Securitization of Turkish Nationalist Non-Governmental Organizations in Germany

Ferzan Çakır

Submit your article to this journal

Securitization of Turkish Nationalist Non-Governmental Organizations in Germany

Ferzan Çakır 🆔

Department of Police and Security Management, Berlin School of Economics and Law, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Since 2013, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) that have adopted Turkish nationalism in Germany have been included in the reports for the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution. According to the reports, they are considered to be elements that threaten German democratic culture and minorities in Germany. The issue was brought to the German Bundestag and it was brought to the agenda that these NGOs could be a security threat and have radical right wing features. In this regard, the main purpose of this study is to examine how and why the NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism in Germany, which have been working through umbrella NGOs as legal entities since 1978, are perceived as a security threat. The background of the path to this process is examined from a social constructivist perspective with the theory of securitization.

Introduction

Securitization happens when an issue is transformed into a threat through social construction processes by security forces, politicians, or bureaucrats (Buzan, Wæverve De Wilde, 1998, pp. 36-40). Problems may exist prior to securitization, however, perceiving problems as threats constitutes securitization. It is a tool that legitimizes immediate action against a constructed security threat. Securitization mechanism sometimes emphasizes taking urgent measures around the securitized phenomenon by disabling political tools. According to the Copenhagen Institute, the securitization process is the discursive creation of the problem in terms of security (Balzacq, 2005, pp. 171-173). In order for the discourse to be successful, not only the actor with the securitization authority is sufficient, but also the discourse must contain a security language. The target audience is then expected to accept and adopt the discourse created with these security elements (Buzan, Wæverve De Wilde, 1998, pp. 32-33).

With the end of the Cold War, the iron curtain was lifted, and the world began to

witness cultural conflicts rather than ideological ones, as Huntington stated in his article, *The Clash of Civilizations* (1997). Thus, the definition of security has changed its structure. It not only includes ideological and military concepts but also began covering global issues such as climate change, migration and terrorism. Through securitization, many items that did not pose a security problem in terms of discursiveness started to be referred to as danger and threat elements and have been defined with a new security terminology. After the 9/11 attacks, the world began to witness a new understanding of security. The use of the notion of security, securitization of political concerns, and the construction of terms that were not perceived as a threat before, such as "migration," as a security threat, are the signals of this change.

The primary purpose of this study is to examine Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that adopt Turkish Nationalism in Germany in the axis of securitization and discursiveness of security. Discussions on the prohibition and restriction of the movement are still ongoing, with the proposal on the limitation of the Ülkücü Movement in Germany that was accepted in the German Bundestag in November 2020. There are 18,000 people affiliated with the Ülkücü Movement in Germany today (Bozay, 2017). The possibility of limiting such a large diaspora formation will undoubtedly bring many problems and question marks. Therefore, in this study, the limitation of NGOs that adopt Turkish Nationalism will be examined within the scope of securitization theory. In this regard, the securitization of security and migration is examined in detail in the first part. The history of NGOs that adopt Turkish Nationalism in Germany is examined next. The last part includes an interview with a person who held a senior position in the NGOs mentioned in the findings and press releases.

Securitization

As of the 1980s, research on security practices gained a new breath at the Copenhagen Institute for Peace Studies. Along with conceptual and theoretical discussions about security practices, security research began to be carried out. Contrary to what traditional security definitions express, the expression of speech act, which includes linguistic concepts (discourse), began to be defined. Accordingly, speech act as words and actions in the political field became a research element. According to Huysmans (2011), language, discourse and speech methods should be studied carefully to understand activities in the field of security. Security actions were turned into security elements through these three elements. The use of these three elements briefly brought up securitization with the speech act method (p. 372). Thus, with the discussion initiated by the Copenhagen Institute, the security elements activated through the "speech act" began to be discussed. The performative structure of language caused a discussion and made the issues that were not an element of security, and its effect on the audience through language an issue.

Waever expressed the withdrawal of an issue to the security area as follows; politicians, bureaucrats or security experts bring together a certain issue by using the word security through language. Thus, the subject, which was previously incompatible with security, was taken to the security field with the speech act (1995, p. 55). Emphasis is placed on the necessity of taking urgent measures by emphasizing the need for security intervention and withdrawing to the field of security. This involves the use of force. In a sense, this means moving away from the political ground of the security element and by bringing the use of force to the agenda with urgent measures, it prevents the public from reaching a consensus. According to the Copenhagen Institute, securitization is used by bureaucrats, politicians and security experts for political purposes, but at the same time, it falls on the opposite ground with politics in terms of discussion and the democratic side of politics, as it emphasizes urgent measures. According to Williams (2003, p. 515), withdrawing an issue to the field of security through securitization is a political decision. The security threat is not a natural process, on the contrary, it is a political decision drawn to this area due to special needs. Therefore, it bypasses the basic processes of politics such as negotiation and debate, bringing with it urgent measures, and urgent measures prevent the public from discussion and reaching agreement. According to Balzacq (2005), securitization has historically been made a justification with the occurrence of certain events. Therefore, securitization is not a natural process, but emerges with the past processes of historical events that may cause securitization. According to Williams (2003), securitization cannot be explained by a speech act alone. Besides language, visuals and actuality also contribute to securitization. Accordingly, the factors visualized through the media also contribute to securitization.

With the end of the Cold War, security in the international arena began to take on a new meaning. With the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the bipolar system officially ended. The world was no longer between liberal and socialist systems. The socialist bloc was no longer a threat, and the notion of security changed in parallel. Accordingly, security, as it was in the Cold War period, has not been defined as a set of military and ideological threats and entered into a new conceptualization (Buzan, 1997, p. 6-9).

This brings with it new elements of the globalizing world. Security is no longer limited to the military sector. Accordingly, economic, social, military, ideological and environmental sectors have become factors forming the building blocks of security (Buzan, Waever & De Wilde, 1998, p. 27-30). Securitization theory argues that national security policy is not spontaneous but is instead created by security actors, politicians, and security professionals. The decision-making actor labels an issue outside the political arena as a "threat" or a "national security threat" through social construction and discursive practices. Thus, it places the issue in the political field and then in the security field (Eroukhmanoff, 2018, p. 1).

The decision-making actor carries out the social construction process with the practice of a "speech act" and convinces the audience of the securitization of the issue. The speech act is an important element because it causes specific reactions by using words (Huysmans, 2011, p. 372-373). For example, using racist terminology on immigration and using words such as "invasion" and "influx" to mean immigrant, reinforces the securitization trend (Kaya, 2009 p. 8). In other words, securitization is the situation in which an issue is politicized by actors and turns into a security element. Of course, the most crucial element of the acceptance of the issue, which is constructed as a national security threat, as a security element is the acceptance of the process by the audience. With the acceptance of the process, the definition of the aforementioned issue as a security problem brings with it the necessity of taking urgent measures, solutions and struggles. The method of struggle and emergency measures sometimes bypass the democratic process and cause an oppressive factor that restrict freedom (Miş, 2014, p. 351).

The Copenhagen Institute draws attention to the necessity of desecuritization of the issue and emphasizes the need of processing the issue in the field of democratic functioning. Unlike the Copenhagen Institute, the Aberystwyth School underscores the necessity for paving the way for discussion and negotiation with the political solution mechanism, and the initiation of dialogue, rather than removing it from being a security issue (Balzacq, Leonard, & Ruzicka, 2016, p. 498).

Securitization of Immigration

With the end of the Cold War, migration to Western Europe increased. At the end of the 1990s, the migration ratio to Europe accelerated through the collapse of the Iron Curtain that separated the West and the Soviet Union, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and Eastern Europe. Thus the migration issue became one of the major discussions in Europe. According to Huysmans' *European Union and the Securitization of Migration* study (2000), migration is perceived as a social and socio-economic threat to the internal security structures of Central Europe. Huysmans emphasized that the European Union's tightened visa policy, increased identity checks for immigrants, and the integration of migrants are the concrete steps toward the securitization of immigration. He emphasizes that with the Europeanized immigration policy, citizens of other countries who do not have the right to free movement in Europe are seen as scapegoats. The discourse on the securitization of immigration has been constructed through groups (non-Western nationals) categorized as potentially dangerous (Huysmans, 2000, p. 751-771).

Ceyhan and Tsoukala, in their article "The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies" (2002), state that the securitization discourse on migration takes place in the socio-economic, securitizing, identifying and political axis. From high birth rates to unemployment, terrorism-related activities to criminal events, the problems are attributed to immigrants without adequate foundation and findings in social, cultural and

economic issues (Ceyhan & Tsoukala, 2002, p. 23-28). Bigo, on the other hand, draws attention in his study, "Security and Immigration" (2002) to the effect of security professionals' practices on the securitization process. He expresses that many practices of security professionals, such as risk assessment, population profile, fear management and unrest, are the main factors in securitizing migration (Bigo, 2002, p. 70-75). According to Kaya's study, *Islam, Migration and Integration: The Age of Securitization* (2009), Western decision-making actors are handling immigration as a source of unemployment, violence, terrorism and socio-cultural problems. It directly affects the public's perception of immigrants. After the 9/11 attacks in the USA and the attacks in London and in Madrid, securitization of immigration has become an essential issue in the West. Accordingly, the media's emphasis on the destructiveness of migration has led to a discursiveness in which immigrants are made hostile. In addition, the necessity of adopting European values for immigrants revealed that integration is cultural, attitudinal and linguistic rather than political and social (Kaya, 2009, p. 201-202).

In Germany, which has been undergoing sociological and economic change since the 1990s with reunification, the issue of immigrants has been brought to the agenda frequently. It has become a discourse in which immigration is securitized. With Germany's acceptance of ethnic German asylum seekers, 1,556,060 ethnic Germans were accepted with 1,397,640 asylum seekers between 1983-1992 (Panayi, 1994, p. 284). In 1992, Germany received 65 percent of all asylum applications in the European Union countries (European Statistical Office, 2007, p. 2). As a result of such a large migration, debates started among the German public that the asylum laws were loose. The written media and civil society began to express that immigrants abuse the lax laws. Between 1990 and 1993, Conservative Alliance parties (CDU-CSU), and newspapers such as *Bild* and *Welt am Sonntag* started a campaign against refugees (Arslan, 2009, p. 26). A new article was added to the Constitution in 1992 as a result of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), Christian Social Union (CSU), and Free Democratic Party (FDP) government reaching an agreement with the Social Democratic Party (SDP) by launching an anti-refugee campaign (16a, paragraph 2[1]). As a result, the right to asylum was tightened (Arslan, 2009, p. 27). From a discursive point of view, immigrants continued to be scapegoated by the public and the press. The fact that the press organs systematically point out that immigrants abuse asylum laws and that immigrants are seen as the cause of increasing youth unemployment, led to increased far-right incidents. In the 1990s, xenophobia and

---

[1] 16a Paragraph 2: Auf Absatz 1 kann sich nicht berufen, wer aus einem Mitgliedstaat der Europäischen Gemeinschaften oder aus einem anderen Drittstaat einreist, in dem die Anwendung des Abkommens über die Rechtsstellung der Flüchtlinge und der Konvention zum Schutze der Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten sichergestellt ist. Die Staaten außerhalb der Europäischen Gemeinschaften, auf die die Voraussetzungen des Satzes 1 zutreffen, werden durch Gesetz, das der Zustimmung des Bundesrates bedarf, bestimmt. In den Fällen des Satzes 1 können aufenthaltsbeendende Maßnahmen unabhängig von einem hiergegen eingelegten Rechtsbehelf vollzogen werden.

racism augmented inexorably. As a result, there was a boost in neo-Nazi attacks against Turkish society and caused severe losses in the 1992 Mölln and 1993 Solingen attacks (Panayi, 1994, p. 284-285). Parallel to Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations* study (1997), it has come to the fore in the German public that immigrants do not try to integrate and do not adapt to German societal norms. While the debate about the integration problem between Western values and immigrants continued to increase rapidly, the discourse of securitization of immigration have become a phenomenon that politicians and security forces constantly argued.

Another important factor in security and migration is the 9/11 attacks. The increased security concerns with the 9/11 attacks undoubtedly reflected on immigration and immigrants. Accordingly, the relationship between migration and security continued to be emphasized in the political arena, with an increase in border controls, border security, and the adoption of strict regulations in visa policy practices. Although immigration is not directly related to the 9/11 attacks, the possible criminal problems that immigration could bring became controversial in connection with drug smuggling and potential terrorist acts (Faist, 2005, p. 3). The essential point here is that this discourse is discussed on the axis of "clash of civilizations". It emphasizes that immigrants who do not adapt to Western civilization or from different cultures and ethnicities are perceived as a threat.

NGOs Adopting Turkish Nationalism in Germany

Germany, which was defeated in the Second World War, lost a significant young population during the war. Through the boost in industrialization after the war and considering the young population lost during the war, the need for labor arose. Germany started recruitment agreements to provide a labor force, firstly with Italy in 1955, Spain and Greece in 1960, Turkey in 1961, Morocco in 1963, Portugal in 1964, Tunisia in 1965 and finally Yugoslavia in 1968 (Steinert, 2014, p. 9-11). The number of 6700 Turkish workers who went to Germany in 1961 reached 605,000 in 1973 (Kaya, 2009, p. 42). Although the recruitment of workers from Turkey was stopped in 1973, the Turkish population continued to increase due to family reunification and births. Because of the military coup in Turkey on September 12, 1980, the initiation of an intense wave of immigration to Germany for political reasons was another factor that increased the Turkish population in Germany (İçduygu, 2012, p. 17). During the labor migration process that started in 1961, it was noted that Turkish workers came especially from rural areas of Turkey (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 100). They experienced serious adaptation problems, difficulties and troubles during the transition from an agricultural society to an industrial society. It has been observed that first-generation immigrants struggled with language and adapting to German social life and culture (Orendt, 2010, p. 169). In light of all these problems, Turkish NGOs started to be established in Germany that were aimed at establishing a bridge between Turkish society and German society. The main purpose of

NGOs is to provide solidarity among Turkish workers, overcome the problems of adaptation and support social rights. While Turkish NGOs have an important place in terms of providing a familiar and friendly environment for Turkish immigrants who were excluded from German society, NGOs also help Turkish immigrants benefit from social rights (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 28). For new generations, they provide an opportunity to protect and promote national and spiritual values. NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism, which will be examined in this study, are essential because they form a large community in Germany. NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism in Germany do not exhibit a homogeneous structure. It is known that there are divisions and separations due to ideological and structural differences, and they maintain their commitment to Turkish Nationalism under three main organizations. In order to better examine the subject, the background and differences between the three main organizations will be detailed. These organizations are respectively Almanya Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu (ADÜTDF or Türk Federasyon); Avrupa Türk İslam Birliği (ATİB) and Avrupa Türk Kültür Dernekleri Birliği (ATB). In the reports of the German Federal Organization for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV), these NGOs are defined as "Grey Wolves". However, the term Gray Wolves will not be used in this study. Since "Gray Wolves" is rarely used in political discourse, the term "Ülkücü" is used instead[2]. Although ATİB is defined under the Nationalist Movement in BfV reports, ATİB does not accept to be defined with this term (ATİB, 2020). Therefore, in terms of conceptualization, the expressions of Turkish Nationalism or NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism will be used in the study. However, the term "Ülkücü" will be used from time to time when referring to official sources since it is used as "Ülkücü Movement" or "Grey Wolves" in official German sources.

Almanya Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu (ADÜTDF)

Almanya Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu (ADÜTDF) was established in order to organize activities and events to protect the Turkish national and spiritual values in a way that respect the culture, religion and laws of the society in which they live. It aims to build a cultural bridge between Germany and Turkey (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 150). As a result of migration from Turkey to Germany in the 1960s, Germany's inability to integrate Turkish immigrants led to the establishment of these organizations. As of April

---

[2] Gray Wolves is an informal name used to describe the Ülkücü movement. The gray wolf motif is frequently used in many Turkish epics. Especially in the Ergenekon epic, in which the origin of the Turks is told, it is believed that the female wolf saved the lives of the Turks. Thus the Gray Wolf motif has become the symbol of the Ülkücü movement. However, sometimes it is used to describe people with Ülkücü ideology. This usage is informal and is not accepted by people affiliated with the Ülkücü ideology.

In this context, although their symbol is Gray Wolf, in our one-to-one interview on the subject, they claim that the use of the Gray Wolf is used to humiliate the ideology they belong to. They stated that the name of the ideology is Ülkücülük.

1978, to establish a strong bond between Germany and Turkey, Christian Social Union leader Franz-Josef Strauss and Alparslan Türkeş met and agreed on establishing a formation that would be a continuation of the Turkish Nationalist movement (Bozay, 2017). According to the statement on the official website, Avrupa Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu, which was founded on 18 June 1978 in Frankfurt, changed its name to the Almanya Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri at the 25th Grand Convention held on 19 May 2007 (Turkish Federation, n.d.). Thus, it continues its activities as a founding member within the Avrupa Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu (Türk Federasyon, n.d.). ADÜTDF rejects assimilation and emphasizes harmony. They argue that preserving Turkish identity can only be possible through "European Turkishness" and that this can only be achieved through the harmony of Germany and Turkish society through multiculturalism rather than assimilation (Türk Federation, n.d.). The concept of "European Turkishness", first expressed by Alparslan Türkeş during the annual general meeting of the Türk Federasyon held in Essen in 1995, emphasizes that Turkish people live in Europe by adhering to their Turkish identity. ADÜTDF emphasizes being a German citizen by adhering to the Turkish identity with the slogan "Be German, stay Turkish" (Werde Deutscher, bleibe Türke) (Bozay and Mangitay, 2016, p. 52). The main element distinguishing ADÜTDF from other NGOs in Germany that adopt Turkish nationalism is the term "European Turkishness". They claim that Euro-Islam destroys the national consciousness of the Turks. ADÜTDF primarily advocates Turkish and then religious education. The main point that distinguishes them from other Turkish nationalist NGOs is that they state that religious education should be in Turkish (Arslan, 2009, p. 127-132).

Avrupa Türk İslam Birliği (ATİB)

Avrupa Türk İslam Birliği (ATİB) was founded in 1987 by Musa Serdar Çelebi, leaving Türk Federasyon. It has been stated that ATİB, established on 17 October 1987 in Nieder-Olm, has no affiliation with any party and is supra-partisan. At the same time, they emphasized that they have an understanding of being active in the political arena of the country they live in by remaining independent from Turkey's domestic politics (ATİB, n.d.). Their main objectives are to protect Turkish culture with pluralism and harmony, to continue its activities in the light of Islamic values, to fight for democratic rights and equality demands in Western Europe, and to strive for the correct promotion of Islam in Europe (Fergen ve Wunsch, 2021, p. 9-10). ATİB defines Turks living in Europe under the term "European Muslim Turkishness". They state that European Turks are permanent in Europe and that they are struggling against Islamophobia while preserving their Muslim-Turkish identity (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 123). The main difference with other NGOs that adopt Turkish Nationalism is that ATİB puts Islam in the foreground. Although German Officials describe ATİB as a member of the Ülkücü Movement, in its official

sources, ATİB stated that they have parted ways with the implied political movement since its establishment ("Great Reaction to the Report Endangered by ATİB", 2020). However, since ATIB is described as Ülkücü in the German official documents, ATIB is included in this article based on the German official documents.

Avrupa Türk Kültür Dernekleri Birliği (ATB / ANF)

Avrupa Türk Kültür Dernekleri Birliği started its activities in Berlin in 1994 under the name of Nizam-ı Alem Ülkü Ocağı and then accelerated its structuring. The perception that distinguishes the association from other organizations is they are more dominant in Islamic understanding, but it is also known that the Turkish nationalist line is to be preserved. In 2002, the organization changed its name to Avrupa Türk Kültür Dernekleri Birliği (ATB). As of 1996, it continued to operate in seven different countries, primarily in Germany. The association aims to bring Turkish and Islamic identity to young generations by emphasizing the need to protect sacred values such as Turkish culture, flag, homeland and Islamic religion in general (Khorchide, 2021, p. 39). The organization, which is based on the concept of "Western European Turkishness", carries out various activities so that Muslim Turks living in Europe can live without losing their identity. They aim to adhere to the traditions and customs of young people in social and cultural terms, and they carry out activities such as trips to Turkey, religious education, mosque programs, and folklore for young people (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 149).

Relations between Turkey and Germany

In 1978, CSU Bavarian leader, Franz Josef Strauss, and Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) Chairman, Alparslan Türkeş, declared the climate is well suited for the first Turkish nationalist NGO in Germany so that Turkish workers would not feel alien in Germany and keep their Turkish identity. This decision, which also aims to ensure that the Turkish workers who came to Germany with the 1961 labor agreement will not feel alienated and adapt to the society in which they live, has a deep connection with the political conjuncture of the period. The Cold War era created a bipolar system in the world, namely the eastern bloc and the western bloc; While the bloc of the west represents the countries affiliated with western democracy, the east bloc represents the socialist system on the axis of the Soviet Union and China. After the Second World War, Germany was experiencing this bipolar world order. With the end of the Second World War, Germany, divided into two; east and west, and lived in a bipolar system until the collapse of the Berlin wall in 1989. Accordingly, the Western block divided by the wall is the Federal Republic of Germany (FDR or West Germany), allied to the Western democracies, and the Eastern bloc is the German Democratic Republic (GDR or East Germany), allied to the Soviet Union.

According to Mascolo (2021), the reason why CSU Bavarian leader Franz Josef Strauss supported the establishment of the Turkish Nationalist movement along with

NGOs in Germany has a connection with the Cold War. Accordingly, he argues that it is aimed at breaking the tendency of Turkish workers to side with socialism in Germany and to keep them away from socialist ideology by ensuring that they are on a nationalist line with the NGOs affiliated with the Nationalist movement. At the same time, the CDU and CSU are aimed to become important actors for the Turkish diaspora in Germany. In this context, a new era began for Germany with the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Accordingly, in the process that started with the anti-immigration campaign led primarily by the CSU and CDU in the 1990s, the view that the Turkish NGOs constituted an obstacle to integrating Turks living in Germany into German society began to prevail. At this point, it can be emphasized that the changing political conjuncture, the end of the Cold War, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and socialism ceased to be a real threat. Parallel to this, the necessity of NGOs affiliated with Turkish nationalism was opened to discussion on the axis of CDU and CSU.

The changing political conjuncture was not limited to only the Cold War period. In parallel with the changing relations between Germany and Turkey in the 2000s, Turkish nationalists NGOs were also affected. In 2013, for the first time in the reports of the Organization for the Protection of the Constitution of Germany, it was stated that NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism were elements that could threaten German democracy, it was stated that they were on the extreme right ideology and that glorifying the Turkish race was against the equality principle of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany. As of 2013, the bilateral relations between Turkey and Germany also started to change. In this context, the discussion of NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism and the deteriorating Turkey-Germany relations show parallelism. Accordingly, the harsh attitude of the Turkish government during the Gezi protests that started in Istanbul in May and June 2013 and led to mass demonstrations throughout Turkey, was criticized by Germany. For this reason, the EU member states accepted Germany's offer to postpone the Turkey-EU accession negotiations for four months. This situation has also put a question mark on Turkey's EU candidate state status. On June 2, 2016, Germany and Turkey's relations became tense again after the German Bundestag adopted the resolution describing the 1915 events as "genocide". NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism organized protests across Germany against the resolution. These tensions also caused controversy among the politicians of the CDU and CSU, and the discussions about attempting to ban members of NGOs that embrace Turkish nationalism from being members of the CDU and CSU. However, it was unanimously rejected. NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism started to create controversy between the CDU and the CSU.

In 2017 Turkish-German journalist Deniz Yücel was arrested in Turkey on charges of "making propaganda for the PKK terrorist organization", and Turkish-German relations were strained again. Deniz Yücel was evacuated as a result of Germany's diplomatic

attempts. But diplomatically, the tense relations between the two countries were striking. As a matter of fact, on March 2, 2017, the Gaggenau municipality rejected the campaign to be organized with the participation of the then Minister of Justice, Bekir Bozdağ, within the scope of the election campaign targeting the Turkish diaspora in Germany for the Turkish Constitutional Amendment Referendum and economy minister, Nihat Zeybekci's campaign in the Porz district town hall was rejected. Upon the refusal of the event to be held, there was a new tension in bilateral relations. Turkish officials interpreted this situation as Germany's attempt to suppress the Turkish diaspora. In June 2017, there was a new tension. After Turkey did not allow the German parliamentary delegation to visit the Incirlik military base, Germany began to withdraw its soldiers from Incirlik Air Base in Adana. As a result of all these developments, the closure of NGOs affiliated with the Nationalist movement and NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism came to the agenda, but the federal interior minister, Horst Seehofer, refused to ban the organizations.

Securitization of NGOs Adopting Turkish Nationalism

In 2019, within the scope of the Symbol Law[3] in Austria, the sign known as the "Gray Wolf Salute", the "Gray Wolf in the Crescent" symbol and various versions of these symbols were banned to fight against extremism. In addition, the restrictions on the NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism began to be discussed. According to the ban that entered into force on March 1, 2019, a fine of up to 4,000 Euros was imposed for the signs and symbols, and a fine of up to 10,000 Euros or six weeks' imprisonment if repeated (Bundesgesetz, BGBl. I Nr. 2/2019 NR: GP XXVI BR: AB 10094).

In France, in 2020, when Armenian groups gathered in the city of Vienne for the Nagorno-Karabakh region, a clash broke out between Turkish, Armenian and Azeri groups, and four people were injured in the clash. In the following days, "Loup Gris", which means Gray Wolves in French, and the abbreviation "RTE", consisting of the initials of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, was painted on the Armenian Genocide Monument with spray in the Décines-Charpieu region. In this regard, the issue was discussed at the Council of Ministers meeting. On November 4, 2020, it was announced that the activities of the Gray Wolves (Ülkücü) movement were banned in France with the decree published by the French Minister of Interior, Geral Darmanin. Darmanin described the movement as "aggressive" ("France Bans the Nationalist Movement", 2020).

The banning of NGOs that adopted Turkish nationalism brought with it an intense debate. After the clash between the Turkish and Armenian groups in France, it was alleged that the "Armenian Hunt" march was organized by the Ülkücü Movement

---

[3] Bundesgesetz, mit dem die Verwendung von Symbolen der Gruppierung Islamischer Staat und anderer Gruppierungen verboten wird (Symbole-Gesetz) BGBl. I Nr. 2/2019 (NR: GP XXVI BR: AB 10094)

members. Thus the question was submitted to the European Parliament on November 10, 2020. In the parliamentary question, they demanded the inclusion of the Ülkücü Movement (the Gray Wolves in the text) on the EU Terrorist List ("Inclusion of Grey Wolves on EU Terrorist List", 2020). However, in the relevant reply on February 4, 2021, it was stated that there was not enough evidence that the mentioned movement participated in the action. However, there would be room for investigation and/or prosecution if there is severe and reliable evidence (Reply on Inclusion of Grey Wolves on EU Terrorist List, 2021). Another significant turning point that the Ülkücü Movement was included for the first time in the 2019-2020 Turkey report prepared by the European Parliament Turkey rapporteur Nacho Sanchez Amor. According to the statement in the report, the necessity of being added to the EU Terrorist List, where the said movement may pose a threat to people of Kurdish, Armenian and Greek origin, was called for to ban these organizations in EU member states and to monitor their activities (Commission Reports on Turkey, 2021). Therefore, it has been argued that Turkish Nationalism and the Nationalist Movement in 2020 were opened for discussion on the axis of all European Union member states. The German Federal Organization for the Protection of the Constitution (Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz, briefly BfV) is an internal intelligence agency responsible for collecting intelligence and reporting to the Federal Ministry of the Interior. It collects data against all kinds of potential dangers and threats that may harm democracy and disturb the security and peace in matters related to the internal security of Germany. The collected data is published in the annual reports (Verfassungsschutzbericht) to inform the public and raise awareness (Verfassungsschutz, 2020). As of 2013, NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism were included in the report. Accordingly, ADÜTDF, ATİB and ATB were described as extreme right wing groups. In the 2020 report, ADÜTDF's ties with the Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) were mentioned. It is stated that ADÜTDF is a far-right movement, but took a moderate stance in front of the public. In the report, it is argued that ADÜTDF included extreme right-wing symbols in its social media accounts, such as the "Gray Wolf Salute" and the "Three Crescents" that were clearly based on Turkism ideology. It has been mentioned that Turkism is equal to Turkish supremacy and hinders the integration of Turks into German society. Moreover in the report argued that the view of "the Turks are superior" violates the principle of equality stated in the constitution and has a divisive effect (Verfassungsschutzbericht, 2020, p. 281-282). Another organization included in the report, ATİB, was stated to be in line with the nationalist ideology and dominant Islamic elements. Although the ATİB official website emphasizes that they are not part of the Ülkücü Movement, it is argued in the report that being a member of the Ülkücü Movement creates a divisive effect and spreads Turkish nationalism with far-right ideologies. This situation leads to discrimination among various groups, such as Kurds and Jews (Verfassungsschutzbericht, 2020, p. 282-283). ATB is stated as another important

organization affiliated with the Turkish-Islamic synthesis, and it is argued that a strict limit is drawn against other beliefs. The report stated that ATB poses a moderate external image and stays away from extreme rhetoric in its official statements. However, it has been noted that the Turkish-Islamic synthesis is not only an ideology for ATB but also an indicator of a line that draws strict boundaries against other beliefs (Verfassungsschutzbericht, 2020, p. 284-285). On November 18, 2020, the joint proposal named, "To Stand Against Racism and Nationalism, to Suppress the Impact of the Ülkücü Movement[4]" was accepted by the majority of the votes in the German Bundestag. The joint proposal of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), the Christian Social Union (CSU), the Social Democratic Party (SDP), the Free Democratic Party (FDP) and the Greens briefly includes the close monitoring of the activities of the Ülkücü Movement (Nationalismus und Rassismus die Stirnbieten, 2020). The proposals submitted separately by the Alternative for Germany (AfD) and the Left Party (Die Linke) regarding the closure of NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism in Germany were rejected. However, in the proposal mentioned above, which was accepted, there is a clause stating that NGOs can be closed if necessary.

Methodology

In the axis of securitization of the diaspora, this study, which examines the NGOs that adopt Turkish Nationalism in Germany, considering securitization, was carried out with the qualitative research method. Qualitative research aims to explore social life's facts and illuminate the subjective meaning between actions and social contexts (Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, & Davidson, 2002, p. 716). This study examines these groups using a purposive sampling technique. Instead of taking a large sample, it is preferred that a single person who has experience on the subject and who takes part in the relevant NGO was chosen as a participant. The aim here is to prevent repetition with more than one participant. It is observed that there are hesitations about participation in the study because of the topic. The participants did not want to talk due to security concerns and avoided the interview. This is another important reason why participation was limited to one person. The participant in the current interview was chosen considering having a command of the legal process and bureaucracy in Germany due to his position in the relevant institution, having deep knowledge and experience about the domestic policy of Germany and the joint decision-making mechanism of the European Union. The study conducted a semi-systematic literature review on the securitization process of NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism in Germany. Since their names are frequently included in the reports of the German Organization for the Protection of the Constitution (Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz, BfV) three organizations were emphasized, and the research was

---

[4] Nationalismus und Rassismus die Stirnbieten – Einfluss der Ülkücü-Bewegungzurückdrängen (19/24388).

formed over three organizations. The three organizations mentioned are, respectively, Almanya Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu (ADÜTDF), Avrupa Türk İslam Kültür Dernekleri Birliği (ATİB) and Avrupa Türk Kültür Dernekleri Birliği (ATB). Within the scope of the document review, the websites of the relevant institutions, the newspapers in terms of scanning the news on the subject, the statements of the Chairman and members of the organizations and press releases were examined. In addition, the study was carried out by studying information brochures, journal articles, questions submitted to the European Parliament, questions submitted to the German Bundestag on the subject, and the reports of the German Organization for the Protection of the Constitution. Since the research was also carried out with document analysis techniques, the statements and press releases of the relevant NGOs were accessed through keywords. The answers to the interview are presented with direct quotations. Findings obtained through press releases, statements, reports and various documents are also included under the relevant themes, including quotations.

Findings

While the roots of immigrants' problems stem from reasons such as poverty, unemployment and discrimination, the problems are masked and externalized with the securitization process. In the 1990s, in the anti-immigration arguments that increased in Germany and the discourse that Turkish immigrants could not integrate into German society began to become widespread. The CDU frequently mentioned the term "leitkultur" especially in the anti-immigration campaign (Arslan, 2009, p. 35-36). Leitkultur expresses the acceptance of German culture as the dominant culture by immigrants and adapting to it unilaterally. The construction of the discourse is based on the others – us. The slogan "German First" is the basis of the discourse for Leitkultur (Arslan: 2009, p. 38). Heitmeyer's work in 1997 is discursively exemplary in the context of the anti-immigration debates that occupied Germany's politics and media in the 1990s. In the study, the inability of Turks to integrate into German society was attributed to their satisfaction with living with Islam and Turkish identity (Kaya, 2009, p. 18-19). In this context, the Turkish diaspora's living with the values of Turkishness and Islam was seen as the main obstacle to integration into German society. Especially in this period, Turkish immigrants started to appear in the German media with negative expressions, such as criminals and fundamentalists. One of the fourth-generation Turkish youth living in Berlin, Bilal was asked about their thoughts on the possible bans and limitations expected to be brought to NGOs that adopt Turkish nationalism, in the study conducted by Burcu Özçelik. He emphasized that while he is a citizen who respects the laws of Germany, there are no obstacles to defining himself as Turkish and Muslim (Özçelik, 2021). In other words, the groups living in Germany adopting Turkish nationalism state that integrating into German society does not mean to reject Turkish and Muslim identity. They respect German laws, and

they can define themselves as Turkish and Muslim at the same time. They argue that they can adapt to German society in this way. In the meeting held with Turan Şen on February 17, 2003 Deputy Chairman of the Turkish Federation in 2003, it was stated that the general view of the NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism in Germany is not very good. The general perspective of German society is that the Turkish identity remains, as long as the NGOs exist (Adıgüzel, 2004, p. 293). In other words, Turkish immigrants cannot integrate into German society because of these NGOs.

The minority part of society, which is exposed to racism daily in various contexts, is seen as "foreigners in need of integration", regardless of their actual needs, and living conditions. They remain as a foreigner and "others" in society. The view of immigrants seen as people needing to be integrated into society causes a negative perception of immigrants. It evokes a negative perception by defining people who need integration. According to Arslan's statement, this negative perception of integration clearly ended with alienation of immigrants in German society (Arslan, 2009, p. 33-34). At the same time, the media's definition of immigrants as an element of danger, as people corrupting the social culture with their foreign customs, as potential criminals, and as exploiting resources lead to alienation for diasporic groups. In this context, the efforts of diaspora groups to be protected against discrimination, racism and assimilation cannot be denied. This situation increases the commitment of diaspora groups to their own culture.

> It should not be forgotten that we do not want assimilation; we want harmony and integration. The associations in question are, of course, established in compliance with German law, considering the German constitution and culture. However, we are against assimilation because assimilation means a kind of genocide. Because assimilation is equivalent to making the people of that country forget their identity. In this respect, we strive to maintain harmony, integration and cultural identity (Personal Interview, Mehmet, Türk Federasyon).

Securitization of NGOs Adopting Turkish Nationalism

In a way, securitization brings along a process that goes along with politicization. Discourse can be constructed for domestic political purposes. Securitization discourse may also change depending on the political conjuncture (Buzan, Waever and De Wilde, 1998 p. 28-29; Miş, 2014, p. 38-349). For the Western world after the 9/11 attacks, the securitization of Islam may not be considered an element of securitization for another country, or issues that were not previously defined as security elements may be drawn into the security field. In this respect, the question of when the NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism in Germany have become a security threat should be questioned. This question was included in the interview:

> This is determined by the political conjuncture. While Germany and Turkey established good relations, the Ülkücü Movement was not perceived as a threat; it is brought to the agenda in case of deterioration of bilateral relations between Germany and Turkey. This is used as a trump card in the context of bilateral relations from time to time. Therefore, it can be said that it depends on the political conjuncture; It is a situation that has sometimes been brought to the agenda and sometimes removed from the agenda since the 1990s (Personal Interview, Mehmet, Türk Federasyon).

In his speech about the ban on the Ülkücü Movement in France, President of the Belgian Türk Federasyon, Hamit Atak, states that the ban was decided as a result of the attack on the Armenian bust in France. However, he argues that it was a conjuncture related to Turkey. He stated that these organizations are non-governmental organizations, not political ones (Aktan, 2020). As of 2013, NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism were included under the title of "extreme foreigners threatening security" in BfV reports, and attention was drawn to the social media posts using extreme right symbols of people affiliated with the Ülkücü ideology, independently of the NGOs. In the interview, the statements in the BfV reports were asked:

> First of all, there is no basis for the reports. I think most of the reports are biased. We are not racist. First of all, Turkish culture is not a culture that can be compatible with racism. A society that has dominated Anatolia for centuries and lived in Central Asia cannot be expected to be racist. It is impossible for Turks who have lived in brotherhood and unity with different communities for years to be racist. At the same time, racism has no place in our religion. We only aim to spread social and cultural activities, social rights and cultural identity. We try to preserve Turkish culture, language and religion (Personal Interview, Mehmet, Türk Federasyon).

The proposal titled, "To Stand Against Racism and Nationalism, to Suppress the Impact of the Ülkücü Movement," has caused intense reactions. ADÜTDF Chairman, Şentürk Doğruyol states that ADÜTDF has been respectful to the constitutional order of Federal Germany since 1978, it is a democratic non-governmental organization and they reject all forms of racism, violence and terrorism (Türk Federasyon, 2020). Durmuş Yıldırım, Chairman of ATİB, in his written press statement, stated that they are not hostile to any religion, political or belief group. He argued that ATİB is not a member of the Gray Wolves or the Ülkücü movement, and it is a transparent and open non-governmental organization (ATIB, 2020).

It is stated that 18,000 people in Germany have contact with NGOs that adopt Turkish nationalism or feel close to this ideology. In this context, the NGOs' coming to the

agenda within the prohibition was met with a reaction from the mentioned NGOs and groups. In this respect, the effects of a possible closure attempt on the Turkish diaspora were asked.

> There should not be a possible shutdown because the Ministry of Interior has already stated that there was insufficient evidence for the closure. We are just trying to create a cultural identity belonging. Therefore, we are not incompatible with German law. On the other hand, one of the major aims of these organizations is to encourage young people in the field of education and training, to prevent young people from bad habits or engaging in other activities such as terrorism and drugs, to prevent identity crisis and identity search, and to establish a bond between Turkey and Germany (Personal Interview, Mehmet, Türk Federasyon).

Securitization through media constitutes one of the important elements in consolidating the social construction of discourse and its acceptance by the audience. The media plays a major role in discursive securitization, establishing social construction, and accepting the discourse by the recipient. According to Ayhan Kaya's statement, media images and statistics become practical ideological tools that contribute to the production of a sterile European space, those that are ethnocultural and religiously different (Kaya, 2009, p. 15). In this context, the language used in the media regarding the NGOs adopting Turkish Nationalism is of great importance in terms of securitization. As a matter of fact, the title of the 2016 report published in *Tagesspiegel* is important for the securitization element in the media: "Women, Children and Fascists" (Frauen, Kinder und Faschisten). The content of the article included the thousands of Turks gathered in Cologne and demonstrating against the July 15 coup attempt in Turkey. It is stated that the term "Fascists" used in the title is because the Nationalist symbols were used by the community during the demonstration. Therefore, it can be stated that the media, by reinforcing the sterile European space in terms of reporting the news, adopts securitizing discourse on the harmony of groups affiliated with Turkish nationalism with social integration and order.

Discussion and Conclusion

With the end of the Cold War, the end of the bipolar world system, and the 9/11 attacks, the process of securitization of immigration has increased rapidly. The presence of Muslim immigrants in Western countries after the 9/11 attacks caused discussions within the security framework and on the securitization of immigration (Faist, 2005, p. 116). Considering that the majority of the Turkish population in Germany is Muslim, the effect of the said securitization process on the Turkish diaspora can be better understood (Yüksel, 2014, p. 178).

The discourse of Turkish identity and Muslim belonging as an obstacle to integration into German society, which were frequently brought to the agenda with the anti-immigration campaign carried out by the CSU-CDU in Germany in the 1990s, accelerated. In the 1990s, the easy acceptance of ethnic Germans as immigrants to Germany or the fact that they could easily benefit from citizenship, brought the issue of structural discrimination against non-German immigrants. Accordingly, the expectation that Turks working with the status of "guest workers" in Germany is temporary and will return to their countries, and the fact that they cannot easily benefit from the right to citizenship even if they were born in Germany, but that ethnic Germans can benefit from this right, led to debates (Modood, 1997, p. 4). Seeing immigrants as "other" and "temporary" brings exclusion from society in this context. As a result of exclusion and marginalization, Turkish immigrants provide solidarity through diaspora organizations and try to cope with the racism and discrimination they encounter. Today, Turkish people constitute the largest diaspora group in Germany. NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism, on the other hand, continue to operate through umbrella organizations that have been active since the 1960s and have taken on an official framework since the 1970s. NGOs, which aim to promote Turkish culture, provide moral support, solidarity, introduce Turkish culture and Islam to new generations, and become a bridge element between Germany and Turkey, have started to be discussed in the German public in recent years under the heading of securitization.

For the first time, in October 2004, the North Rhine-Westphalia Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV) stated that the Ülkücü Movement caused the emergence of a parallel society in Europe and therefore constituted an obstacle to the integration of the European Turkish population (Bozay, 2017). As of 2013, NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism started to take place in BfV reports, and in November 2020, the bans were brought to the agenda in the German Bundestag, but a proposal was accepted regarding restrictions instead of bans. The increasing interest of the young generation for the Turkish nationalist movement in Germany in recent years should be evaluated in this context. As a result of the neo-Nazi attacks that have escalated since the 1990s, the increase in nationalism among immigrant groups is an expected and usual reaction. Re-nationalism is a reaction to the exclusionary mechanisms of the host country. As a matter of fact, after the racist attacks in Mölln and Solingen, the number of members of NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism increased (Aslan and Bozay, 2012). At this point, closing or banning NGOs will cause reactivity for groups that preserve their cultural identity through NGOs. A possible ban or closure attempt has the potential to push the masses underground and is among the possibilities that it will bring along problems such as radicalization and criminalization. At this point, the fact that Turkish Nationalism is under the umbrella of auditable NGOs is essential in preventing radicalization and going underground.

In the resolution adopted by the German Bundestag, there are statements that the Turkish nationalist ideology is shaped around anti-Semitism and that it has a racist view against Armenians and Kurds (Deutscher Bundestag, 2020). However, Faist stated that important conflicts of Turkey, have spread to Germany from time to time since the 1970s. Nevertheless, it has never significantly endangered state or human security in Germany (Faist, 2005, p. 108). Moreover, Turkish immigrants with a Turkish nationalist ideology insist that they have problems with the PKK's European branch, not with the Kurdish people.

In Özçelik›s study, Turkish activists stated that the formation of securitization discourse on Turkish Nationalist groups caused neo-Nazi or far-right perpetrators to be overlooked (Özçelik, 2021). The focus of securitization on Turkish NGOs distracts attention from the devastating consequences of far-right violence, such as the Hanau attack. This situation causes the groups that put far-right activism into practice to be ignored and the necessary reaction to the attacks to be resolved at this point. Defining the Ülkücü movement as a security threat after 2010 strengthens the claim of securitization is derived from the changing political conjuncture. Contrary to the traditional security perception, the discursively constructed notion of security is changed, transformed and created from time to time. In this respect, considering the securitization of NGOs adopting Turkish nationalism could depend on the political conjuncture. Examining the nexus between the changing discourse on Turkish nationalism and Turkey-EU bilateral relations can contribute significantly to the literature for future studies. In general, this study aimed to examine the discourse of limiting and restricting the NGOs that adopt Turkish Nationalism in Germany within the scope of securitization.

Orcid

Ferzan Çakır ⓘ *https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3445-4249*

References

Adıgüzel, Y. (2004). *Kimliğin Korunmasında ve Üretilmesinde Türk Derneklerinin Rolü Almanya/Köln Örneği.*(Doktora Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi).

Aktan, S. (2020, Ekim 21). 'Bozkurtlar' diye bir örgüt var mı, 'Ülkücü Hareket' Avrupa'da neden yasaklanıyor? *Euronews.* Erişim Adresi https://tr.euronews.com/2020/11/20/bozkurtlar-diye-bir-orgut-var-m-ulkucu-hareket-avrupa-da-neden-yasaklan-yor

Alman parlamentosunda 5 partinin Ülkücü Hareketin yasaklanması için ortak önergesi kabul edilerek Merkel'e gönderildi. (2020, Kasım 19). *Sputnik.* Erişim Adresi https://tr.sputniknews.com/20201119/alman-parlamentosunda-5-partinin-ulkucu-hareketin-yasaklanmasi-icin-ortak-onergesi-kabul-edilerek-1043254186.html

Arslan, E. (2009). *Der Mythos der Nation im Transnationalen Raum: Türkische Graue Wölfe in Deutschland.* Springer VS.

Aslan, F., Bozay, K. (2012). *Graue Wölfe heulen wieder: Türkische Faschisten und ihre Vernetzung in Deutschland. Unrast Verlag.*

ATİB'i "Tehlike" Gören Rapora Büyük Tepki. (2020, 16 Temmuz). *Kilim Gazetesi.* Erişim Adresi: https://kilimgazetesi.de/haber/atibi-tehlike-goren-rapora-buyuk-tepki-30330.html

Avrupa Demokratik Ülkücü Türk Dernekleri Federasyonu. (t.y.). *Kuruluşu ve Basın Açıklamaları* içinde. Erişim Adresi https://www.turkfederasyon.com/

Avrupa Türk İslam Kültür Dernekleri Birliği: Kuruluşu. (t.y.). *Kuruluşu* ve *Basın Açıklamaları* içinde. Erişim Adresi https://www.atib.org/

Avrupa İstatistik Ofisi. (1996, Şubat 5). Asylum-Seekers In Europe 1985-1995. *EU Publications.* Erişim Adresi https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2eb657e6-97e1-4ce7-999b-5ad018e593dc

Avusturya'da 'Bozkurt' işareti artık yasak. (2019, Mart 1). *CNN Türk.* Erişim Adresi https://www.cnn-turk.com/dunya/avusturyada-bozkurt-isareti-artik-yasak

Aytemiz, A. (1992).*Batı Avrupa Türkleri: Almanya'da 30. Yıl.* Frankfurt am Main: Avrupa Türk-İslam Birliği Yayınları.

Balzacq, T. (2005). The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. *European Journal of International Relations,* 11(2), 171–201.

Balzacq, T., Léonard, S.,Ruzicka, J. (2016). 'Securitization' Revisited: The oryand Cases. *International Relations*, 30(4), 494–531.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives: global, local, political,* 27, 63-92.

Bowen, G. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal.* 9. 27-40.

Bozay, K. (2009). Ich bin stolz, Türkezusein! *Ethnisierung gesellschaftlicher Konflikte im Zeichen der Globalisierung*, 2, Auflage. Schwalbach / Ts.: WochenschauVerlag

Bozay, K. (2017). Graue Wölfe – Die Größte Rechtsextreme Organisation in Deutschland. Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung. Erişim Adresi https://www.bpb.de/themen/rechtsextremismus/dossier-rechtsextremismus/260333/graue-woelfe-die-groesste-rechtsextreme-organisation-in-deutschland/#footnote-target-24

Bozay, K., Mangitay, O. (2016). Ich bin stolz, Türkezusein! Graue Wölfe und Türkischer (Rechts-) Nationalismus in Deutschland, Wuppertaler Initiative für Demokratieund Toleranze. V., Düsseldorf, 1-98.

Bundesministerium des Innern (2015). Verfassungsschutzbericht. Erişim Adresi: https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/themen/sicherheit/vsb-2015.pdf?_blob=publicationFile&v=4

Bundesministerium des Innern (2016). Verfassungsschutzbericht. Erişim Adresi: https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/themen/sicherheit/vsb-2016.pdf?_blob=publicationFile&v=4

Bundesministerium des Innern (2017). Verfassungsschutzbericht. Erişim Adresi: https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/themen/sicherheit/vsb-2017.pdf?_blob=publicationFile&v=4

Bundesministerium des Innern (2020). Verfassungsschutzbericht. Erişim Adresi https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/themen/sicherheit/vsb-2020.pdf?_blob=publicationFile&v=4

Bundesministerium des Innern (2021). Verfassungsschutzbericht. Erişim Adresi https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/themen/sicherheit/vsb-2021.pdf?_blob=publicationFile&v=4

Buzan, B. (1997). Rethinking Security after the Cold War. *Cooperation and Conflict* 32 (5), 23-24.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O., De Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Londra: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ceyhan, A., Tsoukala, A. (2002). The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies: Ambivalent Discourses and Policies. *Alternatives*, 27(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270S103

Der Verfassungsschutz: Service. (2022). Editörden. Erişim Adresi https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/DE/service/service_node.html

Durmuş Yıldırım'dan Ülkücü Harekete Yasak Talebine Tepki. (2020, 19 Kasım). *Kilim Gazetesi.* Erişim Adresi: https://kilimgazetesi.de/haber/durmus-yildirimdan-ulkucu-harekete-yasak-talebine-tepki-31195.html

Ertan, N. (2021, Mayıs 20).Will Turkey's Grey Wolvesland on EU terrorlist. *Al Monitor.* Erişim Adresi https://www.al-monitor.com/originals/2021/05/will-turkeys-grey-wolves-land-eu-terror-list#ixzz7ZFKi3JVL

European Parliament. (2020, Kasım 10). Question for written answer E-006101/2020 to the Council. Erişim Adresi https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-9-2020-006101_EN.html

European Parliament. (2021, Şubat 4). Reply E-006101/2020(ASW). Erişim Adresi https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-9-2020-006101-ASW_EN.html

The Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat) (2007). Statistics in focus population and social conditions 110/2007. Erişim Adresi:https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-statistics-in-focus/-/kssf-07-110https://ec.euroa.eu/eurostat/web/products statistics-in-focus/-/ks-sf-07-110

Evet oyları Avrupa'yı da demokratikleştirecek. (2017, Mart 20). *Hürriyet.* Erişim Adresi https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/dunya/evet-oylari-avrupayi-da-demokratiklestirecek-40400844

Eroukhmanoff, C. (2018, Jan 14). Securitisation Theory: An Introduction. Erişim Adresi: https://www.eir.info/2018/01/14/securitisation-theory-an-introduction/

Faist, T. (2005). The Migration-Security Nexus: International Migration and Security Before and After 9/11. *Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD).* Erişim Adresi https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-378981

Fergen, K. Wunsch S., Bozay. K, (2021) Graue Wölfe und Türkische Nationalisten. *Brochure of the MBT Hessen*

Fossey, E., Harvey, C., Mc Dermott, F., Davidson. L. (2002). Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 36(6): 717-732.

Fransa İçişleri Bakanlığı, Ülkücü hareketi resmen yasakladı. (2020, 4 Kasım). *Euronews.* Erişim Adresi https://tr.euronews.com/2020/11/04/fransa-icisleri-bakanl-g-bozkurtlar-hareketi-ni-resmen-yasaklad

Heine, H. (2016, Temmuz 31). Frauen, Kinder und Faschisten. *Der Tagesspiegel*. Erişim Adresi https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/demo-fuer-erdogan-in-koeln-frauen-kinder-und-faschisten/13952074.html

Heine, H. (2021, Eylül 22). Linke hoffennach Bundestagswahlauf Verbot der Grauen Wölfe. *Der Tagesspiegel.* Erişim adresi: https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/tuerkische-rechtsextreme-in-deutschland-linke-hoffen-nach-bundestagswahl-auf-verbot-der-grauen-woelfe/27634416.html

Heitmeyer, W., Joachim M., Helmut S. (1997). *Verlocken der Fundamentalismus.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Herschinger, E., Bozay, K., von Drachenfels, M., Decker, O., Joppke, C. (2020). A Threatto Open Societies? Conceptualizing the radicalization of society. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 14(2), 1-16.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1997). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. *New York: Touchstone.*

Huysmans, J. (2000).The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 38(5), 751-777.

Huysmans, (2011). What's in an Act? On Security Speech Acts and Little Security Nothings. *Security Dialogue*. 42(4-5), 371-383.

İçduygu, A. (2012). 50 Years After the Labour Recruitment Agreement with Germany: The Consequences of Emigration for Turkey. *Perceptions.* 17 (2), 11-36.

Kaya, A. (2009).*Islam, Migration and Integration The Age of Securitization.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Khorchide, M. (2021). Die Grauen Wölfe. *Grundlagenbericht der Dokumentationsstelle Politischer Islam*. Erişim Adresi https://www.dokumentationsstelle.at/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Grundlagenbericht-Graue-Woelfe.pdf

Kiefer, M. (2012). *Antisemitismusunter Muslimischen Jugendlichen – Randphänomenoder Problem?* Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Dossier Antisemitismus. Erişim Adresi http://www.bpb.de/politik/extremismus/antisemitismus/145728/ antisemitismus-unter-muslimischen-jugendlichen-randphaenomen-oder-problem

Leemhuis, R. (2021) Türkischer Rechtsextremismus In Deutschland – Die Grauen Wölfe. *American Jewish Committee Berlin Ramer Institute*. Erişim Adresi https://ajcgermany.org/system/files/docu-y ment/AJC-Berlin_GrauenWolfe-Broschuere-RGB-A4.pdf

Mascolo, G. (2021, Kasım 30). Turkish extremist group Grey Wolves finds a favourable climate in Germany. *Open Democracy*. Erişim Adresi https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/countering-radical-right/ turkish-extremist-group-grey-wolves-finds-a-favourable-climate-in-germany/

Miş, N. (2014). Güvenlikleştirme Teorisi ve Siyasal Olanın Güvenlikleştirilmesi. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi.* 6(2), 345-381.

Modood, T (1997) 'Introduction: The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe' in T. Modood and P. Werbner (eds) The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe, *Zed Book*,1997, pp. 1-15.

Orendt, M. (2010). The Integration Of The Turks Into German Society. *Bilge Strateji* 2(3), 165-192.

Özçelik, B. (2021, Haziran 23).Germany's 'GrayWolves' and Turkish Radicalization. *New Lines Magazine.* Erişim Adresi https://newlinesmag.com/argument/germanys-gray-wolves-and-turkish-radicalization/

Panayi, P. (1994). Racial Violence in the New Germany: 1990–93. *Contemporary European History*, 3(3), 265-288.

Amor, N.S. (2021, Mayıs 5). Report on the 2019-2020 Commission Reports on Turkey. European Parliament. Erişim Adresi https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-9-2021-0153_EN.html

Scheffer, U. (2016, Kasım 5). Hannelore Krafts Appell an türkischstämmige Mitbürger. *Der Tagesspiegel.* Erişim Adresi https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/tuerkische-rechtsextreme-in-deutschland-linke-hoffen-nach-bundestagswahl-auf-verbot-der-grauen-woelfe/27634416.html

Sendker, M. (2020, Aralık 7). Germany's mission to muzzle the Grey Wolves. *Qantara* Erişim Adresi https://en.qantara.de/content/turkish-ultranationalist-right-wing-extremists-germanys-mission-to-muzzle-the-grey-wolves?nopaging=1

Steinert, J.-D. (2014). Migration and Migration Policy: West Germany and the Recruitment of Foreign Labour, 1945-61. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 49(1), 9–27. Erişim Adresi http://www.jstor.org/stable/43697286

The Grey Wolves Conquering Europe. (2020, Haziran 30). *MENA Research Center*. Erişim Adresi: https://mena-studies.org/the-grey-wolves-conquering-europe/

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Dışişleri Bakanlığı. (2020, Kasım 4). No: 276, 4 Kasım 2020, "Bozkurtlar Hareketi"nin Kapatılmasına İlişkin Bakanlar Kurulu Kararı Hk. Erişim Adresi: https://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-276_-bozkurtlar-hareketinin-kapatilmasina-iliskin-bakanlar-kurulu-karari-hk.tr.mfa

Vincent, A. (2013).The Advantages of Repeat Interviews in a Study. *International Journal of Research&Method in Education*, 36(4), 341-354.

Williams, M. (2003). Words, Images, Enemies: Securitisation and International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), 511-531.

Yıldırım, A., Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yüksel, S. (2014). Securitization Of Migration: The Case Of Turkey-EU Relations. *Marmara Journal Of European Studies* 22(1), 169-187.