

**TURKEY'S ACCESSION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION: A TWO-LEVEL
GAME ANALOGY**

by

ONUR KAYALAR

**Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts**

**Sabanci University
February 2006**

© Onur Kayalar 2006

All Rights Reserved

TURKEY'S ACCESSION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION: A TWO-LEVEL GAME ANALOGY

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç
(Dissertation Supervisor)

Assist. Prof. Burak Arıkan

Assoc. Prof. Bahri Yılmaz

DATE OF APPROVAL:

To my beloved grandmother

Dr. Fatma Seniha Altuğ

ABSTRACT

TURKEY'S ACCESSION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION: A TWO-LEVEL GAME ANALOGY

ONUR KAYALAR

M.A. in European Studies Programme, Thesis, 2006

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç

Key Words: Liberal Intergovernmentalism, preferences, public opinion, leaders' rhetoric, Turkey's membership in the European Union

The legitimacy crisis that the European Union (EU) is in today has become apparent in the aftermath of the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty in mid 2005 by some member states. The longstanding lack of democratic accountability in the EU decision making mechanism is one of the major problems of the EU that has not yet been resolved. The current crisis and Turkey's accession bid, which has officially begun with 3 October decisions, are in a considerable level of interaction due to the fact that Turkey is one of the reference points of the EU publics and member state governments with respect to the legitimacy crisis of the Union. Turkey's membership to the EU will be subject to inter-state bargaining in the Intergovernmental Conferences during accession negotiations. The hesitation amongst government leaders regarding Turkey's prospective membership is evident and will shape EU decisions to a great extent in the forthcoming years. The European citizens' resistant attitudes matter very much in this sense, which seems to be very hard to be overcome.

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’NİN AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ ÜYELİĞİ: BİR ‘İKİ-DÜZEYLİ’ OYUN ANALOJİSİ

ONUR KAYALAR

Avrupa Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı, Tez, 2006

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liberal Hükümetlerarası Teori, tercihler, kamuoyu, liderlerin retorikleri, Türkiye’nin Avrupa Birliği Üyeliği

Avrupa Birliği (AB) 2005 yılının ortasından itibaren giderek derinleşen bir meşruiyet krizi içerisinde. Bu durum, Anayasal Antlaşma’nın bazı üye devletlerde reddedilmesi ile açıkça ortaya çıkmıştır. AB karar verme mekanizmasında uzun süredir varolan demokratik sorumluluk yoksunluğu AB’nin henüz çözümlenmemiş en büyük sorunlarından. Birliğin bu meşruiyet krizi Türkiye’nin AB üyeliğini etkilemektedir. Türkiye’nin 3 Ekim 2005’te başlayan AB katılım süreci AB kamuoyunun Türkiye’ye bakış açısından dolayı bu krizi derinleştirmektedir. Türkiye’nin AB üyeliği, katılım müzakereleri süresince Hükümetlerarası Konferanslarda devletler arası pazarlığa maruz kalacaktır. Türkiye’nin beklenen üyeliği ile ilgili olarak hükümet liderleri arasındaki tereddüt gelecek yıllarda AB kararlarını büyük ölçüde şekillendirecektir. Hükümet liderlerinin pozisyonları büyük ölçüde kamuoylarının etkisi altındadır. Aşılması zor gözükken Avrupa vatandaşlarının bu dirençli tutumları bu bakımdan çok önem taşımaktadır.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am truly grateful to my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç, who has guided me in such an intelligent way and who is one of the biggest reasons why I have finally received my master's degree. Feeling her support behind me has been my biggest motivation. I would also like to express my gratitude to my Professors; to Bahri Yılmaz, who backed me anytime and anyhow and to Burak Arıkan for his enlightening advices during my studies at Sabanci University. I would also like to thank Zeynep Okan, in whose office I conducted my studies from time to time, for her patience and joy that kept me awake. I am also deeply grateful to my parents; to Dr. Zeynep Rüçhan Kayalar and to Adnan Tunç Kayalar for their support of any type. I owe them a lot since they are the most important constructors of the ethics I possess today. My special thanks go to my brother Anil Kayalar and his wife Büke Kayalar for giving me the necessary motivation I needed to write this thesis from the very beginning. I would also like to thank my grandmother Sermin Kayalar for hosting me during the last weeks of my studies. Finally, I am grateful to my friends as they have been my biggest source of motivation during my thesis blues.

Lastly, this thesis dissertation is just a piece of work of no value when compared to our relationship with my grandmother; it would be insufficient to describe my love and respect to Dr. Fatma S. Altuğ, who has provided me the best environment to study and who is my biggest champion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Chapter I: The Theoretical Framework	4
Chapter II: The empirical and historical analysis of Turkey-EU relations	16
I. Strong but weird; longstanding nature of Euro-Turkish relations: Does one misinterpret ‘the other’?.....	19
II. 1999-2004: Turkey’s progress towards accession.....	28
III. The interpretation of the 17 December decisions and the negotiating framework.....	36
Chapter III: The Domestic-International Linkage and Member State Preferences: Germany, France, Great Britain and Austria	40
I. Domestic Politics and International Relations: Putnam and Moravcsik.....	41
II. Member State Preferences on Turkey’s EU bid: Leaders’ rhetorical actions.....	44
III. The leaders and their stances on Turkey’s accession.....	46
Chapter IV: Public opinion in the EU towards Turkey’s accession bid	74
I. Literature review on support for European Integration.....	76
II. Analysis of Attitudes and Support for Turkey’s membership.....	82
Conclusion	96
Bibliography	101

INTRODUCTION

On 3 October 2005, Turkey – European Union (EU) relations has moved a historic step forward when the accession negotiations began. The Turkish journey for EU membership has begun in 1959 and has not yet arrived at its final destination. The accession negotiations will most probably take at least ten years, during which certain problems can occur in some policy aspects. During the accession process, Turkey has to adopt 90000 pages of EU legislation, namely the *acquis communautaire* that even current member states have struggles in implementation. The negotiations, therefore, will be hard and difficult both for the EU and for Turkey.

In this thesis, member states' preferences' impacts on Turkey's accession bid will be analysed. As will be seen in the forthcoming chapters, the EU-Turkey relations revolve around member state bargaining as all other policies do so. In other words, the results of the Intergovernmental Conferences reflect to a great extent the relative powers of the member states in the bargaining process and the question of Turkish membership provides us a good example of this fact. In addition to this, one of the focus points of this thesis is that public attitudes and member state preferences interact with each other. In other words, not only government leaders' preferences are formed within the limits of public positions but also political and opinion leaders' rhetoric serves as a conductor in the formation of the public opinion with respect to Turkey. Therefore, the European-Turkish relations are a very good example of how elite and mass attitudes interact and how the changing political environment of the EU is being shaped.

The theoretical framework of this thesis is given in Chapter I. Three varying theoretical approaches are applied to the topic of this dissertation. The three theories that are used are the Liberal Intergovernmentalist Theory (LI), which enables one to make rational explanations on issues, the linkage theories of domestic politics and

international relations, which widen the scope of the central claim of rationalism, and the Multi-Level Governance (MLG) theory, which enables one to have a wider perspective with respect to the debate over supra-nationalism and intergovernmentalism. The core theory that will shape this thesis, however, is LI due to the fact that the theory itself is a synthesis. Moreover, in order to assert the significance of public opinion in policy formation, the linkage between domestic politics and international relations is used in explaining the elite-mass interactions. Moreover, it is affirmed in this thesis it is claimed that that government leaders' preferences are shaped in accordance with their positions at home. This proposition, therefore, enables us to better explain the member states' hesitation regarding Turkey's prospective EU membership.

Chapter II will endeavour to provide an empirical-historical analysis of Turkey-EU relations. Taking the theory that is applied into account, the analysis will revolve around member states' preferences rather than providing a straight-forward chronological history of EU-Turkey relations. In this chapter, after giving a very brief historical analysis of the evolution of the EU, Turkey-EU relations will be analysed with reference to certain turning points in the relations' history. Moreover, the reformation process in Turkey that has been triggered after December 1999 is described. Turkey's progress towards accession will be taken into consideration with reference to the Progress Reports of the European Commission from 1999 to 2004. Certain issues, such as civil-military relations, the Cyprus dispute, and minority and human rights are picked as concrete and important matters in the relations. Finally, the 3 October 2005 decisions will be analysed and the analysis will be elaborated in Chapter III.

The rhetoric of political leaders and opinion makers significantly affect the formation of public opinion. The process is "mutually interactive"; politicians have to take into account their constituents' preferences in order to attract their favour and votes. By the same token, they also shape public opinion to a significant extent by means of communication and particularly their style and rhetoric. Therefore, in chapter III, a discourse analysis is conducted. Specifically, an in depth analysis will be done through the speeches of the political leaders and opinion makers in Germany, France, the United Kingdom and Austria.

Finally, Chapter IV will endeavour to explain the mass attitudes on Turkey's accession bid, which, it is believed, will help us to understand the public dynamics of government preferences. The purpose of the chapter is to provide an explanation for the reasons why public in the aforementioned member states oppose or support Turkish membership to the EU. Quantitative analysis will be done through using the spring 2005 Eurobarometer survey data.

Above all, Turkey's accession bid will be analysed in this thesis in a theoretical and empirical manner. In other words, certain empirical data will be tried to be given, while the theoretical approaches will remain in every chapter. The 17 December 2004 and 3 October 2005 decisions of the General Affairs and External Relations Council have been the main motive of the thesis, as Turkish-European relations has entered a new phase in history.

CHAPTER I

The theoretical framework

The European Union (EU) is currently in a crisis, which reflects the most significant rise in Euro- scepticism in the EU since the 1970s, due to the failure of the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty. Whether the EU Constitution will be ratified in the near future or not; it is open to debate. The question that should be posed in analysing the current crisis is if the European citizens are ready to further integrate themselves into the supra-national structures of the EU. The major reasons for the crisis derive from the legitimacy of the EU and its institutions. In other words, the crisis can be named as a legitimacy crisis, which has been disregarded by the Member State governments and leaders since the foundation of the Union. Although overcoming the democratic deficit has been included in the agenda of the union apparently since the late 1970s onwards, the EU has never ever achieved a great level of legitimacy, which national governments have, in the eyes of the public. Therefore, on 29 May, when the Frenchmen and women said no to the ratification of the European Union Constitution with 54.87 per cent, the legitimacy crisis has opened a new debate on the deepening of the EU and its policy of enlargement.

Turkey has applied for full membership to the EU right after the Greek application in 1959 and signed the Ankara Agreement in 1963, after which Turkish journey in full membership started.¹ In 1996, Turkey joined the Customs Union (CU),

¹ It was declared in the Association Agreement that when both parties were ready to fulfil the obligations, Turkey would become a member of the European Community. (Art.28) In addition, Turkey became the Associate Member of the European Economic

and has become the only country that is included in CU without full membership. Turkey was given candidacy status in 1999 Helsinki Summit. On 17 December 2004, it was decided in the Brussels European Council “to further Turkey’s membership process with the initiation of accession negotiations” on 3 October 2005.² The negotiation process has started on the determined date as Turkey brought into force “the six specific items of legislation identified by the Commission” and signed the Protocol on the adaptation of Ankara Agreement, which extends the scope of Ankara Agreement to the 10 new MS that has become full members in May 2004.³

Although it has been perfectly clear what Turkey had to do in order to start negotiations on October 3, MS preferences and positions in accordance with public opinion in the EU mean much. According to the latest Eurobarometer results, only 35 per cent of the Europeans are pro Turkish membership as opposed to the 52 per cent of the people who are against Turkish accession. The picture is even worse in France and Germany, which are the two of predominant powers in the EU; only 21 per cent of the Germans and French people support Turkish membership.⁴ The least support is in Austria with only 10 per cent support. In addition to this, the strong (right) political parties in France and Germany, which has replaced the existing pro-Turkey leadership in the latter and a probable change in leadership in the former can be foreseen, are in favour of a privileged partnership with Turkey rather than full membership. For instance, Edmund Stoiber, the leader of Christian Social Union (CSU) which is the coalition partner of Christian Democratic Union (CDU) today, has said in his election campaign that “he would do ‘everything within his legal power’ to keep Turkey out of

Community. The in depth empirical analysis of EU Turkey relations is given in the second chapter.

² Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs website; “Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy”, available at www.mfa.gov.tr

³ See Council of the European Union, “Brussels European Council, 16/17 December 2004: Presidency Conclusions”, published on 1 February 2005. However, Turkey declared that the so called Republic of Cyprus will not be allowed to benefit from the agreement until a solution to the Cyprus dispute is foreseen.

⁴ The European Commission, Eurobarometer 63, Public Opinion in the European Union, July 2005, pp.26-29 and p.99

the Union.”⁵ Further, Nicolas Sarkozy, the would-be French president after 2007 elections and Angela Merkel, today’s German chancellor, jointly declared that they are both opposed to Turkish full-membership.⁶

The accession of Turkey will no doubt affect the EU than any other enlargement has. Turkey is far more populous than any other already acceded country. Consequently she will have more say in some institutions than any other MS except Germany when the accession negotiations are concluded. Negotiations with Turkey, therefore, will be far more different than previous negotiations; the EU has to lessen the probability of risk as much as possible not only because Turkey is much harder to digest but also due to the exhaustion it experienced after the last enlargement.⁷ Thus, the EU has an enlargement fatigue and is drowning in the deep ocean of internal problems; the member states prefer to lessen the level of risk as much as possible. The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the reflection of member states’ preferences in the EU, as opposition and discontent against Turkey’s full membership is explicitly visible. This chapter endeavours to project the theoretical framework of this dissertation. The Liberal Intergovernmentalist theory (LI) will be at the heart of this thesis, which presupposes that some states are more effective, and even predominant in the policy making process than other states and supranational institutions due to their relevant powers. On top of this, member states bargain in the European Council in accordance with their relative powers. Furthermore, the outcome of the decisions has to be acceptable at home since the government leaders’ ultimate desire is to remain in power. Therefore, the LI theory is the core theory that will enlighten the future analysis of this thesis.

The basic theoretical propositions on the evolution of EU policy making process will be given in this chapter. First and foremost, the major tenets of Liberal Intergovernmentalist theory and its application on the European economic and political

⁵ EU news, policy positions and EU actors website: www.euractive.com, “Rehn: Turkey is already a ‘privileged partner’ of the EU”, 14 July 2005

⁶ Honor Mahony, “German opposition leader woos Paris”, 19 July 2005 www.euobserver.com

⁷ Turkish daily newspaper, *Radikal*, interview with Director of Candidate Countries, Enlargement Directorate General: Pierre Mirel by Mehmet Ali Birand on 8 July 2005

integration will be provided. Secondly, the policy making process will briefly be described with reference to the relative powers of the EU institutions and Member State (MS) governments. In line with the theory that is adopted in this thesis – Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI) – , the significance of convergence of interests between and bargaining among MS, and the impact of MS preferences on policy making as opposed to the supranational authorities of the Union – basically the European Commission, in the decision making processes will be the focus of analysis. Thirdly, the impact of domestic politics in MS on EU policy making; the increasing role of public opinion in the last two decades of the Union’s history and the legitimacy crisis that the former leads to will be discussed with reference to the ratification debate of the Constitutional Treaty (CT). Above all, the three theoretical approaches that have been stated before will constitute the theoretical framework of this thesis dissertation, which will be further explained below.

Liberal Intergovernmentalism, the Two-Level Game Analysis and Multi-Level Governance

To begin with, it would not be wrong to suggest that the EU somehow constitutes the most peculiar type of its kind; the EU is a community that is neither totally bound with supranational decision making organizations and institutions nor free-riding can easily be achieved. In addition, it is neither a purely economic and political community nor it acts directly in accordance with public opinion, although its regulations and decisions affect the daily life of European citizens directly. LI theory suggests that the integration process, which started with the emergence of European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) between France, Germany, Benelux Countries and Italy in 1952, is mainly triggered by convergence of interests between interest/pressure groups within and among MS and evolved through asymmetric interdependence and interstate bargaining – which will all be explained below – rather than “gradual’, ‘automatic’, and ‘incremental’ toward deeper integration and greater supranational

influence”.⁸ For Moravcsik, neo-functionalism, which has been assumed by the Euro-enthusiasts as the main ‘theory’ that could explain the European integration project, lacks coherence and empirical evidence in explaining the nature of the EU since it “advances long term predictions about the future of the EC without underlying, more specific theories that identify the decisive determinants of politicians’ choices among competing alternatives”.⁹ In other words, the major defect of the neo-functionalist ‘framework’¹⁰ is that “neo-functionalism sought to construct a comprehensive synthesis without a reliable set of theoretical elements, to analyse dynamic change without a reliable account of static decision-making, to analyse endogenous causes without a reliable account of exogenous causes and, above all, to predict without a reliable explanation”.¹¹ Hence, Haas’ neo-functionalist framework does not fully comply with the definition of what a theory is since it is not scientific in the Popperian sense as it lacks tentativeness since it predicts without any explanation and as it is untestable and unfalsifiable, it seeks to give unsupported speculation without any empirical evidence and without providing “micro-foundational theories of static preferences”¹². Above all, neo-functionalism is not the theory that is the only tool to explain the European integration project.

Synthesis in international relations (IR) theory, either contributes to the improvement of IR or stabs theory through aggregating propositions and killing the vivid contributions of opposing trends according to different scholars. However, it should be noted that “the broader the range of plausible conjectures tested, the wider the sources of data employed, and the more precise, rigorous, and reliable (the)

⁸ Ernst Haas quoted in Moravcsik, A. (1993) ‘Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31(4): 473-524, p. 476

⁹ Moravcsik (1993) ‘Preferences and Power in the EC’, p.477

¹⁰ Moravcsik maintains that neo-functionalism is a framework rather than a theory. See, Moravcsik, A. (2005) ‘The European Constitutional Compromise and the Neofunctionalist Legacy’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(2): 349-86

¹¹ Moravcsik (2005) ‘The Constitutional Compromise’, p.355

¹² *Ibid.*, p.350

understanding of the relationship between these two, the more satisfying the state of international relations".¹³ LI is a synthesis as it is neither purely liberal nor clearly realist. In other words, not only domestic politics and preferences but also rationality lies at the core of LI. It can be claimed that one of the most accurate ways of analysing the EU is LI since it is able to provide an overview of the evolution of European integration consistently and it is far away from the non-scientific assumptions of neo-functionalism. This is one of the biggest reasons why LI is chosen as the theoretical tool of analysis in this thesis. LI is, therefore, not totally realist in the sense that economic interdependence and domestic power balances are more important than the link between state, power and 'security'.¹⁴ The determinant role of relative power of member states in policy making in the EU lie at the core of the theory. Thus, LI suits the aim of this paper perfectly, as has been pointed out above, that is to explain the differences between positions and preferences of member states and their role in EU policy making processes.

Further, according to LI, 'national preference formation' and 'interstate strategic interaction' are the two major tools of analysis of policy formation in the EU. Further, as has been mentioned above, there are three elements at the heart of LI: (1) "the assumption of rational state behaviour", (2) "a liberal theory of national preference formation" and (3) "intergovernmentalist analysis of interstate negotiation". For the first element, it can be stated that LI does not treat governments' rational choices as 'billiard balls'; rationality does not derive from "fixed preferences of wealth, security or power" but government actions are taken in accordance with domestically defined goals. In other words, "the foreign policy goals of national governments are viewed as varying in

¹³ Moravcsik, A. (2003) 'Theory Synthesis in International Relations: Real Not Metaphysical', *International Studies Review*, Part of a forum entitled "Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?"

¹⁴ Cornett and Caporaso provide a very good analysis of European integration according to four different theories: neoclassical economic theory, neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism and functionalism and neofunctionalism, through which they state they "attempt less to test these four bodies of thought than to illustrate the strengths and limitations of each" (p.220). See, Cornett, L. and Caporaso, J. A. "And Still It Moves!" *State Interests and Social Forces in the European Community*, pp.219-49 in Rosenau J. N. and Czempiel E. (Eds.) (1995) Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain

response to shifting pressure from domestic social groups”, which compete for political influence and “whose preferences are aggregated through political institutions”.¹⁵ Hence, the foreign policy behaviour of states is formed via “the interaction of demand and supply, of preference and strategic opportunities”.¹⁶

For our purposes, changes in governmental and presidential authorities alter states’ preferences and positions as well. In other words, as national preferences are determined by domestically defined goals, governments’ positions change in foreign policy making in accordance with the preferences and pressures of societal groups that delegate power to governmental agents, those of which are responsible to aggregate preferences. In addition to this, as

the primary interest of governments is to maintain themselves in office; in democratic societies, this requires the support of a coalition of domestic voters, parties, interest groups and bureaucracies, whose views are transmitted, directly or indirectly, through domestic

Therefore, national preferences are not necessarily formed by economic interdependence or strategic, geopolitical interests, which will be explained below, but through domestic pressures that limit actions of governments, the ultimate desire of which is to remain in power.

How, therefore, MS in the EU has been and are able to form common policies, which directly affect the lives of millions of citizens? The conceptions of ‘convergence of interests’ and delegation and ‘pooling of sovereignty’ will be helpful in explaining the policy making mechanism in the EU. First of all, in the processes of interstate interaction and policy co-ordination, governments cooperate and form a single policy only when their interests converge. In other words, to apply this to our previous proposition that government policies are formed through domestically defined goals, “international agreement requires that the interests of dominant domestic groups in

¹⁵ Moravcsik (1993) ‘Preferences and Power in the EC’, pp.479-81

¹⁶ Ibid., p.481

different countries converge; where they diverge, co-ordination is precluded.”¹⁷ However, it is crucially important to note that not only domestic pressure but also the role of relative power of MS in interstate bargaining plays a major role in the policy making process. In other words, convergence of national preferences among MS and relative powers of MS are interrelated. The more powerful a MS is, the more likely it is to form the direction of pursued policies. Moravcsik claims that most EU common policies are predominated by three economically and politically most powerful states of the EU: France, Germany and Great Britain.¹⁸ Thus, for instance, it was when all countries interests converged in the mid-1980s to reform, through the election of a Tory government in Britain in 1979, French economic crises due to Keynesian economic policies and the sympathy of Kohl government in Germany towards reform.¹⁹ Although more powerful states dominate EU policy making processes, other MS’ influences should not be underestimated due to their veto power in foreign policy making. Despite the fact that the EU has been moving towards more integration via increasing the scope of qualified majority voting (QMV) system in more policy areas rather than requiring unanimity of votes, which donates smaller states with the power of veto, smaller states can still impact the policy making processes by forming opposition blocks-blocking minorities.²⁰ Hence, smaller states should not be disregarded in the analysis of policy co-ordination. Nevertheless, more powerful states are more influential than smaller member states. It is also worth to mention the concept of ‘asymmetric interdependence’ in the EU, which balances the relationship between small and large member states. As has been stated above, according to LI, the more powerful a state is, the more weight it has in policy making. In contrast, the more a MS desires a policy to be implemented, the more she has to lose. In other words, in EU (and European Community) history, “those who gained the most economically from integration compromised the most ..., whereas

¹⁷ Ibid. p.477

¹⁸ See Moravcsik, A. (1991) ‘Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the European Community’, *International Organization*, 45(1): 19-56

¹⁹ Cornett and Caporaso, ‘And Still It Moves’, p.231

²⁰ The details of QMV and its impacts on EU policy making processes will be provided in the forthcoming section of this paper.

those who gained the least or for whom the costs of adaptation were highest imposed conditions”. Thus, this is the reason why, for instance, during the last enlargement, Ireland, Greece, Portugal and Spain opposed enlargement as they would receive less funds if new members were included, so they received cohesion and structural funds the most in order not to be the losers of enlargement. Similarly, Central and Eastern European Members will oppose Turkish accession in the near future due to the fact that they will receive fewer funds if Turkey becomes a MS. Thus, it would not be wrong to suggest that, according to the asymmetrical interdependence theory, more powerful states can impose policies that they favour the most, although they have to offer a sort of a carrot to the smaller MS.

Above all, MS in the EU delegate or pool their sovereignties (1) for the sake of ‘European federalism’, (2) due to the “need to economize on the generation and analysis of information by centralizing technocratic functions” and (3) in order to constrain one another.²¹ In addition, LI disregards neither of the following neofunctionalist propositions that (a) “national preferences develop in response to exogenous changes in the nature of issue specific functional interdependence”, (b) interstate negotiation and bargaining (relative) power go hand in hand, and (c) “delegation to supranational institutions is designed to facilitate credible commitments”. Rather, LI disregards the exogenous nature of integration and emphasizes endogenous interstate bargaining, which “reflects international state action on the basis of relative power than supranational entrepreneurship, and unlike neo-functionalism, provides a clear theoretical starting point for explaining delegation to supranational institutions”.²²

The Liberal intergovernmentalist theory constitutes the theoretical framework of this thesis. However, a theory synthesis will be adopted to have a more coherent explanation on member states’ preferences on Turkey’s full membership; to better understand future prospects in EU-Turkey relations. First of all, the importance of public’s attitudes in policy making process is significantly important as public grants governments legitimacy through approving the foreseen decisions by the political

²¹ Moravcsik, A. (1998) The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht, London: UCL Press, see, Introduction, pp.1-17

²² Moravcsik, A. (2005) ‘The European Constitutional Compromise’, p.358

leaders. To put it correctly, decision and policy makers has to be responsive in terms of getting international agreements accepted at home. Thus,

Diplomatic tactics and strategies are constrained simultaneously by what other states will accept and what domestic constituencies will ratify. To conclude a negotiation successfully, the statesman must bargain on these two tables, both reaching an international agreement and securing its domestic ratification.²³

In other words, government leaders are bound with their position at home and because they seek to remain in power, they are restricted with their strong/weak position in domestic politics.

Despite the fact that this thesis adopts LI theory in explaining Turkish accession, Multi-level governance theory has a certain level of credibility since national governments role is not as central as it is claimed to be in LI. In other words, sovereignty has eroded considerably especially after the 1980s and decision making consequently is done in a cycle of its own through supra-national authorities.²⁴ On top of economic integration, which has always been the priority of the EU, the Single European Act, the Treaties of Maastricht, Amsterdam, Nice and the Constitutional Treaty have all been forwarded to increase the supranational character of the EU via increasing qualified majority voting in the European Council, strengthening the European Parliament and reserving the important roles and responsibilities of the European Commission as the motor of integration. The role of the supranational actors, therefore, should not be underestimated as they not only function as a facilitator in agreements between member states but also a certain level of polity in the supra-national authorities is existent. Furthermore, sub-national actors' role has been increased through, i.e. the Committee of Regions, in the policy making process, which grants credibility to the argument that decision making is not limited with state-centric approach. Above all, although the LI theory contains a great level of plausibility, the importance of supra-national and sub-national actors in the EU policy making process

²³Moravcsik, A., "Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining", in Evans et. al.(Eds.), International Bargaining and Domestic Politics: Double-Edged Diplomacy, (1993), University of California Press, London

²⁴ See, Marks, et. al., (1996) "European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-Level Governance", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(3), pp.341-78

should not be undervalued. The European Commission's responsibilities provide a good example for the two theories in this respect; according to the Liberal intergovernmentalist theory, the Commission draws up legislation not autonomously and spontaneously but in order to meet member state demands. However, the Multi-level governance theory asserts that demands do not necessarily come from member states but from the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and regional governments and other supra and sub national institutions. Therefore, it should be made clear that 'state' in the EU is not the single actor that initiates policies.

For the purposes of this thesis, in sum, the synthesis of the three approaches is important in the sense as follows. First of all, LI is the core approach since member states' positions and preferences are still at the heart of the decision making mechanism. In addition, stronger member states' influence, especially the impacts of the big three: Germany, France, and the UK in the policy making processes is greater than less powerful states.²⁵ Further, member states bargain not only with respect to their relative powers but also their win-sets at home. In other words, government leaders have to take their positions in domestic politics into consideration while bargaining as their bargaining power is constrained by their constituents. This drives us to the second approach, which is the Robert Putnam's domestic politics – international relations linkage, which will be analysed in great depth and detail in Chapter III and IV. Because leaders' ultimate desire is to remain in power, they act in accordance with their positions at home. In addition to this, the win-sets of leaders and their bargaining power are negatively correlated; the larger the win-set of a member state is, the less bargaining power it has and vice versa. In other words, in smaller win-sets provides the negotiator the necessary incentives to insist on the pursued agreements. Lastly, multi-level governance theory has to be placed in this thesis due to the reason that state is an important but not the only actor in policy formation. The EU has a unique structure of its own, and composed of numerous bodies that more or less have influence in policy making. Turkey's membership to the EU is important in this sense due to the fact that it is one of the most controversial issues among EU policies and there is a great amount of hesitation among EU member states and publics. Therefore, the three theoretical

²⁵ A discourse analysis of the attitudes of governments in Austria in addition to these three member states is given in the Chapter III.

approaches will help this thesis to form a coherent analysis of member state preferences on Turkey's accession bid.

CHAPTER II

The Empirical and historical analysis of Turkey-EU Relations

On 9 November 2005, in its strategy paper for candidate countries – Croatia and Turkey – and for potential candidate countries in the Western Balkans²⁶, the European Commission declared that the future Enlargement policy will be handled on the basis of three principles of ‘consolidation’, ‘conditionality’ and ‘communication’.²⁷ The EU Commissioner for Enlargement Olli Rehn stated on 15 November that enlargement is EU’s one of the most powerful policy tools “as it exemplifies the essence of the EU’s

²⁶ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRM), Serbia and Montenegro and Kosovo are identified as potential candidates in the Enlargement II package. See, European Commission, 9 November 2005, The enlargement package 2005, (MEMO/05/412), Brussels: <http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/05/412&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>. The Commission recommended candidate status to be granted by the Council for FYRM. The Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) negotiations have recently started with Serbia and Montenegro and will start with Bosnia and Herzegovina in a very short period of time. Albania has already signed the SAA with the EU in 2003 and paves the way to conclude negotiations despite low level of progress.

²⁷ The three Cs can be summarized as follows; consolidation refers to the EU’s authority over demanding more on top of existing requirements, while for conditionality, the EU’s aim is to make sure that the Enlargement process proceeds stage by stage. Communication is to improve the debate in the public and among European citizens. See, European Commission, 9 November 2005, Consolidation, conditionality, communication – the strategy of the enlargement policy, (IP/05/1392), Brussels: <http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/05/1392&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

*soft power*²⁸ which broadly but significantly explains what the enlargement policy holds for.

A completely new phase in Turkish-European relations is opened on the eve of 3 October after 30 hours of bargaining between Member States regarding Turkey's accession as a full member to the EU. In her 42 years of European journey on top of more than two hundred years of close relations with the West and Westernization processes, Turkey, for the first time, has been concretely included in the European integration project and the Union's policy of enlargement.²⁹ Despite the fact that the basis of the agreement has not been the smoothest ever as can also be observed by the length and harshness of the General Affairs and External Relations Council meeting, Turkey, today, is a country that is responsible for adopting 90000 pages of EU laws and practices – the *Acquis Communautaire* – in addition to political, economic and *cultural* reforms. At the same time, the EU will have to commit itself to Turkish enlargement to a great extent in the next decade or more and fulfil its promises in order not to alienate one of the biggest Member States of the future, Turkey.³⁰ 3 October is “truly historic for Europe and for the whole of the international community”³¹ as United Kingdom (UK) Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, who is one of the leading figures in the EU due to the UK's Presidency and who is the champion of the Turks due to his success in

²⁸ Olli Rehn, Speech at the Plenary Session of the European Parliament, 15 November 2005, *The 2005 Enlargement Package*, (SPEECH/05/693), Strasbourg: <http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/693&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

²⁹ On 20 October, the screening process has started in “Science and Research” chapter, which is presumably one of the easiest chapters. The whole process will be concluded in around one year.

³⁰ In other words, as a major trend in acceding and member states, public opinion follows a declining trend as a matter of fact. Around 80 percent of the public in Turkey is pro-EU membership today. However the accession process and the decline in public support for the EU are positively correlated, which will be elaborated in the next chapter. Thus, the EU should not further alienate the public in Turkey in order to accomplish the goal of full-membership.

³¹ The Guardian, “EU starts talking with Turkey”, by Nicholas Watt, 7 October 2005: http://browse.guardian.co.uk/search?search=Jack+Straw&IDim=0&No=30&Nso=1&N=0&Ns=P_PublicationDate

reaching a compromise in the wordings in the negotiation framework, has stated. It is also worth to note that Straw proclaimed all EU Member States, Turkey and the international community as ‘winners’ of the game, which has started in 1963. From 3 October 2005 onwards, Turkey and the EU officials will start negotiating 35 chapters of the *Acquis* one by one in the aftermath of the screening process. The negotiations are not expected to end before 2014 for the very simple fact of EU’s financial perspective up to 2014, which does not take Turkey into account at all. Thus, both the Europeans and Turkey will no doubt face many difficulties and complications, which will evolve hand in hand with the deepened relations, on top of the existing problems such as the Cyprus dispute or the resistance among the Member States of the Union and among European citizens themselves against the future membership of Turkey, which will also constitute the framework of this chapter.

As has been provided in the first chapter, there is a wide range of opposition among the Europeans against Turkey’s full membership in the EU. Although the reasons of this general pattern vary in different MS, one of the most important bases of the hesitation of the Europeans meets at a common point, which is the question of whether Turkey is ‘European’ or not in many respects. Despite, technically, Turkish accession negotiations will be no different than previous enlargement processes, the accession negotiations will be ‘harder’ and ‘tougher’ not only because the EU has an enlargement fatigue but also because Turkey is far bigger, poorer and more populous on top of its Islamic character and geographically or culturally more eastern. In this chapter, the analysis of European-Turkish relations will be divided into three periods. Firstly, a brief historical analysis of the evolution of Turkey-EU relations from 1959 – Turkish application to European Community membership, to 1996 – Customs Union Agreement between Turkey and the EU will be provided. Secondly, the period between 1999 Helsinki Summit, where Turkey’s candidacy status was recognised and 17 December 2004 decisions, according to which Turkey would begin accession negotiations from 3 October onwards. Finally, some analytical observations will be made on important official documents concerning Turkey, i.e. the negotiating framework for Turkey. In sum, the main focus of this chapter will be to analyse the positions, interests and preferences of the EU, EU Member States and Turkey in the previous year – 6 October 2004 – 3 October 2005.

I. Strong but weird; longstanding nature of Euro-Turkish relations: Does one misinterpret ‘the other’?

The Turks and the Europeans have been in interaction for more than thousand years, with ups and downs in the relationship. Europe, or rather Europeanness has always been a carrot for the Turks, either in the Ottoman period or in the Republican era. In other words, being accepted as European/Western by the Europeans has always served as a catalyst in reforming the political system in Turkey. For the Ottomans, in order to survive in world politics, the only way out was to follow or imitate what the Europeans had been doing from 18th century onwards. Although there had been various trends, the main path of the Ottoman ruling elite had been being as close as possible to the Europeans. This stream reflected itself in many areas of Ottoman life style as well. However, modernization was limited with the elites; the periphery was disregarded. Nevertheless, from 1839 onwards, the Europeanization process could be considered as the mainstream ideology that was dominant in the centre. In the republican period, there was a radical change with respect to the centre and to every aspect of life of the periphery. The first and foremost goal of “the Kemalist elite was to ‘reach the contemporary level of civilisation’ by establishing its political, economic and ideological prerequisites, such as the creation of an independent nation-state, the fostering of industrialisation and the construction of a secular and modern national identity’.³² Thus, the major elements in the construction of Turkish identity and the identity of the Republic was secularism, which was regarded as the main obstacle in the modernization process, and nationalism, which was the only route in founding a modern nation-state.

No doubt, Turkish-European relations entered a new phase with the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1952 in the first place as a matter of changing structure of the Continent through an integration process, and more

³² Aydin, Senem and Keyman, E. Fuat, “European Integration and the Transformation of Turkish Democracy”, Centre for European Policy Studies, EU-Turkey Working papers, No.2, August 2004, p.3

significantly the Turkish application to the European Economic Community EEC in 1959 in the second. Turkey-EU relations will be analysed in this chapter through providing the major turning points in relations and in EU's history. In addition, in line with the theory that has been outlined in the first chapter, the focus will be to provide empirical examples of how EU MS preferences impact policy making in the EU. Likewise, the probable Turkish future membership vis-à-vis public opinion in MS will also be taken into consideration. In other words, the picture of the relationship between domestic politics that reflects hesitation against Turkey's membership and significant events vis-à-vis Turkey-EU relations will be endeavoured to be given. The political and economic determinants in relations will be the major tenets of analysis. On the other hand, the *cultural* element will also be addressed as a matter of the origins of EU-Turkey relations. Both Turks and Europeans regarded one another either and mostly as enemies, or 'the other' of each other, or as ally against other 'others'. The Turk constituted the 'other' for the Europeans, with whom they identified themselves for centuries. Hence, it is not a big surprise to hear the French President Jacques Chirac, saying, Turkey has to go through a 'major *cultural* revolution'³³, despite the fact that culture is not a determinant in Turkish accession. Above all, Turkey-EU relations and the debate on Turkish membership in the EU are not only about Copenhagen political and economic criteria, but also the relations that have been framed by the element of culture in an increasing fashion. This, somewhat, reflects the reasons and consequences of the concurrent legitimacy crisis in the EU as well.

The Political and Economic Dynamics within the EU

In 1957, what Jean Monnet and Robert Schumann had in mind was that the EEC, which was founded by the Treaty of Rome by six European states – France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux Countries, would lead to a never ending process of integration through 'spill-over' under a supreme supranational authority. The ultimate consequence of the integration process would be a more peaceful continent in contrast

³³ Honor Mahony, "Chirac says Turkey needs major cultural revolution to join EU", 05.10.2005, <http://euobserver.com/15/20012>

destructions of the past and the sufferings of the past. In 1965, the Treaty of Merger united ECSC, European Atomic Agency (EURATOM) and EEC. Thus, the nation states of Europe, once upon a time each of which had more or less imperial rule over the world, would cooperate in every aspect of politics and economics and thus would not fight against each other again. In other words, because Europe was totally destructed after World War II, achieving peace was the major concern among European elite. According to the founders of the Union, through an automatic ‘spill-over’ process, which is, once the cooperation process starts, it inevitably and automatically spills-over other fields, the most peculiar kind of regional organization would emerge. Hence, at the end, individual interests would be replaced by collective interest, national identities would disappear and loyalties would shift to supranational loyalties. However, the picture was not as simple as the founding fathers’ ideals. National interests superseded collective interests of the Community especially during the 1960s and 70s. Decisions could hardly be taken due to the insistences of Member States (MS) over national interests rather than collective interests. Indeed, this is somehow the impact of President Charles De Gaulle, who came to power in 1958 and became the President of the Fifth Republic of France. De Gaulle, who was a strong French nationalist, was not in favour of the idea of European integration or rather the ‘pooling of sovereignty’.³⁴ Thus, following the ‘empty-chair crisis’ of 1965-1966, when no decision could be taken due to the inexistence of the French side at the table, unanimous voting was brought into agenda, namely the ‘Luxembourg Compromise’ of 1966. As a result, there was no more supremacy of the Commission since every decision had been subject to every single MS vote up until 1987 Single European Act (SEA) of 1989. Thus, it would not be wrong to suggest that the ideal of a supranational authority in the decision making mechanism died in 1966 to a great extent until late 1980s.

Adding the recession in European economies on top of high level of unemployment, the 1970s was the era of Euro-scepticism; the future of the Community was in great danger. Another reason why there was high Euro-scepticism was because of the lack of political will to take important decisions at the supranational level due to the impact of unanimous decision making that has been explained above. However,

³⁴ It is worth to state that the decision making mechanism today is the outcome of French – De Gaulle – nationalism since it was him who brought the conception of ‘unanimity’ to the EC institutional setting.

either because of the changing global-political environment as a matter of the decline in the power of the Soviet Union, or because of the boost in European economies at the beginning of 1980s, the EC was no more a sleeping beauty. The 1980s witnessed the rebirth of the Community from its ashes, which ultimately led to the formation of three pillar structure of the European Union (EU).³⁵ From then onwards, the EU MS have continuously integrated; the processes of deepening and widening have been going hand in hand.

As has been stated above, the EC was under major transformation in terms of deepening. The EC got rid of the Euro-scepticism that was dominant in the 1970s and early 1980s and re-entered a process of rapid firstly economic then political integration. The second founding father of the EU – former head of the Commission Jacques Delors – initiated a package that proposed reform in the decision making mechanism, which for him was the major source of Euro-pessimism among MS. The Intergovernmental Conference in December 1985 developed the Single European Act (SEA), based on the Commission’s White Paper, namely “Completing the Internal Market”, which mainly foresaw institutional reform. The main contributions of the SEA had been to increase the competences of the supranational authorities, introduction of qualified majority voting (QMV) in further areas of policies, introduction of co-operation procedure to initiate the involvement of the European Parliament (EP) in the decision making procedures in order to increase the democratic accountability of the Community in the eyes of the public.³⁶ On top of everything, however, the “single, biggest market and trading unit in the world” had been created and cohesion had been introduced for the purpose of preventing “two-speed Europe”.³⁷ This process of institutional reform and

³⁵ The most supranational pillar of the EU is the European Communities, which is composed of ECSC (expired on 23 July 2002), EURATOM and EEC. Today, most of the decisions in the first pillar are taken through Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) in the EU. The other pillars – ‘Common Foreign and Security Policy’ and ‘Justice Freedom and Security’ still require unanimity in the decision making process.

³⁶ For further information and analysis on SEA, see, Fitzmaurice, John, “An Analysis of the European Community’s Co-operation Procedure”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 26(4), June 1988, pp.389-400

³⁷ McCormick, John, (2002), Understanding the European Union, The European Union Series, Palgrave, London

of further integration continued progressively in the following years by the Treaty on European Union (TEU) – Maastricht Treaty (1991), Amsterdam Treaty (1996), and Treaty of Nice (2000). Specifically, the TEU created the three pillars, and name of the European Community had been renamed as European Union. In addition to this, single European currency was initiated to be completed in 1999, the concept of “European citizenship” was created and the co-decision procedure, which gave the EP the power to serve as a body in legislation in certain areas. The Treaty of Amsterdam introduced common policies on the issues in the second pillar, i.e. asylum policy and immigration. Finally, the Treaty of Nice redefined the tasks and the character of the EU institutions; it mainly changed the voting rules and procedures.³⁸ These continuous processes of institutional reformation were mainly aimed at further integrating EU MS through increasing the competences of the supranational institutions. However, as a matter of increasing impact of domestic politics in the EU affairs, increasing the role of the EP has been another goal in reformation since the more MS were integrated, the more the public were affected by EU decisions. In other words, almost 80 per cent of MS law happened to be EU law. As an ultimate result, public has been directly subject to EU decisions, contrary to the previous years. Therefore, increasing the role of the EP would serve for legitimacy purposes by increasing democracy in the EU especially in the 90s and in the millennium. It is also worth to state that if the Constitutional Treaty was ratified, the EU today and in the forthcoming years would have a more supranational character and would be working more efficiently.

Turkey's relations with the EU

In 1959, Turkey applied for associate membership to the EC right after the Greek application and signed Ankara Treaty – the Association Agreement in 12 September 1963, and Additional Protocol in 1970, both of which were aimed to be the road maps towards Turkish involvement in the Customs Union (CU), and became an associate member of the EEC in 1963.³⁹ A three stage process was visualized in the

³⁸ Ibid., p.82

³⁹ Article 1 of the Additional Protocol laid down “the conditions, arrangements and timetables for implementing the transitional stage referred to in Article 4 of the

Association Agreement, which would also lead to Turkey's membership in the Community. The terms of the Agreement was limited as agricultural products and free movement of labour/persons remained out of it. Nevertheless, following the preparatory and transitional stages, Turkey was envisaged to realize CU in the final stage, which would ultimately open the road to full membership in the EC. Thus, it would not be wrong to assert that 'the logic of the extended time framework for membership was based on the argument that the early exposure of the Turkish economy to full competition ... would jeopardize Turkey's industrial development itself'.⁴⁰

Turkey-EU relations during the 1970s were on shaky grounds either because domestic politics in Turkey was highly unstable, or because the EC itself was in struggle in forming truly common policies, the main reasons of which were mainly economic instability and high level of unemployment. In the bipolar world, Turkey was one of the main allies of the Western camp although she had followed a protectionist model of economic development during the 1970s following the major trend in the world. However, it should also be noted that following the 1973 oil crisis, which can be considered as the first major success of the oil-rich previously colonized countries against the rich North, Turkey had very much been economically and politically destabilized. In other words, the 1970s were years of anarchy and political polarization and fragmentation for Turkey which ultimately led her to destabilize her position in international relations.⁴¹

agreement establishing an Association between the European Economic Community and Turkey". The original document is available at European Union website: [http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=21970A1123\(01\)&model=guichett](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=21970A1123(01)&model=guichett)

See also

http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/turkey/pdf/association_agreement_1964_en.pdf for 1963 Ankara Agreement. The Additional Protocol entered into force in January 1973.

⁴⁰ For an in depth information, see, Öniş, Ziya, "Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards an Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations", paper presented at the annual Conference of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies (BRISMES) held at the University of Cambridge, England, July 2-5, 2000.

⁴¹ See Özbudun, Ergun and Tachau Frank, "Social Change and Electoral Behaviour in Turkey: Toward a Critical Realignment", International Journal of Middle East Studies,

There was also an additional complication in the EU-Turkey relations that is Turkey's intervention in Cyprus in 1974.⁴² In the 1970s, although the EU was still uncertain over Cyprus, as all countries – Turkey, Greece and the Republic of Cyprus – were associate members, Turkish intervention in the island complicated matters in EU-Turkey relations. When the Greek junta took over the government and claimed the annexation of the island to Greece, on the basis of Turkey's right to intervene according to the 1960, Treaty of Guarantee⁴³ Turkey sent troops to the Northern territories of the island. Turkey occupied the Northern part of the island on the basis of the argument that the Turkish Cypriots were slaughtered by the Greek Cypriots. According to the Zurich and London Agreements, all Turkey, Greece and United Kingdom⁴⁴ had the right to intervene in the established affairs of the island. In other words, the sufferings of the Turkish Cypriots and the insistence of the Makarios⁴⁵ government over the ideal of *enosis*, which is simply the ideal of unity with Greece through particularly strongly

6(4), October 1975, pp.460-80; See also Çarkoğlu, Ali, "The Turkish Party System in Transition: Party Performance and Agenda Change", *Political Studies*, XLVI, pp.544-71

⁴² We should first and foremost note that the Cyprus dispute between Turkey and Greece is a longstanding and yet insoluble issue. Thus, one should be careful while reading the lines above and should not totally commit him/her to what has been written above. This thesis dissertation deals with the Cyprus dispute with a Turkish perspective not solely because the author is Turkish but because the Cyprus debacle would constitute a separate dissertation and it would be beyond the scope of this dissertation.

⁴³ See, Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, (1997), Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe, Manchester, United Kingdom, Manchester University Press

⁴⁴ Cyprus had been ruled by the British from 1922 onwards. Although the British government offered Cyprus to Greece during the World War I in order to open another battle field against the Central Powers, namely Bulgaria, the Greeks rejected the offer. However, the British offer made Greece be aware of the fact that there was a possibility to apply *enosis* as Cyprus was not really crucially important for the British and led them to claim rights over the completely Greek governance of the island. The debates over the governance of the island prolonged up until the Zurich Agreement when both Greek and Turkish sides made concessions and when Britain became aware of the fact that it would be better to have bases in the island rather than colonizing it.

⁴⁵ He was the Archbishop in 1950 and he can be claimed to be the leader of *enosis*. He was extremely powerful due to the fact that Greek Cypriot politics was very much religiously and nationalist oriented. Both components fitted the profile of Makarios.

religiously oriented nationalist discourses in terms of ideology, led to the ultimate military intervention of Turkish government.⁴⁶

It is worth to note the significance of Greek-Turkish relations within the analysis of Turkey-EC relations as a matter of the balancing role of the West over Turkey-Greece relations. In other words, both had followed more or less similar paths in their process of Westernization in the bipolar system up until 1981, when Greece became a full member of the Community. After the foundation of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus that has not been recognized by the EC/EU, therefore, the West gave an end to its balancing role and Turkey was left alone despite its strategic significance and geographical proximity in the Cold War era. Thus, after the Turkish intervention in Cyprus, Greece applied for EC membership not only because of the rivalry with the Turks, but also due to security reasons and became a member of the EC in 1981. Although both Greece and Turkey belonged to the same camp through North Atlantic Treaty Organization – NATO membership, Greeks regarded the Cyprus intervention as ‘invasion’ and seek EC membership in order to strengthen its position, or in other words, security incentives against Turkey. Greece had been able to Europeanize and to internationalize her conflicts with Turkey ‘through EU’s decision making mechanisms’.⁴⁷ Greece, above all, became a member of the EC in 1981 and obviously strengthened her position in major areas of dispute such as Cyprus against Turkey.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ For further in depth analysis of the dispute, see, Dodd, Clement H., (1998), The Cyprus Imbroglio, England, The Eothen Press.

⁴⁷ Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, 7(2), Summer 2002, pp.82-3

⁴⁸ For instance, in addition to her strong position over Cyprus dispute, Greece vetoed the financial support to Turkey which had been encompassed by the Customs Union Agreement. For further analysis of the impacts of Greece’s membership over Turkish-Greek relations, see, Müftüler-Baç, “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process”, pp.79-95. See also, Öniş, Ziya, “The Role of the European Union in Greek-Turkish Relations: Greek-Turkish Relations and the Role of the European Union: Perpetuator of Conflict or Contributor to Peace?” in Kollias, Christos and Günlük-Şenesen, Gülay, (Eds.), (2003), Greece and Turkey in the 21st Century: Conflict or Cooperation?, New York: Nova Publishers

Turkey-EU relations, therefore, were highly deteriorated during the 1970s not only because of the Cyprus issue but also because of the anarchical and unstable political environment in Turkey.⁴⁹ Moreover, membership in the EC was not primarily important in Turkish governments' agenda. Thus, it might be claimed that Turkey also failed to improve relations with the EC during the 1970s. Following the 12 September 1980 military intervention in Turkey, relations with the EC, which had already been frozen in 1978 unilaterally by Turkey, "the Association Agreement and all relations with the Community were effectively frozen".⁵⁰ Hence, Turkey somehow missed the opportunity to become a full member of the EC, which could have been very likely when one takes Greek-Turkish relations into consideration.

Unlike the Latin American military take-overs, the self perceived duty of the Turkish military was to normalize the state of affairs and leave office as soon as possible. In 1983, three years after the intervention, multi-party elections took place and Turgut Özal, achieved the majority of votes and the Motherland Party – *Anavatan Partisi* – ANAP came into power with a single party government. The major contribution of the ANAP government was to abandon import substitution industrialization (ISI) – inward looking and to liberalize the economy through export oriented-outward looking economic strategy. In addition, there had been considerable political reforms with respect to fundamental rights and liberties. In 1987, Turkey applied for full membership of the EC.⁵¹ In addition, EC membership was at the core of Özal government's foreign policy agenda from 1987 onwards. However, either because the EC had been transforming in terms of deepening and because what had recently happened in Turkey was completely in contrary to the ideals of the EC – that is democracy and human rights, the European Commission declared on 18 December 1989 that Turkey's accession was unlikely, meaning out of the agenda but proposed to proceed in establishing CU as had been envisaged in the Association Agreement.

⁴⁹ For detailed history of the 1970s crisis, see Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, "Turkey's Relations With Europe", pp.58-62

⁵⁰ Ibid., p.62

⁵¹ In the mean time, the Association Agreement had been frozen in January 1982 by the European Parliament until the political crisis was resolved and human rights were guaranteed.

Above all, with respect to the evolution of the EU and of EU-Turkey relations, it can be stated that the more the EU moved towards a supranational order, the more the relations between the EU and Turkey had deteriorated. Although the impact of domestic political developments in Turkey and in the EU member states and the changes in the international environment and order on EU-Turkey relations cannot be underestimated, the evolution of the EU to a more supranational structure and the changes in the relations can be correlated. As has been stated above, the high level of economic and political integration via institutional reforms and new policy fields have been triggered as soon as the European economies started to recover. In other words, member states got rid of Euro-scepticism when domestic economic difficulties, i.e. recession or inflation were finally over. Thus, one could assert that it would be much easier for Turkey to join the EU at the beginning of the 1980s as Greece did due to the fact that there were very limited rules and procedures – criteria – for membership. However, when the EU underwent a deepening process, the response to Turkey's application in 1987 was ultimate. Today, the picture is different; the EU is incomparably more supranational than it was in the 1970s but under pressure of economic difficulties, while has recently initiated accession towards Turkey. Consequently, it is not wrong to state that the accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU will be very hard and difficult.

II. 1999-2004: Turkey's progress towards accession

Turkey signed a Customs Union Agreement (CUA) with the EU in 1995 as foreseen by the Ankara Treaty, which was put into effect in 1 January 1996. However, Turkey-EU relations were driven into one of the deepest crisis in 1997, when the EU MS decided not to include Turkey in the enlargement process, which led the Turkish government to freeze relations with the EU. The main reason of Turkey's aggressive response was mainly not granting Turkey candidacy status and declaring post-communist Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs), some of which lagged far behind Turkey in terms of their market economies and democracies, and Cyprus and Malta as candidates in the 'Agenda 2000' Luxembourg Summit. Turkey, therefore, froze her relations with the EU until when Turkey was convinced through being

officially recognized as a candidate country and was promised to be treated on the basis of the same criteria applied to the 10 forthcoming MS in 1999 Helsinki Summit. The pre-accession strategy for Turkey has been adopted by the EU from 2000 onwards. In response, Turkey initiated the ‘National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis’ in 2001. From 1998 onwards, regular reports on Turkey’s progress towards accession, the last of which – in 6 October 2004 – recommended the Council to start accession negotiations with Turkey, has been prepared by the Commission.

As has been stated above, Turkey was obliged to fulfil political and economic criteria that had been agreed in 1993 Copenhagen Summit by EU MS in addition to the adoption of the *Acquis Communautaire* in order to become a full member of the EU. The Copenhagen Criteria requires the candidate country to have, first, stable institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities, second, a functioning market economy, as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the EU and third the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union.⁵²

The EU, therefore, became the primary catalyst in reforming Turkey, especially in the late 1990s. However, it should also be noted that the EU is not the only reason of the reformation process in Turkey but a triggering factor that fastens the process. In other words, being a full member of the Union is the post-modern version of ‘reaching the contemporary level of civilization’, as explained at the beginning of this chapter. The European states has transformed the ‘modern state’, the basis of which was founded in 1648-Westphalia; the state is less important and democracy and European norms are prior to security concerns. Through integration and pooling of sovereignty, the EU MS has less national sovereignty and therefore focuses less on the elements of the realist world.⁵³ As a result, especially from 1987 onwards, the EU has been the major carrot for Turkey in transforming into a post-modern state.

⁵² EU portal, DG Enlargement, <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/intro/criteria.htm#Copenhagen%20Criteria>
^a For full, original document, see Conclusions of the Presidency, European Council in Copenhagen, 21-22 June 1993, http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/72921.pdf

As has been stated above, from 1998 onwards, regular reports not only on CEECs' and Mediterranean countries' but also on Turkey's progress towards accession reports have started to be prepared by the European Commission. The purpose of the documents has been to outline the extent to which the candidate country accomplishes the fulfilment of the criteria for membership. Although the Commission's reports are not binding, it has usually been the case that the Council follows the recommendations.⁵⁴ In the case of Turkey, a significant improvement in the language used in the reports can be observed in an increasing fashion from 2001 onwards.

According to the 1998 regular report, Turkey fell very much short of the requirements of the EU in terms of Copenhagen political criteria. 'Persistent human right violations' and 'major shortcomings in the treatment of minorities' took the first place in the report. This was mostly due to the Turkey's low human rights records and the guerrilla war that had been continuing in the South-East provinces of Turkey and in Northern Iraq against the terrorist organization PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party). Secondly, lack of civilian control and the strong influence of the Turkish Armed Forces over politics were also strongly underlined.⁵⁵ The reason for the emphasis was mainly because of the influence of the NSC and therefore the strong position of the military in politics. More specifically, the semi-memorandum by the army on 28 February 1997 against the Islamist Welfare Party – RP (*Refah Partisi*) and the closure of party in a year attracted high level of attention from the Europeans. Therefore, Turkey's prospect for membership was very low in 1998. It should also be noted that Turkey-EU relations were unilaterally frozen by Turkey due to the decisions of Luxembourg Summit in 1997 – Agenda 2000 – as the EU left Turkey alone in the applicant list.

⁵³ See, Cooper, Robert, (2000), The Post-Modern State and the World Order, London, Demos, The Foreign Policy Centre

⁵⁴ The Council can also take political decisions. For instance, although the report on Greek accession was considerably negative, the Council decided to grant Greece membership status in 1981.

⁵⁵ Commission for the European Communities, "2004 regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession", 6.10.2004, Brussels. Available at the EU portal: http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_2004/pdf/rr_tr_2004_en.pdf

In the 1999 report, the Commission asserts that Turkey-EU relations have not changed since 1998 as a result of the deadlock in the relations. Despite the importance of the ‘European Strategy’, which Turkey strongly rejected by freezing the relations, is emphasized, the capture of the terrorist leader Abdullah Öcalan constitutes a major area of attention in the report.⁵⁶ Indeed, the report has no significance not only because the relations were in deadlock, but also because no significant measures in relations were taken in terms of progress during 1999. However, two months after the report, the European Council in Helsinki has recognized Turkey as a candidate country, which consequently changed both the EU-Turkey relations and the political environment in Turkey.

On 10-11 December 1999, the European Council decided in Helsinki that “Turkey is a candidate State destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States”.⁵⁷ However, it is asserted in the report that Turkey still did not meet the Copenhagen political criteria. In the 2001 report, the Commission appreciates the Constitutional amendments of 3 October 2001 that limited the capital punishment and strengthened the fundamental rights and liberties and human rights conditions. A number of positive elements are addressed in the report with respect to economic, social and cultural rights. However, it is also noted that human rights conditions must still be improved. Thus, although certain improvements in terms of reforms are praised, implementation of the reforms is still addressed as the biggest obstacle for membership.

⁵⁶ “1999 Regular Report from The Commission on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”, 13.10.1999 Available at the EU portal:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_10_99/pdf/en/turkey_en.pdf

⁵⁷ “2000 Regular Report from The Commission on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”, 8.11.2000, p.7, Available at the EU portal:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_11_00/pdf/en/tu_en.pdf

On 3 November 2002, Turkey went through general elections and the AKP came to power. As soon as it obtained the vote of confidence in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), the party signified the EU membership as its primary goal in the agenda. For this reason, the leader of the party, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, visited almost all the major capitals of the EU MS and asked for support in the 2002 Copenhagen European Council. However, Turkey could not get what it expected, which was to begin accession negotiations. Instead, the EU promised to open accession negotiations ‘without delay’ in the end of 2004, if the European Council in Brussels decides so, on the basis of the Commission’s recommendation that Turkey fulfilled Copenhagen criteria.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Turkey continued the reformation process, which is praised in the 2003 regular report. ‘Far reaching changes’ in Turkey’s political and legal system has been noted in addition to the will of Turkey to effectively implement the reforms are appreciated, although implementation is considered to be uneven. It is therefore concluded in the report that “Turkey has made further impressive legislative efforts which constitute significant progress towards achieving compliance with the Copenhagen political criteria”.⁵⁹

Finally, in its 6 October 2004 report, the Commission recommends the Council to begin accession negotiations with Turkey. Although some areas, such as Turkish Penal Code, in Turkish legal system are highlighted as remaining defects, the Commission approves that Turkey had sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen economic and political criteria that is adequate to start accession negotiations. Consequently, the Brussels European Council has decided on 17 December to, on the basis of a report and recommendation from the Commission, open accession negotiations with Turkey without delay. Turkey, however, was required to “sign the Protocol regarding the adaptation of the Ankara Agreement, taking account of the accession of the ten new Member States...prior to the actual start of the negotiations”.⁶⁰ In addition, Turkey was

⁵⁸ The Council of the European Union, Copenhagen European Council, 12-13 December 2002, “Presidency Conclusions”, 29.01.2003, p.5, http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf

⁵⁹ Commission, “2004 regular Report”, p.14

held responsible for reforming the Penal code until 3 October 2005. Therefore, in her 42 years of journey to the EU, Turkey finally achieved a concrete way to full membership.

The 1982 Constitution of Turkish Republic, which was prepared under non-democratic and authoritative conditions, has been amended to a great extent. The Turkish parliament has enacted eight reform packages since 2001. The reformation process covers ‘fundamental civil rights and liberties’, ‘political rights’, ‘the rule of law’, and ‘civil-military relations’.⁶¹ As has been stated above, the reforms have been directed towards fulfilling Copenhagen political criteria. Firstly, the extent of restriction of fundamental rights and liberties that had previously been enumerated under Article 13 of the Constitution has been limited and the standards have been brought much closer to the Article 17 of the European Convention of Human Rights. Moreover, Article 26 and Article 176 on freedom of expression have also been liberalized. For the former, the phrase, ‘language prohibited by law’ has been deleted. The latter Article, in which ‘no protection shall be afforded to thoughts and opinions contrary to Turkish national interest, the indivisibility of the State with its territory and nation, Turkish historical and moral values; Atatürk’s nationalism, his principles, reforms, and modernism’, has been amended; the words, ‘thoughts and opinions’ has been changed by ‘activities’. Further, on 19 February 2002, Article 312, which used to punish “inciting people to hostility and hatred on the basis of the differences of social class, race, religion, sect and region”, has been amended by adding the condition of ‘criminal offence’ that such expressions should envisage. In addition, the amendment on Article 159 of the Penal code has limited the scope of the offences towards the Republic, Turkishness, the Grand National Assembly, the military and security forces, and the moral personality of the judiciary, which previously foresaw a expression like ‘insulting’ and enabled the state to have extensive, unnecessary control over its citizens and to execute on the basis of vague reasons.⁶² Furthermore, the death penalty has been

⁶⁰ The Council of the European Union, Brussels European Council, 16-17 December 2004, “Presidency Conclusions”, 01.02.2005, p.5
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf

⁶¹ See, Özbudun, Ergun and Yazıcı, Serap, (2004) Democratization Reforms in Turkey (1993-2004), Tesev Publications, Istanbul

abolished and “conformity with the Sixth Additional Protocol to the European Union Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) was attained”.⁶³ As Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan also dictated, a zero tolerance policy towards torture and ill-treatment has been adopted. In addition to this, custody periods have been reduced to 24 hours. Thus, according to the 2004 Council of Europe report and to the Committee of the Prevention of torture, Turkey has achieved considerable improvements in terms of prevention of torture and ill-treatment.⁶⁴ With respect to the protection of minorities according to the Copenhagen Criteria, “the EU’s Accession Partnership document was circumspect as it did not specifically use the word Kurdish and restricted its requirements to cultural rights”.⁶⁵ Thus, although Turkey has fallen short with the requirements, “teaching and broadcasting in ‘different languages and dialects traditionally used by Turkish citizens in their daily lives’, including but not restricted to Kurdish” has been allowed. In addition to this, right to build places of worship, “subject to the approval of competent administrative authorities” for non-Muslim minorities has been granted.⁶⁶ Above all, in accordance with the Copenhagen criteria, Turkish law has been harmonized with EU standards to a great extent.

Lastly, the role of the military in Turkey has been one of the major areas of criticism by the EU. Because the military regarded itself as the guardian of the existing regime and secularism, its self-perceived duty of securing democracy through undemocratic ways has led to the never-ending intervention of the army in politics. In

⁶² For a more comprehensive evaluation of the reforms on the mentioned Articles, see, Özbudun and Yazıcı, “Democratization Reforms”, pp.15-9. See also, Hale, William, “Human Rights, the European Union, and the Turkish Accession Process”, in Çarkoğlu, Ali and Rubin, Barry (Eds.), (2003), Turkey and The European Union: Domestic Politics, Economic Integration and International Dynamics, London, Frank Cass, pp. 107-26

⁶³ Özbudun and Yazıcı, “Democratization Reforms”, p.22

⁶⁴ Aydın and Keyman, , “European Integration”, pp.23-27

⁶⁵ For a deeper analysis of what ‘cultural rights’ and ‘national minorities’ constitute, see Hale, “Human Rights”, pp.116-8. For the concept of protection of minorities, see also, Aydın and Keyman, , “European Integration”, pp.31-9

⁶⁶ Özbudun and Yazıcı, “Democratization Reforms”, p.18

addition, the military has achieved important prerogatives through the constitutions that were prepared in 1961, 1973 and in 1982 under its influence.⁶⁷ In her Europeanization process, Turkey has gone through one of the most significant changes in her institutional and governmental structure. Thus, State Security Courts, which consisted of public prosecutors and military judges were completely civilianized in 1999 and totally abolished by 2004. The National Security Council (NSC), the duty of which had been to give advices according to 1961 constitution, to recommend according to the 1973 amendments and the compulsory duty of the government to give priority to the recommendations of the NSC according to the 1982 constitution, has been re-regulated with the recent amendments in line with the EU standards. The number of the civilian members of the NSC has been increased in addition to the decline of the effects of the NSC's decisions on the government. Further, 'the advisory character of the NSC decisions has been explicitly underlined.'⁶⁸ The Secretary General of the NSC today is no more a member of the military but a civilian and the decisions of the NSC are published in the Official Gazette in order to ensure transparency. The privilege of the army in terms of being subject to the judicial control of the Court of Accounts has been eliminated in 2003. Thus, the budget of the Turkish Armed Forces has been totally civilianized. Moreover, the military member of the Turkish Educational Board has been eliminated as well. Lastly, the privilege of certain expenditures, which used not to be subject to the judicial control of the Court of Accounts, has been abolished.⁶⁹

As can be observed through the data above, Turkish democracy has gone through a major transformation by the EU carrot, if yet not totally be consolidated. First of all, the implementation of the amendments carries a crucial role in order to achieve the European standards in the post-modern order. On the other hand, what Turkey so far has done can be claimed to be a major accomplishment in terms of human rights,

⁶⁷ Ibid., p.32-7

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.39

⁶⁹ For a more in depth analysis of civil-military relations, see, the report of the Task Force that has been co-organized by the Centre for European Security Studies (CESS) and the Istanbul Policy Centre (IPC): Greenwood, David, (2005), "Turkish civil-military relations and the EU: preparation for continuing convergence", project on *Governance and the Military: Perspectives for Change in Turkey*.

political rights, rule of law, and of civil-military relations and relatively of protection of minorities. In addition, Turkey has stabilized its macro-economic situation as well. As a result of these positive developments, the EU, on 17 December 2004, based upon the Commission's recommendation, has decided to open accession negotiations with Turkey. However, there also are some points, or issues, that Turkish democracy lack to conform to the European conception of democracy, which will be demonstrated below in accordance with the Commission's report of 6 October 2004.

III. The interpretation of the 17 December decisions and the negotiating framework

It is crucially important to note that the language in the Presidency Conclusions has been in such a way that one might observe the EU's hesitancy in taking Turkey in. For the Europeans, this is totally because Turkey is a peculiar country in terms of her population, as she is the most populous country that will ever join the EU in the enlargement process. In other words, Turkey will be the most populous country after Germany in the EU when she becomes a member. In the framework for negotiations of the 17 December decisions, it has been stated that:

The shared objective of the negotiations is accession. These negotiations are an open-ended process, the outcome of which cannot be guaranteed beforehand. While taking account of all Copenhagen criteria, if the candidate State is not in a position to assume in full all the obligations of membership it must be ensured that the candidate State concerned is fully anchored in the European structures through the strongest possible bond...In the case of a serious and persistent breach in a candidate State of the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law on which the Union is founded, the Commission will, on its own initiative or on the request of one third of the Member States, recommend the suspension of negotiations and propose the conditions for eventual resumption. The Council will decide by qualified majority on such a recommendation, after having heard the candidate State, whether to suspend the negotiations and on the conditions for their resumption. The Member States will act in the IGC in accordance with the Council decision, without prejudice to the general requirement for unanimity in the IGC.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ The negotiating framework, pp.7-8

As is stated above, the ultimate objective of the negotiations is accession. However, it is also stated that Turkey will be ‘fully anchored in the European structures through the strongest bond possible’, which leads one to interpret the phrase as privileged partnership. In other words, although the condition is based on the assumption of malfunctioning of the EU’s norms and principles in Turkey, Turkey is, implicitly offered privileged membership. This phrase is strengthened by the following statement, which is either with the Commission’s will, or with the request of one third of MS, the negotiations might be suspended. Thus, despite the fact that Turkey has been offered the opening of negotiations, serious reservations within the EU can be observed through the language used in the document. It is also worth to note that what has been stated in the framework is completely true as a matter of fact since this is the nature of the negotiations. In other words, the negotiations would automatically be suspended i.e. if Turkey violated human rights. The problem with the document therefore is there is no reason but the reluctance of the EU to repeatedly emphasize these factorial inputs in the document, which also have been more obviously outlined in the Negotiating Framework of 3 October.

With the initiative of the United Kingdom (UK) Presidency, the MS met on 2 October 2005 to discuss the content of the negotiating framework for Turkey. There was again huge amount of resistance by the MS, specifically by Austria, the position of which on Turkey’s full membership has always been substantially against. Indeed, the *raison d’etat* of the Austrian state has been not to include Turkey in the European integration project but to leave her as an outsider. Although the discussions over the negotiating framework of 2-3 October is the foci of the next chapter, it should be noted that the Austrians got what they wanted by adding Croatia into the agenda, as President Fischer stated that Austria is satisfied with the negotiating framework.⁷¹ Thus, the Council included the phrase of ‘absorption capacity’ in the framework on 3 October, different than the previous framework for negotiations.

It is strongly emphasized in the negotiating framework that there are other options than full-membership. As has been noted above, Turkey will be “fully anchored in the European structures through the strongest possible bond” if Turkey fails to meet

⁷¹ CNNTurk, “Türkiye Kararının yankıları sürüyor”, 5 October 2005: http://www.cnnturk.com/arama/haber_detay.asp?PID=00319&haberID=130312

the obligations of membership, which is simply the Copenhagen criteria. It is crucially important to note that the Union's 'absorption capacity' with respect to Turkish membership will be taken into consideration as it is addressed in the second paragraph of the negotiating framework. The 'absorption capacity' can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, as has been stated by DG Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn⁷², the absorption capacity is existent in the Copenhagen criteria, which is to say absorption capacity of the EU is not a new condition for membership for Turkey but has always been a part of the criteria. In other words, absorption capacity refers to the Union's eligibility 'to reserve the right to decide when it will be ready to accept new members'.⁷³ In contrast, no matter how Turkey tries to fulfil the obligations of membership through the adoption of the *acquis communautaire* during the negotiation processes, the Union, or precisely the Member States, might use the card of 'absorption capacity' by claiming that the EU has not yet achieved the necessary strength in order to absorb Turkey and veto the accession process. Either way or another, Commissioner Rehn seems to be right by stating that 'the absorption capacity' has always been in the Copenhagen Criteria; it is not a new thing that is only created for Turkey, specifically to create obstacles against Turkey's probable future membership in the EU. In addition, according to the framework, any member state holds the right to veto and therefore suspend negotiations at any time, without any reason. However, the problem is the strength of the emphasis in the framework on the options other than full membership which do not exist in the frameworks for negotiations of the recently acceded 10 new member states.

One of the reasons why the IGC on 2-3 October lasted too long was because of Turkey's yet unresolved dispute with one of the MS – the 'Republic of Cyprus'. According to the 17 December decisions, Turkey had to fulfil two more duties that were firstly to implement six specific items of legislation within the Penal Code and secondly to sign the Protocol 'regarding the adaptation of the Ankara Agreement, taking account of the accession of the ten new Member States'⁷⁴ in order to start accession negotiations

⁷² Olli Rehn, 4 October, CNN Turk, press conference.

⁷³ See presidency conclusions 1993

with the EU. In other words, Turkey had been asked to widen the Ankara Agreement in order to have a CU with the ten new MS, which has been fulfilled in July 2005. However, Turkey additionally made a declaration that envisages signing the Additional Protocol does not mean to recognise Southern Cyprus as the 'Republic of Cyprus'. In the Framework for Negotiations, "Turkey's continued support for efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded, including steps to contribute to a favourable climate for a comprehensive settlement, and progress in the normalisation of bilateral relations between Turkey and all EU Member States, including the Republic of Cyprus" and "the fulfilment of Turkey's obligations under the Association Agreement and its Additional Protocol extending the Association Agreement to all new EU Member States, in particular those pertaining to the EU-Turkey customs union, as well as the implementation of the Accession Partnership, as regularly revised" are listed as requirements in the measurement of Turkey's progress towards accession.⁷⁵

In sum, Turkey's EU membership is not yet certain. The negotiations, which have begun with the screening of one of the smoothest chapters, will toughen soon. In other words, when it comes to the chapter on Agriculture, for instance, neither Turkey nor the EU have formed a plausible idea on what will be the procedures like. On top of everything, as can also be observed through the above analysis, the hesitancy of certain member states, some of which are relatively more powerful, i.e. France and Germany, than others, might cause the ever closer relations to disrupt. As has been stated previously, the language that is adopted for the Turkish accession in the official documents, which is the reflection of the relative powers of member states and the result of convergence of their interests, is clearly visible when one considers the latest enlargement that is concluded. Therefore, although it is very hard and also unnecessary to make any further speculations, it might be claimed that beginning accession negotiations does not really mean finalizing Turkey's desire to become a member of the EU.

⁷⁴ Presidency Conclusions, 16-17 December, p.5

⁷⁵ Ibid.

CHAPTER III

The Domestic-International Linkage and Member State Preferences: Germany, France, Great Britain and Austria

This chapter addresses the EU governments' and their leaders' positions and preferences on Turkey's accession to the EU. For that purpose, the speeches of leaders will be analysed through a discourse analysis method; more specifically, the government leaders' preferences and positions will be analysed. The EU's accession criteria are objective as has also been officially declared in Helsinki; Turkey's EU bid will be evaluated on the basis of the same criteria that have been applied to the Mediterranean and Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs). However, there are significant obstacles unique to Turkey, and an analysis of the EU leaders' speeches enables us to claim that this is increasingly apparent since 17 December 2004.

Accession negotiations and screening always begin at the same time and all negotiations are carried out by the Intergovernmental Conferences (IGCs) with the European Commission as mediator. Although the process will follow exactly the same procedures in the Turkish case, some leaders in certain Member States insist on the fact Turkey's EU bid is dependent upon the outcome of IGCs, where every MS has one single vote due to the principle of unanimity. Therefore, the Turkish enlargement will be no different than the previous enlargements; the single difference is in the discourse that is repeatedly used by opinion and political leaders in EU Member States, which explicitly emphasizes factorial inputs as special conditions for Turkey. This thesis

argues that political and opinion leaders' preferences and positions determine the conditions under which Turkey will become a member or not to the EU.

In this chapter, the discourse analysis will cover leaders' speeches in Germany, France and the United Kingdom (UK), as the three countries are the most powerful actors in the EU decision making processes; and in Austria, where the highest level of opposition exists. On top of Andrew Moravcsik's Liberal Intergovernmentalism Theory (LI), Robert Putnam's two-level game, which covers domestic politics and international relations linkages, will constitute the theoretical framework of this chapter since domestic positions at home determine government policies and consequently their preferences at the EU bargaining level.⁷⁶ Therefore, a government which has significant political opposition to Turkish membership to the EU among its public, such as Austria does not have a long list of alternatives but to resist Turkey's EU bid. Public opinion in the EU will be analysed in detail in the next chapter. However, in this chapter, governments' preferences, which reflect publics' positions, are spelled out.

I. Domestic Politics and International Relations: Putnam and Moravcsik

Robert Putnam has opened a new page in international relations (IR) with his distinguished piece of work – *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games* – in 1988.⁷⁷ For our purposes in this thesis, Putnam's way of theorizing IR is crucially important since, in this dissertation, it is asserted that domestic politics and consequently public opinion play a huge amount of role in shaping EU-Turkey relations. In other words, Putnam provides the necessary background for this dissertation as the two-level game analysis enables us to understand the empirical data, which is given below.

⁷⁶ For a detailed description, see Chapter I on Moravcsik's Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI), which is the main theoretical framework of this dissertation, and Putnam's double-edged diplomacy.

⁷⁷ Putnam, Robert, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games", in Evans et. al. (Eds.), International Bargaining and Domestic Politics: Double-Edged Diplomacy, (1993), University of California Press, London

As has also been discussed in Chapter I, domestic politics in member states play a very important role in shaping EU decision making processes as win-sets are crucial determinants in governments' willingness for agreement or compromise. Before giving the win-set analysis, a brief summary of Putnam's theory will be essential. In brief, according to Putnam, international agreements are possible only when "a powerful minority within each government actually favoured on domestic grounds the policy being demanded internationally".⁷⁸ In addition to this, international pressure is necessary in order to push for the policy shifts; within each country, there is a considerable amount of interest groups that favour certain policy shifts. Likewise, "without domestic resonance, international forces would not have sufficed to produce the accord, no matter how balanced and intellectually persuasive the overall package ... Neither a purely domestic nor a purely int'l analysis could account for this episode".⁷⁹ For our purposes, this assumption is critically important since the theoretical framework of this thesis is constructed upon the synthesis of Liberal Intergovernmentalism. In other words, it gives us further credibility to assume governments' relative powers as important determinants in agreements in the EU.

Whether 'state strength' has to be considered as the key element in the analysis of domestic politics – IR linkage or not is still debatable. Although Putnam asserts that the state-centric literature remains uncertain on theorizing the linkage between domestic politics and diplomacy, for our purposes, because certain – powerful – member states in the EU decision making processes have more impacts on policy making than other MS, state strength can still be considered as an important element in the analyses of Turkey-EU relations. The support of the German and British governments for Turkey during the General Affairs and External Relations IGC on 3 October has been incredibly important in the formation of the negotiation framework. In other words, the outcome of the framework for negotiations for Turkey would have been much harsher than it is as Austria had pushed for more seriously harsher conditions but was opposed by the UK. Politics, indeed, should be considered as the domestic determinants of foreign policy and international relations: "social classes, interest groups (both economic and non-

⁷⁸ Ibid. p.432

⁷⁹ Ibid., p.433

economic), legislators and even public opinion and elections, not simply executive officials and institutional arrangements.”⁸⁰ Therefore, it should also be mentioned that

at the national level, domestic groups pursue their interests by pressuring the government to adopt favourable policies, and politicians seek power by constructing coalitions among those. At the int’l level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures, while minimizing the adverse consequences of foreign developments.⁸¹

Lastly, the logic of two-level game enables one to assume the importance of the win-sets in EU decision making processes. The chief negotiator’s preferences in international bargaining are determined by his strong/weak positions in domestic politics. In other words, he/she “seeks simply to achieve an agreement that will be attractive to his constituents”. Putnam identifies Level I as “bargaining between the negotiators, leading to a tentative agreement, and Level II as “separate discussions within each group of constituents about whether to ratify the agreement”.⁸² Thus, the power and preferences of the major actors at Level II are important determinants of the outcomes of bargaining. In addition, the possibility of “no-agreement” and the “fear of losing the agreement entirely” as an outcome is also a powerful determinant in reaching a compromise because less favourable outcomes might be much better than the failure of an agreement, when one takes win-sets into consideration. Thus, a decision has been reached on 3 October IGC since the agreed negotiating framework was acceptable by all EU member states and by Turkey. In other words, the Austrian government had Croatian accession negotiations and the phrase of “absorption capacity”, the Turkish government ensured the Article on Cyprus dispute would not mean recognition and the UK had achieved her goal of enlarging in the negotiating framework. Above all, Putnam provides a perfect analytical framework for this chapter, in which it will be assumed that the two-level game is a huge determinant in the formation of policies within the EU and between Turkey and the EU.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.435

⁸¹ Ibid., p.437

⁸² Ibid., p.438

II. Member State Preferences on Turkey's EU bid: Leaders' rhetorical actions

The issue of Turkish membership is a source of political contention in some Member States such as France, Germany, and Austria. There is a considerable amount of hesitancy against Turkey's membership in the EU in certain member states. As has already been covered in the previous chapters of this dissertation, some member states that are relatively more powerful, specifically France, Germany and the United Kingdom, have significantly more bargaining power in the decision making processes – or at the bargaining level. As opposed to the UK's strong support for Turkey's EU bid, leaders in France and some in Germany have drawn on Turkey as a major source of propaganda in their domestic politics. This is much more obvious in Austria as the level of opposition for Turkey's membership to the EU is the highest among MS, and as Austria uses this endorsement in bargaining at the EU level. It can also be observed in the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty (CT) in France in the end of May 2005 and call for early elections in mid September in Germany. Leaders in both countries utilized Turkey's EU bid; Turkey's 'non-European' and 'Islamic' identity, its population, size and geography on top of the issues such as the Cyprus dispute and the so called Armenian genocide, as an instrument of remaining in or gaining power. However, basing the argument on the developments in these member states, it can be asserted that leaders failed in their goals by using Turkey in domestic politics; in the Euro-barometer post-referendum surveys Turkey's EU membership constituted very small percentages among the reasons of why people said 'no' to the CT in France and in the Netherlands,⁸³ and when the CDU-CSU coalition of Angela Merkel and Edmund Stoiber, for whom Turkey has been a major element of propaganda in the election campaigns, unexpectedly failed to win the elections.

Public opinion in the EU Member States – for our purposes, France, Germany, the UK and Austria, is still very much against Turkish membership in the EU. Differences between Turkishness and the European identity play a very important, though implicit role in the formation of this opposition. This particular element of opposition can be overcome through time and by strong civil society dialogue within and together with Member States and Turkey, which would help to eliminate the lack of

⁸³ See Chapter I.

understanding among publics and to familiarize the cultures. Turkey's population is another element of contention as it will be the second largest population in the EU if Turkey becomes a member. Economic backwardness of such a populated country is also obviously the source of economic reservations. Thus, neither the Cyprus dispute, nor the clash of discourses over what has happened between the Turks and the Armenians in 1915 can be claimed to be strong elements among the reasons for opposition among public. However, leaders' rhetorical actions, which are basically their public speeches and ideas expressed through media channel, constitute a very important element in the formation of public opinion. This is the reason why this chapter analyzes the rhetoric that certain political leaders use for domestic political purposes. In terms of methodology, the government leaders' treatment of Turkey as a source to boost their popularity will be analysed through news that appears in the media; via public and the official speeches and through particular party programmes.⁸⁴ These are important because they shape and determine public opinion. Firstly, government leaders' public speeches in Germany, France, the UK and Austria after 17 December 2004 till 3 October 2005 will be given in detail as the statements that had repeatedly been made have been extremely anti-Turkish accession. Secondly, the rhetoric that the leaders accommodate themselves into after 3 October will be analysed as it will be assumed that there is a certain amount of change and softening in the level of opposition in their speeches regarding Turkey. It will also be born in mind that the time period of both the Turkish accession and the leaders' weakening in their positions coincidentally overlap. Thirdly and lastly, the position of the Commission with respect to the Turkish accession process will be given and the picture of the differences in rhetoric within the EU will be endeavoured to be drawn. In addition, some other MS' leaders' and some Commission officials' opinions on particular issues will be given hand in hand with the analysis that is mentioned above.

It is also worth to note that this chapter will endeavour to draw a picture of differences in the rhetorical actions during election propagandas and when leaders come to power. For example, the German elections of 18 September 2005 could be used to further illustrate this proposition. The data will cover Chancellor Angela Merkel's

⁸⁴ In this sense, domestic and international level becomes connected, which gives credibility to Moravcsik and Putnam.

rhetoric before and after the German elections of 18 September, as Merkel won the elections with a very slight difference with former German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder's SPD as opposed to the expectations of the Christian Democrats, and 3 October, as this date is one of the major turning points in the history of EU-Turkey relations. Hence, does rhetoric become policy is one question; whether this kind of rhetoric enables the leaders to reach their goals is another. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the extent to which Turkish accession has become part of the agendas of the political leadership in the EU Member States.

III. The leaders and their stances on Turkey's accession

The hesitancy of MS concerning Turkish accession has been discussed in great depth and detail in the previous chapter. The language that has been adopted in the official documents, especially in the most recent one – the negotiation framework for Turkey –, perfectly demonstrates the impact of relative powers of MS in the bargaining process. In other words, certain emphases over the hardships and constraints over Turkey's probable EU membership in every particular mean are adopted by the EU due to the fact that certain MS governments, most of which can be considered amongst the most powerful of all, i.e. France and Germany, force the EU decision making in order to satisfy their domestic political power.

Hence, it would not be wrong to suggest that the rhetoric, into which opinion/political leaders accommodate themselves, is highly correlated with the formation of public opinion or with the outcomes of the decision making processes within the EU.

Angela Merkel, who is the current Chancellor and the leader of Christian Democratic Union (CDU) in Germany and Nicolas Sarkozy, who is the current Minister of Interior Affairs and the leader of *Union pour un Mouvement Populaire* (UMP) – Union for a Popular Movement, in France, strongly oppose Turkish membership. Both leaders are very strong in their positions, which ultimately would lead one to assume that the rhetoric they use can either turn into policies or determine the public opinion on certain subject matters to a considerable extent. Although the positions of both has been damaged through the failure in the elections for the former and the recent spread of the discontent between the French police and the immigrants in the *banlieue* areas to all

over Paris and other towns for the latter, the rhetoric the leaders use is significantly important.⁸⁵ Above all, the preferences and positions of government leaders in Germany, France, the UK, and Austria with respect to Turkey's EU bid will be analysed below consecutively.

Germany

German politics constitute an interesting example for Turkey's accession bid. Currently, there is a considerable divide between the Right and Left in Germany over Turkish accession. This is reflected in the party programmes and the party leaders' speeches. The mainstream in German politics is composed of two mainstream parties: The Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) on the centre-left and Christian Democratic Union – Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) on the right, both of which usually form a single party group in the Bundestag. The Green Party for the former and the Free Democratic Party for the latter usually function as the coalition partners of the mainstream political parties. In the aftermath of the German elections of 18 September, the conservative Christian Democrats and the centre-left Social Democrats has formed a coalition government – 'the grand coalition'.⁸⁶ The coalition partners have agreed on a 'coalition agreement' and Angela Merkel has been elected as the Chancellor in the parliamentary vote on 22 November.⁸⁷

The agreement foresees mainly economic reforms in order to overcome the economic hardships such as almost 11 million unemployment level and very low rate of growth. For our concerns in this chapter, despite the fact that the Minister of Foreign

⁸⁵ In other words, the recent events in France demonstrate the existence of societal hostility; mainly against Muslim minorities. Hence, this will also be determinant in shaping French position on Turkey.

⁸⁶ For more detailed information on German politics and its setting, see Bundestag main web page: http://www.bundestag.de/htdocs_e/index.html ; See also, http://www.german-embassy.org.uk/elections_and_political_partie.html

⁸⁷ For a detailed analysis of the Grand Coalition, see Horsley, William, "Analysis: German Coalition Deal", 15 November 2005, BBC News: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4438212.stm>

affairs – Frank-Walter Steinmeier – is a Social Democrat, there are certain changes in German foreign policy that are worth observing. First of all, Germany will follow a more pro-American-transatlantic policy as opposed to the previous governments' Euro-determinist policies. In other words, promoting transatlantic relations, which has gone through a crisis in the aftermath of the Iraq War due to divergence of the positions, approaches and interests, is one of the priorities of the current German government. On the other hand, the coalition agreement is very much in favour European integration as it sees the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty in the near future as indispensable.⁸⁸ Thirdly, there is a significant emphasis on an ambitious and differentiated EU Neighbourhood Policy.

Regarding Turkey's EU bid, it can be claimed that CDU inserted her longstanding position on Turkey. In other words, Germany, according to the coalition agreement, is in favour of a 'privileged partnership' for Turkey. For CDU, as has been discussed in depth in the previous chapters, Turkey's full-membership would harm the European integration process and therefore Turkey should be a privileged partner of the EU instead of a full-member. According to the Agreement, "Germany has a particular interest in a deepening of mutual relations with Turkey and in binding the country to the EU". In addition, there is an emphasis over the 'open-ended' nature of Turkish accession process; the process will not automatically lead to membership and "the outcome cannot be guaranteed at the outset". More specifically, economic, demographic and cultural challenges that Turkey would pose are taken as serious matters of danger. Hence, with respect to the Turkish accession, the views of the grand coalition are accurate: "should the EU not have the capacity to absorb Turkey, or should Turkey not be able to comply completely and in full with all of the commitments which membership entails, Turkey must be linked to the European structures as closely as possible and in a way that further develops its privileged relationship with the EU".⁸⁹

⁸⁸ English translation of the part on foreign policy of the Coalition Agreement of CDU, CSU and SPD coalition government, "Germany as a responsible partner in Europe and the World", p.1; available at CDU website: http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/05_11_11_Coalitionagreement_foreignpolicy.pdf

⁸⁹ Ibid., p.7

Meanwhile, the previous government of Germany, the SPD-Green coalition, had been very supportive of Turkey's EU bid. The former Chancellor of Germany and the former leader of SPD had been one of the champions of Turkey's accession bid during his leadership. Likewise, the coalition partner of the former government, the Greens' and mainly the former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer's contribution to Turkey's accession to the EU should not be underestimated. Fischer, who has continuously supported the Turks on their path to membership, claimed it would be a loss of sight to say 'no' to Turkey and who knew that Turkey is already a privileged partner of the EU in a parliamentary discussion in the Bundestag as opposed to Angela Merkel, who has been strongly insistent on the concept of 'privileged partnership', which is the 'third way', instead of full membership. Merkel also stated, privileged partnership is for the benefit of both parties – the EU and Turkey – and the CDU will put pressure in order to impose this concept as policy when it comes to power.⁹⁰ Moreover, Fischer said in the aftermath of 3 October that

Europe is the winner today. What has been promised for decades is now entering its decisive phase, which will last a long time... By that time, many fears will have been overcome... The eastern Mediterranean will be crucial for peace in the 21st century, not only for Turkey, not only for the region, but for Europe as a whole⁹¹

Above all, without making any emphases over the question of Turkey's European identity, Fischer and Schroeder had been strong supporters of Turkey. In other words, for the two previous leaders, what had to matter was Turkey's progress in terms of the issues that the European Commission addressed. Schroeder went further by calling Turkey's prospective membership to the EU "a blessing" addressing the fact that saying no to Turkey would trigger "the old nationalism and conflicts".⁹²

⁹⁰ *Hürriyet*, Turkish Daily Newspaper, "*Nein demek körlüktür*", 17 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~342@tarikh~2005-03-07-m@nvid~511624,00.asp>

⁹¹ BBC News, "In quotes: Turkey-EU talks deal"; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307730.stm>

⁹² Euractiv – EU News, Policy, Positions and EU Actors online website, "Chirac proposes emergency summit on the pace of enlargement", 17 June 2005, <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-141106-16&type=News>

Even Schroeder and Fischer had not been as enthusiastic as they were with the previous enlargement.⁹³ For the former, enlargement towards the CEECs was politically and morally necessary and defined it as “a requirement of historical justice”; and Europe would “become a continent of uncertainty” unless the EU enlarges for the latter.⁹⁴ In other words, the kinship based duty, which does not exist for Turkey, was the core reason of the last enlargement. Nevertheless, both leaders had been very much supportive of Turkish membership especially after 2003 when the ten prospective member states agreed to become members in 2004. Schroeder strongly opposed any other conception but full-membership of Turkey to the EU. Further, in a meeting with Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, he confirmed his longstanding support by saying that the goal is Turkey’s full-membership but nothing; for him, Turkey and Europe should overcome the suspicions and fears about Turkey’s EU membership together.⁹⁵ It is also worth to note that today, the successor of Schroeder, Frank-Walter Steinmeier is the Foreign Minister and the leader of SPD, in the grand-coalition of Germany today. Steinmeier, who helped to shape Schroeder’s Europe policy, has been very close to the former Chancellor. Thus, it would not be wrong to expect any clear changes in German foreign policy as the Foreign Minister will be supportive of Turkey’s EU bid as opposed to his coalition partners – CDU/CSU. In other words, although Turkey will remain as an issue of disagreement between the coalition partners in Germany, the influence of the SPD wing of the coalition that is led by Steinmeier on Turkey’s accession bid can be foreseen. Steinmeier follows the rhetoric of the previous government; for him, “the accession talks have started, so at least we (the EU) don't have to discuss if Turkey should join any longer”⁹⁶ which derives one to assume he rejects the conception of privileged partnership anyhow.

⁹³ For more detailed analysis of Member States’ enlargement preferences and leaders’ previous rhetoric, see Müftüleri-Bağ, Meltem and McLaren, Lauren M., (2003), “Enlargement Preferences and Policy Making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey”, *European Integration*, vol. 25, pp.17-30

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.20-22

⁹⁵ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “*Teşekkür iftarı*”, 13 October 2005, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=166829>

Above all, in line with its strong position and interests on transatlantic relations, there is great likelihood that Merkel in Germany will focus on the security identity of Turkey especially through signifying the importance of NATO and via declaring Turkey as a very important strategic partner.⁹⁷ The emphases such as the EU's absorption capacity, possible disruption of the Turkish governments' and Turkey's commitment to the EU and EU norms, and the open-endedness of the accession process has also been reflected in official EU documents and agreements. Thus, it would not be wrong to assume that Merkel's preferences, backed by France and Austria and some other MS that have reservations concerning Turkey's full-membership in the EU, has been effective in EU decision making in the bargaining process. In other words, the relative power of the German government and her leader's preferences has led the EU to strongly adopt a hesitant language, which has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, towards Turkey's EU bid.

As has been stated above, Angela Merkel has been very much against Turkish full-membership to the EU; what she offered instead has been the status of 'privileged partnership', according to which strong ties between Turkey and the EU would be established while Turkey would not participate in the decision making mechanism. However, the discourse that Merkel adopts should be divided into two: rhetoric before and after 3 October. Although there is no divergence of preferences in between the two periods, the language that has been used significantly differs in terms of content and the words used.

First and foremost, the position of CDU/CSU partnership is clear on Turkey's accession bid; both political parties are for a different sort of partnership – namely 'privileged partnership' – between Turkey and the EU. There are various reasons for

⁹⁶ BBC News, "New face in German Foreign Office", 21 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4361906.stm>

⁹⁷ It should also be noted that the new German government's position on transatlantic relations might affect Turkey-EU relations in a positive manner as the US government is very much in favour of Turkey's EU membership. Nevertheless, in the coalition agreement, Turkey's geographic proximity that endows Turkey a strategic importance is seen as the most important feature of Turkey. Turkey's importance via NATO is also underlined in the document.

their firm position on Turkish EU membership, which can also be observed in 'Principles and Programme of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany'.⁹⁸ In other words, the principles of the Christian Democrats ultimately drive them into opposing Turkey in the EU as a matter of values and principles. In the programme, there is high level of emphasis over Europe's and Germany's Christian identity. A couple of quotations would be enough to suggest that it is very hard for the Christian Democrats to support Turkey's accession bid as a matter of fact. According to the Programme, the Christian Democrats' "policies are based on the Christian view of Man and his responsibility before God".⁹⁹ The Christian Democrats define themselves as a social, liberal and conservative party, and the basic values of the policies are listed as freedom, solidarity and justice. "The CDU has a particular commitment to preserve and strengthen the Christian values" of democracy as well.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the Christian Democrats views on the EU are as follows:

The task of further developing European Union, ensuring lasting freedom in Europe and strengthening the new democracies offers an opportunity for creating a common European future. For Germany, located as it is at very heart of Europe, this is a particularly important challenge¹⁰¹

It can be claimed that Turkey has no place in Christian Democratic definition of Europe either because of other sources of discourse that are adopted by them or because 'strengthening new democracies' refers to the CEECs, which started to experience democracy in the aftermath of the end of the Cold-War. Further, according to the Programme, Europe has special obligations towards the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, where Turkey has no place again since it is stated that EU membership will provide "access for them to Western security structures, the Western European Union and NATO", of which Turkey has been a participant for decades.¹⁰² Lastly, European identity according to the Programme

⁹⁸ "Principles and Programme of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany", 5th Party Conference, Hamburg, 21-23 February 1994

⁹⁹ Ibid., p.2

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p.4

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

is “based on common cultural roots and common destiny of the people”.¹⁰³ Hence, above all, Christian Democratic values and principles, some of which has been addressed above, are not compatible with the idea of having Turkey in the EU as a full-member.

Angela Merkel has adopted a similar rhetoric with the CDU party programme during her election campaign and before she came to office. In her speeches that have appeared in the media, she explicitly opposed Turkey’s EU membership. To some extent, as has also been stated before, she opposed Turkish accession to boost her popularity among German’s who are against Turkey’s EU bid. In June 2005, Merkel claimed that Turkey would harm the European integration process and “Europe should not deal with everything and everyone”. On top of this, according to Merkel, democracy cannot exist without the roots of Christian thought.¹⁰⁴

Turkey’s stance considering the conception of ‘privileged partnership’ has been very firm from the very beginning. Merkel rejects the accusations among the Turkish side that claim she sees the EU as a ‘club of Christians’ and asserts that the very reason why she opposes Turkish accession is because of the last enlargement.¹⁰⁵ Further, “blocking Turkey’s hopes of eventual full membership in the EU” and pressing the EU government leaders to offer the status of ‘privileged partnership’ has been Merkel’s propaganda element in the election campaigns before 18 September 2005.

Moreover, according to the Turkish media, Merkel sent a letter to the EU government leaders in August 2005 that warned them about Turkey’s prospective

¹⁰² Ibid., p.44

¹⁰³ Ibid., p.45

¹⁰⁴ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “Merkel’in aklı Hıristiyanlıkta”, 12 June 2005, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=155601>

¹⁰⁵ Euractiv, “Turkey rejects proposal for ‘privileged partnership’ with the EU”, 17 February 2004, <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcaturi=tcm:29-114415-16&type=News>

membership. In the letter, it had been stated that Turkish membership would endanger European integration economically, politically and socially.¹⁰⁶ Merkel's position on Turkish accession was as hard as it could be. In other words, Merkel explicitly denounced her reservations against Turkish accession during her propaganda campaign. According to *Le Figaro*, the German right 'has been targeting strengthening relations with Nicolas Sarkozy' in order to prevent probable Turkish accessions as Merkel was the 'would be' Chancellor and Sarkozy, the French President.¹⁰⁷ Thus, interestingly, German Right and French Right might have a coalition over Turkey.

However, in her recent public speeches, there is a considerable amount of softening in the language. Although Merkel emphasized the differences between Turkish and European cultures in her campaign, it can be claimed that she carried her reasons for opposition to the EU level. In other words, there is a slight difference in the rhetoric she uses; instead of stating that Turkey is far different than the EU in various aspects, she connotes much more superficial explanations for opposition such as the EU's absorption capacity. In her speech to the parliament on 1 December, Merkel stated that the accession negotiation process is an open-ended process and there is no guarantee to the decision that will be made at the end of it. Although she highlighted her established terminology – 'privileged partnership', the causes of the outcomes has been listed as the EU's absorption capacity or Turkey's failure in her commitments and in adapting EU laws and practices.¹⁰⁸ Thus, although privileged partnership remains in the agenda, there is certain amount of reduction in the anti-Turkey sentiments.

Furthermore, after 3 October, although she has similar views on Turkish accession, namely privileged partnership, she somewhat stopped pronouncing the phrase repeatedly. In the press conference following the meeting with grand coalition partners on 12 November, instead of the words 'privileged partnership', she stated that Germany wants close relations with Turkey. In addition, the coalition partners asserted

¹⁰⁶ *Radikal*, "Merkel de atakta", 27 August 2005, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=162543>

¹⁰⁷ *Hürriyet*, "Nein demek körlüktür", 17 December 2004

¹⁰⁸ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Merkel: Üyelik garantisi yok", 1 December 2005 <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=171608>

that one should take two elements into consideration in the case of Turkish accession: the absorption capacity of the EU and the Copenhagen criteria.¹⁰⁹ Although the content of the new words does not imply a different and a more positive meaning, it would not be wrong to suggest that changing or reforming the very longstanding element of propaganda might either mean a foreseeable change in the forthcoming policies or at least the end of triggering anti-Turkey sentiments in the public. Hence, again the EU level explanations are listed as obstacles for membership rather than accommodating Germany into the old rhetoric, which basically signifies Turkey's huge Muslim population or the Turks 'non-western' identity.

Hence, there is a change in the CDU position once they come to power. For instance, according to the Turkish official declarations, in the meetings with Merkel and Steinmeier on 18 November, none of the leaders ever spoke of 'privileged partnership'.¹¹⁰ According to Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, the meetings were long and constructive; Turkish-German relations will be as same as it was with the previous government. Gül also stated that there is no point of thinking other means but accession as the negotiations has started. For him, the most important matter is not to deadlock the accession negotiations and for this very reason Merkel will find alternatives other than privileged partnership. Gül also mentioned the significance of Europe's soft power and its huge impacts on the world.¹¹¹ Lastly, in the meetings, on top of good relations with Turkey, for Merkel cooperation with Turkey is very important as both countries have been cooperating as they are members of NATO.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Merkel: Yakın ilişki istiyoruz", 13 November 2005, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=169825>

¹¹⁰ Frankfurter Rundschau, German newspaper, (23 November), "Türkiye'nin endişesi hala geçmiş değil", 30 November 2005
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=171475>

¹¹¹ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Merkel: Türkiye Önemli", 19 November 2005, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=170439>

¹¹² Although she has strong interests in strengthening the position of NATO and in improving transatlantic relations, she officially declared that Germany will not participate in training of the Iraqi forces within the borders of Iraq. Thus, no strong divergence from the Schroeder government policies over the war in Iraq can be

Moreover, in the meeting with Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Merkel stated that Germany would keep her promises and “everything was going as intended”.¹¹³ Thus, as one of her ultimate objectives in foreign policy is improving transatlantic ties, Merkel stresses Turkey’s strategic significance for Germany.¹¹⁴ Above all, Turkish government officially declared that it believes in the good will of the German government as opposed to the previous reservations about today’s government before 3 October.

Lastly, in her policy statement to the Bundestag, Chancellor Merkel has linked public opinion and enlargement by stating “without the support and trust of its citizens Europe is unthinkable...which also means that we cannot overload the EU's capacity to admit new members”.¹¹⁵ She repeated her post 3 October rhetoric that negotiations with Turkey was an open-ended process and not automatic, “whose outcome cannot be guaranteed from the outset”, which had been stated in the coalition agreement as well. In June 2005, Merkel declared that the CDU will “keep pursuing” the ideal of ‘privileged partnership’ “in future negotiations” although they were “bound by signed treaties”.¹¹⁶ However, as opposed to her precious statement, after she met with Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan, Merkel stated that Turkey and Germany “will walk hand in hand as always” reassuring the principle “*pacta sunt servanda* (Latin for agreements

observed yet. See Horsley, William, “Merkel signals German EU rethink”, 25 November 2005, BBC News. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4468560.stm>

¹¹³ *Hürriyet*, Turkish Daily Newspaper, online, English version, “PM Erdoğan and Chancellor Merkel meet up in Barcelona, Spain”.
<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/english/3573408.asp>

¹¹⁴ *Hürriyet*, Turkish Daily Newspaper, “*Merkel: Türkiye ile iyi ilişkiler kurmak istiyorum*”, 18 November 2005.
<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/sondakika/3538077.asp?sd=5>

¹¹⁵ Policy statement by Federal Chancellor Dr. Angela Merkel in the German Bundestag, 30 November 2005, available at German Government’s official website: <http://www.bundesregierung.de/en/-,10001.929347/regierungserklaerung/Policy-Statement-by-Federal-Ch.htm>

¹¹⁶ Euractive, “Chirac proposes emergency summit”,
<http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-141106-16&type=News>

must be respected) applies”.¹¹⁷ Thus, as can be observed above, Merkel, today, adopts a much softer tone in her speeches as such.

Above all, the language that Merkel uses with respect to the Germany-Turkey-EU triangle after 3 October decisions has significantly softened. Although Merkel is much more careful in the words she uses after 3 October and after she became the Chancellor, she nevertheless does not hesitate to use anti-Turkey sentiments in her speeches. In an Austrian TV channel, she praised Austria for insisting on the enactment of the phrase ‘absorption capacity’ and claimed that this type of an attitude increased EU’s integration power.¹¹⁸ As has been stated above, rather than the content of her speeches, the phrases in her rhetoric and the previously rough tone she insisted on has significantly changed. Whether this softening in the language as opposed to the remaining anti-Turkish accession content in the current German government will reflect into the policies or not remains to be seen. It is also worth to state that a considerable softening in German policies toward Turkey is expected as the Foreign Minister – Steinmeier – of the Grand Coalition is a SPD, which partially assures that there won’t be a significant divergence of positions and preferences.

France

Recently, France has gone through a series of hostile demonstrations, the outcome of which is increasing societal tensions and the cost of millions of Euros. The problem of (mainly Muslim) immigrants versus ethnic French/French government clashes can be claimed to be the one of the biggest future problems for France. On top of everything, high unemployment and economic stagnation that triggers the tension are also existent in France. Therefore, in addition to the economic hardships, France has a relatively discontent and disintegrated Muslim and African immigrant population of

¹¹⁷ Euractiv – EU News, Policy, Positions and EU Actors online website, “Merkel: Berlin won’t stand in way of Turkey’s EU bid”, 28 November 2005, <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-150009-16&type=News>

¹¹⁸ *Hürriyet*, Turkish Daily Newspaper, “Merkel’den Avusturya’ya Türkiye teşekkürü”, 26 November 2005. <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/dunya/3567047.asp>

five million, which is influential, both in the formation of public opinion and in decision making.

Up until his defeat in French regional elections when 20 regions out of 22 chose the opposition – the left, President Jacques Chirac was a strong defender of Turkey’s accession in the EU. However, when the charismatic Nicolas Sarkozy replaced the (former) head of UMP – Alain Juppe – and started to shake Gaullist Chirac’s power, Chirac has gone through a major change in his rhetoric.¹¹⁹ Hence, the French case should be analysed in three steps. Firstly, Chirac’s previous support for Turkey’s EU bid will be given. Secondly, President Chirac’s post- (EU Constitution) referendum speeches and declarations will be analysed. It should also be noted that while Chirac is the most important actor in French politics for our purposes, the speeches of political leaders, who are under his influence will also be addressed. Lastly and finally, the rhetoric of Sarkozy will be the focus as he can be considered as the would-be President after 2007. It is also worth to note that, opinion leaders like Valerie Giscard D’Estaing are also influential in the formation of public opinion.

First and foremost, the position of Jacques Chirac in French politics is not very strong. In other words, he not only suffered a defeat in the regional elections in March 2004 but the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty weakened Chirac’s position. Just before the EU Summit of 17 December, the French President declared in his speech in the French television that it would be a great risk to say *non* to Turkey since Turkey had applied for membership in 1963. For him any other suggestion for Turkey, such as ‘privileged partnership’ cannot be accepted. On top of everything, Chirac underlined the fact that Turkey will be a much more different country in a more positive fashion in

¹¹⁹ In his article in *Hürriyet*, Mehmet Ali Birand, who is one of the leading experts on Turkey-EU relations, states that the French President never adopted his support for Turkey. His “invisible hand” in negotiations over Turkey’s EU bid in Luxembourg Summit of 2005 has always been there on behalf of Turkey despite his weak position in French politics. See, *Hürriyet*, Turkish daily newspaper, Mehmet Ali Birand, “*Avrupa ile her toplantı krizli geçti*”, 8 October 2005, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/yazarlar/yazar/0,,authorid~69@sid~9@nvid~641623,00.asp>. Nevertheless, for our purposes, not the inner dynamics in politics and negotiations but the outspoken words on Turkey which leads us to claim there is a strong divergence of rhetoric and position regarding Jacques Chirac.

terms of European way of life and understanding of human rights in 10-15 years time.¹²⁰ Moreover, right after the 17 December Summit, Chirac declared that he believed in the marriage of Turkey and the EU, although the path for this is long and difficult. He further stated that he appreciated and saluted the Turkish government due to its efforts in adopting the necessary reforms.¹²¹

Furthermore, Jacques Chirac is not only weak with respect to his constituents, but also within his own party's dynamics. In other words, even his allies in the UMP have been very critical on his support for Turkey. In June 2004, the General Secretary of UMP – François Baroin – stated that they might say 'yes' to the limited enlargement towards Bulgaria and Romania but the Turkey has to wait as she already is in cooperation with the EU. Similarly, the (former) Chair of the party – Alain Juppe – proposed to have special partnership with Turkey.¹²² Therefore, Chirac, with respect to Turkey's EU bid, has been left alone and consequently he had all the necessary means, such as remaining in power, to oppose Turkish membership to the EU. Moreover, according to a Swiss newspaper, the former Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin, who is known with his loyalty to Chirac, stated in late 2004 that the problem was not the Turkish government but the Turkish public itself. "Do you want Islam to invade the heart of secularism" he continues.¹²³ Furthermore, French Right and Left have no clear position on the issue of Turkey's prospective membership to the EU. In other words, both the socialists and the UMP had divisions among/within their parties. What they wanted was to have a parliamentary discussion in the Assembly, which did not take place. The former Socialist Prime Minister Laurent Fabius stated that he did not share

¹²⁰ *Hürriyet*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Chirac: Türkler gururlu, 'hayır' diyemeyiz", 16 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~1@tarh~2004-12-16-t@nvid~510907,00.asp>

¹²¹ *Hürriyet*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Chirac: Türkiye-AB evliliğine inanyorum", 17 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~3@tarh~2004-12-17-m@nvid~511785,00.asp>

¹²² *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Fransa'dan çatlak sesler", 9 April 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=112700>

¹²³ Gerd Krocke in *Tages Anzeiger*, Swiss daily newspaper, "Türkiye Chirac'a kaybettirecek", 29 September 2004, published in *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, 10 October 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=130742>

the same position with the Commission because taking Turkey in is a matter of European construction, as he believed “Turkey is not in Europe”.¹²⁴ Likewise, a deputy from the UMP, Dominique Paille, stated that an obvious disagreement between Chirac’s and their opinions on the issue existed.¹²⁵ Lastly, 12 parliamentarians sent a letter to the President, according to which “Turkey’s entrance to the EU is a very dangerous project and even a commitment of suicide for federal Europe”.¹²⁶ Above all, these are very strong statements as opposed to Chirac’s firm support for Turkey’s EU membership.

As has been stated earlier in this chapter, the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty on top of the UMP’s defeat in regional elections affected very much of already distorted position of Chirac and the discourse he previously adopted. After the referenda in France and Germany in 29 May and 1 June 2005, the discussion on the EU’s future has increased to a considerable extent. After the Brussels Summit in June 2005, while Romania and Bulgaria had been assured of their membership to the EU, President Chirac underlined the fact that the EU Constitution would enable the enlarged EU work better. “In this new situation, can the EU continue to expand without us having the institutions needed to make this enlarged EU work effectively?” he asked which can be claimed to be a reference to Turkey’s prospective accession starting in a couple of months.¹²⁷

Chirac, nevertheless, followed a considerably balanced path in altering his rhetoric. In other words, it was indispensable for him to decrease the level of support for Turkey’s EU bid at home and at the EU level due to the criticisms by the opposition parties and by the opposition within his party and his constituents and to the very low support for Turkey’s membership to the EU among the Frenchmen and women. From

¹²⁴ *La Liberation*, “Europe: la Turquie repousse les frontières des partis”, 7 October 2005, <http://www.liberation.fr/page.php?Article=244188>

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “Raffarin ter döktü”, 15 October 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=131235>

¹²⁷ BBC News, “EU leaders cautious on enlargement”, 18 June 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4105674.stm>

the very beginning, the French President had always been in favour of Turkey's EU membership, while stressing the facts such as the process will take at least take 10-15 years and neither Turkey nor the EU will be the same. In addition to this, he continuously addressed that the outcome of negotiations does not have to be full-membership; Turkey and the EU might end up with different solutions and conclusions. His major element of propaganda in his resistance against the anti-Turkey opposition has been the fact that the French public will vote on Turkey's membership to the EU in the referendum when the time comes. Hence, Chirac's rhetoric has been more different than Schroeder, who has been one of the champions of Turkey's EU bid, and Merkel, who had constantly opposed Turkey's full membership in the EU up until the 3 October decisions. In other words, Chirac neither could treat Turkey as a propaganda element due to his unavoidable fortune in domestic politics, nor had the necessary support from and among his constituents. He followed a "yes; but/if" policy on Turkey's membership to the EU. For Chirac, Turkey belongs to Europe and 'privileged partnership' is unacceptable. However, Turkey will become a member of the EU if and only if she fulfils the necessary criteria for membership and if the French public says 'yes' for Turkey in the future referendum.¹²⁸

Chirac's statements with respect to Turkish accession have been strengthened with respect to feeding anti-Turkey sentiments, which can be considered as a political struggle by him. As has been stated above, the issues of Cyprus, the so called 'Armenian genocide', or Turkey's shortcomings in human rights should only be considered as minor obstacles in front of Turkey's EU bid and do not constitute critically important places among the European publics' reservations with reference to Turkey. Nevertheless, these issues are treated by political leaders of EU member state governments as political assets in negotiations between Turkey and the EU. The strongest amongst these issues can be claimed to be the Cyprus dispute as the 'Republic of Cyprus' is not recognised by Turkey on the Turkish part and the island is invaded by Turkish Armed Forces according to the Greek Cypriot part. The French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy stated in August 2005 that the Cyprus dispute should be discussed within the EU with all its respects and not recognizing one of the members of the EU is unacceptable. On top of this, the French Prime Minister Dominique de

¹²⁸ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Chirac cok net konustu", 16 December 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=137530>

Villepin asserted that Turkey's membership to the EU is unthinkable if Turkey does not recognize the 'Republic of Cyprus'.¹²⁹ Moreover, Chirac, repeating what his Prime Minister and Foreign Minister had said, stated that "opening accession negotiations with a country, which does not recognize one of the members of the Union, is unthinkable".¹³⁰ The difference in Chirac's rhetoric has also been noted by Turkish PM Erdoğan. Erdoğan claimed that, in the aftermath of 17 December, Chirac had assured him in terms of Turkey signing the Additional Protocol would not mean recognition of the 'Republic of Cyprus', agreeing with (former) German Chancellor Schroeder, and Commission President Jose-Manuel Barroso.¹³¹ Hence, as opposed to the European Commission's firm and clear statements, which is there is no obligation for Turkey to recognize the 'Republic of Cyprus' to begin the negotiations, President Chirac and other leaders treat the Cyprus dispute as a conditional requirement for opening accession negotiations. Therefore, it would not be wrong to suggest that the change in the discourse Chirac uses coincides with the post-referendum crises in France, which pushed him into domestic political struggle.

Lastly, Chirac's last move after the 3 October decisions asserts the fact that he starts to cover a more identity based rhetoric – that is rejecting Turkey's European identity. On 4 October at press conference in Paris, he said Turkey has to undergo a "major cultural revolution" before she becomes a member to the EU, which is neither an accession criterion, nor a conditional requirement by the EU. With reference to Turkey with a very pessimistic tone, Chirac said "Will it succeed? I cannot say. I hope so. But I am not at all sure".¹³² He further states that the French public will have a referendum on

¹²⁹ *Hürriyet*, Turkish daily newspaper, "*Fransa: Kıbrıs'ın tanınması AB'de tartışılın*", 4 August 2005, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~3@nvid~613191,00.asp>

¹³⁰ *Hürriyet*, Turkish daily newspaper, "*Erdoğan: Chirac'ın açıklamasına üzüldüm*", 4 August 2005, <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/kullaniciadi/My%20Documents/H%FCrriyetim.htm>

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Constant Brand, ABC News International, "France says Turkey needs to change for EU", 4 October 2005, <http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=1183350&page=1>

Turkish membership to the EU as a matter of democratic principles. In this regard, it reminds the previous enlargement, for which no referendum took place and leads one to ask if there were no democratic principles in May 2004. Thus, the linkage between domestic politics and international relations becomes apparent; the high level of opposition among French public forces the French leadership to change its position on an international issue. In addition, because the French President has no more credibility in domestic politics, his bargaining power in French domestic political environment is very low, which consequently leads him to relieve the tensions among French public through statements as such.

It is also worth to notice the position of the former French President Valerie Giscard D'Estaing, who chaired the EU Constitutional Convention, and who is known with his extra-anti-Turkey sentiments. His arguments revolve around the culture-identity sphere of argument, according to which Turkey has no place in the EU due to its massive Muslim population, its geographical location and to its non-European and Asian identity. On the eve of the 17 December Brussels Summit, Giscard defined the EU with Turkey as “the end of Europe” because of Turkey’s Muslim and Asian identity.¹³³ In other words, “Turkey has no place in an alliance of Christian nations” for Giscard because 97% of Turkey’s land is in Asia and more than 99% of the nation is Muslim.¹³⁴ Before the referendum on EU Constitution, he said, although Turkey is an important member, “Turkey cannot be a member of the European political system. Why? It will be the most numerous... and poorest, so all the funds will go to Turkey”.¹³⁵ Therefore, hesitation towards Turkey’s prospective membership among opinion and political leaders can be divided into two different perspectives of analyses: Turkey is culturally different from Europe; and Turkey will be the second biggest member state in

¹³³ William Horsley, BBC News, “Turkey’s date with destiny”, 16 December 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4091743.stm>

¹³⁴ BBC News, “Turkish PM pledges Western vision”, 19 November 2002, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2491689.stm>

¹³⁵ Caroline Wyatt, BBC News, “EU Treaty ‘cannot be rewritten’”, 19 May 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4560923.stm>

the decision making mechanism which will both lead to the end of the European integration project.

Last of all, it is crucially important to note down the statements and declarations of Nicolas Sarkozy, who is one of the would-be presidents after the 2007 Presidential elections. His position is also important due to a possible coalition between the French Right and German Right; between him and Chancellor Angela Merkel. Sarkozy's position on Turkey is clear; he does not want to see Turkey in the EU and is very much in favour of 'privileged partnership' for Turkey. In an interview on 18 December 2004, he states that he agrees with Chirac on opening accession negotiations with Turkey and on having a referendum at the end of the process. However, for him, Turkey's prospective membership should be discussed and privileged partnership is the best choice for Turkey. He further lists the reasons why he does not want Turkey to become a member; for Sarkozy, firstly, the EU already has 25 members and with the accession of Bulgaria and Romania, and of course of Croatia, it will become a Union of 28. Secondly, he defines Turkey as a Mediterranean Country and rejects Turkey's European identity as he asks what the EU would say to Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia if they applied for membership if Turkey becomes a member.¹³⁶ For Sarkozy, Turkey is an excellent partner of European common market, however, giving Turkey the biggest say in the decision making mechanism would make the EU fragile. Therefore, 'privileged partnership', which is "pure and simple", would not only facilitate Turkish democracy, but also it will preserve the functioning of Europe, which needs reform.¹³⁷

The major reason why Sarkozy opposes Turkish membership in the EU is because Turkey has a huge population that the EU is unable to digest in the near future. On top of everything, the biggest of Sarkozy's reservations is Turkey's population; Turkey will have a population of 100 million which will give her the biggest voting rights within the Union as she will have the largest population.¹³⁸ He is a strong ally of

¹³⁶ France 2, "Nicolas Sarkozy invite du journal de France 2", available at UMP official web-page, 18 December 2004, <http://www.u-m-p.org/site/actualite.php?IdActualite=393&ActualiteType=Interview>

¹³⁷ Ibid.

Merkel on this particular subject matter and very much in favour of the idea of 'privileged membership'. In September 2004, when he was the Finance Minister, Sarkozy has stated the decision of Turkish membership "could only be taken after there had been a referendum in France, to know what the opinion of the French people is".¹³⁹ Thus, it would not be wrong to suggest that Sarkozy bases his arguments over public opinion. Moreover, as has been stated above, the possible coalition between the French and German Rights will affect Turkey's EU bid and the bargaining balance during the negotiations. Previously, when Schroeder was the Chancellor and Chirac was politically stronger, the two leaders were firm enough to support Turkey's EU bid. The leaders officially declared that "in order to maintain democracy and peace in Europe, Turkey's membership is necessary".¹⁴⁰ However, the centre of gravity of the pendulum has shifted. Sarkozy and Merkel have met in July 2005 and both leaders gave the signals of closer cooperation between Paris and Berlin on the issues with respect to the EU, one of which is their preferences on Turkey's EU bid.¹⁴¹ Both leaders declared that a stronger Franco-German axis is essential. As a matter of fact, one of the issues they bluntly agree is 'privileged partnership' instead of full membership for Turkey. In response to Sarkozy's statement that "the Franco-German axis is indispensable", "Merkel gave the signals of how the future European politics will evolve by stating that 'the axis is an essential element in the EU, but it goes without saying that it should not be directed against the other members. We need to open the Franco-German partnership to the rest of Europe'".¹⁴²

¹³⁸ BBC News, "French 'must vote on Turkey bid'", 27 September 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3693042.stm>

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Türkiye'nin ayak sesleri", 2 October 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=129911>

¹⁴¹ BBC News, "Boost for Franco German 'engine'", 19 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4695943.stm>

¹⁴² Eurosoc web-site, "When Nicolas met Angela", 20 July 2005, http://eursoc.com/news/fullstory.php/aid/841/When_Nicolas_Met_Angela.html

Above all, France's position on Turkey is much more public opinion dependent. In other words, as France has a referendum tradition on critical policy matters; French politicians take public opinion into consideration more seriously than Germany. Therefore, it can be claimed that, as both Sarkozy and Chirac has officially declared, because France will have a referendum on Turkish accession when the time comes, the EU will still have the opportunity not to take Turkey in. Nevertheless, the position of the French public cannot be foreseen by today since neither Turkey nor the EU will be the same as today. In other words, although the French public opinion is very much against Turkish full-membership in the EU, Frenchmen and women might also have different perspectives in the future. Thus, French leaders' insistence and emphasis on the future referendum on Turkish membership is more of domestic political game in using the French public opinion in other domestic concerns and reflecting the hesitancy of the French government rather than ensuring the future right of the French public.

Great Britain

The United Kingdom is the biggest champion of Turkey in her EU bid. Unlike the previous member states that have been discussed above, the UK has continuously supported the prospective membership of Turkey. The reasons why the UK is more supportive for Turkey than the other two countries among the big three can be summarized as follows. First of all, Britain's position and preferences within the EU is the biggest determinant in her position towards Turkey. Unlike France and Germany, the UK is a strong defender of an intergovernmental Europe rather than a much more federal Europe. Secondly, because the UK has joined the EU almost 20 years after the core member states, she does not cover a Euro-centric rhetoric, which provides France and Germany to claim that they are the 'core Europe'. Thirdly, the Great Britain's imperial past pushes her to act independently in terms of international relations. Above all, it can also be claimed that the very long-standing relations between the Britons and the Turks enables the two countries to have a special relationship. Thus, the discourse that Prime Minister Tony Blair and the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Jack Straw adopt will be analysed below, with respect to the points that are listed above.

The UK's tremendous support for Turkey's accession bid during the bargaining among member states on 2-3 October cannot be undervalued. Before getting into that, previous statements of political leaders in the UK should be discussed. First of all, the UK has no 'culture' argument against Turkey; the only requirement of the UK government has been the fulfilment of the Copenhagen Criteria. In other words, the Blair government's objective has been providing sticks to the already reforming Turkey. "Turkey, which is a bridge between east and west, will have to continue with democratic and human rights reforms" he said in a meeting with the Turkish Prime Minister before the 17 December Summit.¹⁴³ It can further be claimed that the special relationship between the UK and the United States gives the UK the strong credentials to support the prospective membership of Turkey.

In addition Turkey's participation in European security organizations and its geographical proximity are the strongest motivations behind the supportive attitude of the UK. "Engaging with the Islamic world" is one of the goals of Great Britain.¹⁴⁴ The discourse that the US covers is that Turkey constitutes a bridge between the Muslims and the Christians and she proves the world that democracy and Islam can coexist. In other words, Turkey provides a great example of America's causes in the Middle East. In his visit for NATO's Istanbul Summit, Bush said, he appreciates the Turkish example, as it "has set on how to be a Muslim country and at the same time a country which embraces democracy and the rule of law and freedom."¹⁴⁵ Blair echoes President Bush's statement by saying "if it (Turkey) fulfils the same principles of human rights, then Muslim and Christian can work together".¹⁴⁶ Therefore, as a strong ally of the US, the UK is very much in favour of a Turkey, which is dedicated to the Western ideals.

¹⁴³ BBC News, "Blair pushes Turkey's case to EU", 16 December 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4102705.stm

¹⁴⁴ See the official web-site of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, www.fco.gov.uk

¹⁴⁵ BBC News, "Bush praise for key ally Turkey", 27 June 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3843795.stm>

¹⁴⁶ BBC News, "Blair hails Turkey-EU talks deal", 17 December 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4105731.stm

Moreover, as has been stated above, the UK is the champion of a less integrated Europe. In addition to this, the definition of the concept of ‘power’ for the UK differs from the Continental conception to a great extent. Although the UK is strongly dedicated to multilateralism in theory, she is very much for the old conception of ‘hard power’ rather than the European conception of ‘normative/civilian power’. The position and preferences of her with respect to the 2003 Iraq War demonstrates the best example for this assumption. With regard to the UK’s conception of power and her positions over Turkey’s accession bid, it could be asserted that Great Britain wants Turkey integrated to Europe as much as possible not only because of her ambitions concerning a less politically integrated Europe but also because she wants Turkey integrated to European security structures, which would facilitate to further strengthen these structures through the inclusion of the huge Turkish Armed Forces into the club. In addition, the blasts under a terrorist attack at the British Consulate – the Pera House – in Istanbul and in front of the HSBC building also strengthened the already close relations between Turkey and the UK. For Blair, Turkish accession ‘may boost’ European security as he stated in July 2005 that “the prospect of Turkish membership, though obviously some time in the future, I think will be important for Europe and for its security”.¹⁴⁷ Hence, Turkish membership would perfectly suit the British interests in the EU that is to have less political integration and more international role in the globalizing world.

The position of the UK is very clear with respect to Cyprus as opposed to other member states such as France and Germany. In a meeting with the Turkish Prime Minister, Tony Blair clearly asserted that “it is simply important for us to re-state the legal fact, which is the signing of the protocol does not involve the recognition of Cyprus”.¹⁴⁸ It is also worth to state that the UK has particular interests in Cyprus as the island was a part of the Imperial Great Britain and as she still has a proportion of territory used as a military base in the Mediterranean. Therefore, her position on the

¹⁴⁷ BBC News, “Turkey in EU may ‘boost security’”, 27 July 2005, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4720629.stm

¹⁴⁸ BBC News, “UK and Turkey set against terror”, 27 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4720555.stm>

Cyprus dispute is the same with the Commission's. On top of everything, the dispute is not treated as a political element within domestic politics in the UK.

As has been stated above, the Prime Minister has no other arguments against Turkey's accession bid such as Turkey's non-European identity or her huge population which would 'mean the end of Europe, but the fulfilment of the accession criteria. On 2 November 2005 in the Prime Minister's questions session in the House of Commons, Blair stated that he was "proud of opening accession negotiations with Turkey and Croatia"¹⁴⁹ but with respect to a question on Orhan Pamuk's trial on 23 November in a similar session, he said Turkey has to comply with the EU rules on freedom of speech if it wanted to join the EU".¹⁵⁰ Thus it would not be wrong to claim he has an objective position on Turkey. Nevertheless, for both Blair and Straw, 3 October is a historic day as Turkey's accession has officially started.

Nevertheless, for Straw, "Turkey has been a part of European history for centuries", as Turkey still "bears the marks of the Greek, Roman and Byzantine civilizations, which have done so much to shape modern Europe".¹⁵¹ This statement is crucially important due to the fact that according to the anti-Turkish membership rhetoric, one of the reasons why Turkey lacks Europeanness is because she has no Roman heritage, which is essential in the formation of the European identity. Straw further addresses the fact that Turkey is one of the founding members of the Council of Europe and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since 1952. Thus, it can be stated that the UK still accommodates herself into the old – Cold-War – definition of Europe, in which Turkey has a long-standing and firm position. Moreover, Turkey's accession is "Europe's future too" for Straw, and "by welcoming Turkey we

¹⁴⁹ BBC News, "Point-by-point: Question time", 2 November 2005, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4399596.stm

¹⁵⁰ BBC News, "Point-by-point: Question time", 23 November 2005, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4463220.stm

¹⁵¹ Speech by UK Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, Bridging the Bosphorus – Turkey's European future", available at the website of the UK Presidency of the EU 2005, 8 October 2005, <http://www.eu2005.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1107293561746&a=KArticle&aid=1125560522451>

will demonstrate that Western and Islamic cultures can thrive together as partners in the modern world”.¹⁵² Furthermore, due to her geographical proximity, Turkey’s EU membership will enable the EU have a more international role in terms of for example, fight against drug trafficking, cross-border crime, international terrorism, energy and of course economics.

Lastly, Blair’s and Straw’s support for prospective Turkish accession during 2-3 October should be underlined. 3 October has been a “truly historic day for Europe and the whole of the international community”.¹⁵³ The UK’s position on Turkey’s accession bid can be summarized as follows in Straw’s words: “the European Union faces a moment, the importance of which we must not underestimate. It will shape the future of the world in which we live. It is one upon which stands the security and prosperity of Europe itself. We cannot afford to get this wrong”.¹⁵⁴

Austria

The highest resistance against the prospective Turkish membership to the EU is among the Austrians. Austria has a longstanding anti-Turkish accession position in the EU not only because public opinion demands so but also because the Right is leading the country for many years. The Austrian contention towards Turkey’s accession bid became apparent when the Austrian Foreign Minister Ursula Plassnik showed a high amount of political will in order not to grant Turkey accession. The preference of Austria is clear; Turkey’s privileged partnership with the EU rather than full-membership to the EU serves her best interests. In fact, Austria’s position is no different than the French and German right, the only reason why Austria is observed as a case in

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ BBC News, “EU hails Turkey membership talks”, 4 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307700.stm>

¹⁵⁴ Straw, “Bridging the Bosphorus”

this chapter is because, firstly, hesitation towards Turkey's EU bid is at its highest levels because the it is demonstrated legitimately as it is right at the core of Austria's governance – at the government – and secondly because Austria is not among the big three with respect to the decision making mechanism in the EU. In other words, her relatively restricted power in the EU enables Austria to have a much freer space in the field of criticism. Nevertheless, Austria's resistance is important due to the fact that she is one of the contributors to the EU budget and on top of everything she is used as a reference point among the anti-Turkey accession opinion and political leaders. Austria also accommodated herself into this role as the Austrian Head of Parliament Andreas Khol asserted that they have been “the voice of the EU's silent public”.¹⁵⁵

As has been previously stated, during the bargains in the General Affairs and External Relations Council on 3 October, Austria had a very firm position in terms of not granting Turkey acceding country status. The bargains took almost two days and the only reason was Austria's resistance on certain aspects. The main reason, however, why Austria insisted so much on privileged partnership status for Turkey, which out of Turkey's win-set, is because she wanted to reach a compromise on another issue that is opening accession negotiations with Croatia. In other words, Plassnik's insistence on privileged partnership, for which Austria's win-set enabled her to do so, gave her the necessary incentives to have a deal on Croatia, which is a neighbour of Austria. Thus, in this thesis, it is argued that the game that Austria played is again a matter of Putnam's win-set analysis.

Chancellor Wolfgang Schuessel said he was 'proud' of what had happened during 2-3 October 2005.¹⁵⁶ As has also been given before, he also said that Austria had reached her goal. Thus, although Austria could not achieve her goal of privileged partnership for Turkey, the Austrian government actually got what it wanted. Further, the Chancellor said that the EU has to take “popular concerns” into consideration, which is a point of view that might lead to “theological-political divide” in Straw's

¹⁵⁵ *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “Avusturya'lı Başkan sinirlendi”, 5 October 2005,

¹⁵⁶ BBC News, “EU hails Turkey membership talks”, 4 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307700.stm>

words.¹⁵⁷ Above all, for the Austrian leadership, Turkey lacks European identity, which will constitute a huge obstacle for Turkey in the accession negotiations. In an interview with Chancellor Schuessel, he stated that Europe's borders are vague towards the East; Turkey has to practically and culturally admit European values in order to overcome the difficulties of the open-ended process of negotiations. He further adds that if the Eastern and all the Mediterranean countries in addition to Russia are considered as Europe, then the EU will resemble an organization like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.¹⁵⁸ The words of Schuessel can be claimed to be denying Turkey's European identity and defining Turkey in European neighbourhood rather than inside Europe. Therefore it is not very surprising that Austria is very much pro 'privileged partnership' and against Turkish prospective EU membership. In addition, he prefers Turkey staying within the limits of European security organizations.

Above all, Austria's preferences and positions on Turkey's accession bid are clear. The Austrian government is very much against Turkey's prospective membership due to cultural reasons on top of Turkey's massive population. The limited win-set of the Austrian government enables it to impose its preferences on other member states, which is demonstrated in 3 October decisions. Hence, Putnam's two-level game analysis perfectly fits to the analysis of the Austrian position on Turkey's EU bid. Lastly, it should also be noted that Austria's relative power limited the Austrian government only to achieve certain desired outcomes in the 3 October IGC, which also gives Moravcsik's theory.

In sum, member state preferences and specifically government leaders play a very important role with respect to Turkey's EU bid. The other aspect of relations that is public opinion on Turkey and her membership to the EU will be elaborated in Chapter IV. What has so far been asserted is that the relative power of member states and government leaders' preferences have huge impacts on Turkish membership. In addition

¹⁵⁷ BBC News, "Deadlock delays EU Turkey talks", 3 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4303550.stm>

¹⁵⁸ *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, German daily newspaper translated in, *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, "Türkiye'nin yeri ayrı", 4 January 2006, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=174804>

to this, because leaders seek to remain in or gain power, they ultimately pursue certain rhetoric that would be favoured by their constituents. In other words, leaders prefer to use certain types of language in order to secure their position at the office. Therefore, the mutually interactive relationship between the government leaders and the European citizens influence the positioning of the EU as a whole at the final stage at both levels.

CHAPTER IV

Public opinion in the EU towards Turkey's accession bid

Member State preferences and positions on Turkey's accession bid through a discourse analysis have so far been discussed in the previous chapters. Following the analyses of Robert Putnam and Andrew Moravcsik on public determinants of government preferences as the theoretical framework, analysing public attitudes is a must in this final chapter. In other words, government preferences do not take shape in a vacuum but public opinion sets the borders of how far the governments can go. The conclusion that has been reached in the previous chapter is, briefly, government leaders' preferences in certain member states – for our purposes, Germany, France, Great Britain and Austria – are determined by their positions in domestic politics. In other words, leaders adopt certain rhetoric that is to a great extent determined and shaped by their own publics' positions on the prospective Turkish membership to the EU due to the fact that leaders' are under pressure specifically by their constituents and by the public in general on certain policy matters. Therefore, public opinion has a very important role in the policy making process as most of the international bargaining processes are done within the boundaries of what is acceptable to the public.

Public support to the EU governments' policies choices have become important for the last two decades in an increasing fashion since the democratic accountability of the EU is one of the major questions posed to the legitimacy of the Union. In other words, increasing the democratic accountability of the EU is one of the major priorities among the policy makers in the EU to provide a source of legitimacy for such an

ambitious project. Thus, the publics' approval has become more important as the legitimacy crisis deepened in the EU. Although it might be claimed that the EU is significantly more democratic in its own structures, i.e. through granting increasing powers to the European Parliament, than it was a decade ago, one can hardly assert that the EU is fully legitimate in the eyes of the European publics.

As the Turkish accession to the EU is one of the most controversial issues in the agenda of the EU, the position of the European public opinion on the issue will be analysed in this chapter. In other words, not only because there is tremendous level of interaction between public opinion and decision makers' preferences, but also because of the high tensions that the prospective Turkish membership to the EU creates within the EU both in terms of governmental relations and of governments and masses interactions, it is crucially important to analyse Turkey-EU relations in this respect. There are two main aspects of the public's views on Turkey: one is centred on the costs of Turkey's membership to the EU, which revolves around the utilitarian perspective, and the other is on the questions of identity. Hence, in this chapter, a quantitative analysis will be done through exploring Eurobarometer surveys. The focus of the analyses will be the prospective Turkish membership. The previous chapter will be the reference point; a correlation between the European identity and support/opposition for Turkish membership will be endeavoured to be established. In addition to this, the socio-economic situations in member states vis-à-vis the priorities of the public will be examined. Therefore, the Eurobarometer 63 survey will be the main data to be analysed.

Even though the public opposition to Turkey's membership revolves around questions of Europeanness and identity, it is still a matter of uncertainty whether EU member state citizens identify themselves Europe-wide or nationwide. In other words, although the EU is far beyond the level of integration of the 1970s and 1980s, it could be stated that Europeanness does not yet supersede national identities; Europeanness has not yet fully established. In contrast, a Europe-wide extreme nationalism is spreading due to a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this dissertation. In order to measure EU member state citizens' identification as European, the Eurobarometer 63 survey will be used below. The two propositions that will be elaborated are if the level of Europeanness and European identity constitute a reason for opposition on Turkey's membership to the EU, and whether or not the materialist and utilitarian explanations on

the issue are the main determinants; which is to say whether the foreseen costs of the prospective Turkish membership are the causes of the high level of public opposition on Turkey's accession bid.

The survey questions of the Eurobarometer 63, which constitute the basis for our identity argument, are as follows: "the climate of opinion" that is basically the satisfaction of and the expectations from the EU among the European citizens, the European citizen's view of the EU membership, the image of the EU and "confidence expressed in the Commission and the EP". As has been stated above, these questions lead one to assume whether, or not, the European citizens, or namely the public opinion in the EU, are for or against the EU and its policies. Although these questions do not directly illustrate conclusions over European identity, it can further be asserted that the sum of all somewhat derives one to assume there is a certain level of identity formation or vice versa. Hence, the expectations and satisfaction of the European publics are the assets of the materialist and the utilitarian perspectives on Turkish membership to the EU; the second part, which is the publics' confidence in EU institutions is the source of data whether Europeans identify themselves with the EU or not and if the proposed level of Europeaness interacts with the support for and opposition to Turkey's membership.

I. Literature review on support for European Integration

To begin with, public opinion and/or European citizens' attitudes toward European integration have been widely discussed and analysed by many scholars previously. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to give what has previously been asserted on this linkage; how one interprets public opinion depends on where he/she stands conceptually, ideologically and theoretically. In other words, one's interpretation of mass and elite attitudes on European integration depends on the concepts and the theory he/she adopts as the author. The literature on European integration is important in order to reveal and/or analyse publics' perceptions on Turkish membership. Nevertheless, it would be fair to suggest that, for the purposes of the thesis dissertation, there is an enormous and increasing amount of interaction between the public and elite attitudes with respect to the European integration project due to the fact that the EU is

no longer an elite project and citizens' lives are under direct influence of the EU decisions rather than national laws and practices. In addition, the publics' involvement in the EU policy making is endeavoured to be increased through referenda and representative channels and through the institution of the European Parliament in order to provide a considerable level of legitimacy to the EU.

No particular theory of mass-elite attitudes is adopted in this last chapter. The previous chapter, in which government leaders' preferences and positions are analysed, will be endeavoured to be connected to this chapter through a quantitative analysis with the help of Eurobarometer surveys. The focus will be the April 2005 Eurobarometer and there will be no comparison between consecutive years. Hence, the purpose of this chapter is to explain governments' preferences through quantitative data on public opinion. Nevertheless, it would be enlightening to provide a certain amount of background on the previous studies that has been conducted in the field. The major reference points in this chapter are Matthew Gabel, who correlates economic conditions and support for membership, Lauren McLaren, who has endeavoured to explain preferences of mass public beyond economic determinism, and Gary Marks and Liesbet Hooghe, who previously explored the reasons for support for EU membership through the light of multi-level governance theory.

Material interests and support for European integration: The case of Turkish accession

Public opinion is one of the major foci of political scientific research, especially for the last few decades. American public opinion has been the focus of the early researchers; the developments in the EU especially after the 1970s attracted more scholars over time to conduct research on the public opinion in the EU. Although it could be claimed that the public does not have consistent and coherent attitudes and politics on varying policies and with respect to different leaderships, public opinion matters a lot for the decision makers' own sake as government and political leaders, as those who consistently seek to remain in power, or gain power for those who do not participate in the decision making process. In other words, there are numerous determinants of public opinion and it is very difficult and inappropriate to identify a single or a few causes for publics' attitudes. Nevertheless, the explanation for mass

attitudes will revolve around two theoretical assumptions that are the economic/material interests assumption and the identity question.

The economic explanations, nevertheless, deserve to be considered as a plausible source of reference. Gabel examines the impact of the economic preferences of the public on their international preferences. In other words, he explores in his study, “whether citizens’ attitudes toward international economic policy (i.e., EU membership) reflect their differential economic interests related to that policy”.¹⁵⁹ Macro and micro economic conditions in member states affect the level of support for EU membership among the public to a great extent. For instance, previous research has found that the level of inflation (macro-economic) and market liberalization (micro-economic) such as transformation of the national market, i.e. the four freedoms of movement, have a considerable amount of impact in the formation of public opinion in the EU.

In addition, the ability to exploit economic opportunities with respect to liberalization affects support.¹⁶⁰ Hence, so far in previous studies, it has been claimed that skilled workers benefit more than unskilled workers in the labour market in the EU as a result of European economic integration. The international economic theory suggests that “the economic benefits of an internal market for an unskilled or a skilled worker depends on how well he/she can compete with workers in his/her occupation throughout the market, not with other factors of production in his/her nation.”¹⁶¹ However, the European economic integration does not benefit high-wage unskilled workers since firms, in an integrated market with free mobility, would prefer low-wage unskilled workers. Therefore, two conclusions could be driven from the aforementioned

¹⁵⁹ Gabel, Matthew J., “Economic integration and mass politics: market liberalization and public attitudes in the European Union”, *American Journal of Political Science*, July 1998, 42(3), p.937. An assertion as such will provide an additional credibility to this dissertation as a theory synthesis that has been applied. In other words, so far, bargaining between member states and the importance of interest groups at Level two has been covered in accordance with Moravcsik’s and Putnam’s theories. Observing public opinion in this chapter, therefore, will enable us to add an extra layer to our theory synthesis, which will also increase the reliability of the Multi-Level governance theory within the synthesis.

¹⁶⁰ Gabel, “Economic integration”, pp.937-39

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.939

hypothesis. Firstly, the reason why support in wealthier member states, where wages are higher, would be expected to be lower due to the fact that low-skilled cheap labour attracts firms to employ. In other words, firms tend to employ cheaper labour in low-wage jobs. Therefore, it leads one to automatically assume that the public in the existing member states should not be expected to support enlargement, as it is a policy that is directed towards poorer countries especially in the last decade and in the case of Turkey. Secondly, in an environment where unemployment is already very high, such as Germany and France, people would not welcome new comers due to the fact that enlargement would not constitute a priority and that people are already discontented because of economic dissatisfaction.¹⁶² Hence, “citizens’ support for membership in the EU is consistent with their occupation-based economic interests”.¹⁶³ It is also worth noting that a similar logic could be applied to the capital market, which is to say, the net receivers of “financial pay-offs” would benefit and consequently support more than the net contributors of the EU budget.¹⁶⁴

It would also be wrong to assume that the only reason for support is economics and/or material interests since member states’ preferences vary in accordance with their publics’. In other words, public in different member states have different positions on certain policies or different causes for support for certain policies as such. The non-economic approaches on support for membership could be enlightening in this case. As has been stated before, information about the EU could be claimed to be one of determinants of support. The more politically affiliated people are, the more they are supportive of European integration due to the level of information they receive. In other words, in McLaren’s words, “the more information one receives about the EU, the less threatening the organization becomes”.¹⁶⁵ People’s value system can also be assumed to

¹⁶² In the Turkish case, there is an additional layer, which is the fact that the EU has an enlargement fatigue.

¹⁶³ Gabel, “Economic integration”, p.949

¹⁶⁴ See, McLaren, Lauren, “Public support for the European Union: Cost benefit analysis or perceived cultural threat?”, *The Journal of Politics*, May 2002, 64 (2), p.552

¹⁶⁵ Inglehart, Ronald, “Cognitive mobilization and European identity”, *Comparative Politics*, 3(1) and Janssen, Joseph I. H., “Postmaterialism, Cognitive Mobilization and

be another non-economic factor in the level of public support. The materialist – post-materialist distinction is worth to note; people, who adopt post-materialist values, which are more abstract in nature, such as democracy or protection of environment, tend to support enlargement more than those, who are materialist since the EU is an abstract concept itself. Finally, the performance of the national governments as another determinant should also be mentioned. Usually, on certain – unsuccessful – policies, the remedies are attributed to the EU and the Union is used as a scapegoat. Thus, going back to the information assumption, it can be stated that support for the EU is also determined by the circumstances at the national level since the information people receive depends on how the information is syndicated.

The question of European identity and Enlargement toward Turkey

The costs of enlargement are taken more readily if the EU public perceives the candidate as a part of the European identity. It is not a matter of question whether candidate countries to the EU are evaluated on the basis of Copenhagen political and economic criteria; it is taken for granted. In other words, in 1993, the EU has made clear that candidate countries have to sufficiently fulfil certain criteria in order to start accession negotiations. However, the EU member states have been more favourable to the CEECs and Mediterranean countries than they have been on Turkey's accession bid. For instance, although Bulgaria and Romania were economically and politically less qualified candidates, they have started accession negotiations years, while Turkey remained as the only candidate country that had not started negotiations.¹⁶⁶ For a more recent example, Poland will receive a total of 59.7 billion Euros from the EU budget in the next six years while Turkey will receive 40 million Euros for initiating the civil-society dialogue.¹⁶⁷ Thus, as Sjørusen asserts, “in the process of supporting applicant states in their efforts to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria, the EU has given priority to some

Public support for European integration”, *British Journal of Political Science*, 21(2) are paraphrased in McLaren, “Public support for the EU”, p.552

¹⁶⁶ See, Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, (2002), “Turkey in the EU's Enlargement Process: Obstacles and challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, 7(2), pp.79-95

¹⁶⁷ Although the status of the countries is different, that is Poland is a member state and Turkey is an acceding country, the incredibly huge difference between the amounts of money that will be allocated nevertheless clearly demonstrates the EU's priorities.

states over others”.¹⁶⁸ In other words, domestic politics in member states has not forced the leaderships to hesitate on enlarging regarding the May 2004 enlargement due to the fact that enlargement was taken for granted by the European publics as culturally the central and eastern Europeans belonged to naturally Europe.

The underlying cause of the difference in the rhetoric, which has been explored in the previous chapter, and in treatment with respect to enlargement can be claimed to be Turkey’s non-European identity. Although Turkey was one of the biggest allies of the Western camp during the Cold-War, the Europeanness that had been attached to Turkey in terms of Western ideals has been replaced by a non-European identity. In other words, the definition of Europe and Europeanness has been changed in the aftermath of the Cold-War since the ideological counterpart of Western ideals – communism – that ‘kidnapped’ eastern Europe and threatened Western Europe expired. Thus, the definition of Europe, which was previously based on democracy and human rights, has been partly replaced by a cultural definition, according to which Europeanness means common cultural heritage.

The European identity, therefore, “has been reconstructed with ethno-cultural dimensions clarifying who is European and who is not”, which lead to the formation of “Turkey’s perpetual outsider status”.¹⁶⁹ Hence, the democratic ideals, to which Turkey has had strong commitment, were no more at the core of the Europeanness; “a common cultural heritage, with foundations in ancient Greece, Christianity, and Europe of the Enlightenment” are the new elements that define European identity.¹⁷⁰ Hence, “it is the cultural logic of ‘us and them’, of collective identity”, in which Turkey has a fairly less place in ‘us’ than eastern European countries according to the Western Europeans.

¹⁶⁸ Sjørnsen, Helen, (2002), “Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU’s Enlargement Policy”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(3), p.492

¹⁶⁹ Müftüleri-Bağ, Meltem, (2000), “Through the Looking Glass: Turkey in Europe”, *Turkish Studies*, 1(1), pp.24-25

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.26

The above proposition strengthens the presupposition of the “kinship based duty” that the Western Europeans felt towards the Eastern European regarding the policy of enlargement. Justifications for enlargement with respect to the ten new member states revolved around the identity argument. Not only the discourse that is used by the opinion leaders and decision makers but also the publics’ support for the previous enlargement demonstrates the established place of identity in the justification process. However, with respect to Turkey, neither the rhetorical actions of the leaders, nor the public illustrates a support as such, which consequently leads one to question Turkey’s European identity and its place in Europe. Thus, while the eastern Europeans “rejoined” the EU as they were the abandoned part of Europe as a whole, “Turkey is described as an important partner of Europe”.¹⁷¹

Above all, the question of identity should be helpful to explain the parts where material interests argument is insufficient in analysing member states’ and publics’ attitudes on Turkey. In addition to this, the “perceived cultural threat” that Turkey poses to the Europeans also feeds the argument not only because Turkey is much more populated and much poorer than the CEECs but also because the perception of Turkey’s cultural European identity lacks.

II. Analysis of Attitudes and Support for Turkey’s membership

This thesis argues that there is a correlation between levels of satisfaction, i.e. material interests, and Turkish accession. For this purpose, the Eurobarometer 63 data is to be analysed. *One would expect that as the level of satisfaction with the EU increases, so would support to enlargement and to Turkish accession.* First of all, the level of satisfaction with EU policies and procedures in the EU 25 is fairly high with 80 percent. The Eurobarometer question for this analysis is as follows:


- On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the life you lead?¹⁷²

Here, the phrase “the life you lead” is interpreted as satisfaction with the EU laws and practices and the policies and procedures, which constitute more than 80% of member

¹⁷¹ For an in depth analysis on the argument, see Sjurson, “Why Expand?”, pp.491-513

¹⁷² Eurobarometer 63, Annex, p.57

states' laws. In other words, the level of satisfaction with the EU refers to the material interests of the European peoples. The EU average this is 81%; 60% of which is for "fairly satisfied". The percentage of satisfaction in Germany and France is slightly over the EU average by 83% for each, and 86% for Austria. Interestingly, the level of satisfaction in the UK is even more than that of the German and the French public with 88%. However, it might also be stated that the UK adopts a more independent economic policy as she opts out from certain economic and social policies; i.e., she neither is in the euro zone, nor belongs to the Schengen countries. Thus, the question is whether the European public want to spread this material interest to Turkey.



MS	very satisfied with the life they lead	fairly satisfied with the life they lead	Total satisfaction
Germany	21	62	83
France	19	64	83
The UK	32	56	88
Austria	19	67	86
EU Average	21	60	81

In addition, the expectations with respect to the European life style are optimistic with 34% for better expectations and 51% for same expectations. The survey question is:

- What are your expectations for the next twelve months: will the next twelve months be better, worse or the same, when it comes to...? (Your

life in general) / (The economic situation in our country) / (The financial situation of your household) / (The employment situation in our country) / (Your personal job situation)¹⁷³


The public in the UK has the highest rate regarding “better expectations” with 42%, same as French expectations, as opposed to 20 and 24 percent rates for Germany and Austria. Hence, it could be claimed that if the publics are satisfied materially at home, it could also be asserted that they would support its enlargement as well. This conclusion, however, is only true for the UK, since a clear hesitation of the French public is existent. For this reason, the question of identity should be included in the picture, according to which the level of attachment to European identity and the level of support to enlargement are positively correlated. In other words, the French opposition to Turkish accession is because of the fact that the French public has no feeling of “kinship based duty” towards Turkey as they had for the Central and Eastern Europeans. Therefore, the proposition of material interests is not applicable to the French case and consequently, support for Turkish accession in France is very low.


Better expectations	Germany	France	The UK	Austria	EU Average
Life in General	20	42	42	24	34
The economic situation	17	17	15	15	19
The financial situation	14	29	31	18	24
The employment situation	15	19	16	13	18
Personal job situation	14	26	25	18	22
Worse expectations	Germany	France	The UK	Austria	EU Average
Life in General	15	10	5	9	11
The economic situation	48	42	27	32	37
The financial situation	23	17	11	12	18
The employment situation	54	50	28	42	42
Personal job situation	12	6	5	6	9

With respect to the economic situation, however, the optimistic picture changes. On top of the 19% average, the expectation for better economic situation in the future is even lower in all four member states. Nevertheless, expectation for the same economic situation in the UK and Austria is over 10 percent higher than in Germany and France. Furthermore, expectation for worse employment situation on the EU average is 42

¹⁷³ Eurobarometer 63, pp.54-8. Five different questions are posed to the respondents.

percent. On top of this, the percentage is even higher in France, Germany and Austria as opposed to the 28 percent in the UK. Moreover, the better personal job situation expectation in the UK and in France is slightly over the 22 percent average of the EU as opposed to the lower expectations in Germany and Austria. Above all, it can be stated that the economic rationality theory can be adopted in explaining public support for Turkey. As has been stated previously, the more the public is satisfied with the economic conditions at home, the more people tend to support European integration and the Turkish enlargement. In the case of France, but especially of Germany, the macro and micro economic conditions are not very fair to people. In other words, more than five million Germans constitute the 11 percent unemployed in Germany, who are not expected to support EU policies. It is, therefore, plausible to assume that the low level of support to Turkish accession among Germans is to a certain extent due to the high level of macro and micro economic difficulties at home since the level of material satisfaction determines the level of support to Turkey's membership. British position toward Turkish accession could be explained in a similar logic, which will be elaborated below. The UK follows more independent economic policies and has a completely different and established liberal economic structure when compared to France and Germany. Consequently, do the Britons identify less with the EU?





The answer to this question would be yes, as will also be seen below when the level of Europeanness in the UK is elaborated. Thus, the British support for Turkey's EU bid at the public and elite level could be explained from two different perspectives: firstly the British are economically/materially more satisfied at home than any other three member states, which makes them more comfortable with the EU, especially in expressing their expectations for the future and economic/material satisfaction with the EU as they have no fear of allocating their scarce resources. This is also the reason why French and German publics strongly oppose Turkish accession; both publics are neither satisfied with the life they lead nor they draw a positive economic and materially smooth picture for the future and nor do they support Turkey's accession. Secondly, as has been presupposed above and as will be explained below, the level of feeling of Europeanness in the UK is relatively low in the UK when compared to the other three countries. Thus, European identity in the UK and support for Turkey's membership is negatively correlated; the relatively low attachment to Europeanness can be claimed to be one of the reasons for support for Turkey's EU bid. This also explains the Austrian public's attitudes. The Austrians show similar attitudes with the UK economically and materially, which leads one to assume the material interests assumption fails to explain the extremely low support for Turkey's membership in Austria. The second proposition, however, explains the Austrian behaviour adequately; the level of Europeanness is higher in Austria than it is in the UK, which will also be seen below. Thus, because the Austrians adopt a different definition of Europe and European identity, which has also been described above, their attitudes on Turkish accession differ, despite their similar economic/material expectations and satisfaction.

The question of whether the EU membership is a good or a bad thing is as follows:

- Generally speaking, do you think that (OUR COUNTRY)'s membership of the European Union is (A good thing) / (A bad thing) / (Neither good nor bad) / (Don't Know).¹⁷⁴

The question is responded as a good thing with 54 percent on the EU average. The percentages in Germany and France remain close to the average. However, the people of the UK and Austria evaluate EU membership in this regard as a good thing only with 37 and 36 percents. Thus, despite the fact that the UK is satisfied with the economic policies of the EU, Euro-scepticism in the UK is significantly high. In other words, although the Britons are satisfied with the life they lead in general, this satisfaction is only relevant when one speaks economically as can be observed via their responses on their satisfaction level with, i.e. the economic and employment situation. A similar proposition can be made on the Austrian public's position. Likewise, the EU average of the benefits of EU membership is 55 percent as opposed to the detriments of membership of 33 percent. The situation in France and Germany, which is very near the EU average, is again different than the positions of the Austrian public and the British public. Only 40% and 41% of the Britons and Austrians state that they have benefited from membership, whereas 42% and 46% of the people think they have not benefited. Thus, this result further supports the proposition above, which is to say the publics in Austria and Great Britain are less satisfied with EU membership than in Germany and France. In the Austrian case, however, the question of identity comes into the picture amongst the reasons why the Austrian public is against Turkish membership. Moreover, over the half of the Britons and Austrians feel less safe within the EU in addition to the French public's position. With respect to economics, the situation is vice versa, as the Germans and the French feel around 10 percent less economically stable than the British. The highest feeling of political instability is in France and Austria with 66% and 65% while the Germans and the Britons remain around 50 percent. Thus, stability at home affects the level of support to the EU and its enlargement towards Turkey since it might be presupposed by the public that material losses would increase with Turkish accession.

¹⁷⁴ Eurobarometer 63, p.59

As the public feels more European, support to Turkey's membership would increase. How the EU is perceived amongst the publics is questioned in the Eurobarometer, which could be interpreted as a measure to understand the level of Euro-skepticism. The question is:

- In general, does the European Union conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?¹⁷⁵

46 percent of the Europeans regard the EU to have a positive image as opposed to the 18 percent of negative image. However, only 30 percent of the Austrians and 29 percent of the Britons conjure up for a positive image and 33% and 35% invoke a negative image respectively. This high level of negative image of the EU among the Austrians and the Britons further illustrates the level of Euro-scepticism. Lastly, the question of:

- Are you, yourself, for or against the development towards a European political union?¹⁷⁶

can be claimed to be the final illustrator of the above proposition. Although the Germans with 64 percent and the French with 54 percent are in favour of a political union, the Austrians only with 40% and the British with 34% support the idea of it. Above all, the public in the UK and in Austria support their membership to the EU only to a limited extent as can be observed through the analyses. With respect to support for Turkey, it can be claimed that the level of identification as European is a determinant in the level of support. The Austrian case is unique in this sense since, the Austrians position and our proposition diverge. Nevertheless, the question is general in this sense; to the EU and its institutions illustrates that the sense of belonging to the EU is much higher in Austria than it is in UK, which highlights the correlation between opposition/support to Turkey.

The survey question that measures the legitimacy of the Union's institutions is as follows:

- For each of them, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it? (The European Parliament) / (The European Commission)¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Eurobarometer 63, p.63



¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p.64

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., pp.73-4

The trust in the EU institutions enables one to have claims on the legitimacy of the EU in the eyes of the public. The average trust in the European Parliament is 52 percent. This percentage is 46% in Germany, 50% in France, 48 percent in Austria and 35 percent in the UK. The trust in the European Commission is even further lower; the EU average is 46 percent in addition to the 37 percent in Germany, 45 percent in France, 44 percent in Austria and 31 percent in the UK.

The European Commission		
MS	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust
Germany	37	42
France	45	35
The UK	31	38
Austria	44	39
EU Average	46	31
The European Parliament		
MS	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust
Germany	46	40
France	50	34
The UK	35	38
Austria	48	42
EU Average	52	31

Therefore, the EU has the least legitimacy in the eyes of the public in the UK. Interestingly, the Frenchmen and women have the highest trust in the Commission among the four countries that are analysed. It can be stated that trust in the EU and its institutions tells us that the level of trust is negatively correlated with support to Turkey. The more the people trust in the EU, the less they would support Turkey's accession bid. Trust in the EU's institutions means that publics in the four member states identify themselves as European citizens of the EU to a considerable extent. Thus, Austrians' opposition to Turkey is not very surprising in this sense since almost half of the Austrians identify with the EU institutions, which is considerably high. This also explains the differences in the attitudes of the Austrians and the Britons on Turkey despite their similar attitudes on economic/material gains of the EU.



Above all, support for EU institutions can be claimed to be one of the signals for support for the EU. In other words, publics' positive attitudes towards institutions grant a certain level of legitimacy to the EU and its decisions; trust is an important indicator of the legitimacy of the Union. Thus, this thesis argues that one would expect as the level of Europeanness gets stronger opposition to prospective Turkish membership would increase. This might also be partly why the UK is more favourable to Turkey than the other three member states. It can be observed in the above tables that the UK significantly supports the EU institutions less than the other member states. Hence, on top of economic explanations, identity argument shall also be considered as a term of reference in explaining opposition.

Lastly, it is worth to note the conception of "perceived threat" in explaining mass attitudes on Turkish accession. "Fear of, or hostility toward, other cultures"

constitute an important reason for contention. In explaining Austrian public attitudes, the best way to formulize the very low level of support for Turkey’s accession bid, is to assume that “people do not necessarily calculate the costs and benefits of the EU to their own lives when thinking about issues of European integration, but instead are ultimately concerned about problems related to the degradation of the nation-state.”¹⁷⁸ Opposition to Turkey, which has constituted the “other” for the Europeans, has a certain amount of identity component. Thus, it can be claimed that Austrian mass attitudes are formed through economic satisfaction and expectations in certain areas in accordance with the British. However, the point where the Austrians and the Britons attitudes do not match is their support for the institutions,


The most important issues facing the publics of the EU member states are mainly economic; unemployment is the highest among all with 50 percent in addition to economic situation (27%), rising prices/inflation (16%), and taxation (7%).¹⁷⁹

MS	Economic Situation	Rising prices/inflation	Unemployment
Germany	42	9	81
France	25	24	67
Austria	21	20	63
The UK	8	3	11

The values in Germany are striking, as the major problem is signified as unemployment with 81 percent and economic situation with 42 percent by the Germans. The position of the French public opinion is not very different from the German; the 67 percent of the French people say the most important problem is unemployment and 24 percent say the rising prices are the most important problems. The Austrians signify unemployment as the most important problem by 63 percent as well.

¹⁷⁸ McLaren, “Public support for the EU”, pp.553-4

¹⁷⁹ Maximum two answers are given for this question.



However, only 11 percent of the Britons signify unemployment as the major problem in addition to the 8 percent for the economic situation and 3 percent for the rising prices. The position of the British public further illustrates the economic satisfaction of the Britons. However, the Britons are less socially satisfied as crime and healthcare system are signified as the major problems with 31% and 30% as opposed to the 21% and 9% in France, 24% and 9% in Austria and 14% and 10% in Germany. Interestingly, immigration is amongst the most important problems with 31 percent. In contrast, immigration according to the French with 11 percent, the Austrians with 16 percent, and 6 percent in Germany is the most important problem. Above all, firstly, it could be asserted that the more the Europeans are socially satisfied, the more they feel European. This proposition can also be supported with the European (continental) social model as opposed to the *laissez-faire* approach of the UK. Secondly, economically, public in the Continental European member states – Germany, France and Austria – is much less satisfied as opposed to the British, which further attaches them to their European identity. In other words, the economic hardships in the three member states have nothing to do with their attachment to the European identity. With respect to the Turkish prospective membership to the EU, at this point, it can be stated that the economic hardships push the Europeans to hesitate to welcome Turkey in the club because of Turkey’s massive and poor population, which would bring extra burdens on the shoulders of the Europeans. For the Britons, who are more satisfied economically and less attached to the EU; the Turkish integration would not constitute a major element of concern. Lastly, it can be observed that the Austrians are not materially and economically very comfortable at home in contradiction with what have been said

previously. This particular data, therefore, increases the credibility of the material interest argument since the Austrians are not at all economically/materially happy, which gives Austria another reason to find Turkish membership detrimental.


The survey question on enlargement is as follows:

- For each of the following countries, would you be in favour or against it becoming part of the European Union in the future? (Turkey)¹⁸⁰

MS	In	
	Favour	Against
Germany	21	74
France	21	70
The UK	45	37
Austria	10	80
EU Average	35	52

Support for Turkey’s membership is 35 percent on the EU average and 21 percent in Germany and France, 10 percent in Austria and 45 percent in the UK. As has been endeavoured to be given before, this position of the German, French and Austrian publics is mainly due to the material costs of Turkey. In other words, because Turkey has a huge population, which is a mainly poor huge amount of money to be allocated to Turkish accession is expected. Above all, it could be asserted that, firstly, economic rationality and materialist arguments fits to this dissertation in explaining the contention of the European publics towards Turkish accession. Secondly, it could also be stated that the level of feeling of Europeanness is positively correlated with the level of opposition to Turkey’s membership to the EU. Hence, the best way to overcome this clash between EU decisions and mass attitudes is to increase the visibility of the economic benefits of the EU in member states, and to trigger a civil society dialogue within the EU and between Turkey and the EU to beat the mutual misunderstandings between cultures, namely the “perceived cultural threat”.

¹⁸⁰ Eurobarometer 63, p.97



In conclusion, Turkey’s membership would be most easily sold to European public if the EU governments could demonstrate its economic/material benefits of Turkey. Enlargement is not amongst the priorities of the European citizens. As opposed to the 4 percent support for enlargement, “fighting poverty and social exclusion” constitute 44 percent and “fighting unemployment” 47 percent among the priorities.¹⁸¹ The percentages are 41% and 60% in Germany, 54% and 63% in France, 45% and 53% in Austria and 33% and 15% in the UK respectively. The support for enlargement is the same with the EU average; 4 percent both in Austria and the UK and 2 percent in Germany and France.

The priorities of the EU should be...			
	Welcoming new member countries	Fighting poverty and social exclusion	Fighting unemployment
Germany	2	41	60
France	2	54	63
The UK	4	33	15
Austria	4	45	53
EU Average	4	44	47

¹⁸¹ A Maximum of three answers is given.

Above all, as can clearly be observed, enlargement is not amongst the priorities of the EU according to the European citizens.

In sum, back to the economic rationality argument, if the publics in member states were more materially satisfied at home, support for Turkey's accession would be much higher as can be observed in the British case. In other words, although it is not very certain if enlargement would constitute a priority for the Europeans or not, Turkish accession would be more favourable if the member states' governments were able to sell the economic benefits of Turkey to their publics in the aftermath of providing material satisfaction at home. Although the identity argument helps one to better analyse certain behaviour of member states and attitudes of masses where material interests explanation remains insufficient, it is much more relevant for explaining attitudes at the elite level. Nevertheless, it should also be stated that the identity argument should not be undervalued; it not only provides a better understanding of certain attitudes, especially in the Turkish case with respect to enlargement, but also widens the approach and leads one to question other propositions more extensively.

CONCLUSION

The rejection of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005 in France and the Netherlands has pushed the European Union (EU) into a crisis, which has roots in elite and mass attitudes toward the Union. The crisis can be named a 'legitimacy crisis' and will remain until when the decision makers in the EU fix the gap between the European citizens and the decision making bodies. Although the democratically elected governments in member states have the final word on decisions, the supranational authorities and their decisions affect the lives of European citizens to a tremendous extent. Therefore, member states have to increase the democratic accountability of the EU in order to overcome the lack of legitimacy.

Turkey's accession to the EU is in the agenda of the EU's enlargement policy since 1999 Helsinki Summit. 3 October is a turning point in the relations as the accession negotiations have finally begun. It would be fair to suggest that Turkey has been treated differently than the previous applicant countries. However, what has been endeavoured to be asserted in this dissertation is not the EU's unfairness towards Turkey but an understandable reluctance among member states due to the Union's enlargement fatigue and Turkey's uniqueness in terms of population and culture. In other words, the procedures of enlargement towards Turkey and accession negotiations are no different than the official procedure; new rules and conditions have not been brought for Turkey. The difference lies in the rhetoric, which is to say, government leaders and opinion makers stress and underline certain facts continuously, which is also reflected in the official documents.

In this dissertation, the impacts of the preferences and positions of member states in the EU decision making mechanism with respect to Turkey's prospective membership to the EU has been discussed. The dissertation adopts a theory synthesis; as

is focused in Chapter I, liberal intergovernmentalism, double-edged diplomacy and multi-level governance theory are synthesized. The empirical and historical analysis of Turkey-EU relations is endeavoured to be covered in Chapter II by providing the analysis of official documents meanwhile. Chapter III consists of the analysis of leaders' speeches and attitudes towards Turkey, with which decision and opinion makers' influence on the formation of the public opinion in the EU is evaluated. Lastly, Chapter IV tries to understand the reasons for opposition to Turkey's membership to the EU amongst the EU publics.

Although enlargement is one of the most successful policies of the EU, there is a significant amount of resistance for future enlargement among member states. The EU has gone through five enlargement processes, the fifth of which gave 10 relatively poor post-communist central and eastern countries the status of membership in May 2004. The main purpose of enlargement is to promote democracy in new member states through normative/civilian power, on top of mutual economic benefits. The success of enlargement can be observed in, for instance, Spain and Ireland, where GDP per capita has increased since accession to a significant extent and where democracy has been consolidated. Despite the fact that "asymmetric interdependence" theorem is valid in the enlargement policy, where stronger member states that favoured enlargement the most has had to concede more than the weaker, the policy gives the EU strong credentials to become an international actor. In addition, the mutual benefits of enlargement cannot be undervalued despite its economic burdens on bigger member states. Therefore, "consistent with its dynamic nature, an enlarged Europe can best maintain coherence by means of this variable geometry ..., which, in turn, would help to reconcile the legal definition of the Union with its de facto arrangement, and would allow the EU to proceed with the agreed program of enlargement that has been such an essential part of its success story".¹⁸²

The Turkish enlargement will for sure be much more different than the previous enlargements when one takes Turkey's geographical proximity, economic situation and massive population into consideration. It will be impossible for the EU to function

¹⁸² Evin, Ahmet Ö., (2005) "Is the EU truly in crisis", Media Monitors Network, <http://world.mediamonitors.net/content/view/full/17075>

efficiently when Turkey becomes a member with the existing legal order since the current legal agreement – namely the Treaty of Nice does not adequately serve the best interests of the member states in terms of efficiency. In other words, the EU has to go through an institutional reform in order to deal with the future social, economic and political problems. A future as such is blurry due to the fact that the Constitutional Treaty that was created for this cause is rejected. However, the EU has to overcome the current legitimacy crisis in time in order to survive as a Union. Thus, either way or another, an institutional and legal reform will emerge as a matter of nature, unless member states decide to kill the EU by their own wills, which is very unlikely.

As has been stated previously, neither the Pamuk affair, nor the Cyprus dispute and the Armenian question are at the major problems that cannot be resolved. In other words, neither of these confrontations between Turkey and the EU will constitute obstacles for Turkey's membership because of the fact that Turkey has to first be understood by the European publics. During the time this thesis has been written, for instance, it was claimed that Orhan Pamuk's trial, which has begun in October 2005, was not a real problem in the relations since Turkey would take the necessary measures in time in order to consolidate full freedom of speech. On 22 January 2006, the case was dropped by the Turkish court. However, one must also not to deny the internal reformation dynamics of Turkey. Thus, although the aforementioned disputes are much more established and have roots in history, they will be resolved indispensably in time. Thus, this at least shows how Turkey is committed to democratic ideals and to the EU membership.

It is also worth to mention that the crisis could be overcome not only through political will but with strong civil society dialogue. Achieving solidarity in the EU should be one of the main priorities of the political elite, which can only be done through initiating and investing in a dialogue among member states and with Turkey. As Jones suggests, "what we need to understand is what that support really is: how people support integration and why their support matters in practical terms...the answer is solidarity".¹⁸³ The EU was able to demonstrate a significant level of solidarity in the aftermath of 11 March bombings in Madrid, which it failed to have during Istanbul

¹⁸³ Jones, Eric, "The Politics of Europe 2004: Solidarity and Integration", *Industrial relations Journal*, 36(6), pp.437-8

blasts.¹⁸⁴ Thus, it would not be wrong to suggest that the EU has reached a certain level of solidarity since its foundation, which is not to claim of course European identity supersedes national identities. A further civil society involvement within the European integration project and a strong civil society dialogue between the Turks and the Europeans would thus help both sides to overcome mutual misunderstandings and to increase familiarity between cultures. This could only be done with the encouragement of the political elite and with a strong civil society. The civil society in Turkey is not premature anymore and evolves in a positive way to reach the European levels of civil society involvement. Thus, despite the existence of a negative picture in terms of the European's willingness to see Turkey in the EU, both Turkey and the EU have very strong inputs and motivation to overcome the difficulties in relations in 10 years time.

It is still an open question whether public opinion is directly related with government leaders' preferences. In other words, whether leaders shape their policies in accordance with public's position or not remains as a question mark. Despite the fact that current German and French leaderships oppose Turkey's prospective membership to the EU, the previous leadership in Germany, and the previous stance of the current French Presidency on the issue was very much supportive of Turkish accession to the EU as opposed to the longstanding opposition among the public. How one explains this question mark is open to discussion. For our purposes, it can be claimed for the German case that the constituents of the SPD government in Germany are more supportive of Turkey's membership than the rest and for the French government, it could be claimed that the weakening of the position of Chirac led to a change in preferences as such, which are both inadequate. Nevertheless, these explanations are beyond the scope of this thesis and remains to be explored in future research.

In sum, the two-level game analysis that has been used to explain EU-Turkey relations in this thesis provides a plausible explanation for one to understand the hesitancy of EU member states with respect to Turkey's accession. At Level I, the member state governments bargain with respect to their relative powers. At Level II, as the government leaders have to take the publics' preferences into account, there is a

¹⁸⁴ See Jones, "The politics of Europe", pp.436-55 for an in depth discussion.

mutual interaction between the two elements. Thus, on top of the strong civil-society dialogue, the EU government leaders have to make the material benefits of the Turkish enlargement visible in order to overcome the high level of public opposition on the issue, which will strengthen their positions as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Additional Protocol and Financial Protocol, Final Act Declaration” (1970) – (Official Journal L 293 , 29/12/1972 P. 0004 – 0056) available at European Union website: [http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=21970A1123\(01\)&model=guichett](http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=21970A1123(01)&model=guichett)
- Aydin, Senem and Keyman, E. Fuat, “European Integration and the Transformation of Turkish Democracy”, Centre for European Policy Studies, EU-Turkey Working papers, No.2, August 2004
- BBC News, “Turkish PM pledges Western vision”, 19 November 2002, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2491689.stm>
- “Bush praise for key ally Turkey”, 27 June 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3843795.stm>
- “French ‘must vote on Turkey bid’”, 27 September 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3693042.stm>
- “Blair pushes Turkey’s case to EU”, 16 December 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4102705.stm
- “Blair hails Turkey-EU talks deal”, 17 December 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4105731.stm
- “EU leaders cautious on enlargement”, 18 June 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4105674.stm>
- “Boost for Franco German ‘engine’”, 19 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4695943.stm>
- “UK and Turkey set against terror”, 27 July 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4720555.stm>
- “Turkey in EU may ‘boost security’”, 27 July 2005, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4720629.stm
- “Deadlock delays EU Turkey talks”, 3 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4303550.stm>
- “EU hails Turkey membership talks”, 4 October 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307700.stm>

- “In quotes: Turkey-EU talks deal”; 4 October 2005,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307730.stm>
- “EU hails Turkey membership talks”, 4 October 2005,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4307700.stm>
- “New face in German Foreign Office”, 21 October 2005,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4361906.stm>
- “Point-by-point: Question time”, 2 November 2005,
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4399596.stm
- “Point-by-point: Question time”, 23 November 2005,
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4463220.stm
- Bruter, Michael, (2004), “Developments in the Member States”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, V.42, (Annual Review), pp.135-51
- (2004), “On What Citizens Mean by Feeling ‘European’: Perceptions of News, Symbols and Borderless-ness”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(1), pp.21-39
- The Bundestag main web page: http://www.bundestag.de/htdocs_e/index.html ;
- Caroline Wyatt, BBC News, “EU Treaty ‘cannot be rewritten’”, 19 May 2005,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4560923.stm>
- CNNTurk, “*Türkiye Kararının yankıları sürüyor*”, 5 October 2005:
http://www.cnnturk.com/arama/haber_detay.asp?PID=00319&haberID=130312
- The Coalition Agreement of CDU, CSU and SPD coalition government, “Germany as a responsible partner in Europe and the World”; available at CDU website:
http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdf/05_11_11_Coalitionagreement_foreignpolicy.pdf
- Constant Brand, ABC News International, “France says Turkey needs to change for EU”, 4 October 2005,
<http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=1183350&page=1>
- The Council of the European Union, Copenhagen European Council, 12-13 December 2002, “Presidency Conclusions”, 29.01.2003, p.5,
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf
- The Commission for the European Communities, “2004 regular Report on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”, 6.10.2004, Brussels. Available at the EU portal:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_2004/pdf/rr_tr_2004_en.pdf
- Conclusions of the Presidency, European Council in Copenhagen, 21-22 June 1993,
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/72921.pdf
- Cooper, Robert, (2000), *The Post-Modern State and the World Order*, London, Demos, The Foreign Policy Centre

Cornett, L. and Caporaso, J. A. ““And Still It Moves!” State Interests and Social Forces in the European Community”, pp.219-49 in Rosenau J. N. and Czempiel E. (Eds.) (1995) Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain

The Council of the European Union, Brussels European Council, 16-17 December 2004, “Presidency Conclusions”, 01.02.2005, p.5
http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf

Çarkoğlu, Ali, “The Turkish Party System in Transition: Party Performance and Agenda Change”, Political Studies, XLVI, pp.544-71

Dodd, Clement H., (1998), The Cyprus Imbrolio, England, The Eothen Press.

EU portal, DG Enlargement,

<http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/intro/criteria.htm#Copenhagen%20Criteria>

EU news, policy positions and EU actors website: www.euractive.com, “Rehn: Turkey is already a 'privileged partner' of the EU”, 14 July 2005

Euractive – EU News, Policy, Positions and EU Actors online website, “Chirac proposes emergency summit on the pace of enlargement”, 17 June 2005,
<http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-141106-16&type=News>

----- “Chirac proposes emergency summit”,
<http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-141106-16&type=News>

----- “Turkey rejects proposal for ‘privileged partnership’ with the EU”, 17 February 2004, <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-114415-16&type=News>

----- EU News, Policy, Positions and EU Actors online website, “Merkel: Berlin won’t stand in way of Turkey’s EU bid”, 28 November 2005,
<http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-150009-16&type=News>

The European Commission, 9 November 2005, The enlargement package 2005, (MEMO/05/412), Brussels:
<http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/05/412&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

----- 9 November 2005, Consolidation, conditionality, communication – the strategy of the enlargement policy, (IP/05/1392), Brussels:
<http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/05/1392&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

----- “Eurobarometer 63”, Public Opinion in the European Union, July 2005

- Eurosoc web-site, “When Nicolas met Angela”, 20 July 2005,
http://eursoc.com/news/fullstory.php/aid/841/When_Nicolas_Met_Angela.html
- Evin, Ahmet Ö., (2005) “Is the EU truly in crisis”, Media Monitors Network,
<http://world.mediamonitors.net/content/view/full/17075>
- Fitzmaurice, John, “An Analysis of the European Community’s Co-operation Procedure”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 26(4), June 1988, pp.389-400
- The Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), The official web-site of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, www.fco.gov.uk
- France 2, “Nicolas Sarkozy invite du journal de France 2”, available at UMP official web-page, 18 December 2004, <http://www.u-m-p.org/site/actualite.php?IdActualite=393&ActualiteType=Interview>
- Frankfurter Rundschau, German newspaper, (23 November), “Türkiye’nin endişesi hala geçmiş değil”, 30 November 2005
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=171475>
- The official web site of the German Embassy in the UK, http://www.german-embassy.org.uk/elections_and_political_partie.html
- Gabel, Matthew and Whitten Guy D., (1997), “Economic Conditions, Economic Perceptions, and Public Support for European Integration”, *Political Behavior*, 19(1), pp.81-96
- Gabel, Matthew J., (1998) “Economic integration and mass politics: market liberalization and public attitudes in the European Union”, *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(3)
- (2003), “Public Support for the European Parliament”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41(2), pp.289-308
- Gerd Krocke in *Tages Anzeiger*, Swiss daily newspaper, “Türkiye Chirac’a kaybettirecek”, 29 September 2004, published in *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, 10 October 2004,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=130742>
- Greenwood, David, (2005), “Turkish civil-military relations and the EU: preparation for continuing convergence”, project on *Governance and the Military: Perspectives for Change in Turkey*.
- The Guardian, “EU starts talking with Turkey”, by Nicholas Watt, 7 October 2005:
http://browse.guardian.co.uk/search?search=Jack+Straw&lDim=0&No=30&Nso=1&N=0&Ns=P_PublicationDate
- Hale, William, “Human Rights, the European Union, and the Turkish Accession Process”, in Çarkoğlu, Ali and Rubin, Barry (Eds.), (2003), *Turkey and The*

European Union: Domestic Politics, Economic Integration and International Dynamics, London, Frank Cass, pp. 107-26

Honor Mahony, “German opposition leader woos Paris”, 19 July 2005 www.euobserver.com

----- “Chirac says Turkey needs major cultural revolution to join EU”, 05.10.2005, <http://euobserver.com/15/20012>

Horsley, William, “Turkey’s date with destiny”, 16 December 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4091743.stm>

----- “Analysis: German Coalition Deal”, 15 November 2005, BBC News: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4438212.stm>

----- “Merkel signals German EU rethink”, 25 November 2005, BBC News. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4468560.stm>

Hooghe, Liesbet and Marks, Gary, (2004), “Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration”, PSOnline, pp.415-20

Hürriyet, Turkish Daily Newspaper, online, English version, “PM Erdoğan and Chancellor Merkel meet up in Barcelona, Spain”. <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/english/3573408.asp>

----- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Chirac: Türkler gururlu, ‘hayır’ diyemeyiz*”, 16 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~1@tarih~2004-12-16-t@nvid~510907,00.asp>

----- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Chirac: Türkiye-AB evliliğine inanıyorum*”, 17 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~3@tarih~2004-12-17-m@nvid~511785,00.asp>

----- Turkish Daily Newspaper, “*Nein demek körlüktür*”, 17 December 2004, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~342@tarih~2005-03-07-m@nvid~511624,00.asp>

----- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Fransa: Kıbrıs’ın tanınması AB’de tartışılın*”, 4 August 2005, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/haber/0,,sid~1@w~3@nvid~613191,00.asp>

----- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Erdoğan: Chirac’ın açıklamasına üzüldüm*”, 4 August 2005

----- Turkish daily newspaper, Mehmet Ali Birand, “*Avrupa ile her toplantı krizli geçti*”, 8 October 2005, <http://www.hurriyetim.com.tr/yazarlar/yazar/0,,authorid~69@sid~9@nvid~641623,00.asp> .

- Turkish Daily Newspaper, “Merkel: Türkiye ile iyi ilişkiler kurmak istiyorum”, 18 November 2005. <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/sondakika/3538077.asp?sd=5>
- Turkish Daily Newspaper, “Merkel’den Avusturya’ya Türkiye teşekkürü”, 26 November 2005. <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/dunya/3567047.asp>
- Inglehart, Ronald, “Cognitive mobilization and European identity”, *Comparative Politics*, 3(1)
- Janssen, Joseph I. H., “Postmaterialism, Cognitive Mobilization and Public support for European integration”, *British Journal of Political Science*, 21(2)
- Jones, Eric, “The Politics of Europe 2004: Solidarity and Integration”, *Industrial relations Journal*, 36(6), pp.437-8
- La Liberation*, “Europe: la Turquie repousse les frontières des partis”, 7 October 2005, <http://www.liberation.fr/page.php?Article=244188>
- Magnette Paul and Nicolaidis, Kalypso, (2004), “The European Convention: Bargaining in the Shadow of Rhetoric”, *West European Politics*, 27(3), pp.381-404
- Marks, et. al., (1996) “European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-Level Governance”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(3), pp.341-78
- McCormick, John, (2002), Understanding the European Union, The European Union Series, Palgrave, London
- McLaren, Lauren M. and Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, (2003), “Enlargement Preferences and Policy Making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey”, *European Integration*, vol. 25
- McLaren, Lauren, “Public support for the European Union: Cost benefit analysis or perceived cultural threat?”, *The Journal of Politics*, May 2002, 64 (2)
- Moravcsik, A. (1991) ‘Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the European Community’, *International Organization*, 45(1): 19-56
- (1993) ‘Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31(4): 473-524
- “Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining”, in Evans et. al.(Eds.), International Bargaining and Domestic Politics: Double-Edged Diplomacy, (1993), University of California Press, London
- (1998) The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht, London: UCL Press

- (2003) ‘Theory Synthesis in International Relations: Real Not Metaphysical’, *International Studies Review*, Part of a forum entitled Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?
- (2005) ‘The European Constitutional Compromise and the Neofunctionalist Legacy’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(2): 349-86
- Müftüleri-Baç, Meltem, (1997), Turkey’s Relations with a Changing Europe, Manchester, United Kingdom, Manchester University Press
- (2000), “Through the Looking Glass: Turkey in Europe”, *Turkish Studies*, 1(1)
- (2002), “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, 7(2)
- Müftüleri-Baç, M. and Güney, A., (2005), “The European Union and the Cyprus Problem 1961-2003”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 41(2), pp.281-93
- Neumann, I. and Welsh J., (1991), “The Other in European self-definition: an addendum to the literature on international society”, *Review of International Studies*, V.17
- Official Journal of the European Communities, V.16, No.C113, 24 December 1973, *Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey* (signed in 12 September 1963), Ankara. Available at http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/turkey/pdf/association_agreement_1964_en.pdf
- Olli Rehn, Speech at the Plenary Session of the European Parliament, 15 November 2005, The 2005 Enlargement Package, (SPEECH/05/693), Strasbourg: <http://europa.eu.int/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/693&format=PDF&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>
- Öniş, Ziya, “Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards an Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations”, paper presented at the annual Conference of the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies (BRISMES) held at the University of Cambridge, England, July 2000
- Öniş, Ziya, “The Role of the European Union in Greek-Turkish Relations: Greek-Turkish Relations and the Role of the European Union: Perpetuator of Conflict or Contributor to Peace?” in Kollias, Christos and Günlük-Şenesen, Gülay, (Eds.), (2003), Greece and Turkey in the 21st Century: Conflict or Cooperation?, New York: Nova Publishers
- Özbudun, Ergun and Tachau Frank, “Social Change and Electoral Behaviour in Turkey: Toward a Critical Realignment”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 6(4), October 1975, pp.460-80

- Özbudun, Ergun and Yazıcı, Serap, (2004) Democratization Reforms in Turkey (1993-2004), Tesev Publications, Istanbul
- “Policy statement by Federal Chancellor Dr. Angela Merkel in the German Bundestag”, 30 November 2005, available at German Government’s official website:
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/en/-,10001.929347/regierungserklaerung/Policy-Statement-by-Federal-Ch.htm>
- “Principles and Programme of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany”, 5th Party Conference, Hamburg, 21-23 February 1994
- Puchala, Donald J., (1999), “Institutionalism, Intergovernmentalism, and European Integration: A Review Article”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37(2), pp.317-31
- Putnam, Robert, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games”, in Evans et. al. (Eds.), International Bargaining and Domestic Politics: Double-Edged Diplomacy, (1993), University of California Press, London
- Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “Fransa’dan çatlak sesler”, 9 April 2004,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=112700>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Türkiye’nin ayak sesleri”, 2 October 2004,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=129911>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Raffarin ter döktü”, 15 October 2004,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=131235>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Chirac çok net konuştu”, 16 December 2004,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=137530>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Merkel’in akli Hıristiyanlıkta”, 12 June 2005,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=155601>
- Turkish daily newspaper interview with Director of Candidate Countries, Enlargement Directorate General: Pierre Mirel by Mehmet Ali Birand on 8 July 2005
- “Merkel de atakta”, 27 August 2005,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=162543>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Avusturya’lı Başkan sinirlendi”, 5 October 2005
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Teşekkür iftarı”, 13 October 2005,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=166829>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “Merkel: Yakın ilişki istiyoruz”, 13 November 2005,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=169825>

- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Merkel: Türkiye Önemli*”, 19 November 2005,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=170439>
- Turkish daily newspaper, “*Merkel: Üyelik garantisi yok*”, 1 December 2005
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=171608>
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs website; “Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy”, available at www.mfa.gov.tr
- Schimmelfennig, F., Engert, S. and Knobel H., (2003), “Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 41(3), pp.495-518
- Smith, Julie, (2005), “Enlarging the European Union”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, V.43 (Annual Review), pp.127-30
- Straw, J., Bridging the Bosphorus – Turkey’s European future”, available at the website of the UK Presidency of the EU 2005, 8 October 2005,
<http://www.eu2005.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1107293561746&a=KArticle&aid=1125560522451>
- Sjursen, Helen, (2002), “Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU’s Enlargement Policy”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(3)
- Süddeutsche Zeitung*, German daily newspaper translated in, *Radikal*, Turkish daily newspaper, “*Türkiye’nin yeri ayrı*”, 4 January 2006,
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=174804>
- “1999 Regular Report from The Commission on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”, 13.10.1999 Available at the EU portal:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_10_99/pdf/en/turkey_en.pdf
- “2000 Regular Report from The Commission on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession”, 8.11.2000, p.7, Available at the EU portal:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_11_00/pdf/en/tu_en.pdf