



Bachelor Thesis in Public Administration (ES)
**“How comparable is the Turkish AK Parti to European
Christian Democratic parties?”**

Martijn Vlaskamp
University of Twente/ The Netherlands
Academic year 2007/08

Bsc Thesis in Public Administration (ES)

University of Twente/ The Netherlands

Tutor: Dr. M. Rosema

Co-Reader: Dr. P.W.A. Scholten

Submitted on 1 August 2008



**“How comparable is the Turkish AK Parti to European
Christian Democratic parties?”**

Martijn Vlaskamp

Student number: s0045519

St,-Martin-Str.19

47574 Goch-Pfalzdorf

Germany

m.c.vlaskamp@student.utwente.nl

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	6
2.	The background of Christian Democracy and the AKP	9
2.1	Christian Democracy	9
2.2	The AKP	12
2.3	Conclusion of this chapter	20
3.	Comparison of the dimensions	21
3.1	Methodology	21
3.2	Economical dimension	23
3.3	Social policy	26
3.4	Religion	28
3.5	Environment	30
3.6	Nationalism	32
3.7	Decentralisation	35
3.8	Immigration	38
3.9	Europe	40
4.	Conclusion	44
	Literature	46
	Appendix 1: Complete lists of all dimensions	51
.	Appendix 2: The parable of the talents (Matthew 25, 14-30)	67
	Appendix 3: Member parties of the European People's Party	68

Abstract

In this bachelor thesis the Turkish AK Parti is compared with European Christian Democratic parties. The parties are compared with the results of expert surveys by Benoit and Laver on eight different dimensions. The results of these comparisons are analysed to explain the similarities and differences. As definition for a Christian Democratic party a membership in the EPP is used.

In empirical terms the AKP fitted into the patterns of Christian Democratic parties. However, a closer analysis of the compared dimensions showed that many similarities and differences can be attributed to the special Turkish situation. The attitudes of the AKP can in many cases be more attributed to the domestic situation in Turkey as to ideological similarities. Summarising they are more ‘social conservative’ as most Christian Democratic parties and even economical liberal. However, the main conclusion is that the AKP as a party is due to his history and its setup a Turkish phenomenon and it is very hard to put them in a European political framework. It is not correct to see them just as an Islamic variant of “Christian Democracy”, for that there many of its political priorities are too much connected to the Turkish scenario as to the Christian Democratic ideology. But since they are in a quite unique situation within the European party spectrum the EPP looks as the natural ally and, if they enter one day the European parliament, its fraction could be an appropriate place for the AKP.

Foreword

In the summer of 2006 I did an internship at 'Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı' (Foundation of Sciences in Arts) in Istanbul. The main part of this internship was to learn more about Turkey and about Islam, since the foundation had a religious background. The foundation understood itself as a platform on what scientists could freely work and overcome limitations that they had at their own Universities to academic work and teaching. Most of the participants were religious people and so was –only to give two short anecdotal examples- the canteen closed in the Ramadan and had the building its own prayer room. However, in this period I thus got in touch with another view on Turkish politics as the one that, at least in those days, usually was broadcasted in European media. Many of the people who worked there had a more critical view on Kemalism and explained me their ideas about the relationship between religion and state in Turkey. This period in Istanbul formed the inspiration to this bachelor thesis. Although it is not written as direct result of an internship I included a lot of the insights and knowledge I got there.

This bachelor thesis took eventually almost on year to finish due to organisation problems. (I missed on First Year subject till I officially was permitted to start) And when I was almost at the end the public prosecutor in Turkey started a disbanding procedure against my research object –the AK Parti- at the Constitutional Court. Since I was afraid that a disbanded party wouldn't be a very relevant topic anymore it felt in the last weeks of my writing sometime as a race against this Court. However, eventually the Court didn't follow the Prosecutor and this topic stays actual and I hope interesting to the reader.

Last, but not least I want to thank some people. First of all, of course, my supervisor Dr. Martin Rosema, who gave me helpful and critical advises. I also want to thank the co-reader Dr. Peter Scholten who wanted to fulfil this role at a very short notice. And finally I want to thank the people at the Foundation of Sciences and Arts in Istanbul, without whom I would never had started with this project at all.

Enschede, August 1 2008

Martijn Vlaskamp

1. Introduction

In the summer of 2008 Turkish political life was paralysed by the spectacular case at the Constitutional Court against the ruling ‘Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi’¹ (AKP), which was accused of anti-secular activities. At July 30 2008, the eleven judges voted by six to five for closure. But under the court's rules, at least seven votes in favour were needed for a dissolution ruling. The court instead opted to strip the party of state funding - a verdict that implied the AKP has been guilty of anti-secularism but not sufficiently to justify closure. The showdown at the Constitutional Court was widely assumed as the last step of a power struggle in the country between the Islamist-rooted government and the secular establishment that feels itself committed to the Turkish ‘state ideology’ Kemalism, which was created by state founder Kemal Atatürk. (Tait, 2008)

This power struggle between this old Kemalist nomenclature and the newcomers from the AKP is going on for years in Turkish politics now. Since its foundation in 2002 the AKP was confronted with accusations that it was a ‘wolf in sheep’s clothes’ that had the final goal to transform Turkey into an Islamic state. The fact that most of its prominent members were rooted in political Islam and some of them, even prime minister Erdoğan, had spend time in prison for “incitement to religious hatred” even enhanced this perception. (Gottschlich, 2004, 88) On the other hand the AKP could celebrate spectacular electoral successes in the past: in the national elections in July 2007 it gained 47 percent of the votes and an absolute majority in the Turkish parliament. With this landslide victory it was the first governing party in Turkey since 1954 that could even increase its votes. (The Economist a, 2007)

Also different many western analysts don’t share the critical assessment of the Kemalist elite and the Constitutional Court: Michael Thuman from German opinion paper ‘Die Zeit’ called the electoral success of the AKP for instance “a vote against authoritarians and for democracy”. He described Erdoğan as an important Turkish reformer who wants to modernise his country into a normal western democracy. (Thuman, 2007, 6) British magazine ‘The Economist’ tried to approach the phenomenon AKP by putting it in a European political framework and described the party as an Islamic version of European Christian-democratic parties, like the German CDU or the Dutch CDA. (The Economist b, 2007) It argued that the

¹ In English: Justice and Development Party

AKP tries to merge (western) democratic values with Islamic values. This –in western media quite popular- assessment is the starting point of this paper. Since the AKP is a relatively new phenomenon the paper will attempt to compare it with European Christian Democratic parties to get a better view on it and to see if it is compatible with the European party system. The main question that will be tackled in this paper is: How comparable is the AKP to European Christian Democratic parties?

To answer this main question we have to solve two questions first: (1) how to compare the AKP with such a heterogeneous party family as the Christian Democrats and (2) how to define if a party is Christian Democratic.

The first question will be approached in two different ways which are interlinked with each other: a historical dimension and the results of an expert survey. The reason for this ‘double strategy’ is to provide deeper insight in the motives of different political preferences. As Peter Mair states parties have two goals: the first is survival, the second is success. Both goals are of course multi-faceted and in different systems as well as across different parties the definition and ordering of these goals may vary significantly. (Mair et al, 2004, 264) So if a party has the ambition to play a central role in the political arena, which as well most Christian Democratic catch-all-parties as the AKP have, they have to look at the special demands of their electoral market. Since the AKP is the protagonist of this paper we have to know how it has positioned itself in this market in the past to survive and succeed, and contrast it with the Christian Democratic parties. So the goal of chapter 2 is to create background knowledge which is necessary to understand the preferences of the parties on different issues in the third chapter.

In chapter 3 we will compare the AKP with Christian Democratic parties. Of course there is yet a lot of work done in the field of comparative party policy positions and there is a plurality of different approaches. (e.g. Manifesto analysis like Budge et al, or mass surveys like Thomassen and Schmidt) This paper will use expert surveys as measurement and will rely on the dataset by Kenneth Benoit and Michael Laver that they presented in their book “Party Policies in Modern Democracies” in 2006. In their book they compared the policy positions of political parties in 47 countries on a number of different dimensions. (We will take a closer look on the methodology in chapter 3.1)

There are different advantages of this approach, the most relevant for us is that it uses the a priori approach to estimate key political parameters. First informal surveys of expert judgement are used to identify the key policy dimensions in a country. Once, the experts have placed the parties in the pre-defined scales it is much easier to compare them since it eliminates any ambiguity or guesswork from interpreting final results and minimised interpretation of results by the researchers that could influence the results. So we can assume that the material on which this paper bases is not biased by researchers and can thus form a sensible source for comparative research. (Benoit and Laver, 2006, 110-114)

To use the dataset we have to answer question 2, how we define if a party is Christian Democratic or not. The best way seems to take a membership in a Christian Democratic umbrella organisation as criterion. (e.g. the Centrist Democratic International) In this paper we will use a membership in the European People's Party (EPP) as evidence that a party is Christian Democratic. The EPP defines itself as Christian-Democratic party in its basic programme and bases it explicitly on "Judaean-Christian values". (EPP, 1992, 3) Another advantage is that the AKP has an observer status in this organisation, so this forms some guarantee that our comparison is not completely absurd.

The basic programme of the EPP, that it gave itself in 1992, will form the fundament of the textual comparison with the AKP in the second part of this paper. It is of course not possible in this paper to compare the AKP to each European Christian Democratic party individually. One way would be to look at cases but there is always the threat that just this party is in a special situation on this dimension. Since all member parties accept this basic programme of the EPP we can assume that it forms a 'common sense' of the member parties and thus forms a more trustable tool to compare the AKP's stances with Christian Democratic ideas. (In Appendix 3 there is a complete overview of all member parties of the EPP)

However, this paper doesn't just provide statistical evidence for its conclusions but will be also attempt to interpret them in the light of the special situation in Turkey. To get a better view on the similarities and disparities, all dimensions that are used are briefly put in the Turkish context and the position of the AKP is compared with the positions of the Christian Democratic parties. In chapter 4 this paper will conclude with a general analysis and an answer to the main question if the AKP is comparable to European Christian Democratic parties.

2. The backgrounds of Christian Democracy and the AKP

2.1 Christian Democracy

Of course there are complete books written about the history of the Christian Democracy and this chapter can only provide a very narrow overview about its 'character'. As explained in the introduction do parties have to look at their domestic electoral market to survive. So similarities in electoral markets create more similarities in a party family while big differences create of course disparities. Exemplary we can think about the different social and economic situation in the North Western countries of the European Union and the new member states in the East. Due to these differences Christian Democratic parties have to find a balance within their ideological background and the electoral needs.

Most Christian Democratic parties in Europe have the ambition to be so-called catch-all parties, thus not so focus on particular social or economical groups but attempt to form a social roof for an as broad as possible social alliance. But this ambition requires of course some ideological flexibility so that different scholars argue that, given the range of policies and ideas advocated by themselves Christian-democratic calling parties over the years in different countries, there is a little rationale for treating such parties as a distinctive party family beyond their common religious origin. Heywood argues for instance that Christian-democracy is only an ideological tradition within European conservatism that is characterised by a commitment to the social market and qualified economic intervention that was developed after World War II (Heywood, 1998, 327) Nevertheless the label 'Christian Democratic' is worn by parties in almost all European countries, and also the largest fraction in the European parliament –the EPP- identifies itself explicitly with this term in its basic programme. (EPP, 1992, 1) So you can at least conclude that the term 'Christian Democracy' has a meaning on the complete continent and can put in the political framework by voters.

The roots of the European Christian-democracy start at least in the 19th century. The political philosophy developed as a result of the revolutions of 1848/49 and the industrialising and should provide a political alternative to nationalism, liberalism and socialism. These social changes forced especially the Roman Catholic Church to react on the new realities since the new ideologies formed threat to its position. As the founding paper of Christian Democracy is widely the papal encyclical "Rerum Novarum" (1891) by Pope Leo XIII considered in which the fundamentals of the Catholic social teaching are formed. In it he is trying to find a third

way between the new ideas of liberalism and socialism. At one hand he criticised the Socialist ideas and restates the central role of private property. On the other hand he argues against unrestricted capitalism and claimed that the free operation of market forces must be tempered by moral considerations. The Pope also advised the workers to form trade unions and to bargain collectively to get a stronger voice, but he opposed state interventions. So, already in this first document the, for Christian democracy essential, idea of subsidiarity is used by quoting Thomas of Aquin: “As the part and the whole are the same in a certain sense, so the property of a part is in certain sense property of the whole.” (Klink, 1991, 73)

With the first elections in the 19th century also different Christian inspired parties were founded as for instance the German Catholic ‘Zentrumspartei’ (1870) the Dutch Catholic ‘Algemeene Bond van Roomsche-Katholieke Kiesverenigen’ (1904) and the Protestant ‘Anti-Revolutionaire Partij’ (1879). But, as the pope Leo XIII had recommended, also Catholic unions, charities, workers sports clubs and other organisations were started. The church assumed that this would be the best way to protect its member from the influence of socialism and other concurring ideologies. The same reason also motivated Protestant churches to start similar organisations.

The position of the Roman Catholic Church on this matter was further clarified in a subsequent encyclical, ‘Quadragesimo Anno’, by Pius XI in 1931. Pius XI affirmed in it the idea that private property is essential for the freedom and development of the individual. But, so Pius, private property has a social function as well. Private Property loses its morality, if it is not subordinated under the common good. So, in extreme cases, the state has the right to interfere.

The political star of Christian Democracy rose quickly after World War II. In most countries the traditional party system was more or less erased. Especially the Communists and Socialists seemed to profit from this situation. While the centre-right and conservative political forces in most European countries were discredited by allowing the fascists come to power (Germany, Italy) or collaborated with the enemy (France) Communists and democratic Socialists had been spearheads of the resistance. Especially the Communists formed a serious threat to the recovering democracies in Italy and France. As an alternative to the “left endangerment” Christianity, especially in its Roman-Catholic form was discovered. In most countries the Catholic Church was the only major organisation that was neither Communist nor Socialist

that hadn't collaborated structurally with the fascists. So Christian-democracy could form a binding political idea for conservative voters. (Hale, 2006, 67-70)

This recovering marked the beginning of modern political Christian Democracy: the parties were installed as a broad movement, so that for instance in Western Germany former Christian political prisoners were in one party with former middle-rank Nazi-officials. In Western Germany the CDU was founded after the war with many members of the former Zentrumspartei, but with the goal to include not only Catholics, but also Protestants, in a common confessional and conservative party.

Also in many western European countries the Christian Democratic parties grew very quickly. Already at the beginning of the 1950ies Christian democrat parties had dominant or near-dominant positions in six European countries. (Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Western Germany) Most voters were Christians, usually Catholics, from different social layers.

Because of their significant role in the European politics in the 1950ies and 1960ies the different Christian Democratic politicians played an important role in the beginning of the European integration process. Most of the founding fathers of the predecessors of the European Union were Christian Democrats. Prominent examples are Robert Schuman and Konrad Adenauer. This devotion to the European unification process is still an important shared ideal of the European Christian Democrat parties.

Many scholars expected that the decline of organised Christianity in post-war Europe would also cause a decline of the political Christian-democracy. And the role of Christian-democracy in for instance Italy and France is today, due to different reasons, indeed marginalised. But at the other side are in most other western-European countries parties who refer to themselves as Christian-democrats still a major party and in most cases even in power (e.g. Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany). In these countries the parties managed to stay a major political force in a more and more secularised world. In Germany, for instance, regular church attendance by Catholics fell from 61 percent in 1953 to 32 percent by 1987, with attendance by Protestants falling from 18 percent to only 4 percent between the same dates. In 2000 about 10 percent of the population of the former West Germany, and half of that of the former East Germany, admitted to be nonreligious. (Hall, 2006, 73) Nevertheless the CDU is

still a major political force, even in East Germany where they deliver the prime ministers in two of the five states. The Christian Democratic countries managed to become also interesting to voters without a religious background as centric party between socialism and liberalism (e.g. the CDA in the Netherlands) or as big 'people's party' from the centre till the conservatives (e.g. the German CDU). The election of Christian Democrat Angela Merkel as German chancellor is often used as an example of this 'new' Christian Democracy: she is a woman, protestant, divorced and was member of Communist organisations in her youth in the GDR. These four attributes would have made her completely unvotable to most Christian Democratic voters forty years ago.

Summarising we have to take in account for our analysis following aspects. First, we have to be aware of the fact that many Christian Democratic parties are defined as 'catch-all'-parties in their countries. Since issues and priorities in these countries differ we will see some large differences between the parties. Secondly, we have to see the Christian Democratic parties as proponents of a 'Third Way' between Socialism and Liberalism. The core values are linked to the Catholic social teaching and are solidarity and subsidiarity. (The value 'subsidiarity' will be explained in chapter 3.7)

2.2 The AK Parti

Although there is a relatively strict separation between religion and state in almost all European countries only few people saw Christian Democratic parties as a threat to the secularity of their countries. Turkey had also known more religious inspired parties in its history, but usually they were very careful with the religious label 'Islamic'. Also the AKP, which is widely assumed as at least by the Islam inspired, doesn't use the word in its official party programme and relates only once explicit it by concluding with the wish that 'Allah (may) be the beloved and assistant of our nation' (AKP, 2002, 63). The hesitance is only to understand if you look on the special relationship of religion and state in Turkey.

To track this relationship back we have to look at the Ottoman Empire, the predecessor of the present Turkey. The power of the state relied in the Empire heavily on Islam with as most significant symbol the sultan at the top of the state, who had the title "the shadow of Allah on earth" and was the official head of the Islamic nation (*umma*). Officially all new laws had to be inspected if they weren't in conflict with the Holy Quran. (Canatan, 2001, 25-39)

His position got weaker already at the end of the 19th century, but the big caesura came with the foundation of the modern Turkish state by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1923 (Züricher, 2004, 50ff) As his major political goal he saw the establishment of a new society according to western models. This was, in his eyes, the best way to make Turkey a “civilised” nation that could defend its independence against western colonialism. (Canatan, 2001, 32) A central part of his modernisation-programme was a secularisation of the new Turkish state. In Atatürk’s eyes this didn’t only mean to separate state and religion. He actively tried to push religion back in the private life. His secularisation politics consisted out of three dimensions: institutional, symbolic and social secularisation.

The first step was the secularisation of state, education and the legal system. He eliminated the sultanate and the caliphate, introduced a republic with a new constitution and replaced the last remaining religious laws by western law books. Religious institutions as the fatwa-institute Sheikh ul-Islam and the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Pious Organisations were disestablished. He replaced them by the ‘Diyanet İşleri Müdürlüğü’ (Office of Religious Affairs) and the ‘Evkaf Umum Müdürlüğü’. (Office for Pious organisations) This is a very important part of Atatürk’s reforms: he didn’t separate religion and state but enhanced the control of the state about religious affairs.

The second step was the replacement of religious symbols by western symbols. He prohibited for instance the traditional fez and it was only allowed to wear religious clothes at religious services in the mosque. Atatürk even replaced the (Islamic) free day of Friday by the (Christian) Sunday. These, and other steps as the introduction of the Latin alphabet, had a huge symbolic meaning. With these reforms the new political elite made clear that they preferred the western lifestyle about the traditional, oriental one.

The third step was the social secularisation. In the Ottoman Empire there had been an “official” Islam of academics and officials and a grassroots Islam, with many old traditions and powerful religious orders like the dervishes. Atatürk attacked directly this people’s Islam. He prohibited the traditional dervish-orders and closed a lot of monasteries and sacral memorials. The objective of these steps was to abolish all institutions between the individuals and the state. In the positivist ideology of Atatürk they were also an obstacle in the way to a scientific common sense. (Züricher, 2004, 172) (Canatan, 2001, 32)

The ideas of Atatürk became the official ideology of the Turkish Republic. The political programme of his Republican People’s Party was even integrated in the Turkish constitution

in 1937. Also after his death in 1938 this ideology, which is called 'Kemalizm' (Kemalism), stayed the fundament of the state. To replace the old idea of Islam as connecting element of the state Atatürk (and his successors) introduced a very strong Turkish nationalism that should replace the bounding role of the religion. Summarising we can say that the transformation from the Ottoman Empire to a modern Turkish state meant the change from an Islamic "Umma-society" to a western "nation-society". This is actually very special in the Islamic world in which religion and state are usually heavily interwoven. Thus, to refer back to Christian Democracy, while in most European states there had been a separation between Church and state since Napoleon, Turkey made these changes hundred years later.

Since this model is quite unique in the Islamic world, the Kemalist elite usually perceives every form of political Islam forms as a threat to the secular nature of the state. (The most recent example was of course this case at the Constitutional Court in the summer of 2008) In the tradition of Atatürk the state still tries to hold a grip on the organised religion to control it as far as possible: the Office of Religious Affairs for instance manages all mosques in Turkey and has almost 89.000 employees. (Most of them are Imans, muezzins or Quran teachers) (Canatan, 2001, 32)

Through the years there were several parties in Turkish politics which relied implicitly or explicitly on Islam as framework for its political beliefs. Also the state had periods in what it was less hesitant to Islam as part of nationalism: in the 1970ies the so-called Turkish-Islamic synthesis was developed. This synthesis, which was created by the political right in that period, claimed that Turkishness and Islam are equally important elements of the Turkish identity. It emphasised the great contribution of the Turkish Nation to Islamic civilisation and often implied the superiority of the Turkish interpretation of Islam. It was an effort to enforce the national aspects of social identity; one had to be proud to be a Turk, since Turks were the best servants and interpreters of Islam. As an ideology it was conflicting at one hand with the secular Kemalism, but on the other hand also with Islamism that puts more emphasis on the idea of an 'Ummah', thus a global community of believers beyond the nation state. (Mert, 2000, 79-81)

But as the breakthrough of political Islam is usually the election of "Millî Görüş"-father Necmettin Erbakan as prime minister in 1996 seen. In the 1995-elections his party, the Welfare Party, had become with 22 percent the strongest party in Turkey. This success can't

only partly be attributed to the Islamic nature of the party. According to Ali Çarkoğlu was the electoral success a result of the high level of alienation from the political system in general and a serious degree of dissatisfaction with government politics. So a party outside the system, as what the Welfare Party was seen, was a good alternative for many voters. According to his research the Turkish voters have the highest volatility score of Europe. (Çarkoğlu, 1998, 124) This dissatisfaction with the political parties and its representatives formed also one of the reasons of the electoral success of the AKP.

The rise of the Welfare Party ended in 1997 when in a so-called “post-modern coup” the Turkish army forced more or less Prime Minister Erbakan to resign. In the following months, a lot of steps were done to suppress the political activities of the Islamists: the constitutional court banned the Welfare Party and Erbakan personally was banned from politics for five years, a sentence later increased to a life ban. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who was a quite popular and successful mayor in Istanbul at that time, was accused of inciting religious hatred and sentenced to ten months in prison. (Züricher, 2004, 300)

After the ban of the Welfare Party in 1998 its members founded a new party, the Virtue Party. But in 1999 the Virtue Party was accused of being a direct continuation of the Welfare Party and after a two year case the constitutional court banned this party again. This brought to a head the debates within the Virtue Party between the conservatives, who were in favour of a strict Islamist line and the modernists who wanted to turn the party into a broad right of centre movement and jettison the Islamist rhetoric. When the modernists lost out, they broke away under the leadership of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Abdullah Gül to form the AKP on 14 August 2001. The conservatives went under a new name yet again, this time that of ‘Saadet Partisi’ (Party of Happiness) (Züricher, 2004, 304)

In the following national elections at November, 3rd 2002 they AKP polled more than 34 percent and gained the absolute majority in the National Assembly. The Republican People’s Party was with 19 percent the only other party that passed the 10 percent threshold. With 363 seats in the 550-seat parliament the AKP could rely on a comfortable majority.

The dramatic rise had, according to Erik-Jan Züricher (2004, 306), several causes. One was the rejection by the voters of the parties of the government coalition. These were hold responsible for the collapse of the financial system at the end of the 20th century. Another was

the existence of the floating vote. As the success of the Welfare Party already had shown traditional party loyalties seemed almost completely to have disappeared. The Turkish voters were prepared to vote anyone who could offer hope.

A crucial role played the figure of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. He was not only a charismatic leader with a working class background who could appeal to the masses. But in his years as mayor of the Istanbul metropolitan area he had also proved himself as a very popular and successful public servant. So he formed a perfect mix of “outside the system” (because of a conviction for “inciting to religious hatred” he could not even stand as a candidate himself) and at the same time he had credibility as an administrator. Most of the Turkish voters voted him, because they believed that he and his party could end poverty and corruption in their state, not because they wanted an Islamic state. However, the AKP even trounced the “real” Islamists of the Party of Happiness in Konya, their heartland.

Another reason, which also had promoted the growth of the Welfare Party, was the demographic development. The Turkish electorate is, according to Mardin, divided by a centre-periphery cleavage. Mardin argues that Turkish politics is built around a strong and coherent state run by a distinct group of elites. These hardline Republicans fear the dismantling of the secularist legacy of Kemalism. This secular establishment comprised the military top brass, upper echelons of the bureaucracy and judiciary, some of the prominent figures of the intelligentsia and a number of established political parties like the Republican People’s Party, which was even founded by Atatürk. (Cinar, 2006, 469) This centre is organised around the Kemalist secular principles and represents a centralist, nationalist and state protectionist voice. As political heirs of Kemal Atatürk they see Islam as incompatible with both democracy and modernity.

On the other side is the so-called “periphery”. This heterogeneous group was traditionally composed by peasantry, small farmers and artisans. They are more conservative and religious. (Çarkoğlu, 1998, 133) Since the economic reforms in the 1960ies many members of this group went to the big cities as Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir. And more and more members of this group became economic successful and demanded more political power. The AKP managed it to become a voice of this new middleclass and to canalise their need for more political power in crosses on the ballot cards. Hence, Cinar (2006, 471ff) argues that the “battle” between the AKP and this old elite is not about Islam but more about reforming the old-fashioned

Kemalism by a modern system. He defines Kemalism as a state-centered, elite-defined and illiberal modernisation project:

“Kemalism denies what politics pre-supposes, i.e., identity and interest differences, and confuses unity with uniformity/homogeneity. It therefore cannot see politics as an integrative societal activity of identity and interest differences; since politics is by definition an activity of differences, it keeps an eye on the political sphere so as to control the polity while purporting to “modernize” it. To the extent that the development of a healthy civil society and democratic civility is dependent on the creation of a civilized and self-limiting state that is open to public participation, Kemalism today can be considered as a hindrance to democracy.” (Cinar, 2006, 471)

This old understanding of modernisation resulted, according to the AKP, in a bureaucratic-statist form of state-society relationship that kept the domains of state intervention quite large. So the party argued that such a relationship hindered societal dynamism, economic development and further modernisation because it does not set society free from the conservative grip of the state. (Cinar, 2005, 476)

As a reaction on these problems the AKP wanted to introduce a “conservative democracy” in Turkey. Thus, as Erdoğan defined it, “a concept of modernity that does not reject tradition, a belief of universalism that accepts localism, an understanding of rationalism that does not disregard the spiritual meaning of life, and a choice for change that is not fundamentalist.” (Erdoğan, 2004, 335) Eventually, Turkey should even get a new, more liberal, constitution that would end many of the old Kemalist structures.

After the election victory of the AKP, the appointment of Erdoğan as prime minister was delayed due to legal reasons. But when he was finally elected prime minister on 9 March 2003 he could start the ambitious programme of the AKP. However, in his function as Prime Minister he, probably the experiences of the Welfare Party in his mind, didn’t search the direct confrontation with the powerful military. As a guarantee of his reforms Erdoğan used the Turkish EU-bid. “Our fundamental objective” Abdullah Gül then Minister of Foreign Affairs- declared, “is to transform Turkey into a fully functioning European democracy.” An EU-membership was at that time a sort of “Holy Grail” of the secular forces in Turkey. A Turkish EU-membership would be the clearest symbol of a Turkish west-integration and so it

was hard to argue against the reforms of the AKP. The AKP introduced plenty of reforms in its first years in power, and almost all of them were made within the framework of fulfilling the Copenhagen Criteria, a precondition for the start of accession negotiations with the EU. Underlying the AKP's strong political will behind the Europeanization project is that "the only way for this party to survive in power and endure is through a liberal transformation of the Turkish polity and its civilization." (Cinar, 2005, 480) However, as will be shown and explained in paragraph 3.9 the reform spirit fatigued after some years.

After crisis around the election of new President, which formed another political battlefield between the Kemalists and the AKP, Erdoğan had to call fresh elections four months ahead of schedule in 2007. These elections ended in a huge victory of the AKP and support of there politics. The party could even increase its votes and won 47 percent of the vote on July 22nd, a 12-point increase in the vote. Especially the government's strong economic performance (7.3 percent average annual grow, record foreign investment and lower inflation) persuaded many Turks to vote for the AKP again. (The Economist b, 2007)

In the period after that the reform fatigue of the AKP slowed down. The biggest reform was to tackle a very sensitive issue: to permit headscarves at Universities. In Turkey the ban of headscarves is a very symbolic issue, for Kemalists it demonstrates the separation of religion and state, while it is assumed as a symbol of the discrimination of religious people by the AKP. So, stopping this ban is a political minefield, and it was halted –after some weeks- by the (Kemalist) Constitutional Court, which argued that an end of the ban would form an attack on the secular nature of the state. This discussion also formed the direct reason for the ban proposal in March 2008 and was used as the main argument by the Public Prosecutor. And also this case symbolised the cleavage in Turkish society at the moment: 53.3 percent of the respondents were against a ban, 34.3 percent for. (Outshoorn, 2008, 5) As we have seen did the Constitutional Court decided on the edge not to ban the party but as some form of punishment to cut 50 percent of its state funding. Observers see this as some form of warning to the AKP to look for broader alliances for its politics and to include Kemalist ideas. (Tait, 2008)

2.3 Conclusion of this chapter

We started this chapter with the goal to get a better idea of the ‘nature of the beast’ and to see what similarities and disparities there are in the development of Christian Democracy and the AKP. After this short overview we can already see some similarities, but also some disparities that we have to take in consideration when we look at the issues in the next chapter.

The most obvious similarity is of course the religious background of both parties. They are both rooted in a religious milieu and their ideologies are related to the moral framework of their religions. However, both of them at least claim not to be radical in these political thoughts and to accept the primacy of the secular order above the religious laws.

A very strong difference we have to take into consideration is the role of religion in Turkey and the other European states. In most European countries there is some form of balance between the religious world and the secular world. In some countries there is a very strict separation (e.g. France) and in other countries the Churches are seen as important social partners. (e.g. Germany) However, there is a balance and almost no one would expect a “Christian” party to have a secret agenda to transform the state in a Christian theocracy. Christian Democracy parties are in the middle of the state and have, in many cases, even formed the modern state after World War II. In the Netherlands or Germany it is still quite hard to form even a government without the Christian Democratic party, since they play such central roles.

The AKP, and also its Islamic predecessor parties, are in a complete different situation. They form a maverick of the political establishment of Turkey and are even accused to be in conflict with the nature of the state. On the other hand, while most Christian Democratic parties are usually hesitant to big changes in the fundamentals of the state (which is not so strange since they often shaped its form) the AKP wants to transform fundamental elements and had even plans to install a new constitution. So, while the AKP is at one hand a ‘value conservative’ party it is very progressive in radical changes in its country. Such a revolutionary spirit is normally not seen among Christian Democratic parties.

Another important factor is the electorate. The old European Christian Democratic parties are offspring’s of the Catholic Social Teaching which was developed in at the end of the 19th

century. Since they are related to –for instance- Catholics they have usually a very broad focus, they have to find internally compromises between the different Catholic social layers and are so in the middle of the political spectrum. Usually Christian Democratic parties are seen as catch-all parties. This role even increased with the decline of organised religion in Western Europe: many Christian Democratic parties are nowadays seen as ‘ordinary’ centre till centre-right parties and also attractive to non-religious voters.

This is to a certain extent also a similarity with the AKP. The AKP is at one hand the party of the poor Turks and the countryside, but on the other hand also of the new middle class that developed from this social group in the past decades. So the AKP always has to find a middle way between the economic needs of the social weaker (and thus more spending for social projects) and a more liberal course that the new merchants of the middle class favour. This balance act is to some extent comparable with the balance act between ‘socialism’ and ‘liberalism’ that Christian Democracy is doing since its foundation.

3. Comparison of the dimensions

3.1 The Methodology

Since the dataset of Benoit and Laver is one of the fundamentals of this paper it is probably helpful to get a short idea how it is applied in this paper. Benoit and Laver have chosen the method of expert survey for their party comparison. Hence, their first step was to gather separate lists of country specialists, either provided by the national political science association of the concerned countries, or compiled meticulously from academic and organisational listings. The next step was, to select candidate policy dimensions for each country's survey and let it conform by at least two local experts in each country. Their goal was to use as far as possible the same criteria for all country but there are still some dimensions which can only be found back in few countries. For instance former communist countries have a list of special dimensions, like the extent of privatisation or the role of former Communist party officials in public life. (Laver and Benoit, 2006, 9) For this paper of course only the dimensions were interesting on which Turkish parties, and in particular the AKP, were judged by the experts. So out of the 38 different dimensions the authors used, in total only ten plus the general left-right dimension are exerted². These are the issues that we will look on in this chapter.³

The approach to the research question is to compare these values with the average values of Christian Democratic parties and measure if the AKP fits in the patterns of the party family. To define Christian Democratic values, the results of other parties of the EPP are used. What is done in this paper is that all parties of the EPP, are put in one list and we will try to see if the AKP fits in that patter or differs a lot from the average. (In appendix 1 the complete lists on these issues are presented) Since only parties from EU-member states can be full member of the EPP the AKP will only be compared to EU-27 parties. The reason for this decision is that you can assume that most of the issues in the other countries (especially in the former

² EU-applicants, like Turkey, have the policy dimension 'EU Joining', which refers to the position of a party on a EU membership of its country. On the other hand the parties in EU-member states have some dimensions on the EU, like for example its position on the range of areas in which the EU can set policy. One of them is chosen to compare the parties on the dimension 'Europe'

³ One dimension won't be used in this paper which is the attitude towards NATO. Next to Turkey only Cyprus and Luxembourg were included so that it didn't make much sense to use it. However, the values can be found in the appendix 1.

Soviet Union) differed so much from European issues that a comparison would be not very valid. To make a relatively recent comparison only the data of the last elections were used.

At the beginning of every dimension there will be given a short overview of the results in a table to give a quick orientation. The table will provide the exact question, the parties with the lowest and highest vales, the EPP average, the AKP and the two parties which are directly next to the AKP located.

Table 1: ‘Please locate each party on a general left-right dimension, taking all aspects of party policy in account. Left (1) Right (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	8,66
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	14,1
26.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	14,14
27.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	14,28
28.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	14,3
47.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	18,13

Table 1, which shows the general left-right dimension, is an example of such an overview. We can see that the AKP is very close to the average of the EPP, although we have to take into consideration that the EPP-party spectrum obviously reaches from centre left (PSL) till very right (TP). The AKP is, as the EPP, average centre right in this spectrum and 27th out of 47 parties, which is thus also quite close to the median.

3.2 Economical dimension ('Taxes vs. Spending' and 'Deregulation')

On these dimensions the experts were asked to estimate parties on their financial policies (Taxes vs. Spending) and its view on the influence of the state on the market (Deregulation). As table 2 shows there is some discrepancy on the dimension of 'Taxes vs. Spending'. The AKP has the second lowest value of all researched parties and is also left of the EPP average. The AKP slightly tends to promote raising taxes to increase public services more than the cutting of public services. However, this is still not a quite moderate left position.

Table 2: Taxes vs. Spending: 'Promotes raising taxes to increase public services' (1) till 'Promotes cutting public services' (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	6,1
2.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	8,2
3.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	8,5
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,7
48.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	17,7

Interestingly, they are on the other economical dimension - 'Deregulation' - more right and favour deregulation of markets. Most Christian Democratic parties can be found right of the centre and the value of the AKP is thus quite close to the average of the EPP and the median.

Table 3: Deregulation: 'Favours high levels of state regulation and control of the market' (1) till 'Favours deregulation of markets at every opportunity' (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	9,82
5.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	12,36
6.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	13,36
7.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	13,43
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	13,9
14.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	17,88

As we have seen in chapter 2.1 Christian Democracy is usually seen as a middle way between the regulated market ideology of socialism and the free market ideology of liberalism. It clearly endorses economical freedom, but also emphasises the responsibilities that freedom

creates. From their perspective citizens have to recognise these duties and responsibilities otherwise (economical) freedom can even pose a threat to the fabric of society. (Haywood, 1998, 31). The EPP summarises this position in its Basic Programme as following: “We believe that genuine freedom mean autonomy and responsibility, not irresponsible independence. It renders every person responsible for their actions according their conscience and also before their community and the future generations”. (European People’s Party, 1992, 4) The consequence of this argumentation is that individuals are, from a Christian Democratic perspective, obliged to take part in the construction of society. No human being can freely exist without being part of a community; because people can only experience full freedom in company with others.

The construction of society and thus also economical and social progress is seen by religiously inspired Christian-Democrats as a contribution to “God’s work of creation and freedom”. The world is not seen as a property of mankind, humans are only stewards of God. So they have the duty to take care for the world and provide it for future generations. As biblical inspiration for these values often the parable of the talents is used. (Matthew 25: 14-30) (Appendix 2) Most Christians interpret this parable in a way that it means that diligence in carrying out one's responsibilities is essential for more important tasks in the future. Thus humans are obligated to lead a good life and use the “talents” given by God in a good way. This gives for instance the obligation to treat the environment in a good way. But it doesn’t only mean the nature, but also gifts and talents in science, technics, labour and culture. So from a Christian perspective people are obliged to make the best out of all the talents they have, an idea which is of course very favourable to the personal ambitions and economical development of the individual.

The picture of the AKP in the two economical dimensions is rather ambivalent: while it is obviously tending to a more centre-left stance in the ‘Taxes vs. Spending’ dimension, it favours deregulation of markets. This looks somewhat paradox and the picture doesn’t get much clearer if we take a closer look on the party programme of 2002. First, of all we have to take into consideration that Turkey was in a deep economical crisis at the time. The economical crash in 2001 had caused massive unemployment and put the public finances under huge pressure. The tax revenues for 2002 didn’t even cover the amount of interest on public debt. (Salihoglu, 2002, 25) So it was pretty obvious that the public finances needed to be reformed and the AKP supports in its programme clearly economical liberal positions:

privatisation⁴, deregulation and to some extent even a night watchman state.⁵ This explains its tendency to deregulation on our scale.

However, the AKP also has to take in consideration its electorate. As Başlevent et al (2002, 558) show is its electoral success in the 2002-elections to a large extent based on the poor economic performance of the incumbent government. Voters, who stated that their household's economic situation had worsened over the past year, belonged to the main voter groups of the AKP. Since the economical losers form one of the core voter groups it looks - from a tactical perspective- understandable, that the AKP had to moderate its tune in regard to privatisations in the social security. In its party programme it advocates special programmes for the needy that "allow them to live in a way that commensurate with human hono(u)r" (AKP, 2002) However, the party programme concludes its chapter on Social policies with a warning that spending on social issues "will not be allowed to interrupt the functioning of the economy, disrupting confidence or causing instability, as a result of inflationist and populist implementations." (AKP, 2002)

Summarising we can say that are parallels between the positions of the AKP and the Christian Democratic parties. Both try to find a way between a dominant state and laissez-fair capitalism. Especially in the dimension 'deregulation' we can see this, both favour deregulation of the state. This policy of the AKP was rewarded in the past years that saw an economic boom in Turkey: since the AKP took power more foreign capital was invested in the country as in forty years before. On the other hand the Christian Democrats are stricter on the dimension 'taxes and spending' as the AKP is. But also the AKP doesn't take a radical left position on this issue and is still quite close to a centre position

⁴ AKP Party programme: Privatisation is important for the formation of a more rational economic structure. Privatisation is a vehicle to increase productivity in the economy and to take the State out of activities which could disturb the full competition environment.

⁵ AKP Party programme: The state must withdraw from all the service areas and remain exclusively in the areas of foreign security, justice, basic education, health and infrastructure services, which are its basic functions as an executing body, whereas its regulating and inspecting functions must continue.

3.3 Social Policy

On the dimension ‘Social Policy’ –which is actually a bit misleading since it values parties on ethical questions- the AKP is very conservative in comparison to the more centre-right EPP. With a 40th place out of 48 parties and an average higher than the EPP average you can clearly count them to the most social conservative parties of the researched parties.

Table 4: Social Policy- ‘Favours liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia’ (1) till ‘Opposes liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	6,38
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	13,9
39.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	16,31
40.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	17,15
41.	PP	People's Party	Spain	17,16
48.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	19,71

If you want to explain the more conservative stance of the AKP in social values questions you have to take in consideration that Turkey is, according to surveys of the Eurobarometer, still in many regards a fairly social conservative country.⁶ Turkey is –together with Malta- the European country in which most citizens believe in a God. (95 percent; EU25: 52 percent). (Eurobarometer, 2005, 9) And in their education most Turkish parents put emphasis on more traditional values, according to the same survey the most important values that children should learn at home were ‘sense of responsibility’ (TR: 92 percent, EU25: 80 percent) and ‘hard work’ (TR: 92 percent, EU25: 47)⁷ (Eurobarometer, 2005, 35)

However, we should be careful to attribute these positions to the Muslim character of the country and party. The survey also shows that Mediterranean (Roman-Catholic and Orthodox) countries are in general more conservative as the other European countries. And also the

⁶ However, as the same surveys show are the Turkish citizens more conservative as the EU-25 average but there in most social value questions countries which are more conservative. (e.g Malta and Ireland)

Christian Democratic parties from Mediterranean countries are mostly more conservative as the EPP-average as the complete table shows.

In Islam and Christianity are ethical similarities which we also can find back in the political programme of the AKP and the basic programme of the EPP. In both programmes the family plays an essential role in the dimension of social values for example. The family is in Christian Democracy usually assumed as the lowest level of community and the “nucleus of society”. Also the AKP sees the family as foundation of society and as an important institution that plays a major role in the formation of social solidarity. The party claims that “the way to social happiness, solidarity, peace, affection and respect passes through the family.” They also mention this special role of family in developing countries. According to the AKP the strong family structure is a major reason that Turkey “is still standing despite all the economic policies”. (AKP, 2002)

However, at the moment the traditional family structures are rapidly changing in Europe: there are more single parents or patchwork families. Also more and more countries are introducing social liberal laws as adoption rights for homosexual couples; although this is usually opposed by Christian Democratic countries.⁸ This new family structures are a challenge for Christian-Democrats because they want to maintain their core value of course, but have to deal with new social realities. So, under the pressure of society most Christian Democratic parties at least in Northern and West Europe got more liberal positions on social issues. Since most citizens in Turkey are more conservative the AKP doesn't have to change its politics due to electoral pressure and can fulfil the conservative sentiments within the Turkish electorate. This leads even to sometimes extreme proposals as the proposal to criminalise adultery that was initiated by some members of the AKP in 2004. Such a conservative proposal was of course not consistent with the penal codes in other EU-member states and was stopped under EU-pressure. (Bowcott, 2004)

⁸ In the European Union Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Spain and the United Kingdom legalised adoption by homosexual couples. In France and Germany is step-child adoption legalised.

3.4 Religion

As we have already seen in chapter 2 the arguable most controversial dimension of the AKP is its position on 'Religion'. According to the experts it strongly supports religious principles in politics, even more as the EPP. (EPP: 7.9; AKP: 4.2) However, we have to be cautious with this value of the EPP since it was formed almost only by parties in post-communist countries. Due to their history it is imaginable that they have significant other values as parties in the EU-15 would have.

Table 5: Religion- 'Supports religious principles in politics' (1) till 'Supports secular principles in politics' (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	1,29
4.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	3,55
5.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	4,68
6.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	4,84
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	7,9
25.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	15,53

As we have seen in the short introduction to Christian Democracy is its rise closely connected to the role of the Church. And even nowadays there is still a more or less visible band between the Church and the Christian Democratic parties in some countries. A quite extreme example is the Spanish elections in spring 2008 in what the Spanish council of bishops implicitly called on voters to back the conservative/Christian-democratic Partido Popular (PP). The church leaders opposed the social reforms introduced by the Socialist government since 2004, including the relaxing of divorce laws, the legalisation of gay marriage and the removal of religious classes from the national school curriculum. So the statement warned of the "danger of political and legislative choices that contradict fundamental values" and that "not all political programmes are equally compatible with our faith and with the demands of a Christian life". (Hamilos, 2008) However, since less and less Europeans are churchgoers its influence is shrinking and even in the still pretty Catholic Spain the words of the Bishops weren't strong enough to convince the Spanish voters not to re-elect the Socialists.

Due to the restrictions we have seen in chapter 2 official religious leaders in Turkey certainly are much more cautious with statements as their Catholic counterparts in Spain. Also the AKP

keeps its opinions about this topic in its official programme pretty broad, its politics towards religion can be summarised with Erdoğan's words: "Religion shouldn't interfere with issues of government. (...) But government shouldn't interfere with issues of religion either. That's the message we are trying to spread". (Morris, 2005, 61) According to the AKP the Turkish democracy is stable enough to relax relationship between Islam and state. We have seen that Kemalist policy gave the state a dominant position above religion. The Turkish state had to control religion. This policy has led to some very strict examples of discrimination of Islamic believers. In 2003 the European Union even warned Turkey because of its restrictive politics towards religious citizens.

As we have seen earlier the AKP sees itself as a reform party that claims to transform Turkey into a "normal" western nation. One part of this reform package is in its eyes more individual freedoms and, in particular, religious freedom. For the AKP one threat to general freedom is restrictions to religions. (The AKP never uses the word Islam in its party programme) It sees religion as one of the most important institutions of humanity and secularism as a prerequisite of democracy, and an assurance of freedom of religion and conscience. The AKP also opposes the interpretation of secularism as enemy against religion. Secularism is in its eyes a principle that allows religious people to comfortably practise their religions, but also allows people without beliefs to organise their lives along these lines. Secularism is thus seen as a principle of freedom and social peace.

Another dig at Kemalist principles in its programme is that they literally consider "attitudes and practises which disturb pious people, and which discriminate them due to their religious lives and preferences, as anti-democratic and in contradiction to human rights and freedoms. On other hand, it is also unacceptable to make use of religion for political, economic and other interests, or to put pressure on people who think and live differently by using religion." The party clearly refers to practises like not accepting women with headscarves at universities. (AKP, 2002) In 2008 the AKP wanted to lift the headscarf ban on universities with the argument that it forms an unfair denial of individual rights and religious liberty in a country where two-thirds of women still cover their heads. However, this change of the constitution was stopped by the constitutional court that ruled that religious symbols were not permitted to be shown in public buildings. (CNN, 2008) This headscarf issue was already delicate enough in Turkey to form the official reason of the disbanding process against the party.

Concluding we can say that the AKP wants to come to a point where most religious people in Europe are, that religion is clearly a private issue and that people are not discriminated because of their beliefs. Since the Turkish interpretation of secularism is quite unique the AKP is hard to compare to the Christian Democratic parties on the special issue. But you conclude that the values they refer to, individual freedom for citizens also in religious affairs, would be underlined by Christian Democratic parties.

3.5 Environment

On the dimension “Environment” can see that as well the EPP as the AKP tend to support economic growth, even at the cost of damage to the environment. However, the data shows a more centric position by the EPP as by the AKP (EPP: 12.4; AKP 15.7) The AKP is almost the party which is least concerned about the environment, only three parties have higher values.

Table 6: Environment- “Supports protection of the environment, even at the cost of economic growth”(1) till “Supports economic growth, even at the cost of damage to the environment”(20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	8,36
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,4
44.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	15,03
45.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	15,71
46.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	16,12
48.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	17,22

In its basic programme the EPP calls its section on environment “Respect for the created world” and advocates an incorporation of the protection and restoration of the environment in the market economy system. It believes that there is a combination possible between economical and ecological interests. (EPP, 1992, 14) Christian Democratic thinking on environment issues is inspired by the idea of stewardship. This means that, from a Christian perspective, humans are responsible for the world, and should take care of it. An example of stewardship is in Genesis 2:15. "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." The drive to "serve the garden in which we have been

placed" (also Genesis 2:15) is assumed as legitimating Christian influence in political and practical affairs.

As the data shows is the AKP less concerned with the role of environment protection. The party regards environmental issues "from the point of view of creating a healthy environment, as well as reducing national costs." Most environmental problems they mention are quite obvious problems like harmful wastes or the problems of migration to the cities. (AKP, 2002)

The difference to the EPP is certainly also rooted in the different economic and social situations. The Turkish experts of Benoit and Lavers research valued it as the dimension with the lowest priority among the Turkish people. This low valuation is also backed by a research from Bodur and Sarigöllü. It shows that the Turkish respondents didn't pay very much attention to environmental problems. Especially under uneducated and poorer Turks there is not much environmental sensitivity, mostly because their concern for day-to-day survival looms larger than their concern for the environment. (Bodur, Sarigöllü; 2005; 487-510)

If we keep in mind that many of these people belong to the main voter group of the AKP it is –from an electoral position- understandable that the party doesn't give this topic a high priority. However, the party wants at least to initiate an educational program to equip citizens with environmental awareness starting at an early age. This is actually a step that is also recommended by Bodur and Sarigöllü.

Thus we can conclude that this is an issue in what there are differences between the AKP and many Christian Democratic parties. However, these differences are not so much ideological rooted but can be more explained by the social situation in Turkey. In a –compared to most EU-countries- poor country as Turkey people can't afford the 'luxury' to think too much about the environment since they are more busy with their daily survival.

3.6 Nationalism

On the dimension ‘Nationalism’⁹ the EPP and the AKP are surprisingly close to each other. (EPP 11.8; AKP: 11.2) This is perhaps surprising to the reader because Turkey is widely seen as a country with a very strongly developed national pride. However, like at the dimension ‘Religion’ we have to be careful with the analysis since this dimension was only researched among parties in former communist countries.

Table 7- Nationalism- ‘Strongly promotes a cosmopolitan rather than a ____ national consciousness, history and culture.’ (1) till ‘Strongly promotes a ____ national rather than a cosmopolitan consciousness, history and culture.’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	2,5
11.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People’s Party	Hungary	10,44
12.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	11,17
13.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	11,33
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	11,8
26.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	19,14

It its basic programme the EPP clearly denounces a “misplaced nationalist ideology”.¹⁰ However it also assumes a feeling of patriotism and belonging to a specific community as inherent to the existence of any human being and thus entirely legitimate. Nevertheless, Christian Democracy usually has also a rather internationalist touch, and not without any reason many of the founding fathers of the European Community were Christian Democracy. Catholic politicians were even for a long period accused of ultramontanism, thus that they were more loyal to the Roman Catholic Church and the Pope as to their own country. A very famous example is the speech of John F. Kennedy, the first (and only) Catholic who was President of the United States, who had to make explicitly clear in his campaign 1960 that he was more loyal to his country than to orders from Rome. (Kennedy, 1960)

⁹

¹⁰ EPP Basic Programme: “The most dangerous response to the fall of communism is a misplaced nationalist ideology. The feeling of patriotism and of belonging to a specific community is inherent to the existence of any human being and thus entirely legitimate. Nationalism can no longer be acceptable, however, when it becomes absolute and denies other values and responsibilities, such as loyalty to the democratic state and the rights of minorities.” (EPP, 1992, 2)

Turkey has a very strong national identity and it is heavily propagated by the state. The reasons for this are rooted in the fundamentals of the Turkish republic which were laid by Atatürk. As we have seen he attempted to create a nation state from the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. For instance, he introduced a Turkish language as official language, which was pruned from all Arabic and Persian loanwords. This language became the official language and all other languages were more or less forbidden. However, the population of the new state was still relatively heterogeneous: so Turkish wasn't (and still isn't) a description of ethnicity but a commitment to an 'imagined' nationhood of people living within the national pact that should replace old communities and ethnic cleavages by one patriotic identity. (Mert, 2000, 67) His final goal was to create a Turkish nation state like the, at that time dominating, western nations.¹¹ The famous quote "How happy is he that can call himself a Turk" needs also to be understood in that context. Officially all citizens of the Turkish Republic were Turks and there were no minorities (like Kurds or Armenians) since they were also included in this new idea of a nation. This means that you are assumed as a member of the "Turkish nation" if you are a Turkish citizen and "protect and promote the moral, spiritual, cultural and humanistic values" of it. As we have seen in the chapter 2.2 it was also supposed to be a new identification object, as successor of religion. To some extent you can compare this form of nationalism with the idea of a nation the United States have which are bounded by the 'American values' not by ethnicity.

However, we have to distinct between the "Republican nationalism" of Atatürk, and the Turkish nationalism of recent times. Republican nationalism was, according to Mert, rather an elite phenomenon and, since it was thought of as the engine of a larger social project –the creation of a modern, westernised and secular nation-state, the nationalist quality was predetermined by the other aspects of this project. This more intellectual form of nationalism didn't become a mass phenomenon and instead a more spontaneous form of nationalism evolved in Turkey. (Mert, 2000, 67) This form of nationalism is more comparable with the 'ordinary' form of nationalism that is heavily linked to symbols (e.g. the national flag), pride on your country and in the worst case even a feel of superiority above other nations. This more popular form manifests itself for instance very strongly in matches of the national

¹¹ A popular misbelieve is that Atatürk wanted to transform Turkey into a western nation. However, his reform projects were more a form of cultural benchmarking. Since he assumed the western nations to be the most developed at his time he concluded that Turkey had to copy their methods to become strong and keep its independence from foreign, western powers.

football team which are seen as a matter of national pride.¹² (Bora, 2000, 375-402) Another evidence of this “people’s nationalism” is that there was at one point in the last elections a serious lack of Turkish flags. Every party had to show that it was more patriotic as the other, and in Turkish politician’s perception an excessive use of national flags is obviously the best proof of love to your country. (Großbongardt, 2007)

Of course the AKP also has to proof this people’s patriotism on many occasions, the official slogan of the party is for instance: “All for Turkey” and the symbol of the modern Turkey, the omnipresent “Great Atatürk” as he is described in the AKP party programme, greets the visitors already on the homepage of the party¹³. Also in its party programme the AKP clearly underlines its ‘patriotism’ like for instance in the fundamentals: “(...) it is one of our Party’s fundamental objectives to develop the consciousness of citizenship and to share with all our countrymen, the pride to possess and belong to the country where we live.” (AKP, 2002)

But in its Cultural policies the AKP tries to find a balance between “national culture” and “universal values”. While it wants to maximise the protection and developing of “nationalist values” on the one hand, on the other hand it sees cultural interaction as enrichment to the Turkish culture. (AKP, 2002) This is interestingly enough a more Kemalist idea: the idea that there is “civilised world” and Turkey has to interact and learn from it to be a part of it. So, not close itself from outside developments.

Concluding we can say that the Christian Democratic parties and AKP are quite close in their attitude to nationalism. Due to the special situation in Turkey the AKP has to live up to this ‘people’s nationalism’ with a lot of symbolic but on the issues they are relatively moderate as most Christian Democratic countries are.

¹² Turkish popular media use for instance frequently the term “60 million are in the field’ when the national football team is playing. And the Turkish coach Fathi Terim dramatised the Euro 2008-semifinal against Germany to the ‘revenge for 1683’ (The siege of Vienna)

¹³ According to its political programme the AKP also regards Atatürk’s “principals and reforms as the most important vehicle for raising the Turkish public above the level of contemporary civilisation and sees this as an element of social peace.” (AKP, 2002)

3.7 Decentralisation

As well the AKP as the EPP favour a decentralised state. However, while the EPP average is relatively central, the AKP is more clearly in favour of decentralisation. (AKP: 6.4; EPP 9.4) If you look on the data you see that you can find parties with almost all values, the range is very broad from 1,65 till 17,29.¹⁴

Table 8: Decentralisation- ‘Promotes decentralisation of all administration and decision-making’ (1) till ‘Opposes any decentralisation of administration and decision-making. (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	1,65
7.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	6,32
8.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	6,43
9.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	6,5
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	9,4
48.	JL	New Era	Latvia	17,29

This principle of subsidiarity -that you can find back in this dimension- stands very central in Christian Democracy. For them society is an organism, a living entity. Society thus has an existence outside the individual, and in sense is prior to the individual; it is held together by the bonds of tradition, authority and a common morality. (Heywood, 1998, 77) This balancing act between socialist collectivism and liberal individualism is very sharply defined by Irving: “The individual can only reach fulfilment within the ‘natural social structures’ of society, such as the family, the community or the place of work... (but) they totally reject the notion that the collectivity can ever be more important than the individuals. ... Man as an individual is always regarded as more important than society as a whole, but it is necessary for the state to provide a combination of freedom and justice, so that man can develop his full potential both spiritually and materially.” (Huntington&Bale, 2002, 45)

¹⁴ Although the two lowest values can be explained by the ethnic background of the parties: the UDMR is the party of the Hungarian minority in Romania, and the CiU is a Catalan party. So it is explainable why they favour decentralisation so much.

The degree of help that the community should give the individual is called “subsidiarity” According to Utz three forms of government intervention are called “subsidium”:

- 1) Help for the individual if it wishes support, because it can’t reach its goal on his own
- 2) Complete assumptions of activities, that it individual wants to do, but can’t
- 3) Intervention by the state in cases, that individuals don’t ask for it, but the state thinks that the individual can’t fulfil his duties on its own (Pfürtner & Heierle, 1980, 141)

Subsidiarity is, according to Pfürtner and Heierle, in a certain sense a product of the ideas of solidarity. Subsidiarity marks the limits between individual freedom and shared responsibility. The responsibility should be where it is best and this is usually on the lowest as possible level. The society should (with for instance unions and employer’s associations) try to find solutions to problems. Only if the society is not able to find a solution the state should interfere. As we have seen in chapter 2.3 is this principle of subsidiarity an important part of Catholic Social since the important encyclical ‘Rerum Novarum’ 1891 by Pope Leo XIII. (Pfürtner & Heierle, 1980, 95)

Of course it has also a central role in the political programme of the EPP that claims that its vision of society is based on the principle of subsidiarity. It defines subsidiarity as a principle that means “that power must be exercised at the level which corresponds to the requirements of solidarity, effectiveness and participation of citizens, in other words, where it is both most effective and closest to the individual.” (EPP, 1992, 7)

Turkey is on the other hand a highly centralised country. One of the six arrows of Kemalism was “statism” which means that the state should have a lot of control about the national economy. The political heirs of Atatürk still advocate a relatively centralised, strong state with a powerful grip on the national economy. This policy is naturally in conflict with the idea of subsidiarity. The AKP also wants to change this situation. It wants to transfer a lot of power from the central government to local governments and administrators. On the economic level it supports a withdrawal of the state from all service areas and exclusively remaining in the areas of foreign security, justice, basic education, health and infrastructure services. They also support the implementation of a social state concept. In the perception of the AKP the state thus should keep only its basic functions as an executing body, but has to continue its regulating and inspection functions. (AKP, 2002)

What is even more revolutionary is the fact that it want to tackle the problems in the “east and the southeast”. With this euphemism it means the ongoing problems with the Kurdish minority. For a long period there was no Kurdish problem in the official language of Turkey, only a problem with some terrorists. In theory there weren’t even Kurds, because there was only one Turkish nation as we have seen. Thus all Kurdish media was banned; many expressions of the Kurdish culture were suppressed and the elections got a 10-percent threshold so that normally no ethnic Kurdish party could enter the national parliament. For years there was an ongoing war between the Turkish army and the PKK. There was a ceasefire but there were attacks again in the last months. (Züricher, 2004, 316-323) The Kurds weren’t the only victims of this “One-Turkish-Nation”-policy, other minority groups like the (remaining) Armenians and Syrian-Orthodoxs had to suffer too.

In its party programme the AKP regards the cultural activities in other languages than Turkish as an asset that reinforces and supports the unity of Turkey rather than weaken it. But the AKP warns that this cultural diversity doesn’t mean that the different cultures of Turkey should push the mutuality’s to the background: being a citizen of the Republic of Turkey is the cement of the Turkish society. So this is more linked to the idea of the ‘intellectual nationalism’ again. The traditional perception was that of a homogenous nation state while the AKP accepted the reality, that Turkey is a heterogeneous state. This shift opens the opportunity to give cultural minorities the space the express its cultures. This new idea was an important reason for the strong electoral performance of the AKP not only among Kurdish voters but also among Christian voters in the South East in the past elections. By acknowledging the special situation in the South East and the principle of governing on a more local level, the AKP uses the principle of subsidiarity, which is so central to Christian Democracy. We can thus conclude that they are close to each other on this dimension.

3.8 Immigration

Although Turkey is not a classical immigration country it was chosen as a dimension by Benoit and Laver. The positions on immigration¹⁵ don't differ dramatically between the EPP and the AKP. Both parties are pretty much in the centre of the spectrum in this dimension. (EPP 12.4, AKP 10.4)

Table 9: Immigration – ‘Favours policies designed to help asylum seekers and immigrants integrate into ____ society’ (1) till ‘Favours policies designed to help asylum seekers and immigrants return to their country of origin’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	7,68
4.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	9,48
5.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	10,37
6.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	10,59
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,4
24.	PP	People's Party	Spain	16,61

Europe is of course dealing with massive immigration from all over the world. In its Action programme for the European elections 2004 the EPP advocates clear standards for the three main categories of immigrants, temporary refugees, asylum applicants and economic immigrants. While the EPP acknowledged the fundamental human rights of refugees to shelter in Europe it is more critical on economical immigration. It calls for a special mechanism under the new common immigration policy that should regulate legal entry for job seeking immigrants. In their eyes, this entry track to Europe is to be controlled by the demand of labour. (EPP, 2008, 24-25)

To hear that Turkey is dealing with immigration may sound a bit strange to western European ears, since it is usually seen more a source of immigrants to Europe. For a long time most Turkish immigrations came from ‘brother states’ as Bosnia, the Kosovo and Turk-nations were easily absorbed in the “Turkish nation”. However, also Turkey is dealing with a lot of immigrants in the past decade which are not of Turkish origin or culture. Large numbers are transiting migrants (traveling for mixed political and economical reasons) and usually find easily their way to Turkey (legally or not) but have a hard time finding their way out – to

¹⁵ The dimension goes from ‘Favours policies to help asylum seekers and immigrants integrate into ____ society’ (1) till ‘Favours policies to help asylum seekers and immigrants return to their country of origin.’(20)

Europe usually. Another large group are petty traders, usually from former Soviet countries, who move back and forth between Turkey and their country of origin.

But while most European countries have policies to deal with immigration the Turkish state is more or less doing anything to protect, help or reject this population because they are not part of the 'Turkish nation'. Thus, you can say that the Turkish state is highly "liberal" in matters of immigration, in that immigration (of non-Turkish nature) is not one of the spheres of intervention and regulation of the state. They have to find a way to survive somehow and can only rely on the support of the local Turkish population, as well as diverse associations and NGO's. This causes on the hand social problems among the (illegal) immigrants since they normally have to live under difficult conditions and are highly vulnerable to diverse abuses. But on the other hand the lack of willingness and financial and administrative capabilities on the Turkish side also leaves migrants rather free and immune from arrest, detention and deportation. So concludes Tolay-Sargnon that this Turkish policy of complete neutrality and "liberalism" toward illegal migrants is probably not even so inhuman compared to the stricter policy of many western European countries. (Tolay-Sargnon, 2007, 9) This Turkish 'ignorance' of immigration issues also explains that you can't find any remarks about this topic in the political programme of the AKP. While the European Christian Democratic parties want to regulate immigration somehow the AKP obviously wants to keep the present situation that the issue is not seen as relevant at all.

3.9 Europe

The last dimension we want to look on is 'Europe'. Turkey is since the 17 December 2002 Brussels summit a EU-accession candidate country, a status that is widely attributed to the reform politics of the AKP-lead government. Unfortunately Benoit and Laver don't provide one dimension 'Europe'. EU-accession candidates (at that time also all the countries of the 2004-enlargement) were asked if they opposed or favoured their country joining the EU. The parties in the 15 EU-member-states of those days had more EU-specific dimensions.¹⁶ To see if a party is more pro-European or Euro-sceptical the dimension 'EU-authority' is chosen, thus if a party favours to increase the range of areas in which the EU can set policy or favours reducing these areas. (Plus 'EU: Strengthening' for Ireland) If we look at the first dimension – EU Authority- we see that the EPP average is pretty close to the middle. The median is a bit more to a lower value leaning, it is the value of 8,37. (KD, the Swedish Christian Democrats)

Table 10: EU-Authority- 'Favours increasing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy' (1) till 'Favours reducing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy.' (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	5,97
AVE	EPP	EPP Average EU Authority	EU	9,4
21.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	14,62

In the EU-accession states almost all EPP-member parties were very enthusiastic about a possible EU-membership of their countries. (17,2) Also the AKP is clearly in favour of a Turkish EU-accession. (17,39)

Table 11: EU Joining- 'Opposes joining the European Union' (1) till 'Favours joining the European Union' (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	9,75
11	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	17
AVE	EPP	EPP Average EU Joining	EU	17,2
12	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	17,39
13	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	17,75
26	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	19,8

¹⁶ EU: Enlargement (Ireland only), EU: Peacekeeping (EU-15 except France and Ireland), EU: Strengthening (Ireland only), EU: Accountability (EU-15 except France and Ireland) and EU: Larger Stronger (France)

You may assume the Basic Programme of the EPP probably not very up-to-date on this issue anymore, since it was written only few months after the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and a lot of things have happened in the field of European integration since then. It is very pro-European and calls even for a federal Europe, which is assumed to be “more than ever a necessary and realistic political objective” (EPP, 1992, 9) But also in the EPP’s Action Programme for the 2004-2009 elections the party is still very pro-European and in favour of a “decentralised, federal Europe”. It defines federalism as “uniting countries in pursuit of commonly defined objectives, but at the same time respecting the diversity of their cultures, traditions and languages, and allowing them the broadest possible autonomy in how they choose to achieve these objectives.” Of course the EPP refers on this issue on his core value ‘subsidiarity’ and that it should form the fundamental principle of the divisions of powers within Europe. (EPP, 2004, 6)

The AKP is very much in favour of a EU-membership of Turkey. However, it would be very politically naïve to attribute this only to a passionate love for Europe. Its pro-European position is usually interpreted as the usage of the EU-accession process as a tool to reform Turkey. According to supporters with the goal to make Turkey a more liberal and free country, according to opponents to deinstall all the security institutions and mechanisms that ensure the secular nature of the state.

Whatever the reasons are, it is hard to deny that Turkey made more progress in becoming a EU-member state in the time of the AKP-legislation as in 40 years before. Turkey already applied for a EU-membership (then the European Economic Community) in 1963, but it only became a official EU-candidate country at the Helsinki Summit in 1999. In December 2002 the Copenhagen criteria were formulated that every future member state has to fulfil. Turkey was promised that the EU would start without delay open negotiations with it if the European Council would decide that it would fulfil these criteria. The then freshly elected AKP used this perspective to reform many institutions, statuses and laws in Turkey in a rapid speed: abolition of capital punishment, crackdown on torture and more rights for the Kurdish minority are only some examples. During its first two years in office the AKP government single-mindedly concentrated its political agenda on obtaining a date to open accession talks and rapidly pushed major constitutional amendments and new legislation through parliament to this end. However, after it got a date on 17 December 2004, the reform speed in Turkey

fatigued. There are different reasons for that, on what we will only elaborate very briefly here. (Patton, 2007, 339-340)

The major reason was, according to Patton, a growing EU-scepticism among the Turkish public. The unclear course of the EU and the idea that the EU is creating all the time new obstacles for a Turkish membership, have soured Turkish public opinion with only 44 percent in spring 2007 regarding membership a positive thing, down from 66 percent two years before. (Patton, 2007, 355) On a domestic level nationalist groups, from the left and the right, have fuelled the perception that the EU is a 'Christian club' that doesn't want Turkey as a member and the complete accession process is getting more and more a big humiliation for Turkey. Especially the Cyprus-issue, in what many Turks have the idea that all the concessions have to come from their side, and the growing Kurdish self-consciousness as result of the Iraq-war, have enhanced these nationalist feelings. (Patton, 2007, 344-347)

These feeling of a special treatment for Turkey are of course supported by the traditional Kemalist groups who would lose power due to EU-reforms. Patton sees especially the Turkish Higher Education Board (YÖK), the judiciary and the military as Kemalist strongholds. All these traditional elites have to give up some power and privileges if Turkey wants to access the EU. They see themselves as guarantors for a western, Kemalist identity of the country and are thus, ironically, against the fulfilment of the EU-criteria since they are afraid that the AKP will use these new freedoms to transform Turkey into an Islamist state. (Patton, 2007, 349-355) The Kemalist nomenclature has managed to delay and stop many reforms of the AKP-government with this argument in the past years.

However, the shift in the Turkish public to a more sceptical attitude towards a EU-accession and the obstacles from the EU, did naturally also change the priorities of the AKP. With an eye on the elections in 2007 it got a more EU-sceptical attitude: if the EU didn't accept Turkey as a member, than it would have to accept it and be confident enough not to beg for a membership.

Concluding it is still hard to say how Europe-minded the AKP actually is. The Kemalist argument that the AKP is using the EU-accession criteria as a tool to create a momentum for an Islamic state is neither to deny nor to confirm at the moment. However, also taking the nationalistic feelings in Turkey in consideration, it should be clear that pure Europhilia is not

the only motive for the AKP's enthusiasm for a future EU-membership. Since the Turkish EU-euphoria is weaker also the AKP is less enthusiastic about an accession. While the member parties of the EPP put more emphasises on an ideological based 'destiny Europe' it is clearly more practical oriented. The AKP's is so much in favour because it wants to transform Turkey, but if it is only to a more liberal country or to a more Islamic country is still uncertain.

4. Conclusion

The main task of this paper was to answer the question of the Turkish AKP is comparable to European Christian Democratic parties. To answer this question we have used the dataset by Benoit and Laver and compared values of the member parties of the European Christian Democratic Party -the EPP- with the values of the AKP. A first glance showed us that both parties are very close to each other in the general left-right scale on which they both were placed centre right. This didn't come as a surprise since the AKP is already an observing member of the EPP. However, a closer analysis of the compared dimensions showed us that many similarities and differences can be attributed to the special Turkish situation.

When we want to analyse the AKP we have to take a look on the domestic situation in Turkey. The AKP is often described as the voice of a new Anatolian middle-class and forms an opposition to the Kemalist establishment that is dominating the country and its key institutions for more than 80 years. The AKP doesn't have a really consistent ideology, the 'conservative Democracy' that prime minister Erdoğan is advocating is a rather fuzzy term. We can see a more structural opposition to the present state of Turkey and the intention to change the country. But the direction remains vague. In its economical policies it is relatively liberal thus to a certain extent pretty comparable to the Christian Democrats. One of the reasons of its popularity is the fact that it could reform the desolate Turkish economy, mainly because it continued the economical policies of former World Bank expert and then Minister of economical affairs Kemal Derviş. In social issues the AKP is more conservative as most European Christian Democratic parties are. But this can be explained to a huge extent to the more social conservative attitude of the Turkish population and especially AKP's voters.

But what we could see in almost every dimension of the analysis is that the political position of the AKP could be mainly attributed to the special situation in Turkey and less to a higher ideology. This is not very surprising of course, Turkey is geographically and culturally an unique case and so many patterns which for instance took part relatively parallel in western Europe (e.g. Industrialiation) happened in a different period in Turkey. This differing history is also recognisable in the political programme of the AKP: you could summarise is as 'social conservative' and 'economical liberal' but this would only be a simplification.

These problems show of course a general of party comparisons that work with quantitative methods: you never know what is hiding behind certain numbers. In this case we have taken a deeper look on the special situation in Turkey and could discover that different values were statistical equal but were based on complete different reasons and thus only partial comparable. The most prominent example is of course the attitude towards the EU, while the EU-support of many Christian Democratic parties is rooted in ideological reasons, it is a pure domestic calculation for the AKP.

On the other hand we don't know the reasons of the values of other parties either of course. Probably values of some parties in for example Latvia or Cyprus are also more based on domestic issues as on big ideological thoughts. So you have to look on the background if you want to compare two parties. We have tried to avoid this problem by often using an average or a median in the analysis's and this gives hopefully a good picture. But just taking claiming that party X is for instance more social conservative than party Y only based on the numbers of Benoit and Laver would be very speculative.

Concluding we can say that the AKP as a party is due to his history and its setup a Turkish phenomenon and it is very hard to put them in a European political framework. It is not correct to see them just as an Islamic variant of "Christian Democracy", for that there many of its political priorities are too much connected to the Turkish scenario as to the Christian Democratic ideology. But they have a lot of similarities and on the European party theatre the EPP should at least be their natural ally. A big problem remains that it is still unclear what the long term orientation of the AKP will be and if it is able to formulate a consistent political ideology, which can be an example to other parties which want to combine (western) democratic values with Islamic values. Or if the complete democratic road of liberalisation is just one big masquerade to transform Turkey in an Islamic countries as the Kemalists fear. They remember very well the quote of Prime Minister Erdoğan in the 1980ies: "democracy is just a tram. When we have arrived at our destination, we leave it." (Gottschlich, 2004, 78) So it will certainly be interesting to see what decision the AKP takes if they get one day the opportunity to seat in the European parliament in Brussels.

Literature

Akdoğan Y (2006) 'The Meaning of Conservative Democratic Identity' in M.Hakan Yavuz (ed) *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti*, The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City pp.49-65

AKP (2002) 'Development and Democratization: AK Parti Party Programme' Retrieved July 31, 2007 from <http://eng.akparti.org.tr/english/partyprogramme.html>

Başlevent C, Kirmanoğlu H., Şenatalar B. (2005) "Empirical investigation of party preferences and economic voting in Turkey" in *European Journal of Political Research* 44: 547–562

Bodur M, Sarigöllü E (2005) 'Environmental Sensitivity in a Developing Country: Consumer Classification and Implications' *Environment and Behavior*, vol. 37 No. 4, July 2005 pp 487-510

Bora, T (2000) 'Football and its Audiences: Staging Spontaneous Nationalism' in Yerasimos S. et al (2000) *'Civil Society in the Grip of Nationalism'*, Istanbul: Orient-Institut der Deutschen-Morgenländischen Gesellschaft", pages 375-403

Bowcott, O. (2004) "Turkey moves closer to EU after retreat on adultery law" in *The Guardian* of September 24, 2004, retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/sep/24/turkey.eu>

Çavdar, G (2006) 'Islamist New Thinking in Turkey: A Model for Political Learning?' *Political Science Quarterly* vol. 121 No. 3 2006, pp 477-497

Canatan, K (2001), 'Turkse Islam: Perspectieven op organisatievorming en leiderschap in Nederland', PhD Thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Çarkoğlu, A (1998) 'The Turkish Party System in Transition: Party Performance and Agenda Change' in R Hofferbert (ed) *Parties and Democracy: Party Structure and Party Performance in Old and New Democracies*, Blackwell Publisher, Oxon, pp 122-149

Cinar M (2006), 'Turkey's Transformation under the AKP Rule', *The Muslim World*, vol.96, July 2006, pp 469-486

CNN (2008) 'Turkish court upholds Islamic head scarves at Universities' retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/europe/06/05/turkey.scarves/> (5 June 2008)

Erdoğan, RT (2004), 'Conservative Democracy and the Globalization of Freedom' in M.Hakan Yavuz (ed) *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti*, The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City pp.333-340)

Eurobarometer (2005) 'Social Values, Science and Technology', retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_225_report_en.pdf

European People's Party (1992) "Basic Programme: adopted by the IXth EPP Congress, Athens, November 1992", retrieved from http://www.epp.eu/dbimages/pdf/athene-BASIC_PROGRAM.pdf

European People's Party (2004) 'European People's Party Action Programme 2004-2009' retrieved from http://www.epp.eu/dbimages/pdf/action_programme.pdf

Freedom House (2007) 'Electoral democracies' retrieved August, 22nd 2007 from <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=368&year=2007>

İnalçık, H (2006), *Turkey and Europe in History*, Istanbul: Eren Press

Klink, A (1991), *Christen-democratie en overheid: de christen-democratische politieke filosofie en enige staats- en bestuursrechtelijke implicaties*, PhD Thesis, University of Leiden.

Leggewie C. (2004) "Die Türkei und Europa: Die Positionen", Frankfurt am Main: Edition Suhrkamp

Gibbons, J (1999), 'Spanish politics today', Manchester University Press, Manchester

Großbongardt, A. (2007) „Fahnenrausch: Türkisches Nationalbanner als Allzweckwagge im Wahlkampf“ in *Der Spiegel*; retrieved from <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/0,1518,489989,00.html> (24 June 2007)

Gottschlich, J. (2004) “Die Türkei auf dem Weg nach Europa: Ein Land im Aufbruch”, Berlin: Ch.Links Verlag, 1st edition

Gunther, R (1987), ‘Democratization and Party Building: The Role of Party Elites in the Spanish Transition’ in R P Clark & M H Haltzel (eds) *Spain in the 1980s: The Democratic Transition and a New International Role*, Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge (Massachusetts) pp 45-51

Hamilos, P. (2008) “Zapatero tells church to stop election meddling” in *The Guardian* of 15 February 2008, retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/feb/15/spain.religion>

Outshoorn, E. (2008) ‘Partij van Erdogan wacht laatste slag’ in *De Volkskrant*, 1 July 2008

Jong, H M de, Dorbeck-Jung B R 1997 *Juridische staatsleer*, Uitgeverij Coutinho , Bussum

Hall, W 2006, ‘Christian Democracy and the JDP: Parallels and Contrasts’ in M.Hakan Yavuz (ed) *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti*, The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City pp.66-87

Heywood, A. 1998, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction (Second Edition)*, MacMillan Press Ltd, Houndsmills

Huntington, N & Bale T 2002 ‘New Labour: New Christian Democracy?’, *The Political Quarterly*, vol.73 (1), January-March 2002, pp 44-50

Kennedy, J.F. (1960) ‘Transcript: JFK's Speech on His Religion’, hold on September 12 1960, retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=16920600>

Kleinman, M 2002 *A European Welfare State?: European Union Social Policy in Context*, Palgrave, Houndmills

Mair P, Müller WC, Plasser F (2004) 'Conclusion: Political Parties in Changing Electoral Markets' in *Political Parties and Electoral Changes*, Sage Publications, London, pp.264-274

Mert, N. (2000) 'The Political History of Centre Right Parties: Discourses on Islam, the Nation and the People' in Yerasimos S. et al (2000) "*Civil Society in the Grip of Nationalism*", Istanbul: Orient-Institut der Deutschen-Morgenländischen Gesellschaft", pages 49-99

Morris, C (2005) 'The New Turkey: The Quiet Revolution on the Edge of Europe', London: Granta Books

Patton, M.C.(2007) 'AKP Reform Fatigue in Turkey: What has happened to the EU Process?' in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.12, No.3, November 2007, pages 339-358

Pförtner, S H & Heierle W (1980) ,Einführung in die Katholische Soziallehre', Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft

Reuters (2008) 'Prosecutor asks Turkish court to close ruling party', retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUSL1478286320080314?pageNumber=2&virtualBrandChannel=0> (14 March 2008)

Salihoglu, S. (2002) "Welfare State Policies in Turkey" in *SouthEast Europe Review for Labour and Social Affairs*, Issue: 04 / 2002, pages: 21-26

Sözen, E (2006) 'Gender Politics of the JDP' in M.Hakan Yavuz (ed) *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti*, The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City pp.258-280

Tait, R. (2008) 'Turkey's governing party avoids being shut down for anti-secularism' in *The Guardian* of July 31 2008, retrieved from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jul/30/turkey.nato1>

The Economist a (2007) 'Turkey's election: Of mullahs and majors' in *The Economist*, July, 19th 2007, retrieved from
http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm?story_id=9516424

The Economist b (2007) 'Elections in Turkey: The Burden of Victory' in *The Economist*, July, 26th 2007, retrieved from
http://www4.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=9558347

Thumann, M (2007) 'Erdoğan's bunte, neue Mitte' in *Die Zeit*, July, 26th 2007 (No.31) p.6

Tolay-Sargnon, J. (2007) "Turkey's Immigration Policy: Can EU Norms Change Turkey's Identity?" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago*, Retrieved from
http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p197938_index.html

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid 2004, *De Europese Unie, Turkije en de islam*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Zürcher, E J 2004, *Turkey- A Modern History*, I.B.Tauris, London, 2nd edition

Appendix 1: Results of the dimensions

Dimension 1: ‘Please locate each party on a general left-right dimension, taking all aspects of party policy in account. Left (1) Right (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	8,66
2.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	9,81
3.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	10,65
4.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	11,06
5.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	11,14
6.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	11,19
7.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	11,86
8.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	12,32
9.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	12,39
10.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	12,5
11.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	12,53
12.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	12,74
13.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	12,83
14.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	13
15.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	13,21
16.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	13,25
17.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	13,42
18.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	13,57
19.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	13,58
20.	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	13,58
21.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	13,6
22.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	13,63
23.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	13,67
24.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	13,86
25.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	14,08
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	14,1
26.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	14,14
27.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	14,28
28.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	14,3
29.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	14,31
30.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	14,68
31.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	15,1
32.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	15,19
33.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	15,56

34.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	15,58
35.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	15,59
36.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	15,63
37.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	15,73
38.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	15,74
39.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	16,04
40.	JL	New Era	Latvia	16,5
41.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	16,97
42.	PP	People's Party	Spain	16,99
43.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	17,06
44.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	17,14
45.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	17,19
46.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	17,5
47.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	18,13
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populists	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

**Dimension 2: Taxes vs. Spending: ‘Promotes raising taxes to increase public services’ (1)
till ‘Promotes cutting public services’ (20)**

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	6,1
2.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	8,2
3.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	8,5
4.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	9
5.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	9,1
6.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	9,3
7.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	9,4
8.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	9,5
9.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	9,8
10.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	9,9
11.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	10
12.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	10,4
13.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	10,6
14.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	10,7
15.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	10,9
16.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	11,2
17.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in	Romania	11,3

		Romania		
18.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	11,8
19.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	12
20.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	12,1
21.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	12,4
22.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	12,5
23.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	12,6
	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	12,6
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,7
25.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	12,8
26.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	13
27.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	13,1
28.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	13,3
29.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	13,7
30.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	13,8
31.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	13,9
32.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	14,4
	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	14,4
	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	14,4
	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	14,4
36.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	14,5
37.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	14,7
38.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	14,8
	JL	New Era	Latvia	14,8
40.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	14,9
41.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	15
42.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	15,3
43.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	15,8
44.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	16,5
45.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	16,7
	PP	People's Party	Spain	16,7
47.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	17,5
48.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	17,7
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

Dimension 3: Deregulation: ‘Favours high levels of state regulation and control of the market’ (1) till ‘Favours deregulation of markets at every opportunity’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	9,82
2.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	10,19
3.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	10,53
4.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	11,1
5.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	12,36
6.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	13,36
7.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	13,43
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	13,9
8.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	14,04
9.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	14,32
10.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	16,69
11.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	16,75
12.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	16,82
13.	PP	People's Party	Spain	17,32
14.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	17,88
	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	no data
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	no data
	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	no data
	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	no data
	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	no data
	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	no data
	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	no data
	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	no data
	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	no data
	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	no data
	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	no data
	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	no data
	KDNP	Christian Democratic People’s Party	Hungary	no data
	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	no data
	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data
	JL	New Era	Latvia	no data

TP	People's Party	Latvia	no data
LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	no data
TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	no data
CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	no data
PO	Civic Platform	Poland	no data
PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	no data
PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	no data
PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	no data
PD	Democratic Party	Romania	no data
UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	no data
SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	no data
KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	no data
SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	no data
SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	no data
Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	no data
SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	no data

Dimension 4: Social Policy- ‘Favours liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia’ (1) till ‘Opposes liberal policies on matters such as abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	6,38
2.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	6,89
3.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	7,73
4.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	8
5.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	8,68
6.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People’s Party	Hungary	9,83
7.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	10,5
8.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	11,47
9.	JL	New Era	Latvia	11,63
10.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	12,01
11.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	12,29
12.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	12,3
13.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	12,48
14.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	12,6
15.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	12,69
16.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	12,88

17.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	13,23
18.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	13,47
19.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	13,63
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	13,9
20.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	14
	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	14
22.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	14,07
23.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	14,14
24.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	14,44
25.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	14,47
26.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	14,6
27.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	14,65
28.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	14,7
29.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	14,85
30.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	14,93
31.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	15
32.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	15,12
33.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	15,25
34.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	15,61
35.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	15,84
36.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	15,91
	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	15,91
38.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	16
39.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	16,31
40.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	17,15
41.	PP	People's Party	Spain	17,16
42.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	17,34
43.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	17,52
44.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	17,75
			Czech	
45.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Republic	18,11
46.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	18,42
47.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	18,58
48.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	19,71
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

Dimension 5: Religion- ‘Supports religious principles in politics’ (1) till ‘Supports secular principles in politics’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	1,29
2.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	3,11
3.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	3,53
4.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	3,55
5.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	4,68
6.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	4,84
7.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	5,29
8.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	5,37
9.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	5,55
10.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	5,63
11.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	5,71
12.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	6,6
13.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	6,62
14.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	6,74
15.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	7,03
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	7,9
16.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	8,4
17.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	8,45
18.	JL	New Era	Latvia	10,13
19.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	11,59
20.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	12
21.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	12,13
22.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	12,2
23.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	13,52
24.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	13,8
25.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	15,53
	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	no data
	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	no data
	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	no data
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	no data
	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	no data
	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	no data
	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	no data
	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	no data

UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	no data
CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	no data
CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	no data
ND	New Democracy	Greece	no data
FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	no data
UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
FI	Forza Italia	Italy	no data
SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data
UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	no data
CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	no data
NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	no data
CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	no data
PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	no data
CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	no data
PP	People's Party	Spain	no data
M	Moderate Party	Sweden	no data
KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	no data

Dimension 6: Environment- “Supports protection of the environment, even at the cost of economic growth”(1) till “Supports economic growth, even at the cost of damage to the environment”(20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	8,36
2.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	8,81
3.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	9,45
4.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	9,5
5.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	9,6
6.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	10,26
7.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	10,27
8.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	10,42
9.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	10,44
10.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	10,5
11.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	10,61
12.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	10,84
13.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	10,94
14.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	11,18
15.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	11,5

16.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	11,64
17.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	11,65
18.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	11,67
19.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	11,8
	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	11,8
21.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	11,82
22.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	12
23.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	12,05
24.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	12,13
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,4
25.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	12,56
26.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	12,68
27.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	12,81
28.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	12,82
29.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	13
	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	13
31.	JL	New Era	Latvia	13,13
	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	13,13
33.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	13,14
34.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	13,62
	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	13,62
36.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	13,75
	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	13,75
38.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	14,5
39.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	14,51
	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	14,51
41.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	14,52
42.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	14,75
43.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	15
44.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	15,03
45.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	15,71
46.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	16,12
47.	PP	People's Party	Spain	16,64
48.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	17,22
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

Dimension 7- Nationalism- ‘Strongly promotes a cosmopolitan rather than a ____ national consciousness, history and culture.’ (1) till ‘Strongly promotes a ____ national rather than a cosmopolitan consciousness, history and culture.’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	2,5
2.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	6,44
3.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	6,94
4.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	7,09
5.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	7,29
6.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	7,89
7.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	8,8
8.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	8,94
9.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	9,8
10.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	10,2
11.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	10,44
12.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	11,17
13.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	11,33
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	11,8
14.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	12,14
15.	JL	New Era	Latvia	13,25
16.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	13,45
17.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	14,31
18.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	14,79
19.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	15,1
20.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	15,71
21.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	15,89
22.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	16
	TP	People's Party	Latvia	16
24.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	16,06
25.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	16,17
26.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	19,14
	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	no data
	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	no data
	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	no data
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	no data
	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	no data
	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	no data

KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	no data
KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	no data
UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	no data
CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	no data
CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	no data
ND	New Democracy	Greece	no data
FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	no data
UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
FI	Forza Italia	Italy	no data
SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data
UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	no data
CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	no data
CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	no data
PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	no data
CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	no data
PP	People's Party	Spain	no data
M	Moderate Party	Sweden	no data
KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	no data

Dimension 8: Decentralisation- ‘Promotes decentralisation of all administration and decision-making’ (1) till ‘Opposes any decentralisation of administration and decision-making. (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	1,65
2.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	3,1
3.	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	4,16
4.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	5,82
5.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	6,13
6.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	6,2
7.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	6,32
8.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	6,43
9.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	6,5
10.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	7
11.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	7,25
12.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	7,41
13.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	7,71
14.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	7,88

15.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	8,14
16.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	8,25
17.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	8,51
	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	8,51
19.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	8,81
20.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	8,87
21.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	8,94
	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	8,94
23.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	8,95
24.	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	9,1
25.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	9,13
26.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	9,16
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	9,4
27.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	9,82
28.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	9,94
29.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	9,95
30.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	10,08
31.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	10,3
32.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	10,47
33.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	10,5
34.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	10,52
35.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	10,56
36.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	10,63
37.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	10,72
38.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	10,76
39.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	11,31
40.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	11,79
41.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	12,24
42.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	12,61
43.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	13,16
44.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	13,17
45.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	14,11
46.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	14,14
47.	PP	People's Party	Spain	14,67
48.	JL	New Era	Latvia	17,29
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

Dimension 9: Immigration – ‘Favours policies designed to help asylum seekers and immigrants integrate into____ society’ (1) till ‘Favours policies designed to help asylum seekers and immigrants return to their country of origin’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	7,68
2.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	8,56
3.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	8,88
4.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	9,48
5.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	10,37
6.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	10,59
7.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	10,97
8.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	11,43
9.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	11,45
10.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	11,5
11.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	12,24
12.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	12,38
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	12,4
13.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	12,57
14.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	12,84
15.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	12,88
16.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	13,63
17.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	14
18.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	14,36
19.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	14,5
20.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	14,56
21.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	14,62
22.	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	14,62
23.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	15,72
24.	PP	People's Party	Spain	16,61
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data
	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	no data
	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	no data
	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	no data
	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	no data
	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	no data
	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	no data
	KDNP	Christian Democratic People’s Party	Hungary	no data
	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	no data

UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data
JL	New Era	Latvia	no data
TP	People's Party	Latvia	no data
LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	no data
TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	no data
PO	Civic Platform	Poland	no data
PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	no data
PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	no data
PD	Democratic Party	Romania	no data
UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	no data
SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	no data
KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	no data
SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	no data
SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	no data
Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	no data
SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	no data

Dimension 10: EU-Authority- ‘Favours increasing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy’ (1) till ‘Favours reducing the range of areas in which the EU can set policy.’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	M	Moderate Party	Sweden	5,97
2.	CD&V	Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	6,68
3.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	6,75
4.	CDH	Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	6,76
5.	ND	New Democracy	Greece	7,25
6.	CiU	Convergence and Union	Spain	7,37
7.	KF	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	7,5
8.	KOK	National Coalition Party	Finland	7,61
9.	UDC	Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	8,25
10.	FG	Fine Gael	Ireland	8,31
11.	KD	Christian Democrats	Sweden	8,37
12.	OVP	Austrian People's Party	Austria	9,38
13.	PSD	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	9,4
AVE	EPP	EPP Average EU Authority	EU	9,4
14.	CDA	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	9,7
15.	CSU	Christian Social Union	Germany	10,77

	CDU	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	10,77
17.	KrF	Christian Democrats	Denmark	11,61
18.	UMP	Union for a Popular Movement	France	12,43
19.	PP	People's Party	Spain	12,61
20.	KD	Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	14,42
21.	FI	Forza Italia	Italy	14,62
	UDEUR	UDEUR Populars	Italy	no data
	SVP	South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	no data

Dimension 11: EU Joining- ‘Opposes joining the European Union’ (1) till ‘Favours joining the European Union’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	PSL	Polish People's Party	Poland	9,75
2.	FIDESZ	FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	12,93
3.	SLS	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	15,37
4.	LKD	Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	15,58
5.	KDNP	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	15,79
6.	KDH	Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	15,88
7.	MDF	Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	16,28
8.	G	St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	16,8
9.	KDU	Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	16,92
	Nsi	New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	16,92
11.	SDS	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	16,98
12.	Isam	Fatherland Union	Estonia	17
AVE	EPP	EPP Average EU Joining	EU	17,2
13.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	17,39
14.	PPCD	Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	17,75
15.	BZNS	Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	18
16.	TP	People's Party	Latvia	18,38
	PO	Civic Platform	Poland	18,38
18.	PD	Democratic Party	Romania	18,53
19.	UDMR	Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	18,59
20.	ResP	Res Publica	Estonia	18,6
21.	JL	New Era	Latvia	18,63
22.	TS	Homeland Union	Lithuania	18,74
23.	NP	Nationalist Party	Malta	18,86
24.	SMK	Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	18,94
25.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	19
26.	SKDU	Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	19,47

27.	ODS	Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	19,8
	DSB	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	no data
	DP	Democratic Party	Bulgaria	no data

Dimension 12: NATO- ‘Favours ____ involvement in European security and peacekeeping missions’ (1) till ‘Opposes any ____ involvement in European military affairs’ (20)

Place	Abbr.	Party	Country	Value
1.	DISY	Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	4
2.	AKP	Justice and Development Party	Turkey	6,43
AVE	EPP	EPP Average	EU	7,88
3.	CSV	Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	11,75

Appendix 2: The Parable of the Talents (Matthew 25:14-30)

“For it is like a man going on a journey, who summoned his slaves and entrusted his property to them. To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one, each according to his ability. Then he went on his journey. The one who had received five talents went off right away and put his money to work and gained five more. In the same way, the one who had two gained two more. But the one who had received one talent went out and dug a hole in the ground and hid his master’s money in it.

After a long time, the master of those slaves came and settled his accounts with them. The one who had received the five talents came and brought five more, saying, ‘Sir, you entrusted me with five talents. See, I have gained five more.’ His master answered, ‘Well done, good and faithful slave! You have been faithful in a few things. I will put you in charge of many things. Enter into the joy of your master.’ The one with the two talents also came and said, ‘Sir, you entrusted two talents to me. See, I have gained two more.’ His master answered, ‘Well done, good and faithful slave! You have been faithful with a few things. I will put you in charge of many things. Enter into the joy of your master.’ Then the one who had received the one talent came and said, ‘Sir, I knew that you were a hard man, harvesting where you did not sow, and gathering where you did not scatter seed, so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. See, you have what is yours.’ But his master answered, ‘Evil and lazy slave! So you knew that I harvest where I didn’t sow and gather where I didn’t scatter? Then you should have deposited my money with the bankers, and on my return I would have received my money back with interest! Therefore take the talent from him and give it to the one who has ten. For the one who has will be given more, and he will have more than enough. But the one who does not have, even what he has will be taken from him. And throw that worthless slave into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.’

Appendix 3: Member parties of the European People's Party (EPP)

Name	Country	Type
Democratic Party of Albania	Albania	Observer Member
New Democrat Party	Albania	Observer Member
Austrian People's Party	Austria	Full Member
United Civil Party	Belarus	Observer Member
Belarusan Popular Front	Belarus	Observer Member
Humanist Democratic Centre	Belgium	Full Member
Christian Democratic & Flemish	Belgium	Full Member
Party of Democratic Progress	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Observer Member
Party of Democratic Action	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Observer Member
The Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Observer Member
Democratic Party	Bulgaria	Full Member
Agrarian People's Union	Bulgaria	Full Member
Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Full Member
St.George's Day Movement	Bulgaria	Full Member
Union of Democratic Forces	Bulgaria	Full Member
Croatian Peasant Party	Croatia	Associate Member
Democratic Centre	Croatia	Observer Member
Croatian Democratic Union	Croatia	Associate Member
Democratic Rally of Cyprus	Cyprus	Full Member
Christian and Democratic Union	Czech Republic	Full Member
Christian Democrats	Denmark	Full Member
Conservative People's Party	Denmark	Full Member
Res Publica and Fatherland Union	Estonia	Full Member
National Coalition Party	Finland	Full Member
Christian Democrats in Finland	Finland	Full Member
Union for a Popular Movement	France	Full Member
Christian Social Union	Germany	Full Member
Christian Democratic Union	Germany	Full Member
New Democracy	Greece	Full Member
Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	Full Member
Hungarian Democratic Forum	Hungary	Full Member
FIDESZ – Hungarian Civic Party	Hungary	Full Member
Fine Gael	Ireland	Full Member
South Tyrolean People's Party	Italy	Full Member
Union of Christian and Centre Democrats	Italy	Full Member
UDEUR Popolars	Italy	Full Member
Forza Italia	Italy	Full Member

New Era	Latvia	Full Member
People's Party	Latvia	Full Member
Homeland Union	Lithuania	Full Member
Lithuanian Christian Democrats	Lithuania	Full Member
Christian Social People's Party	Luxembourg	Full Member
VMRO-DPMNE	Macedonia	Observer Member
Nationalist Party	Malta	Full Member
Christian Democratic People's Party	Moldova	Observer Member
Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	Full Member
Christian People's Party	Norway	Observer Member
HOYRE (Right)	Norway	Associate Member
Civic Platform	Poland	Full Member
Polish People's Party	Poland	Full Member
Social Democratic Party	Portugal	Full Member
Democratic Party	Romania	Full Member
Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	Full Member
Christian-Democratic People's Party	Romania	Full Member
San Marinense Christian Democratic Party	San Marino	Observer Member
Alliance of Hungarians in Vojvodina	Serbia	Observer Member
Democratic Party of Serbia	Serbia	Associate Member
G17PLUS	Serbia	Associate Member
Slovak Democratic and Christian Union	Slovakia	Full Member
Party of the Hungarian Coalition	Slovakia	Full Member
Christian Democratic Movement	Slovakia	Full Member
New Slovenia- Christian People's Party	Slovenia	Full Member
Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	Full Member
Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	Full Member
People's Party	Spain	Full Member
Convergence and Union	Spain	Full Member
Christian Democrats	Sweden	Full Member
Moderate Party	Sweden	Full Member
Christian Democratic People's Party	Switzerland	Associate Member
Justice and Development Party	Turkey	Observer Member
All-Ukrainian Union "Fatherland"	Ukraine	Observer Member
People's Movement of Ukraine	Ukraine	Observer Member
People's Union "Our Ukraine"	Ukraine	Observer Member