



**NAVAL  
POSTGRADUATE  
SCHOOL**

**MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA**

**THESIS**

**TURKEY'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE EUROPEAN UNION:  
ANALYZING POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS**

by

Abdi Pehlivan

December 2008

Thesis Co-Advisors:

David S. Yost  
Donald Abenheim

**Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

<b>REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE</b>			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)</b>	<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> December 2008	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Master's Thesis	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> Turkey's Membership in the European Union: Analyzing Potential Benefits and Drawbacks		<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Abdi Pehlivan		<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> N/A		<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.	
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Distribution Statement		<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)</b>  Relations between Turkey and European integration institutions began with Turkey's application for associate membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1959. Turkey applied for full membership in the EEC in 1987 but did not gain candidate status until 1999. Since 1999, relations between Turkey and the European Union (EU) have gained momentum, and Turkey's EU accession negotiations began in 2005. Since that time, discussions about the implications of Turkey's prospective EU membership have become more serious and extensive in both Turkey and the EU. This thesis analyzes the potential advantages and drawbacks of Turkey's EU membership for both Turkey and the EU. It considers economic, social, political, and security factors. The main conclusion of the thesis is that, taking into account all the possible effects, the possible advantages of this membership outweigh the potential drawbacks for both Turkey and the EU. Greater efforts to conclude the negotiation process with full EU membership for Turkey would therefore be highly desirable.			
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b> Turkey, European Union, European Security and Defense Policy, NATO, European Commission, European Council.		<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 91	
		<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UU

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited**

**TURKEY'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE EUROPEAN UNION:  
ANALYZING POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS**

Abdi Pehlivan  
First Lieutenant, Turkish Air Force  
B.S., Turkish Air Force Academy, 2003

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES  
(EUROPE AND EURASIA)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
December 2008**

Author: Abdi Pehlivan

Approved by: David S. Yost  
Thesis Co-Advisor

Donald Abenheim  
Thesis Co-Advisor

Harold A. Trinkunas, Ph.D.  
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **ABSTRACT**

Relations between Turkey and European integration institutions began with Turkey's application for associate membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1959. Turkey applied for full membership in the EEC in 1987 but did not gain candidate status until 1999. Since 1999, relations between Turkey and the European Union (EU) have gained momentum, and Turkey's EU accession negotiations began in 2005. Since that time, discussions about the implications of Turkey's prospective EU membership have become more serious and extensive in both Turkey and the EU. This thesis analyzes the potential advantages and drawbacks of Turkey's EU membership for both Turkey and the EU. It considers economic, social, political, and security factors. The main conclusion of the thesis is that, taking into account all the possible effects, the possible advantages of this membership outweigh the potential drawbacks for both Turkey and the EU. Greater efforts to conclude the negotiation process with full EU membership for Turkey would therefore be highly desirable.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESIS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>METHODS AND SOURCES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>F.</b>	<b>THESIS OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF EU-TURKEY RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>RELATIONS BETWEEN 1959 AND 1989 .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>RELATIONS BETWEEN 1990 AND 1997 .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>RELATIONS BETWEEN 1998 AND 2008 .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF TURKEY’S MEMBERSHIP FOR THE EU.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE IMPACTS OF TURKEY’S MEMBERSHIP ON EU’S COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Foreign Policy Dimension: Turkey and Its Neighborhood .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Security Dimension .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF TURKEY’S MEMBERSHIP IN THE EU .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>The Macro-Economic Impacts of Turkey’s Membership.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>The Budgetary Impacts of Turkey’s Membership .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>The Possible Consequences of Migration from Turkey into Other EU Member Countries after Accession to Membership .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE IMPACTS OF TURKEY’S MEMBERSHIP ON EU INSTITUTIONS.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP ON TURKEY’S FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY INTERESTS .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Foreign Policy Dimension.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Security Affairs Dimension .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE POLITICAL IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>THE POSSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY .....</b>	<b>58</b>

1.	The Effects of the Customs Union .....	59
2.	The EU's Financial Assistance to Turkey.....	61
3.	Macro Economic Effects of EU Membership.....	64
E.	CONCLUSION .....	65
V.	CONCLUSION .....	67
	LIST OF REFERENCES .....	73
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST .....	77

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Annual Real GDP Growth Rate (%) of Turkey and EU (27) .....	34
Figure 2.	Basic Economic Indicators for Turkey and the EU (27) .....	35
Figure 3.	Maximum budgetary cost of Turkey's membership .....	38
Figure 4.	Distribution of the population as percentage in EU25 per age group .....	41
Figure 5.	Distribution of the population as percentage in Turkey per age group .....	41
Figure 6.	The EU in the Global Economy .....	49
Figure 7.	The Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 1993 and 1995.....	61
Figure 8.	The Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 1996 and 1999.....	62
Figure 9.	The Projected Amounts of Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 2007 and 2009 in million € .....	63

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to thank the Turkish Air Force and the Republic of Turkey for providing me the opportunity to pursue advanced education at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School.

I would like to thank Professor David S. Yost for his invaluable guidance during the writing of this thesis. This study could never have been completed without his precious contributions and reviews. I would also like to thank Professor Donald Abenheim for his kind understanding and comments.

Finally, my special thanks go to my family for their outstanding support during my education at the Naval Postgraduate School, as in every stage of my life.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# I. INTRODUCTION

## A. MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTION

The European Union (EU) is an extraordinary success and the consequence of a “process of voluntary economic and political integration between the nation-states of Europe.” This integration began with the establishment of a coal and steel community, and it has led to an economic, social, and political union.<sup>1</sup> Considering the historical evolution of the union, it can be clearly seen that besides transformation in the purpose of the integration movement, the number of states participating in this movement has increased from six in 1951 to twenty seven in 2007.

The six rounds of enlargement in the European Union’s history, and its current twenty seven members give important details about how enlargement has been – and remains – a significant major policy tool for the EU. The importance of the enlargement process can also be understood from EU officials’ comments and the documents prepared by EU institutions. In the report of the European Commission entitled *Europe in the World – Some Practical Proposals for Greater Coherence, Effectiveness and Visibility*, enlargement is cited among the EU’s important external policy assets which provide the EU substantial international influence.<sup>2</sup>

When the enlargement process of the EU is considered, Turkey and the future of EU-Turkey relations are often discussed. As Heinz Kramer, head of the “EU External Affairs” research unit at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik in Berlin, has observed, “Turkey and the EU share a decades-old common history of the contractual-based relations since the late 1950s which finally led to the start of accession negotiations at the beginning of October 2005.”<sup>3</sup> Turkey’s relations with European integration institutions

---

<sup>1</sup> Simon Hix, *The Political System of the European Union* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 1.

<sup>2</sup> European Commission, “Europe in the World – Some Practical Proposals for Greater Coherence, Effectiveness and Visibility,” June 8, 2006, 3, [www.unizar.es/euroconstitucion/library/documents/Com%202006\\_278.pdf](http://www.unizar.es/euroconstitucion/library/documents/Com%202006_278.pdf) (accessed February 26, 2008).

<sup>3</sup> Heinz Kramer, “Turkey and the EU: The EU’s Perspective,” *Insight Turkey* 8, no.4 (2006): 24, [www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get\\_document.php?asset\\_id=3789](http://www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get_document.php?asset_id=3789) (accessed February 26, 2008).

started with the Ankara Agreement signed in September 1963. Since that time, there have been ups and downs in the relationship. Since the start of Turkey's EU accession negotiations at the beginning of October 2005, relations have gained a new momentum and ambiguity has begun to disappear.

This study analyzes the basic underlying dynamics concerning Turkey's eventual EU membership for both the EU and Turkey and investigates answers to the following two key research questions:

How would Turkey's prospective membership in the EU affect both Turkey and the EU?

What are the mutual advantages that would make Turkey's EU membership beneficial to both sides? What are the potential disadvantages to Turkey's EU membership that have raised concerns in Turkey and the EU?

## **B. IMPORTANCE**

"The EU today is one of the most unusual and widest-ranging political actors in the international system." Its efforts to pursue policies towards almost every corner of the world have increased since the 1950s. Today, with its important foreign policy tools and diplomatic, economic, and military operations for peace keeping and peace enforcement, the EU is playing important roles in the international arena and gaining stature as a global actor.<sup>4</sup>

The establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in the 1993 Treaty on European Union signed at Maastricht<sup>5</sup> was a major turning point for the EU in terms of its role in the international arena. Before the establishment of the CFSP, the foreign policy of the European Community (EC) was managed by the European Political Cooperation (EPC) mechanism established in 1970. Because the EPC's organs

---

<sup>4</sup> Roy H. Ginsberg and Michael E. Smith, "Understanding the European Union As a Global Political Actor: Theory, Practice, And Impact," *Princeton University*, September 6, 2005, 1, [www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/GinsbergSmith%20Memo.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/GinsbergSmith%20Memo.pdf) (accessed February 26, 2008).

<sup>5</sup> European Commission, "Common Foreign and Security Policy," [http://ec.europa.eu/external\\_relations/cfsp/intro/index.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/cfsp/intro/index.htm) (accessed February 26, 2008).



were weak and separate from those of the EC and because some countries were concerned about not losing sovereignty in foreign and security policy, the EC could not implement effective and well-coordinated policies in the international arena, even in the nearby Yugoslavia crisis.<sup>6</sup> Since the establishment of the CFSP, many changes have appeared in the EU's foreign policy. Roy Ginsberg and Michael Smith have highlighted the EU's increasing role in the world since the 1990s by drawing attention to a shift in the EU's terminology. The tendency to refer to "foreign policy" cooperation instead of "external relations" means (to some observers at least) that the EU has been more involved in global issues thanks to institutional growth.<sup>7</sup>

Enlargement holds an important place in the increasing role of the EU in the international arena. When the CFSP was established, the EU had twelve members. Today the EU has twenty seven members, and it is not only an economic power but also an important political actor, dealing with developments throughout the world and conducting military operations far from its territory. The efforts to take new initiatives and its responses to developments in the international arena show the EU's will to be a global actor. In this regard, the prospect of Turkey's membership in the EU gains importance. As Mehmet Ögütçü, a former Turkish diplomat, has noted, this membership will make important changes in "the future outlook of both Turkey and the EU. Turkish accession will affect the geopolitical and economic balance of power in the region, [and the] EU's demographic, security, foreign policy, financial and institutional capacities."<sup>8</sup>

In view of its geostrategic position at the intersection of three key regions (Europe, the Middle East, and the Caucasus), young dynamic population, substantial military capacity, and growing market, Turkey is an important country for the EU and its

---

<sup>6</sup> Rafael Biermann, "Back to the Roots: The European Community and the Dissolution of Yugoslavia-Policies under the Impact of Global Sea-Change," *Journal for European Integration History* 10, no.1 (2004): 36.

<sup>7</sup> Ginsberg and Smith, "Understanding the European Union As a Global Political Actor: Theory, Practice, And Impact," 1.

<sup>8</sup> Mehmet Ögütçü, "Turkey and the European Union, How to Achieve a Forward-Looking and Win-Win Accession by 2015", *Civitas International*, March 2005, 3, <http://www.civitas.org/pdf/turkey.pdf> (accessed February 26, 2008).

future global plans. Considering its relationship with European integration institutions since 1963, as well as its efforts in the reform process intended to gain EU candidacy status, the EU is also important for Turkey.

Turkey's EU membership prospects thus constitute a popular topic of discussion and analysis. As noted above, the future of the relationship, including in particular the outcome of Turkey's membership negotiations, is significant for both sides. The history of the relationship indicates that the two sides can not do well without each other. The EU can not become a more powerful actor in the international arena without Turkey's membership, while Turkey can not disregard the reality of how important membership is for its own goals.

### **C. PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESIS**

This thesis investigates the hypothesis that the advantages of Turkish membership in the European Union (EU) would outweigh the potential disadvantages for both Turkey and the EU.

This study analyzes Turkey's prospective membership in the EU, including the potential advantages and drawbacks of the membership for both sides. Both sets of factors must be considered in making a balanced comparison and in reaching informed judgments about the implications of membership.

Analyzing the potential drawbacks discussed by each side's skeptics about Turkey's membership is relevant because many of these purported drawbacks are in fact normal costs associated with any new membership and consistent with what the EU has experienced in previous rounds of enlargement. In addition, Turkey will go through experiences similar to those of other new members on the eve of joining the EU. Some of these potential drawbacks emanate from concerns about issues such as Turkey's large population and agricultural capacity and cultural differences. These issues are, however, not unmanageable and must be assessed in a long term perspective.

## D. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are different schools of thought about Turkey's prospective membership in the EU. Because Turkey's membership in the EU would have important effects on both the EU and Turkey, studies in the literature have examined the implications from various perspectives.

From the EU's perspective, there are two main schools of thought about the probable effects of this membership on the EU. According to the first school of thought, Turkey's prospective membership will contribute positively to the EU in several ways, including security matters. According to Meltem Müftüler Baç, a professor at Sabancı University in Istanbul, in the new international system, the EU is arising as an international actor with new roles. The EU has to enhance its capabilities for coping with new security threats and performing new roles. From Baç's point of view, "Turkey's possible accession to the EU becomes crucial in affecting the future of the EU's security role," and "Turkey's impact on European security is one of the main benefits for the EU of Turkey's membership."<sup>9</sup>

For example, the membership of Turkey would be an important factor in advancing the EU's Barcelona Process and Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Dialogue. Moreover, the EU's foreign policy would be supported by Turkey's contributions to the EU's Neighborhood Policy. "Turkey could play a buffer role between Europe and the Middle Eastern countries."<sup>10</sup> In addition, Turkey with its military bases and substantial military capacity would make valuable contributions to the EU's operational potential and help to close the EU's military gaps.<sup>11</sup> Energy security is another factor which would make Turkey's membership beneficial for the EU. According to Katinka Barysch, the deputy director of the Centre for European Reform in London, Turkey as a "European energy hub" is "one of the world's biggest energy markets in the west." Considering the

---

<sup>9</sup> Meltem Müftüler Baç, "Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy," in *Turkey and European Security*, IAI-TESEV Report, July 3, 2006, 14-15, [http://www.iai.it/pdf/Quaderni/Quaderni\\_E\\_08.pdf](http://www.iai.it/pdf/Quaderni/Quaderni_E_08.pdf) (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 23-24.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 25-27.

fact that the EU is currently worried about its dependence on Russian gas and trying to find alternative energy resources and transit corridors, Turkey's membership in the EU would contribute to fulfilling the EU's energy security goals.<sup>12</sup>

The report prepared by the Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation entitled *The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU* examines the probable effects of membership in a broader context. The report emphasizes that, in addition to military force contributions, "Turkey's membership would enable the EU to play a more powerful and effective role in world politics." Turkey as a NATO member and strategic partner of the United States, with close relationships with the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Islamic world, would facilitate the pursuit of the EU's goals as a global power.<sup>13</sup>

In their paper entitled *Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy*, Michael Emerson, a Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies, and Nathalie Tocci, a Jean Monnet Fellow at the European University Institute, emphasize that Turkey is geographically surrounded by different regions and countries which are important for the EU's primary security concerns. Turkey's "geographical advantages," "military capabilities," and "civilian human resources" would make it a "bridgehead" between the EU and Turkey's Eurasian and Middle Eastern neighborhood. Turkey would also serve as a "spearhead" of EU power in the region. In this context, Turkey is an important country for the EU in terms of its foreign and security policies.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, Seda Domaniç examines the Turkish accession

---

<sup>12</sup> Katinka Barysch, "Turkey's Role in European Energy Security," *Centre For European Reform*, December 2007, 1, [www.cer.org.uk/pdf/essay\\_turkey\\_energy\\_12dec07.pdf](http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/essay_turkey_energy_12dec07.pdf) (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>13</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, "The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU," December 2004, 15, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/ab/uyelik/etki/olasi-i.pdf> (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>14</sup> Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," *Centre for European Policy Studies*, no. 1 (2004): 33-34, [http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item\\_id=1143](http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1143) (accessed March 14, 2008).

to the EU in light of the EU's security concerns such as "terrorism," "illegal trafficking of arms and people" and points out Turkey's support the EU's stabilization efforts.<sup>15</sup>

Four main factors – the population, the geography and security, the modernizing economy, and religious issues – are listed as important potential benefits of Turkish accession to the EU by Stergos Kaloudis, a doctoral candidate at the Catholic University of America, in his article "Why Europe Cannot Ignore Turkey."<sup>16</sup> Considering the facts that 12.5 million Muslims live in the EU and that two potential future members (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Albania) have Muslim populations, denial of Turkish membership based on religion is not reasonable. Islam must be taken into account as an advantage of Turkey's prospective membership in the EU in terms of bringing diversity to the union.<sup>17</sup> The membership of Turkey would help to refute Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" argument by showing that Western values and Islam are compatible.<sup>18</sup>

Economic factors must also be considered in an analysis of the benefits of Turkey's prospective membership in the EU. According to Domaniç, at the beginning of the millennium, the EU aimed to become the world's most dynamic economy. Recent GDP growth rates show that the EU is far from reaching that goal. In contrast with the EU, Turkey has been showing high economic growth since 2001. In addition, Turkey has become a reliable investment environment, a fact which is apparent from the high level of foreign direct investment. In this context, Turkey's membership in the EU would bring dynamism to the EU economy.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, the EU's population is getting older, and this

---

<sup>15</sup> Seda Domaniç, "The Turkish Accession to the European Union: Mutually Beneficial? Mutually Possible?," *Europeum Institute for European Policy*, January 12, 2007, 5, [http://www.europeum.org/disp\\_article.php?aid=863&cid=3&nolang=0&page=1&type=0&lang=en](http://www.europeum.org/disp_article.php?aid=863&cid=3&nolang=0&page=1&type=0&lang=en) (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>16</sup> Stergos Kaloudis, "Why Europe Cannot Ignore Turkey," *International Journal on World Peace* 24, no. 2 (2007): 48.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>18</sup> Baç, "Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy," 22-23.

<sup>19</sup> Domaniç, "The Turkish Accession to the European Union: Mutually Beneficial? Mutually Possible?" 3.

situation will create problems in terms of the need for an active working population. At this juncture, Turkey's young, educated population could be the remedy to the EU's problem.<sup>20</sup>

As noted above, from the EU's perspective there is also another school of thought concerning the probable effects of Turkey's membership in the EU. According to this school of thought, Turkey's prospective membership will contribute negatively to the EU. The first reason advanced by skeptics for this negative effect is Turkey's growing population. It is estimated that Turkey's population will exceed Germany's population by 2020. That means that, if Turkey became a member of the EU, it would have a great influence in the EU decision making process. In addition, a number of people in the EU consider that the prospective membership of Turkey would mean "massive immigration flows from Turkey and cheap imports at the cost of workers and producers in the EU."<sup>21</sup> Moreover, critics argue, Turkish membership would mean the flow of substantial amounts of funds from the EU budget to Turkey.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, in the study entitled "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU" prepared by Wolfgang Quaisser, a Research Fellow at Osteuropa Institut in Munich, and Steve Wood, a Research Fellow at the National Europe Centre of the Australian National University in Canberra, have stated that the EU core countries may suffer "adaptation costs" because of the large economic disparities between them and Turkey.<sup>23</sup>

One of the other arguments about possible disadvantages in Turkey's membership in the EU is related to Turkey's geographical location. With Turkey's membership, the EU would have borders with nations like Iraq and Syria, which could mean risky security

---

<sup>20</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, "The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU," 40.

<sup>21</sup> A.M. Lejour, R.A. de Mooji and C.H. Capel, "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU," *CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis*, no. 56 (March 2004), 13-14, <http://www.cpb.nl/eng/pub/cpbreeksen/document/56/doc56.pdf> (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>23</sup> Wolfgang Quaisser and Steve Wood, "EU Member Turkey? Preconditions, Consequences and Integration Alternatives," *Research Group Eastern Europe (FOROST)*, October 2004, 12, [http://www.forost.lmu.de/fo\\_library/forost\\_Arbeitspapier\\_25.pdf](http://www.forost.lmu.de/fo_library/forost_Arbeitspapier_25.pdf) (accessed March 14, 2008).

conditions for the union.<sup>24</sup> Heinz Kramer points out that some opponents of Turkey's membership in the EU believe that it could affect significantly the EU's financial system considering that "huge money transfers are foreseen in terms of EU structural funds and [the] agricultural support mechanism."<sup>25</sup>

From Turkey's perspective, there are two main schools of thought about the probable effects of EU membership on Turkey. According to the first school of thought, this membership would contribute positively to Turkey. Mustafa Aydın, an associate professor at Ankara University, and Sinem Akgül Açıkmeşe, a PhD candidate and research assistant at the same university, state that the endeavor to become a member of the EU has triggered economic and political reforms. Turkey has shown important signs of improvement in terms of the reform process. "By the time of accession, as a country committed to fulfill all the Copenhagen criteria and implement the Acquis Communautaire effectively, Turkey will have modernized, stabilized and restructured its political, economic and legal systems."<sup>26</sup> Likewise, in discussing Turkey's reform process, Quaisser and Wood hold that "A perspective of EU membership certainly supports the internal reform process."<sup>27</sup>

The study entitled "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU" prepared by A.M. Lejour and R.A. de Mooji, researchers in Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB) in the Hague, and C.H. Capel, an expert on Turkey at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, assesses the potential effects of Turkey's membership from the economic point of view. According to this study, membership in the EU would enable Turkey to gain access to the EU's internal market. Private income would increase. Sectors such as "textiles" and "wearing apparel" would benefit the most

---

<sup>24</sup> Spiegel Online International, "Turkey and the EU, The Pros and Cons", *Spiegel Online*, December 16, 2004, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,333126,00.html> (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>25</sup> Kramer, "Turkey and the EU: The EU's Perspective," 30.

<sup>26</sup> Mustafa Aydın and Sinem Akgül Açıkmeşe, "To Be or Not to Be with Turkey; December 2004 Blues for the EU," *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, (Fall 2004): 9, [http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=88&Itemid=201](http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=88&Itemid=201) (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>27</sup> Quaisser and Wood, "EU Member Turkey? Preconditions, Consequences and Integration Alternatives," 12.

sectors from accession. Moreover, as noted above, the impact of reforms on national economic institutions would also be significant.<sup>28</sup> The development of the economy in the wake of membership would promote a higher standard of living for Turkish society.<sup>29</sup>

However, there is also another school of thought concerning the probable effects of Turkey's membership in the EU. According to this school of thought, this membership would have negative effects on Turkey. In addition to "Turko-skeptics" in Europe, there are also "Euro-skeptics" in Turkey. According to Euro-skeptics in Turkey, "the membership will certainly do away with Turkish identity and sovereignty."<sup>30</sup> Özge Ağar and Orçun Doğan mention similar expressions of this skepticism and add that, "With the concept of Westernization, some main elements of Turkish culture would be abolished" and "the sovereignty of the Republic of Turkey would be constrained by EU rules and regulations."<sup>31</sup>

Additionally, Özer Ertuna, who is a professor at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul, has mentioned the remarks of Kenichi Ohmae, who is regarded as one of the world's leading strategists, dealing with prospect of the EU membership. According to Ohmae, the EU membership would restrain the fulfillment of Turkey's potential and constricts its entrepreneurial spirit. It would prevent Turkey from establishing positive relations with other regions of the world.<sup>32</sup>

## **E. METHODS AND SOURCES**

This study analyzes the implications of Turkey's prospective EU membership in terms of both the EU and Turkey. It includes a review of the history of Turkey's relations with European integration institutions. The basic turning points in the relationship which

---

<sup>28</sup> Lejour, Mooji and Capel, "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU," 49.

<sup>29</sup> Özge Ağar and Orçun Doğan, "AB-Türkiye Bitmeyen Vals," *Middle East Technical University Management Club*, (Fall 2005): 3, <http://www.ba.metu.edu.tr/~manclub/yayinlar/glokal/dosya/vals.html> (accessed March 14, 2008).

<sup>30</sup> Aydın and Açıkmeşe, "To Be or Not to Be with Turkey; December 2004 Blues for the EU," 2.

<sup>31</sup> Ağar and Doğan, "AB-Türkiye Bitmeyen Vals," 3.

<sup>32</sup> Özer Ertuna, "Türkiye'nin AB Üyeliği: AB ve Türkiye İçin Bu Bir Fırsat mı, Tehlike mi?," *Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, no.26 (April 2005): 19.



are important in terms of understanding today's situation are taken into account. The potential effects of Turkey's membership on the EU are then examined through the analysis of potential advantages and drawbacks. The potential effects on Turkey are addressed in the same manner. The thesis concludes with an assessment of these potential outcomes.

This study relies upon data obtained through secondary sources such as books, articles, and reports. In addition, as primary sources the parts dealing with Turkey's prospective membership in EU Summit Declarations and EU Commission Reports are also taken into consideration.

## **F. THESIS OVERVIEW**

This study consists of five chapters. The first chapter, as an introduction, discusses the purpose of the thesis as well as the importance of the thesis topic, and it also offers a literature review. The second chapter presents a review of Turkey-EU relations in their historical context. The third and fourth chapters examine the potential advantages and disadvantages of Turkey's EU membership, in terms of the EU and Turkey respectively. The fifth chapter offers conclusions.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **II. ANALYSIS OF EU-TURKEY RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Turkey is a part of Europe...one day the final step is to be taken: Turkey is to be full member of the Community. This wish, and the fact that it is shared by us and our Turkish friends alike, is the strongest expression of our community of interest.<sup>33</sup>

In 1963, Walter Hallstein, the first President of the European Commission, made the above statement during the signing ceremony of the Ankara Agreement. The Ankara Agreement has been one of the cornerstones of Turkey's relations with European integration institutions. There have been many significant developments between Turkey and European integration institutions since the conclusion of the Ankara Agreement. Turkey and its European counterparts have enhanced their economic relations. Turkey applied for full membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1987, and the candidate status of Turkey was recognized by the EU in 1999. Turkey's accession negotiations began in 2005. However, the wish expressed by the President of the European Commission has not yet come true. Today, the accession negotiations continue; and the open ended nature of this process is such that there are no exact answers as to when it will end, and as to whether Turkey will ultimately become an EU member.

This chapter reviews the main developments in Turkey's relations with European integration institutions since 1959. These relations, beginning with Turkey's application for associate membership in the EEC, are examined within the periods determined by the main turning points.

### **A. RELATIONS BETWEEN 1959 AND 1989**

The first step in the relationship consisted of Turkey's application for associate membership in the EEC on 31 July 1959. Its application was accepted by the EEC Council of Ministers on 11 September in the same year. On 12 September 1963, the

---

<sup>33</sup> Walter Hallstein quoted in Christopher Brewin, "Association Status and the Path to Membership," in *Turkey and the European Union: 2004 and Beyond*, ed. Armand Clesse and Seyfi Taşhan, (Amsterdam: Dutch University Press, 2004), 157.

Ankara Agreement was signed between Turkey and the EEC. The Ankara Agreement entered into force on 1 December 1964. The main aim of this agreement was, as stated in Article 2:

to promote the continuous and balanced strengthening of trade and economic relations between the Parties, while taking full account of the need to ensure an accelerated development of the Turkish economy and to improve the level of employment and living conditions of the Turkish people.<sup>34</sup>

The Ankara Agreement established an association between Turkey and the EEC; the ultimate goal of this association is the full membership of Turkey in the Community.

The Ankara Agreement foresaw the deepening of this association in a three-stage process.<sup>35</sup> According to Ziya Öniş, a professor at Koç University in Istanbul, the main thought rested on pursuing this process in three periods and thus alleviating the possible negative effects for Turkey. The early engagement in the competition in the European market could harm the industrial development of Turkey.<sup>36</sup> The initial preparatory stage aimed to strengthen the Turkish economy and assist Turkey in the fulfillment of the obligations. The transitional stage aimed to “establish progressively a customs union between Turkey and the Community,” and “align the economic policies of Turkey and the Community more closely.” The final stage aimed to further the coordination between the two parties on economic policies. Article 28 of the agreement articulated the goal of full membership:

As soon as the operation of this Agreement has advanced far enough to justify envisaging full acceptance by Turkey of the obligations arising out of the Treaty establishing the Community, the Contracting Parties shall examine the possibility of the accession of Turkey to the Community.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Ankara Agreement,” <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?6ff60bd9-ffd0-4ac2-a177-f7438895084f> (accessed November 14, 2008).

<sup>35</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, “The Likely Effects of Turkey’s Membership Upon the EU,” December 2004, 5.

<sup>36</sup> Ziya Öniş, “Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards and Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations,” *Government and Opposition* 35, no.4 (2000): 467.

<sup>37</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Ankara Agreement.”

After the agreement was signed, in the period between 1963 and 1970, trade relations between Turkey and the EEC began to improve, but it did not reach the expected level. After the completion of the preparatory stage, the transitional stage started. During this period, economic relations were conducted according to the Additional Protocol, as well as the Ankara Agreement. The Additional Protocol, which was signed on 23 November 1970, entered into force at the beginning of 1973. The Additional Protocol set out the basic issues regarding the formation of the Customs Union covering industrial products. Within the framework of this protocol, the European Community (EC) “abolished customs duties on imports of industrial products” from Turkey beginning in 1972. Unlike the EC, Turkey would not abolish customs duties all at once. It started to “reduce gradually customs duties on imports of industrial products from the EC” beginning in 1973. These developments precipitated an increase in trade and contributed positively to economic relations.<sup>38</sup>

The 1980s were important in the development of economic and political relations. Turkey made several economic policy reforms designed to create the necessary conditions for a strong open market economy. Additionally, multiparty elections were held in 1983 after the 1980 military coup in the country. These measures contributed to the normalization of relations between Turkey and the EEC, which had reached a freezing point at the beginning of the 1980s.

The year 1987 was one of the most important years in the history of relations between Turkey and European integration institutions. On 14 April 1987, Turkey applied for full membership on the grounds of Article 237 of the Treaty establishing the EEC, which indicates that any European country may apply for membership in the European Community. The European Council sent Turkey’s application to the European Commission to get its opinion. The opinion prepared by the European Commission was ratified by the European Council on 5 February 1990. “It basically underlined Turkey’s eligibility for the membership, yet deferred the in-depth analysis of Turkey’s application until the emergence of more favorable environment” both in Turkey and in the EC

---

<sup>38</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, “The Likely Effects of Turkey’s Membership Upon the EU,” 5.

itself.<sup>39</sup> It also emphasized the importance of the completion of the Customs Union by 1995, as had been planned, and the establishment of political and cultural dialogue between the European Community and Turkey.<sup>40</sup>

## **B. RELATIONS BETWEEN 1990 AND 1997**

After the European Council endorsed the European Commission's opinion regarding Turkey's membership application, it can be argued that a new era started in relations. Turkey's application brought dynamism to the relations. Each side's efforts to improve relations increased. The political and technical chairs of the Association took a number of measures serving to complete the Customs Union.<sup>41</sup> In this period two important developments affected the course of relations. One of them was the completion of the Customs Union foreseen since the signing of the Ankara Agreement.

With the decision made on 6 March 1995 by the Association Council, which is the "highest ranking organ of the association," the Customs Union between Turkey and the EU, which covers industrial goods and processed agricultural products, was completed by 31 December 1995.<sup>42</sup> This means that these goods freely circulate between Turkey and the EU market without being subjected to customs duties. Additionally, "The Customs Union envisages the harmonization of Turkey's commercial and competition policies including intellectual property laws with those of the European Union."<sup>43</sup> In all these respects, the Customs Union has increased trade and furthered the economic integration of Turkey into the EU.

---

<sup>39</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Secretariat General for EU Affairs, "History of Turkey-EU Relations," <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=2> (accessed November 14, 2008).

<sup>40</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community, December 20, 1989," <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?6ff60bd9-ffd0-4ac2-a177-f7438895084f> (accessed November 14, 2008).

<sup>41</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Secretariat General for EU Affairs, "History of Turkey-EU Relations."

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "The Customs Union Between Turkey and the European Union," <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?6ff60bd9-ffd0-4ac2-a177-f7438895084f> (accessed November 26, 2008).

The Luxembourg Summit in December 1997 was another important development affecting the course of relations. After the completion of the Customs Union, Turkey focused its attention on the EU enlargement process. Turkey's aim was full membership, and Ankara wanted to be in this "new European architecture." Before the Luxembourg Summit, the European Commission prepared a report entitled "Agenda 2000." In this report, the European Commission "excluded Turkey from the enlargement process."<sup>44</sup> The Luxembourg Summit Decisions were significant in terms of Turkey-EU relations. At this summit, while countries that had fallen behind Turkey in meeting the EU's economic and political criteria for membership were given candidate status, Turkey was not granted this status. This situation created great disappointment in Turkey. It also strengthened the anti-EU membership tendency in public opinion that started to grow after the rejection of Turkey's membership application in 1987.<sup>45</sup>

### **C. RELATIONS BETWEEN 1998 AND 2008**

The European Council at subsequent summits – the Cardiff Summit (June 1998), the Vienna Summit (December 1998), and the Cologne Summit (June 1999) – did not propose constructive solutions to rectify the stalemate between Turkey and the EU. Turkish government officials continued to judge that the EU was not treating Turkey in the same fashion as other candidates for membership.<sup>46</sup>

The Helsinki Summit, which was held on 10-11 December 1999, was one of the most significant in view of the EU's decision to give Turkey candidate status. It was the initiation of a new era in the relations lasting since 1959. In the Presidency Conclusions of the summit, it was stated that "Turkey is a candidate State destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States."<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Secretariat General for EU Affairs, "History of Turkey-EU Relations."

<sup>45</sup> Atilla Eralp, "Turkey and the Enlargement Process of the EU," in *Turkey and the European Union: 2004 and Beyond*, ed. Armand Clesse and Seyfi Taşhan, (Amsterdam: Dutch University Press, 2004), 184-185.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>47</sup> European Parliament, "Helsinki European Council 10 and 11 December 1999-Presidency Conclusions," [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/hell\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/hell_en.htm) (accessed November 26, 2008).

Since the Helsinki Summit, Turkish-EU relations have gained momentum. As envisaged in the Presidency Conclusions, the EU Commission began to prepare “an Accession Partnership Document for Turkey,” the first version of which was ratified by the EU Council on 8 March 2001. The National Program, prepared by considering the issues mentioned in the Accession Partnership Document, was submitted to the EU Commission by the Turkish Government on 26 March 2001.<sup>48</sup> Since gaining candidate status, Turkey has undergone an intensive reform process.

At the Copenhagen Summit held on 12-13 December 2002, “it was decided to start accession negotiations with Turkey without delay in December 2004, on the condition that Turkey fulfills the Copenhagen political criteria.”<sup>49</sup> At the Brussels Summit on 16-17 December 2004, the issue of Turkey’s starting the accession negotiations became clearer. The European Council made an important decision regarding Turkey’s EU membership prospective. The Council “decided to open accession negotiations on 3 October 2005.” Within this framework, the EU Commission prepared “the Negotiation Framework Document.” Additionally, the Additional Protocol, which extends the Ankara Agreement to the latest entrants to the EU, “was concluded by the exchange of letters among Turkey, the Commission and the Council,” on 29 July 2005.<sup>50</sup> In this regard, Turkey issued a declaration which underlines the fact that extending the Ankara Agreement to the new members does not mean that Turkey recognizes the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus. At this point it should be noted that, although EU membership of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus is inconsistent with the provisions of the 1959-1960 Treaties on Cyprus since “both Turkey and Greece are not members”<sup>51</sup> and is also inconsistent with the EU’s “own criteria, which requires that a country should settle its border disputes before it can join the

---

<sup>48</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Secretariat General for EU Affairs, “History of Turkey-EU Relations.”

<sup>49</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Relations Between Turkey and the European Union.”

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Cyprus Issue,” [http://www.mfa.gov.tr/cyprus-issue-summary\\_en.mfa](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/cyprus-issue-summary_en.mfa) (accessed November 26, 2008).



EU,”<sup>52</sup> the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus became a member of the EU in 2004. After Turkey’s declaration, the EU made a counter declaration regarding this issue.<sup>53</sup> However, this situation did not block the initiation of the accession negotiations. The accession negotiations opened as planned on 3 October 2005. Today, the accession negotiations, which are being conducted over 35 chapters, are still continuing, and they constitute the center of gravity of Turkish-EU relations. Although three years have passed since the beginning of the accession negotiations, little has been accomplished.

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

There are important milestones in the long history of relations between Turkey and the EU. Though sometimes these relations came to the verge of a freezing point, they returned to the road of recovery in a short period of time.

To analyze the general characteristics of the relations over the years, it can be concluded that Turkey-EU relations have not been fortunately conducted. Even though relations have continued since 1959, Turkey was not given candidate status until 1999. Relations have gained momentum since 1999. Important steps have been taken, and Turkey started accession negotiations with the EU in 2005. The open-ended nature of the accession negotiations makes it hard to forecast their outcome. Yet, the slow progress of the negotiations suggests that there is still much to accomplish on the way to full membership.

---

<sup>52</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, “The Likely Effects of Turkey’s Membership Upon the EU,” 17.

<sup>53</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Relations Between Turkey and the European Union.”

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

### **III. THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF TURKEY'S MEMBERSHIP FOR THE EU**

“Enlargement is one of the EU’s most powerful policy tools. It serves the EU’s strategic interests in stability, security, and conflict prevention. It has helped to increase prosperity and growth opportunities and to secure vital transport and energy routes.”<sup>54</sup> This opening statement of the EU Commission report entitled “Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2007-2008” makes clear the importance of enlargement for the EU. Indeed, this can be clearly understood when the EU’s enlargement process is scrutinized. Since its establishment, the EU has experienced six enlargement waves. As a result of these enlargement waves, the number of states participating in this integration process has increased from 6 to 27.

The European Commission has described the current situation of the EU with the following statement: “Today’s EU, with 27 Member States and a population of close to 500 million people, is much safer, more prosperous, stronger and more influential than the original European Economic Community of 50 years ago, with its 6 members and population of less than 200 million.”<sup>55</sup> The current EU enlargement agenda, which includes the Western Balkans and Turkey, shows the EU’s intention to be stronger and to have a substantial influence in the international arena.

Turkey, a country that has had relations with EU integration institutions since the 1960s and that started accession negotiations in 2005, holds an important place in this agenda. Besides its long-standing relations with the EU, the view that Turkey’s accession would be different from previous enlargement rounds increases the importance of Turkey’s place in the agenda and makes its accession to the EU more controversial than some others have been.

---

<sup>54</sup> European Commission, “Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2007-2008,” 6.11.2007, 1, [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2007/nov/strategy\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2007/nov/strategy_paper_en.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>55</sup> European Commission, “Enlargement-The Policy,” [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/the-policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/the-policy/index_en.htm) (accessed September 6, 2008).

The EU Commission report entitled “Issues Arising from Turkey’s Membership Perspective” defines the factors that would make this accession different from the previous enlargements as a “combined impact of Turkey’s population, size, geographical location, economic, security and military potential, as well as cultural and religious characteristics.”<sup>56</sup> Turkey, with its population of nearly seventy million; 775,000 km<sup>2</sup> total area; geographical borders with the EU, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Iraq, and Syria (which not only geographically, but also economically and culturally bridge between the East and West); developing economy; one of the largest military powers of both the region and NATO; and its large Muslim population, is the country whose accession to EU membership has been perhaps the most widely discussed over the years. One of the aspects of these discussions is the impact that Turkey’s membership could have on the EU. This brings up the questions, “How would this prospective membership affect the EU, and what are the potential advantages and disadvantages of this membership for the EU?”

The potential advantages of Turkish membership outweigh the potential disadvantages for the EU. This chapter examines the implications of Turkey’s prospective membership with regard to the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the EU’s economic performance, and EU institutions.

#### **A. THE POSSIBLE IMPACTS OF TURKEY’S MEMBERSHIP ON EU’S COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY**

Since its establishment, the EU has increased its power in the international arena both economically and politically. Its willingness to enter into new policy areas and play more important diplomatic, economic, and military roles in the international arena has made the EU one of the major foreign policy players in the world. In this context, the EU’s enlargements have played important roles in foreign policy formulation and its efforts to be an influential international actor.

---

<sup>56</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey’s Membership Perspective,” 6.10.2004, 4, [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key\\_documents/2004/issues\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key_documents/2004/issues_paper_en.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

Enlargement implies new member countries, new neighbors, new security issues, new markets, new political issues, and new opportunities to exercise political power over new and wider geographical arenas in the foreign policy of the EU. Turkey's EU membership would affect the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFPS) of the EU since it is directly concerned with all of the aforementioned issues.

Turkey is geographically positioned at the junction of three continents: Europe, Asia, and Africa. This strategically important position makes Turkey a bridge between Europe, the Middle East, and the Transcaucasus, as well as a confluence point for cooperation and competition involving different historic cultures.<sup>57</sup> As a result, Turkey's location has attracted the attention of many countries for a variety of economic, political, and military reasons.

During his official visit to Turkey in April 2008, the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Durão Barroso, addressed the Turkish Grand National Assembly. In his address he emphasized the importance of Turkey's geographical position:

Forty years ago, during his visit to Turkey, the French President General de Gaulle said: "Here is Turkey, master of the Straits... guardian of several of the doors through which, in this region of the world, goes peace, through which can go war, and, as a consequence, holder of great and fruitful opportunities, but also exposed to the worst possibilities." General de Gaulle had indeed grasped Turkey's key position and value for Europe.<sup>58</sup>

Barroso's statement illustrates that Turkey's value for Europe has been increasingly recognized, especially since the beginning of the Cold War era. Even though, according to some, the importance of Turkey for the EU has decreased since the end of the Cold War, Turkey's importance has actually increased due to new, emerging

---

<sup>57</sup> David A Davies, *Friends At the Gate: Why Turkey Matters in U.S. and European Security* (Newport, Rhode Island: United States Naval War College, 18 May 2004), 3.

<sup>58</sup> President of the European Commission José Manuel Durão Barroso, "Turkey: Master of the Straits, Master of its Destiny," Turkish Grand National Assembly, Ankara, 10 April 2008, 2, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/188&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> (accessed September 6, 2008).

threats; Turkey's contributions to regional stability efforts; and Turkey's increasing geostrategic significance in terms of economic, military, and political aspects of globalization.

Today, the implications for CFSP hold an important place in the analysis of the potential effects of Turkey's membership upon the EU. The EU's CFSP would experience both positive and negative effects if Turkey joined the EU. In the event of Turkish membership, the EU would become a direct neighbor of the Caucasus to the east, Iran to the southeast, and Iraq and Syria to the south. Considering the latest developments in these regions, it can be clearly seen that these are turbulent areas.<sup>59</sup> The volatility of the regions in Turkey's neighborhood has been illustrated by the following factors: the Second Gulf War and subsequent ongoing conflict in Iraq, concerns stemming from allegations of Iran developing nuclear weapons, the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia due to Armenian occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh, and the recent Georgia-Russian armed conflict. Having a direct border with this conflict-prone neighborhood would force the EU to face significant new security challenges and new problems waiting to be settled in the EU foreign policy agenda.

Besides dealing with these problems, the EU would have to address its newly expanded external borders, which would require the EU to reshape and reformulate its foreign policy. New policy areas could increase the probability of differing views and attitudes within the EU. This situation could make it difficult to define and implement a common policy. EU members might be divided, as in the Iraq crisis in 2002-2003.

On the other hand, Turkey's membership could also have positive consequences for the EU's CFSP. Turkey's membership would enhance "the credibility of EU policies towards the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, and the Mediterranean regions." The EU's new borders would force the EU to take new initiatives and engage with new

---

<sup>59</sup> Heinz Kramer, "Turkey and the EU: The EU's Perspective," *Insight Turkey* 8, no. 4 (2006): 30, [www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get\\_document.php?asset\\_id=3789](http://www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get_document.php?asset_id=3789) (accessed February 26, 2008).

political challenges as a result of the push for a common foreign policy. Therefore, Turkey's membership would make the EU a more active foreign policy actor.<sup>60</sup>

In this regard, an important question has to be asked to understand the basic dynamics of the CFSP. "Does the EU aspire to become a major actor in the nearby southern and eastern neighborhoods?"<sup>61</sup> The answer to this question will be important in clarifying the positive and negative impacts of Turkey's membership on the EU's CFSP. The purpose of the European Neighborhood Policy of the EU (ENP), which was developed in 2004, was the avoidance of "the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and its neighbors, and instead strengthening the prosperity, stability and security of all concerned."<sup>62</sup> As part of this endeavor, the EU's negotiations and efforts involve the search for political and diplomatic solutions to the Iranian nuclear issue. The ENP also aims to resolve the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia, as well as the recent conflict between Russia and Georgia. These are just a few examples of the EU's interest in being a major actor in the nearby southern and eastern neighborhoods of Turkey. The military operations conducted by the EU (not only in its neighborhood, but also in countries far from Europe, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo) and its economic and diplomatic relations in different parts of the world are also significant indications of its desire as a global actor to wield influence in international politics.

Given the EU's interest in exerting influence in Turkey's southern and eastern neighborhoods, it is important to examine Turkey's surroundings and consider in greater depth the likely effects of Turkey's membership on the EU in both foreign and security policy dimensions.

---

<sup>60</sup> Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," *Centre for European Policy Studies*, no.1 (2004): 8-10.

<sup>61</sup> Kemal Derviş, Michael Emerson, Daniel Gros and Sinan Ülgen, "The European Transformation of Modern Turkey," *Centre for European Studies*, September 1, 2004, 63, [http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item\\_id=1156](http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1156) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>62</sup> European Commission, "The Policy: What is the European Neighborhood Policy," [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/policy\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/policy_en.htm) (accessed September 6, 2008).

## **1. Foreign Policy Dimension: Turkey and Its Neighborhood**

Turkey's policies toward its neighborhood have been important not only for Turkey itself, but also for the entire region. As a result, Turkey has established a leading role in the region. In this context, Turkey's relations with its neighbors, the convergence of Turkish and EU foreign policies, and complementary nature of these policies gain importance in understanding the positive contributions that Turkey could bring to the EU's common foreign policy.

The Balkans constitute an important geographic area both for Turkey and the EU. Today there are three Balkan countries in the European Union (Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania). The remaining Balkan states, known as the Western Balkan countries, continue their relations with the EU in the candidationship and potential candidationship frameworks. In retrospect, it can be clearly seen that both the Ottoman Empire and Turkey have played significant roles in the prevention of conflict and disorder and have made contributions to security and stability in the Balkans. Turkey continues to make efforts for the social development and stabilization of the region. Turkey has participated actively in the EU's police missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as in the Republic of Macedonia. It also supported the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) and the Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Kosovo Force (KFOR) in Kosovo.<sup>63</sup> Turkey is a supporter of the EU's "Stabilization and Association Process" and the EU policies facilitating the accession of the Western Balkan countries to the EU. Turkey is also a member of the Stability Pact aimed at conflict prevention in southeastern Europe.<sup>64</sup> These are noteworthy indications of Turkey's efforts in the region. Turkey's prospective membership in the EU could promote several positive outcomes. It could facilitate the solution of bilateral Turkey-Greece problems. Considering Turkey's relations with the Western Balkan countries, its efforts for stabilization of that region, and its support for

---

<sup>63</sup> Emerson and Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," 10-12.

<sup>64</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 9.



the Balkan countries' membership in Euro-Atlantic international and intergovernmental organizations, it can be concluded that it could contribute to the region's integration with the EU.<sup>65</sup>

The Black Sea is another important issue in the EU's foreign policy. Bulgarian and Romanian membership (which occurred in 2007) extended the EU's borders to the western coast of the Black Sea. With Turkey's membership, the EU would control the entire western and southern coastline of the Black Sea. This would enable the EU to expand its influence over the Black Sea, which is important in terms of "transportation, energy links, fisheries and combating organized crime and illegal immigration." Turkey, which played a key role in the establishment of Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) and was an initiator in creating the Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group (Blackseafor), would contribute to the implementation of the EU's policies both in economic and security dimensions.<sup>66</sup> Thus, the EU would increase its influence over the region.

Turkey's membership would also be important in terms of EU-Russia relations. Despite historical political rivalry issues, such as being on the opposite sides during the Cold War, and overlapping interests in the Caucasus and Central Asia, Turkish-Russian relations are currently positive. Economic indicators illustrate the thriving relations between the two countries. Russia is the second largest trading partner of Turkey, after Germany. After Turkey's accession, EU relations with Russia might well become more important in terms of "competing energy interests and developments in Caucasus and Central Asia."<sup>67</sup>

In regard to the southern Caucasus, through Turkish accession, the EU would gain a border with Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. Considering Turkey's willingness to solve conflicts, as well as its efforts to bring security and stability to the region, Turkey's

---

<sup>65</sup> Sedat Laçiner, Mehmet Özcan and İhsan Bal, *European Union With Turkey: Possible Impact of Turkey's Membership on The European Union* (Ankara: International Strategic Research Organization, 2005), 38.

<sup>66</sup> Emerson and Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," 12.

<sup>67</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 8.

EU membership could make the EU more influential in the stabilization of the region.<sup>68</sup> Turkey recently proposed a “Caucasia Stability and Cooperation Platform” in order to bring together Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russia, and Turkey to discuss their regional problems and issues. If implemented in the context of Turkey’s EU membership, such a discussion platform could give the EU a pivotal role in the region. In addition, thanks to Turkey’s membership, the EU could enhance its relations with countries located around the oil-rich Caspian Sea, which is significant in terms of energy security.<sup>69</sup>

Looking at Central Asia, after the Central Asian Republics gained their independence with the collapse of the Soviet Union, Turkey played important roles in linking Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan with the rest of the world. Cultural, linguistic, religious, and historical ties between Turkey and the Central Asian Republics have favored the establishment of economic, military, and political relations. Turkey has assisted them in participating in international organizations such as the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Economic Cooperation Organization, as well as in joining NATO’s Partnership for Peace (PFP) program. Turkey has also supported these countries in many other arenas.<sup>70</sup> Turkey could therefore be a channel for enhancing the EU’s policies in Central Asia.<sup>71</sup>

With its ongoing conflicts, the Middle East is one of the most unstable regions of the world. Yet, it is obvious that the EU and other global actors can not disregard this region. Through Turkey’s membership, the EU’s borders would extend to Iran, Iraq, and Syria in the Middle East. Turkey and the EU agree on the need for a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear crisis and a functioning democracy in Iraq. According to the European Commission, “Turkey has an important role to play in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq.”<sup>72</sup> Although the EU members disagreed on whether to support the U.S.-led coalition in the Second Gulf War, they recognize that their economic and

---

<sup>68</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey’s Membership Perspective,” 8.

<sup>69</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey’s Membership Perspective,” 8.

<sup>70</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, “The Likely Effects of Turkey’s Membership Upon the EU,” 14.

<sup>71</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey’s Membership Perspective,” 8.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

security interests rule out being indifferent to developments in the region. In this context, as a significant actor working for the stabilization of the region, Turkey could be an important agent in the promotion of the EU's interests. These interests include energy security, spreading democratic values to the region, and resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Iranian nuclear problem.

Regarding the Mediterranean region, Turkey's possible accession would be an important factor in the enhancement of the EU's Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Dialogue,<sup>73</sup> which aims to advance cooperation between the EU-27 and southern Mediterranean states on political, economic, cultural, social, and migration issues.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, it could contribute to fulfilling the objectives of the aforementioned EU Neighborhood Policy, at the center of which is Turkey.

Lastly, Turkey's accession would be important for the EU's relations with the Islamic world. Over the years, Turkey has been successful in building firm relationships with both Western and Eastern countries. On the one hand, Turkey has membership in organizations such as NATO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the Council of Europe. On the other hand, it has membership in organizations such as the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the Economic Cooperation Organization. These memberships have established close ties with both Western and Islamic countries and have enabled Turkey to serve as a bridge between West and East. In this regard, Emerson and Tocci specifically emphasize Turkey's membership in the OIC and how this membership "has been and is increasingly an asset to Europe, when it comes to deepening and institutionalising its relations with the Muslim world."<sup>75</sup> Additionally, a World Economic Forum report entitled "World Economic Forum in Turkey, Connecting Regions, Creating New Opportunities" identifies Turkey's role as a "bridge between civilizations," and discusses Turkey's

---

<sup>73</sup> Meltem Müftüler Baç, "Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy," in *Turkey and European Security*, IAI-TESEV Report, July 3, 2006, 23.

<sup>74</sup> European Commission, "The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership," [http://ec.europa.eu/external\\_relations/euromed/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/euromed/index_en.htm) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>75</sup> Emerson and Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," 26.

possible role in the future: “The country can easily share the knowledge it has gained over time regarding the differences between East and West, and also the similarities...It can promote a culture of dialogue, both religious and political.”<sup>76</sup> If Turkey, a secular democratic country with a predominantly Muslim population, became a member of the EU, it would prove that Western values and Islam are compatible, as opposed to Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations”<sup>77</sup> theory, and demonstrate that the EU is not simply a “Christian Camp.” This membership would show that “Western nations have no insuperable prejudice against Islam,” and contribute to easing tensions between the West and the Islamic world and improving economic, cultural and political relations.<sup>78</sup>

## 2. Security Dimension

As noted earlier, Turkey’s membership in the EU would mean new borders with the Middle East and the Caucasus for the EU. Considering the fact that this neighborhood is volatile, this could present security challenges for the EU. Yet over the years, Turkey has succeeded in enhancing the stability and security of this neighborhood and its own. From this perspective, Turkey would be a security asset for the EU. During the Cold War, it played an active role in the security of NATO against the Soviet threat. Since the end of the Cold War, Turkey has continued to play major roles by participating in military operations aimed at solving crises in the Balkans and other parts of the world, such as Afghanistan. The resolution of the problems concerning the “modalities of cooperation between NATO and the EU” and “the agreement reached in October 2002 for allowing the participation of non-EU NATO allies in European security and defense policy incorporated Turkey closer to the EU led security operations.”<sup>79</sup> As Sinan Ülgen has noted, “Turkey has participated in a number of military and civilian ESDP missions

---

<sup>76</sup> World Economic Forum, “World Economic Forum in Turkey, Connecting Regions Creating New Opportunities,” 23-24 November 2006, 16, [www.weforum.org/pdf/summitreports/turkey2006.pdf](http://www.weforum.org/pdf/summitreports/turkey2006.pdf) (accessed September 21, 2008).

<sup>77</sup> Baç, “Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy,” 22-23.

<sup>78</sup> Laçiner, Özcan and Bal, *European Union With Turkey: Possible Impact of Turkey’s Membership on The European Union*, 33.

<sup>79</sup> Baç, “Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy,” 26-27.

including Concordia and Proxima (Macedonia), and EUFOR RD Congo. It is currently participating in Althea (Bosnia), EUPM (Bosnia), and EUPOL Kinshasa.”<sup>80</sup>

Considering Turkey’s high defense budget and its experienced and well-equipped military forces, the largest in NATO’s European contingent by number of personnel, Turkey’s accession would make significant contributions to the EU’s military capabilities and the development of the ESDP.<sup>81</sup>

In addition, Turkey’s membership would be important in terms of the EU’s efforts to counter contemporary threats. According to the European Union’s European Security Strategy, the struggle against global threats such as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and regional conflicts requires the EU to be “more active, more coherent and more capable.”<sup>82</sup> This objective stands in contrast with the anti-expansionist argument that the EU would become more vulnerable to these threats, if it enlarged toward the east by welcoming Turkey as a member. In this document, the global nature of these threats and the necessity for a multilateral struggle against them are emphasized.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, these threats demonstrate the importance of Turkey’s membership in the EU on security grounds.

As mentioned above, Turkey’s membership would make the EU geographically closer to the volatile regions which may be a source of these types of threats. From this perspective, Turkey’s membership raises concerns among EU members. Yet it should not go unnoticed that these threats are global. Some of these threats, such as terrorism and illegal immigration, already constitute significant security threats in the EU. Also, Turkey has struggled against these threats, particularly terrorism, illegal immigration, and drug trafficking, over the years and has gained experience with handling them. Turkey’s

---

<sup>80</sup> Sinan Ülgen, “The Evolving EU, NATO and Turkey Relationship: Implications for Transatlantic Security,” *Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies*, April 2008, 3, <http://www.edam.org.tr/index.php?lang=english> (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>81</sup> Emerson and Tocci, “Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy,” 32.

<sup>82</sup> Javier Solana, “A Secure Europe in a Better World, European Security Strategy,” A document adopted by Heads of State and Government at the European Council on 12 December 2003, 17, [www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/solanae.pdf](http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/solanae.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-16.

membership would mean the full harmonization of its efforts with those of the EU in the struggle against these threats.<sup>84</sup> Therefore, Turkey's membership would contribute positively to the EU's efforts in addressing global threats.

Additionally, Turkey is located between the EU and its southern neighborhood and serves as a corridor in road, rail, maritime, and pipeline connections. Turkey's accession would enable the EU to control these transportation modes,<sup>85</sup> especially for energy, which has gained importance as a critical issue on the EU's security agenda. Concerns about possible oil price shocks and energy supply interruptions cause countries to search for new energy sources in order to reduce their dependence on any one supplier. The EU is concerned about these issues. Turkey, with its geographical proximity to a region containing a great amount of the world's oil and gas reserves, has active pipelines passing through its territory for transporting gas and oil to the west, such as the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline, which has become an important energy conduit for European Union countries. Ongoing projects show that Turkey will increase its importance in energy transport in the coming years. In this context, Turkey's membership would contribute a great deal to the EU's energy security.<sup>86</sup>

## **B. THE POSSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF TURKEY'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE EU**

Another aspect of Turkey's membership in the EU would be economic. The possible effects of this membership have been extensively discussed by government officials and citizens throughout the EU. Since Turkey began full membership negotiations on 4 October 2005, discussions about the possible economic benefits and costs of this membership have intensified. Assessments have been mostly focused on macro-economic and budgetary effects on the EU economy, as well as Turkey's young, dynamic population and potential migration from Turkey into other EU member

---

<sup>84</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 9.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Katinka Barysch, "Turkey's Role in European Energy Security," *Centre For European Reform*, December 2007, 1-7.

countries after Turkish accession. As a result, these three main aspects of Turkey's possible accession must be analyzed and the potential economic consequences for the EU must be examined.

### **1. The Macro-Economic Impacts of Turkey's Membership**

According to World Bank 2007 data, Turkey, with its 657,091 million dollars Gross Domestic Product (GDP), is the seventeenth largest country in the world. In the list, it follows six EU member countries: Germany (3<sup>rd</sup> on the list), United Kingdom (5), France (6), Italy (7), Spain (8), and Netherlands (16).<sup>87</sup> Yet, considering its large population, its GDP per capita is low relative to that in most EU countries. Among the EU-27, according to the International Monetary Fund's 2007 data, Turkey's GDP per capita at nominal values (\$9,629) is only higher than those of the two latest EU entrants: Romania (\$7,697) and Bulgaria (\$5,186).<sup>88</sup>

Due to political and economic instability, Turkey's growth rate has been erratic in the past. Yet since the 2001 economic crisis, the Turkish economy has entered a transition period and resembles a country "which is just moving away from a highly distorted boom-and-bust economy to a stable market economy." During this transition period, Turkey has become more open to international trade and foreign investment and has achieved sustainable growth and macroeconomic stability.<sup>89</sup> From 2002 to 2007, the Turkish economy's average GDP growth rate has been 6.78%. In the same period, the average growth in the EU (27) has been 2.15%. Distributions of annual GDP growth rate, including the estimates for 2008 and 2009, are shown in Figure 1.

---

<sup>87</sup> The World Bank, "Gross Domestic Product 2007," <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf> (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>88</sup> International Monetary Fund, "World Economic Data Base-2008," <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2008/01/weodata/weoselco.aspx?g=2001&sg=All+countries> (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>89</sup> Ansgar Belke, "Turkey in Transition to EU Membership: Pros and Cons Of Integrating a Dynamic Economy," *Perception* 10, (Spring 2005): 54, [www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/volume10/spring2005/asangarbelkeson.pdf](http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/volume10/spring2005/asangarbelkeson.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008 (estimated)	2009 (estimated)
<b>Turkey</b>	6.2	5.3	9.4	8.4	6.9	4.5	4.3	4.7
<b>EU (27)</b>	1.2	1.3	2.5	1.9	3.1	2.9	2.0	1.8

Figure 1. Annual Real GDP Growth Rate (%) of Turkey and EU (27)<sup>90</sup>

Would Turkey’s accession to the EU be “just another enlargement” or would it be different from the two previous enlargement rounds (in 2004 with 10 new countries and in 2007 with two new countries)? In terms of relative GDP per capita and the higher degree of employment in the agriculture sector, Turkey shares characteristics with the less advanced Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC), yet Turkey’s GDP and population are greater. In terms of GDP and population, Turkey is about twice as large as Bulgaria and Romania combined. In addition, while the workforce in Turkey continues to grow, in most CEEC countries it is in decline. That gives Turkey “much more dynamism and leeway for growth.” Due to a customs union agreement, Turkey is partially participating in the EU’s internal market, which means that in comparison with the CEECs’ situation before their accessions, Turkey has achieved more trade integration with the EU. On the other hand, in comparison with the economies of the CEECs, the Turkish economy is more dualistic. That is, a high-performing modern sector and a large, poor rural sector coexist in the economy. Also, Turkey’s foreign debt is larger than those of the CEECs. In some ways Turkey’s accession would resemble those of the CEECs, but in others it would be distinct.<sup>91</sup>

According to comments and assessments by the EU’s top officials, Turkey’s membership in the EU before 2014 is out of the question. In this context, estimating the net quantitative effects of this membership is difficult. The basic economic indicators of both Turkey and the EU in 2007 and estimates for 2013, which are produced by the IMF,

<sup>90</sup> European Commission-Eurostat, “Real GDP Growth Rate: 1998-2009,” [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?\\_pageid=1090\\_30070682\\_1090\\_33076576&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=1090_30070682_1090_33076576&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>91</sup> Belke, “Turkey in Transition to EU Membership: Pros and Cons Of Integrating a Dynamic Economy,” 54-57.



are indicated in Figure 2. According to this data, if Turkey had been an EU member in 2007, it would have increased the EU's GDP calculated according to current market prices by 3.79% and the EU's GDP according to purchasing power standards by 5.31%. On the other hand, according to estimates of possible economic performance in 2013, Turkey's contribution to the output of the EU would slightly increase. This increase for the two different GDP values would be 3.81% and 6.46% respectively. These calculations and estimates suggest that Turkey's membership would increase the EU's GDP; however, this increase would be comparatively modest.

	<b>Turkey (2007)</b>	<b>EU27 (2007)</b>	<b>Turkey (2013)(est.)</b>	<b>EU27 (2013)(est.)</b>
<b>Population (in million)</b>	68.8	494.9	73.7	503.7
<b>GDP(market prices);(in billion, \$)</b>	663.4	16 830.1	952.7	24 013.3
<b>GDP (PPS); (in billion, \$)</b>	824.0	14 684.7	1 311.1	18 956.4

Figure 2. Basic Economic Indicators for Turkey and the EU (27) <sup>92</sup>

Another economic effect of Turkey's membership would be increased trade between Turkey and other members of the EU. Since the Customs Union was established in 1995, the tariffs and restrictions on trading industrial goods between the two parties have been removed. Turkey's accession would deepen trade integration between the EU and Turkey through "the removal of tariffs in areas not currently covered (e.g. agriculture,) as well as the reduction of non tariff-barriers through the implementation of the *acquis*." This would mean new investment opportunities for both EU and Turkish companies. Additionally, Turkey's fast growing economy would bring dynamism to the

<sup>92</sup> International Monetary Fund, "World Economic Data Base-2008," <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2008/01/weodata/index.aspx> (accessed 14 October, 2008).

EU economy and create a positive impulse for EU exports.<sup>93</sup> In addition to the Turkish market, reaching the Central Asian, Middle Eastern, and Black Sea markets would be much easier for EU entrepreneurs.<sup>94</sup>

## **2. The Budgetary Impacts of Turkey's Membership**

The EU budget is one of the important instruments of the EU. The member countries both contribute to and benefit from the EU budget. The EU budget has been described as “a zero sum game: what the recipient gains, others must pay for.”<sup>95</sup> Budget decisions precipitate hot debates among EU members in the EU institutions.

The budgetary side of each new membership is a popular topic in pre-accession debates and assessments. In this context, Turkey's potential impact on the EU budget is widely discussed. The possible budgetary impact of Turkey's accession raises concerns in EU member states. One of the main reasons for these concerns, as noted above, is the process of a zero sum game. Since new members are entitled to benefits from certain funds, these entitlements decrease the funds that can be made available to other countries. These concerns are more widespread in the countries that are current beneficiaries of these EU funds. Another reason for these concerns is that Turkey's large population and comparative level of economic development mean that it would be a net recipient of these EU funds.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, Turkey's large agricultural sector would make it eligible for substantial support under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).<sup>97</sup>

Various estimates have highlighted the potential budgetary impact of Turkey's membership. For example, a study entitled “The European Transformation of Modern Turkey” examined Turkey's potential budgetary impact considering 2004 EU spending

---

<sup>93</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective,” 14-16.

<sup>94</sup> Laçiner, Özcan and Bal, *European Union With Turkey: Possible Impact of Turkey's Membership on The European Union*, 77.

<sup>95</sup> Siegfried Schultz, “The EU's Medium-Term Financial Perspective and Turkey's Potential Slice of the Cake,” *Intereconomics* 40, no.6 (2005): 352, <http://www.intereconomics.eu/archiv/autor/355/> (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>96</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective,” 46.

<sup>97</sup> Schultz, “The EU's Medium-Term Financial Perspective and Turkey's Potential Slice of the Cake,” 347.

policies. According to this study, if Turkey had been an EU member in 2004, it would have been entitled to approximately €20 billion annually from the funds under CAP, structural, and other funding programs. Turkey would have contributed around €2 billion annually to the EU budget. Thus, Turkey's net financial benefit would have been approximately €18 billion (all 2004 prices). Furthermore, assuming that Turkey will be a member in 2015 and that the EU will have 28 other members (with Croatia's membership in addition to that of Bulgaria and Romania, which joined in 2007), according to the same study Turkey's potential receipts from and contributions to the EU budget as a percentage of EU GDP would be 0.25% and 0.05% respectively. Therefore, the net financial benefit for Turkey would be approximately 0.2% of the EU-28 GDP from the EU budget, as indicated in Figure 3.<sup>98</sup>

Because there may be changes in the EU's spending policies, it is hard to make an accurate quantitative estimate of one candidate's impact on the EU budget in the future. For example, assuming that Turkey's membership would be after 2014, by using the spending policies determined according to the current budget period of the EU (2007-2013), it is impossible to accurately predict how much Turkey would receive from the EU funds and how much it would contribute to the EU budget. Even assuming that Turkey would be a member in 2014, the experience of past enlargements has shown that integration into all support programs of the new member country can take between 5 and 10 years. This means that the new member country cannot fully benefit from the EU's budgetary support before this time period has elapsed.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Derviş, Emerson, Gros and Ülgen, "The European Transformation of Modern Turkey," 68-71.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 68.

	<b>Turkey in EU(25) (2004 prices)</b>	<b>Turkey 2015 in enlarged EU As a % of EU GDP</b>
<b>Structural Funds</b>	€8 billion	0.16%
<b>CAP receipts</b>	€9 billion	0.08%
<b>Total Receipts (including other)</b>	€20 billion	0.25%
<b>Contributions to EU Budget</b>	€2 billion	0.05%
<b>(Max) Net Receipts for Turkey</b>	Roughly 0.18% of EU GDP	0.20%

Figure 3. Maximum budgetary cost of Turkey’s membership<sup>100</sup>

### **3. The Possible Consequences of Migration from Turkey into Other EU Member Countries after Accession to Membership**

The issue of potential migration from Turkey into other EU member countries after accession is one of the prominent topics of this membership. It is widely discussed, and there are various opinions on the topic. It is an important issue which creates great concern and opposition to Turkish membership among not only EU officials, but also the EU population.

The study entitled “Explaining Opposition to Turkish Membership of the EU,” prepared by Lauren M. McLaren, Associate Professor of Politics at the University of Nottingham, reveals important details about the effects of concerns about potential migration from Turkey to the rest of the EU after enlargement. McLaren explores the reasons for higher levels of opposition to Turkey’s membership relative to the opposition expressed to other countries’ membership in the last two enlargement rounds of the EU. According to McLaren, “rational economic self-interest,” “perceived threat to group

<sup>100</sup> Derviş, Emerson, Gros and Ülgen, “The European Transformation of Modern Turkey,” 71.

resources, and perceived threats to culture” and “way of life,” evoked similar levels of opposition for both Turkey’s and the last twelve entrants’ memberships.<sup>101</sup>

However, McLaren finds migration a reason which explains the greater opposition to Turkey’s membership. This and similar studies indicate that the migration issue is one of the important factors generating great concerns about Turkey’s potential membership in the EU. Considering Turkey’s large population, its low level of economic wealth relative to that in Western European countries, and the history of migration flows from Turkey to some European countries, it could be argued that Turkey’s membership could trigger greater migration to certain EU countries. Generally speaking, such migration could present both challenges and opportunities in the recipient countries. These opportunities and challenges could vary according to different people’s perspectives. For example, from an entrepreneur’s perspective the migration could mean cheap labor. From the recipient country’s citizens’ perspective, the migration could signify an increase in unemployment. From the government’s perspective, the migration could lead to new social problems to deal with. On the other hand, it could also mean a productivity increase on the macro-economic level and an enlarged source of revenue from taxes. In other words, the potential migration from Turkey would present both challenges and opportunities for the enlarged EU.

How many people would migrate from Turkey to the rest of the EU after Turkish accession? It is hard to forecast the extent of potential future migration from Turkey to the rest of the EU after Turkish accession. Estimates differ. The EU Commission report mentions studies which reach estimates based on different methods. Figures about potential migration from Turkey to the rest of the EU in the long term (defined as 2025 to 2030) range from 0.5 to 4 million people. Austria, France, Germany, and the Netherlands, which have been major recipients of Turkish migration in the past, are expected to receive the biggest share of Turkish immigrants.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Lauren M. McLaren, “Explaining Opposition to Turkish Membership of the EU,” *European Union Politics* 8, no: 2 (2007): 272-274.

<sup>102</sup> European Commission, “Issues Arising From Turkey’s Membership Perspective,” 18-19.

Important points should be noted relating to the potential migration from Turkey to the rest of the EU following Turkish accession. First, this potential migration would partly depend on the economic and social conditions in Turkey at that time. As long as Turkey sustains its current economic and social growth, the potential migration with Turkish accession to the EU will decrease.

Secondly, before ten new members acceded to the EU in 2004, the EU-15 countries introduced a transition period of up to seven years (2 plus 3 plus 2) for the liberalization of labor flows between incumbent EU members and new entrants.<sup>103</sup> In this context, assuming that Turkey would be an EU member by 2014, Turkey's labor force could not be mobile before 2021. Therefore, the certain migration effects of this membership could not be understood before the 2020s.

Thirdly, the EU is currently experiencing demographic change. According to an EU Economic Policy Committee report, "Europe's population will be slightly smaller and significantly older in 2050." Between 2004 and 2050, there will be little change in the EU25 numerical population. The population will decrease from 457 to 454 million. On the other hand, there will be great changes in the age structure of the population. As of 2010 while the working age population (15 to 64) will fall by 48 million (or 16%), the elderly population (65+) will rise by 58 million (or 77%) by 2050.<sup>104</sup> Similarly, Figure 4, prepared according to data in the EU commission report, reveals how aging will be important in the age structure of the EU25. There may be important consequences arising from the aging population in the EU. The aging population is projected to negatively affect the EU economy, owing to the potential labor shortages and lower productivity in the long run and the higher pension and health care costs.

---

<sup>103</sup> Derviş, Emerson, Gros and Ülgen, "The European Transformation of Modern Turkey," 67.

<sup>104</sup> EU Economic Policy Committee and EU Commission, "Impact of Ageing Population on Public Spending: Projections for the EU25 Member States on Pensions, Health Care, Long Term Care, Education and Unemployment Transfers (2004-2050)," February 6, 2006, 7, [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/epc/epc\\_sustainability\\_ageing\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/epc/epc_sustainability_ageing_en.htm) (accessed September 22, 2008).

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2050</b>
0-14	17.1	14.4	13.3
15-64	67.1	62.9	56.4
65+	15.7	22.7	30.3

Figure 4. Distribution of the population as percentage in EU25 per age group<sup>105</sup>

Turkey's population projections stand in contrast with those for the EU25. Figure 5 indicates that in 2000, the working age population (15-64) consisted of 65% of the total population. According to official projections, in 2025 it will increase to 69%. Even though it is projected to decrease to 66% by 2050, compared to the EU's level of 56.4 %, it will still be relatively high.

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2050</b>
0-14	30	22	17
15-64	65	69	66
65+	5	8	18

Figure 5. Distribution of the population as percentage in Turkey per age group<sup>106</sup>

According to these population projections, the elderly proportion of the EU's population is growing. This circumstance could create serious economic setbacks for the EU in the future. In contrast, it seems that Turkey will continue to have a young, dynamic population. In this context, Turkey's membership in the EU could positively affect the EU's demographic structure. Turkey's young, dynamic population could be a remedy for the EU's adverse population distribution.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>105</sup> EU Commission, "Green Paper 'Confronting Demographic Change: A New Solidarity Between the Generations,'" 16.3.2005, 19, [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/news/2005/mar/comm2005-94\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/news/2005/mar/comm2005-94_en.pdf) (accessed September 22, 2008).

<sup>106</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, "The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU," 39.

<sup>107</sup> Laçiner, Özcan and Bal, *European Union With Turkey: Possible Impact of Turkey's Membership on The European Union*, 33.

### **C. THE POSSIBLE IMPACTS OF TURKEY'S MEMBERSHIP ON EU INSTITUTIONS**

The possible impacts of Turkey's membership on the various EU institutions constitute another set of issues raising concerns among existing EU members. The size of the population of Turkey would determine the degree of these impacts. In 2015, Turkey could have approximately the same population as Germany, which already has the largest population in the EU. Turkey's membership would change the allocation of seats in the European Parliament; this could mean a smaller number of seats for existing members.<sup>108</sup> Additionally, the Lisbon treaty would put qualified majority voting into effect. This would be based upon the double majority principle (both 55% of EU states and 65% of the EU's population). Decisions could be blocked by a minimum of four countries.<sup>109</sup> Since this principle would decrease the power of the highly populated countries, Turkey could not exert much power in the decision making process owing to its large population. Yet its demographic power would be more important when and if it joined with other highly populated countries in the blocking minority.<sup>110</sup>

According to the Lisbon Treaty, as of 2014, the commissioner numbers would be equal to two-thirds of the member states and they would be chosen according to an equal rotation system involving all member countries.<sup>111</sup> This would mean that Turkey's membership would have no more impact on the European Commission than that of any other member state.

### **D. CONCLUSION**

Enlargement has been one of the important policy tools of the EU. Since its establishment, the EU has undertaken six rounds of enlargement, and its number of members has increased from 6 to 27. In all of these enlargement rounds, new members

---

<sup>108</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 45.

<sup>109</sup> Foundation Robert Schuman, "The Lisbon Treaty, 10 easy-to-read fact sheets," December 2007, 9, [www.robert-schuman.org/doc/divers/lisbonne/en/10fiches.pdf](http://www.robert-schuman.org/doc/divers/lisbonne/en/10fiches.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

<sup>110</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 45-46.

<sup>111</sup> Foundation Robert Schuman, "The Lisbon Treaty, 10 easy-to-read fact sheets," 6.



made important changes to the EU's interests and capabilities. Each enlargement has increased the EU's influence in the international arena. Today, the enlargement process retains its importance for the EU. There are several candidate and potential candidate countries on the EU's enlargement agenda.

Turkey is one of these countries. Turkey's potential membership and its implications constitute a great topic of discussion. Turkey's large population relative to many current EU members, its predominantly Muslim population, its geostrategic position, its military capacity, and its level of economic development are some important factors which differentiate the possible consequences of this membership from the previous enlargements of the EU.

Turkey's membership would affect the EU in various ways. First, Turkey's membership in the EU would have effects on the EU's CFSP. Thanks to Turkey's accession, the EU foreign policy area would expand, and the EU would increase its influence in Turkey's neighborhood and play more active roles in the international arena. Turkish contributions to EU policies regarding specific regions in Turkey's neighborhood, Turkey's relations with its neighbors, and its active roles and policies regarding its neighborhood would be major factors in the development of the EU's CFSP. From a security perspective, Turkey's membership would expand the EU's borders and the EU would become neighbors with the currently volatile countries Iraq and Georgia. On the other hand, Turkey, with its military capacity, would contribute positively to the ESDP and to the EU's efforts to counter global threats such as terrorism and illegal immigration.

Secondly, Turkey's membership would have economic effects. At the macro level, Turkey's developing economy would bring dynamism to the EU's economy and would increase the EU's GDP; however, this increase would be moderate. Membership would also deepen the trade integration between Turkey and the current EU members and provide new investment opportunities for EU entrepreneurs. On the other hand, from the budgetary perspective, Turkey's potential gains from EU funds could be seen as a disadvantage by the current member countries. Additionally, Turkey's membership would over time pave the way for migration from Turkey to the current EU member

countries. It is difficult to estimate the potential outcomes of the projected migration. Yet, the current population projections indicate that, considering the EU's aging population and Turkey's young and dynamic population, despite its potential drawbacks, there could be advantages in the migration from Turkey to the rest of the EU, especially in the long term.

Finally, Turkey's membership would have effects on the EU's institutions. Its increasing population would bring modest advantages to Turkey in the EU decision making process, which raises concerns especially in the countries with large populations such as France. However, the EU's changing rules on the decision making process with the Lisbon Treaty show that demographic power would not be as important in the decision making process as it used to be. Overall, the advantages of Turkey's membership outweigh the potential disadvantages for the EU.

#### **IV. THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY**

The founder of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, “pointed to achieving and even going beyond the level of contemporary civilization as the goal of the Turkish nation.”<sup>112</sup> In the framework of this goal, he played a major role in the accomplishment of many important revolutions and in the foundation of modern, democratic, and secular Turkey.

EU membership has been regarded as one of the significant tools for achieving this goal in Turkey. In this context, Turkey has given great importance to its relations with EU integration institutions. The long history of relations starting with the signing of the Ankara Agreement on 12 September 1963 between Turkey and the European Economic Community (EEC) is an evident indication of this importance. Turkey, one of the founding members of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and a member of NATO since 1952, showed its willingness to continue to increase its role in the different areas of Western policy.

With the signing of the Ankara Agreement, trade began to be liberalized, followed by the completion of the Customs Union by the end of 1995.<sup>113</sup> As stated in Chapter II, since the signing of Ankara Agreement, there have been ups and downs in the relations between Turkey and EU integration institutions. Turkey applied for full membership in the EEC in 1987. In 1990, the European Council endorsed the Commission opinion underlining “Turkey’s eligibility for membership,” but deferred the assessment of this application “until the emergence of a more favourable environment.”<sup>114</sup> Additionally, despite the advanced relations and economic integration between Turkey and the EU,

---

<sup>112</sup> Utkan Kocatürk, “Atatürk’s Revolution and Modernization,” *Atatürk Araştırma Dergisi* 5, no.13 (October 2006), <http://www.atam.gov.tr/index.php?Page=DergiIcerik&IcerikNo=915> (accessed October 28, 2008).

<sup>113</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Relations Between Turkey and the European Union,” <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/relations-between-turkey-and-the-european-union.en.mfa> (accessed October 29, 2008).

<sup>114</sup> Embassy of Republic of Turkey in London, “About Turkey and the EU,” [http://turkishembassylondon.org/canon/aboutturkey\\_eu.htm](http://turkishembassylondon.org/canon/aboutturkey_eu.htm) (accessed October 29, 2008).

Turkey was not characterized as a candidate country at the Luxembourg Summit in 1997. These developments alienated Turkey and adversely affected its EU membership perspective. At that point, Turkey's past efforts to join the EU played an important role in the EU decision to review the country's prospects for membership. Candidate status was given to Turkey in 1999 at the Helsinki Summit. Finally, six years later, on 23 October 2005, the accession negotiations started between the EU and Turkey.

Starting the accession negotiations was a big step for Turkey. Turkey had accomplished this despite the opposition to its membership by some EU member countries. Considering the fact that some of this opposition is still present, Turkey's EU membership prospects seem to be as uncertain now as during the years from 1963 to 2005.

The candidate countries have to fulfill certain political, economic, and legal criteria for EU membership. Politically, the candidate country must have stable institutions which guarantee "democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and, protection of, minorities." Economically, the candidate country must have "a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union."<sup>115</sup> Legally, the candidate country "must be able to comply with the obligations of EU membership, including the adoption of the body of EU law."<sup>116</sup>

The Republic of Turkey is defined in the second article of its constitution as "a democratic, secular and social state governed by the rule of law; bearing in mind the concepts of public peace, national solidarity and justice; respecting human rights; [and] loyal to the nationalism of Atatürk."<sup>117</sup> Ankara has taken important steps to meet the accession criteria. The general view among high ranking Turkish officials is that EU

---

<sup>115</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Relations Between Turkey and the European Union."

<sup>116</sup> BBC News, "Q&A: Turkey and the EU," *BBC*, October 6, 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3682828.stm> (accessed October 29, 2008).

<sup>117</sup> The Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, [www.anayasa.gov.tr/images/loaded/pdf\\_dosyalari/THE\\_CONSTITUTION\\_OF\\_THE\\_REPUBLIC\\_OF\\_TURKEY.pdf](http://www.anayasa.gov.tr/images/loaded/pdf_dosyalari/THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_REPUBLIC_OF_TURKEY.pdf) (accessed October 29, 2008).

membership would be an important tool for economic, social and political progress. Yet, this membership is not a sine qua non for Turkey. Turkey wants to be treated as well as previous and current candidate countries. In this regard, options other than full membership (such as privileged partnership) will not be accepted by Turkey.

EU membership prospects are widely discussed throughout Turkey. The key questions in these discussions are the following: How would this prospective membership affect Turkey? What are the potential advantages and disadvantages of this membership for Turkey?

In light of the possible consequences of Turkey's membership for the EU discussed in Chapter III, this chapter aims to investigate answers to the above questions and examine the possible consequences of this prospective membership for Turkey. The possible effects of EU membership are two fold for the accessing country. The pre- and post-accession periods entail different effects on the country. Considering the whole process, as long as Turkey is treated as fairly as previous candidates for accession, the potential advantages of EU membership will outweigh the possible disadvantages for Turkey.

In an attempt to examine this topic systematically, this chapter starts with an assessment of the possible consequences of EU membership on Turkish foreign and security policy interests and continues with an investigation of the possible political, social and economic consequences for Turkey.

## **A. THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP ON TURKEY'S FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY INTERESTS**

### **1. Foreign Policy Dimension**

The primary objective of Turkish foreign policy, as noted by the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is "to help secure and nurture a peaceful, stable, prosperous and cooperative regional and international environment that is conducive to human development at home as well as in neighboring countries and beyond." In the pursuit of this objective, the policy of "Peace at Home and Peace Abroad," which was set

by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, has always played a unique role and has contributed to the formation of the multi-dimensional character of Turkish foreign policy. Today, Turkey, with its “multi-dimensional foreign policy that reconciles the West with the East and the North with the South and is active in all regions,” plays an active role in the international arena and through the instruments of its geographical location and historical and cultural ties serves as a bridge between different cultures.<sup>118</sup>

Turkey’s relations with other European countries have been attributed great importance on the foreign policy agenda over the years. Since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, through its bilateral relations with other countries and through its active involvement in international organizations, Turkey has played significant roles in European economic, political, and security affairs. Participating in cooperation with European integration institutions has become an important foreign policy project for Turkey since the 1950s. In this light, it applied for associate membership in the EEC in 1959 and for full membership in 1987.<sup>119</sup>

Today, the EU has become an important global actor. Economically powerful and increasingly potent politically, the EU has increased its sphere of influence in the international arena. John McCormick, a professor and chair of the Department of Political Science at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), defines the EU’s current situation in the global arena as follows: “The European Union is the world’s biggest capitalist marketplace, the world’s biggest trading power, and – along with the United States – one of the two most influential political actors in the world.”<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy,” <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/synopsis-of-the-turkish-foreign-policy.en.mfa> (accessed October 29, 2008).

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> John McCormick, *The European Union* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2008), 1.

	<b>% of World Population</b>	<b>% of World Economic Production</b>
<b>EU (27)</b>	7.6%	30.2%
<b>United States</b>	4.6%	28.1%
<b>Japan</b>	0.2%	10.2%
<b>China</b>	20.2%	5.0%
<b>India</b>	17.0%	1.8%

Figure 6. The EU in the Global Economy<sup>121</sup>

Figure 6 indicates that the EU has the largest share of the world's economic production. Also, with its nearly 40% share of world trade in terms of both merchandise and commercial services, the EU takes first place in the list of world trading powers. The currency used by 15 of the 27 EU members, the euro, is among the most important currencies in the world. All of these factors, together with the EU's status as "the biggest source of foreign direct investment" and "the biggest market in the world for mergers and acquisitions," make the EU "an economic superpower" in the world.<sup>122</sup>

The EU is also a politically important global actor in the international arena. However, it is not as powerful politically as it is economically. One of the main reasons for this is that economic integration preceded the pursuit of political cooperation. The Treaty of Rome did not mention foreign policy matters. During the first twenty years of the integration process (the 1950s and 1960s), the member states took steps to enhance economic integration but did not accomplish successful foreign policy coordination among themselves. As noted in the first chapter, in 1970 the first solid step was taken to establish foreign policy cooperation in the European Community (EC) and the European Political Cooperation (EPC). The EPC contributed to the development of an EC foreign policy. Yet, the EPC was not entirely successful in formulating and implementing a common EC foreign policy. The failure to pursue an effective common strategy during

---

<sup>121</sup> McCormick, *The European Union*, 346.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 345-348.

the first Gulf War (1990-1991) and the Yugoslavia crisis (1991-1999) revealed the requirement for progress in the creation of a common policy.<sup>123</sup>

The establishment of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty was one of the most important steps taken by the EU to constitute a collective political identity in the international arena. The Maastricht Treaty set out significant objectives such as “to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, and independence of the EU,” “to strengthen the security of the EU and its member states in all ways,” and “to promote international cooperation.”<sup>124</sup> The effort to advance the CFSP continued in the following years, and it was revised with the Amsterdam Treaty. Since the Amsterdam Treaty entered into force in 1999, the EU has implemented a more active foreign policy in the global arena. This treaty also increased cooperation regarding defense matters among the member countries and contributed to the emergence of the EU’s European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP).<sup>125</sup> ESDP has enabled the EU to conduct peace keeping and peace building missions in different parts of the world.<sup>126</sup>

All these initiatives and efforts promote unity among the member states of the European Union. However, events such as the divergence among EU member states regarding support for the United States in the 2003 Iraq War have demonstrated that there are still serious problems in developing and pursuing a common foreign policy under the EU framework. McCormick attributes the problems in implementing a common foreign policy to “the lack of policy focus and leadership,” and “policy differences among the governments of the member states.” As McCormick notes, the Lisbon Treaty, one of the aims of which is to advance cooperation on foreign policy and security matters, foresees the creation of a post for a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The person occupying this post will be the single foreign representative

---

<sup>123</sup> McCormick, *The European Union*, 338-340.

<sup>124</sup> Desmond Dinan, *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publisher, Inc, 2005), 585.

<sup>125</sup> Simon Hix, *The Political System of the European Union* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 390-392.

<sup>126</sup> Hanns W. Maull, “Europe as a Global Power,” paper from “Worldviews of Major and Aspiring Powers” Conference at the George Washington University, September 2007, <http://www.gwu.edu/~sigur/publications.html> (accessed November 07, 2008).



of the EU. In this regard, if implemented, the treaty may bring a solution to the leadership problem.<sup>127</sup> Yet, a complete resolution of the policy differences among the member states seems too difficult to be realized in the short run.

Although it faces problems, the EU is increasing its weight in the international arena. Today, the EU pursues an international development strategy by using the instruments of trade relations and direct financial and technical assistance, especially to the poor regions of the world. The official development assistance offered by the EU and its members in 2007 comprised over 56 percent of the total assistance supplied by major industrialized countries.<sup>128</sup> Considering all the aid provided by the European Commission and EU member states, the EU is the “biggest aid donor” in the world. Additionally, it maintains its efforts to enlarge with new member states and to establish stronger relations with other states, notably its neighbors, through various instruments, including the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP).<sup>129</sup> Since the establishment of ESDP, the EU has conducted several important military, police, and civilian missions in different regions of the world. Fourteen of those missions are still continuing, and they contribute to stability and development in Africa, Asia, the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East.<sup>130</sup> Moreover, by using diplomatic tools, the EU tries to find peaceful solutions to ongoing conflicts and crises such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Iranian nuclear crisis.

Turkey’s accession to the EU would mean that Turkey would be one of the members of this significant global actor. With EU membership, Turkey would be an active participant in some or all of the military, police and civilian missions conducted by the EU. This would allow Turkey to strengthen its position in the international arena.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> McCormick, *The European Union*, 340-342.

<sup>128</sup> European Commission, “The EU in the World-The Foreign Policy of the European Union,” June 2007, 10, [www.delago.ec.europa.eu/ao/ue\\_global/en.doc](http://www.delago.ec.europa.eu/ao/ue_global/en.doc) (accessed November 07, 2008).

<sup>129</sup> European Commission, “European Union in the World,” [http://ec.europa.eu/world/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/world/index_en.htm) (accessed November 07, 2008).

<sup>130</sup> Council of the European Union, “European Security and Defense Policy,” [http://consilium.europa.eu/cms3\\_fo/showPage.asp?id=268&lang=en&mode=g](http://consilium.europa.eu/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=268&lang=en&mode=g) (accessed November 08, 2008).

<sup>131</sup> Senem Aydın, *Türkiye’ nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye ye Katkuları* (İstanbul: İktisadi Kalkınma Vakfı Yayınları, 2002), 43.

Turkey's political, military, and growing economic power; its leading role in its neighborhood; its cultural, political, and economic importance in bridging West and East; and its significance in terms of countering contemporary security threats and protecting European energy security have been analyzed as some of the possible positive impacts of Turkey's prospected membership on the EU's CFSP in Chapter III. EU membership would bring Turkey to a crucial position in the formulation and implementation of the CFSP about all these issues. Consequently, this would enable Turkey to increase its weight in the European Union.

Membership in the EU would pave the way for establishing closer relations with other member countries. In addition to the member countries that Turkey already has close relations with due to geographical proximity, and/or historical, economic, and political ties, Turkey would strengthen its relations with members located in the north and western parts of the European continent.

Turkey's EU membership could also contribute to the resolution of problems such as the Aegean disputes between Turkey and Greece. This would bring advantages to both countries, as well as to the EU itself. Since its establishment, the EU has been a constructive platform in the resolution of bilateral disputes between and within member states. The EU's contribution to the improvement of relations between France and Germany – and its role in the consolidation of democracy in Spain and Portugal – constitute important examples.<sup>132</sup>

The EU has not, however, had any positive impacts on the resolution of problems between Turkey and Greece so far. There are two main reasons for this. First, until the 1980s, the EU did not want to get involved in Greek-Turkish relations. After 1981, when Greece became a member of the EU, while “Turkey perceived the EU as ‘captured by Greece,’” Greece perceived the EU “as an attractive lever to be used against Turkey.”<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Aydın, *Türkiye' nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye ye Katkıları*, 12-13.

<sup>133</sup> Bahar Rumelili, “The European Union's Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict,” *Working Paper Series in EU Border Conflicts Studies*, no.6 (January 2004): 25, [www.euborderconf.bham.ac.uk/publications/files/WP6GreeceTurkey.pdf](http://www.euborderconf.bham.ac.uk/publications/files/WP6GreeceTurkey.pdf) (accessed November 08, 2008).

Yet, with Turkey's EU Membership, the EU would become a neutral party and could be a significant agent in finding more constructive and even-handed ways to resolve the problems between these two countries.

In addition to these possible post-EU membership impacts, the potential effects the pre-accession process on Turkey's foreign policy should not go unnoted. As mentioned above, Turkey applied for full membership in the EEC in 1987, and its candidate status was not recognized until the Helsinki Summit in 1999. This situation created ambiguities for Turkish foreign policy, especially after the endorsement of the Commission's decision declaring Turkey's eligibility for membership by the EU Council; Turkey could not get a clear response from the EU. These ambiguities negatively affected Turkish foreign policy because it was not clear whether Turkey should act with or without an EU membership perspective in foreign affairs. Even though these ambiguities have decreased since Turkey gained candidate status and obtained a date for beginning accession negotiations, they have not completely disappeared. Even though Turkey started negotiations with the EU in 2005, due to the open-ended nature of the EU negotiation process, certain ambiguities will continue to exist until the outcome of the negotiations has become wholly visible, which means that Turkish foreign policy will continue to be affected throughout the process.

## **2. Security Affairs Dimension**

Turkish membership in the EU could have various consequences for the country's security affairs. The first possible consequence would be Turkey's full participation in ESDP with its full membership in the EU. On 17 March 2003 NATO and the EU approved the arrangements known as Berlin Plus, which "provide the basis for NATO-EU cooperation in crisis management by allowing EU access to NATO's collective assets and capabilities for EU-led operations." As the NATO website has noted, these arrangements "allow the Alliance to support EU-led operations in which NATO as a whole is not engaged."<sup>134</sup> Turkey has subsequently participated in a number of ESDP

---

<sup>134</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "NATO-EU: Strategic Partnership," <http://www.nato.int/issues/NATO-eu/evolution.html> (accessed November 11, 2008).

missions and supported the EU's efforts to conduct crisis management missions in different parts of the world. However, not being a full member in the EU bars Turkey from full participation in the planning and implementation of each ESDP mission led by the EU. Moreover, Turkey does not participate in the different EU agencies located under the ESDP framework such as the European Defense Agency.<sup>135</sup>

With Turkey's EU membership, all the obstacles to Turkey's full integration into the ESDP would be lifted. With full participation in the ESDP missions, Turkey, as a country acting in accordance with the objective of "Peace at Home and Peace Abroad" since its establishment and having made substantial contributions to security and stability not only in its neighborhood but also in other parts of the world, would have a chance to increase its efforts in the international arena in this direction. Additionally, with its substantial military capacity, Turkey would play a major role in the formulation of the EU's security strategy and in the conduct of ESDP missions, which would bring the country to a significant position in the ESDP institutions.

The second possible impact of EU membership on Turkish security affairs would concern countering contemporary security threats. Chapter III reviewed the importance of Turkey's membership in the EU's struggles against global threats such as terrorism, illegal immigration, and drug trafficking. EU membership would be important for Turkey as well with respect to these struggles.

Terrorism, one of the most important global threats, holds a significant place on the security agenda of many countries, including Turkey. Over the years, Turkey has given great attention to fighting against all kinds of terrorist organizations threatening both national and international security. The PKK/KONGRA-GEL terrorist organization, which has been conducting terrorist activities within Turkish territory since 1984, is on the EU's list of terrorist organizations. To date, however, Turkey has not received the support that it expected from European Union countries in fighting against this terrorist organization. Additionally, considering the fact that the PKK/KONGRA-GEL terrorist

---

<sup>135</sup> Sinan Ülgen, "The Evolving EU, NATO and Turkey Relationship: Implications for Transatlantic Security," *Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies*, April 2008, 4, <http://www.edam.org.tr/index.php?lang=english> (accessed September 6, 2008).

organization continues to make its propaganda by using certain media organizations broadcasting from some European Union countries, such as Roj Tv (Denmark), and uses bank accounts in some European Union-based banks, it is expected that Turkey's EU membership could provide robust leverage in enhancing the required efforts of European Union countries against this terrorist organization. Also, it would advance cooperation between Turkey and its fellow EU members in the fight against terrorism.<sup>136</sup>

Today, having efficient policies in areas such as migration, asylum, and border management affects the prospects for success in the struggle against smuggling, illegal immigration, terrorism and other threats. The EU's efficiency in developing the necessary policies and laws and coordination among the member states in these areas has been increasing. Since 2001, Turkey has also made important institutional and legislative reforms and achieved great success in aligning its laws and practices with EU law and regulations in those areas.<sup>137</sup> With full membership, Turkey's borders would become EU borders, the coordination between the EU and Turkish institutions in these areas would go further, and Turkey's rules and regulations would be fully harmonized with the Schengen acquis. Also, Turkey would participate in the European Police Office (Europol) and Schengen Information System (SIS), which would facilitate information exchanges between Turkey and other EU member states. All of these factors would contribute positively to Turkey's efforts in fighting against these global contemporary security threats.<sup>138</sup>

## **B. THE POSSIBLE POLITICAL IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY**

EU membership creates a number of political effects for the member states. Indeed, some of them are felt in the pre-accession period. As mentioned above, from the

---

<sup>136</sup> Can Buharalı, "Turkey's Foreign Policy Towards EU Membership: A Security Perspective," *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, (Fall 2004): 10, [http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=84&Itemid=201](http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=84&Itemid=201) (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>137</sup> Bülent Çiçekli, "Impact of Turkish-EU Accession Process on the Development of Turkish Immigration Law," *The Journal of Turkish Weekly*, November 2, 2004, <http://www.turkishweekly.net/articles.php?id=21> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>138</sup> Aydın, *Türkiye'nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye'ye Katkıları*, 48-49.

political standpoint, the candidate countries have to meet the Copenhagen political criteria for membership, which require “stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities.”<sup>139</sup> The efforts to fulfill these criteria pave the way for the start of the political reform process in the candidate countries. The reforms carried out during this process constitute one of the major political effects of EU membership.

Since Turkey gained candidate status for EU membership at the Helsinki Summit (1999), comprehensive political reforms have been carried out in the country. “Important steps have been taken in the areas of human rights and fundamental freedoms, freedom of thought and expression, non-Muslim religious foundations and their rights of acquiring and disposal of property, broadcasting and education in languages and dialects that are traditionally used in daily lives of Turkish citizens.”<sup>140</sup> Also, the reform process has contributed to further strengthening of the legal system in the country. Necessary arrangements have been made in the Penal Code, and the new Civil Code became law. “Between February 2002-July 2004 with an aim to fulfill the EU’s political criteria eight reform packages have been adopted.”<sup>141</sup>

These political reforms and other reforms, such as in the economy, played a major role in the EU Commission’s decision: “Turkey sufficiently fulfils the political criteria.” The European Commission recommended starting accession negotiations with Turkey on 6 October 2004.<sup>142</sup> Turkey has continued to carry out its political reforms since starting negotiations with the EU. All of these political reforms, together with the new ones carried out to completely meet the political criteria, would contribute positively to the political development and modernization of state institutions in the country. These

---

<sup>139</sup> EU Commission, “Enlargement-Accession Criteria,” [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/enlargement\\_process/accession\\_process/criteria/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/enlargement_process/accession_process/criteria/index_en.htm) (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>140</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Relations Between Turkey and the European Union,” <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/reasons-between-turkey-and-the-european-union.en.mfa> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

<sup>142</sup> EU Commission, “Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament - Recommendation of the European Commission on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession,” October 6, 2004.

reforms would be the major positive political impacts of EU membership<sup>143</sup> and would promote the realization of the aim of “reaching beyond the level of contemporary civilization,” set by Atatürk. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that any EU demand which would jeopardize Turkey’s unitary state structure could reverse the political positive effects of this membership.<sup>144</sup>

The second major political effect of EU membership for Turkey would be Turkey’s representation in EU institutions. Chapter III examined the possible impacts on EU institutions of Turkish membership and concluded that Turkey’s increasingly large population would probably bring some advantages to Turkey in the decision making process of the EU. However, the advantages of having a large population in the EU decision making process have been lessened by changes in the decision-making arrangements in the EU over the years. Population is still important in the determination of voting weight in the European Council and the allocation of seats in the European Parliament. Considering that Turkey has a larger population than all EU member states except Germany, and that in the following years, its population could be equal with and surpass Germany’s,<sup>145</sup> it can be argued that with its voting power, Turkey would have an important position in the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament. This would enable Turkey to play a major role in the decision making process of the EU.<sup>146</sup>

### **C. THE POSSIBLE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY**

EU membership creates social effects in both the pre- and post-accession periods. It makes several changes in the candidate country’s social policies. One of the major

---

<sup>143</sup> Aydın, *Türkiye’nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye’ye Katkıları*, 47-48.

<sup>144</sup> Özge Açar and Orçun Doğan, “AB-Türkiye Bitmeyen Vals”, *Middle East Technical University Management Club*, (Fall 2005), 3.

<sup>145</sup> Kristy Hughes, “The Political Dynamics of Turkish Accession to the EU: A European Success Story or the EU’s Most Contested Enlargement?,” *Swedish Institute for European Political Studies*, Report no:9, December 2004, 12.

<sup>146</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, “The Likely Effects of Turkey’s Membership Upon the EU,” December 2004, 12.

instruments precipitating these changes is the adoption of the *acquis communautaire* (the entire body of legislation of the European Communities and Union).<sup>147</sup> Adopting the *acquis communautaire* is one of the accession criteria for full membership in the EU. Besides its political and economic effects, it also plays an important role in the social transformation of the candidate country. Turkey, as a candidate country, needs to adopt the *acquis communautaire* through the negotiations over 35 different chapters. A number of these chapters deal with social issues such as “consumer and health protection,” “social policy and employment,” and “education and culture.”<sup>148</sup> Alignment of Turkish laws and practices with the EU’s would mean that Turkey would follow EU standards in these areas; and this would contribute positively to the further social development of the country.<sup>149</sup> Additionally, with full membership, Turkey would be entitled to benefit from certain EU funds provided in the framework of the EU’s regional policy, “which is intended to narrow the development disparities among regions and Member States.”<sup>150</sup> Additionally, since Turkish citizens would become EU citizens as well, they would have certain rights, such as free movement within the EU’s territory.

#### **D. THE POSSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF EU MEMBERSHIP FOR TURKEY**

Possible economic implications constitute one of the most popular parts of the discussions about Turkey’s prospective EU membership. Two facts highlight the economic importance of these discussions: (a) that the economic relations between Turkey and the EEC go back to 1959; and (b) that Turkey is the only country to have become a customs union partner with the EU without yet having joined the EU as a full member.

---

<sup>147</sup> Frank Bönker, “Consequences of EU Accession for Social Policy in the New Member States,” *European University Viadrina*, October 2006, 3.

<sup>148</sup> Turkish Secretariat General for EU Affairs, “Screening Process,” <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=38&l=2> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>149</sup> Senem Aydın, *Türkiye’nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye’ye Katkıları*, 25-26.

<sup>150</sup> The European Union Glossary, “Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund,” [http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/structural\\_cohesion\\_fund\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/structural_cohesion_fund_en.htm) (accessed November 11, 2008).



After the 2001 economic crisis in the country, Turkey achieved great success in catching up and maintaining high rates of growth. Inflation has dropped to single digits. The Turkish economy has gained in economic competitiveness and has attained the stature of a dynamic economy. The strengthening economic conditions in the country have positively contributed to the country's EU membership process, notably in the way of meeting membership economic criteria, which require "the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union."<sup>151</sup> The 2005 Progress Report about Turkey prepared by the EU Commission noted that "Turkey can be regarded as a functioning market economy, as long as it firmly maintains its recent stabilisation and reform achievements."<sup>152</sup> This indicates that Turkey has met one of the two key economic criteria for membership. It also has gained ground in meeting the second one in that it is achieving more macroeconomic stability, further strengthening trade relations with the EU, enhancing the investment and business environment in the country, and carrying out several economic reforms.<sup>153</sup>

From the economic standpoint, not only the post-accession but also the pre-accession period of EU membership must be considered to understand the complete economic effects. An analysis of the effects of the Customs Union coming into force between Turkey and the EU is a good starting point.

### **1. The Effects of the Customs Union**

The Customs Union, which "guarantees the free circulation of industrial goods and processed agricultural products" between Turkey and the EU, was established in 1995. In this context, "Customs duties and charges have been abolished and quantitative

---

<sup>151</sup> The EU Commission, "Turkey 2005 Progress Report," November 9, 2005, 43, [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/key\\_documents\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/key_documents_en.htm) (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>153</sup> Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation, "The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU," 19-21.

restrictions such as quotas are prohibited.”<sup>154</sup> It was an important step in Turkey-EU trade relations, and it has created both positive and negative effects for Turkey.

One of the effects of the Customs Union has been its contribution to advancing trade integration between Turkey and the EU. The foreign trade indicators of Turkey with the EU show that Turkey’s exports to the EU increased from \$11,078 million in 1995 to \$60,397 million in 2007. Also, Turkey’s imports from the EU increased from \$16,861 million to \$68,589 million within the same years.<sup>155</sup> The completion of the Customs Union has played a significant role in this trade increase. Additionally, the Customs Union has played an essential role in the decisions shaping Turkey’s EU membership process, such as giving Turkey candidate status.<sup>156</sup> Moreover, the Customs Union will facilitate the negotiation process in the relevant chapters.

Besides its positive effects, the formation of the Customs Union has also created negative effects for Turkey. Because Turkey is not a member of the EU, it cannot take part in the decision mechanisms which shape the EU’s trade relations with third party countries and determine the trade tariffs for third countries. However, Turkey has to adopt all these decisions. Also, while the EU signs free trade agreements with third countries, Turkey cannot participate in these agreements. Ultimately, third country goods can enter the Turkish market via the EU without facing Turkish custom duties. However, custom duties are imposed on Turkish goods when they enter the same third countries.<sup>157</sup> All of these circumstances negatively affect Turkey’s foreign trade development and cause economic losses in the country.

---

<sup>154</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “The Customs Union Between Turkey and the European Union,” <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-customs-union-between-turkey-and-the-european-union.en.mfa> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>155</sup> T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı, “Türkiye'nin Dış Ticareti ve AB'nin Payı,” <http://www.dtm.gov.tr/dtmweb/index.cfm?action=detay&yayinID=376&icerikID=475&dil=TR> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>156</sup> T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı, “Avrupa Birliği,” <http://www.dtm.gov.tr/dtmweb/index.cfm?action=detay&dil=TR&yayinid=1130&icerikid=1236&from=home> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<sup>157</sup> Yiğit Bulut, “Gümrük Birliği Bizi Eritiyor mu?,” *Radikal*, 15 Mart 2004, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=109634> (accessed November 11, 2008).

## 2. The EU's Financial Assistance to Turkey

Another economic aspect of Turkey's EU membership process has been the positive contribution of the EU's financial assistance to Turkey. Since the signing of the Ankara Agreement, the EU has extended financial assistance to the projects and programs designed to promote economic and social development in Turkey. The projects and programs that the EU supports have been determined in coordination with the relevant Turkish and EU institutions. The financial assistance offered so far and planned for the future can be examined in three different periods: the pre-Customs Union period, the Customs Union period, and the pre-accession period.

In the pre-Customs Union period, the financial cooperation between Turkey and the EU was regulated in the framework of the additional financial protocols to the Ankara Agreement. In this regard, the EU extended €1,005 million in financial assistance to implement a number of projects in Turkey. Due to Greece's veto, the assistance amounting to €600 million could not be used by Turkey in this period.

<b>Financial Assistance (1963-1995)</b>	<b>Committed</b>	<b>Used</b>
Credit ( in million €)	1,152	927
Donation ( in million €)	453	78
Total ( in million €)	1,605	1,005

Figure 7. The Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 1993 and 1995<sup>158</sup>

The financial assistance of the EU to different projects continued between 1996 and 1999. In this period, Turkey could use €609 million in financial assistance. This amount was under the EU's commitment in the pre-Customs Union period. Greece's veto of €1,125 million amount in financial assistance played a great role in this situation.

---

<sup>158</sup> T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı, "Türkiye-AB Mali İlişkileri," 1, <http://www.dtm.gov.tr/dtmweb/index.cfm?action=detay&yayinID=378&icerikID=477&dil=TR> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<b>Financial Assistance (1996-1999)</b>	<b>Committed</b>	<b>Used</b>
Credit ( in million €)	1,507	557
Donation ( in million €)	768	52
Total ( in million €)	2,275	609

Figure 8. The Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 1996 and 1999<sup>159</sup>

After Turkey gained candidate status and began accession negotiations, the financial assistance mechanism between Turkey and the EU was restructured. The EU decided to make available €126 million for 2002, €144 million for 2003, €250 million for 2004, €300 million for 2005, and €500 million for 2006 project packages. Currently, the implementation of some of the projects within these packages is about to finish.<sup>160</sup>

For the 2007-2013 period, the EU has made some changes in its pre-accession financial assistance programs and united them under one program named the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA). In this context, the EU has decided to provide €1,602.3 million in financial assistance to Turkey in five different components constituting the IPA. The amount of assistance for each component is presented in Figure 9.

<sup>159</sup> T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı, “Türkiye-AB Mali İlişkileri,” 2.

<sup>160</sup> Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği, “Katılım Öncesi Mali Yardımlar,” <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=5&l=1> (accessed November 11, 2008).

<b>Component</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>Total</b>
Institution Building	252.2	250.2	233.2	735.6
Cross-border cooperation	6.6	8.8	9.4	24.8
Regional Development	167.5	173.8	182.7	524
Human Resources Development	50.2	52.9	55.6	158.7
Rural Development	20.7	53.0	85.5	159.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>497.2</b>	<b>538.7</b>	<b>566.4</b>	<b>1,602.3</b>

Figure 9. The Projected Amounts of Financial Assistance from the EU to Turkey between 2007 and 2009 in million €<sup>161</sup>

Although Turkey could not get the whole amount of the assistance committed by the EU, and the amount of benefits that Turkey received was lower than that obtained by EU membership candidate countries in the past, the EU's financial assistance has contributed to Turkey's social and economic development. It is estimated that, with the beginning of accession negotiations, the increasing amount of financial assistance will play a significant role in the acceleration of Turkey's EU harmonization process.<sup>162</sup>

At this point, it has to be noted that financial relations would continue with Turkey's EU membership. As an EU member, Turkey would be entitled to certain EU funds. On the other hand, Turkey would also contribute to the EU's budget. As discussed in Chapter III, it is hard to make accurate quantitative estimates regarding Turkey's net benefits from and contributions to the EU budget. Yet it could be concluded that, although EU membership is not as beneficial as it used to be in budgetary terms for new members, the funds that Turkey would be entitled to receive would create positive impacts, especially for the country's economic and social development.

<sup>161</sup> The EU Commission, "Commission Decisions on a Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document (MIPD) 2007-2009 for Turkey," 30.04.2007, 16, <http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/e50020.htm> (accessed November 18, 2008).

<sup>162</sup> Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği, "Katılım Öncesi Mali Yardımlar."

### 3. Macro Economic Effects of EU Membership

From the macroeconomic perspective, EU membership brings important advantages for new member countries. Above all, trade liberalization (including the free movement of people, goods, money and services in the EU market) enables the country to complete its economic integration with the EU. The abolition of all tariffs between the country and the EU's markets obliges companies to take the measures necessary to survive in a more competitive business climate. This triggers an increase in productivity. Also, increasing competition due to the enlarged internal market encourages technological development and enhances living standards in the country. All of these factors contribute to economic growth and increase foreign direct investments in the country. Consequently, the national income of the country will become higher.<sup>163</sup>

EU membership would bring similar consequences for the Turkish economy. It would abolish all the negative affects of being a partner in the Customs Union without EU membership.

Also, with full membership, Turkey would complete its integration in the EU's single market. This would increase Turkey's trade with other EU member countries. Turkish companies would gain a chance to compete with those of other member countries in the EU market. According to the study prepared by A.M. Lejour, R.A. de Mooji, and C.H. Capel, the accession to the EU's internal market would cause a 0.8 % increase in Turkey's GDP and an 8.1 % increase in Turkey's total exports to the rest of the EU and a 12.2 % increase in its imports from the rest of the EU. A number of sectors in the country's economy would expand. While this expansion would be great for the clothing and textile sectors, it would be modest for sectors such as machinery and equipment. On the other hand, sectors such as food processing, transport equipment, and transport services would experience modest declines with membership.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> S. Sami Tan, "The Effects of Turkey's Accession to the EU On Tax Revenues: An Analysis from the Taxable Capacity Perspective," *The Journal of Turkish Weekly*, June 20, 2006, <http://www.turkishweekly.net/articles.php?id=125> (accessed November 18, 2008).

<sup>164</sup> A.M. Lejour, R.A. de Mooji and C.H. Capel, "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU," *CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis*, no.56 (2004): 40-44.

Besides its trade liberalization effects, the EU membership process would contribute to institutional reforms in the country. As mentioned above, Turkey is currently continuing its efforts to meet the accession criteria. In the framework of full adaptation to the EU acquis, it is making institutional reforms and structural changes. These reforms and changes would make a significant contribution to economic growth and stability in the country.<sup>165</sup> Yet, it should be noted that, although part of it would be compensated by the EU's pre-accession assistance, this process would be costly and difficult for Turkey.

Another economic effect of Turkey's EU membership process would be its contribution to foreign direct investment (FDI) coming to Turkey.<sup>166</sup> Since 2004 there has been a sharp increase in the FDI inflows to Turkey. While the amount of FDI inflows was \$2,883 million in 2004, it rose to \$9,803 and \$20,120 million in 2005 and 2006, respectively.<sup>167</sup> Together with the developing economic conditions in the country, the start of accession negotiations with the EU and the EU harmonization process have played essential roles in these increases. From this perspective, it can be concluded that the EU membership process would contribute positively to the dynamism of the Turkish economy.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

EU membership has held a significant place on Turkey's foreign policy agenda for many years. Turkey has had a long historical relationship with the EU integration institutions. Although it applied for membership in 1987, it could not start accession negotiations with the EU until 2005. Today, Turkey and the EU are continuing with the accession negotiations. Although Turkey has achieved great success, there is still much to be done throughout the long open-ended accession negotiations process.

---

<sup>165</sup> Lejour, Mooji and Capel, "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU," 44-45.

<sup>166</sup> Selin Sayek, "FDI in Turkey: The Investment Climate and EU Effects," *The Journal of International Trade and Diplomacy* 1, no.2 (Fall 2007): 132.

<sup>167</sup> United Nations, "World Investment Report 2007: Transnational Corporations, Extractive Industries and Development," 253, [www.unctad.org/en/docs/wir2007\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/wir2007_en.pdf) (accessed November 18, 2008).

EU membership and the accession process would affect Turkey in several ways.

From the foreign policy standpoint, with membership, Turkey would conclude one of its long-standing foreign policy projects. The ambiguities regarding the future of the accession process would be resolved. Turkey would take part in the European Union's policies as a global actor, and that would strengthen the EU's position over time. EU membership would provide a number of opportunities to Turkey to play a more active role in the international arena. After becoming a member, Turkey could be an important actor in the strengthening and implementation of the EU's CFSP, and this would solidify its position in the EU. Additionally, Turkey's EU membership would be beneficial for the resolution of problems between Turkey and Greece. From the security affairs perspective, with EU membership, Turkey would fully participate in the EU's ESDP and other security initiatives.

Both the accession process and membership would have political and social effects on Turkey. The political reforms, taking account of Turkey's unitary structure, would contribute positively to the country's political development. Thanks to its large population, Turkey would play an essential role in the decision making process of the EU. EU membership would bring several advantages for Turkish citizens, such as having a right of free movement throughout the EU.

Additionally, EU membership would have important economic consequences for Turkey. The financial assistance from the EU would compensate for the cost of the EU harmonization process to some degree and contribute to the social development of the country. Turkey would contribute to the EU budget and benefit from EU funds after becoming a member. The full integration in the EU market would create positive welfare effects for Turkey.

Consequently, considering the main possible consequences of both the EU accession period and membership, it can be concluded that the potential advantages of EU membership outweigh the possible disadvantages for Turkey.



## V. CONCLUSION

Since its establishment, the Republic of Turkey has played significant roles in European political, economic, and security affairs. Turkey has assigned great importance to advancing its relations with other European countries. Since World War II, it has actively participated in different initiatives and become a member of several intergovernmental organizations that play critical roles in European affairs such as the United Nations (UN), the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Turkey has also strengthened its efforts involving the European integration process by establishing relations with the European Economic Community (EEC).

Turkey applied for associate membership in the EEC in 1959. This moment was the starting point of Turkey's EU journey. Turkey's application was accepted shortly after its application and, with the signing of the Ankara Agreement (1963), contractual relations began between Turkey and the EEC. The Ankara Agreement envisaged a three-stage process (the preparatory stage, the transitional stage, and the final stage) for developing the relations between Turkey and the EEC. This agreement was a significant step; it not only established economic integration between Turkey and the EEC, but also set a goal of full membership for Turkey in the Community. Within the framework of this agreement and the additional protocol signed in 1970, economic integration involving the two parties was carried forward.

In 1987 Turkey took a significant step to further relations by applying for full membership in the European Community. Although its eligibility for full membership was noted, the analysis of its application was deferred until the signing of the Commission Report by the European Council on 5 February 1990.<sup>168</sup> This was not the outcome that Turkey expected. However, this application did bring dynamism to the

---

<sup>168</sup> Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community, December 20, 1989," <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?6ff60bd9-ffd0-4ac2-a177-f7438895084f> (accessed November 14, 2008).

relations. The Customs Union covering industrial and agricultural products was completed and entered into force on 1 January 1996.

The Luxembourg Summit (1997) affected the course of the thriving relations. At the summit, while countries that did not have long-standing relations with the EU and that were lagging behind in meeting the EU criteria compared to Turkey gained membership candidate status, Turkey did not. This alienated Turkey and created disappointment in the country.

The fluctuation in relations continued until the Helsinki Summit (1999). At this Summit, Turkey was granted candidate status, which brought momentum back to the development of relations. Since 1999, Turkey has accelerated its efforts to meet the required EU criteria for starting the accession negotiations.

At the Brussels Summit, which was held on 16-17 December 2004, the EU decided to open accession negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005. It is a milestone for relations that started in 1959. The accession negotiations opened as planned, and the negotiations on 35 different chapters are continuing. Due to the open-ended nature of the accession negotiations process, it is difficult to make a prediction about the outcome. At this point, it is clear that, along with the negotiations, Turkey's prospects for membership will continue to be widely discussed both in Turkey and the EU.

The possible consequences of Turkey's prospective membership in the EU – both for the EU and Turkey – constitute a popular aspect of these discussions, as in previous years. Besides the EU's long-standing relations with Turkey, the view that Turkey's EU membership would be different from previous enlargement rounds considering "Turkey's population, size, geographical location, economic, security and military potential, as well as cultural and religious characteristics,"<sup>169</sup> increases the importance of Turkey's place on the EU enlargement agenda. An analysis of the implications of Turkey's prospective membership is therefore timely.

---

<sup>169</sup> European Commission, "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective," 6.10.2004, 4, [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key\\_documents/2004/issues\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key_documents/2004/issues_paper_en.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

Turkey's EU membership would have different possible effects on the EU. One of these effects would be on the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). After the establishment of the CFSP, the EU began to be increasingly involved in international affairs and increased its ability to define and pursue a common policy. In addition to its economic power, it has employed political and military power in the international arena. Turkey – with its geostrategic position, leading role in its neighborhood, and military capacity – would contribute substantially to the EU's efforts in the international arena. With Turkey's EU membership, the EU would become a more powerful global actor.

From the foreign policy perspective, considering Turkey's relations with its neighbors, the convergence and the complementary nature of its policies toward its neighborhood with those of the EU would positively contribute to the development of the EU's CFSP.<sup>170</sup> Turkey's leading roles in its region would increase the prospects for the success of the EU's current and future initiatives regarding the Balkans, the Black Sea region, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean region. With its geographical position, Turkey has served as a bridge between West and East from political, cultural and economic aspects. This characteristic of Turkey would allow the EU to enhance its relations with other countries in Turkey's geographic region. Considering its predominantly Muslim population, Turkey's EU membership would prove that the EU is not a "Christian Club," and this would increase the EU's cultural richness.

From the security perspective, Turkey's membership would make the EU a closer neighbor of volatile regions such as the Middle East and the Caucasus, which could present security challenges for the EU. However, considering Turkey's efforts to bring stability and security to these regions, its important geopolitical position in terms of the EU's energy security, and its experienced and well-equipped military forces, Turkey would be a security asset for the EU. Turkey would increase the EU's military capability and contribute to the development of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP),

---

<sup>170</sup> Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci, "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy," *Centre for European Policy Studies*, no.1 (2004): 10.

which would be a significant advantage for the EU, especially in countering contemporary security threats such as terrorism and illegal immigration.

Another impact of Turkey's membership would be economic. With Turkey's membership, the EU market would become larger. If Turkey maintained its sustainable economic development, its economy would bring dynamism to the EU's economy. Turkey's membership would increase the EU's GDP, even if by a modest percentage. On the other hand, with membership, Turkey would be entitled to benefit from EU funds. The entitlements for Turkey would decrease by a marginal amount the funds allocated for current EU members. Turkey's membership could trigger migration from Turkey into other EU member countries. From this perspective, although Turkey's membership might be perceived as disadvantageous by some observers in the recipient countries, considering the EU's aging population, it can be concluded that Turkey's young, dynamic population could be a remedy for the possible demographic deficit of the EU as a whole.

The last possible impact of this membership on the EU would be institutional. Turkey with its large population would have important voting power in the European Parliament and in the European Council; and this raises concerns among some EU member states. All factors considered, Turkey's membership would bring many important advantages to the EU. Skeptics about Turkey's membership in the EU fail to understand that the potential disadvantages of Turkey's membership would be the normal costs associated with any new member. Overall, the advantages of Turkey's membership would outweigh the potential disadvantages for the EU.

EU membership would have various possible impacts on Turkey. One of these impacts would be on Turkish foreign policy and security affairs. From the foreign policy perspective, in Turkey, EU membership has been regarded as a significant tool for achieving the goal set by Atatürk of "reaching beyond the level of contemporary civilization." In this regard, EU membership would be an important step for Turkey. Since the EU is a global power, with this membership, Turkey would increase its weight in the international arena. The ambiguity present since 1987 regarding Turkey's membership status would be eliminated. Turkey's unique characteristics would make it a significant actor in the formulation and pursuit of the EU's CFSP. With EU membership,

Turkey would be able to deepen its relations with other member states. EU membership would also contribute positively to the resolution of the problems between Turkey and Greece, which would be beneficial for not only Turkey and Greece but also for the EU as a whole. In security affairs, this membership would increase the coordination between Turkey and other member states, which would be important for countering contemporary security threats.

Another possible impact of this membership on Turkey would be political. Turkey has made several political reforms thus far. This process would continue until Turkey completely fulfilled the accession criteria. In this regard, the reforms which would not jeopardize Turkey's unitary structure and which would contribute to Turkey's political development would be beneficial for Turkey. Additionally, as mentioned above, thanks to its large population, Turkey would have important voting power in the European Council and the European Parliament. Therefore, it would play an essential role in the EU decision making process.

EU membership would also have social effects on Turkey. Alignment of Turkish laws and rules with those of the EU on social policy issues would positively contribute to furthering social development in the country.

The last major possible impact of EU membership on Turkey would be economic. With EU membership, the negative effects of the Customs Union would be abolished. The full integration of Turkey into the EU market would be realized, and this would bring several macroeconomic advantages to the EU. The full adoption of EU laws and rules would be a costly process for Turkey as it was with other new EU members; however, the cost of this process would be compensated to some degree by EU financial assistance. Additionally, with EU membership, Turkey would be entitled to benefit from certain EU funds. Again, all factors considered, it can be concluded that the potential advantages of EU membership would outweigh the possible disadvantages for Turkey.

In accordance with this analysis, it can be concluded that Turkey's EU membership would offer both Turkey and the EU important benefits in several respects. To bring about this membership, both Turkey and the EU must fulfill their

responsibilities. Turkey should continue to make efforts to fulfill the accession criteria. The EU should treat Turkey as it has treated previous candidates for membership. Adopting different practices toward Turkey would not only decrease the potential advantages of this membership for Turkey, but also alienate the Turkish people.

Since Turkey's membership in the EU would bring about valuable consequences for both Turkey and the EU, greater efforts by both sides to strengthen relations and conclude this negotiation process with full EU membership for Turkey would be highly desirable.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ağar, Özge, and Doğan, Orçun. "AB-Türkiye Bitmeyen Vals." *Middle East Technical University Management Club*, (Fall 2005), <http://www.ba.metu.edu.tr/~manclub/yayinlar/glokal/dosya/vals.html> (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Aydın, Mustafa, and Açı kmeşe, Sinem Akgül. "To Be or Not to Be with Turkey; December 2004 Blues for the EU." *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, (Fall 2004), [http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=88&Itemid=201](http://www.turkishpolicy.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=88&Itemid=201) (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Aydın, Senem. *Türkiye' nin Tam Üyeliğinin Avrupa Birliğine Ve Türkiye ye Katkıları*. İstanbul: İktisadi Kalkınma Vakfı Yayınları, 2002.
- Baç, Meltem Müftüler. "Turkey Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common European Security and Defence Policy." in *Turkey and European Security*, IAI-TESEV Report (July 3, 2006), [http://www.iai.it/pdf/Quaderni/Quaderni\\_E\\_08.pdf](http://www.iai.it/pdf/Quaderni/Quaderni_E_08.pdf) (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Barysch, Katinka. "Turkey's Role in European Energy Security." *Centre For European Reform*, (December 12, 2007), [www.cer.org.uk/pdf/essay\\_turkey\\_energy\\_12dec07.pdf](http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/essay_turkey_energy_12dec07.pdf) (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Belke, Ansgar. "Turkey in Transition to EU Membership: Pros and Cons Of Integrating a Dynamic Economy." *Perceptions* 10, (Spring 2005), [www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/volume10/spring2005/asangarbelkeson.pdf](http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/volume10/spring2005/asangarbelkeson.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).
- Biermann, Rafael. "Back to the Roots: The European Community and the Dissolution of Yugoslavia-Policies under the Impact of Global Sea-Change." *Journal for European Integration History* 10, no.1 (2004): 36-37.
- Clesse, Arman, and Taşhan, Seyfi. *Turkey and The European Union: 2004 and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Dutch University Press, 2004.
- Derviş, Kemal, Emerson, Michael, Gros, Daniel, and Ülgen, Sinan. "The European Transformation of Modern Turkey." *Centre for European Studies*, September 1, 2004, [http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item\\_id=1156](http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1156) (accessed September 6, 2008).
- Dinan, Desmond. *Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publisher, Inc, 2005.

- Domaniç, Seda. "The Turkish Accession to the European Union: Mutually Beneficial? Mutually Possible?" *Europeum Institute for European Policy*, January 12, 2007, [http://www.europeum.org/disp\\_article.php?aid=863&cid=3&nolang=0&page=1&type=0&lang=en](http://www.europeum.org/disp_article.php?aid=863&cid=3&nolang=0&page=1&type=0&lang=en) (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Emerson, Michael, and Tocci, Nathalie. "Turkey as Bridgehead and Spearhead- Integrating EU and Turkish Policy." *Centre for European Policy Studies*, no. 1 (August 1, 2004), [http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item\\_id=1143](http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1143) (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Ertuna, Özer. "Türkiye'nin AB Üyeliği: AB ve Türkiye İçin Bu Bir Fırsat mı, Tehlike mi?" *Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, no. 26 (April 2005): 19-20.
- European Commission. "Issues Arising From Turkey's Membership Perspective." 6.10.2004, [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key\\_documents/2004/issues\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key_documents/2004/issues_paper_en.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).
- European Commission. "EU Policies." [http://ec.europa.eu/policies/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/policies/index_en.htm) (accessed September 6, 2008).
- Ginsberg, Roy H., and Smith, Michael E. "Understanding the European Union As a Global Political Actor: Theory, Practice, And Impact." *Princeton University*, September 6, 2005, [www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/GinsbergSmith%20Memo.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/GinsbergSmith%20Memo.pdf) (accessed February 26, 2008).
- Hix, Simon. *The Political System of the European Union*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Kaloudis, Stergos. "Why Europe Cannot Ignore Turkey." *International Journal on World Peace* 24, no. 2 (2007): 48.
- Kocatürk, Utkan. "Atatürk's Revolution and Modernization." *Atatürk Araştırma Dergisi* 5, no.13 (October 2006), <http://www.atam.gov.tr/index.php?Page=DergiIcerik&IcerikNo=915> (accessed October 28, 2008).
- Kramer, Heinz. "Turkey and the EU: The EU's Perspective." *Insight Turkey* 8, no. 4 (2006): 24-30, [www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get\\_document.php?asset\\_id=3789](http://www.swp-berlin.org/en/common/get_document.php?asset_id=3789) (accessed February 26, 2008).
- Laçiner, Sedat, Özcan, Mehmet, and Bal, İhsan. *European Union With Turkey: Possible Impact of Turkey's Membership on The European Union*. Ankara: International Strategic Research Organization, 2005.



- Lejour, A.M., Mooji, R.A. de., and Capel, C.H. "Assessing the Economic Implications of Turkish Accession to the EU." *CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis*, no. 56 (March 2004), <http://www.cpb.nl/eng/pub/cpbreeksen/document/56/doc56.pdf> (accessed March 14, 2008).
- McCormick, John. *The European Union*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2008.
- McLaren, Lauren M. "Explaining Opposition to Turkish Membership of the EU." *European Union Politics* 8, no: 2 (2007): 251-278.
- Ögutçü, Mehmet. "Turkey and the European Union, How to Achieve a Forward-Looking and Win-Win Accession by 2015." *Civitas International*, March 2005, <http://www.civitatis.org/pdf/turkey.pdf> (accessed February 26, 2008).
- Öniş, Ziya. "Luxembourg, Helsinki and Beyond: Towards and Interpretation of Recent Turkey-EU Relations." *Government and Opposition* 35, no.4 (2000): 467.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Turkey and the EU." <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/sub.en.mfa?6ff60bd9-ffd0-4ac2-a177-f7438895084f> (accessed November 14, 2008).
- Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Secretariat General for EU Affairs. "Turkey-EU Relations." <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=4&l=2> (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organisation. "The Likely Effects of Turkey's Membership Upon the EU." December 2004, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/ab/uyelik/etki/olasi-i.pdf> (accessed March 14, 2008).
- Rumelili, Bahar. "The European Union's Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict." *Working Paper Series in EU Border Conflicts Studies*, no.6 (January 2004), [www.euborderconf.bham.ac.uk/publications/files/WP6GreeceTurkey.pdf](http://www.euborderconf.bham.ac.uk/publications/files/WP6GreeceTurkey.pdf) (accessed November 08, 2008).
- Sayek, Selin. "FDI in Turkey: The Investment Climate and EU Effects," *The Journal of International Trade and Diplomacy* 1, no.2 (Fall 2007): 132.
- Schultz, Siegfried. "The EU's Medium-Term Financial Perspective and Turkey's Potential Slice of the Cake." *Intereconomics* 40, no.6 (2005), <http://www.intereconomics.eu/archiv/autor/355/> (accessed September 6, 2008).
- Solana, Javier. "A Secure Europe in a Better World, European Security Strategy," A document adopted by Heads of State and Government at the European Council on 12 December 2003, 5-17, [www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/solanae.pdf](http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/solanae.pdf) (accessed September 6, 2008).

World Economic Forum. "World Economic Forum in Turkey, Connecting Regions  
Creating New Opportunities." 23-24 November 2006,  
[www.weforum.org/pdf/summitreports/turkey2006.pdf](http://www.weforum.org/pdf/summitreports/turkey2006.pdf) (accessed September 21,  
2008).

## INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center  
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California
3. David S. Yost  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California
4. Donald Abenheim  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California
5. Hava Harp Okulu Komutanligi  
Kutuphane  
34807 Yesilyurt, Istanbul  
Turkey
6. Harp Akademileri Komutanligi  
Kutuphane  
Ayazaga, Istanbul  
Turkey
7. Abdi Pehlivan  
9ncu Ana Jet Us K.ligi  
Balikesir, Turkey