trigger or Anchor for Reform”, *South European Society & Politics*, Vol.10, No.1, pp.73-83.

Uğur, Mehmet and Nergis Canefe (eds.) (2004), *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*, Routledge: London and New York.

Ulusoy, Kıvanç (2008), “The Europeanization of Turkey and its Impact on the Cyprus problem”, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.10, No.3, pp. 309-329

Vachudova, Milada Anna (2000), “EU Enlargement: An Overview”, *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol.9, No.4, Fall 2000, pp.64-69.

Vachudova, Milada Anna (2001), “The Trump Card of Domestic Politics: Bargaining Over EU Enlargement”, *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol.10, No.2, (Spring/Summer 2001), pp.93-97.

Van Esch, Femke (2012), “Why Germany Wanted EMU: The Role of Helmut Kohl's Belief System and the Fall of the Berlin Wall”, *German Politics*, Volume 21, Issue 1, p.34-52.

Wiliarty, Sarah Elise (2008), “Angela Merkel's Path to Power: The Role of Internal Party Dynamics and Leadership”, *German Politics*, Vol. 17, Issue 1, pp. 81-96.

Wimmel, Andreas (2009), “Beyond the Bosphorus? Comparing Public Discourse on Turkey's EU Application in the German, French and British Quality Press”, *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.223-243.

Wirsching, Andreas (2001), *Deutsche Geschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*, C.H. Verlag: München.

Yalçın, Aydın (1967), “Turkey: Emerging Democracy”, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 45, Issue 4, pp. 706-714.

Yılmaz, Hakan (2007), “Turkish Identity on the Road to the EU: Basic Elements of French and German Oppositional Discourses”, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol.9, No:3, p.293-305.

Wolfgang Quaisser and Steve Wood (2004) “EU Member Turkey? Preconditions, Consequences and Integration Alternatives”, *Forschungsverbund Ost- und*

Südosteuropa Arbeitspapier No.25. Available online at http://www.forost.lmu.de/fo_library/forost_Arbeitspapier_25.pdf

Official Documents

Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği (2007), *Avrupa Birliği Uyum Yasa Paketleri*, Available online at <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/pub/abuyp.pdf>

Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1945), *Berliner Gründungsaufwurf der CDU: "Deutsches Volk"*, Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>.

Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1945), *Kölner Leitzätze: Vorläufiger Entwurf zu einem Programm der Christlich Demokratischen Union Deutschlands*, Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1947), *Ahlener Programm: CDU überwindet Kapitalismus und Marxismus*. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1953), *Hamburger Programm: Sozialer Rechtsstaat im geeinten Europa*. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) (1968), *Berliner Programm*, available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (1978), *Ludwigshafener Programm*. Available online at <http://www.kas.de/wf/de/71.9132/>

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (1994), "Hamburger Grundsatzprogramm: Freiheit in Verantwortung". Available online at <http://www.grundsatzprogramm.cdu.de/doc/grundsatzprogramm.pdf>

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands - CDU (2005a), "Gemeinsam für Deutschland – mit Mut und Menschlichkeit - *Koalitionsvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und SPD*, Beschlossen und unterzeichnet am 11. November 2005. Available online at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/05_11_11_Koalitionsvertrag.pdf

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (2005b), *Beschluss des CDU-Bundesfachausschusses Europapolitik unter dem Vorsitz von Elmar Brok MdEP, Europa muss man richtig machen: Wie Deutschland auf die Krise der Europäischen Union reagieren muss*". Available online at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/05_07_01_Beschluss_BFA_Europapolitik.pdf

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (2007), Freiheit und Sicherheit, Grundsätze für Deutschland, Grundsatzprogramm: Hannover, p.4. Available online at <http://www.grundsatzprogramm.cdu.de/doc/071203-beschluss-grundsatzprogramm-6-navigierbar.pdf>

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (2009a), Wachstum. Bildung. Zusammenhalt. Koalitionsvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und FDP. Beschlossen und unterzeichnet am 26. Oktober 2009, p.114 Available online at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/091026-koalitionsvertrag-cdu-csu-fdp.pdf>

Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands (CDU) (2009b), *Starkes Europa-Sichere Zukunft-Programm der Christlichen Demokratischen Union Deutschlands zur Europawahl 2009*, pp.23-26. Available online at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/090421-cdu-europamanifest-2009.pdf>

Council of the European Union (2001), “Council Decision of 8 March 2001 on the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with the Republic of Turkey”, Official Journal of the European Communities,

Council of the European Union (2005) Negotiation Framework for Turkey

Council decision on the principles, priorities and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with Turkey, Official Journal of the European Union, L22/34, 26 January 2006.

Council of the European Union (2004) Presidency Conclusions, Brussels 16 and 17 December 2004.

Council of the European Union, European Council Presidency Conclusion in Helsinki European Council, 10 and 11 December 1999.

Council of the European Union, European Council Presidency Conclusions in Copenhagen, 12 and 13 December 2002.

Council of the European Union, European Council in Copenhagen, 21–22 June 1993, Conclusions of the Presidency (Copenhagen: Council of the European Union, 1993), p. 13. Available online at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_DOC-93-3_en.htm

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 12. Wahlperiode, 231. Sitzung, 27 May, 1994.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 12. Wahlperiode 110. Sitzung, 8 Oktober, 1992.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 12. Wahlperiode, 218. Sitzung, 13 April, 1994.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 13. Wahlperiode, 44. Sitzung, 22 Juli 1995.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 13. Wahlperiode, 77. Sitzung, 7 Dezember 1995.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 13. Wahlperiode, 128. Sitzung, 10 Oktober 1996.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 13. Wahlperiode, 180. Sitzung, 11 Juni 1997.

Deutscher Bundestag, Stenografischer Bericht, 13. Wahlperiode, 210. Sitzung, 11 Dezember 1997.

European Commission (1997), "Agenda 2000: For a Stronger and Wider Union", Bulletin of the European Union, Supplement 5/97.

European Commission (2011), "Special Eurobarometer 346 / Wave 73.3 : New Europeans". Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_346_en.pdf

European Commission (2002), "Flash Eurobarometer 132/1: Enlargement of the European Union." Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl132_en.pdf

European Commission (2006), "Special Eurobarometer 255 / Wave 65.2: Attitudes towards European Union Enlargement." Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_255_en.pdf

European Commission (2006), "Standard Eurobarometer 66 / Herbst Nationaler Bericht Deutschland." (own translation) Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb66/eb66_de_nat.pdf

2007 German Council Presidency Work Programme, Available on http://www.eu2007.de/includes/Downloads/Praesidentschaftsprogramm/EU_Presidency_Programme_final.pdf

Kohl, Helmut (1990), “Fernsehansprache von Bundeskanzler Kohl anlässlich des Inkrafttretens der Währungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialunion”, Available on <http://helmut-kohl.kas.de/index.php?msg=555>

Kohl, Helmut (1989), “Erklärung vor dem Deutschen Bundestag: Zehn-Punkte-Programm zur Deutschlandpolitik, 28. November 1989”, Available on <http://helmut-kohl.kas.de/index.php?msg=627>

Lamers, Phillip and Wolfgang Schaeuble (1994), “Überlegungen zur Europäischen Politik” Available online at, <http://www.cducsu.de/upload/schaeublelamers94.PDF>

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1959), Bad Godesberg Programme. Available online at http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1816/data/godesberger_programm.pdf

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1989), Berliner Programm, Available online at http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1812/data/berliner_programm.pdf

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1998a), “Arbeit, Innovation und Gerechtigkeit- SPD Programm für die Bundestagswahl 1998”, Beschluß des außerordentlichen Parteitages der SPD am 17. April 1998 in Leipzig. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bibliothek/retro-scans/a98-04467.pdf>

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (1998b), “Aufbruch und Erneuerung -Deutschlands Weg ins 21. Jahrhundert”, Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN”, Bonn, 20. Oktober 1998. Available online at http://www.boell.de/downloads/stiftung/1998_koalitionsvertrag.pdf

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2002), Erneuerung – Gerechtigkeit – Nachhaltigkeit, Für ein wirtschaftlich starkes, soziales und ökologisches Deutschland. Für eine lebendige Demokratie.” Koalitionsvereinbarung zwischen der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands und Bündnis 90/Die GRÜNEN, Berlin, den 16. Oktober 2002. Available online at http://www.boell.de/downloads/stiftung/2002_Koalitionsvertrag.pdf

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2002), “Erneuerung und Zusammenhalt –Wir in Deutschland, Regierungsprogramm 2002 –2006”. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bibliothek/retro-scans/a02-03539.pdf>

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2003), “Europamanifest der SPD”, Europadelegiertenkonferenz am 16. November 2003. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/netzquelle/02088.pdf>

Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) (2007), Hamburger Programm, Online available at http://www.spd.de/linkableblob/1778/data/hamburger_programm.pdf

Rede von Gerhard Schröder zur Europapolitik Deutschlands (20. November 2001) Available on http://www.cvce.eu/obj/rede_von_gerhard_schroder_zur_europapolitik_deutschlands_20_november_2001-de-4677ec97-7782-4c5e-a7a2-aff3304da633.html (accessed on 12.08.2012).

Şahin, Alpay(2006), “EU’s ‘Soft Power’: The Case of Turkey, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Fokus Türkei 03/2006,p.3. Available online at <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/tuerkei/04799.pdf>

Vertrag vom 12. September 1990 über die Abschliessende Regelung in Bezug auf Deutschland, 2+4-Vertrag”, Politisches Archiv des Auswaertigen Amts, MUTL-781, Available on <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/372800/publicationFile/153322/ZweiPlusVierVertrag.pdf>

Zu Guttenberg, Karl-Theodor (2004), “Die Beziehungen zwischen der Türkei und der EU-Eine Privilegierte Partnerschaft”, Akademie für Politik und Zeitgeschehen, Hans-Seidel Stiftung e.V., München., p.5. Available online at http://www.hss.de/downloads/aa33_internet.pdf

Newspaper and Web Sources

Berliner Zeitung (06.12.1995), “Kohl und Scharping sichern Unterstützung zu. Für EU-Zollunion mit Türkei”, available online at <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/archiv/kohl-und-scharping-sichern-unterstuetzung-zu-fuer-eu-zollunion-mit-tuerkei,10810590,9048888.html> (accessed 08.02.2013)

Berliner Zeitung (23.02.2004), “Kanzler wirbt für Reformen”, Bettina Westring, Available on <http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/archiv/kanzler-wirbt-fuer-reformen,10810590,10153960.html> (accessed on 23.12.2012)

Das Abendblatt (28.10.2010), “Schröder will große EU-Erweiterung: Ex-Kanzler wünscht sich Aufnahme der Türkei und Freihandelszone mit Russland. Available

on <http://www.abendblatt.de/politik/deutschland/article1677334/Schroeder-will-grosse-EU-Erweiterung.html> (accessed on 15.08.2012).

Der Spiegel (31.07.1995), “Interview: Tansu Çiller, Grenzt uns nicht aus! Ministerpräsidentin Tansu Ciller über ihre Demokratie-Bemühungen”. Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-9206291.html> (accessed on 08.02.2013)

Der Spiegel (03.12.1999), “Auf nach Europa: Schröder will die Türkei integrieren”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/auf-nach-europa-schroeder-will-die-tuerkei-integrieren-a-55030.html> (accessed on 09.12.2012) (own translation).

Der Spiegel (10.12.1999), “Christdemokraten Ausweitung auf zwölf EU-Kandidaten ‘falscher Weg’ available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/christdemokraten-ausweitung-auf-zwoelf-eu-kandidaten-falscher-weg-a-55988.html> (accessed on 09.12.2012) (own translation).

Der Spiegel (02.09.2003), “Schröder bezeichnet Türkei-Kritik der Union als billige Polemik”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/erdogan-besuch-schroeder-bezeichnet-tuerkei-kritik-der-union-als-billige-polemik-a-264073.html> (accessed 22.12.2012)

Der Spiegel(17.12. 2004), “EU-Gipfel zur Türkei Erdogans Rache”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/eu-gipfel-zur-tuerkei-erdogans-rache-a-333402.html>, (own translation) (accessed on 09.12.2012).

Der Spiegel (14.01.2011),”Zypern Streit: Erdoğan attackiert Merkel”, available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/zypern-streit-erdogan-attackiert-merkel-a-739620.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

Der Spiegel (11.01.2011), “Merkel appelliert an die Türkei im Zypern Streit”, Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/geteilte-insel-merkel-appelliert-an-die-tuerkei-im-zypern-streit-a-738987.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

Der Spiegel (26.10.1998), “Rückkehr in die Wirklichkeit”, Available on <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-8026528.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

Der Spiegel (17.07.2011), “Schuldenkrise: Helmut Kohl rechnet mit Merkels Europapolitik ab”, Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/schuldenkrise-helmut-kohl-rechnet-mit-merkels-europapolitik-ab-a-774875.html> (accessed on 11.12.2012)

Der Spiegel (25.08.2011), “Rüge des Altkanzlers: Merkel lässt Kohls Kritik abprallen”, Available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/ruegedes-altkanzlers-merkel-laesst-kohls-kritik-abprallen-a-782283.html>, (accessed on 11.12.2012)

Der Spiegel (14.12.2012), Severin Weiland und Carsten Volkery: “Merkel und die EU Krise: Die Europameisterin”, available on <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/kanzlerin-merkel-setzt-sich-in-europadurch-a-872951.html> (accessed 15.12.2012).

Die Welt (07.10.2011), “Sigmar Gabriel auf Integrationstour”, Available on http://www.welt.de/print/die_welt/hamburg/article13646352/Sigmar-Gabriel-auf-Integrationstour.html accessed on (18.11.2012).

Die Zeit (24.04.1987), “Heikler Antrag: Die Türkei in die Europäische Gemeinschaft?”, Available at <http://www.zeit.de/1987/18/heikler-antrag> (accessed 08.02.2013).

Euractiv (08.10.2009), “Turkey's chief negotiator: 'Privileged partnership' is an insult”, available at <http://www.euractiv.com/enlargement/turkey-chief-negotiator-privileged-partnership-insult/article-186179> (accessed on 15 May 2012).

EUObserver (31.08.2005), “Austria Moots Alternative to Turkish Membership, Available at <http://euobserver.com/enlargement/19752> (accessed on 20 April 2012).

EU Observer(17.03.2006), “Merkel Moots Privileged Partnership for Western Balkans, available at <http://euobserver.com/enlargement/21163> (accessed on 20 April 2012).

Focus (24.03.1997), “Interview: Klaus Kinkel.Deutschland: Türken Müssen Waehlen Dürfen” Available at http://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/deutschland-tuerken-muessen-waehlen-duerfen_aid_165233.html (accessed 08.02.2013)

Focus (20.09.2006), “Religionsstreit: Stoiber attackiert Türkei”, available on http://www.focus.de/politik/ausland/papst/religionsstreit_aid_115919.html

Focus (03.11.2010), “Sigmar Gabriel: Türkei-Politik: Gabriel wirft Merkel „Spielchen“ vor”, Available on http://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/tuerkei-politik-gabriel-wirft-merkel-spielchen-vor_aid_568443.html (accessed on 16.08.2012)

Frankfurter Allgemeine (22.01.2004), "EU-Erweiterung „Türkei-Beitritt wichtiger als ein Raketenabwehrsystem“, Available on <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/eu-erweiterung-tuerkei-beitritt-wichtiger-als-ein-raketenabwehrsystem-1143364.html> (accessed on 23.12.2012).

Hallstein, Walter, (12.09.1963), "Rede anlässlich der Unterzeichnung des Assoziationsabkommens zwischen der EWG und der Türkei (Ankara), Available online at http://www.cvce.eu/obj/rede_von_walter_hallstein_anlasslich_der_unterzeichnung_des_assoziationsabkommens_zwischen_der_ewg_und_der_tuerkei_ankara_12_september_1963-de-c79fccb6-6c2e-4d9d-86aa-5e830da3ac9e.html (accessed on 02.02.2013).

Hürriyet (17.04.2004), "Erdoğan: İmtiyazlı Ortaklık Asla Olmaz, available at <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/ShowNew.aspx?id=203221> (accessed on 15 May 2012).

Hürriyet, Tarihi Mektuplar, available online at <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=-83722>

Matthias Wissman Pressegespräch – 22. Januar 2004, Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für die Angelegenheiten der Europäischen Union des Deutschen Bundestages

Merkel, Angela (16.02.004), "The Future of Europe", Speech given in 46.Discussion Forum organized by Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Ankara Office and Turkish Democracy Foundation, Available at http://www.kas.de/proj/home/home/44/12/webseite_id-2515/index.html (accessed 22 April 2012)

Merkel, Angela (16.12.2004), „Für ein glaubwürdiges Angebot der EU an die Türkei“, Speech given in the plenary session of German Bundestag, 16 December Available online at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/12_16_04_Rede_Merkel_Tuerkei_St_Bericht.pdf (accessed on 22 April 2012)

Official petition to the German Bundestag by the CDU fraction on 19.10.2004, (own translation) Available at <http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/1503949.pdf>

Schröder, Gerhard (2004), Rede des Bundeskanzlers am 23. Februar in Ankara, Available on <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/adrien.barbaresi/corpora/BR/t/616.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012)

Schaeuble, Wolfgang (2004) “Die privilegierte Partnerschaft ist die richtige Lösung”, Rede des stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden der CDU/CSU-Bundestagsfraktion, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble MdB, in der Türkei-debatte des Bundestages am 28.10.2004 (own translation). Available at http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/10_28_04_Schaeuble_Rede_St_Bericht.pdf (accessed 22 April 2012)

Schröder, Gerhard (2004), Rede des Bundeskanzlers am 15.04.2004 an der Erasmus Universität "World Leader Cycle", Available on <http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/adrien.barbaresi/corpora/BR/t/639.html> (accessed on 12.08.2012).

Schröder, Gerhard (2005), Rede von Bundeskanzler Gerhard Schröder am 12. Oktober 2005 in Istanbul. Available on <http://archiv.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Archiv16/Rede/2005/10/2005-10-12-rede-von-bundeskanzler-gerhard-schroeder-am-12-oktober-2005-in-istanbul.html?nn=273438> (accessed on 12.08.2012).

Stübgen, Michael, Personal Interview, 22.09.2012.

The Guardian (14.12.2002),” EU embraces 10 new members-and opens the door to Turkey, Available on, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/dec/14/eu.politics3> (own translation) (accessed on 09.12.2012)

The Guardian (09.11.2002), “Turkey must be kept out of the Union, Giscard says”, Available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/nov/09/turkey.eu> (accessed on 02.12.2012).

The Guardian (05.10.2005), “Splendid Isolation”. Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/oct/05/worlddispatch.turkey> (Accessed on 15 May 2012).

The Economist(12.03.1998), “Mesut Yilmaz, ambivalent Turk”, available on <http://www.economist.com/node/371347> (Accessed on 23.12.2012).

The Economist (14.11.2002), “Too big for Europe? The Turks at the Gate of Europe”, available at <http://www.economist.com/node/1442045> (Accessed on 15 May 2012).

Transatlantic Trends(2006), Top Line Data. Available online at http://trends.gmfus.org/files/archived/doc/2006_english_top.pdf

Transatlantic Trends(2012), Top Line Data. Available online at:
<http://trends.gmfus.org/files/2012/09/TT-2012-Topline-Data.pdf>

Verheugen, Günther, Interview, 18.09.2012.

Wissmann, Matthias (2004), “Europapolitik: Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei nicht nur ergebnisoffen, sondern auch optionsoffen führen, 15 December. Available at http://www.cdu.de/archiv/2370_6040.html (accessed 20.04.2012)

APPENDIX

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü
- Enformatik Enstitüsü
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: