

Turkey's Accession to the European Union: Debating the Most Difficult Enlargement Ever

Ioannis N. Grigoriadis

This study focuses on the intricacies of Turkey's prospective membership in the European Union. It begins with a chronology of EU-Turkey relations and an account of the debate on the future of the European Union, which relates to Turkey's prospective E.U. membership. It then explores the strategic implications of Turkey's accession to the European Union and addresses recent developments on the issue, with an emphasis on the start of accession negotiations on Oct. 3, 2005. In conclusion, this study highlights the factors that may have an impact on the outcome of EU-Turkey accession negotiations in the coming years.

Turkey's prospective membership in the European Union has captured significant attention in Europe for several years. Turkey's geographic size, large population, low per-capita income and level of economic development, as well as its location at the crossroads of Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia, have made it a candidate state different from all the others. The prospect of Turkey's EU membership already has been a catalyst toward the realization of an ambitious—albeit incomplete—domestic reform program, which brought Turkey much closer to the model of consolidated liberal democracy. On the EU side, the debate on Turkey's membership has acted as a proxy for a larger and overdue debate on the future shape of the European Union. Hidden European fears and prejudices often come to surface when the discussion touches upon Turkey, which has very aptly been described as “Europe's tainted mirror.”¹ The start of accession negotiations on Oct. 3, 2005 was a major step toward Turkey's EU membership, yet this result is by no means guaranteed.

Completion of the Turkish process of democratic consolidation, resolution of the EU institutional crisis and, last but not least, winning over an unfriendly European public opinion will be key issues for the success of the

The obstacles to Turkey's membership can be overcome in a spirit of compromise.

Ioannis N. Grigoriadis has recently defended his Ph.D. thesis in Turkish politics at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. He is currently teaching at Sabancı University, Istanbul. He holds a Master of International Affairs (MIA) and a Certificate of Middle Eastern Studies from the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University.

accession negotiations. Turkey's EU membership is a technically difficult but not impossible task. The existing obstacles arising from Turkey's demography and economy can be surmounted within a spirit of compromise for the mutual benefit of the European Union and Turkey.

Turkey and European Integration: The History²

Turkey's bid for membership in the European Union represents the latest and probably the most critical challenge in the 200-year history of Ottoman and Turkish efforts to adopt the European political, economic and cultural paradigm. Westernization of the Ottoman state, society and culture was the primary goal of the Tanzimat reforms in the mid-19th century, while the same goal was later adopted by Young Turks and implemented by Kemal Atatürk, who believed that the formation of a solid Turkish nation and state were prerequisites of Westernization.³

Turkey has pursued close relations with what started as the European Economic Community (EEC)⁴ since the late 1950s.⁵ Turkey and the Community signed an Association Agreement in 1963. An Additional Protocol signed in November 1970 outlined the rules for a customs union between the European Economic Community and Turkey.⁶ Nonetheless, political developments in the 1970s and early 1980s hampered relations between Turkey and the Community.

Turkey again became interested in EC membership during the Özal administration in the mid-1980s and filed a formal application in 1987. Yet crucial time had been wasted, making the situation much less favorable for Turkey's bid.⁷ Despite the rejection of Turkey's application in 1989, the improvement of EC-Turkey relations continued. A customs union agreement between Turkey and the European Union was signed in 1995 and became effective in 1996. Nonetheless, Turkey again became disillusioned when the EU Luxembourg Summit in 1997 refused to award it the status of a candidate state, although numerous other states in East Central Europe and the Mediterranean earned this status. This brought EU-Turkey relations to their lowest point.⁸

Relations improved during the Helsinki EU Summit in December 1999, when Turkey finally became a candidate state. The Helsinki Summit also marked the shift of Greece's position from opposition to support for Turkey's membership. Greece's obstructive stance had hampered EU-Turkey relations ever since Greece joined the European Community in 1981.⁹ The start of EU-Turkey accession negotiations would depend on Turkey's compliance with the Copenhagen Criteria. Several political reform packages attempted to achieve Turkey's convergence with the Criteria. Constitutional amendments aimed to alter the illiberal character of the 1982 Constitution. The Constitution was amended eight times between 1995 and 2004, with the most far-reaching amendment coming in October 2001.¹⁰

As the critical EU-Copenhagen Summit of December 2002 approached, Turkey's political liberalization seemed to proceed at a surprising pace. In the course of 10 years, the prospect of Turkey's accession to the European

Union caused the most significant political transformation the Republic of Turkey had experienced since the introduction of multiparty politics in 1945. The Copenhagen Summit decided, however, to defer the decision on the commencement of EU-Turkey accession negotiations until the next EU Summit in December 2004. Despite Turkey's disillusionment, reforms aiming at Turkey's full political liberalization continued. The reward came on Dec. 17, 2004, when the starting date of EU-Turkey accession negotiations was set for Oct. 3, 2005.

The Emergence of an "Ever Closer Union" and Turkey¹¹

During the 1990s, the European Union underwent a radical transformation. It ceased to be a predominantly economic organization regulating a free-trade zone with minimal political ambitions. Instead, EU leaders sought to supplement the organization's economic character by gradually establishing common foreign and security policies. This pivotal switch in the character of the Union led to the articulation of the Copenhagen Criteria for prospective member states and the rise of the European federal debate. The Copenhagen Criteria, adopted at the June 1993 EU Council Summit, required the following conditions from prospective member states:

- the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and respect for and protection of minorities,
- the existence of a functioning market economy, as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the European Union, and
- the ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union.¹²

Within the European federal debate, two opinion groups soon formed. On one side, the Euro-federalists maintained that the European Union should be only an intermediate stage toward the development of a supranational European federal state.¹³ To facilitate this process, political and cultural elements, which constituted the common European heritage, should form the basis of a new, overarching common European identity. Political liberalism would be unequivocally among the basic components of that identity, while the inclusion of religious elements was heavily contested.

On the other hand, opponents of Euro-federalism contended that the European Economic Community's transformation into the European Union should be the final stage of convergence among member states. This side believed the European Union should retain a heavily economic character and considered the debate on a common European identity to be both chimerical and redundant. The influence of Euro-federalist views within the European Union, however, meant that Turkey's membership application would be judged not only on its observance of the Copenhagen Criteria, but on the country's compatibility with the common European identity project. Some Euro-federalists, who considered Europe's Greco-Roman and Judeo-

Christian heritage to be the foundations of European identity, vehemently opposed the prospect of Turkey's membership. Others, who believed that Europe's identity should be based not on religion but on liberal political values, strongly supported the accession of a liberal democratic Turkey. They argued this would signal the Union's inclusive, tolerant character.

This debate had a constant bearing on EU-Turkey relations and Turkey's concomitant political liberalization process. The Helsinki EU Council Summit's decision in 1999 to grant Turkey the status of a candidate member state implied a positive answer to the question of Turkey's European identity. However, the question of whether Turkey could be considered European continued to be debated, affecting European views of Turkey and of itself.¹⁴ But these debates were not unique to member states. In fact, Turkish proponents of Turkey's membership in the Union had to contend with other sources of opposition, not least of which came from the domestic political arena.

Strategic Implications of Turkey's EU Membership¹⁵

The Domestic Field

The possibility of Turkey's accession to the European Union met with the suspicion and opposition of a substantial part of the Kemalist military and bureaucratic elite.¹⁶ In this group's view, the price of liberal reform and restriction of national sovereignty would be the disintegration of the Turkish national ideology and, possibly, Turkey itself. The whole nation-building project, as conceived by Turkish nationalist leaders in the last years of the Ottoman Empire and implemented by Atatürk in the early republican years, would be endangered. Existing national minorities might then claim self-determination and independence, while latent ethnic divisions within the Turkish people could re-emerge and threaten Turkish national unity. The resuscitation of the "Eastern Question," concerning the partition of the Ottoman Empire, which dominated European politics in the 19th century and briefly materialized in 1920 with the Treaty of Sèvres, has haunted the political thought of Turkish Euro-skeptics, who also doubt Turkey's European identity.¹⁷

On the other hand, there is no other visible political orientation as favorable for Turkey as its full participation in the European Union. Membership in the Union is also still seen as part of the "Kemalist imperative" of identification with (implicitly Western) modernity. The European Union is viewed as an international organization that can guarantee Turkey's economic development and political stability. Meanwhile, current political and economic conditions in the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia offer no serious strategic alternatives to Turkey's option to pursue membership in the Union.¹⁸ A further deepening of Turkey's strategic relationship with the United States and its primary regional ally, Israel, could not substitute for Turkey's EU aspirations. The EU member states are by far Turkey's largest trading partner, while Turkey's willingness to blindly serve U.S. foreign policy objectives is far from given.

The U.S. Factor

While an increasing strategic rift is thought to threaten long-term relations between the United States and the European Union, the United States has been one of the most assertive proponents of Turkey's EU accession.¹⁹ The improvement of EU-Turkey relations and Turkey's eventual incorporation into the Union are viewed as extremely favorable for U.S. strategic interests in Europe and the Middle East. Turkey's membership in the European Union is seen as the best guarantee for the consolidation of Turkey's secular, pro-Western political system and globalized economy. Turkey thus could serve U.S. regional strategic interests in the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia by providing the paradigm of a Muslim democratic state, fully integrated in Western political and economic institutions.

Open U.S. support for Turkey's EU membership²⁰ has led to widespread suspicion within some EU circles that this is part of U.S. efforts to subvert the European Union's transformation into a federal state that might be capable of challenging U.S. global hegemony. EU suspicion of the U.S. role peaked in December 2002, when U.S. President George W. Bush's open intervention in support of Turkey during the Copenhagen European Council backfired.²¹ This effect became more pronounced as a result of European—mainly French and German—opposition during 2002 and 2003 to the impending U.S. campaign in Iraq.

Still, the technical difficulties posed by Turkey's possible EU membership were not fictitious. Its large population and weak economy would disturb sensitive balances of political power inside EU institutions and strain the organization's economic and financial capacity. At the political level, Turkey's accession was seen as strengthening the anti-federalist and Atlanticist blocs inside the Union. Steps toward the empowerment of European political institutions would become even more difficult, critics noted, while the deployment of a European security structure independent of NATO and U.S. influence would be shelved, and a common foreign policy would be harder to achieve. Turkey thus would undertake the role of a U.S.-sponsored "Trojan horse" inside the European Union.²²

The weakness of this argument was its assumption that the strategic interests of the United States and Turkey were identical. In the aftermath of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, Turkey is no longer in complete agreement with U.S. regional strategic interests and policies. Efforts to create a U.S.-Turkey-Israel strategic partnership have had only partial success, while the rise to power of Islamic-oriented parties, which were more sensitive to the plight of the Palestinian people, made the alliance even more precarious. The new U.S. strategic doctrine promulgated after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, also alienated Turkey. The gap grew even wider in view of the 2003 U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq. This marked a watershed in U.S.-Turkey relations, making clear that U.S. and Turkish regional strategic interests might even come into conflict.²³ Anti-Americanism rose to unforeseen levels and became a strong feature of Turkish public opinion.²⁴ Even the traditionally pro-U.S. and initially circumspect Turkish military eventually moved toward this position. U.S. policies in Iraq came

under criticism both from proponents of Turkey's strategic cooperation with the European Union and from staunchly nationalist officers.²⁵ The U.S. unwillingness to address Turkey's security concerns by eliminating the remaining PKK forces in Northern Iraq, its ambivalent position regarding the future of Northern Iraq and the role of the Iraqi Kurds, and its support for Israeli policies in the Middle East served as reasons for different parts of Turkish society to support this negative shift in attitudes toward the United States. The strategic partnership between the United States and Turkey no longer could be considered as a given. Now a credible alternative—an E.U. strategic vision—could appeal to Turkish strategic and security concerns more effectively.

The European Vision

Turkey's potential EU accession sparked a serious debate inside the European Union. Although the strategic, political and economic dimensions of Turkey's EU membership have been anything but insignificant, Turkey's EU membership debate also has been a proxy for debates on what the European Union is or should become. Differing approaches to prospective Turkish membership highlight divergent visions of the present and future of the European Union project. Supporters and opponents of Turkey's EU membership also have been internally divided, basing their position on different grounds. As different definitions of European identity and visions of Europe coexist, the same arguments may be used for and against Turkey's EU membership, thus making the picture even more complex.

Turkey's Islamic religious and cultural identity can, for example, be viewed as a reason either to accept or reject Turkey's EU membership application. This mirrors the lack of consensus on how to deal with religion in the debate over a common European identity.²⁶ Advocates of multiculturalism and supranationalism, who argue that the EU identity should be based on liberal democratic values and cultural diversity, firmly support Turkey's membership. In their view, Europe's diversity is its strength rather than a weakness. Such diversity should be celebrated, as the European Union strives to provide an alternative way "not to reproduce a national model at the level of the continent but to shape another way for people to live together and share a common project," as Kalypso Nicolaidis puts it.²⁷ The admission of a Muslim country into the European Union would constitute the most effective guarantee of its secular, inclusive, and multicultural character and provide a powerful example to the rest of the world.

On the other hand, Turkey's Islamic character becomes the most powerful argument against the country's membership, especially for many European conservatives who focus on the religious and cultural aspects of European identity. In their view, further European integration is possible only if the European Union forges an identity based on its Judeo-Christian religious and Greco-Roman political heritage. As Turkey lacks this heritage, it is unsuitable for EU membership, these critics argue, though some agree that a "special relationship" between the European Union and Turkey would be desirable for strategic and economic reasons.²⁸

Turkey's geographical position, demographic size and level of economic development also are used as arguments for and against Turkey's EU membership. This echoes persisting divisions within the European Union between those who favor widening over deepening and prefer to view Europe as a huge integrated market, on the one hand, and those who favor Europe's deepening and have a clear federal vision for Europe, on the other. Supporters of Turkey's candidacy point to the potential growth of the European Union's strategic role in the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia as a result of Turkey's proximity to these volatile and strategically crucial regions. Turkey's demographics also could be seen as an advantage, as the country could help alleviate serious labor shortages in Western Europe and the prospective shortfall of contributions to social security systems. Turkey's relatively low level of economic development, combined with its large, young population, also makes Turkey a large and tempting market that is far from reaching the saturation point.

On the other hand, opponents of Turkey's membership argue that Turkey's geostrategic position could drag the European Union into unnecessary adventures. Instead, these critics say, the European Union should focus on establishing a deeper political union among existing member states. Without this, any efforts to claim a major European regional role would be futile. This political union would be seriously complicated and eventually compromised in favor of a wider and more lax economic union if Turkey joined the Union. Moreover, the discrepancy between Turkey's population size and economic capacity²⁹ would upset the balance of European policy-making, seriously strain the EU economy, and result in massive migration of Turkish workers³⁰ to the prosperous EU member states, with unpredictable socioeconomic consequences. In this view, at a time when the proclamation of a European Constitution already has met serious objections, undertaking the burden of Turkey's EU membership would be suicidal for the European federal project.³¹

“Privileged Partnership”

More recently, opposition to the prospect of Turkey's full EU membership has been translated into support for an alternative mode of advanced EU-Turkey relations called “privileged partnership.” What this means remains unclear, as none of its proponents have described it in detail. Instead, the implication is that it would entail a closer strategic, political and economic relationship between the European Union and Turkey,³² which would, however, run short of full membership in such fields as freedom of movement for Turkish citizens and Turkey's access to EU structural funds and subsidies from the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). Implicitly it also means that Turkey no longer would be pressured to continue its economic and political reform program or contribute to the resolution of the Cyprus issue and its disputes with Greece.³³ This idea became popular among the leaders of the German Christian Democratic parties. Both Angela Merkel, the leader of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and new German

Chancellor, and Edmund Stoiber, the leader of the Bavarian Christian Socialist Union (CSU), became active proponents of this “privileged partnership” option,³⁴ lobbying their colleagues in the European Popular Party in an effort to win their support for this policy.³⁵

In France, opposition to Turkey’s full EU membership and support for a privileged partnership first received expression by Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, former French President and President of the European Convention, which prepared the EU Constitutional Treaty.³⁶ Nicholas Sarkozy, the popular leader of President Chirac’s neo-Gaullist party UMP and possible presidential candidate in the 2007 elections, became the staunchest opponent of Turkey’s full EU membership.³⁷ France’s position also was affected by the rejection of the EU Constitutional Treaty in the referendum of May 29, 2005. The rejection of the treaty, which aimed to reform EU institutions in view of recent enlargement and to shape a path for further European integration, was a heavy blow for President Chirac, resulting in the resignation of the French government under Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin. Opponents used Turkey as one of their campaign issues, identifying that country’s possible accession as one example of the false path that European enlargement had taken. Hence, President Chirac and the new French government under Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin attempted to appease French public opinion by diluting French support for Turkey’s full membership. Interestingly, France developed an unforeseen interest in the Cyprus question, objecting to the unilateral Turkish statement of July 29, 2005, which stated, “the signature of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement neither amounted to the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, nor prejudiced any of its rights and obligations.”³⁸

The next country to object to Turkey’s membership was Austria, which became the staunchest advocate of privileged partnership. Support for Turkey’s accession in Austrian public opinion is the lowest among EU member states.³⁹ Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel repeatedly expressed his opposition to Turkey’s full membership, suggesting an alternative model of EU-Turkey relations. An additional reason for Austria’s opposition to Turkey’s full membership may have been its special interest in achieving membership for Croatia. The start of Croatia’s EU accession negotiations was postponed due to that country’s lack of cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Perhaps the Austrian government thought that stiffening its position on Turkey would allow a subsequent compromise to unblock accession negotiations for both states.

The Oct. 3 Crisis

On Dec. 17, 2004, the European Council decided that EU-Turkey accession negotiations would start on Oct. 3, 2005, provided Turkey achieved some further human rights reforms. Because the EU Commission later reported such progress, many thought that drafting the Negotiating Framework Protocol would be no more than a technical issue. However, reaching consensus on the protocol turned out to be an extremely difficult task. Austria

insisted on including the option of privileged partnership in the document and removing a phrase stating that “the shared objective of the negotiations is accession.” It also insisted that Turkey should meet the Republic of Cyprus’ demand to lift its trade embargo. Further, the Austrian government argued that Turkey should withdraw its unilateral statement, made during the signing of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement, that “this signature did not mean recognition of the Greek Cypriot government.” Cypriot objections to the protocol were lifted when the European Union issued a statement on Sept. 20, 2005 to counter Turkey’s unilateral declaration.⁴⁰ Yet Austrian objections to the text of the Negotiating Framework Protocol persisted until the very day the accession negotiations were scheduled to commence. The crisis was finally resolved on Oct. 3, 2005, with the withdrawal of Austria’s demands for inclusion of the privileged partnership clause in return for the start of Croatia’s EU accession negotiations.⁴¹ The text of the Negotiating Framework agreement included the following conditions in addition to the Copenhagen Criteria:

- Turkey’s unequivocal commitment to good neighborly relations and its undertaking to resolve any outstanding border disputes in conformity with the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the United Nations Charter, including if necessary jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice⁴²;
- 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 favorable climate for a comprehensive settlement, and progress in the normalization of bilateral relations between Turkey and all EU Member States, including the Republic of Cyprus; and
- the fulfillment 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.⁴³

The Negotiating Framework Protocol was finally signed in the late hours of Oct. 3, 2005, and a ceremony for the start of EU-Turkey accession negotiations was held thereafter. Nevertheless, despite the ensuing celebrations and optimism, it became evident early on that this was the beginning of a very long and cumbersome negotiation process.⁴⁴

The Road Ahead

What does the future hold for EU-Turkey accession negotiations? To begin, the accession negotiations will be largely technical. They will refer to 35 separate chapters and focus on how and when Turkey will adapt to the European *acquis communautaire*, the 100,000-page body of European legislation accumulated since the foundation of the European Economic Community in 1957.⁴⁵ The costs of convergence will be high for both sides, and

political factors will affect whether the parties will be willing to undertake them. The course of political developments within the European Union and Turkey over the following decade will have a crucial impact on whether the European Union—or Turkey itself—maintains its interest in Turkey's EU membership. If the European Union succeeds in overcoming its current constitutional crisis and finding answers to the questions posed by consecutive waves of enlargement and globalization, then it will be more able to deal with the additional structural problems Turkey's potential membership would pose. While there has been a positive correlation between voting power and contribution to the EU budget among existing EU member states, Turkey's entry will disturb this balance drastically. By the time of its potential accession, Turkey is expected to be the most populous country of the Union, which will be translated into the strongest representation in the European Parliament and a sizeable voting allocation. The EU Constitutional Treaty took into account past and future enlargement steps of the Union and attempted to address, among other issues, power allocation, decision-making and vote weighting among member states.

The failure of the Constitutional Treaty will greatly hamper the Union's smooth operation, with or without Turkey's membership.⁴⁶ The European Union's success in claiming a global geopolitical role also will be of major importance.⁴⁷ If the Union manages to develop a strong common foreign and security policy, then Turkey's EU membership will become more attractive, due to the important geostrategic benefits it will entail for the Union.

Turkey will improve its chances for accession greatly if it continues to carry out its political and economic reform program.⁴⁸ In both fields, significant progress already has been made, but much more is necessary. In the field of political reform, Turkey clearly lags behind European standards in many respects. Minority rights and freedom of expression are only two of the fields in which substantial progress is necessary.⁴⁹ Two cases that demonstrate the shortcomings of Turkish democracy are the famous Turkish writer Orhan Pamuk's indictment for statements he made during an interview with a Swiss newspaper on the Armenian and Kurdish issues and the controversy over a conference to discuss the Armenian issue.⁵⁰

Turkey's success in dealing with its chronic economic problems also will be of major importance, because successful policies could narrow the gap between Turkey's per-capita income and the European average. Hence, at the time of Turkey's EU membership, the much-feared wave of Turkish immigrants to EU member states would be smaller, and Turkey would not be the enormous burden for the EU agricultural and structural funds budgets that many Europeans fear. Finally, yet importantly, there is the Cyprus issue. Turkey's international position on the Cyprus question has improved because the Turkish Cypriots approved UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's proposed solution, while the Greek Cypriots rejected it, with both referenda held simultaneously in April 2004. Yet the Republic of Cyprus is an EU member state with full veto rights, meaning that an unresolved Cyprus issue will continue to be a frequent source of friction on Turkey's way

toward membership. Turkey's EU membership certainly has the potential to cause serious problems for both sides. Nonetheless, none of these problems are insurmountable. Compromises can be made. Transition periods can be discussed and agreed upon. The European Union needs to show its good faith in Turkey's accession negotiations to protect its diplomatic credibility, while Turkey has to prove its continued strong commitment to economic and political reform.

What might prove difficult to overcome, though, is a mutual temptation to use the issue of Turkey's EU membership for domestic political purposes. Turkey's past human rights and democratic record, the presence of large numbers of Turkish immigrants in Western Europe, and the persistence of religious and cultural prejudices have contributed to the formation of a Turco-phobic European public opinion in many countries. This makes opposition to Turkey's EU membership an easy way to rally domestic political support. Turning Turkey's EU membership into a scapegoat for all European ills can distract from the discussion of crucial issues like Common Agricultural Policy reform and the uncertain future of the European socioeconomic model. Similarly, capitalizing on the nationalist feelings of Turkish public opinion can be a swift way to stall the process of political and economic reform. Turkish opponents of membership can increase public concerns by pointing to the impossibility of membership, the alleged duplicity of the European Union, the inevitable sovereignty concessions that membership would require, and the inability of membership to serve as a panacea for all Turkish economic and social ills.⁵¹ It now seems improbable that the government of the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*-AKP) will consider such a policy shift, as it has anchored its own political future on the successful course of Turkey's accession negotiations. However, the situation may

change if difficulties in the course of negotiations further alienate Turkish public opinion. The European Commission and the Turkish government have to confront European prejudices and lack of information about Turkey, as well as unrealistic Turkish expectations, nationalist fears, and lack of infor-

mation about the meaning of EU membership. Only by bridging this gap between public opinion and reality regarding Turkey's membership can the interested parties hope to protect the already difficult accession negotiations from serious destabilization.

Advocates of Turkey's membership must overcome the gap between public opinion and reality.

Notes

¹ See Kalypso Nicolaidis, "Europe's Tainted Mirror: Reflections on Turkey's Candidacy Status after Helsinki," in Dimitris Keridis and Dimitrios Triantaphyllou, eds., *Greek-Turkish Relations in the Era of Globalization* (Dulles VA: Brassey's, 2001), 245-77.

² Ioannis N. Grigoriadis, “Turkish Political Culture and the European Union,” unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of London, 2005), 82–84

³ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford, London & New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 106–28.

⁴ The European Economic Community (EEC) later referred to as European Community (EC) during the 1980s and as European Union (EU) after the 1991 Treaty on the European Union.

⁵ For more information about the early phase of EEC-Turkey relations, see Şaban H. Çalış, “Formative Years: A Key for Understanding Turkey’s Membership Policy Towards the EU,” *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. IX, no. 3 (2004).

⁶ Meltem Müftüler-Bac, “The Impact of the European Union on Turkish Politics,” *East European Quarterly*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (2000), pp. 160–64.

⁷ Greece’s EEC membership in 1981 further complicated EEC-Turkey relations, as Greece refused to consent to the improvement of EEC-Turkey relations, unless Turkey made “positive” steps toward the resolution of the Cyprus and bilateral Greek-Turkish disputes.

⁸ Atilla Eralp, “Turkey and the European Union,” in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis, eds., *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy* (Cambridge MA & London: MIT Press, 2002), 71–75.

⁹ For more details on Greece’s position change, see Kalypso Nicolaidis, “Europe’s Tainted Mirror: Reflections on Turkey’s Candidacy Status after Helsinki,” in Dimitris Keridis and Dimitrios Triantaphyllou, eds., *Greek-Turkish Relations in the Era of Globalization* (Dulles VA: Brassey’s, 2001), 251–53.

¹⁰ The 2001 constitutional amendment included 34 articles and had the most far-reaching effects on the fundamental rights and liberties. This amendment changed not only the overall approach to the restriction of fundamental rights and liberties, but also brought about improvements with respect to a great number of individual rights. For more information, see .

¹¹ Grigoriadis, “Turkish Political Culture and the European Union,” 70–72

¹² Desmond Dinan, *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration* (Boulder CO & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999), 191.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 138–39.

¹⁴ See Paul Kubicek, “Turkey’s Place in the ‘New Europe’,” *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. IX, no. 3 (2004), 55–58.

¹⁵ Grigoriadis, “Turkish Political Culture and the European Union,” 75–82

¹⁶ İhsan D. Dağı, *Batılılaşma Korkusu* (Ankara: Liberte Yayınları, 2003), 3.

¹⁷ Sina Akşin, “Avrupalı Mıyız?” *Radikal Cumhuriyet*, Oct. 29, 2004.

¹⁸ Several nationalist authors have opted for the development of special relations with Russia, India or China. See Erol Manisalı, “Rusya ile İlişkiler Alternatif mi, Yoksa Bir Denge Arayışı mı?” *Cumhuriyet*, 10/12/2004 and Ahmet Erdoğan, “Tek Alternatif Avrupa Değil,” *Radikal*, Nov. 1, 2004. A similar view was expressed by Samuel Huntington, who argued that Turkey should seek a leading position in the Islamic world. See Samuel P. Huntington, “Culture, Power, and War: What Roles for Turkey in the New Global Politics,” *Zaman* (English edition), May 26, 2005.

¹⁹ For a succinct account of the impact of Turkey’s prospective EU accession on US-Turkey relations, see Morton I. Abramowitz et al., *Turkey on the Threshold: Europe’s Decision and U.S. Interests* (Washington DC: Atlantic Council of the United States, 2004), 22–25.

²⁰ US support reached its highest point in December 2002 when the US President George W. Bush personally telephoned EU leaders during the EU Copenhagen Summit to convince them to adopt a decision favorable for Turkey’s EU membership prospects.

²¹ Ziya Öniş and Şuhnaz Yılmaz, “The Turkey-EU-US Triangle in Perspective: Transformation or Continuity?” *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 59, no. 2 (2005), 273.

²² Graham E. Fuller, “Turkey’s Strategic Model: Myths and Realities,” *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 27, no. 3 (2004), 57–59.

²³ Sedat Ergin, “Türk-ABD İlişkileri Yokuş Aşağı,” *Hürriyet*, Dec. 12, 2004.

²⁴ Soner Çağaptay, “Where Goes the U.S.-Turkish Relationship,” *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol. XI, no. 4 (2004), 44–46.

²⁵ David L. Phillips, "Turkey's Dreams of Accession," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 83, no. 5 (2004), 92-93.

²⁶ The heated debate and final compromise on the inclusion of religion in the European Constitution is characteristic.

²⁷ Kalypto Nicolaidis, "Turkey Is European for Europe's Sake," in The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ed., *Turkey and the European Union: From Association to Accession?* (The Hague, 2004).

²⁸ See Wolfgang Schäuble, "Talking Turkey," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 83, no. 6 (2004).

²⁹ Michael S. Teitelbaum and Philip L. Martin, "Is Turkey Ready for Europe?" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, no. 3 (2003), 106-07.

³⁰ Wolfgang Quaisser, "Vier Millionen Zuwanderer," *Interview with Martin Halusa, Die Welt*, Dec. 15, 2004.

³¹ Former European Commissioner Frits Bolkestein has been one of the fiercest opponents of Turkey's EU membership. See Frits Bolkestein, *The Limits of Europe* (Tiel, Netherlands: Lannoo, 2004).

³² This would differentiate the "privileged partnership" model from the European Neighborhood Policy, which the European Union has developed to improve relations with the states in its East European and Mediterranean periphery.

³³ Fadi Hakura, *Partnership Is No Privilege: The Alternative to EU Membership Is No Turkish Delight [Chatham House Briefing Paper EP BP 05/02]* (London: Chatham House, 2005), 4-5.

³⁴ See Angela Merkel and Edmund Stoiber, "Kanzler Muß Türkei-Beitritt Stoppen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Dec. 5, 2004 and Angela Merkel, "Türkei: Partnerschaft statt EU-Mitgliedschaft," *Die Welt*, Oct. 16, 2004.

³⁵ See Frankfurt Büro, "EU-Beitritt der Türkei: Merkel und Stoiber Bestärken in der EU Ihren Widerstand," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, August 26, 2005.

³⁶ See Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, "Pour Ou Contre L' Adhésion de la Turquie À L' Union Européenne," *Interview to Le Monde*, Nov. 8, 2002 and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, "A Better European Bridge to Turkey," *Financial Times*, Nov. 25, 2004.

³⁷ Sarkozy suggested a moratorium on further EU enlargement after the accession of Bulgaria and Romania. See Edwy Plenel, "Au Vif": Le Cas Sarkozy," *Le Monde*, July 1, 2005.

³⁸ The Additional Protocol meant to extend the Association Agreement between the European Union and Turkey to the ten new member states, which had joined the Union in 2004. See Heinz Kramer, *Turkey's EU Accession Negotiations at the Mercy of Conflicting Interests [SWP Comments 43]* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2005), 4-5.

³⁹ When it comes to Turkey, Austrian public opinion is in the exceptional situation of combining bitter historical memories of Ottoman expansionism, common in Southeastern Europe and xenophobic reactions against the Turkish immigrant communities, common in Western Europe.

⁴⁰ In this statement, the European Community and its member states declared that Turkey's declaration was unilateral and had no legal effect. The statement added that the Republic of Cyprus became an EU member state on May 1, 2004, and that its recognition by Turkey was a necessary component of Turkey's EU accession process. Finally, the Union stated Turkey had to apply the Protocol fully to all EU Member States - i.e. lift the trade embargo against the Republic of Cyprus - and that it would monitor this issue closely and evaluate full implementation in 2006.

⁴¹ This became possible after a timely report by the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia Carla del Ponte that Croatia "was fully cooperating" with the International Criminal Court authorities for the arrest of the Croatian war criminal suspect Ante Gotovina. Del Ponte later refused that she had made this statement under EU pressure.

⁴² This point primarily referred to Greek-Turkish territorial disputes in the Aegean Sea.

⁴³ European Union, *Negotiating Framework for Turkey: Principles Governing the Negotiations* (European Union: Brussels, 2005), available from http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/docs/pdf/st20002_en05_TR_framedoc.pdf

⁴⁴ This was made clear by many-otherwise jubilant-columnists of the Turkish press. See Hasan Cemal, "Tarihi Yürüyüşe Devam!" *Milliyet*, Oct. 4, 2005, Murat Yetkin, "Önümüzde

Zor Günler Var,” *Radikal*, Oct. 4, 2005, Zülfü Livaneli, “Derin ve Tarihsel Bir Dönüşüm Geçireceğiz,” *Vatan*, Oct. 5, 2005 and Erdal Güven, “Hedefe Gitmenin Yolu,” *Radikal*, Oct. 7, 2005.

⁴⁵ See the relevant statement of the EU Commissioner for Enlargement Policy Olli Rehn: Olli Rehn, “The European Union and Turkey: Beginning the Common Journey,” *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 4, no. 3 (2005), 5.

⁴⁶ Richard Baldwin and Mika Widgrén, *The Impact of Turkey’s Membership on EU Voting [Working Document No. 62]* (Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 2005), 8.

⁴⁷ Rehn, “The European Union and Turkey: Beginning the Common Journey,” 7.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ See Vincent Boland, “Faith, Hope and Parity,” *Financial Times*, August 26, 2005.

⁵⁰ See Vincent Boland, “Doubts over Turkish Justice Cast Shadow on EU Accession Talks,” *Financial Times*, Sept. 26, 2005. The case against Orhan Pamuk was finally dropped on January 22, 2006.

⁵¹ Such opinions have already been expressed by columnists and Deniz Baykal, leader of the Republican People’s Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*-CHP), Turkey’s biggest opposition party. See Hasan Ünal, “Teslimiyet Bayramına Devam,” *Milli Gazete*, Oct. 6, 2005 and İstanbul Bürosu, “Deniz Baykal: Kral Çıplak . . .” *Hürriyet*, Oct. 5, 2005.