



## Documentation

### Avrupa'ja?

## Turkey and the European Union – Chances for a common future

4-12 December 2004

Werftpfuhl (near Berlin), Germany



*financially supported by*



### **Introduction:**

The conference brought together young people in the age of 18-25 from Cyprus (Greek and Turkish Cypriots), Greece, Germany, Poland and Turkey to inform them about and discuss the relations between Turkey and the European Union considering a possible future EU membership of Turkey. The conference was divided into three parts (see schedule next page): intercultural learning, political questions, and activating youth. The latter gave participants the opportunity to either develop joint projects or to work on a European-Turkish youth magazine that will be published in spring 2005. The following pages reflect some of the discussions and the workshop results.

*The organizers would like to **thank the German National YOUTH Agency (JUGEND für Europa), [www.webforum-jugend.de](http://www.webforum-jugend.de), and the Dutch development organisation Cordaid, [www.cordaid.nl](http://www.cordaid.nl), for their financial support.***

*Furthermore, we would like to thank **the outside speakers** for their active engagement in the conference, i.e.: **Prof. Dr. Dehn, Ilknur Yenidede, Niels Kadritzke, Johannes Ahlefeldt, Owen Parker, and Christian Meier.***

## **Table of Content**

<b>A Schedule</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>B Minutes</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>B.1 Minutes Part I – Intercultural Learning</b>	<b>4</b>
B.1.1 Ice-breaking games (Saturday, 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2004, 19:30-21:30)	4
B.1.2 Identity and Prejudices (Sunday, 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2004, 9:00-17:30)	4
B.1.3 Intercultural communication (Monday, 6 <sup>th</sup> December, 9:00-12:30)	6
B.1.4 Religion (Monday, 6 <sup>th</sup> December, 13:30-17:30)	7
B.1.5 Intercultural evening (Monday, 6 <sup>th</sup> December, 20:00 – open end)	10
<b>B.2 Minutes Part II – Political Questions</b>	<b>11</b>
B.2.1 Migration (Tuesday, 7 <sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 9:00 – 12:30)	11
B.2.2 Economics (Tuesday, 7 <sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 13:30 – 17:00)	12
B.2.3 Travel Day Berlin Kreuzberg (Wednesday, 8 <sup>th</sup> December)	13
B.2.4 Workshop on Cyprus (Thursday, 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2004, 10:00-17:30; Friday, 10 <sup>th</sup> December 20:00 – 01:30)	13
B.2.5 Workshop on minorities in both Turkey and EU member countries (Thursday, 9 <sup>th</sup> December, 10:00-17:30)	16
B.2.6 State and religion (Friday, 10 <sup>th</sup> December, 9:00-12:30)	19
B.2.7 Inside the European Commission (Friday, 10 <sup>th</sup> December, 14:00-17:30)	20
<b>B.3 Minutes Part III – Activating Youth</b>	<b>22</b>
B.3.1 Participation	22
B.3.2 Project Management	23
B.3.3 Magazine Group	26
<b>C Participants</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>D Coordinating and Partner organisations</b>	<b>29</b>

**Please note:** The content of the project does not necessary reflect the point of view of the European Union or the National Agency. They assume no liability.

## A Schedule

	4. Dez. 04	5. Dez. 04	6. Dez. 04	7. Dez. 04	8. Dez. 04	9. Dez. 04	10. Dez. 04	11. Dez. 04	12. Dez. 04	
	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	
	Intercultural Learning		Political questions				Activating Youth			
sub themes	8:30 - 9:00 Breakfast				7:15 Breakfast	8:30 - 9:00 Breakfast				
		identity and prejudices	intercultural communication	migration	(7:45 departure)  <b>Travel Day: Berlin-Kreuzberg;</b> 9:30 – 11:30 round tour	financial issues  <i>lecture by Niels Kadritzke</i>  workshop on Cyprus	<i>lecture by Johannes Ahlefeldt</i>  workshop on minorities	state and religion	activating youth	departure
	12:30 – 13:30 Lunch					12:30 – 13:30 Lunch				
	<i>arrival of participants</i>	continuation	religion  <i>lecture by Prof. Dr. Dehn</i>	economic problems and chances  <i>lecture by Ilknur Yenidede</i>	free afternoon and evening (till ~19:00)	continuation	continuation	inside the EC  <i>lecture by Owen Parker</i>	activating youth	evaluation of the conference
		activating youth	17:30 – 18:30 Organizers meeting / computer room and internet				17:30 – 18:30 Organizers meeting / computer room and internet			
	18:30 – 19:30 Dinner					18:30 – 19:30 Dinner				
	ice-breaking games	activating youth	intercultural evening	movie			activating youth	activating youth	final party	

An organizers meeting took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> of December in Werftpfuhl. In addition to the official programme, participants offered dancing or music in the evening.

## B Minutes

This section is divided into the main three parts of the conference programme: *Intercultural Learning (E.1)*, *Political Questions (E.2)*, and *Activating Youth (E.3)*, the latter comprising *Project Management* and the *Magazine Group*. In every session minutes were taken that will be presented in the next chapters.

### B.1 Minutes Part I – Intercultural Learning

#### B.1.1 Ice-breaking games (Saturday, 4<sup>th</sup> December 2004, 19:30-21:30)

**Organizer:** Kristian Brakel

**The following games were played:**

**Chair-game:** a circle of chairs, participants are asked to step on the chairs and arrange themselves silently in alphabetical order from a defined starting point.



**Map-game:** A detailed map of Europe incl. Turkey is laid on the floor. Everybody names his country of origin and, if different, his country of residence. Another participant is asked to find this place on the map and to put a small photo with the name of the first participant there. The map is afterwards put up on the wall and remains there till the end of the conference.

**Prejudice game:** Participants group in pairs of two and get to know each other. After five minutes they are asked to present their partner to the audience, answering three questions:

- What do you do (study/work)?
- What is your hobby?
- Where would you like to live?

One of these answers has to be a lie that the partner just made up for the audience. The audience is asked to guess which one it is.

#### B.1.2 Identity and Prejudices (Sunday, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2004, 9:00-17:30)

**Organizers:** Kirsten Vogl, Eva Fuchs and Fatima Beg

- 09.00: Brainstorming, five questions
- 09.30: Explain one of the answers in the plenum
- 10.30: Break
- 11.00: Division into six small groups and practice of a role play
- 12.30: Lunch
- 13.30: Presentation of the role-plays
- 15.00: Break
- 15.30: Discussion in the plenum
- 17.30: closure

“Brainstorming, five questions”

The participants were asked to answer the following five questions for themselves:

Which is your peer group? Why?

Which traditions and celebrations are important to you? Why?

Which role does nationality take? Why?

What is most important in your life? Why?

Which role does religion play? Why?

The participants had approximately 15 minutes of time to reflect upon those questions. They were then asked to cluster the replies on a dashboard for the whole group.

“Explain one of the answers to the plenum”

Actually it was planned that everybody would be allowed to explain all of his points but as we noticed that the time calculation was insufficient for such a big group everybody had to pick out one of his answers and explain why she believed it to be the most crucial point for her identity.

It was interesting to see that a lot of participants noted for themselves that they considered religion to be a crucial point for shaping someone’s identity while almost all of them stated that they did not consider themselves to be very religious.

Another interesting point was the question of nationality. It led to many different answers even in the same national group. For example, one Cypriot from the South saw nationality as very important while another one answered that due to the situation of the island such a thing did not really exist. Almost the same was true for two of the Germans. While both referred to the special treatment of nationality and history in their country, one stated that she feels oppressed by what she considered to be the mainstream interpretation of national pride and that she does not agree with this. Another German saw this mainstream interpretation as far too relaxed towards national pride.

“Division into six small groups and practice of a role play”

The participants were divided into six groups with a representative from each country. Every group was given the task to prepare a small role play about what they thought to be an outside (prejudiced) view about one of the partner countries.

“Presentation of the role plays”

The groups then presented their role plays in the plenum.

While most of them were of course very funny for the public they all contained some of the most widely spread prejudices about these countries (e.g. Dutch drink, smoke and party all the time and gay love is very common in the public, while Greeks are very chaotic, always move in big groups and are very noisy).

“Discussion in the plenum”

Afterwards, the role plays were discussed in the plenum. It was, however, only partly satisfying as the group turned out to be too big.

The participants were asked to explain what they experienced in the group while preparing the role-play, in particular the person whose nationality was in the focus of the role play.

While some groups had no problems at all finding stereotypes of their country, others had more difficulties as they could not agree on certain prejudices and stereotypes. It was interesting to see that the group showing typical Cypriote behaviour chose to concentrate on the behaviour of German tourists on the island as the group could not agree on a common stereotype for both parts of the island.

Later a participant from the Greek group argued that the scene shown about Greece was no stereotype but real (“we are really like this”).

### **B.1.3 Intercultural communication (Monday, 6<sup>th</sup> December, 9:00-12:30)**

**Organizer:** Kristian Brakel

9:00 – 10:00: Game

10:30 – 11:30: Lecture by Kristian Brakel about Intercultural Communication

11:30 – 12:30: Discussion in two Groups about Culture. Moderated by Kristian Brakel and Eva Fuchs

#### **1. Game:**

Participants were divided into two groups, then again into 2 subgroups. The groups included all nationalities. The subgroups moved to their working space. Each group appointed one ‘messenger’ who was entitled to visit the other subgroup. Each group was assigned to build a “statue” with their given materials. The completed “statue” had to be one meter high. The two subgroups had to build the same “statue” till the end of the given time. The only way to be informed about the other group’s activities was to rely on the two messengers passing information back and forth between them. Rules to be kept in mind while playing: Everybody can only speak in his or her own language. The messenger was not allowed to communicate in any language, only through sounds, grunts and gestures. The messenger was not allowed to touch the materials.



#### **2. Lecture about Intercultural Communication by Kristian Brakel:**

He asked the question what is culture. Of course this is a rather critical field. If you look into an anthropological encyclopaedia you will find as much as 164 and more definitions of the term "culture". For operating he used a rather simple model of culture and defined it as:

“A collective system of attitudes, principles, assumptions, values, value assumption, norms of conduct, and basic attitudes that influence the behaviour of the members of this group and that they use to interpret the behaviour of others.”

Then he talked about culture as a model. He argued that culture is structured like an onion, i.e. many different layers that influence each other. On the outside of this onion are rituals and behaviours as are artefacts and products of culture. In general these are the visible points of culture. The next layer is a combination of systems and institutions of a society, the social, economic, political, legal and executive systems of a culture. The next layer is norms, attitudes and beliefs. In the centre we find the basic values and norms of a culture. These influence all the layers above.

Then he pointed out that intercultural communication happens every time when people with different cultural backgrounds interact with each other. This does not necessarily include people from different

states. Cultural programming, he argued, takes place at a very early age – at the age of 7 most cultural norms are already set in their basics – and it is mostly a not very intentional process. This means that if people are asked to explain these basic norms mostly they are not able to do so as they are a logic presumption for them. This does of course also not mean that all individuals from one cultural background act the same. They only share the same code of values but the way they react on them may be totally different. However, compared to people with a foreign cultural background they more or less react in the same way.

Then he talked about cultural dimensions. He pointed out that there are different ways to measure cultural differences such as individualism/collectivism; masculinity/femininity; uncertainty avoidance; power distance index; long term orientation

### **3. Discussion about Culture:**

The participants discussed in two groups the question of culture and its influence. As culture is a wide field, the discussion was about many topics of culture. First the participants started to discuss about how culture is constructed (history, nationality, traditions, language) and how one belongs to culture. Then the discussion went on about the question if culture is static or flexible. Some said culture is flexible because there are so many changes and influences in life that there is always a new creation of culture. Others stated that culture is static and that it has to be resolved by the persons who are living in it. This means they have to pass their way of living to their children and be aware of foreign influences. Then the discussion turned to the relationship between culture and identity. At the end, the participants discussed about the possibility of global and supranational culture.

## **B.1.4 Religion (Monday, 6<sup>th</sup> December, 13:30-17:30)**

**Organizers:** Kirsten Vogl and Tanja Strube

- 13.30: energizer
- 13.40: “10 minutes of silence”
- 13.55: “What would be different if you were part of another religious community?”
- 14.40: presentation of results
- 15.00: break
- 15.30-17.30: lecture by Prof. Dehn<sup>1</sup> on “Similarities and Differences between Christianity and Islam” and discussion

### **“10 minutes of silence”**

The participants got the following questions about their personal religious beliefs:

Do you pray? In what situations do you pray?

Which role does religion play in your life?

How important are symbols in your religion? Which of these symbols are important for you?

How/when did you become aware of your religion?

Which values are connected to your religion?

There were about ten minutes of silence during which everyone thought about these questions without talking to the others.

---

<sup>1</sup> Born 1954 in Düsseldorf, pastor of Protestant Church of Rhineland, doctorate in Hamburg 1985, Habilitation in Heidelberg 1992, 1986 to 1994 working at Tomisaka Christian Center in Tokyo, since 1995 at the Evangelische Zentralstelle für Weltanschauungsfragen, Berlin, in charge of non-Christian religions, and professor at Humboldt University, married, two children.

**"What would be different if you were part of another religious community?"**

After thinking about their own religious beliefs the participants were split into four groups of about 10 persons each. They went into separate rooms without facilitators and thought about the above given question. While discussing the answers they could refer to the questions of the "10 minutes of silence" or to anything else they might find important. They wrote down the answers on big sheets of paper.

**Presentation of results:**

The groups presented their replies to "What would be different if you were part of another religious community to each other.

The replies were:

First group:

If I would have lived in a less religious society, I wouldn't be so sceptical about religion.

The values wouldn't change, only the practices.

We are a product of our environment: a lot of things would change

If I were a Muslim in Germany, I would have problems with discrimination; but I go on the same beliefs to my religion.

If I were part of another religion, I would inform myself about my religion and would practice this religion, because everybody is born into a religion/nationality.

Second group:

social life

education

unconscious ignorance [i.e. the participants felt they didn't know enough about other religions to be able to know what would be different in their lives if they were part of another religious community]

Third group:

lifestyle

habits

traditions

different peer group

position in society (e.g. cast system in India)

relationships

Fourth group:

Ideally, all religions express similar eternal values like love, hope, discipline/hard work, community, faith... :)

However, we agree that there are differences in terms of the ways those values are implemented. Moreover, religion merges with the given spirit of times and traditions of a given society; this further differentiates religions. PEACE.

While presenting their views the participants added a few points:

You are born into a religion.

Pressure makes you reject your religion.

It's easier to share the religion of your environment than to be different.

Changing your religion is a conscious choice. The relationship to other people and the position within society changes.

It's different whether you are a Christian in Turkey or in the EU.

Time and place are important when you chose religion.

The participants felt the need to express their own religious views in the groups but there wasn't even enough time to discuss the question. The topic is too complex and private for such a short time.

**Lecture by Prof. Dehn on "Similarities and Differences between Christianity and Islam" and discussion**

First Prof. Dehn gave a speech on the characteristics that Islam and Christianity share and those that differ. He started by stating that religion consists of identity forming elements and not of conflict creating ones.



The current publications in main stream media give the impression that Christianity and Islam don't share much though the Koran says that Christians are the nearest to Muslims. Islam is different in a major way, i.e. it had the chance to look back on Christianity and Judaism while it was being created. Mohammed offered a common monotheistic ground

for everyone but Christians and Jews were not willing to join him. When Mohammed realised that he started saying that Christians and Jews have differing views. But still Muslims are supposed to refer to Christianity and Judaism if their own religious texts don't give them the answer they are searching.

The old Christian view was that the Koran was written by the devil. That is something the Muslims still expect an apology for. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century the Christians started translating and reading the Koran and began to change their minds.

In some Muslim countries Christians and Jews have a special status including minority rights, in other countries this is not the case.

Then Prof. Dehn compared the basics of Islam and Christianity step by step referring to his notes on his two papers:

<u>Christianity</u> <u>specific profile</u>	<u>and</u> <u>common faith</u>	<u>Islam</u> <u>specific profile</u>
start as new religious movement within Jewish context		start as political-religious community in Yathrib/Medina
Bible as written by Humans inspired by God's Spirit		Koran as 'inverbation' of God
	Monotheism God as Creator	
	figures in Bible and Koran: Noah, Abraham, Ismael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Mose, Jesus	
	High appreciation of Jesus	
as saviour and son of God message of God's reign		as prophet and receiver of the Gospel
cross and resurrection		somebody else was crucified
	God as 'judge' in a court case	
man as essentially sinful, depending on God's grace man is saved by God's grace, not by his/her own merits		man does good and evil and is judged accordingly

PAGE 1

<u>Christianity</u> <u>specific profile</u>	<u>and</u> <u>common faith</u>	<u>Islam</u> <u>specific profile</u>
following Jesus		following the guidance of the Koran, the way of Muhammad
prayer		five daily prayers, fasting, pilgrimage, offerings
	resurrection of the dead reappearance of Jesus	
	mortality of the human soul (= no reincarnation)	
ordained clergy theological hierarchy		no ordained clergy islamic law experts
theological tradition		law tradition of shari'a and fiqh
<b><u>Points of dispute</u></b>		
separation of religion and state		
understanding of human rights		
equal rights of female and male		
freedom of religious practice and conversion		

PAGE 2

In the following discussion, the participants had many questions and comments.

(Written as heard by Fatima Beg.)



### **B.1.5 Intercultural evening (Monday, 6th December, 20:00 – open end)**

The intercultural evening concluded the first part of the conference, intercultural learning. Every national group prepared something, e.g. a dance, a game or quiz, and brought typical food or drinks with them. The evening went very well as every group put a lot of efforts in preparing a small show. Moreover, every national group had prepared a small dictionary at the national preparatory meetings for everyone.



## B.2 Minutes Part II – Political Questions

### B.2.1 Migration (Tuesday, 7th of December 2004, 9:00 – 12:30)

**Organizers:** Eva Fuchs and Fatima Beg, additional workshop moderators: Kristian Brakel and Christine Binzel

9:00 – 9:30: address of welcome, energizer, 2 short movies

9:20 – 12:00: moderated discussions in four workshops (break individually by each group)

12:00 – 12:30: presentation of the role plays of each group in the big assembly

At first, two short movies were presented in the big assembly addressing the problems of migrants (Tony Gatlif / Frankreich / PARIS BY NIGHT and Constantine Giannaris / Griechenland / ROOM FOR ALL, in: Europäische Visionen: 25 Filme von 25 Regisseuren, published by Lars von Trier 2004). The movies were to stimulate the discussions that followed afterwards in four workshops, each being confronted with the same questions:

1. What are reasons for migration? (hereby considering experiences of individuals in the group)
2. What are the consequences of migration in the emigration country (positive / negative)?
3. What are the consequences of migration in the immigration country (positive / negative)?

Eventually, every workshop had to prepare a role play based on the following situations that was presented in the assembly (two workshops had the same outgoing situation):

- a) Situation in emigration country: All inhabitants under 30 years of age left a small village in eastern Anatolia to achieve a better way of living for themselves and for the whole family. What is the situation in the small village like?
- b) Situation in immigration country: A person who just migrated from Turkey to the Netherlands meets a migrant in a Döner-Shop who has been living in Amsterdam for several years. What is the dialogue about?

**As example, the results of one of the workshops:**

***What are the reasons for migration ?***

- economic (labour migration)
- political: racism, being against the government, persecution, insecurity
- choice
- settling
- family reunion
- health
- refugees
- prosecution

**2. *What are the consequences of migration in the emigration country?***

**positive**

awareness of international community

less unemployment (?)

remittances

network – economic trade

lobbying abroad for own country

**negative**

demographical problems (young people move away)

brain drain

tensions in case of political migration

loss of economic / political power

bad image (internationally)

less opponents in case of forced migration (for the ruling country)	cultural losses (artists, musicians, and 'normal' people)
if former emigrants come back (well educated, bring capital, etc.) - but also:	new cultural elements / problems regarding integration

**3. What are the consequences of migration in the immigration country?**

<b>positive</b>	<b>negative</b>
demographic factors (composition), postpones ageing population problem	integration problems / cultural clash
cheap labour force (for enterprises)	potentially causes racism
brain gain	costs
cultural diversity / multiculturalism	demographic factors
	wage dumping
	redistribution of political power (perhaps loss of power of natives) - long term
	unemployment raises (?)

**B.2.2 Economics (Tuesday, 7th of December 2004, 13:30 – 17:00)**

**Organizers:** Fatima Beg and Christine Binzel

13.30 – 15:30: lecture by Ms. Ilknur Yenidede and discussion

15.30 – 16:00: break

16:00 – 17:00: lecture by Christine

The session was divided into two parts: in the **first part, Ms. Ilknur Yenidede<sup>2</sup>** gave a lecture on "The economic consequences of an EU membership of Turkey – with regard to Turkey as well as with regard to the EU".

In the first part of her lecture she presented the milestones of Turkish-EU relations starting in the year 1959 when Turkey made its first application to join the European Union, followed by

- the Ankara Agreement in 1963,
- the Additional Protocol of the Ankara Agreement on November 23, 1970,
- Turkey's application for full membership on April 14, 1987,
- the Customs Union between Turkey and the EU beginning in 1996,
- the Commissions exclusions of Turkey from the enlargement process in the "Agenda 2000" in 1997 and the Luxembourg Summit in Dec 1997,
- the recognition of Turkey as candidate state at the Helsinki Summit in Dec 1999,
- the so-called Accession Partnership of Turkey accepted by the European Council of Ministers in March 2001 followed by the Progress Report published in November 13, 2001,
- the Laeken Summit in Dec 2001 and the Seville Summit on June 22-23, 2002,
- the latest Progress Report for Turkey published on October 9, 2002, and eventually
- the Copenhagen Summit in 2002 when the EC submitted Dec 2004 as a conditional date for Turkey to begin accession negotiations.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ilknur Yenidede has studied Economics, Political Science and International Relations at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul. She then did her master at the European Institute in France on "European and International Studies". Currently she is preparing for her doctoral work on Turkish-EU relations with an energy geopolitics perspective. At the same time, she is working for BATI (Berlin European Turks Initiative) as assistant in lobbying activities for Turkey's accession to the EU.

In the second part, the Customs Union between Turkey and the EU was explained more in depth emphasizing that Turkey is the only non-EU member with such an advanced form of integration and its impact on Turkey and the EU. Finally, figures on Turkey's economy were shown. – Time was left for answering the participants' questions.

(Written as heard by Christine Binzel.)

**The aim of the second part of the session** was to give an insight to non-economists into economic analysis, i.e. into the economic approach that stands behind such figures as presented by the lecture of Ms. Yenidede. For this a model describing the effects of migration on social welfare and income distribution was chosen because of its relative simplicity and because it was thematically connected to the morning session. This standard model of migration theory was presented by Christine Binzel. The model as well as the presentation of empirical findings on migration were based on the seminar paper no. 718 "Turkey and the EU: Politics and Economics of Accession" by Harry Flam (Feb 2003) which can be downloaded at <http://ideas.repec.org/p/hhs/iiesp/0718.html>. – Time was left for answering the participants' questions.

Both power point presentations have been made available to the participants.

### **B.2.3 Travel Day Berlin Kreuzberg (Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> December)**

see *B Auswirkungen auf lokaler Ebene*.



### **B.2.4 Workshop on Cyprus (Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> December 2004, 10:00-17:30; Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> December 20:00 – 01:30)**

**Organizer:** Kristian Brakel

Thursday:

10.00: Lecture by Niels Kadritzke<sup>3</sup> on the Cyprus conflict and questions

11.20: break

11.40: continuation

12.30: lunch break

13.30: Conflict Resolution Workshop "Vision, obstacles, solutions"

15.00: break

15.20-17.30: continuation

17.30-19.30: internet and dinner break

19.30-22.00: continuation

---

<sup>3</sup> Niels Kadritzke studied history and is concerned with the Cyprus-issue since 30 years. Today he works as an editor and journalist for the German edition of "Le monde diplomatique", a leading newspaper for foreign affairs. Since years he is leading a project for the German "Friedrich Ebert Foundation" that brings together journalists from northern and southern Cyprus.

Friday/Saturday:

20.00-1.30: continuation of "Vision, obstacles, solutions" (with a few very short breaks in between)

The "Cyprus" workshop took place with about half of the participants. The other participants were in the "minorities" workshop. The working method chosen was as such very good. It turned out, however, to be inappropriate regarding the given time frame. Since the participants didn't want to stop the process in between on Thursday evening, further sessions took place that limited other workshops (in particular project management and the magazine group.)

#### **Lecture by Niels Kadritzke on the Cyprus conflict and questions**

Mr. Kadritzke is a journalist and writes for the German issue of Le Monde diplomatique, a major international newspaper for international affairs.

He gave a short introduction into Cyprus's history of the last decades. Then he explained the current political situation, also briefing the participants on the outlines of the Annan Plan. The "Cyprus question" was also looked at in the light of Turkey's accession to the EU. There were many questions especially by the participants from the Northern European countries who had not dealt with the Cyprus problem in depth before.

#### **Vision, obstacles, solutions**

The participants started a process in which they had to define their common vision for Cyprus in 2015. Every participant wrote down the three major characteristics of his/her vision. Afterwards, they were collected and clustered. Then the participants discussed the points they didn't agree on. Sometimes the participants were able to agree on those points after the other participants explained their underlying reasons for writing this point and after the discussion-process allowed all participants to understand those reasons or to rephrase the point in a term that suited everybody.

After the vision was agreed upon the participants continued in the same way with the obstacles that were in the way to reach their common vision. After having completed that they proceeded to the solutions.

The method aimed not so much at finding an agreement but emphasised the discussion process. In this process the participants discussed the underlying reasons for their specific opinions face to face and therefore were forced to rethink their position in the light of what the others said.

The discussion was very long and hot. The main differences were among the Greek Cypriots themselves because they had very differing views on the situation in their country and therefore also on the solution of the problems. Another sometimes very critical perspective came from some of the Turkish participants who did not want to have Turkey pictured as the main bad guy.

The workshop was altogether very successful as the evaluation showed afterwards.

One of the southern Cypriots stated:

"I suddenly realized that my position which I believed to be quite liberal was conservative and not necessarily shared by the other people from southern Cyprus."

#### ***The outcome:***

##### **Vision 2015:**

- no land consuming tourism
- all states in EU
- civil marriage
- unified Cyprus
- steps towards a Cypriot identity

- no interference in political affairs (from motherlands)

**Obstacles:**

- Selective use of history
- little or no interaction between the two communities
- nationalism
- bad governance
- lack of common goal
- economic interests investing in separation
- emotions
- influence from Turkey and Greece
- different languages
- propaganda education
- weakness of civil society
- Cyprus vetoing against Turkey’s accession to the EU
- settlers
- influence of the church
- manipulative live media
- implementation of the solution



**Solutions:**

- deep reforms of the education system:
  - the other community’s language should be taught in school obligatory
  - change curricula
  - educate teachers to promote peace-oriented values
  - surveillance of teachers by community officials
  - education in school that promotes tolerance, peace etc.
- official apology to other side (by governments of Greece, Turkey and both parts of Cyprus)
- apologies from civil societies of the same countries
- passport and visa changes
- regulation by government to present both sides
- giving equal time to all parties to present themselves on TV (better implementation!)
- issuing the problem of “irresponsible” media, self-reflecting media
- more bi communal programmes
- independent media watch (from both sides and outside representatives) monitoring the media by publishing reports
- to inform the people in Cyprus about the advantages of Turkey’s accession to the EU
- reopening of the negotiations with participation of Turkey, Greece and the EU
- give incentives for economic interaction between the South and the North
- free trade between the North and the South
- create a suitable legislation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector
- establish and support existing NGOs
- diplomatic pressure for “YES” from the Council (especially from Greece)
- more organisations or special departments of government to support the relation of both sides
- de facto recognition of Cyprus by Turkey

- task for NGOs: to encourage new (young) talented people to go into politics, become candidates, support them
- Spring Festival: cultural event for the whole island

the last solutions were agreed upon after several participants had left because it was late in the night:

- government must empty some houses and build new ones
- government regulates media ownership
- restarting the negotiations with the participation of Greece, Turkey and the EU
- a referendum for the basis of the state
- a fair public campaign to inform about any future solution plan
- settlers situation should be given priority in the solution with the participation of all concerned parties

### **B.2.5 Workshop on minorities in both Turkey and EU member countries (Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> December, 10:00-17:30)**

**Organizers:** Eva Fuchs and Tanja Strube

**Participants:** 17 (no Cypriot participants)

10.00 – 12.30: lecture by Johannes von Ahlefeld<sup>4</sup> on "The human rights' situation in Turkey with special regard to the situation of minorities" and discussion

12.30: lunch

13.30: "How is the situation of the largest minority group in your country?"

14.30: presentation of results and discussion

15.15: break

15.30 – 17.30: continuation of the discussion

#### **Lecture by Johannes von Ahlefeld on "The human rights' situation in Turkey with special regard to the situation of minorities" and discussion**

Mr. Ahlefeld spoke in his lecture about the following points; the discussion was between and after the lecture:

- he started by stating that speaking about minority rights in Turkey is always speaking about the human rights situation in general.
- according to Amnesty International the key problems of keeping human rights in Turkey are the period of police detention (in the past it was 14 days without trial, today it is less and depends on the crime) and the torture.
- today physical torture is used less than a few years ago but „white torture“ (psychological torture) still remains a big problem.
- there are no figures on torture cases because of many reasons. One is that the doctors are not free enough to declare torture cases as torture. There is a big need of independent staff in this field. Even people who have a constitutional right in this field don't have it in reality.
- the death penalty law has changed last year, now it is completely forbidden.
- the State Security Courts and the military have a very strong ascendancy in politics.
- from the legal point of view Turkey is ensuring minimal standards in the fields of human rights, which is one of the Copenhagen criteria but this legal framework has not been implemented yet (for example 15 years imprisonment for human rights activists).

---

<sup>4</sup> Johannes Ahlefeldt works for the coordination group on Turkey of the German section of Amnesty International. Moreover, he works for a Member of Parliament of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

- teaching Kurdish language is legal, but there can be "administrative barriers" in realising these courses.
- very important are personal rights but also important are collective human rights for groups
- urban problems in eastern Turkey. For example 3000 people resettled under Tansu Ciller because of PKK and local gendarmerie which was not really under control by the central government.
- building churches is very difficult because there is a problem of property. Churches are not accepted as legal bodies, so they are not able to buy land as the institution "church".
- Alevis (Muslims with different habits, their messenger is Ali, more liberal than orthodox) are a strong minority in Turkey. In the past few years Kurds and Alevis have gained a stronger voice in Turkish policy. Nevertheless the mosques of Alevis are still not recognized as official mosques.
- there are approx. 70 000 Armenians living in Turkey and Turkey was the first state recognizing the Armenian state. However the "Armenian question" (Was the killing of 500.000-2.000.000 Armenians a genocide?) still hasn't been solved.
- Turkish scholars have apologised for the genocide, but no politician did until today. Why? Because this could mean to pay reparations to victims. Today there is more dialogue between Armenian representatives and Turkish state. Mr Ahlefeld stated that if Turkey joins the EU it has to accept the dark side of its history.
- in the field of violence against women honour killings are the main problem. They commonly occur in eastern Turkey. There is a new law in the penal code which says that rape among married couples is forbidden and honour killings are punished more severely.

(Written as heard by Tanja Strube.)

**"How is the situation of the largest minority group in your country?"**

The participants were divided into national groups to prepare a short presentation of the following questions:

- 1) How is the situation of the largest minority group in your country?
- 2) What is the problem?
- 3) Are they integrated?
- 4) How can the situation be changed?

They wrote down their results on big sheets of paper and presented them to the group:

***Poland***

All together: 1%

1) Biggest Minority:

Germans, officially recognized, reserved seats, well-integrated  
Ukrainian, Belarusian, Kasubian, Silesians, Roma

2) Problems:

- Tensions about reparations and the permission for buying land (esp. Mazury case)
- illegal migration from Ukraine -> negative perception
- Kasubians and Silesians claim recognition as a minority-> Strasbourg decision
- totally disintegrated-> Roma (mixed with Romanian)
- lack of syllabus for minority schools

3) Integration:

Bilingual schools of the eastern border

4) Possible improvements:

- representation for Belarusians and Ukrainians
- bilingual signs and possibility to use minority language at office

### **Greece**

- Muslims in Thrace-> officially recognised by the Greek government
- more than 50% in Komotini and in other places
- live in harmony with Greek habitants
- representatives in the Greek parliament
- Greek universities available for Muslims ( 1% of the enrolments only for Muslims without requirements)
- Muslims have the right to buy land but not close to the borders
- high equality of life compared to other minorities in Greece
- no mixed weddings (their choice)
- sometimes reactions in the Greek government's regulations
- most of the times problems that occur are immediately solved in order not to create disorder
- mutual respect between Christians and Muslims
- ➔ the situation doesn't have to be changed since both sides have accepted their role and their status

### **Netherlands**

- 1) Suriname (+/- 500000) -> former colony  
Turks (+/- 350000) -> workers and their children
- 2) What is integration?
  - "Not integrated"
  - Xenophobia
  - Generalisation-> Crime
  - Language
  - Marriage from homeland
  - Islam
- 3) Research: Not integrated: own communication, Television/ Newspapers, focus on Turkey  
Integrated: 2<sup>nd</sup> generation speaks Dutch, no big problems-> Morocco
- 4) Accept differences: See "them" like Dutch, education courses, EU-member Turkey

### **Germany**

- Turks: 3 Million
  - some have been living in Germany for years and don't have a German citizenship-> no political rights
  - diversity concerning identity and integration (which is not very much represented in the media)
  - they are not necessarily between German and Turkish culture: a German-Turkish culture exists
  - struggle with a rather limited concept of being German (for comparison USA), they don't feel accepted as Germans
  - missing discussions about Germany as a multicultural society and immigrant country
  - lack of language courses, no integration methods in education and schools
  - after September 11<sup>th</sup> Turks are more seen as "Moslem danger"
  - they are concentrated in certain districts of towns
- 4) How to change:
    - acceptance of Germany as a multicultural society (in politics media and society)
    - German language courses
    - education in multicultural and integrational aspects (not only for the Turks, also for the Germans)
    - give a voice to the Turkish community

- give political and local rights
- encourage a migrant network

### **Turkey**

- 1) Its Kurdish people usually live in the eastern part of Turkey. But most of them moved to the big cities to have better conditions.  
Situation: differences in health, education, accommodation, economic opportunities
- 2) Although Turkish and Kurdish have been living together. They have also had some integration problems but now it gets better because of the change in the attitudes of both people, example: identity and citizenship
- 3+4) Constitutional Citizenship:
  - to materialize the concept of constitutional citizenship which refers to the idea that the state treats all its citizens equally regardless of their religion or ethnicity.
  - Turkey should conduct urbanisation projects and create industry centres to decrease unemployment, to prevent massive population shifts to the big cities in western Turkey and stimulate the return of displaced people

The presentations were followed by long discussions especially about the situation of Kurdish people in Turkey. Furthermore the participants discussed the following questions:

"What differences among EU member states are ok in your opinion?"

"What should be the situation like in Turkey so the accession talks could start?"

"What should be the situation like in Turkey so they could be a member state of the EU?"

## **B.2.6 State and religion (Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> December, 9:00-12:30)**

Organizers: Christine Binzel, Kristian Brakel, Tanja Strube

9:00: Short lectures by a participant of every country on the relation between the state and religion in their country

10:00: Minority / Majority Game  
(break in between)

12:00: Short discussion and summing up in the plenary

### **1. Short lectures by a participant of every country on the relation between the state and religion in their country**

The participants presented both how the relation is formally regulated in the law of their country and how it is perceived by the society and practiced. It gave a very interesting insight into the different regulations of the different participating countries showing that there are very different approaches even in the EU.

### **2. Minority / Majority Game**

The participants were divided into 8 groups and received the following task:

*Discuss the following questions in your group and decide if these matters should be decided by the majority.*

*Every group should agree on a common answer!*

*You have 45 min. of time after that we will present the results in the plenum.*

#### **Shall the majority decide...**

*1...what kind of clothes teachers are allowed to wear in school?*

*2...what language is spoken in school and university?*

- 3...if prayers are performed in schools?
- 4... if abortion is illegal?
- 5... if a mosque/church is build in my neighbourhood?
- 6... what religion is to be set in the constitution of my state?
- 7... what media is allowed to broadcast?
- 8... if religious educated people are allowed to enter state-service?
- 9... if divorce is illegal?
- 10...if I pay taxes for my religious community?
- 11... if homosexuality is illegal?
- 12... if God may be insulted?

The crucial part in this game are the discussions until the group reaches a common point of view on a certain point, not the result.

### 3. Short discussion and summing up in the plenary

Main points of controversies and difficulties of every group were stated and discussed; a long argument started around the point of abortion and homosexuality.

All questions from above were discussed in the light of whether there should be a connection between politics and a certain religious belief and if yes, how strong. Almost all participants agreed that a formal / legal connection between both should not exist in their countries though the participants had difficulties in finding a justification for that. Some argued that Human Rights should be the basis of all laws instead of principles stemming from a certain religion. However, no agreement was reached on how to justify that Human Rights should be prior to any religious belief.

## B.2.7 Inside the European Commission (Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> December, 14:00-17:30)

**Organizer:** Kistian Brakel

- 14:00: Lecture by Owen Parker<sup>5</sup> on "The stance of the EC towards Turkey's accession to the EU"
- 15:00: Questions and Discussion
- 16:00: Break
- 16:30: continuation

### 1. Lecture by Owen Parker on "The stance of the EC towards Turkey's accession to the EU"



Among others, Owen Parker gave an overview of the development of the relation between Turkey and the EU from 1959 on. Some of the key events he mentioned have been:

- 1959: Turkey applied for becoming an association state.
- The Association Agreement signed in 1963 aimed at securing Turkey's full membership through establishing a Customs Union.
- Following the Military Coup in 1980, the Community froze commercial relations. Relations gradually normalised after the restoration of civilian government in 1983.
- In 1987, Turkey applied for membership.
- The commission's opinion in 1989: "*It would not be useful to open accession negotiations with Turkey straight way*".

---

<sup>5</sup> Owen Parker is the detached regional expert for the Turkey unit at the DG Enlargement of the European Commission. He assisted the unit in the drafting on the EC's report on Turkey especially in the field of the human rights' situation.

- The 1997 Luxembourg European Council confirmed Turkey's eligibility for accession to the European Union. A strategy was drawn up to prepare Turkey for accession.
- The 1999 Helsinki summit: "... *Turkey is a candidate State destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States...*"
- And the 2002 Copenhagen European Council: "*The Union encourages Turkey to pursue energetically its reform process. If the European Council in December 2004, on the basis of a report and a recommendation from the Commission, decides that Turkey fulfils the Copenhagen political criteria, the European Union will open accession negotiations with Turkey without delay.*"

He then further explained the Copenhagen political criteria established in 1993 that are:

- stable democracy
- respect for human rights
- the rule of law
- the protection of minorities

Moreover, he put emphasis on the Accession Partnership which sets out the priorities and objectives for membership including the political criteria. More specific than the abstract Copenhagen criteria it refers to specific issues relevant to Turkey and highlights measures to be taken. The current Accession Partnership dates from 2003. The recommendation of the Report on Turkey's progress and current state: "*In view of the overall progress of reforms, and provided that Turkey brings into force the outstanding legislation, ...the Commission considers that Turkey sufficiently fulfils the political criteria and recommends that accession negotiations be opened.*"

(Written as heard by Eva Fuchs.)

## **2. Questions and Discussion**

After the lecture there was a rather long discussion about the relationship between Turkey and the EU and Turkey's chances of becoming an EU member. This discussion functioned also as a review of the conference week so far.

## **B.3 Minutes Part III – Activating Youth**

**Organizers:** Christine Binzel, Fatima Beg, Kristian Brakel and Michael Traub

The first session in the activating youth part on Sunday late afternoon was for all participants, i.e. the groups "project management" and "magazine" (see E.3.1). From then the two groups met separately (see E.3.2 and E.3.3). Furthermore, an information table with brochures and books on the conference topic and project management was accessible for everyone in the assembly room.

Sunday, 5<sup>th</sup>:

16.00-17.00: Participation

19.30-22.00: Magazine and Projects

Monday, 6<sup>th</sup>:

19.30-21.30: Magazine and Projects

Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup>:

19.30-20.30: Magazine and Projects

Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup>:

19.30-22.00: Magazine and Projects

Friday, 10<sup>th</sup>:

19.30-22.00: Magazine and Projects (for those who were not in the Cyprus workshop)

Saturday, 11<sup>th</sup>:

9.00-12.30: Magazine and Projects

13.30-16.30: Magazine and Projects

Separate meetings to work on the magazine or on one of the projects took place in between the other sessions.

### **B.3.1 Participation**

The participants collected ways of possible participation in changing society. This was done in a brainstorming session where everything was collected on a big chart.

#### **1 Different kinds of participation**

What is the subject "participation" good for?

Participation is a basic right in all societies which call themselves democratic. Even children are more and more involved into decision-making processes in societies.

#### ***Some questions to get started:***

Are you a member of a club? - Who is representing your interest there and which interest?

Where have you already expressed your political interest or opinion?

Have you worked in a project before? What was it for? Have you taken part in a project concerning your neighbourhood?

Have you ever communicated your opinion about a political, cultural or social topic to someone?

Think about spaces like school, university, private live, free time, and hobbies.

#### **2 Checklist of some possibilities of participation:**

Participation can be:

##### **2.1 Inside the governmental system:**

- be a member of a party

- be a member of the government
- elect members of the government
- write a petition
- visit public meetings and discussions of the (local) government
- organise a petition for a referendum

### **2.2 Outside the governmental system - civil society**

- inform people about political topics or about the programs of parties
- take part in or organise a demonstration, sit-in
- take part in or organise youth exchanges, international seminars, intercultural activities, discussions, public debates..
- find out in how far your rights of being involved are fixed in the law of your community, country, town... (sometimes there are different rules on different levels)

#### ***university:***

- visit the different political groups
- take part in student projects
- take part in the institutions and levels of decision making
- organise (public panel) discussions

#### ***general:***

- write letters to the editor to newspapers – they are the part of newspapers that is most often read by the readers
- collect signatures

#### ***leisure time:***

- be member of a club – sports, human rights, nature
- engage in committees of the club – fundraising, representing interests,
- make a funny motto party to inform people in an easy way, getting them interested in it, making it public
- do a project – e.g. an exchange (pupils, students), information (project week, information boards)
- do seminars i.e. politicians and pupils/students together

## **B.3.2 Project Management**

**Organisers:** Fatima Beg, Kristian Brakel, and Christine Binzel (preparation of the handout and the templates)

**Sunday, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2004, 19.30-22.00**

### ***Project Management and Brainstorming***

The project group was divided into four smaller groups. Each group got a pen, tape, two sheets of paper, a plastic bag and a raw egg. They were given the task to “make the egg fly” with the given material only, i.e. the egg wasn’t to break when thrown down from the balcony of the second floor. The groups had half an hour to prepare. Then the eggs were thrown from the balcony. Marks were given for the three categories: the condition of the egg, the looks of the contraption and the presentation by the group when throwing down the egg.



Everyone enjoyed the egg game because it was very active and some of the presentations were funny. None of the eggs broke but all concepts of protecting the egg were completely different.

In the following barometer game the participants had to evaluate their work during the egg game. When answering questions they had to stand on a line ranging from “low” to “high” in the room. Some of the questions were:

- Were the tasks in your group highly divided (or did everyone do everything)?
- Was there a hierarchy among the members of the group?
- Did you first plan what to do (or did you just start)?

Several participants were asked to give a short view on how the work went in their group.

After that Kristian gave a short introduction into project management that contained the information given in chapter 1 of the project management handout based on the T-Kit 3 Project Management, downloadable at Training Youth.Net (Partnership of the European Council & European Commission) <http://www.training-youth.net/site/publications/tkits/tkits.htm>.

In the end, the participants had to come up with possible project ideas that they would like to implement. They would ideally be connected to the topic “Turkey&EU” but could be about anything else too. The participants’ first ideas ranged from small local projects like lectures at their university to international conferences. The project ideas were written down and put up on the wall in the staircase so that participants could look at them and think about them during the following day with the result of getting to know the others’ projects and deciding whom to do which project with.

#### **Monday, 6th December 2004, 19.30-20.30**

##### ***Structuring ideas***

The participants were given paper and pen and time to write down the project that they would like to do. Every project proposal included the name of the organiser(s), the name of the project, the project category (e.g. students’ exchange) and a short description of the project. All project ideas were pinned to a board with envelopes below them for the participants to exchange messages. This was done to give them the possibility during the following days to read the others’ project descriptions and to find the people they wanted to work with. This system of communication didn’t work very well because the participants didn’t exchange much information concerning the projects.

#### **Tuesday, 7th December 2004, 19.30-20.00**

##### ***Overview session***

During this short session the participants were given an overview of how the project group would proceed during the remaining days and what the expected outcome was. They received a handout on project management that could serve them as a guide during the development of their projects.

#### **Thursday, 9th December 2004, 19.30-22.00**

##### ***Starting of projects***

During this evening the participants were to actually start off with their projects. They were to choose the project that they wanted to start planning during the remaining two days and that they would implement once they got home. The participants formed several project groups. Some material (a checklist for the different steps that had to be taken for the project, a task schedule with the dates for the steps, a possible budget with several things one had to take into account when calculating the costs and a project description template) was distributed and explained to facilitate the process of planning.

**Friday, 10th December 2004, 19.30-22.00 and Saturday, 11th December 2004, 9.00-12.30 and 13.30-16.30**

***Developing the projects***

The project groups worked independently discussing their projects. Some started filling out their project description templates and calculating their budgets. They decided on how to proceed with their work after the conference. The facilitators went around and gave the participants ideas on how to proceed if advice was necessary. A budget making introduction was given by Christine Binzel to those who were interested.

In the end of Saturday the projects were on very different levels. One project group was very concrete (see project no. 10 below): it knew what the thematic content would be, when and where the project would take place, where the money would come from and how much was needed and in which organisational framework it would take place. They had filled out the project description template, the budget template and had thought about when which step had to be taken. They had also divided the tasks among themselves. Another group (see project no. 8 below) had only decided about the general topic of the project but there was no concrete step taken because it felt that it didn't have enough information to proceed. All other groups were well distributed on the range between these two. Most participants really want to implement the projects. Some won't do it because they lack the time or team or because there are other projects they would prefer to do.

The project ideas are the following:

No.	Organisers	Place	Short description
1	Two Cypriots	Cyprus	Different projects to make the educational system in Cyprus more peace oriented
2	One Cypriot	Cyprus	Regular workshops on "Cyprus & Turkey in the EU"
3	One German	Germany	Dialogue between German Muslim and non-Muslim women
4	Two German and four Polish	Poland	Youth exchange: young Germans coming to Poland in the summer vacations and doing a project or seminar together
5	One German	possibly Germany	Conference on the causes of Sept. 11 <sup>th</sup> with young people from different countries (including the US and the Middle East)
6	One German	Germany	Preparing a booklet on "What does it mean to be a Muslim?", with a focus on Turkish people in Germany
7	Three Greeks	Greece	Lectures with information for students on European law
8	One Greek	Greece	"Perceptions of history" in Greece and the neighbouring countries with students from all countries concerned
9	Four Dutch	The Netherlands	Young Dutch Muslims informing Dutch youth about Islam in bars and community centres
10	Four Turks	Turkey	Conference for students on "Turkey&EU" in Istanbul
11	One Turk	International	Finding writers for his magazine on Philosophy
12	One Turk	International	Informing European students about Turkey

### **B.3.3 Magazine Group**

**Organizers:** Michael Traub (in particular for design/ layout of the magazine), Christine Binzel, from 10-12th December: Christian Meier<sup>6</sup>

**Participants:** per national group in general 2 people

(Alexandra (gr), Anna (dl), Aydjeren (nl), Egemen (tr), Erdinc (nl), Erhan (tr), Jagoda (pl), Loizos (cyp), Nicos (cyp), Orestis (gr), Orcun (tr), Sezis (cyp), Wojciech (pl), Xenia (cyp))

#### **Sunday, 5<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 19:30 – 21:30**

The introduction was given by Michael about the theory and use of media and in particular the use of publications / magazines. Next, the structure and aim of the workshop was explained. Moreover, the general frame of the magazine was presented.

After the introduction, the group discussed possible topics for articles as well as the respective format – whether it shall be an interview, short or long article, etc.

Each participant chose one (sometimes more) of the most interesting ideas, which she/he liked to write about. It was agreed that everyone would start by doing research during the next days and also try to begin writing the article.

#### **Monday, 6<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 19:30 – 21:30, and**

#### **Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 19:30 – 20:30**

The time was mainly used to do research for the articles and start writing as well as to start working on the structure of the magazine.

#### **Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 20:00 – 22:00**

The group found a consensus on the general structure of the magazine as well as on the main articles. For this, every page of the magazine was displayed by small cards that were put on a board (two pages together), to get a better impression of the magazine as a whole. Also, the group came to the agreement to use the conference title (“Avrupa’ja?”) as main title for the magazine. Additionally, a short subtitle – “Turkey and the EU” – should explain the content of the magazine, in particular since the meaning of “Avrupa’ja?” might not be understandable to our target group. The cover shall be similar to the flyer of the conference.

Moreover, problems that appeared so far during the research or writing were discussed.

For those interested in the layout of the magazine, Michael gave a short introduction into design.

#### **Friday, 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 20:00 – 22:15**

#### **Saturday, 11<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, 9:00 – 12:30 and 13:30 – 16:30**

continuation.

Considering the time shortage, the additional lectures about design were not given so the group could concentrate working on the content.

At the end of the workshop the occurring problems within the workflow and teamwork were discussed. Lack of time as well as technical problems with the Macintosh and open source software were

---

<sup>6</sup> Christian Meier studies Middle Eastern Studies/ Islamic Studies and history at the University of Hamburg. He is co-founder and editor of “Zenith”, a renowned German magazine on the Middle East and the contemporary Islamic world.

mentioned most. In addition to this, the research sources limited to internet were considered as another obstacle.

Since not all of the articles could be completed during the conference, it was asked how to continue from now on in order to get all articles ready in the next weeks. (Other tasks for job and university that have to be done at the end of the year might be the biggest problem because they would consume a lot of time.) The decision was to complete the started articles, and then try to produce the magazine without the articles which were not started yet.



## C Participants

Ayca Kurnaz  
Demetris Tsaousis  
Levent Kizilduman  
Loizos Solomou  
Nicos Demetriou  
Sezis Okut

### Cyprus

### Germany

Anna Schumacher  
Harun Kulac  
Marie Becher  
Oliver Friedrich  
Sandra Engelhardt  
Wenke Niehues

Alexandra Stathopoulou  
Helena Margellou  
Konstantina Lampropoulou  
Orestis Schinas-Papadopoulos  
Panagiotis Kapsalis  
Spiridoula Sveroni

### Greece

### The Netherlands

Aydjeren Rahimi  
Barbara Benda  
Erdoğan Saçan  
Jantine Konings  
Orla King  
Pelin Aksoy

Aleksandra Siuta  
Agnieszka Bugaj  
Błażej Murlowski  
Barbara Regulska  
Jagoda Gregulska  
Wojciech Makowski

### Poland

### Turkey

Nur Seda Köktürk  
Egemen Tavsanci  
Erhan Eren  
Merve Oral  
Nursu Sucuoglu  
Seher Simsek  
Serdar Alper  
Tanyeli Behiç Sabuncu  
Ümit Dimen

## D Coordinating and Partner organisations

### ***Coordinating Organisations:***



**dialogue lab e.V.**

**www.dialogue-lab.org**

**Contact persons:** Fatima Beg (fatima@dialogue-lab.org),  
Christine Binzel (christine@dialogue-lab.org)

**emyb (european-mediterranean youth bridge)**

**www.emyb.org**

**Contact person:** Kristian Brakel (emyb@gmx.net)



### ***Partner organisations:***

**AECEE-Amsterdam (the Netherlands) \* [www.aegee-amsterdam.nl](http://www.aegee-amsterdam.nl)**



**Cultural Group of Women Karpenissi (Greece)**

Women's group  
of Karpenisi

**Mikuszewo (Poland) \* [www.mikuszewo.org](http://www.mikuszewo.org)**



**Turkish Youth Union Association (Turkey) \* [www.tgbd.org](http://www.tgbd.org)**



**Youth Promoting Peace (Cyprus) \* [www.y2p.org](http://www.y2p.org)**

