



New political challenges for Germany, Turkey and the EU 2022

Deliberating innovative and stimulating approaches

**1st Early Career Workshop of the
Turkish German University (TAÜ/TGU/TDU)
and the
University of Cologne (UoC)
Istanbul, 26 May 2022**



Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



ABSTRACT

After two years without the joint conference due to the Covid pandemic, the two universities additionally organized an early career workshop the day before the actual conference and another senior career workshop the day after. The early career conference welcomed scholars from all over Europe who are currently in the early stages of their academic careers. In two sessions in the morning and in the afternoon, the scholars presented their current research topics and received inputs from the other researcher on potential refinements.

The topics of those early scholars, while always connecting to the EU and Turkey, range from security policy analyses, climate policy analysis towards more constructivist approaches of feminist policies of the European Commission in Turkey.



Source: CETEUS, University of Cologne.

Program

| Thursday, 26 May 2022 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Venue: Turkish-German University (TDU), Beykoz / Istanbul (Building of Social Sciences, 1 st floor, room 177) | |
| 09.00 h - 09.30 h | Reception and Registration |
| 09.30 h - 10.00 h | Welcome and explanation of the workshop: criteria for academic works |
| 10.00 h - 12.00 h | Presentation of four works by selected early career researchers |
| 12.00 h - 13.00 h | Lunch |
| 13.00h - 15.00 h | Presentation of four works by selected early career researchers |
| 15.00 h - 15.30 h | Coffee break |
| 15.30 h - 16.00 h | Workshop Findings: desiderata for academic works and launching of cooperation projects |
| 16.30 h | Departure to Historical Summer Residence of the German Ambassador, Tarabya / Istanbul (upon invitation) |



Presentation: Turkey's policy towards the Black Sea and the Ukraine war: Regional dynamics amidst the Russia-NATO confrontation

Speaker: Dr. Daria Isachaneko (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik)

Feedback: Prof. Dr. Birgül Demirtas (Turkish-German University)

Rapporteur: Valentin Althoff (CETEUS, University of Cologne)

Dr. Isachenko introduces her topic through connecting Turkish interests in the Black Sea and their policies on Russia after its invasion of Ukraine. While the interests did not change due to the war, the situation created a polarization where Turkey can either be with or against Russia, a situation that puts Turkey in a dilemma. Because its interests in the region of the Black Sea differs from its interests with Russia on a wider scale.

The paper she discusses is split into two parts: It first discusses Turkey's policy in the Black Sea through hegemony and then afterwards through the regional ownership approach. Following the hegemonic approach, she states that Turkey wants neither the NATO or Russia to be too much involved in its Black Sea poli-

cies which can be seen through Turkey's usage of the Montreux convention. With regards to the regional ownership approach on the other hand, it can be understood why Turkey already had a key interest in the Ukraine in the 1990s, especially about the Crimean Peninsula.

Generally, Isachenko states the point that the strategic position of Turkey, especially regarding the Black Sea, constantly creates a dilemma where it cannot deal with Russia when it is dealing with the NATO and the other way around. To better understand this situation, she argues that one has to differ between the regional level where Turkey sees the necessity to work with Russia and the global level where it needs to distinguish itself from Russia. And while the NATO only pays attention to the



global level, Turkey is caught in a regional level with Russia's dealings in Syria on the one side and its dealings with Ukraine on another. Finally, all this shows, according to the author, why it is impossible for Turkey to take sides.

In her feedback, Prof. Demirtas praises the research but suggests to put also the focus of the topic towards Ukraine or the Black Sea. Also, she states that the inclusion of Turkish domestic politics could benefit the research. Other scholars point out other inclusions that could increase the scope of the research such as the economic and cultural importance of the Black Sea or the EU's interests in this area, as well as the matter of public opinion on these matters in Turkey.





Presentation: The making of the Turkey-EU Green Deal

Speaker: Hakan Yapar (Turkish Industry and Business Association)

Feedback: Dr. Manuel Knoll (Turkish-German University)

Rapporteur: Valentin Althoff (CETEUS)

Starting with a small introduction by Manuel Knoll on the current status of EU's climate policies and Turkey's role in it, Mr. Yapar introduces his paper on this topic. Following his key question of why Turkey went in line with the EU's climate policies, he uses his approach of "geoeconomics" as well as many different other approaches such as differentiated integration to solve the puzzle.

On the question of why this is of interest, Mr. Yapar states the fact of the long reluctance by Turkey to ratify the Paris agreement. Also, in other policy fields between the EU and Turkey, such as the potential membership, there was almost no cooperation recently while setbacks in Mediterranean policy even showed conflict.

On the other hand, the European Union would have a key interest to keep Turkey close in the matter of climate

policies as the European Green Deal is considered for the whole of Europe. Turkey, in contrast, has an interest to keep its position in the global supply chain which could be undermined through not going in line with the EU's climate policies.

These reasons based on geoeconomics approach are the main findings by Mr. Yapar. Thereby, the policies of the EU would create a balanced combination of push and pull factors for Turkey to implement their own climate policies. As an example, for push factors, he shows the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism by the EU and for a pull factor the special offer of climate finance that is co-sponsored by key EU-member states. Other factors such as climate catastrophes and clauses in international treaties are considered as secondary factors.



In his feedback Mr. Knoll asks the question of the nature of Turkish climate action, also regarding its planned coal plants with China. Other scholars praise Mr. Yapar's presentation but also state several points for a potential enlargement of the research. For example, it is asked if this conditionality of climate policies could accelerate a potential EU membership for Turkey. Besides it is asked if this approach could be connected to the transactional approach of current policy making between the EU and Turkey.





Presentation: European Energy Independence

Speaker: Shane McLorrain and Noé Sainderichin (Center for Critical Democracy Studies (CCDS))

Feedback: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels

Rapporteur: Jonas Nagel (CETEUS, University of Cologne)

The two Parisian scholars present one of the most acute topics: energy dependency and its consequences. Being one of the biggest net importers of fossil fuels, the European Union is to some extent diplomatic inflexible when it comes to relations with non-democratic states such as China and Russia. Even though the EU could agree on some sanction packages, the problem remains: how to end energy dependency?

The answer presented is the diversification of the energy market. Denmark for example obtains more than 50% of its energy from wind power. Regarding renewable energy, there are extended linked problems: the disassembly of solar power comes along with increased demand for raw earth materials. Luckily, not only China and Russia possess a wide range of Lithium and co., but also countries in Africa. Whether these are the less malicious partners is yet to be seen. Another method of harvesting raw earth material sounds rather science fictional but could

come true within the next 50 years: asteroid mining.

Question and Answer:

Facing all these energy issues, one might think that the newly elected government in Germany -a coalition consisting of the Greens - have the right answers when it comes to energy transformation. However, neither Germany nor France, have developed proper plans for a social agreeable transformation. Solving the energy dependency problem could retrieve social time bombs.





Presentation: EU-Turkey accession ship negotiation

Speaker: Ece Özbey (IMPRS-SPCE/ Cologne Center for Comperative Politics (CCCP))

Feedback: Dr. Dominic Heinz

Rapporteur: Jonas Nagel (CETEUS)

Similar to Dr. Bugra Güngör's presentation, Ece Özbey examines the EU-Turkey accession negotiation with a longitudinal and modern method approach: using computer-assisted text analysis, the so-called structural topic model (STM), and a dictionary approach, Özbey and her colleague examines 1.4 million parliamentary speeches from members of the Turkish parliament.

The preliminary question is whether the attitude of members of Erdogan's AKP differ from members of the opposition and how the discourse has developed over time.

Conclusion:

Apparently, the opposition talks more about the accession process than members of the AKP in the Turkish parliament. Moreover, accession has been a crucial topic for over 30 years.

Question and Answer:

Emphasizing that Turkey is very unique in its parliamentary work, it is stated that comparison to other countries bear difficulties and hence the given presentation provides an exclusive insight into the current and past attitude of members of the Turkish parliament on the EU-Turkey accession negotiation.



Presentation: Turkey's accession to the EU: A textual analysis on the EC's Turkey reports between 1998 and 2020

Speaker: Dr. Bugra Güngör (The Graduate Institute, Geneva, Switzerland)

Feedback: Dr. Wulf Reiners (Turkish-German University)

Rapporteur: Valentin Althoff (CETEUS, University of Cologne)

Making use of automated text analysis Dr. Bugra Güngör tries to retrace changes in the attitude by the European Union towards Turkey's accession. For doing so, he creates a text corpus derived from the yearly reports by the European Commission on Turkey's accession status that includes a period of 20 years in 1847 pages. Those texts are chosen as data because they incorporate decisions by the organization, legislation as well as additional sources by third parties and are published on a yearly basis. Additionally, the Commission has the right to open and close chapters, which gives those texts more importance.

For a better analysis of the data, Güngör established three topics based on the Copenhagen Criteria: Political, economic, and legal. Afterwards he

looked for key words for those topics to do a three-stepped analysis. First, each word within the text corpora is given a value of positivity between 1-10 through lexical semantics. Then a text segmentation and finally a topic analysis are done.

What he finds is that while the words mostly have a value around five, the values start to shift more gravely in both directions after 2001. The most salient topic over all periods is the legal one and the political one is the least salient. This is seen in the frequent usage of words such as "law", "market" and "freedom" while words like "democracy" are seldom found.

The automatic topic modeling created 10 topics that are established in the corpora during the last 20 years, including ones like the Islamist Gülen



Movement, party closure, or the Uludere airstrike.

Concluding his analysis, Dr. Güngör notices that the European Commission has both stable and changing views on topics regarding Turkey's accession. Possible explanations for changing views could be Turkey's gradual process towards authoritarianism. The trade relations that do not allow the parties to cut ties on the other hand could explain the stable views.

In his feedback, Dr. Reiners praises the research for finding this gap in the literature. However, he struggles to find causality in the research. As an interesting follow-up for the research, he suggests comparisons to other cases. Other scholars asks further questions on the sentiment development or potential other key words. Especially the usage of different key words seems interesting as Dr. Güngör remarks how institutions might use synonyms and detours in their reports.





Presentation: Claiming the Bosphorus? A representative claim analysis of the European Commission. The cases of Women and Turkey

Speaker: Darius Ribbe (University of Greifswald)

Feedback: Assoc. Prof. Ebru Turhan (Turkish-German University)

Rapporteur: Valentin Althoff (CETEUS, University of Cologne)

Mr. Ribbe presents his research on representative claims by the European Commission with a special emphasis on its continuing work in Turkey. Starting with a small introduction of representation and claim making, Mr. Ribbe shows how the European Union itself has problems because of its perceived lack of representation of different societal groups. Following this, he concludes that women face this problem, especially as they make up the largest marginalized group in the Union. A representative claim goes one step further where someone would not only represent a position but also actually claim to represent a certain position and thereby constructing a representative claim.

The case Mr. Ribbe presents in detail is the claim the European Commission makes on behalf of Turkish women. To do so he uses speeches by

the European Commission as a data set that are split into either making representative claims on behalf of women or not. Additionally, the frequency of Turkey as a topic in speeches is analyzed.

Through the analysis Mr. Ribbe was able to identify a change of pattern in the representative claims by the Commission. The speeches used to have “we representation”, meaning the Commission claimed the women as part of their social group it wants to address. Since 2015 the Commission changed towards “misrepresentation” *thereby simply claiming that the Turkish officials do not represent the Turkish women.*

In the feedback as well as in the discussion with the other scholars, the vivid presentation is praised and some suggestions for further research were made. On the Turkish



case, one suggests to include the current incidents surrounding the Istanbul Convention and several scholars suggested to include other marginalized groups such as the LGBTQ-community. Another scholar suggests, as

a potential follow-up research question, to investigate what Turkish women themselves feel represented by. Lastly, some connections to the previous research presentation by Dr. Güngör's are drawn.

Presentation: Hybrid Regimes

Speaker: Cigdem Celik (Turkish-German University)

Feedback: Prof. Dr. Manuel Knoll

Rapporteur : Jonas Nagel (CETEUS)

In her dissertation about hybrid regimes, Cigdem Celik examines and compares the political systems of Hungary and Turkey. She introduces her subject by presenting an interesting figure : nearly 62% of the world's population lives under hybrid regimes.

A hybrid regime is a grey zone between liberal democracies and closed authoritarian regimes. Additionally,

hybrid regimes are to be seen as a diminished version of authoritarian regimes.

Important questions within the above mentioned paper are : How do dominant parties in hybrid regimes win elections repeatedly and are there any similarities or differences between Hungary and Turkey?

Using a comparative case study, qualitative and quantitative data were gathered and evaluated.





Findings :

Both the ruling unities in Hungary and Turkey do share some methods to obtain and ensure their power. First, altering the system of checks and balances, for example reducing the power and the independence of the constitutional court. And second, achieving a certain degree of media control through targeting critical media and blocking or restricting social media.

Another question that aroused was whether the EU rule break act against Hungary could prevent it from sliding into a total authoritarian regime.

control through targeting critical media and blocking or restricting social media.

Question and Answer :

The lively debate concentrated amongst others on the difficulty to find a precise definition for the term « hybrid regime ».



Presentation: Global Britain

Speaker: Efsane Deniz Bas (Turkish-German University)

Chair: Prof. Dr. Manuel Knoll

Rapporteur : Jonas Nagel (CETEUS)

In the last presentation of the Early Career Workshop, Efsane Deniz Bas examines the United Kingdom's Global Britain Vision on the European Union Indo-Pacific region policies. Comparing German and French newspaper articles, Ms. Bas dived into the subject of changing alliance strategies.

Especially in the light of Brexit, the United Kingdom is reaching out not only to old but also to new allies. Fostering the UK – Indo-Pacific- relations will not only benefit both partners but will also provide a counterbalance to the massive Chinese silk road project. But the EU and their member states are also having strong linkages to the Indo-Pacific region: France is still a resident power thereabouts and the Indo-Pacific region is vital for the economic growth of the EU.

Conclusion:

The paper concludes that the UK excludes the EU regarding its foreign policies and seeks to enhance bonds with new allies, such as the Indo-Pacific region.

Question and Answer:

During a vivid debate, the scholars emphasize on how important the Indo-Pacific market is for both the EU and the UK. The UK has high trading ambitions but lacks EU market access after Brexit and is therefore seeking to develop alternative markets.

During the discussion, the post-colonial issues were illuminated, and it was stated that there will be severe problems since the ex-colonies still bear much hatred towards the former oppressors.



Source: CETEUS, University of Cologne.

Contact:

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels
Institut für Politische Wissenschaft und Europäische Fragen
Centrum für Türkei- und EU-Studien (CETEUS)
Jean-Monnet-Lehrstuhl
Gottfried-Keller-Str. 1
50931 Köln

Research Associate: *Betül Türkeri, M.A.*
b.tuerkeri@uni-koeln.de | Tel.: +49 (0) 221-470-8618

Research Assistant: *Valentin Althoff, B.Sc.*
valentin.althoff@uni-koeln.de | Tel.: +49 (0) 221-470-1493

Student Assistant: Jonas Nagel,
jonas.nagel@uni-koeln.de