comments welcome!

Looking beneath the surface – invisible othering in the German discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession

Rainer Hülsse
FU Berlin and EUI Florence
huelsse@zedat.fu-berlin.de

1. Introduction - interpreting this paper

Does Turkey belong to Europe? This question has frequently been asked in the debates about a possible EU-membership of Turkey, from the early days of European integration until today. The discourse topic (EU-accession of Turkey) is constructed in a certain way (is Turkey European?). This is the first proposition to be explored in this paper.

Proposition 1: The discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession constructs the issue of accession as a question of Turkey's 'europeanness'.

Apart from investigating this linkage, it is of interest how the question of whether or not Turkey is European has been answered. Or, to put it differently, how discourse participants judge Turkey's europeanness. According to Article 49 (former Article O) only European countries may become EU-members, europeanness thus is a precondition for membership. Since I simply extract the meaning which discourse participants attribute to the concept of europeanness, I do not need to come up with my own definition of europeanness. My discourse analysis shows that Turkey's europeanness is seen ambivalently: While it appears to be confirmed on the surface of the texts, an interpretation of metaphors reveals the numerous doubts about Turkey's europeanness. Thus my second proposition reads as follows:

Proposition 2: The discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession constructs Turkey's europeanness ambivalently.

If the discourse does construct Turkey as not clearly European, Turkey is – at least to some extent - an 'other' to Europe. It is by way of 'othering' that identities, including European identity, get constructed. Thus, the discourse under study not only constructs Turkey as Europe's other, but at the same time constructs European identity.

Proposition 3: The discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession constructs European identity.

The empirical object of my research is the German discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession between January 1997 and March 2000. In this paper, however, I will

only analyse statements from the period between January 1997 and October 1998 by the then foreign minister of Germany, Klaus Kinkel.

As far as theory is concerned, this paper connects with constructivist and postmodernist research in International Relations (IR). Not only due to a shared interest in the role of language and discourse for the construction of reality, but also due to its focus on identities. Moreover this paper builds - as does postmodernism and some, but not all constructivist work - on a post-positivist epistemology. Accordingly my paper tries to *understand* how reality is being constructed. It asks *how-questions* instead of the *why-questions* that positivists try to address. In this respect, my approach differs from those constructivist approaches in IR which remain within a positivist framework. The latter usually model reality constructions, such as identity or norms, as independent variables to *explain* interests, actions or policy outcomes (Maier 1998: 12; Doty 1993: 298).

The structure of this paper is as follows: In the next chapter, I will introduce discourse analysis and hermeneutic social sciences as the theoretical and methodological basis of my research. In Chapter 3, the results of the discourse analysis on the macro-level will be presented. The micro-level of the discourse will be dealt with in chapter 4. The results of the discourse analysis will then be looked at from an identity-theoretical perspective (chapter 5). Finally, I will sum up the argument and provide some conclusions (chapter 6).

2. Discourse Analysis - theoretical-methodological background and empirical application

This chapter discusses different discourse analytical and hermeneutic approaches, in order to develop my own framework of research. Following a suggestion sometimes made in the literature (van Dijk 1998b: 15; Matouschek 1997: 112-115), I split my discourse analysis into a macro- and a micro-part.

Macro-analysis

In the first assumption I claim that the discourse constructs its topic in a certain way. It will be the prime task of a discourse analysis on the macro-level to see whether this

holds true. This macro-level analysis is based on the following understanding of discourse:

> "A discourse is a group of statements which provide a language for talking about - i.e. a way of representing - a particular kind of knowledge about the topic. When statements about a topic are made within a particular discourse, the discourse makes it possible to construct the topic in a certain way. It also limits the other ways in which the topic can be constructed" (Hall 1992: 291).

It follows from this definition that the discourse I study consists of all the texts dealing with the discourse topic, that is Turkey's possible EU-accession. Europeanness may be called a concept (Barnes/Duncan 1992: 8) which constructs the topic in a certain way. My discourse analysis will show the importance of the concept 'europeanness' in the examined discourse. Due to its importance the concept defines the way one can talk and write about the discourse topic. The discourse about Turkey's possible EU-membership thus becomes a question of whether or not Turkey is European.

As far as methods of discourse analysis on the macro-level are concerned, there is very little which could be considered standard tools of analysis. Even van Dijk, who may hardly be reproached neglect for practical aspects of discourse analysis, remains vague as far as macro-analytical tools are concerned. However, he tries to identify the discourse topics (which he calls semantic macrostructures) in order to find out what discourse participants are talking about (van Dijk 1998a: 19-20; 1998b: 5-6). My macro-analysis mostly consists of documenting those parts in texts which construct the discourse topic in the way explained above.

Before moving on to the microanalysis, a few words need to be said about my particular interpretation of the discourse: I demonstrate that there is a link between the discourse topic and a certain concept, namely that europeanness is an important concept in constructing the topic of membership. However, this is not to deny the existence and relevance of other concepts. Other links exist indeed, for example the framing of the membership-question through concepts such as democracy or economy. But, these other links will be taken into consideration in my study only if they are linked to europeanness at the same time, e.g. if Turkey's democratic deficits are considered to be prove of a lack of europeanness.

Micro-analysis

In the second proposition, I claim that the europeanness of Turkey is seen ambivalently. But how is the assessment of Turkey's europeanness to be analysed? In my view this can be done by taking a closer look at those parts of the texts where Turkey's europeanness is discussed, either explicitly or implicitly. I will call this exercise in close reading a discourse analysis on the micro-level.

Most of the ideas for my microanalysis stem from research carried out in the tradition of German sociology of knowledge, especially a strand named 'social scientific hermeneutics' (German: 'sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik'). Its distinguishing feature, as compared to conventional qualitative analysis, is its attempt to look beyond/beneath the superficial content of texts and thus to discover their 'deep structure', that is their 'hidden meaning' (Hitzler/Honer 1997: 23). At its core is the distinction between the manifest content of a text, that is its literal meaning, and a deeper level of the production of meaning 'between the lines', the latent content of a text, is made.[1] In contrast to classical hermeneutics, 'social scientific hermeneutics' does not try to find out the intended meaning of a text, namely what the author really meant. Hence it does not ask questions like the following: Is the speaker conscious of the meaning he/she produces? Is he/she hiding his/her true opinion? Is he/she lying or telling the truth?[2] To 'social scientific hermeneutics' meaning is produced independently from subjective intentions. The speaker is not necessarily aware or in control of the meaning he/she produces. In this respect, 'social scientific hermeneutics' are remarkably close to discourse analyses such as the one undertaken by Doty in IR (1993, 1996):

> "(...) I am not providing an interpretation of the consciously motivated, self-serving images constructed by the participants. Rather, I am providing an interpretation of what the discursive practices do, which does not necessarily coincide with individual motivations, perceptions, and intentions" (Doty 1993: 305).

[1] This distinction between manifest and latent content, is rooted in various schools of thought. The proximity to Freud is obvious, just as the similarity with poststructuralism's notion of subtext.

[2] Thus it is quite different from van Dijk's (1998b: 3) for whom any statement is founded on beliefs: "(...) people do not always say exactly what they think, as we know from our own daily experiences. But this does not mean that they never express their 'true' feelings at all. They may try to hide them, mitigate them, be indirect or lie about them, but somehow strong beliefs will 'leak' in several ways to the surface of text and talk, if only in non-verbal ways."

The micro-analysis undertaken for the purposes of this paper focuses on metaphors. Of course, an analysis of metaphors can grasp only some of the meaning produced in discourses. But metaphors appear to be an important element of the production of meaning, since people frequently employ metaphors to make sense of the world and communicate their individual sense-making to others (Miller 1979: 161; Donati 1992: 153; Lakoff/Johnson 1980; Schäffner 1996: 56; Chilton/Lakoff 1995: 56; Milliken 1996: 221; Böke 1997: 164; Laclau/Mouffe 1985: 110). In addition, various empirical studies have shown the importance and dissemination of metaphors in the political realm (Straehle et al. 1999; Chilton 1996; Chilton/Ilyin 1993; Wilson 1990; Schäffner 1996).

Cognitivists emphasise the importance of metaphors in structuring cognition. According to this model, people understand new phenomena by applying existing, known concepts (or frames, schemes, scripts) to the unknown. Metaphors then stand for certain concepts (Straehle et al. 1999: 71). Without denying the cognitive function of metaphors, I disregard it here and focus on their interactive/social-constructivist function instead. I take metaphors to be particularly important in the process of constructing collective meaning for two reasons: First, because they carry within themselves references to already shared meanings. Second, because they are rather vague and thus allow for individual interpretations. Metaphors do not determine collective meaning, but rather construct a corridor of meaning, allowing for individual paths within (Chilton/Ilyin 1993: 9-10; Schäffner 1996: 31-33).

The call to look for meaning beyond the surface seems to be particularly appropriate when coming across metaphors. Many metaphors do not make much sense at the manifest level at all. This is the reason why I do not always find a strict distinction between manifest and latent levels very useful and therefore will not make it in my analysis of metaphors. As soon as one starts interpreting metaphors, one leaves the manifest level and enters the realm of latent content.

As far as practical matters of the analysis of metaphors are concerned, one is confronted with the same problem as in the macro-analysis: The methodological toolbox is not very well equipped. The one feature most analyses of metaphors in political sciences seem to be sharing is a certain systematisation of metaphors, namely to develop groups of related metaphors. Apart from that, one finds few explicit techniques of analysis. 'Free-style' interpreting seems to be the normal mode of

research. Thus the analysis of metaphors is very much a 'Kunstlehre' (art) of text interpretation, as hermeneutics is often described. By making the process of interpretation as transparent as possible, I hope to get a grip on the methodological problems one inevitably encounters in work of this kind. Thus, intersubjective examination of my 'Verstehen' (understanding) should be possible (Hitzler/Honer 1997: 25, Fn. 9; Soeffner/Hitzler 1994: 33, 36; Schröer 1994: 20-21).

3. The macrolevel - the accession-discourse in the light of 'europeanness'

In this chapter, I will show that Klaus Kinkel's statements repeatedly tie together the membership question and the question of whether or not Turkey is a European country. Or, to put it differently, Turkey's europeanness will be shown to be a concept in the examined discourse. In this section, I will only point at framing that takes place at the surface of the texts, namely at statements in which Turkey's europeanness is explicitly made an issue. Chapter 4, in contrast, will address instances of implicit framing.

Before starting with the actual text analysis, I would like to point at the difficulties of translating the analysed texts (and also the analyses of these texts) from the original language into another one. There is a great danger of not transferring all nuances of meaning from one language to another. Therefore, not only my translation of the statements, but also the original quote will be presented.

An example of an explicit linkage is the following quote from a television interview. Being asked about Turkey's chances for accession, Kinkel answers - without even being asked - that Turkey is part of Europe.[3]

> "Question: Did you make it unmistakably clear to the Turkish government, that actually they will never come to the European Union?
> Answer: I have said clearly and distinctly that *Turkey belongs to Europe*, but that - in the foreseeable future - she has no chance of becoming member of the European Union (...)" (Kinkel-interview, Tagesthemen, 26.3.97).[4]

---

[3] The emphases in this and all other citations are mine.
[4] The original, German, version: "Frage: Haben Sie der türkischen Regierung unmißverständlich klargemacht, daß sie eigentlich nie zur Europäischen Union kommen werden?
Antwort: Ich habe klar und deutlich gesagt, daß die *Türkei zu Europa gehört*, daß aber auf absehbare Zeit keine Chance besteht, daß die Türkei der Europäischen Union angehört." (Kinkel-Interview, Tagesthemen, 26.3.97).

In the following quotation it is the interviewer who frames the topic of accession under the premise of 'europeanness'. Klaus Kinkel takes it up and links the confirmation of Turkey's belonging to Europe with the membership-question, despite the fact that the interviewer had not asked about EU-accession.

> "Question: Turkey, does she *belong to Europe* or not...?
> Answer: Turkey does *belong to Europe*, but it looks as if - for the foreseeable future - she has no chance to become a member of the European Union (...)" (Kinkel-interview, Heute-Journal, 26.3.97).[5]

Klaus Kinkel confirms Turkey's belonging to Europe in various other statements. Europeanness is thus made an issue, the discourse topic is defined in a certain way.

> "Turkey undoubtedly *belongs to Europe*" (Kinkel, quoted in Die Welt, 13.9.97).[6]

> "*Turkey belongs to Europe*, we want to have her with us" (Kinkel, quoted in Frankfurter Rundschau, 16.12.97).[7]

> "But I have made it clear that we want to keep Turkey on the track to Europe. We want to have her with us, *she belongs to Europe*, but she has to make an effort herself, and we want to help her with that" (Kinkel-interview, SZ, 22.12.97).[8]

> "We want that Turkey *belongs to Europe*, we will continue to support this" (Kinkel, quoted in Der Spiegel, 12/98, 16.3.98).[9]

We find another quite explicit reference to the concept of 'europeanness' in those instances where Turkey's 'European vocation', 'European option', or 'European perspective' are being evoked.

> "The European Council has - in addition to this - confirmed the *European vocation* of Turkey" (Kinkel-speech about the results of the European Council, 14.12.97).[10]

---

[5] "Frage: *Die Türkei, gehört sie nun zu Europa oder nicht...?*
Antwort: Die *Türkei gehört zu Europa*, aber sie hat wohl auf absehbare Zeit keine Chance, Mitglied der Europäischen Union zu werden (...)" (Kinkel-Interview, Heute-Journal, 26.3.97).
[6] "Die *Türkei gehört ganz zweifellos zu Europa*" (Kinkel, zitiert in Die Welt, 13.9.97).
[7] "Die *Türkei gehört zu Europa*, wir wollen sie dabeihaben" (Kinkel, zitiert in FR, 16.12.97).
[8] "Ich habe aber deutlich gesagt, daß wir die Türkei auf dem Gleis nach Europa halten wollen. Wir wollen sie dabeihaben, *sie gehört nach Europa*, muß sich aber selber anstrengen, und wir wollen ihr dabei helfen" (Kinkel-Interview, SZ, 22.12.97).
[9] "Wir wollen, daß die *Türkei zu Europa gehört*, das werden wir auch weiterhin unterstützen" (Kinkel, zitiert in Der Spiegel, 12/98, 16.3.98).
[10] "Der Europäische Rat hat darüber hinaus die europäische Berufung der Türkei bekräftigt" (Kinkel-Rede zu den Ergebnissen des Europäischen Rates, 14.12.97).

> "She is our NATO-partner, she needs to keep the *European option* - in our interest, too" (Kinkel-interview, Süddeutsche Zeitung, 22.12.97).[11]

> "The Turkish government knows very well that the *European option* is in the country's very own interest" (Kinkel-interview, Kölnische Rundschau, 13.3.98).[12]

> "Turkey, naturally, has got a *European and an Islamic option*. But Turkey belongs to NATO and to Europe. Therefore, we have to do everything, in order to maintain Atatürk's *European option* for Turkey" (Kinkel-interview, Tagesspiegel, 15.12.97).[13]

> "We have offered Turkey a clear *European perspective*" (Kinkel, quoted in Süddeutsche Zeitung, 17.12.97).[14]

The topic's construction through the concept of europeanness is also done by the metaphor of the European family. Here, the concept of europeanness is disguised as a question of whether or not Turkey belongs to this European family. This question may be translated - as I will explain in more detail in the following chapter - to the question of whether or not Turkey belongs to Europe.

> "Turkey belongs to the European family" (Kinkel-speech, German Parliament, 11.12.97).[15]

> "We want to have Turkey in the European family" (Kinkel-interview, Tagesspiegel, 15.12.97).[16]

In conclusion, it may be said that Klaus Kinkel repeatedly discussed the issue of Turkey's possible EU-accession in the light of the question if Turkey belongs to Europe. Even though he appears to confirm Turkey's europeanness, this linkage has the effect of making 'europeanness' a concept in the discourse. Every single mentioning of the concept underlines its importance as a point of reference in the debate. The discourse topic (may Turkey join the EU?) is looked at from a certain angle (does Turkey belong to Europe?). This stresses one aspect of the issue at the expense of other aspects.

---

[11] "Sie ist unser NATO-Partner, sie muß die *europäische Option* beibehalten - auch in unserem Interesse" (Kinkel-Interview, SZ, 22.12.97).

[12] "Die türkische Regierung weiß sehr genau, daß die *europäische Option* im ureigensten Interesse des Landes liegt" (Kinkel-Interview, Kölnische Rundschau, 13.3.98).

[13] "Die Türkei hat natürlich eine *europäische und eine islamische Option*. Aber die Türkei gehört zur NATO und zu Europa. Deshalb müssen wir alles tun, um die Atatürksche *europäische Option* für die Türkei zu erhalten " (Kinkel-Interview, Tagesspiegel, 15.12.97).

[14] "Wir haben der Türkei eine klare *europäische Perspektive* geboten" (Kinkel, zitiert in SZ 17.12.97).

[15] "Die Türkei gehört zur europäischen Familie" (Kinkel-Rede, Bundestag, 11.12.97).

Moreover, the linking of EU-accession and europeanness may be witnessed in another conspicuous feature of the discourse. It is less direct, but can be discovered in several of the above-quoted statements: The EU is talked of and thus constructed as Europe. In these cases, no distinction is made between the EU as a political and Europe as a geographical unit.[17] This observation, too, supports my proposition. If the EU is understood as being Europe, the matter of Turkey's EU-accession automatically becomes a question of Turkey's europeanness. By equating EU and Europe the membership-question is transformed into a question of whether Turkey is European. The discourse, then, is not only about EU-accession but also about europeanness.

4. The microlevel - about Turkey's europeanness

In the preceding chapter it was shown that Turkey's europeanness had been an important topic within the discourse about a possible EU-membership of Turkey. In this section I will examine how Klaus Kinkel judged Turkey's europeanness.

A first glance at the quotes from chapter 3 gives the impression that Klaus Kinkel sees Turkey as a European country: *Turkey is part of Europe, Turkey belongs to Europe, Turkey's European vocation/option/perspective, Turkey belongs to the European family.*

My analysis, however, does not stop here but takes a second look at the texts, the results of which will be presented in the following. On a general level, it gives prove of what is being remarked about the dissemination of metaphors in the literature: "Once one begins with the observation of the phenomenon of language called metaphor, human speech will seem to be composed of metaphors just as the black forest is of trees" (Bühler 1934, quoted in Schmitt 1995: 72, my translation).[18] This insight and the importance of metaphors in the process of constructing reality discussed above explain why my microanalysis will for the most part be an interpretation of metaphors.

---

[16] "Wir wollen die Türkei in der europäischen Familie mit dabeihaben" (Kinkel-Interview, Tagesspiegel, 15.12.97).
[17] Schäffner (1995: 175, 179) observes the very same for other areas of EU-discourse.
[18] The German original: "Wer die sprachliche Erscheinung, die man Metapher zu nennen pflegt, einmal anfängt zu beobachten, dem erscheint die menschliche Rede bald ebenso aufgebaut aus Metaphern wie der Schwarzwald aus Bäumen."

Most of the metaphors to be found in my text-corpus can be classified as one of the following two types of metaphors: *container-metaphors* or *movement-metaphors*. In the literature this classification of metaphors is quite common, at times complemented by other groups. In addition, these two types are said to cover large parts of metaphor use in political discourse (Lakoff/Johnson 1980; Schäffner 1995,1996; Chilton/Lakoff 1995).

Container-Metaphors

The common feature of metaphors of this type is the picturing of Europe as a container. This container is a closed entity to which one either belongs or not, just as one can be either inside or outside a container (Schäffner 1995: 176). In political discourse this type is very popular for the description of states (Chilton/Lakoff 1995: 50). However, it is used in quite diverse ways, some of which will be discussed here.

A frequently used concrete instance of the container-metaphor-type is the family metaphor. It characterises Europe as a family, thus turning Turkey's EU-application into a request to become a member of the family. Answers to this request may be extracted from the following citation:

> "With the European Conference we want to set a sign that Turkey belongs to the *European family*" (Kinkel-speech, German Federal Council, 18.11.97).[19]

In this statement it seems to be confirmed that Turkey is part of the European family. Due to what usually is associated with the term 'family' - especially common descent/origin - Turkey is marked as a European country. However, one may wonder why the family membership needs to be confirmed in the first place. Would it make sense if there were no doubts about Turkey being part of the family? Or, as a counterfactual: Would it make sense to confirm Switzerland's membership in the European family? In my opinion, the confirmation of Turkey's being part of the family suggests doubts about what is being confirmed. Surely, the former communist states of Middle and Eastern Europe, too, have been welcomed as members of the European family. However, I would hold that this is part of the very same process,

---

[19] Wir wollen mit der Europakonferenz ein Zeichen setzen, daß die Türkei zur *europäischen Familie* gehört" (Kinkel-Rede vor dem Bundesrat, 28.11.97).

namely to construct these countries as European, while at the same time giving way to diverging interpretations.

Furthermore, the first part of the sentence deserves some attention. A *signal* is being given. But - one may ask - why is there a need to signal that Turkey belongs to the family? Western-type families may be regarded as prototypical container-metaphors, since for them the unity-feature is particular fitting. Someone who does not belong to the family by birth may become a member of the family only through marriage or adoption. Thus the signal given to Turkey makes sense only if Turkey is not considered to be an original family member. The fact that *we* are the ones who signal that Turkey belongs to the family indicates a hierarchical relation, thus the possible accession of Turkey is seen more like an adoption of a child than a marriage between equals. In any case, an interpretation of this sequence shows that it produces a sceptical evaluation of Turkey's europeanness, despite the fact that the text surface seems to indicate quite the opposite.

Lastly, the agents do not simply set a signal, but only *want* to set a signal. It is an expression of will and thus much weaker than a commitment to act. Two interpretations may be thought of: Either, we are dealing with an intention, the realisation of which is uncertain. Or, we find the speaker - and those he speaks for - willing to integrate Turkey, however it is up to Turkey to see this signal. Thus, the use of the term *want* also contributes to the weakening of the original confirmation of Turkey's belonging to the European family.

In conclusion, one can hardly see how this statement constructs Turkey as clearly inside or outside the container that is Europe. While it seems to see Turkey as being inside it contains several moments of doubts about its own message on the latent level.

A further example of the container-metaphor is the conceptualisation of Europe as a house (Schäffner 1996: 43). Its most famous application is the 'common house of Europe', an expression which was coined by Gorbatshev and which featured very prominently in European discourses before and after the events of 1989 (Chilton/Ilyin 1993). Though one cannot find explicit usage of the house-metaphor in my text-corpus, an interesting derivation of the house metaphor can be found: Doors, which one cannot picture without some form of building. If the idea of a door (or windows, for that matter) is inextricably linked to the idea of a house, one can regard them as

being part of the same subgroup of metaphors. There is frequent talk of doors in my text corpus, particularly as to their function of allowing someone in.

> "The *door* for Turkey to Europe remains open" (Kinkel-speech, German Parliament, 5.3.98).[20]

To begin with one could try to paraphrase the statement in the following way: Turkey may not be part of Europe, but Europe wants Turkey to become part of Europe. This statement constructs Turkey as being outside the European house, since only then it makes sense to keep the door to Europe open. If it is by walking through a door that Turkey would get to Europe, she cannot yet be inside. The word order of the sentence is quite awkward in the English translation, but in German, too, it sounds rather strange. Instead of simply saying that for Turkey the door to Europe remains open, it gives the impression that there is a door which is for use by Turkey only, a special entrance so to say. Turkey may not use the normal entrance. She is constructed as a special case. This reminds us of the rapprochement-strategy, invented by the Luxembourg summit to comfort Turkey for not being granted the status of a candidate.

Furthermore, it may be noticed that the door *remains* open. It follows that the door must have already been open before. Nothing has changed. If one looks at the context within which this remark has been made its meaning becomes quite clear. After the Luxembourg summit Turkish politicians held Germany to be responsible for what Turkey considered the discriminating result of the European Council. The Turkish Prime Minister Yilmaz even compared Germany's politics vis-à-vis the Middle-and Eastern European countries with Hitler's 'Lebensraumpolitik', a comparison that provoked angry reactions by the German government. Thus the offer to keep the door open for Turkey may be read as 'we keep the door open for you, though we would have the right to close it considering your misbehaviour'. Thus we encounter a double construction: the own position is described positively - the generosity of keeping the door open - while at the same time the apparent mistakes of the other are alluded to. I will return to this combination of positive self-representation and negative representation of the other in the chapter on identity.

Another aspect that is worth being mentioned is the distribution of agency in the

statement: The inmates of the house decide about the opening and closing of the doors. Whether or not Turkey may enter is up to the inmates, namely the European countries. But Turkey herself needs to do the steps through the door. Or, to put it differently: In principle Turkey has the potential to be European, but she has to realise this potential herself. If and when she has actually realised it, is decided by (EU-) Europe. The EU decides whether or not Turkey fulfills the criteria for membership. In sum, the interpretation of this statement shows that Turkey is located outside Europe. But, though being outside at the moment, Turkey does not necessarily have to stay there. Since the door to Europe remains open, Turkey is potentially European. But as long as she has not stepped through the door, she has not yet become European.

Before moving on to the group of movement-metaphors I want to point at an aspect of the container-group, which is mentioned in Schäffner (1995: 176) and which I find confirmed by my analysis, namely that mainly those inside the container are capable of actions. It is mainly to them that agency is ascribed. Thus Turkey is only a passive object of European actions, she is acted upon: Turkey *belongs* to the European family. Whether Turkey wants to belong to the Europe family is not being asked.

Movement-metaphors

As with the container-metaphors movement-metaphors are frequently used in political discourse (Schäffner 1996: 37). Realisations of movement-metaphors stress different aspects of movement: the action of moving, the destination, the speed, or the means of transport (Schäffner 1996: 43-51). Unlike container-metaphors movement-metaphors are dynamic. Thus they are well-suited to describe developments. Whereas the discourse on European integration usually constructs the EU/Europe as the moving subject (e.g. two-speed Europe), the moving subject in the discourse studied here is Turkey. She moves in the direction of Europe.

Klaus Kinkel's favourite movement-metaphors are all from the realm of railways, this at least is the impression one gets from the discourse on Turkey's possible EU-accession. His tendency to use train-metaphors was so strong that a newspaper editorial gave him the nickname 'stationmaster' (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 27.3.97).

---

[20] "Die Tür für die Türkei nach Europa bleibt offen" (Kinkel-Rede, Bundestag, 5.3.98).

Most of Kinkel's uses of railway-metaphors follow the same pattern: *Turkey is on the track to Europe* or *Turkey is on/in the European train*. Thus not only the destination (Europe), but also the means of transport (train) as well as the movement as such (be on the track/train) are included. How Turkey's europeanness is constructed in these metaphors will be discussed by looking at an example:

> "But she is still sitting on the *European track* and may not *uncouple* her own wagon from the European train (...) At present, Turkey is *uncoupling* herself a little bit" (Kinkel-interview, Phönix, 8.4.98).[21]

In this utterance several related metaphors are combined into a metaphorical phrase. Europe is both, track and train. Implicitly Europe is also the destination of the rail journey, thus the European train is on the European track to Europe. Turkey, on the other side, is a wagon in the European train, she is sitting on the European track. However, we are presently witnessing a breakdown, due to Turkey's attempts to uncouple her wagon. The trip to Europe is interrupted.

The statement constructs Turkey as being on the way to Europe. But, by constructing her as on the way it is implied that she has not yet arrived. And she herself is responsible for the delay, due to her uncoupling efforts.

Movement-metaphors describe a movement between two places. Turkey has left one place (however it is not specified, what place that is) and is on the way to the other which is Europe. Since she has not yet arrived, she is 'in-between' or 'hybrid', as theories of postcolonialism would have it (Bhaba 1996). I will return to this aspect in chapter 5.

Whereas container-metaphors normally construct Europe as the acting subject, most of the movement-metaphors in the examined corpus ascribe agency to Turkey: Turkey is sitting on the track, she is uncoupling herself. The only possibility expressed, the only reality constructed through this phrase is a movement of Turkey in the direction of Europe. The opposite, a Europe approaching Turkey, is not implied - it is not part of the reality constructions and thus outside possible ways of acting. Europe is the centre towards which all movement is oriented. Turkey is the periphery that is attracted by the centre. And she is not even allowed to move away from the centre:

---

[21] "Aber sie sitzt noch auf dem *europäischen Gleis* und darf ihren eigenen *Wagen* auch nicht vom *europäischen Zug abkoppeln* (...) Die Türkei ist im Augenblick ein klein wenig dabei, sich selber *abzukoppeln*." (Kinkel-Interview, Phönix, 8.4.98).

she *may* not uncouple her own wagon.

It is revealing to recall the context of the statement: In protest against the Luxembourg resolution of the European Council, Turkey did not participate at the European Conference. The latter was held in London in March 1998 and was organised as part of the special rapprochement-strategy for Turkey. Interpreting Turkey's decision as uncoupling, constructs Turkey as an uncertain European. Turkey is seen as turning away from Europe as soon as she is no longer satisfied with Europe's decisions. Turkey's reaction is not interpreted as a normal decision, but instead as a repudiation of Europe. This, again, gives evidence of how the question of accession was linked to the question of europeanness (proposition 1) and of the ambivalent assessment of Turkey's europeanness (proposition 2).

5. Turkey's europeanness and European identity

> "Identity and difference are inextricably entwined. You can not have
> one without the other (...) Interrogating identity is to highlight how
> 'otherness' is constructed" (Campbell 1992: 8).

In this section I will explore some connections between the discourse under study here and the formation of European identity. In the introductory chapter the claim was made that European identity is constructed through the discourse about a possible EU-accession of Turkey. This assumption is based on the discussion about the 'self/other-nexus' in identity theory (Neumann 1996). The principle argument is the following: One's identity is knowable only by knowing what one is not, by an awareness of difference. Only through an idea of what Europe is not, of who and what is not European, the concept of Europe is taking shape. Demarcation thus is a necessary component of identity building, in fact 'othering' is a core activity in the construction of identities (see for example: Neumann 1996; Hall 1997a: 229-237; Wagner 1998: 45; Smith 1992: 75). As far as this study is concerned, my discourse analysis should then not only help us to understand how the discourse constructs Turkey, but also how it constructs Europe. The latter, I strive to do by discussing six different, albeit related, aspects of the identity building going on in the discourse about Turkey's EU-accession.

First one may notice that the question of a possible EU-accession of Turkey triggered, or at least boosted, a debate on the future boundaries of the EU. In this context it has,

for example, been warned that an EU-membership of Turkey would make the EU share a border with Iran and Iraq. Kinkel, however, opposed the fixing of the EU's future borders (Kinkel-speech 'Grenzfall Europa', 1998). None the less he could not halt the linking of the two issues, especially by his government partners, the CDU/CSU. Through the reflection on who should be in- and who should be outside the EU, they were engaging in a process of identity construction.

The *second* aspect focuses on identity formation through othering. In chapter 4 it was shown that the confirmation of Turkey's europeanness on the texts' surface did not match with the meaning created by the metaphors. The metaphors constructed Turkey as not truly European. Rather than being a clear-cut other, she was made a hybrid 'in-between space'.[22] But this, too, involves othering. Some students of identity (Neumann 1996: 167; Hall 1997a: 236; Norton 1988) in fact argue that doubtful others of this kind are particularly interesting cases. Since the hybrid entities are relatively similar to it, the self needs to make a special effort to discursively construct some difference. The discourse constructing Turkey as a hybrid thus constructs an idea of Europe proper, it makes a distinction between Europe, of which Turkey may possibly be part of, and Europe proper, to which Turkey definitely does not belong.

European identity, *thirdly*, is constructed through the presentation of Europe as a homogenous entity. Rather than differentiating between the various EU-member-states, not to mention the Commission or the European Council, (EU-)Europe is constructed as a uniform actor that is facing Turkey. In fact, one could argue that this makes for a binary opposition Europe/Turkey (Doty 1996: 229). Binary oppositions make meaning from the difference between opposites, as in white/black or man/woman. The world thus established is void of nuances, its either black or white, but not grey (Hall 1997a: 235). Turkey and Europe thus become mutually exclusive. At the same time the binary opposition (EU-)Europe/Turkey makes Europe a nation-state-like entity, since the opposites are categories of the same level, like the pair man/woman, for example. The discourse thus constructs Europe as an entity that goes beyond a supranational organisation, constructing it as a quasi nation-state.

Taking this point a bit further one can argue a *fourth* point: On the one hand the binary opposition raises the EU to the same level as Turkey, on the other side it also

establishes a power relation in favour of the EU. According to Derrida binary opposi-
tions are rarely neutral. Instead they create and reflect a power relation, for instance
by connotating one pole positively, the other negatively as is the case in man/woman
or white/black (Hall 1997a: 235). I claim that the discourse under study here con-
structs a hierarchy of a superior (EU-)Europe and an inferior Turkey. Two considera-
tions may help to justify this claim:

On the one hand it is the agency-issue which has already been mentioned in chapter 4:
There I argued that container-metaphors construct the EU as the agent which can
decide about Turkey's becoming member or not. Thus the EU is being constructed as
active and capable of acting whereas Turkey is passive and acted upon. This creates
identities based upon a difference of power. On the other hand the positive represen-
tation of (EU-)Europe in many of Kinkel's statements may be recalled, contrasting
with the negative representation of Turkey in some of his statements. Thus, a Europe
is being constructed which one likes to identify with due to its positive connotations.

A *fifth* identity constituting effect of the discourse is the equation of the EU with
Europe. This aspect has already been pointed to in chapter 3: The discourse rarely
makes a distinction between the EU and Europe, instead the two are used synony-
mously. This implies a cultural-geographical definition of the EU rather than a mere
political one. Speaking of the EU as Europe underlines the importance of cultural and
geographical characteristics, they are made the substance of (EU)European identity.

The *sixth* and last aspect once more takes us back to the container-metaphors. They
construct Europe in a way that creates a sense of unity and togetherness. Talking
about Europe as if she was a family emotionalises people's relation to Europe.
Belonging to Europe is like belonging to a family. Thus container-metaphors create
European identity by referring to the common origin of the family members.

In sum, we may state that the discourse about Turkey's possible accession to the EU
becomes part of the discourse on European identity. The discourse about Turkey's
accession coincides frequently with reflecting upon the borders of Europe, a reflection
that is part of the process of constructing European identity. Talking about Turkey's
EU-accession thus not only constitutes the object (Turkey), but also the subject (EU-
Europe).

---

[22] Schlesinger (1994: 45) comes to a very similar conclusion.

6. Summary and conclusions

This paper showed that the discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession, or more precisely the discourse contributions of Klaus Kinkel, linked the discourse topic to the question of whether Turkey actually was European. Discussing Turkey's europeanness thus became a normal activity in the accession-discourse. Next, the paper took a closer look at the judgements about Turkey's europeanness by analysing metaphors. Metaphorical analysis helped to explore the production of meaning below the texts' surface. Thus I was able to discover that Turkey had neither been constructed as being an unequivocal European, nor as being clearly Non-European. Rather, she was constituted as an 'in-between-space'. Based on identity theories, it was then argued that the discourse not only constructs Turkey, but that by the same token it constructs Europe. European identity is being created both by positive self-representations as well as by othering Turkey.

In theoretical perspective, this paper indicates the analytical space opened up to IR by discourse analysis. Discourse analysis pursues other goals than social research based on a positivist epistemology. Instead of explaining a particular political action or policy outcome, discourse analysis looks at the processes of constructing the very 'reality', on the basis of which people act. However, my empirical analysis shows that the research of the social construction of reality is far from being unproblematic. If one remains on the surface of the texts, one will discover only part of the reality the discourse constructs. Therefore, I want to repeat Zehfuß' (1998: 132) call to IR-constructivists for more research on the role of language. But, in addition to that, I would like to call for an increased awareness of the complexity of language and discourses. Speakers do not only constitute reality by what they say, but also by what they say between the lines and by what they say not. In my opinion, IR-constructivists need to deal with language much more thoroughly than they usually do.

In anticipation of possible critique I want to point at one important shortcoming of this paper: It does not reflect upon the relation between discourse and action. Many authors argue that it is a necessary component of discourse analysis to explore discursive practices (Hall 1997b: 44; Keller 1997: 314). Since discourses create a certain way of seeing the world, they have an impact on the actions undertaken in this world:

"(...) discourses are both *enabling as well as constraining*: they determine answers to questions, as well as the questions that can be asked" (Barnes/Duncan 1997: 7; my emphasis). As far as the discourse about Turkey's possible EU-accession is concerned, one would need to analyse what actions are enabled and what others are ruled out by the discourse. But, luckily, this is beyond the scope of this paper.

7. References

Barnes, Trevor J./Duncan, James S. 1992: Introduction. Writing Worlds, in: Barnes, Trevor J. /Duncan, J.S. (eds.): Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape, London, 1-17.

Barth, Frederik 1969: Introduction, in: Barth, Frederik (ed.): Ethnic Group and Boundaries, Oslo, 9-38.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1996: Culture's In-Between, in: Hall, Stuart /Gay, Paul du (eds.): Questions of Cultural Identity, London, 53-60.

Böke, Karin 1997: Die 'Invasion' aus den 'Armenhäusern Europas'. Metaphern im Einwanderungsdiskurs, in: Jung, Matthias/Wengeler, Martin/Böke, Karin (eds.): Die Sprache des Migrationsdiskurses. Das Reden über 'Ausländer' in Medien, Politik und Alltag, Opladen, 164-193.

Burgess, J. Peter 2000: Legitimacy between Institution and Identity. What's European about the European Union?, unpublished manuscript, Florence.

Campbell, David 1992: Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, Minneapolis.

Chilton, Paul/Ilyin, Mikhail 1993: Metaphor in political discourse: the case of the 'common European house', in: Discourse & Society 4: 1, 7-31.

Chilton, Paul/Lakoff, George 1995: Foreign Policy by Metaphor, in: Schäffner, Christina /Wenden, Anita L. (eds.): Language and Peace, Aldershot, 37-59.

Chilton, Paul A. 1996a: Security Metaphors: cold war discourse from containment to common house, New York.

Chilton, Paul A. 1996b: The Meaning of Security, in: Beer, Francis A. /Hariman, Robert (eds.): Post-Realim: the rhetorical turn in international relations, East Lansing, 193-216.

Dijk, Teun A. van 1998a: Categories for the Critical Analysis of Parliamentary Debates about Immigration, first draft, May.

Dijk, Teun A. van 1998b: On the Analysis of Parliamentary Debates on Immigration. Working paper for the Project Racism at the Top. second draft, July.

Donati, Paolo R. 1992: Political Discourse Analysis, in: Diani, Mario /Eyerman, Ron (eds.): Studying Collective Action, London, 136-167.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn 1993: Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines, in: International Studies Quarterly 37, 297-320.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn 1996: Imperial Encounters: the politics of representation in North-South relations, Minneapolis.

Hall, Stuart 1992: The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power, in: Hall, Stuart /Giebsen, Bram (ed.): Formations of Modernity, Oxford, 275-332.

Hall, Stuart 1997a: The Spectacle of the 'Other', in: Hall, Stuart (ed.): Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, London, 223-290.

Hall, Stuart 1997b: The Work of Representation, in: Hall, Stuart (ed.): Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, London, 13-74.

Hitzler, Ronald/Honer, Anne 1997: Hermeneutik in der deutschsprachigen Soziologie heute, in: Hitzler, Ronald /Honer, Anne (eds.): Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik, Opladen, 7-27.

Hitzler, Ronald/Honer, Anne (eds.) 1997: Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik, Opladen.

Keller, Reiner 1997: Diskursanalyse, in: Hitzler, Ronald /Honer, Anne (eds.): Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik. Eine Einführung, Opladen, 309-333.

Laclau, Ernesto/Mouffe, Chantal 1985: Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics, London.

Lakoff, G./Johnson, M. 1980: Metaphors We Live By, Chicago.

Maier, Matthias Leonhard 1998: Three images of ideas in political science: conceptual and methodological issues, Paper presented at workshop 'Norms and interests in international relations', EUI, Florence, November 20-21.

Matouschek, Bernd 1997: Soziodiskursive Analyse öffentlicher Migrationsdebatten in Österreich. Zu Theorie, Methodik und Ergebnissen einer diskurshistorischen Untersuchung, in: Jung, Matthias/Wengeler, Martin/Böke, Karin (eds.): Die Sprache des Migrationsdiskurses. Das Reden über 'Ausländer' in Medien, Politik und Alltag, Opladen, 106-120.

Miller, Eugene F. 1979: Metaphor and Political Knowledge, in: The American Political Science Review, 73, 155-170.

Milliken, Jennifer 1996: Metaphors of Prestige and Reputation in American Foreign Policy and American Realism, in: Beer, Francis A. /Hariman, Robert (eds.):

Post-Realism: the rhetorical turn in international relations, East Lansing, 217-238.

Milliken, Jennifer 1999: The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods, in: European Journal of International Relations 5: 2, 225-254.

Neumann, Iver B. 1996: Self and Other in International Relations, in: European Journal of International Relations 2: 2, 139-174.

Norton, Anne 1988: Reflections on Political Identity, Baltimore.

Obeng, Samuel Gyasi 1997: Language and Politics: indirectness in political discourse, in: Discourse & Society 8: 1, 49-83.

Said, Edward W. 1995 (1978): Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient, London.

Schäffner, Christina 1995: Metapher als Bezeichnungsübertragung?, in: Pohl, Inge /Ehrhardt, Horst (eds.): Wort und Wortschatz: Beiträge zur Lexikologie, Tübingen, 175-184.

Schäffner, Christina 1996: Building a European House? Or at Two Speeds into a Dead End? Metaphors in the Debate on the United Europe, in: Musolff, Andreas/Schäffner, Christina/Townson, Michael (eds.): Conceiving of Europe: diversity in unity, Aldershot, 31-60.

Schlesinger, Phillip 1994: 'Europeanness' - a new cultural battlefield?, in: Pohoryles, Ronald (ed.): European Transformations: Five Decisive years at the turn of the century: an innovation reader, 1988-1992, Aldershot, 33-49.

Schmitt, Rudolf 1995: Metaphern des Helfens, Weinheim.

Schröer, Norbert 1994: Einleitung: Umriß einer hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, in: Schröer, Norbert (ed.): Interpretative Sozialforschung. Auf dem Wege zu einer hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, Opladen, 9-25.

Schröer, Norbert (ed.) 1994: Interpretative Sozialforschung. Auf dem Weg zu einer hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, Opladen.

Smith, Anthony D. 1992: National identity and the idea of European unity, in: International Affairs 68: 1, 55-76.

Soeffner, Hans-Georg/Hitzler, Ronald 1994: Hermeneutik als Haltung und Handlung. Über methodisch kontrolliertes Verstehen, in: Schröer, Norbert (ed.): Interpretative Sozialforschung. Auf dem Wege zu einer hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, Opladen, 28-54.

Straehle, Carolyn et al. 1999: Struggle as metaphor in European Union discourses on unemployment, in: Discourse & Society 10: 1, 67-99.

Titscher, Stefan et al. 1998: Methoden der Textanalyse. Leitfaden und Überblick, Opladen.

Tonkiss, Fran 1998: Analysing Discourse, in: Seale, Clive (ed.): Researching Society and Culture, London/ Thousand Oaks, 245-260.

Wagner, Peter 1998: Fest-Stellungen. Beobachtungen zur sozialwissenschaftlichen Diskussion über Idenität, in: Assmann, Aleida/ Friese, Heidrun (eds.): Identitäten. Erinnerung, Geschichte, Identität. Band 3, Frankfurt/M., 44-72.

Zehfuß, Maja 1998: Sprachlosigkeit schränkt ein. Zur Bedeutung von Sprache in konstruktivistischen Theorien, in: Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 5: 1, 109-137.