

Introduction

The European Union is engaged in an extensive process of enlargement. The European Council decided in its Luxembourg summit of December 1997 to open the path for the Union's enlargement towards the Central and Eastern European countries and Cyprus, upon the European Commission's proposal in its Agenda 2000 of July 1997. The Helsinki summit of December 1999 included Turkey and Malta in this process of enlargement. Currently, there are 13 candidate countries aspiring for full membership of the EU, an analysis of these countries' relations with the EU is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Candidate countries and the agreements they signed with the EU

Country	Association Agreement	Operation of the Association	Membership application	Start of Accession negotiations
Turkey	September 1963	December 1964	14 April 1987	----
Cyprus	December 1970	April 1971	3 July 1990	31 March 1998
Malta	December 1972	June 1973	18 July 1990	15 February 2000
Hungary	December 1991	February 1994	31 March 1994	31 March 1998
Poland	December 1991	February 1994	5 April 1994	31 March 1998
Bulgaria	March 1993	February 1995	14 Decem. 1995	15 February 2000
Czech Rep.	October 1993	February 1995	17 January 1996	31 March 1998
Romania	February 1993	February 1995	22 June 1995	15 February 2000
Slovakia	October 1993	February 1995	27 June 1995	15 February 2000
Estonia	June 1995	February 1998	24 Novem. 1995	31 March 1998
Latvia	June 1995	February 1998	13 October 1995	15 February 2000
Lithuania	June 1995	February 1998	8 December 1995	15 February 2000
Slovenia	June 1996	February 1998	10 June 1996	31 March 1998

Source: Table compiled by the author from various Bulletins of the European Union issues, external relations sections.

Of these candidates, the European Union seems to have the hardest time in handling the Turkish application; this is indicated by the fact that Turkey, despite its longest association with the EU and oldest

membership application, is the only country with which accession negotiations are not yet open. An additional proof for the EU's hesitancy towards Turkey is provided in the December 2000 Nice summit when the European Council agreed on a draft of institutional reforms for the EU to prepare for its next wave of enlargement. In these forecasted institutional reforms, the EU took into consideration all but one candidate country, Turkey. Similarly, there was some disagreement over the inclusion of Turkey in the Convention on the Future of Europe, with the European Council initially leaving Turkey out in its informal Ghent summit of October 2001, despite the European Commission's recommendation for its inclusion. The reservations over Turkey's participation to the Convention were resolved in the Laeken summit of the Council in December 2001.

EU decision-making with regard to Turkey is interesting to examine in terms of European integration and enlargement issues. One basic assumption of the paper is that Turkey's position in the enlargement process cannot be treated as an independent case on its own, but should be evaluated within the larger framework of enlargement. In other words, the EU's reservations, the role of the EU public towards the process of enlargement, the bargains that will be conducted between member states during enlargement negotiations for all candidate countries affect Turkey's position in the enlargement process. This is not to say that the EU does not have specific reservations and issues that relate only to the Turkish case, but that the picture is more complicated than a European Union-Turkish bilateral relationship. The factors that are relevant in this picture are the European Union's policy making mechanisms, the role of public opinion, the EU's institutional set-up and of course the EU member states' preferences. This approach therefore differs from previous work on the subject by placing EU-Turkish relations within a multilateral framework of enlargement in general, rather than a binary relationship.ⁱ Similarly, I have argued elsewhere in a work co-authored with Lauren McLaren, that Turkey's relations with the European Union should be evaluated within a perspective of the enlargement preferences of EU members and policy making in the European Union. The assumption in that work was that member states' preferences determine the outcome of bargains in the European Union's policy of enlargement.ⁱⁱ

This is not to deny that the EU's enlargement process is guided by objective criteria. The first requirement to be considered in the enlargement process is to be European. The importance of this requirement is that no applicant country will be considered *eligible* for membership unless it is deemed European. It was on this ground that Morocco's application for full membership to the EU was rejected outright. As for Turkey, its eligibility for membership is noted by the Commission's Opinion in 1989 on the Turkish application as well as the Presidency Conclusions in all European Council summits regarding enlargement. In addition to being European, there are certain conditions to be fulfilled for membership. The general framework for the enlargement process is set by the Copenhagen criteria, adopted at the June 1993 European Council Summit in Copenhagen, for candidate countries' accession negotiations to begin. The Copenhagen criteria for the EU's enlargement process are as follows:

- stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities; -these criteria are integrated into the Charter of Fundamental Rights, adopted in the 2000 Nice summit of the European Council.
- the existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;

- the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union, in other words the ability to adopt the EU's *acquis communautaire*.

All candidate countries must satisfy these criteria in order to qualify for membership of the EU and their progress in meeting these criteria is evaluated by the European Commission on an annual basis since 1998 with its Progress Reports on every candidate. The objectivity of these criteria is best summarised by the Commissioner responsible for Enlargement, Guenther Verheugen, that “negotiations should proceed on the basis of merit not on the basis of compassion”.ⁱⁱⁱ Turkey, as a candidate country, is subject to this evaluation in terms of its ability in meeting the Copenhagen Criteria. The Commission applies a ‘policy of differentiation’ in its negotiations in which every candidate proceeds at its own speed. Thus a candidate with which accession negotiations were opened in Helsinki may move ahead of a candidate with whom accession negotiations were opened in Luxembourg- or vice versa -depending on their progress. In addition, the candidate countries must also ensure the effective implementation of the reforms enacted under the Copenhagen criteria. In the Madrid summit of the European Council in December 1995, the European Union made it explicitly clear that the candidates will be evaluated in terms of their capacities in the successful implementation of Community legislation, specifically in enforcing the Union’s *acquis*.

In addition to the problems associated with its meeting the Copenhagen Criteria, there are other unspoken factors that are arguably obstacles to Turkish membership of the EU.^{iv} The first of these is the perceived cultural differences between Turkey and the EU; presumably resulting from the different religious background of Turks compared to most other Europeans. Second, with a relatively poor population of approximately 65 million, there are also concerns of mass migration from Turkey to the EU, the redistribution of regional development funds, and the allocation of votes and seats in EU institutions such as the Commission, Council of Ministers, and European Parliament. The impact of this concern was illustrated with the Nice Council’s decision to omit Turkey from the calculations of voting power in an enlarged Union.

The European Union had a problematic stance with respect to Turkey’s membership in terms of its inclusion in the enlargement process up to the Helsinki Council of December 1999 when it finally granted Turkey candidacy status. Turkey’s ability in meeting the Copenhagen criteria did not significantly improve from Luxembourg summit of December 1997-when it was excluded from the enlargement process-to the Helsinki summit of December 1999-when it was included as a candidate country. This fact raises the question that there must be another variable impacting Turkey’s position in the enlargement process and this paper proposes that this variable is the EU’s institutional set-up. Thus, this paper proposes that Turkey's relations with the European Union are problematic because of the inherent tensions in the European Union, the diverging preferences of the EU states and the EU’s institutional set-up. This is not to deny the importance of Turkey’s shortcomings in meeting the Copenhagen criteria and the EU's reservations about Turkey’s political and economic conditions. One might consider these as an additional factor complicating Turkey’s accession to the EU on top of the requirement of fulfilling the basic conditions for membership.

However, in answering the question as to why Turkey is included in the EU’s enlargement process despite all the question marks and obstacles, the following quote from Mr. Verheugen, lies at the heart of the matter: “This decision was made long ago. For decades, Turkey has been told that it has prospects for

becoming a full member. It would have disastrous consequences if we now tell Turkey: actually we did not mean this at all.”^v This declaration illustrates that the EU’s institutional credibility would be at stake if Turkey were excluded from the process of enlargement.

There are three major obstacles to Turkey’s membership to the EU: (i) Turkey’s ability in meeting the Copenhagen criteria, (ii) the EU’s institutional set-up and the role of the member states’ preferences—particularly important here is Turkey’s relations with Greece,^{vi} and (iii) the European public’s support for Turkey’s membership to the European Union.

Aside from the general reservations towards enlargement, the EU has specific concerns towards Turkey in the sense that the EU has explicitly stated that ongoing disputes with a Member State act as an obstacle to Turkey’s closer integration to the European Union. This means that Turkey’s relations with Greece is an important factor in determining the nature of its relations with the EU.

The paper will evolve by a brief discussion of Turkey’s history with the EU, an analysis of the role of Turkish-Greek relations on Turkey’s relations with the EU, the EU’s institutional set-up and the role of public opinion towards enlargement and towards Turkey’s membership.

Obstacles to Turkey’s Accession to the European Union

Turkey became an Associate member of the EC/EU when it signed the Ankara Treaty/Association Agreement on September 12, 1963. It has the longest association with the European Union among the candidate countries. It signed an Additional Protocol in 1970 and a Customs Union Agreement – as foreseen by the Association Agreement- in 1995. Turkey applied for full membership in the EU in April 1987. In its Opinion of December 18, 1989, the Commission stated that Turkey’s accession is unlikely at the moment. When the European Union embarked on its process of enlargement in 1997 with the European Commission’s Agenda 2000, it left Turkey out of this process. In its Luxembourg summit of December 1997, the European Council decided not to include Turkey among the candidate countries even though it included all the applicant countries from Central and Eastern Europe, as well as Cyprus. In its Helsinki summit of December 1999, the Council elevated Turkey’s status from an applicant to a candidate country. The Council decisions integrate Turkey into the Community programs and agencies; and moreover, allow its participation in meetings between candidate States and the Union in the context of the accession process. On November 8, 2000 the European Commission adopted its Accession Partnership Document for Turkey which was approved in the General Affairs Council of December 4, 2000 and finally adopted by the Council on March 8, 2001. Turkey adopted its National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis on March 19, 2001. Despite these positive developments, as of present, Turkey is the only candidate country with which accession negotiations have not begun.

To turn to the first factor impacting Turkey’s relations with the EU, the Copenhagen criteria, one should note that these criteria are not specific to Turkey and that every candidate for EU membership must satisfy the basic criteria for membership. In terms of its economic development, Turkey demonstrated its capabilities to deal with the pressures of a market economy far better than the Central and Eastern European countries, at least prior to its financial crisis of 2001. According to the Commission’s Progress Report, “Turkey has many of the characteristics of a market economy. It should be able to cope albeit with difficulties, with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union”^{vii}. Of course, Turkey has a lower per capita income than the EU members; it has a staggering inflation rate and a budget deficit; which

are all obstacles to Turkey's incorporation. According to the 2001 Progress Report, "Turkey has been unable to make further progress towards achieving a functioning market economy....Turkey has been implementing an ambitious economic program that addresses...the risks and vulnerabilities of the domestic financial sector and seeks to reduce government intervention in many areas of the economy. These problems are at the heart of the crises."^{viii} Thus, it seems Turkey's success in its new economic program adopted in March 2001 will also determine its capacity to satisfy the economic aspects of the Copenhagen criteria. As for the ability to take on the responsibilities of membership, Turkey's adoption of Community law and the harmonization of its laws since the Customs Union demonstrate that Turkey would not have serious problems there. Thus, it is no coincidence that Turkey's adoption of the *acquis* is most advanced in these areas. "Turkey has made substantial preparatory efforts for the implementation of the Accession Partnership....considerable further efforts are needed to meet the short term Accession Partnership priorities related to the *acquis*."^{ix} Although adopting the necessary legislation is not sufficient, an important component of the adoption of the *acquis* is the implementation of the harmonised legislation as foreseen by Madrid Council of December 1995.

Despite the current problems in the Turkish economy and in Turkey's ability in adopting the *acquis*, the most important obstacle to membership is the political aspect of the Copenhagen criteria. The Copenhagen European Council stated that "membership requires that the candidate country achieve stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and the respect for and protection of minorities".^x According to the Commission Progress Reports of 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001, Turkey's main problem is its adherence to the political conditions of the Copenhagen criteria. The main problems are structural problems in Turkish democracy, such as the role of the military in civilian politics, respect for human rights and the Kurdish problem. Thus, when the Helsinki Council decided to elevate Turkey's status to a candidate country, it specifically stated that accession negotiations are possible only when Turkey fulfils the political conditions. "Building on the existing European strategy, Turkey, like other candidate States, will benefit from a pre-accession strategy to stimulate and support its reforms. This will include enhanced political dialogue, with emphasis on progressing towards fulfilling the political criteria for accession with particular reference to the issue of human rights."^{xi} According to the Commission, "The basic features of a democratic system exist in Turkey, but a number of fundamental issues, such as civilian control over the military, remain to be effectively addressed. Despite a number of constitutional, legislative and administrative changes, the actual human right situation as it affects individuals in Turkey needs improvement".^{xii}

Turkey has been trying to reform its political system since the second half of the 1980s. For example, by accepting the authority and jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights in 1987, Turkey has demonstrated its willingness to comply with European standards.^{xiii} Thus, even though Turkish democracy has a number of problems, serious steps are being taken to deal with them, including the possibility of abolishing death penalty. It seems that full membership of the EU is a powerful incentive for political change in Turkey. The pre-accession strategy for Turkey, as agreed in Helsinki, is proceeding along the lines of enhanced political dialogue with three main components: human rights, border issues and Cyprus. According to the European Union, the human rights issue is where Turkey must focus its energies in order to meet the Copenhagen criteria. On that matter, delegations from the European Parliament and the Commission frequently visit Turkey. On October 3 2001, the Turkish Grand National Assembly adopted thirty-four amendments to the 1982 Constitution, which included a series of political reforms on reforming the death penalty sentence, the usage of 'mother tongue',

increased civilian control in politics, and freedom of expression. These reforms are in line with Turkey's adjustment process to the Copenhagen criteria.

Turkish adherence to the basic principles of liberal democracy would be the path to take in fulfilling the political aspects of the Copenhagen criteria. This is a desired goal for Turkish society at large, with or without EU membership. Meeting the Copenhagen criteria is not only necessary as a means to membership but also could be seen as an end in itself. It is my contention that in order to negotiate with the European Union credibly; Turkey must reform its political system in line with the basic requirements of liberal democracies. As long as the EU can claim that Turkey does not fulfil the basic requirements of membership, Turkey cannot legitimately argue that the EU has a biased stance towards the EU.

In this aspect, it is important to differentiate between the European Community of the 1970s and early 80s from the European Union of the 1990s. In the Mediterranean enlargement of the EC- the accession processes for Greece (1981), Spain and Portugal (1986)- one important factor motivating the EC was to prevent the relapse of these countries into authoritarianism. Thus, adherence to democratic principles and stability of democratic institutions were not pre-accession criteria but rather the ultimate aim, a by-product, of these countries' membership. However, it is now a pre-condition to qualify for membership and this is due to the internal changes in the European Union and external changes in the European environment following the collapse of the Cold War structures.

To sum up, Turkey had a particularly rocky relationship with the EU up to the Helsinki summit and EU membership provides an additional incentive to Turkey's reforms. In addition, these legislative changes on their own are not sufficient, but these reforms must be enforced as foreseen by the Madrid Council of 1995 and Gothenburg Council of 2001. The second factor that impacts Turkey's relations with the EU is the EU's decision-making mechanisms and the role Greece plays in that aspect. This brings us to the proposition that for a proper analysis of EU states' position on Turkey's candidacy, a look into Greek-Turkish relations is required.

Greece and Turkey

Of all the EU members, Greece is the easiest state to analyse in terms of its policy preferences towards Turkey. Prior to the Helsinki summit, a German official stated that "the Greeks have the biggest problems" for Turkey's candidacy.^{xiv} One should also note that in the 1997 Luxembourg summit when Germany under Helmut Kohl was as opposed to Turkish candidacy as Greece, it was able to benefit from Greek opposition without explicitly voicing its own negative vote.

Greece, a member of the EU since 1981, has used its membership in the EU as a platform in which it can further its own interests vis-à-vis Turkey. The Greek veto has been an important factor in Turkey's relations with the EU. During the customs union negotiations, the Greeks vetoed the Commission proposals in 1994 and only when a tacit understanding was reached that the EU would open accession negotiations with Greek Cyprus, did Greece agree to lift its veto on the customs union agreement to be signed with Turkey. Soon after, the European Council, at its Corfu summit of 1994, declared its intention of incorporating Cyprus even in the case of no political solution to the problem. Subsequently, the Customs Union Agreement between Turkey and the EU was signed on March 6, 1995. In the Luxembourg summit of the Council in 1997, Greece opposed -along with Germany and Luxembourg- the inclusion of

Turkey among the list of candidate countries. When, at the 1998 Cardiff summit and 1999 Cologne summit of the Council, the United Kingdom and Germany –the respective hosts of the summits as holders of the EU presidency- tried to adopt new proposals for Turkey, Greece was among the most ardent opponents of such proposals. Since 1981, Greece has been an important, and in certain cases the determining, factor of Turkey’s relations with the EU. This is possible due to the institutional set-up of the EU. For example, the Luxembourg compromise empowers Greece through the principle of unanimity in EU’s external relations-this is discussed in the next section.

The conflicts of interests between Turkey and Greece can be summarised as territorial disputes over coastal waters of the Aegean Sea, the continental shelf and airspace over the Aegean, the issue of sovereignty over the Aegean islets, the Cyprus problem and the issue of minority rights-there is a Turkish minority in Western Thrace and a relatively small Greek minority in Western Turkey. In 1974, in response to the Greek overthrow of the Cypriot government and annexation of the island to Greece, Turkey staged a unilateral intervention revoking its right of interference under the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960 London-Zurich Accords.^{xv} The island has since been divided into two different administrations, the internationally recognised Greek Cypriot administration and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus that is only recognised by Turkey. The summer 1996 border incidents along the Green Line in Cyprus and the January 1996 Turco-Greek crisis over the Aegean islets Kardak/Imia demonstrates the precarious balance Turkish-Greek relations are at. For the purposes of this paper, one should note that Turkey’s relations with Greece along the issues mentioned above have been effective blocks in front of Turkey’s integration into the EU. Various Greek governments, for example, sought the resolution to the Cyprus problem by linking the issue to EU-Turkish relations. Since 1993, the resolution of the Cyprus problem has become a foreign policy objective for the EU. The EU opened accession negotiations with Cyprus following the 1997 Luxembourg summit hoping that EU membership would provide an incentive to the Turkish and Greek Cypriots to resolve their differences. One of the conditions Greece put forward prior to approving any Union decision with regard to Turkey is a political settlement in Cyprus. This perspective has in turn made Cyprus and relations with Greece important issues blocking Turkey’s membership of the EU.^{xvi}

This block was overcome in the Helsinki Council with a change in the traditional Greek and Turkish positions. On the Turkish front, Turkey did not explicitly object to the Council’s suggestion to resort to the International Court of Justice by 2004 for the resolution of bilateral conflicts with Greece. This is not to be interpreted as an outright Turkish acceptance but it still is a step forward. On the Greek front, certain changes made the Greek position on Turkey’s candidacy to the European Union become more positive. First, it is worthwhile to mention that after the devastating August earthquake in Turkey, there has been a thawing of Turkish-Greek relations. Second, the Greeks have entered the Euro-zone in January 2001, the preparations for which have been undergoing since 1998. The strict budgetary requirements of participation in the euro-zone necessitate budgetary revisions for Greece that meant a decrease or revision in Greek defence expenditures. In order to revise their defence spending, warmer relations with Turkey was a pre-condition for Greek policy makers.^{xvii} Thus, it is no coincidence that one aspect of bilateral talks between Greece and Turkey revolves around the Greek request of decreasing Turkey’s defence expenditures and regional arms limits.

The resolution of the conflicts with Greece is insinuated as a precondition for Turkey’s accession negotiations along with its adherence to the political conditions of the Copenhagen criteria in the Helsinki Presidency Conclusions on paragraphs 4, 9(a) and 12. Paragraph 4 reads “The European Council will review the situation relating to any outstanding disputes, in particular concerning the repercussions on the

accession process and in order to promote their settlement through the International Court of Justice, at the latest by the end of 2004”.^{xviii} Paragraph 9(a) refers to political settlement in Cyprus; and Paragraph 12, which emphasises the above conditions, is on Turkey’s candidacy. Turkey has traditionally held the view that Turkish-Greek conflict of interests should be solved through bilateral negotiations rather than through resort to international mediation and arbitration. Thus, some Turkish political leaders regarded the acceptance of the above clause as a concession to Greece.^{xix}

Central to the Greek-Turkish relations is the Cyprus problem that rests as the most urgent problem in the EU’s enlargement process in terms of its relations with Turkey. Cyprus is an official candidate for EU membership since 1997 and is quite far along in meeting the Copenhagen criteria as reported by the European Commission in its Progress Report of 2001. The Cyprus case is problematic for the EU because the island is divided and Turkey and Greece are at odds with each other over the nature of the settlement on the island. In addition, the EU finds itself in the unenviable position that if it decides against Cyprus’s membership, then Greece may block Central and Eastern European candidates’ accession-which the EU is committed to. The Greek Foreign Minister declared in November 1996 that “If Cyprus is not admitted, then there will be no enlargement of the Community”.^{xx} Even though a group of EU members would not like to see a divided Cyprus accede to the EU, the EU is now committed to Cyprus’s accession independent of a resolution of the conflict, with the Helsinki European Council decision of 1999. In other words, a united Cyprus would be a more desirable alternative for the EU, but it is not a necessary condition for Cyprus’s membership. This perspective in return decreases the motives for the Greek Cypriots to negotiate and compromise with the Turkish Cypriots. A recent example of Greek manouvering came in 2000 during the preparations of the Commission’s Accession Partnership Document for Turkey. “Greece persuaded its 14 members in the Union to add resolving the division of Cyprus to the list of short-term actions that they (Turks) must carry out before the start of membership negotiations.”^{xxi}

Turkey’s position in Cyprus is that the island should be united in a loose confederation where there are two politically equal, sovereign states whereas the Greek and subsequently the EU position is that the island should be unified as a federal state composed of two communities. The Turkish Cypriots demand the resolution of the conflict through the creation of a bi-communal, bi-zonal confederation that recognises their political equality and the Greek Cypriots demand a unitary, sovereign state with indivisibility of territory, and single citizenship and recognition of the Turkish Cypriots as a minority.^{xxii} The involvement of the European Union on the Cyprus problem by granting Cyprus candidacy to the EU and opening accession negotiations has deepened the intransigence of the conflict. After the EU opened membership negotiations with Cyprus in December 1997, Mr.Denktaş- President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus- and Suleyman Demirel- then President of the Turkish Republic- jointly declared: “the Turkish Cypriots would sit at the negotiating table with the Greek Cypriots only if their sovereignty and political equality are recognised”.^{xxiii} This is an effective request for the diplomatic recognition of the TRNC and it came only when the EU began accession negotiations with the Greek Cypriots.

The EU perceives the solution to the Cyprus problem to pass through Turkey. The Regular Report of 2001 explicitly states that: “... EU representatives indicated their disappointment that these expressions of support (coming from Turkish authorities) have not been followed by concrete actions to facilitate a settlement of the Cyprus problem”.^{xxiv} This is precisely the problem: the EU’s major diplomatic blunder is in its treatment of the conflict solely through the position of the Greeks. The EU’s one-sided approach

to the problem in Cyprus, in return, decreases its legitimacy as a neutral arbiter of interests aiming at the resolution of the conflict in a conciliatory manner. As any person working on conflict resolution techniques would testify, the position taken by the EU on the Cyprus problem, endorsing the concerns and arguments of one party to the conflict is counter-effective.

The situation is further complicated by Cyprus's membership to the EU in the very near future. The Turkish Foreign Minister, Ismail Cem's declaration of November 2001 that Cyprus's membership to the EU would trigger an integration process between Turkey and the TRNC must be evaluated in the light that the EU may have a hot potato in its hands. The possibility of Cyprus's membership to the EU is becoming more concrete as EU members would like to see the first wave of entrants participate in the European Parliament elections to be held in 2004. A further complication is that Greece will hold the Presidency of the Council- the Council of the European Union and the European Council- from January to June 2003. It seems that, in the next two years, Turkey will either have to change its position or sever its ties with the European Union- neither of which seems desirable policy options. A breakthrough came at the end of 2001 when Denktash and Clerides resumed their direct talks under UN auspices. In that manner, the urgency of resolving the Cyprus problem prior to Cyprus' accession to the EU may have finally brought the two sides to the bargaining table. According to Greek Foreign Minister George Papandreou, "Turkey's dilemma would be to decide whether it wants the Turkish Cypriots in the EU- the Greek and the Greek Cypriot sides undoubtedly want them and hence wish for a solution to be found- or Cyprus to accede to the European Union without the Turkish-Cypriot community."^{xxv} The Greek Cypriots are now engaged in a shuttle diplomacy of convincing EU members that "Cyprus's accession course to the EU would contribute to the successful conclusion of talks between Clerides and Denktash".^{xxvi} This of course remains to be seen, however, there does seem to be a breakthrough on the Cyprus problem through its internationalisation via EU membership. There is, for the first time since 1974, some pressure on the Greek Cypriots to resolve the problem if they are serious in their EU membership intention. This pressure, however, is not exerted directly by the EU- as it is already committed to Cyprus' membership irrespective of a resolution of the Cyprus problem- but by individual member states who would not like to see a divided Cyprus join the EU ranks. For example, in September 1998, France, Italy and Spain sent a message to then EU term President Austria, that "If a solution in Cyprus is not reached, they might veto the Greek Cypriot application".^{xxvii} Thus, it is not at all certain that a divided Cyprus would have no problems completing its accession negotiations and become a member of the EU upon the ratification of its accession treaty by the national parliaments and the EP. This might be the incentive that brings the Greek Cypriots back to the bargaining table with Denktash.

It is interesting to note that many other EU members have benefited from the Greek opposition to Turkey's membership- which many opposed for reasons of their own- and they were able to free ride on Greece. A common occurrence in almost all forms of cooperation involving collective action, one dissenting actor is enough to break the cooperation, but other actors who benefit from the breakdown of cooperation need not dissent, and can free ride on the one actor who has already done so. In this case, Greek opposition to Turkey removed the ordeal of dealing with the Turkish demands from the EU; and other member states who opposed Turkish membership for reasons of their own were able to free ride on Greece. It also provided a valid excuse in their confrontations with the Turkish officials with the argument that it is Greece that is blocking further cooperation between the EU and Turkey.

What makes the role of Greece so pronounced in the EU's relations with Turkey are the EU's decision-

making mechanisms and its institutional set-up. Thus, a latent proposition of this paper is that meeting the Copenhagen criteria is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for accession negotiations to begin, especially for a candidate country such as Turkey. The EU actors and its institutional set-up are important factors in determining the nature and pace of accession negotiations. The next section analyses the institutional set-up of the EU in terms of its impact on Turkey's relations with the EU.

The challenges to enlarging the European Union

The process of EU enlargement is now an irreversible process and is impacted by internal mechanisms of the EU. There are four major challenges in front of this process. The first one is concerned with the underwriting of enlargement, who will pay for the new members? Net contributors to the EU budget are UK, France, Germany and Netherlands, and the recipients of the funds are Spain, Portugal, Greece, Italy and Ireland. The inclusion of poorer members will necessitate a loss of funds received by these countries, as well as an increased contribution to the EU budget from all members. In addition, countries like Ireland will become contributors rather than beneficiaries due to the Community rule that in order to receive financial aid, a country or a region must have a much lower average income than the EU average. Since most of the candidates, with the exception of Cyprus and Malta, have very low incomes, they will decrease the average income of the EU as well as make the current lower income countries of the EU move up the income distribution ladder. The second concern is related to funding issues as well, but also carries political and economic power ramifications. The second issue is the Common Agricultural Policy, which constitutes more than half of the Community's budget; and the possible dangers of keeping the CAP after countries such as Poland with substantial agricultural sectors join the EU. The importance of these funding issues are illustrated by the Italian minister of European Affairs, Mr. Buttiglione's statement that "Europe needs to enlarge but we must not forget the poor regions of the Italian south."^{xxviii} The third issue concerns the institutional reforms the EU has to go through prior to enlargement. The European Union decided to reform its decision-making procedures, institutional checks and balances prior to enlargement. This is not an easy task to undertake as it involves serious intergovernmental bargaining.^{xxix} The final issue is to convince the European public of the desirability of the EU's enlargement.

The institutions of the European Union were established in the 1950s when it was only a Community of Six. Throughout the various enlargements the Community experienced in its lifetime, there were certain minor revisions in these institutions. The economic integration program necessitated another round of institutional reform. Even without new members, the Union is in need of institutional reform, but the possibility of enlargement is increasing the urgency. Reducing the size of the Commission, revising the votes and representation of the members in the Council and balancing the institutions are the most pressing issues. But, it is only now that the EU is embarking on a serious enlargement program-which will nearly double its size- has it become urgent to modify the voting system and the decision-making bodies of the EU. When the member states signed the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, they accepted the necessity of a comprehensive institutional reform that would enable an enlarged Union to continue performing efficiently and effectively. During the European Council summit meeting in Cologne in June 1999, the EU members identified four main issues that needed reform: (i) the size and composition of the Commission, (ii) the weighting of the votes in the Council, re-weighting, double majority, threshold of qualified majority, (iii) extension of majority voting, (iv) extension of the co-decision procedure of the Parliament. The Community method of decision-making is a triangle; it is a three-way bargaining process between the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. EU decision making is an intergovernmental

bargaining process, but the negotiating parties are not only the members of the EU, but the institutions of the EU as well.

The EU's institutional set-up determines, to a certain extent, the relative power of the states. In that aspect, there are two important institutional factors that need to be noted; the 1966 Luxembourg compromise and the unanimity voting in the EU in its external relations. The 1966 Luxembourg compromise deserves a special note in this context. Initially adopted to overcome the 1965 empty chair crisis between French President de Gaulle and the European Commission, the compromise gave de facto veto power to states for EC policies.^{xxx} The protection of national interests against supranational authority via the veto became a legitimate EU practice. The Luxembourg compromise and unanimity voting decreases the likelihood of collective action and cooperation in the EU. Even though the SEA of 1987, the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 and the Treaty of Nice of 2001 relaxed the legacy of the compromise, it is still valid on the EU's external relations-which basically encompass all relations with Turkey. For example, when Greece became a member of the EC in 1981, it greatly benefited from the Luxembourg compromise and was able to provoke the compromise on various occasions to block EU policy towards Turkey. The unanimity voting is important for two reasons: since Turkey's membership has to be decided unanimously, any state that has reservations about that may veto the process. Secondly, if Turkey becomes a member and unanimity remains on certain issues, Turkey would have the tool to block Community legislation in policies where it is most sensitive, such as agriculture. However, after the Nice summit, this second option became less of a possibility since the Council decided to expand the scope of qualified majority voting and when the Nice Treaty comes into effect, over 90% of decisions will be taken that way as reinforced by the Ioannina Compromise. This reform was necessary to decrease the probability of stalled decision-making in a Union enlarged to 27 members.

Another important point not directly related to Turkey's impact, but to the impact of EU decision-making on Turkey's accession is that at the supranational level, policy making towards Turkey gets stuck between the three main organs of the EC; the Commission, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament and the decision-making procedures of the EU. The procedure is such that the Commission makes a proposal, but the Council of Ministers/Council of the European Union has to adopt the proposals for them to become Community decisions. This sometimes impedes Turkey's relations with the EU in instances when the Commission would like to adopt a package on Turkey but is blocked in the Council of Ministers by one or more member states. For example, in 1990, the Commission recommended the release of the 4th Financial Protocol to Turkey under the June 1990 Matutes package, but Greece blocked the adoption of the Commission's recommendation in the Council of Ministers. Similarly, the financial aid packages to Turkey under the auspices of the Customs Union Agreement and the MEDA program of the EU had the same fate as the Matutes Package. Thus, even though the Commission adopts a proposal for Turkey, its implementation is not always possible, due to EU policy-making procedures. In addition, since 1993- the operationalisation of the Treaty on the European Union- the European Parliament impacts Turkey's relations with the EU. The institutional reforms in the 1990s increased the EP's role in EU policy making with regards to the EU's external relations. The Maastricht Treaty has expanded the role of the EP on relations with third parties by requiring the assent of the EP for their accession to the EU: the assent procedure, Article O of the Treaty on the European Union. The European Parliament-with its large Social Democratic group- has specific reservations about Turkey's democracy and human rights record. Thus, the assent requirement made the EP an important player in EU-Turkish relations. Nonetheless, the European Parliament has become more sympathetic to Turkey's candidacy over the last

two years, despite the EP resolution on the ‘Armenian genocide’ adopted in February 2002. The European Parliament also reacted favourably to Turkey’s National Programme and labelled it as “an important step in Turkey’s EU career”.^{xxxix}

At the Nice summit of the Council of the European Union, in December 2000, the institutional reforms that needed to be done prior to EU enlargement- the number of Commissioners, the weight of the votes in the Council, the respective parliamentarians to the European Parliament- were decided. In the European Union, votes in the Council of Ministers and seats in the European Parliament are determined according to the population weight of the member states.^{xxxix} Turkey’s population is higher than all the member states, except Germany, as well as the candidate countries. In Table 2, the post-Nice votes of the members and the candidate countries in the European Council can be seen.

Table 2: Institutional Changes with the Nice Summit

Countries	Votes in the European Council	Number of Commissioners
Germany	29	2(current), 1 (After 2005)
UK	29	2(current), 1 (After 2005)
France	29	2 (current), 1 (After 2005)
Italy	29	2 (current), 1 (After 2005)
Spain	27	2 (current), 1 (After 2005)
Poland*	27	1
Romania*	15	1
Netherlands	13	1
Greece	12	1
Belgium	12	1
Portugal	12	1
Hungary*	12	1
Czech Rep.*	12	1
Sweden	10	1
Austria	10	1
Bulgaria*	10	1
Denmark	7	1
Finland	7	1
Ireland	7	1
Slovakia*	7	1

Lithuania*	7	1
Latvia*	4	1
Slovenia*	4	1
Estonia*	4	1
Cyprus*	4	1
Luxembourg	4	1
Malta*	3	1

Source: Table compiled by the author following the European council's Nice summit Presidency conclusions. * Indicates candidate countries with which the EU began accession negotiations and who were included in the Nice Council's calculations.

Article 189 of the Treaty, establishing the Community, limits EP members to 700. The Nice summit suggestion is to increase the number of MEPs from 626 to 732 and to make the number of each member state's seats dependent on its population, determined according to a system of adjusted proportionality. Even though all candidate countries were included in the future forecasting of institutional reforms, Turkey was not included in these calculations for the future. The Treaty of Nice, which summarises the revisions to the EU institutions, is yet to be ratified but the reforms are decided according to the member states' and candidate countries' populations and an accepted clause in the Treaty is that this would be the last time that decision-making processes and voting rights in the EU institutions would be determined according to members' population. This effectively explains the reason behind Turkey's exclusion from the future planning of the EU, as by the time Turkey is included in the EU decision-making processes, its population would not determine its powers in the EU. One should note that Turkey has a rapidly increasing population of about 71 million, and the second most populous candidate is Poland with 39 million people-almost one half of Turkey. According to the EU, Turkey was not included because it had not yet begun its accession negotiations. The fact that the EU members left only Turkey out of the calculations of weights of votes and declared that this was the last treaty revisions for EU institutions based on population, is a tribute to the impact of Turkey's membership on EU institutions. The dilemma that the EU faces in terms of Turkish membership is to find a formula to prevent Turkey's dominance in the EU institutions due to its population weight. Turkey's inclusion would make it the second largest member of the Union after Germany. Even countries that are supportive of enlargement have doubts about Turkey's membership because of its size and population.^{xxxiii} If Turkey becomes a member and the EU decides to adapt the still valid formula of population determined voting and representation power, then Turkey would have more votes in the Council, and more seats in the Parliament than all the members but Germany.^{xxxiv} This partly explains the EU's hesitancy towards Turkey's membership that cannot be explained solely through the Copenhagen criteria.

The Intergovernmental Conference of 2004 is extremely important in that it will determine whether the Charter of Fundamental Rights adopted at the 2000 Nice summit will be legally binding and if so, under what conditions. In addition, the powers of the Community institutions and national governments will be readjusted with serious revisions to reconcile the Community method and intergovernmental method of decision-making in the Union. The institutional set-up of the Union empowers the EU member states in their dealings with candidate countries and this involves a

bargaining process between the EU members. In addition, the publics of the EU member states impact the EU's decisions especially on matters relating to the external relations of the EU.

There is a two-level game being played in the EU. On the lower level, within each member state, there is a bargaining process between social groups, most of which is beyond the focus of this paper. For the purposes of this paper, the issue is the inclusion of Turkey in the EU enlargement process. An example of the role of domestic social groups in determining the EU's policy towards Turkey is that in Greece, ultranationalists oppose Turkish membership and more moderate groups favour it; and their relative power within the Greek polity determines the overall Greek preference at the EU bargaining table. On the higher level, ie. the EU level, there is a bargaining process between EU members over this issue, and again the relative power of the players--at this level the EU member states' relative power--determines EU policy. At the lower level, even when the state elites perceive a greater benefit in granting Turkey candidate status, they may refrain from doing so due to domestic opposition.^{xxxv} To return to the example of Greece, where bilateral relations with Turkey are an important political matter, popular opinion and political opposition restrain even a moderate government in its policy choices. On the other hand, policy makers, as in the case of the former Greek foreign minister, Theo Pangalos, may capitalise on the issue to boost their own popular support, similar to rally-round-the-flag type of political mobilisation.

One should note that the role of public opinion is critical when those who oppose Turkey's candidacy are the most active. In other words, it is not public opinion in general that determines public support but the opinion of public groups that are most active, visible and vocal. Thus, the European public constitutes an important factor in setting the boundaries around which governments may act. For a candidate country such as Turkey, towards whose Europeanness the public is sceptical, public opinion may be as important a factor as meeting the Copenhagen criteria.

Public opinion

The public's attitudes to enlargement is shaped by the public's concerns about increased immigration, increased unemployment, increased crime and drug trafficking, loss of funds to the current members, increased difficulty of making decisions in an enlarged union and lower living standards. It is also interesting to note that according to Eurobarometer 55 (2001), 59% of the European public that supports the process of European integration is also supportive of enlarging the Union.

Of all the countries that have applied for EU membership, Turkey has the lowest level of support from the European public, with the least support coming from Greece, Austria, France and Germany; and the highest support from Spain, Netherlands, Portugal, Ireland, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The public's support or opposition to Turkey's membership might be influenced by the public's general concerns about enlargement over the following issues: fear of foreigners, loss of structural funds, loss of resources and revenues. In addition, they might be influenced by specific concerns related to the Turkish case: fear of an 'alien' culture, racism, security issues and Turkey's large population. Tables 3 and 4 demonstrate the EU public's support for enlargement in general as well as towards Turkey.

TABLE 3: % Population in each Member States in Favour of New Countries joining the EU (Average Support for the 15 countries and Spread from Lowest to Highest % Support)

Country	Average support % EB 55-Fall 2001	Average Support % EB 54- Spring 2001	Difference
Greece	70	70	0
Ireland	59	52	+7
Spain	55	58	-3
Portugal	52	52	0
Italy	51	59	-8
Sweden	50	56	-6
Denmark	50	56	-6
Finland	45	45	0
Belgium	44	45	-1
EU15	43	44	-1
Luxembourg	43	46	-3
Netherlands	42	40	+2
United Kingdom	35	31	+4
Germany	35	36	-1
France	35	35	0
Austria	33	32	+1

Source: Standard Eurobarometer 55.1, First Results in September 2001- surveys conducted in Spring 2001, Table 3.6a, and Eurobarometer 54, April 2001, fieldwork November-December 2000, B76.

TABLE 4: EU Member State's Support to Turkey's Membership

Country	In Favour	Against
Spain	43%	25%
Netherlands	42%	41%
Portugal	41%	34%
Ireland	39%	28%
Sweden	37%	46%
Italy	34%	48%
Denmark	34%	54%
United Kingdom	32%	34%
Belgium	28%	59%
Finland	27%	53%
Greece	26%	67%
Luxembourg	25%	65%
Germany	24%	57%
West Germany	25%	58%
East Germany	23%	56%
France	21%	62%
Austria	21%	63%
EU Total	30%	48%

Source: Standard Eurobarometer 54, Spring 2001, Table 5.12a, p.B.78

As seen in these tables, there seems to be some correlation between states that do not support enlargement in general and Turkey's inclusion in particular, the most striking case for that is Austria with France and Germany following more or less closely. This is interesting given the French President Jacques Chirac's and German Chancellor Gerard Schroeder's relative enthusiasm towards Turkish membership. The spread is the result of people's differing views on specific countries' membership to the EU: the difference between the highest and lowest support to candidate countries. Table 5 analyses the public's preferences with the highest level of spread.

TABLE 5: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SPREAD

Country	Highest Support	Lowest Support	Spread
Greece	Cyprus/84%	Turkey/26%	58%
Austria	Switzerland/77%	Turkey/21%	56%
Denmark	Norway/88%	Turkey/34%	54%
Finland	Norway/80%	Turkey/27%	53%
Germany	Norway/76%	Romania/21%	52%
	Switzerland/76%	Turkey/24%	
Luxembourg	Switzerland/70%	Turkey/25%	45%
Netherlands	Norway/86%	Turkey/42%	44%
Belgium	Norway/73%	Turkey/28%	45%
	Switzerland/73%		
Italy	Norway/77%	Turkey/34%	43%
Portugal	Switzerland/65%	Turkey/41%	24%
Spain	Norway/66%	Turkey/43%	23%
Ireland	Switzerland/65%	Turkey/39%	26%
Sweden	Norway/84%	Turkey/37%	47%
United Kingdom	Switzerland/57%	Turkey/32%	25%

France	Switzerland/61%	Turkey/21%	40%
--------	-----------------	------------	-----

Source: Standard Eurobarometer 54, Spring 2001, Table 5.12a, p.B.78

In almost all countries where the spread is high, this is due to the low support given to Turkey's candidacy. So even in countries where support towards enlargement is high, support for Turkey's inclusion is low and that explains the high levels of spread. Greece has the highest level of spread, as even though it has the highest support for enlargement, its support for Turkey's membership is among the lowest of all members due to the conflicts of interests between Turkey and Greece. What Tables 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate is that Turkey is the least preferred candidate even for countries supportive of enlarging the EU. Spain seems to be only exception, supportive both of enlargement and Turkey's inclusion.

Table 6: Comparison of Average support to Enlargement and to Turkey's membership

Member state	Average support to enlargement	Average support to Turkey	Difference
Spain	%58	%43	%15
Portugal	%52	%41	%11
Ireland	%52	%39	%13
Netherlands	%40	%42	-%2
Sweden	%56	%37	%19
Denmark	%56	%34	%22
Italy	%59	%34	%25
United Kingdom	%31	%32	-%1
Belgium	%45	%28	%17
Finland	%45	%27	%18
Greece	%70	%26	%44
Luxembourg	%46	%25	%21

Germany	%36	%24	%12
France	%35	%21	%14
Austria	%32	%21	%11

Source: Standard Eurobarometer 54, Spring 2001.

Public support in Greece, Spain, Ireland, Italy and Portugal towards enlargement in general seems to be highest. What is particularly interesting is that these countries will be the ones to lose most from enlargement in terms of their shares from EU funds. On the other hand, public support to enlargement in general seems low in Belgium, the United Kingdom, Luxembourg, Germany, France and Austria. One central question for the EU public in general is the cost of enlargement; that is who is going to pay for enlargement? For example, this issue became the central concern that motivated the Irish people's rejection of the Nice Treaty on June 7, 2001. Ireland is a net beneficiary of EU's Structural Funds, but in 2006-with the new Community budget- its role will most probably change from being a beneficiary to a contributor because it will no longer qualify and will have to pay for the accession of new members. Another factor that impacts the public's support for enlargement is the expansion of the Union's impact on the core values of the community that the EU symbolises. To put it differently, xenophobic tendencies among the European public make them hesitant about enlarging the Union. Closely related to the impact of xenophobic tendencies on expanding the Union is the issue of racism. Racism and xenophobia are the unspoken factors in the EU that complicate Turkey's relations with the EU. The Commission Survey on Racism of 1997 revealed some interesting facts in the EU, namely that there is a high proportion of EU nationals, 9% of all interviewees, who define themselves as very or quite racist. The least racist countries were Spain and Portugal. The most racist were Austria, Belgium, Denmark, and Germany. One may point out that Spain and Portugal are also the two countries that are most in favour of Turkey's membership. Interestingly, Austria (25%), France (23%), and Belgium (22%) declared that the EU should not enlarge at all when the question for the differentiation on the nature and speed of enlargement was introduced to the Eurobarometer 55 of 2001, whereas Portugal (41%), Italy (34%), Sweden (31%) and Spain (27%) hold the attitude that the EU should be open to all countries.

Of all EU members, public opinion in Spain is most favourable towards Turkish membership: according to Eurobarometer surveys of 2001, 43% of all Spaniards are in favour of Turkey's membership. In Portugal, 52% of the population supports enlargement in general and 41% support Turkey's membership. However, Spain and Portugal are the major beneficiaries, along with Italy and Ireland, of the EU's structural funds and Cohesion Fund. The possibility of Turkey's membership would cause Spain and Portugal to receive less from these funds. Additional Spanish concerns on enlargement are fear of unfair competition in agricultural products and the disappearance of small and medium sized enterprises. So why would the Spanish and Portuguese publics give relatively more support to Turkey's membership of the EU despite their concerns about losing their share in the structural funds? To this question, one may point out that Spain and Portugal would like to increase the geo-strategic weight of the Mediterranean in the European Union.

Spain would like to see the Mediterranean members of the Union acquire greater muscle because of its

concerns that stability in the European territory is tied directly to stability in the Mediterranean. In that aspect, Spain perceives that Turkey may play an important role in achieving stability in the Mediterranean. “The fall of the Berlin wall and the vigorous renewal of MittelEuropa revived in Spain the feeling of being on the periphery of Europe. Therefore, the Spanish government insisted that the southern frontiers should not be forgotten. This is not the first time Spain has faced this dilemma, as for years it has insisted on balancing the Eastern and Southern dimension of the EC”.^{xxxvi} For example, it was under the Spanish leadership that the EU adopted the program on Euro-Mediterranean Partnership- the Barcelona Process that was launched in 1995. The assumption was that threats to security in Europe come from the impoverished South, and dangers of immigration from the Southern Mediterranean countries pose a security risk to the Union. Thus, one way to deal with these security risks is to create incentives for the peoples of the Mediterranean non-EU members to stay home by creating employment opportunities there. The Spanish initiative is aimed at eliminating the push factors from the South Mediterranean countries toward the European Union through the European-Mediterranean Initiative. Similarly, the Spanish public looks more favourably towards Turkey’s membership. As Spain will take over the Presidency in January 2002, Turkey’s prospects might be a bit brighter during that period. The first signs of the possibility of a more fruitful dialogue between Turkey and the EU came when Prime Minister Ecevit visited Spain and met the Spanish Prime Minister Aznar in summer 2001.

The political weight of the EU members determine its agenda, thus the greater the number of Mediterranean countries- that have similar concerns and interests- the higher the probability that EU policies would be favourable to these countries. This is one reason why the Mediterranean members of the EU-with the exception of Greece- support Turkey’s membership. A second related factor is that the Mediterranean countries might fear the impacts of a politically stronger Germany as a result of the EU’s incorporation of CEEs. The end of the Cold War led to concerns regarding the containment of a greater Germany to which the EU has responded with further deepening and institutional reform. One should also keep in mind that one factor that traditionally motivated the process of European integration in the first place was to contain Germany after World War II. The issue of keeping the Germans in check has been an important European concern in the post-World War II period and that concern has been intensified after the unification of Germany in 1990. France also deserves a note in that context, in that it pushed for Turkey’s candidacy to the EU prior to the Helsinki summit. For example, President Chirac told the Finnish President Ahtissari that “he would judge the Finnish presidency by their success or failure with the Turkish question”.^{xxxvii} In addition, when the Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit seemed to reject the initial Helsinki offer, it was President Chirac who gave his private plane to Javier Solana, to fly to Ankara to convince the Turks, and who intervened in Helsinki to convince the Greeks.^{xxxviii} The French and other Mediterranean countries’ fear of an omnipotent Germany in the midst of the EU motivates them to extend membership to other Mediterranean non-EU European countries. Thus, one might not be unjustified in claiming that one motive behind the Mediterranean countries’ relative support to Turkey’s membership might be to counterbalance the political weight of Germany and MittelEuropa. This also fits well with the general thesis of this paper that Turkey’s relations with the EU should be evaluated within a multilateral framework rather than bilaterally. It is the general reservations and concerns about enlargement and the possible changes in the delicate balance within the EU between East and South that would impact Turkey’s position in the enlargement process as well.

In this framework, immigration, or the fear of an influx of foreigners, has an important role to play in shaping the public’s support towards enlargement in general and towards Turkey in particular. The issue of immigration is a cause of concern for many member states as it is associated with the fear that

enlargement will bring ‘outsiders’ claiming resources that naturally belong to the ‘insiders’ as well as threatening the norms, values and basic structure of their community.^{xxxix} The EU member states which have substantial immigrant populations are wary of the impacts that Turkey’s membership would bring on the mobility of people. Coupled with the income and unemployment differences between Turkey and the EU, there is a great likelihood that there would be a net influx of people from low income sectors of Turkey to EU states in search of employment and better living standards. This is not a pleasant prospect for the EU members, specifically to Germany, Belgium, Austria, and to a certain extent Sweden. These countries have substantial Turkish immigrant populations and along with that a whole set of social problems to solve. On the other hand, a country like the United Kingdom, which is less threatened by immigration and which retains its border controls by refusing to participate in the Schengen agreements, has less problems with Turkey in this respect. For example, during the Amsterdam Treaty negotiations, Germany wanted to increase the EU’s role in coordinating efforts towards immigration because it is greatly threatened by immigration. Germany’s insistence on more supranational control over immigration also reflects its preferences with respect to Turkey, which traditionally provided Germany with an influx of immigrant workers. Since immigration is a top priority issue for Germany, it is not far-fetched to claim that Germany has serious reservations about Turkey’s membership along migration issue lines. According to Eurobarometer 55 of 2001, 52% of all Germans believe that enlargement would lead to a significant increase in immigration and 77% of those perceive this as an undesirable outcome. 33% of those people believe that increased immigration would lead to increased unemployment and a decrease in wages whereas 17% fear crime and illegal drug trafficking would increase. A similar situation is also valid in France, where %51 of the people interviewed fear increased immigration to France. Another very good example is Austria and the Austrian public. One issue that the Freedom Party of Jorg Haider was able to manipulate to its own advantage in the general elections of October 1999, was the fear among Austrians of an influx of ‘alien’ cultures into Austria. The general proximity of Austria and Germany to the Central and Eastern European countries is of course a cause of concern for these countries’ publics in their evaluation of enlargement. This is partly the reason why the Commissioner responsible for enlargement, Guenther Verheugen, suggested in September 2000 that a referendum must be held in Germany in order to assess the public’s support towards enlargement. According to Verheugen, “the EU should not ‘decide over the heads of the people [but hear] the valid fears of their citizens’. These would include worries about the resulting influx of cheap labour and possible increases in cross-border crime.”^{xi} This declaration, in turn, caused uproar in the EU governments because of their perceptions that the German public would not endorse enlargement based on immigration and fear-of-foreigners concerns. Austria and Germany suggested a seven-year transition period before opening up the EU’s labour market to the newcomers, one of the four freedoms on which the Rome Treaty (1957) and the Single European Act (1987) rests. Hungary is the first candidate to comply as Hungarian Foreign minister Janos Mortanyi declared that “We have to be realistic and take people’s fears into consideration”.^{xii} But, it should be no coincidence that France, Germany and Austria where fear of immigration is highest also have the lowest public support to enlarging the Union and Spain and Portugal where fear of immigration is lowest have the highest public support to enlargement.

The factors discussed above constitute a more multilateral picture of Turkey’s relations with the EU. That is, the issues of centres of gravity, immigration, racism, and distribution of funds are all factors that impact the public’s support to enlargement in general. With the possible exception of racism-to a certain extent- almost all of these concerns apply to all the current candidates of the European Union.

Specific to Turkey are concerns over Turkey's population, and the impact of Turkey's inclusion on the EU's security. For example, the countries that have assigned a lower priority to the issues of European security tend to view Turkey as not as important as those countries that give a higher priority to security issues. A perfect example would be the United Kingdom. The UK is more concerned with the EU's security role than smaller states such as Luxembourg or Belgium- which depend on the protective umbrella of NATO and larger EU states such as the UK- and is therefore more aware of the potential security risks that Turkey's exclusion may carry. Thus, it is not surprising to see that the UK has tried to reverse the Luxembourg decisions of 1997 in its own Presidency in 1998. For example, when the UK took over the EU Presidency, it tried to integrate Turkey into the enlargement process by including Turkey into the list of countries on which the European Commission would prepare Progress Reports, which was agreed at the Cardiff summit of June 1998. The UK tried to improve European Union-Turkish relations through the adoption of a Pre-Accession Strategy for Turkey.

The evolving security role of the Union, as decided at the 1999 Cologne summit, necessitates Turkey's participation in some manner. Turkey as a NATO member and an associate member of the WEU is disturbed by the EU's plans of incorporating the WEU and engaging in operations borrowing NATO assets. With regards to the EU's CESDP, the Turkish position is that:

Turkey must participate on a regular basis in the day-to-day consultations of European security. It should also participate fully and equally in decision-making on all EU-led operations using NATO assets. And on the other hand, in EU operations not using NATO assets, it must participate in the decision shaping and the implementation of such operations if it decided to join them.^{xlii}

Turkey's importance for the EU's evolving CESDP is twofold, its NATO membership and vote in the North Atlantic Council, and its military capabilities and geographical proximity to potential crises. Thus, a credible European security arrangement requires Turkey's participation. The EU member states, ie. UK, Netherlands and France, who are aware of Turkey's strategic importance and who also would like to see the EU acquire more muscle in security issues are more favorable to Turkey's membership.^{xliii}

The developments in global and European security since the September 11 terrorist attacks against the USA might have altered the EU officials and the public's stance towards Turkey. Verheugen's statement of October 17, 2001 is a tribute in that aspect: "In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks, it is clearer than ever that Turkey and the EU need each other. The EU is indispensable for Turkey, and Turkey is indispensable for the EU."^{xliv} This, of course, is not to claim that the road to Turkey's membership will be paved with security concerns. However, security has become an important factor impacting Turkey's relations with the EU especially in the light of the Union's Common European Security and Defence Policy-CESDP and its Rapid Reaction Force-RRF. Therefore, an important aspect of Turkey's position in the EU enlargement process is its potential impact on the EU's evolving CESDP. This, in turn, impacts certain EU member states as well as the European Commission's stance on Turkey's accession negotiations. A breakthrough in the Turkish position with regard to the EU's access to NATO's strategic assets-about which Turkey had serious reservations –came about in November 2001 prior to the Laeken summit of the European Council. Turkey, the USA and the UK agreed on the EU's access to NATO's strategic assets while taking Turkey's reservations into account and that decision was submitted to the Council. The breakthrough is important in the sense that Turkey no longer could be perceived as the only NATO country that is sabotaging the EU's security aspirations.

Of the relatively more supportive camp, the British would favour Turkey's membership because of the widening-deepening issues. The UK would like to see a more intergovernmental Union, rather than a federal Euro-state. Turkey's size and its cultural diversity from the rest of the Union would be an impediment to the federalist aspirations of certain states. This is also the reason for the lack of support for Turkey's accession by the EU members aspiring towards a federal Europe such as Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany and France.

As for Germany, it seems as if on almost all the issues—immigration, security, culture- especially under the Christian Democratic Union, the country is opposed to Turkey's EU membership. However, when Gerhard Schroder came to power, one of the things he put in his EU agenda was to ameliorate relations with Turkey. In its presidency, in the first half of 1999, Germany under Schroder, tried to reverse the 1997 Luxembourg summit decisions and drafted a proposal for Turkey and presented it to the European Council in Cologne in June 1999. His proposals were rejected by Greece-for the reasons noted above-, Italy-probably due to the Turco-Italian crisis of November 1998 over the Ocalan case^{xlv}-, and Sweden-due to Sweden's reservations about Turkey's human rights record. It still is noteworthy to witness a change of heart in Germany with respect to Turkey; an analysis of this requires a look at Germany's domestic politics. When the Luxembourg summit decisions were adopted, it was the CDU under Helmut Kohl that led the anti-Turkish front of the Christian Democratic parties in the EU. The CDU's major problems with Turkey were related to migration, religion, culture, the problems of dual citizenship and the centres of gravity mentioned above. One may note that during the election campaign in Germany, the Social Democrats stressed the need for resolving Germany's Turkish problem and the recognition of dual citizenship.^{xlvi} When the CDU lost power to the Social Democrats, Germany's national preferences with regards to Turkey's EU membership changed. This is consistent with the general proposition of the paper that it is the national preferences of the member states that determine EU policy, and at the same time, it gives us an insight as to the change of heart from Luxembourg to Helsinki. In his speech to the Bundestag on December 16, 1999, Gerhard Schroder noted an additional incentive for Germany; "The decisions of Helsinki are important for the ability of everyone to live together in Germany, regardless of their origins. For the many people of Turkish origin living among us, it will be crucial to know whether the land of their fathers will be able to hope for a democratic future in Europe and as a part of Europe."^{xlvii} This also summarises the Social Democrats' view that in order to deal with the problems of immigration and minority rights at home, Turkey should be included in the larger EU structure.

A member state is most likely to get its preferences reflected as EU policy when its preferences are close to the 'median' preferences of the other members.^{xlviii} EU member states' preferences towards Turkey are more-or-less similar with slight modifications along some issues. However, there seems to be a consensus of some sort that Turkey's membership to the EU is not possible in the short or medium term based on Turkey's ability to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that Turkey's relations with the European Union should not be evaluated strictly through a bilateral lens where Turkey's accession would be determined by case-specific factors that are endogenous to Turkey. The main proposition is that Turkey's position within the EU's enlargement process is impacted by the EU's institutional set-up, its decision-making mechanisms, and the role of public opinion towards enlargement in general as well as towards Turkey in particular.

On the Turkish front, there are important challenges for Turkey to fulfil in order to strengthen its case for membership in its negotiations with the European Union. The most visible of these is with regards to its political system, and a second one is concerned with its economic stability. Turkey's major problem lies with its process of democratisation, and the consequent absence of a political will to fulfil the political aspects of the Copenhagen criteria. Turkey might be more democratic than Greece, Spain or Portugal in the 1970s, however, this is not a valid argument any more. Turkey's immediate tasks are to reform its democratic institutions, and acquire transparency in government policies. According to one EU official, the first thing that needs to be done is "to correct the divergence of Turkish reality with the Copenhagen criteria". The Constitutional Reforms of October 2001 are proper steps in that regard. However, one should not think that the process of democratisation is only to fulfil the basic requirements of EU membership, instead these are important steps for the sake of the Turkish people in general. In the economic sphere, the financial crisis of February 2001 in Turkey demonstrated the fragility of the Turkish economy and the lack of macroeconomic stability. Nevertheless, despite its current problems, Turkey has one of the most dynamic economies among the candidate countries. The European Commission acknowledges this fact in its Progress Reports of 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001. An important problem that affects the Turkish economy and Turkey's ability to adopt the *acquis* is the competition rules in Turkey and the level of corruption. Turkey's efforts in meeting the Copenhagen criteria-irrespective of EU membership-are desirable goals in themselves for Turkey's development. The most important element in meeting the Copenhagen criteria would be to have a sound and credible basis to negotiate with the EU. As long as Turkey falls short of the basic requirements of membership, it would not be possible to claim that the EU is discriminating against Turkey. It is only when Turkey completely fulfils the criteria, would it then forcefully argue that the EU's policy of enlargement is guided by other factors.

These other factors are the EU's institutional set-up, which empowers members such as Greece in terms of influencing the overall EU policy towards Turkey, and member specific concerns towards enlargement. The central proposition in that aspect is that the EU has become hostage to the Greek position with respect to the Turco-Greek conflict over the Aegean Sea issues and the Cyprus problem. In terms of the Cyprus issue, the period up to the Greek presidency-until January 2003- should be treated by the Turkish government as a window of opportunity where a sustainable settlement to the problem which would also let Turkey save face could be found. Otherwise, the 6-month period of Greek presidency along with the possibility of Cyprus's accession to the EU by 2004 may seriously complicate Turkey's relations with the EU with catastrophic consequences. Thus, one policy proposition of this paper is related to the resolution of the Cyprus problem prior to the Greek presidency of January to June 2003 and preferably prior to Cyprus's accession to the EU. This seems to be materialising to a certain extent with the resuming of direct talks between Clerides and Denktash in 2002. Paradoxically, a by-product of Turkey's candidacy to the EU may be the improvement in Greek-Turkish relations. Turkey's closer integration into the EU creates a favourable environment for the resolution of the differences between Turkey and Greece; their friendship would be beneficial to both countries and enhance regional stability. One might also consider the Greek presidency as an important opportunity for the Greek government to ameliorate its relations with Turkey without becoming hostage to its anti-Turkish interest groups and without being labelled as 'the traitor to Greek national interests'.

As for public support for Turkish membership, the European public is not unified in its support or opposition to enlargement. In member states such as Ireland or Denmark, the public speaks with a more powerful voice because they have a constitutional right to ratify their governments' agreements via

referendums. As illustrated by the Irish people's rejection of the Nice Treaty in June 2001, the EU governments do not have an easy task in front of them in terms of convincing their public for enlargement. However, this is not specific to Turkey, as even though Turkey has the lowest support for its accession among all the candidates, the European public is not at all enthusiastic about enlarging the European Union. Spain has the highest level of support for enlargement and Turkey's accession; in addition the Spanish government has a more favourable stance to Turkey due to the strategic balance in the EU between MittelEuropa and Southern Europe. Another policy proposition of this paper is, therefore, that the Turkish government should treat the Spanish presidency of the EU from January to June 2002 as a window of opportunity to deepen Turkey's position in the overall enlargement process.

In short, this paper has argued that it must be evident that even if Turkey fulfils all of the Copenhagen criteria, its accession is going to be influenced by issue-specific reservations the European Union has, as well as by the EU public's support towards Turkey's membership. Turkey's negotiations with the EU require an understanding of the overall enlargement process and the factors that guide it, rather than bilateral negotiations over the extent to which Turkey meets the Copenhagen criteria.

Notes

i For further information, see Meltem Müftüleri-Bac, *Turkey's relations with a changing Europe*, Manchester University Press, UK, 1997; Meltem Müftüleri-Bac, "The Never-Ending Story: Turkey and the European Union", *Middle Eastern Studies*, , vol.34, no.4, October 1998, pp.240-258; Barry Buzan and Thomas Diez, "Turkey and the European Union", *Survival*, vol.41, no.1, 1999, pp.41-57; Paul Kubicek, "Turkish-European Relations at a New Crossroads?", *Middle East Policy*, vol.6, no.4, June 1999.

ii Meltem Müftüleri-Bac and Lauren McLaren, "Enlargement Preferences and Policy making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey", unpublished manuscript, Bilkent University, 2001.

iii Peter Norman, "Bold Approach Carries Risk" *Financial Times*, December 3, 1999, p.6.

iv For further information on the role of these factors see, Gerard Delanty, *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity and Reality*, London: Macmillan Press, 1995; Soledad Garcia, *European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy*, London: Pinter, 1993; Chris Husbards, "The Dynamics of Racial Exclusion and Expulsion: Racist Politics in Western Europe", *European Journal of Political Research*, vol.16, 1998, pp.701-20; Iver Neumann and Jennifer Welsh, 'The Other in European self-definition: an addendum to the literature on international society', *Review of International Studies*, vol.17, 1991, p.327-348.

-
- ^v “EU Enlargement Commissioner criticises Austria over enlargement position”, BBC Monitoring, Die Presse, December 5, 1999.
- ^{vi} Greece is of course not the only member with serious reservations about Turkey. Germany and Austria, for example, have problems with Turkey’s candidacy based on immigration and culture concerns. But, Greek opposition to Turkey’s candidacy is the most visible and vocal opposition allowing other members with similar reservations hide behind Greece.
- ^{vii} 1999 Regular Progress Report, Turkey, October 14, 1999.
- ^{viii} European Commission, the Regular Report on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession, Brussels, 13.11.2001, Sec (2001) 1756, p.45.
- ^{ix} European Commission, the Regular Report on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession, Brussels, 13.11.2001, Sec (2001) 1756, p.95.
- ^x Presidency conclusions, the Council of the European Union, Copenhagen, 1993.
- ^{xi} Presidency conclusions, Helsinki European Council, December 10-11, 1999.
- ^{xii} European Commission, the Regular Report on Turkey’s Progress Towards Accession, Brussels, 13.11.2001, Sec (2001) 1756, p.32.
- ^{xiii} For an in-depth analysis of Turkey’s political system to the EU’s democratic principles, please see my previous work, Meltem Müftüler-Bac, “The Never-Ending Story: Turkey and the European Union”, Middle Eastern Studies, vol.34, no.4, October 1998, 240-258; “The Impact of the European Union on Turkish Politics”, East European Quarterly, vol.XXXIV (34), no.2, June 2000, 159-179. Türkiye ve Avrupa: Soğuk Savaş Sonrası İlişkiler, İstanbul, Alfa, 2001.
- ^{xiv} “German Official sets out different approaches to EU Enlargement”, BBC Monitoring, December 3, 1999.
- ^{xv} For further information on Cyprus, see Meltem Müftüler-Bac, “The Cyprus Debacle: What the Future Holds”, Futures, vol.31, June 1999, 559-575.
- ^{xvi} Ziya Onis, “Greek-Turkish Relations and the European Union: A Critical Perspective”, Mediterranean Politics, vol.6, no.3, Autumn 2001, pp.31-45.
- ^{xvii} Briefing, April 9, 2001, Issue 1337, pp.10-12.
- ^{xviii} Presidency Conclusions, Helsinki European Council, December 10-11, 1999.
- ^{xix} Louis Meixler, “Some Turks Question EU Membership”, Associated Press, December 10, 1999.

xx.Cyprus News, Cyprus High Commission, London, November 1996, no.87.

^{xxi} Douglas Frantz, “Some in Turkey see minefield along road to European Union”, New York Times, December 1, 2000, p.A13.

^{xxii} For more information on the Greek and Turkish positions on a possible settlement, please see Clement H.Dodd, The Cyprus Imbroglia, (Hemingford Grey, UK:Eothen Press, 1998); Van Coufoudakis, "Domestic Politics and the Search for a solution of the Cyprus Problem", in Norma Salem (ed.) Cyprus: A regional Conflict and its Resolution, London: Macmillan, 1992; Oliver Richmond, “Ethno-Nationalism, Sovereignty and Negotiating Positions in the Cyprus Conflict: Obstacles to Settlement”, Middle Eastern Studies, vol.35, nol.3, July 1999, pp.42-63.

xxiii.Turkish Daily Newspaper Yeni Yüzyıl, 1.9.1998.

^{xxiv} Regular Report on Turkey’s Accession, 2001, p.30.

^{xxv} “Papandreou-Turkish side needs to display the political will for a Cyprus settlement”, M2 Communications & Presswire, Coventry, February 28, 2002, <http://www.presswire.net>.

^{xxvi} “Finland unreservedly supports Cyprus’ EU membership”, M2 Communications & Presswire, Coventry, February 25, 2002, <http://www.presswire.net>.

xxvii.Turkish Daily Newspaper, Cumhuriyet, 23.9.1998.

^{xxviii} BBC Monitoring, June 14, 2001.

^{xxix} For further information on the impact of institutional reforms on enlarging the EU, please see, Schulz H and König T., “Institutional reform and decision-making efficiency in the European Union”, American Journal of Political Science, 44 (4), 2000, pp. 653-666; Christiansen T, “Intra-institutional politics and inter-institutional relations in the EU: towards coherent governance?”, Journal of European Public Policy, 8 (5), 2001, pp. 747-769; Raunio T, Wiberg M, “Winners and losers in the Council: Voting power consequences of EU enlargements”, Journal of Common Market Studies, 36 (4), 1998, pp. 549-562.

^{xxx} In 1965, French President Charles de Gaulle had serious conflict with the European Commission and its President Walter Hallstein over the Commission’s budgetary powers, as a result of which France boycotted EC meetings for a year. For further information on the empty chair crisis, please see Desmond Dinan, Ever Closer Union, London, St.Martin’s press, 1999; Anthony Teasdale, “The Life and Death of the Luxembourg Compromise”, Journal of Common Market Studies, vol.31, no.4, 1993, p.557-579.

^{xxxi} Briefing, April 9, 2001. P.15.

^{xxxii} For further information on the EU institutions and member states’ weight in these, please see, Madeleine O.Holsti’s work, “Power, Connected Coalitions, and Efficiency: Challenges to the

Council of the European Union”, International Political Science Review, vol.20, no.4, 1999, pp.371-391; and “The Balance between Small and Large: Effects of a Double Majority system on voting power in the European Union”, International Studies Quarterly, vol.39, 1995, pp.351-370.

xxxiii Marco Martiniello, (ed.) Migration, Citizenship, and Ethno-National Identities in the European Union, Aldershot: Avebury, 1995. Lauren McLaren, "Immigration and the new politics of inclusion and exclusion in the European Union," European Journal of Political Research, vol. 39, 2001, pp. 81-108.

xxxiv An analysis of Turkey’s impact is provided in Gamze Avci, Fuad Aleskerov, Z. Umut Türem, “European Union Enlargement and Power Distribution in the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament: The Case of the Turkish Application”, New Perspectives on Turkey, vol. 21, 2000, pp.103-124.

xxxv Robert Putnam, “Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games”, International Organization, vol.42, no.3, Summer 1988, pp.427-460.

xxxvi Esther Barbe, “Spanish Security Policy and the Mediterranean Question”, in Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union, Kjell Eliassen (ed.), London: Sage, 1998, p.157.

xxxvii Paul Gillespie, “Turkey’s invitation welcomes as boost”, Irish Times, December 13, 1999.

xxxviii Leyla Boulton, Financial Times, December 13, 1999.

xxxix Lauren McLaren and Meltem Müftüler-Bac, “Citizen Attitudes towards Enlarging the European Union”, unpublished manuscript, 2001; De Master, Sara and Le Roy, Michael. 2000. “Xenophobia and the European Union.” Comparative Politics 32 (July): 419-436; Ehin. Piret. 2001. “Determinants of Public Support for EU membership: Data from the Baltic countries.” European Journal of Political Research 40 (August): 31-56.

xl Toby Helm, “EU chief reprimanded for expansion gaffe”, Daily Telegraph, London, England, September 4, 2000 p12.

xli Die Presse, Vienna, BBC Monitoring , June 13, 2001, p.1.

xlii Joint press meeting of Turkey’s Foreign minister Ismail Cem and NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, Ankara March 9 2000.

xliii For more information, see Meltem Müftüler-Bac, ”Turkey’s Potential Role in the EU’s CESDP”, Security Dialogue, December 2000, vol.31, no.4, 489-502.

xliv Guenther Verheugen’s, Commissioner for enlargement, speech on October 17, 2001 in Brussels, <http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/english/e-news-19-11.html>.

^{xlv} In November 1998, Abdullah Öcalan, the leader of the Kurdish terrorist organization-PKK, was arrested in Italy. Turkey demanded his extradition and Italy refused. The crisis was diffused when Öcalan was caught in hiding in Nigeria in the Greek embassy in February 1999.

^{xlvi} Frederick Studemann, “German dual citizenship plan under fire”, The Financial Times, Jan 11, 1999 p2.

^{xlvii} Gerhard Schroder, Policy statement on the results of the European Council in Helsinki, Speech delivered German Bundestag on December 16, 1999.

^{xlviii} John Peterson and Erik Jones, “Decision-making in an enlarging European Union”, Two Tiers or Two Speeds: The European security order and the enlargement of the EU, James Sperling (ed.) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999, pp.38-42.