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Abstract

In time, the enlargement policy proved to be one the most dynamic European Union’s policies. Today, the prospect of membership for 34 countries (including here Turkey and Western Balkans) draws attention even more and start an important debate related with the values of EU. This paper address the current EU agenda on enlargement and also the historical and theoretical perspectives of the process in order to understand better the position on Turkey. It argues that with Turkey’s accession EU will expend for the first time outside the Europe’s geographical borders and by this will open the door for other non European countries. Based on this, Turkey is presented as a particular case with a big importance for the future of this policy and even for the EU’s future in general.
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CHAPTER 1. Introduction

1.1. Methodology

The current paper addresses the EU enlargement process through six chapters. In the beginning the process as a hole is analyzed together with the steps from the past in a historical perspective. In the same time the current criteria for accession are underlined and also a standard accession process is presented.

In the second chapter, the theoretical perspectives are presented starting by defining concepts and presenting the current literature on enlargement. The chapter continues with a parallel between UE, USA and URSS as being similar type or organization but with particular aspects. In the end the two theoretical approaches to enlargement are addressed, namely the rationalist approach and the constructivist approach.

The paper continues with the third chapter which is addressing the current strategy of EU on enlargement presenting the current Candidate Countries: Turkey and Croatia, the Potential Candidate Countries: Western Balkans and in the end the requirements that EU has to fulfill in support of the current strategy.

The forth chapter study the reasons for the enlargement process, both for the candidate countries and for EU.

The chapter five on Turkey as a case for EU enlargement starts by creating a country profile which includes historical, political and economic perspectives. It continues with the relations between Turkey and EU in time and also addresses the level of accomplishment of the Copenhagen Criteria. In order to support scenarios, the positions of

---

different EU members are presented together the position of other countries with influence on Turkey’s debate: USA, Israel, Russia and Muslim world. The arguments and the problems to be solved are presented in relation with the opponents and the supporters. In the end of the chapter three scenarios are identified: Accession in 2014, Postponement and Negative answer based on incompatibility.

The final chapter presents three types of conclusions: general conclusions for the enlargement process, for the current step of enlargement and Turkey particular case and also for the future enlargement possibilities, changes in the process and Potential Candidate Countries.

1.2. Background

The process of enlargement has started in January 1973 with United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland, after 16 years from the foundation of the European Economic Community (EEC). The three countries can be seen as being part of the Community from the beginning, being known the fact that UK has participated in the initial discussion about European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) but they withdraw in order to concentrate on Commonwealth aspects. The other two countries were in a similar position, their decision being strong influenced by UK.

In time the motivations for enlargement and also the time passed between the different steps has changed. Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986 and later East Germany in October 1990 have been included in the Community in order to protect their democracies and avoid future dictatorships. These steps can be related with the one from 2004 and probably with the one from 2007 as shown before their motivation being different.

Austria, Finland and Sweden in January 1995 is more related with the first group from 1973 their inclusion in the community being seen as less problematic step.

Nowadays the process of enlargement is addressed as a unique opportunity both for the European Union and for the member states. The integration of the European continent, the promotion of peace and the extension of prosperity are one of the main arguments in favor of enlargement.

---

2 The Commonwealth is a voluntary association of independent states, nearly all of which were once British territories. There are 54 members.
The dynamic of the accession process has accelerated and "enlargement is a top priority" for EU due to the important changes from everyday life both for MS and the CS.

In order to extend peace, stability, prosperity, democracy and the rule of law the EU's enlargement policy is taking in consideration three factors: consolidation, conditionality and communication.

The European Union grew from 6 to 25 members and enlargement proved to be one of the successfully EU's policies talking in terms of number of countries that finished the negotiations process. Bulgaria and Romania are will join EU most probably in 2007 while Croatia, Turkey and more recently Macedonia are candidate countries.

Due to its effects, it is considered to be of vital importance that people from the MS and CS to understand the reason of the Enlargement. Also the benefits and the changes for each actor have to be addressed properly.

### 1.3. Past steps in the process

Today, the EU is the world's largest custom union with 25 Member States and a population of 455 million. This has been done in just over 30 years after five rounds of enlargement:

EU has grown from a six-member entity with a population of 185 million into a 15-member entity with 375 million people before becoming a 25-member entity with 455 million citizens on 1 May 2004.

During this period numerous obstacles have been passed through and several membership applications have not led to enlargement:

- the applications of the United Kingdom in March 1961 and 1967 were twice vetoed by France;
- Denmark, Ireland and Norway has withdrawn their applications but they re-applied for the third time in 1969, and were all successful in negotiating their membership;
- Norway has a special situation because The Accession was rejected by referendum twice in September 1972 and November 1994 (after application in April 1962 and December 1992); a new referendum is discussed;
- Switzerland's application from June 1992 was rejected by referendum in December 1992 and application for membership subsequently withdrawn;
Table 1. The five steps of enlargement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Area (sq km)</th>
<th>Population (July 2006 est.)</th>
<th>GDP - per capita (PPP 2005 est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Founding members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,279,921</td>
<td>10,379,067</td>
<td>31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>547,030</td>
<td>60,876,136</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany*</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>357,021</td>
<td>82,422,299</td>
<td>29,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>301,230</td>
<td>58,133,509</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>474,413</td>
<td>55,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,526</td>
<td>16,491,461</td>
<td>30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First enlargement</strong></td>
<td>358,194</td>
<td>70,122,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>August 1961</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
<td>43.094</td>
<td>5,450,661</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>July 1961</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
<td>70.280</td>
<td>4,062,235</td>
<td>34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>August 1961</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
<td>244.820</td>
<td>60,609,153</td>
<td>30,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second enlargement</strong></td>
<td>131,140</td>
<td>106,880,582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third enlargement</strong></td>
<td>597,173</td>
<td>51,003,712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>March 1977</td>
<td>January 1986</td>
<td>92.391</td>
<td>10,605,870</td>
<td>18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>July 1977</td>
<td>January 1986</td>
<td>504.782</td>
<td>40,397,842</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth enlargement</strong></td>
<td>871,979</td>
<td>22,440,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
<td>January 1995</td>
<td>83.870</td>
<td>8,192,880</td>
<td>32,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
<td>January 1995</td>
<td>449.964</td>
<td>9,016,596</td>
<td>29,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth enlargement</strong></td>
<td>738,460</td>
<td>74,572,942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus**</td>
<td>July 1990</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>9.250</td>
<td>784,301</td>
<td>14,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>January 1996</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>78.866</td>
<td>10,235,455</td>
<td>18,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>45.226</td>
<td>1,324,333</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>March 1994</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>93.030</td>
<td>9,981,334</td>
<td>16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>October 1995</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>64.589</td>
<td>2,274,735</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>65.200</td>
<td>3,585,906</td>
<td>13,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>July 1990</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>400,214</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>April 1994</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>312.865</td>
<td>38,536,869</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>June 1995</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>48.845</td>
<td>5,439,448</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>June 1996</td>
<td>1 May 2004</td>
<td>20.273</td>
<td>2,010,347</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from EurActiv article Introduction - Enlargement and CIA The World Factbook 2006 - for reasons regarding the availability of statistical data *Germany includes also East Germany ** Cyprus includes also Northern Cyprus
Figure 1. Founding members of the ECSC

Source: adapted from Directorate General for Enlargement website

Table 2. The planned and possible next steps of enlargement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Area (sq km)</th>
<th>Population (July 2006 est.)</th>
<th>GDP - per capita (PPP 2005 est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next enlargements (planned)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185,532</td>
<td>104,597,626</td>
<td>9,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>1 January 2007</td>
<td>110,910</td>
<td>7,385,367</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>June 1995</td>
<td>1 January 2007</td>
<td>237,500</td>
<td>22,303,552</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>20 February 2003</td>
<td>1 January 2009 [scheduled but less certain]</td>
<td>56,542</td>
<td>4,494,749</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not certain</td>
<td>780,580</td>
<td>70,413,958</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible future enlargements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207,560</td>
<td>20,963,730</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td>24 March 2004</td>
<td>not certain</td>
<td>25,333</td>
<td>2,050,554</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>SAA on 18 February 2006</td>
<td>28,748</td>
<td>3,581,655</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>SAA since 25 October 2005</td>
<td>51,129</td>
<td>4,498,976</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>SAA since 10 October 2005</td>
<td>102,350</td>
<td>10,832,545</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from EurActiv article Introduction - Enlargement and CIA The World Factbook 2006
A very special case is represented by the Application in July 1987 of Morocco which was rejected by the Council as a non-European state. **This is the first and until now the only rejected application.** In order to analyze this application the historical perspective is important. In 1987 not even the great enlargement to the East was not predictable. On the other hand other factors such as the developing economy or unresolved border issues with several of its neighbors were factors that influence Morocco rejection. In that moment it was a union of 12 states which was facing difficulties with the lagging behind regions from Spain, Portugal and Greece. The perspective of poor African countries knocking on EU door probably scared the Commission which adopted a strong position against Morocco’s accession in order to prevent future application from countries situated in the Mediterranean region, like Tunisia. The argument used was the geographical aspect, one impossible to solve by Morocco.

Today the perspective is changed, the geographical aspect has faded and it is possible. In the future, the Magrebiene countries, which are now included in the European Neighborhood Policy, can try again to apply and it is possible to find the door opened for them.

In conclusion the EU’s “classical method of enlargement” was based on a “constant pattern both in the formal accession procedures adopted, and in the implicit assumptions and principles which have shaped the expectations of the participants and the progress of negotiations”\(^3\). The six principles identified are:

- Applicant countries have to fully accept the acquis (no exceptions being available);
- Accession negotiations are focused almost exclusively on the practical issues by which the applicants adopt the acquis;
- The introduction of new policy instruments is used to address the problems which arise from the enlarging Community's increased diversity rather than by reforming the current instruments;
- The new MS are accepted into the Community's institutional structures with a limited adaptation
- The Community prefers to negotiate with groups of states which are close related
- The existing Member States pursue their own interests throughout the enlargement process and collectively externalize their internal problems.

---

\(^3\) Christopher Preston, Enlargement and Integration in the European Union
1.4. Steps in the accession process

The Copenhagen Council of June 1993, reinforced by the European Council in Madrid in 1995, laid down the foundations for the EU's fifth enlargement process by fixing the so-called 'Copenhagen criteria', which a candidate country must meet. These criteria are:

- **Political criteria** - "stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the respect for and protection of minorities"

- **Economic criteria** - "the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union"

- **Acquis criterion** - adoption of the acquis communautaire (the entire European legislation) and its "ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union"

Following the Commission's enlargement methodology Regular Reports are issued on the candidate countries to assess their progress in meeting the Copenhagen criteria. Progress in each criterion is assessed by The Commission, as well as for each of the twenty-nine chapters of the acquis.

Basically a 'standard' accession process entails the following steps:

- Submitting the application for membership;
- Formulating Commission's opinions ['avis'] based on assessments against the Copenhagen criteria;
- Opening accession negotiations and concluding based on Council resolutions;
- Ratifying accession treaty by the Member States' parliaments / citizens;
- Accession takes place.
CHAPTER 2. THEORIZING EU ENLARGEMENT

“Enlargement of an organization is a process of gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization of organizational rules and norms. Institutionalization means the process by which the actions and interactions of social actors come to be normatively patterned. The difference between ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical’ institutionalization corresponds to the common usage of ‘widening’ and ‘deepening’.”

The literature on EU enlargement is vast, but it consists mainly on studies on the effects of EU enlargement process, from an analytical perspective, like the financial implications or the effects of the process on the current EU policies. The approaches on the enlargement of the EU suffer from a theoretical neglect and often “suffer from a predominant focus on single cases and from not being linked to the more general study of international organizations”.

In order to address properly the theoretical background of EU enlargement and to address the international organizations, this chapter is divided in three parts:

- one regarding the definitions of concepts used and the perspective of the current literature on the subject;
- a second regarding the process of enlargement of similar international and supranational unions (USA and in a smaller amount Soviet Union), with focus on the basic differences from the organization, the principles and values and also to the tools used for enlargement;
- a third one regarding the current tendencies from the EU level on enlargement namely rationalist/functionalist approach and the sociological/constructivist approach;

2.1. Definitions and concepts

As defined in the beginning of this chapter, by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, **enlargement is a process of gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization**. This definition is valid on a special issue as the enlargement of the European Union, but also on a more general scale, as the enlargement of other regional organizations.

---

4 Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research
5 Helen Wallace, EU enlargement: a neglected subject
Defining EU enlargement as institutionalization, an explicit link to the study of EU institutions is established. In the same time also moves the discussion of EU enlargement from the field of decisions about formal membership to subjects like the expansion of the EU’s policies, and the impact of enlargement on the applicants, the member states, and the EU itself.

‘Horizontal’ institutionalization correspond to the more used term of ‘widening’ and basically takes place when the group of actors (MS) whose actions and relations are governed by the organization’s (EU) norms becomes larger (adding new members). In the same time ‘vertical’ institutionalization corresponds to the common usage of ‘deepening’.

**Enlargement is a gradual process that begins before, and continues after, the admission of new members to the organization.** Sometimes even in the absence of full membership, outside actors might follow certain organizational norms and rules (see example of Norway who implements more EU directives compared to some MS). EU is the type or organization which condition accession of non-members with the alignment to organizational rules (EU aquis). In the same time new members of the organization may negotiate post-accession transition periods before applying some of its norms (Poland access to CAP), or they might begin to participate in some of the organization’s policies at different times (as in the EMU or the Schengen Agreements).

### 2.2. Current literature on enlargement

According to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier the literature on EU enlargement can be divided in four main dimensions or aspects of enlargement. The dimensions are:

1. **applicants’ enlargement politics**: regards the studies of the conditions on which non-members seek accession to EU and also the studies of relationship with the EU which non-members prefer;

2. **member state enlargement politics**: includes studies focused on the conditions under which a member state of EU favor or oppose enlargement to a particular applicant country;

3. **EU enlargement politics**: cover the field of studies done on the conditions which determine EU to admit a new member, or modify its institutional relationship with a non-member; two aspects can be identified in this dimension: one regarding concerns of candidate selection and different pattern membership of the EU and a second one regarding the debate on the concrete substance of EU aquis implemented;
(4) the impact of enlargement regards the studies of distribution of power and interests in the EU, and also how enlargement influences the identity, norms, goals and the effectiveness and efficiency of the EU;

According to this typology the current paper address topics from all dimensions but primarily the second and the third dimensions are enlighten.

The focus in today’s literature is primarily on the first three dimensions of enlargement which all concern the process leading to enlargement, while in the same time the fourth dimension, regarding the process after the enlargement, has received comparatively little attention concerns.

In a general manner, the theoretical existing studies have been primarily single case studies and for this reason the insights generated are not easily generalizable and do not contribute too much to our cumulative understanding of enlargement. An improve of the situation can be obtained through comparative research with more cross-sectional studies, seen as comparison between the politics of different applicants and member states, the EU and other supranational unions, and through more longitudinal studies, seen as studies that take the comparison further to the study of applicant and member state politics over time, the analysis of different enlargement steps of EU, and also short-term and long-term impacts.

In conclusion, the studies on EU enlargement have focused so far primarily on the EU macro politics and on eastern enlargement while the greatest deficits are in the study of the impact of enlargement and in the comparative analysis of member state politics and EU macro politics.

2.3. The process of enlargement of similar international and supranational unions

The need of understanding the insights of enlargement as a process drive us to similar experiences from the past. The process of enlargement is not new, from thousands a year countries with stronger values, knowledge and resources expand, examples can be found starting from the Roman Empire to the Napoleonic Empire or the British Empire.

The methods used through the time have changed dramatically and for this reason some examples from the past are not relevant to our days. EU’s enlargement is a totally changed process because European Union is built on benevolent transfer of sovereignty and expansion through conquest based on military advantage is unacceptable concept. Indeed European Union can be considered the most evolved type of supranational union based on its complexity and use of fundamental
rights. In order to better understand the process two cases have two be addressed: the formation and enlargement of United States and the Soviet Union, the two “superpowers” of the 20th century.

2.3.1 The case of USA

The USA originated from 13 colonies in British North America, formed as an informal alliance of independent states, which declared their independence in 1776 and start the revolution. In the process of its expansion, the USA displaced most Native American nations residing in the area and also changed its organizational form in a federal union of sovereign states.

As shown in the map no 2 the enlargement of USA is a mixture of procedures which has included the following types of actions:

- **annexation** by proclamation as in the case West Florida 1810;
- **acquisition** by the United States as in the case of The Louisiana Purchase in 1803, Red River Basin in 1818, Gadsden Purchase 1853 and latter The Alaska purchase in 1867;
- **cession** as in the case of East Florida and the Sabine Free Stat in 1819, Mexican Cession in 1848;
- **voluntary annexation** as in the case of Texas Annexation (the of Republic of Texas) from 1845 and Hawaii, annexed in 1898;
- **occupation** as in the case of American Samoa, in 1899 or other small islands from the Pacific and the Atlantic Ocean;

As a conclusion the methods used for the enlargement of the USA changed through time and suffered transformation conducting to a similar form used today by the EU, meaning voluntary annexation.

Through the important particularities of this process, starting from 13 to 50 states is the fact that the territories included were newly formed states, without tradition and personal identity. This compared to the case of “old Europe” constituted an important advantage.

Regarding the values promoted, USA success is based on The Constitution of the United States which guarantees freedom of speech, religion, the press, the right to a fair trial, universal suffrage, and property rights. In the same time democracy is considered of fundamental importance.

---

6 A superpower is a state with the first rank in the international system and the ability to influence events and project power on a worldwide scale. The term in its current political meaning was used in the book The Superpowers, written by W. T. R. Fox and it was applied to the Soviet Union and the United States
Through time USA expansion was influenced by two important theories namely The Manifest Destiny\(^7\) and the Monroe Doctrine\(^8\).

2.3.2 The case of USSR

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was created and expanded as a union of Soviet republics formed within the territory of the Russian Empire and existed from 1922 to 1991. The Soviet Union’s geographical boundaries varied with time. The first Republics, established shortly after the October Revolution of 1917, were technically independent from one another but their governments acted in closely coordinated confederation. In 1922, four Republics (Russian SFSR, Ukrainian SSR, Belarusian SSR, and Transcaucasian SFSR) joined into the Soviet Union. And between 1922 and 1940, the number of Republics grew to sixteen.

---

\(^7\) The term was first used primarily by Jackson Democrats in the 1840s and express the belief that the United States had a mission to expand, spreading its form of democracy and freedom

\(^8\) expressed in 1823 by President James Monroe, it proclaimed the United States' opinion that European powers should no longer colonize the Americas and in return, the United States planned to stay neutral in wars between European powers and in wars between a European power and its colonies
Formed in the beginning as a union of independent states, tied by the common belief in communism, USSR expand after 1950 only by occupying territories from countries in Eastern Europe, in the same time turning them into Soviet satellite states. The situation is presented in the map no 3.

**Figure 3. USSR expansion 1922 - 1991**
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*Figure 3. USSR expansion 1922 - 1991*  
*Source: Matthew White and Pearson Education*

Compared to USA which changed from conquering territories to voluntary annexation, USSR follow the opposite way from a voluntary union based on common beliefs to a totalitarian union which expanded through territorial occupying. This led in 1991 to dissolution of the USSR and the independence of the republics.

Differences reside also in the nature of the territories before the USSR. The republics had own cultural identity but also a common past in the Russian empire. The republics were not organized as independent republics for long time. On the other hand the most important difference is the one connected with the values and principles. Compared to USA and EU which promote democracy, USSR promoted communism. Also the human rights were addressed totally different, USSR being a totalitarian regime based on the one-party rule of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

### 2.3.3 A comparison with EU

When it comes to method used for enlargement, Compared to USA and USSR, the countries that form the UE have strong identity and tradition, which make the process much more complex. EU has used only voluntary annexation and no change or exception appeared in the process. On the principle level, UE promote similar values as USA, namely democracy and human rights but the focus on the mission to expand, spreading development is not present.

Through this comparison different criteria can be identified:
utility which refers to an effort to find efficient solutions to concrete problems or dilemmas while;

Figure 4. EU expansion 1952 - 2004

Source: BBC News Enlargement website

- values referring to a particular idea of the 'good life' that is grounded in the identity of a specific community;

- rights refer to a set of principles that are mutually recognized as morally acceptable;

According to these aspects the USA, USSR and EU had been legitimized, with reference to principles.

Putting EU in a historical context is an important issue; its particularities were addressed in this chapter on a basic level in order to open the debate on the current approaches on enlargement, from the EU level.
2.4. Theoretical approaches to enlargement

“It is a mistake to depict Europe as a kind of renaissance cathedral entirely designed by a powerfully-minded architect. To stick to religious architecture, one could say it is more like a medieval cathedral, patiently build by several generations of craftsmen with the materials available to them, in response to what they perceived as the needs of their time hence probably the lack of coherence of the whole construction.”

Taking into consideration the definition used for EU enlargement as a process of gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization, the theoretical foundations for this process is highlighted by the current international debate between rationalist and functionalist approach on one side and the sociological and constructivist approach on institutionalism.

Basically this debate divide the two disciplines that contributed most until now to the process of EU enlargement: economy and sociology.

The two approaches, rational and constructivist can’t be rigorously tested against each other, because both fail to provide fully elaborated consisting hypothesis, being defined mostly by assumptions rather than by specific hypothesis.

It is important to understand that, in reality, the arguments from this approaches are mixed and the actors are usually situated somewhere in between.

As presented in table 3, at the purely theoretical level, rationalist is based on individualism and materialism and has consequentiality logic of action, while rationalist is based on social and ideational ontology and has appropriateness logic of action, opposed to the one of rationalist.

The differences between the rational and constructivist are not in principle (both accepting enlargement) being mainly in the type of addressing the situation. Based on that, the two approaches can be regarded as being partially competing and partially complementary, for the study of enlargement.

In the two cases, the rationale, the conditions and the mechanisms of enlargement are competing hypotheses based on divergent premises and different perspectives on the causal status and purposes.

9 Renaud Dehousse, Rediscovering Functionalism
10 see March and Olsen, Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics
Table 3. Comparison between the ideal types of rationalist and constructivist approach of enlargement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>RATIONALIST</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTIVIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General hypotheses</td>
<td>Expected individual costs and benefits determine the applicants' and the member states' enlargement references. States favor the kind and degree of enlargement that maximizes their net benefits.</td>
<td>The more an external state identifies with the international community that EU represents and the more it shares the values and norms that define the purpose and the policies of EU, the more the member states are willing to pursue horizontal institutionalization with the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values promoted</td>
<td>Individualism and materialism</td>
<td>Social and ideational ontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic of action</td>
<td>Consequentially</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of study</td>
<td>Consists in the material, distributional consequences for individual actors.</td>
<td>Consists in the analysis of social identities, values, and norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions of EU institutions</td>
<td>Emphasizes the instrumental, regulatory, and efficiency-enhancing functions of EU organizations</td>
<td>Sees them as autonomous and powerful actors with constitutive and legitimacy-providing functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations of enlargement</td>
<td>Start with actor preferences level</td>
<td>Start of the systemic, ‘organizational’ level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The base of enlargement</td>
<td>The outcomes of EU enlargement</td>
<td>Ideational, cultural factors as collective identity and fundamental beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective on enlargement</td>
<td>EU expands its institutions and membership if for both the member states and the applicant states, the marginal benefits of enlargement exceed the marginal costs.</td>
<td>EU expands (its institutions) to outside states to the extent that these states share its collective identity, values, and norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The end of enlargement</td>
<td>EU enlargement will continue until marginal costs will be equal with marginal benefits</td>
<td>Enlargement will continue until the (cultural) borders and the (formal, institutional) borders of EU match.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier

At the EU level the rationalist approach is represented by the MS who argue that the history of European integration is based on functional arrangements and it is easier to achieve compromise on concrete proposals, whose costs and benefits can be (more or less) anticipated, and which can be the subject of trade-offs of various kinds. On the other hand the constructivist approach is represented by the MS who argue that a common “vision” is needed for EU in order to preserve its identity and avoid collapsing.
2.4.1. The rationalist and functionalist approach

In this approach the enlargement policy is justified with reference to the output that it is expected to produce. It is based on an instrumental conception of rationality and the aim of the actor is to maximize utility for the actor.

On the other hand this means that one would not expect actors to support enlargement, unless arguments could be found to support the idea that it would provide utility. A MS will favor the integration of a CS under the conditions that it will reap positive net benefits from enlargement, and that these benefits exceed the benefits it would secure from an alternative form of enlargement.

Rationalist explanations of EU enlargement involve two steps\textsuperscript{11}: first, in which the enlargement preferences are explained to the applicant and the member state and, second, the EU collective decisions on enlargement at the macro and policy levels are explained.

In Buchanan book on the club theory\textsuperscript{12}, the most pertinent rationalist approach to the optimal size that can be apply on EU, the enlargement is done if, for both the MS and the CS, the marginal benefits of enlargement exceed the marginal costs. In the club-theoretical perspective, the state of equilibrium indicates the optimal size of the EU and enlargement will continue until marginal costs equal marginal benefits. However, the outcomes of EU’s enlargement policy depend on:

- **constellations of bargaining power** because it is not necessary that EU enlargement to be equal beneficial to each member. For this reason, EU enlargement can be influenced by unequal bargaining power among MS, in which conditions, the MS that expect net losses from enlargement will agree on it if by their bargaining power they will obtain compensation from the winners (in turn, the necessary concessions should not exceed the winners’ gains from enlargement). Without that, the MS which don’t gain from enlargement can be convinced to agree only by threaten them, but this is not at all usual at EU level.

- **formal decision-making rules** because EU’s enlargement requires the consensus of all member states. Three aspect that have to be taken into account in EU. First, accession treaties have to be ratified by national parliaments and the treaties can be subjected to a referendum in the CS as well

\textsuperscript{11} Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research

\textsuperscript{12} Buchanan, James M., An economic theory of clubs
as in some of the MS (see the case of France who threatens to make the Turkey accession subject of a referendum). Second, the consent of the European Parliament (EP) is required and third, EU policies that are affected by enlargement (such as agriculture, trade, or regional policies) have their own different policy rules and decision-making procedures.

2.4.2. The sociological and constructivist approach

According to constructivist approach the EU enlargement will be shaped in generally by ideational and cultural factors. Some of the discussion on enlargement address the concept of community or cultural match, which can be defined as “the degree to which the actors inside and outside the organization share a collective identity and fundamental beliefs”13.

The justification of this approach is relying on the conception of the collective “us” and on the idea of the values represented by a specific community. According to this, the enlargement will be justified in connection to duties and responsibilities that emerge from the quality of member of a particular community and need to address the social identities, norms and values.

From this perspective, EU’s MS and CS build their relationships on the ideas that define the Union as the Single market or the common European currency. After those relationships are established the current MS decide upon new enlargements based on the degree of community sense which they have to the CS. The constructivist perspective situates the level of conflict within the CS and in a lesser degree between the MS. This derives from the fact that for the CS, the joining of the Union represents a major political reorientation, while for the MS the decisions on enlargement represents just matters of policy. In the group of MS that use the constructivists arguments there is a low conflictual situation and a low degree of variation on preferences which cause homogeneity.

In some cases, on the EU level, tensions can be identified between values and norms and for this reason it is very difficult to shape the enlargement preferences of the MS. In the same time there is a different degree of identification with the enlargement process between the MS based on each state opinion on values and norms.

Compared to the first approach, on which the decisions on EU enlargement were made on a process of bargaining, the constructivist approach highlights this type of decision based on the process of arguing.

13 Checkel, Jeffrey T, Norms, institutions, and national identity in contemporary Europe
The MS does not involve in a negotiation, they engage in a discourse and start a debate based on rhetoric. The consensus is much harder to obtain on this situation because the whole debate can be also affected by the fact that the identities and norms can be subject of change in time. On the other hand the positive effects can be identified in the fact that this type of approach can more easily give birth to new identities and norms and modify the old ones.

In order to better understand the two approaches, concrete cases from EU have to be addressed. The rationalist perspective is represented by the Founding Fathers of EU, Monnet and Schuman and their approach is based on concrete objectives and gradual change. For this reason, for 50 years the EU history is a long history of functional arrangements for each concrete project which has no blueprint for the final state. The other perspective, constructivist one, is maybe best represented by Joschka Fischer, who argue that on the last steps of integration the discussions have been deliberated avoided and there is urgent need for a common view on the future architecture of Europe. On the other hand it is very important to highlight that in reality in almost all cases there is a mixture of arguments from both perspectives, none of the member states or the important figures from EU level are situated on one side and completely disagree the other arguments. On the contrary, facing different situation, they make use of arguments appropriate to the situation, both from constructivist or rationalist side.
CHAPTER 3. THE CURRENT STRATEGY OF EU ON ENLARGEMENT

In order to understand the current situation regarding the enlargement process, one of the essential parts of the European project, the focus should be on “2005 Enlargement Strategy Paper”. This document, dated November 2005, includes all the elements needed to obtain a complete picture of this stage of the process.

According to this paper the EU “cannot abandon its responsibilities to ensure security, stability and prosperity on its own continent and further afield”14 because EU has helped the former communist countries from Central and Eastern Europe to approach and stabilize their democracies. In the same way EU is helping Turkey, Croatia and the Western Balkans countries and the EU efforts can be seen in the increasing reforms from these countries.

Another important aspect underlined in the paper regards the fact that all European citizens benefit from having neighbors that are stable democracies and prosperous market economies and the public support has to be regained in order to sustain the enlargement agenda. It is very important for the EU to ensure the extension “of peace, stability, prosperity, democracy, human rights and the rule of law across Europe”15 as main factors for the development.

The particularities of the current step of enlargement, compared to the one from 2004 and 2007, reside in the different characteristics of the groups. Both groups of countries are homogenous but they comply different with the accessions criteria. The group from 2004 and 2007 was facing mainly economic problems, the democracy being stable, while the current group of countries is confronted with political problems. Their political situation is unstable and their democracy week. While The Balkans are recovering after the war and still facing ethnic problems, Turkey is known as being a country facing problems when it comes to human rights, especially when it comes to Kurds situation. For this reason the focus of the strategies for those two steps of enlargement is different, each situation asking for different solutions of the problems.

The communications strategy for Enlargement tries to meet the growing demand for information about enlargement. The strategy has different objectives for the member states and for the candidate countries as presented in Table number 1.

15 idem
The EU’s heads of state and government have decided, based on the progresses achieved by each individual country, that “the current enlargement agenda is the Balkans and Turkey”\textsuperscript{16}.

After the ten new members joined EU in 2004, an accession treaty has been signed, in April 2005, with Bulgaria and Romania. The accession negotiations with Turkey and Croatia have been opened together with negotiations on a stabilization and Association Agreement with Serbia and Montenegro in October 2005.

### Table 4: The key objectives of EU enlargement process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE MEMBER STATES</th>
<th>THE CANDIDATE COUNTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- to communicate the reasons for enlargement to the public including its likely impact and the challenges it poses. The outcome should be improved understanding of the enlargement process, which in turn should assuage apprehensions about its impact;</td>
<td>- to improve public knowledge and understanding of the European Union;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to promote dialogue at all levels of society between policy-makers and the public on issues related to enlargement. This should ensure that progress through the negotiations towards enlargement is accompanied by public understanding and support; and</td>
<td>- to explain the implications of accession for each country;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to provide information about the candidate countries to help promote general understanding.</td>
<td>- to explain the link between the pace of preparations for membership and the progress of the negotiations. This should encourage the acceleration of the transposition of EU laws and the creation of the necessary administrative structures. It will also increase public understanding of the reasons why negotiations may proceed at different speeds in different candidate countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Communications Strategy for Enlargement

Even if from geographical point of view, Croatia can be grouped in the Balkans area, this paper, following the “2005 Enlargement Strategy Paper” methodology, is treating Croatia separately. This is done because Turkey and Croatia are seen as already candidate countries, which have started the accession negotiations process, while the others countries from the Western Balkans are regarded as potential candidate countries or as in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia special case as “candidate country” which is not a “negotiating country” yet.

\[\text{idem}\]
3.1. Candidate Countries: Turkey and Croatia

Even if, together with the opening of accession negotiations on 3 October 2005, the relations between the EU, on one side, and Turkey and Croatia, on the other side, have entered in a new phase but the two countries are situated on different positions concerning the speed of the accession process.

Croatia was able to launch accession negotiations due to the fact that, now, they are fully cooperating with International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY). Throughout the accession process, the cooperation with the ICTY will remain one important requirement that Croatia has to fulfill.

Compare to Turkey whom political transition is ongoing, Croatia doesn’t face difficulties in meeting the political criteria required for membership. On the same time, concerning the economic criteria, Croatia is regarded as a functional market economy which is able to with the increased competitive pressure from the EU level.

**Figure 5. The current EU enlargement map**

![Enlargement Map](source: adapted from Directorate General for Enlargement website)

Accession negotiations with Turkey are considered to be a long-term process. Aspects of this process are analyzed in detail in a later chapter on this paper.

The first step of the negotiations has already been made on 20 October 2005 with the start of the “screening” process, which is a step by step examination of the EU laws (acquis). The screening process brings
together experts from CS and from the Commission “to explain EU rules and examine each country’s plans for adopting and implementing them ... After a chapter has been screened the EU will decide, on a proposal from the Commission, whether it can be opened or which benchmarks need to be met before opening it”.\textsuperscript{17} It is expected that all the acquis chapters will be addressed according to the screening process until autumn 2006.

In order to support reforms in both candidate countries the Commission has proposed, based on the priorities established, Accession Partnerships. The pre-accession financial assistance amounts to EUR 140 million in 2006 for Croatia and 500 million in 2006 for Turkey.

### 3.2. Potential Candidate Countries: Balkans

The Western Balkans is a particular challenge for the EU because the states are weak and societies divided, and there is an urgent need to keep their reforms on track.

In the Treaty on European Union, in Article 49 it is stated that “any European State which respects the EU’s fundamental democratic principles may apply to become a member of the Union” but these countries, in order to join, have to meet the criteria in full. The criteria for membership set by EU are related to political and economic aspects, but also with “the obligations of membership and the administrative capacity to implement and enforce the EU’s laws and policies”\textsuperscript{18} (the adoption of the acquis).

Because the Western Balkans contains smaller countries which are, in this moment in different position concerning the EU’s requirements it is expected that, in the future, EU enlargements will continue step by step in close correlation with each country’s performance concerning the required standards. In order to be absorbed in a smooth way the new member countries will join EU in different moments. For example The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has an advantage, based on their own reforms, compared to Serbia and Montenegro, which has to deal with the delicate situation of Kosovo but also with other political and economical aspects.

The functioning of the democratic institutions is generally improving and the juridical systems are reformed and improved. However, the protection of human rights and the issue of minorities are addressed in

\textsuperscript{17} Commission of the European Communities. 2005 Enlargement Strategy Paper. Brussels, 2005
\textsuperscript{18} The conclusions of the European Councils from Copenhagen (1993) and Madrid (1995)
almost all countries from the area, but some cases of discrimination are still taking place.

In **Albania** governance still needs to improve significantly although its political system is more stable, as demonstrated by change of government from August 2005. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** has to address the problems that appear in the decision making process mostly because of its complex constitutional structure. In order to strengthen the country’s stability, **The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** is appreciated as being one of the countries that shown commitment regarding the accession negotiation and in the same time made important progress since 2001. **Serbia and Montenegro** is dealing with weaknesses in structure and coordination, due to the fact that is sharing the competences with the two republics. In the special case of **Kosovo**, it is believed that the institutions need to be more mature taking in considerations that they have to deal with a problematic multi-ethnic society.

In order to sustain growth rates and moderate inflation, in all countries of the region, macroeconomic stability has been further strengthened overall. However, structural reforms are progressing uneven due to the fact that the actions meant to privatize the state companies and also to restructure the economy are not well coordinated.

“All the Western Balkan countries have been given the prospect of EU membership once they fulfill the necessary conditions”. The EU respects this commitment but it will continue to be rigorous and fair regarding the fulfillment Copenhagen criteria. According to this each country will progress on its own merits and based on its reforms.

### 3.3. Requirements for EU

Most of the time the requirements necessary to be met for enlargement are placed on the CS side, but also EU has to prove political and administrative capacity to finalize the negotiations and give the go-ahead to the entry of the CS. **If EU doesn't fulfill its requirements the enlargement it is not possible even if the CS are prepared** and they did their job.

In order to avoid a begging of the Community’s decline through enlargement, EU has to transform the process in a success. Basically in order to fulfill this, three conditions are necessary:

- **EU has to approve a budget sufficiently large** so the future MS to enjoy the same level of solidarity as the previous member have enjoyed from many years. An enlarged Europe will require a greater distribution of costs in order for the new members to take advantage of the internal market. Even if the solidarity policy is more and more questioned it is
obvious that the new members require investments in infrastructure and economy and also education and training.

- **EU has to adapt its institutional structure** in order to function properly with the increased number of members. The collective capacity to make decisions will need modifications because of the need to think in the spirit of the Community as a group and not in terms of individual interests. The idea of a solid core of countries is gaining more adepts but it is essential that some of the new MS to be present in this core in order to avoid a division between the old members and the new ones and also between West and East.

It is also known, that in order for the current CS to join, a new treaty is needed, but the situation of EU Constitution continues to remain a very delicate subject after the referendums hold in France and Netherland.
CHAPTER 4. REASONS FOR THE ENLARGEMENT PROCESS

Most of the times the challenge of enlargement is regarded from the EU point of view but in reality it represents a greatest challenge for both actors involved: the EU and the candidates. Both actors have their own expectations from the process, but also requirements.

Nevertheless, the distance on the subject between the politicians and the public opinion is growing and is producing democratic conflicts. In EU, the population from the member states is very skeptical, but the situation is similar in the states who wish to become a part of the Union. This situation rise the need of understanding both the motivation and also the requirements from each side in order to better understand whether the enlargement is necessary or not.

In order to better understand the situation, this chapter, analyze the different points of view starting with the candidate countries, because always the accession process starts from the candidate state level through the submitting of the application for membership.

4.1. Motivation for the candidate countries

There is no doubt that for CS joining the EU requires a profound transformation of a country’s laws, institutions and policies but in the same time means anchoring the state in a strong political community of stable democracies and prosperous economies.

Even if now it is much harder to gain entry in the Union and the process is more difficult and complex, compared to Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain accession from the 1970s and 1980s, the CS continue to be interested in joining EU and for this reason they are prepared to make a lot of efforts. The EU itself used to be less complex before the creation of the Single Market and the establishment of Euro as common currency, so membership then required fewer adjustments from the CS.

Despite the difficulties, new states are constantly interested in joining the Union. Basically several reasons can be identified:

- their territorial integrity and also their existence as an independent state is protected (from Russia as in the case of the Baltic States and Finland, or from inside conflicts as the Kurdish conflict in the case of Turkey);

- the credible prospect of membership increase stability in all domains which has an important result especially in the FDI;
- a modern set of standards and regulations according to the EU legal and regulatory frameworks with important results in food safety and also in environmental protection;

- the structural foundations represent a motivating reason especially for the countries with developing problems which requires important investments in the infrastructure

- accession help to built up well functioning, market-based economies;

- helps the state to overcome critical problems as corruption, and to also to improve the administrative capacity and the judicial systems;

- by joining the EU the countries prepare for a globalize world where the laws are less and less local and more and more international;

In the same time, for the citizens of the CS joining EU means also continuity of reform efforts and the prospect of EU full membership is considered to be one of the most powerful incentives for undertaking major reforms. The European Commission ensures consistent external pressure on successive governments and can be look as a guaranty of the developing process.

On the other hand, the accession requirements are not the same as development needs in all the moments and for some states can appear the need to recognize the opportunity costs of EU accession preparations.

In spite of that, for countries that intend to join the Union, the overall benefits of EU membership certainly outweigh the short term costs of unpopular policies and regulatory regimes. This continues to be a strong incentive for the countries that are not members of the Union yet.

### 4.3. Motivation for EU

Usually the candidate countries motivation is rather obvious and easier to identify while the Commission (as partner in the negotiations process) motivation is not very well underlined and also not very well communicated, especially to the EU citizens. The Commission has a basic role, when it comes to enlargement, because it is the only part capable to carrying it out. It is impossible to handle this subject at the MS level.

Basically the EU has 5 basic reasons regarding the enlargement as:

- an obligation towards the countries that regained democracy and stability through last decades (this motivation is not new and the situation has began with Spain after the dictatorship);
- **a political necessity** in order to build a strong European bloc, as a political projects **meant to protect the common values**. Despite the opinions regarding EU as a project based on economic interests, EU should be regarded as a project meant to support the adoption of the common values all over Europe. This will represent a basic element of stability with respect for democracy and individual liberties;

- **as an increase of Europe weight in the world** meant to strength the Europe’s role in the international conflicts. In the twentieth century Europe has lost its influence in the world leaving all the great decision in the hands of the United States. An enlarged Europe, in the next 10-15 years, has the opportunity to achieve leaderships in terms of values through the weight of a population of 500 million and a great geographic area;

- **an economic and social opportunity** because enlargement will bring advantages for EU and the candidate countries by opening a market with millions of new inhabitants with a standard life below the one from the Community. Also the great growth in Europe in the coming years is expected to take place in these countries and bringing them into the Union means bringing dynamics in terms of development in the Union;

- **a way to cover greater geographic area** (especially through big countries like Turkey) as by this as a way to offer major prospects for EU economy and its companies. Turkey, by its geographic position mainly in Asia, will open those markets for EU businesses and in the same time their important energetic resources.

As discussed in the previous chapters of this paper the EU motivation have been different in the different steps of enlargement. The enlargement through Spain, Portugal and Greece together with the last steps from 2004 and probably 2007 represent a way to strengthen their democracies and also to include in EU countries expected to have an important economic growth. On the other hand, the first step of enlargement (UK, Ireland and Denmark) and the forth step (Sweden, Austria and Finland), represented a way to strengthen the EU in economics. Those countries mainly helped EU to increase its role in the world; the question of preventing dictatorships and protect democracy did not have any role here.
CHAPTER 5. TURKEY

“It makes the rather obvious conclusion that as an EU member Turkey would offer both great opportunities and major challenges, both for the EU and Turkey.”

The debate about Turkey accession to EU can be considered as a debate about the true nature of the European Union. Because of its history, culture, size and geographical position, Turkey has generated a debate about the political aim of the integration process and also about the Union’s political and geographical limitations. Turkey’s candidature has unveiled the need of a certain ethical-cultural nationalism at European level, which needs to build only on civil and political foundations.

5.1. Country profile

The Republic of Turkey (Türkiye Cumhuriyeti) is a Eurasian country located mainly in the Anatolian peninsula in Asia, with a small portion of its territory located in the Balkan region of Southeastern Europe. Turkey's area inclusive of lakes is 814,578 square kilometers, of which 790,200 square kilometers occupies the Anatolian peninsula (also called Asia Minor) in Asia, and 3% or 24,378 square kilometers are located in Europe. Turkey borders eight countries: Bulgaria to the northwest; Greece to the west; Georgia, Armenia and the Nakhichevan exclave of Azerbaijan to the northeast; Iran to the east; and Iraq and Syria to the southeast.

Turkey is generally divided into seven regions: the Marmara, the Aegean, the Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, East Anatolia, Southeast Anatolia and the Black Sea region.

Turkey is subdivided into 81 provinces (iller in Turkish; singular il). Each province is divided into subprovinces (ilçeler; singular ilçe). The capital of Turkey is the city of Ankara, but the largest city is Istanbul. The three largest cities by population are Istanbul with 10,019,000 inhabitants, Ankara with 4,319,000 inhabitants and Izmir with 2,409,000 inhabitants.

The Republic of Turkey is a democratic laic constitutional republic, whose political system was established in 1923. Turkey is a member state of the United Nations, NATO, OSCE, OECD, OIC and the Council of Europe.

19 Olli Rehn, speech Turkey and the EU: a Common Future?
5.1.1. The historical perspective

From historical point of view the current territory of Turkey has been a part of the Eastern Roman Empire, known as the Byzantine Empire, centered on Constantinople (known in ancient times as Byzantium). They ruled for more than 1500 years being also known as Greek-speaking Roman Empire and have been strong influenced by the Greek culture.

The origins of modern Turkey can be traced back to the arrival of Turkish tribes in Anatolia in the 11th century. They establish themselves as a powerful force in the region and in 1453, the Eastern Roman Empire, fell to the Ottoman Turks. In the 16th century, at the height of its power, the Ottoman Empire grew to cover Anatolia, North Africa, the Middle East, South-Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. Following its defeat in World War I, Western powers sought to partition the empire through the Treaty of Sevres. But the Turkish revoke the terms of treaty which had been signed by the Sultan in Istanbul and started the Turkish War of Independence. The modern secular republic was established in the 1923 when a republic was declared with nationalist leader Mustafa Kemal Atatürk as President.

Atatürk instituted a wide-range of far reaching reforms, known as the Kemalist reforms, with the aim of modernizing the new Republic from the remnants of its Ottoman past. The reforms lead to the adoption of the Gregorian calendar, the introduction of a modified Latin alphabet and the adoption of new civil, commercial and penal codes based on European models.

Turkey intervened militarily in Cyprus in 1974 in response to a Greek coup by the militant nationalist group National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA-B). The breakaway de-facto independent Northern Cyprus is not officially recognized by any country except Turkey itself and constitutes one of the problems regarding the Turkey accession to EU.

A New constitution was adopted in 1982 following a military coup and the imposition of martial law in 1980. The new Constitution created a seven-year presidency, and reduced the parliament to a single house.

5.1.2. The current political profile

Turkey is a Parliamentary Republic. Its present Constitution was ratified 7 November 1982 and has been amended several times since then. The parliamentary system is unicameral, with the 550 members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) facing election every five years. The head of state is the President who is elected by an absolute majority of the TGNA to serve a seven year term.

The Present government is formed by the Justice and Development Party (AKP) and took up office following the November 2002 general
The government is led by the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan and the current President is Ahmet Necdet Sezer.

The Armed forces have traditionally been a political powerful institution, and have on several occasions intervened directly in political affairs.

### 5.1.3. The economic profile

Turkey’s economy can be seen as a complex mix of modern industry and commerce along with an undeveloped traditional agriculture sector that in 2004 still accounted for 35% of employment and by this will represent a major challenge for the CAP. Turkey’s private sector has a strong and rapidly growing, but the state still plays a major role in basic industry, banking, transport, and communications.

The largest industrial sector is textiles and clothing, which accounts for one-third of industrial employment. Other sectors, notably the automotive and electronics industries are rising in importance. In recent years, the Turkish economy has expanded, registering growth rates of 8.2% and 7.6% for the 2004 and 2005 fiscal years respectively. The inflation has been significantly reduced, having come down from 65% in 1999 to single digit rates by the middle of 2004.

Turkey population now estimated at 70 millions is constantly growing and it is expected that, if the accession is postponed, to become larger that the one of Germany before accession.

The combination of healthy growth, falling inflation and a tight fiscal policy has made the Turkish economy more robust and resilient to shocks. By this Turkey has significantly improved the functioning of its market economy, although macroeconomic imbalances remain.

### 5.2. The relations with EU

Turkey has started negotiations in order to join European Union on October 3, 2005. This is by now the longest process of accession to EU. The first step is represented by Turkey’s application for associate membership in the European Economic Community in 1959, which le to the signing of an Association Agreement in 1963. This has provided for the future the possibility of full membership.

The Ankara Agreement (an association agreement) from September 1963 was signed in order to take Turkey to Customs Union and finally to full EEC membership and it also provide the first financial protocol.
The next step was represented by The Additional Protocol and the second financial protocol signed in Brussels in November 1970, which entered into force in January 1973. The protocol had set out comprehensively how the Customs Union will be established.

After that for a period of 10 years the relations between Turkey and the Community come to a virtual freeze following Turkey invasion of Cyprus in July 1974 and the military coup d’etat on 12 September 1980. This represented a major brake on the process and a road meant to bring Turkey in the Community, which appeared to be cleared and already decided, was almost totally vanished.

The process has continued in September 1986 when The Turkey-EEC Association Council meeting has revived the association process. Based on that on 14 April 1987 Turkey has applied for full EEC membership.

In December 1989 The Commission has endorsed Turkey’s eligibility for membership but also deferred the assessment of its application. A successful step is represented by finalization of the agreement on the Customs Union in March 1995, which has entered into force on 1 January 1996.

After that the new enlargement opportunities offered by the fall of the communist regimes in the Central and Eastern Europe has placed Turkey’s accession on a secondary plan. For EU it was much more important to allow the Central and Eastern European countries to join in order to protect their young democracies and reduce the influence of Russia in the region.

The internal EU struggle on Turkey’s subject can be revealed by the declining of granting the candidate status to Turkey at the Luxembourg Summit in December 1997. Later the EU leaders has changed their mind and decided on the candidate status of Turkey in December 1999 at the EU Helsinki Council.

On March 2001 The EU Council of Ministers has adopted EU-Turkey Accession Partnership and also the Turkish government has established the National Programme of Turkey for the adoption of EU laws. Following this on September 2001 the Turkish parliament has adopted over 30 amendments to the constitution in order to meet the Copenhagen political criteria for EU membership. Also the reforms meant to meet the EU’s human rights criteria had passed The Turkish Parliament in August 2002.

Based on the Council of Europe recommendation for ending monitoring of Turkey in March 2004 and the progress report on Turkey issued in October 2004 the European Council has decided in 17
December 2004 to open accession negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005 with strings attached.

The reforms continued in Turkey with a protocol banning death penalty in all circumstances signed and the penal code revised and entered into force in 1 June 2005.

After the presentation by the Commission of its "rigorous" negotiating framework to Ankara in 29 June 2005, the Accession talks have been symbolically opened with Turkey in 3 October 2005.

The EU's strategy on accession negotiations with Turkey is based on three pillars to guide and accompany the accession negotiations:

- The first pillar would provide support for the reform process in Turkey in order to assure the irreversibility and the sustainability of the reforms;

- The second pillar outlines the approach for accession negotiations proper with Turkey, which will no doubt be complex. It sets clear benchmarks for the opening and closing of chapters and specific arrangements in some areas;

- The third pillar will be geared to strengthen the political and cultural dialogue between EU and Turkish citizens because EU citizens need to know more about Turkey, and Turkish citizens more about the EU.

The negotiating framework has some specific elements, which are present for the first time in this kind of framework:

- the negotiations are “open-ended”, which means that their outcome cannot be guaranteed beforehand;

- even Turkey fail to qualify in full for all obligations of EU membership Ankara will still be “fully anchored in the European structures through the strongest possible bond”;

- the negotiations will be conducted with the participation of Turkey and all EU member states and the policy issues will be broken down into 35 policy areas (chapters) - more than ever before - and the decisions will require unanimity;

- the EU may consider the inclusion of long transition periods, derogations, specific arrangements or permanent safeguard clauses in its proposals for each framework;

- membership talks can only be concluded after 2014, the scheduled date for the establishment of the EU's new financial framework (because Turkey “accession could have substantial financial consequences”);
- **negotiations can be suspended** in case of a “serious and persistent breach […] of the principles of democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law on which the Union is founded”;

### 5.3. Level of accomplishment of the Copenhagen Criteria

According to “2005 enlargement strategy paper” Turkey continues to sufficiently fulfill the Copenhagen’s Criteria. are a long-term process.

**The Political Criteria** represented the main concern of EU because the transition is ongoing in Turkey. Major legislative reforms have entered into force and it is expected to lead to structural changes in the legal system. The human rights violations are diminishing, but they still continue to occur. Efforts are required to address “fundamental freedoms and human rights, particularly freedom of expression, women’s rights, religious freedoms, trade union rights, cultural rights and the further strengthening of the fight against torture and ill-treatment”

Turkey has progressed also towards the **Economic Criteria** field being now regarded as a functional market economy. The competitive pressure and market forces within the Union should be addressed by maintaining the current trend of stabilization and reforms. Also further steps towards structural reforms are still required.

Regarding the **adoption and implementation of the EU acquis**, the third Criteria from Copenhagen, Turkey’s has progressed in few areas but “remains at an early stage in most areas”. This will be done in the near future according to the necessary adjustments on each chapter of negotiations.

### 5.4. The position of different EU members: PRO or CON

#### 5.4.1 PRO members and Turkey’s strong points

The side favorable to Turkey’s membership generally talks about the future, arguing on the developing potential of Turkey. In the same time they admit that Turkey situation still needs improvement especially in political and economical terms but they don’t forget to underling the changes from the last five years. The belief in the continuation of this...
process is optimistically expressed “In 10 years, Turkey won't be the same Turkey as today ... and certain fears that exist today can be put aside”\textsuperscript{22}. The main arguments in favor of Turkey's accession are:

- **geopolitical security**: It is argued that through Turkey, as an Islamic ally, EU can improve its connection to the Middle East and use Turkey as an interface to Asia.

- **commitment to democratic values**: Turkey’s young democracy can constitute a model to other Muslim countries, in this moment being the only Islamic country with a democratic regime. In the same time, the situation of the human rights is improving.

- **economic expansion**: EU is Turkey’s biggest trading partner, Turkey being a member of a customs union with the EU since 1995. However, Turkey continues to improve its economy for example the economic growth was 5.10 in 2005 compared to 1.70 in European Union.

- **young and increasingly well-educated population**: This argument is used towards EU problem with ageing population, 23\% of Turkey's population being under 15.

**Figure 6. The Roman Empire, a common past for EU and Turkey**
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\textsuperscript{22} European Commission president Jose Manuel Barroso in December 2004
- **Turkey’s involvement in European history**: Starting through the Eastern Roman Empire and later through the Ottoman Empire, Turkey made key contributions to European culture. On the other hand, Turkey considers itself a European state, its capital Istanbul being in fact the famous Constantinople “Queen of Cities”, ancient Rome’s successor and the largest and wealthiest city in Europe throughout the Middle Ages.

- **Multicultural aspect**: Through Turkey, EU becomes more diverse which is often used as a condition that triggers progress. EU can gain from Turkey’s experience and culture and by this improve its cultural life.

The EU’s member states that can be identified as supporting the Turkey’s accession are:

**Great Britain.** It is considered to be one of the most important supporters of Turkish membership, based also on the historical good relations between the countries. The British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s is “a supporter of Turkey. Britain argues that Turkey “can help bridge differences between Europe and the Muslim world and aid in the fight against terrorism”23 and also provide “a shining example across the whole of its neighboring region”24.

**Italy.** Italy is another strong supporter of Turkish membership based on historical links between Italy and the “Near East”25. On the other hand, the senior Vatican officials have argued that the EU should focus on its Christian roots. Besides that, the commercial opportunities offered by the Turkish market especially through the Mediterranean Sea seem to be more important than the contra arguments.

**Netherlands.** The connections between the constitutional referendum and Turkey’s EU prospect are weaker here compared to France. In time, Netherlands was one of the great supporters of enlargement and by this largely in favor of letting Turkey join the Union. Both the politicians from government and from opposition favor Turkey’s membership in principle. Even if the Dutch are struggling to cope with the issues of religion, immigration and integration their concerns on EU are not so much related with Turkey. On the other hand in the future it is possible to bargain their power vote in order to obtain certain benefits.

**Poland.** If Turkey will become a member of EU it will face similar problems as Poland, on the cohesion and CAP policies. The countries are also related by the polish interests on Ukraine and Belarus, Poland.

---

23 Jack Straw, Britain Foreign Secretary  
24 idem  
25 see the Eastern Roman Empire issue addressed before
supporting Turkey in order to open the door for these countries. The politicians from Warsaw argue that Turkey will strengthen pro-American attitudes and consolidate Western influence on Middle East and the Caucasus. The history of close bilateral relations constitutes also an argument for supporting Turkey.

**Spain.** Spain indicated that Ankara could expect their support, but after the French and Dutch referendums, it suggested “postponing the Turkish accession talks until a more advantageous time”\(^{26}\).

**Greece.** Even if Greece was under Ottoman occupation for a long period of time, the Greek government tries to address the bilateral tensions through Turkish integration. They underline the Cyprus recognition and argue that the fate of Turkey’s EU application depends, primarily, on the Turks themselves.

**Hungary.** Also under Ottoman occupation for 150 years, but around half the population supports Turkish membership. Hungary also used Turkey in order to favor Croatia.

Some groups can also be identified:

**The Nordic countries** are positive when it comes to Turkey’s accession but they ask for urged caution. A special case is represented by Finland, one of the strongest supporters of Turkey.

**The new member states** including here Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Romania and Bulgaria are largely in favor of the enlargement process being confronted recently with the process and by this much more opened to this idea. Especially the Eastern countries are very much interested in Turkey’s accession especially for the economical benefits obtained through increased trade.

**5.4.2 CON members and the problems to be solved**

The arguments against Turkey accession usually come from a constructivist approach where the concept of identity is underlined. The opponent’s main arguments are:

- **security:** By accepting Turkey in EU, which has borders with Syria, Iran and Iraq, will put EU in a situation is not ready to handle.

- **the human rights situation is still fragile:** Turkey’s reform in this domain are recent and there is no tradition in this direction. Some voices from EU level express their concern that once accepted in EU Turkey may stop reforms. This arguments is well addressed in the negotiations framework where it is

---

\(^{26}\) Miguel Angel Moratinos, Spain Foreign Minister
stipulated that if the reforms will not continue the negotiations will be suspended.

- **differences in values and culture**: Being a Muslim country (99.8% of the population), Turkey come in contrast with the Christian continent. This is best argued by the prospect of Bosnia and Albania in EU, both Muslims countries. While those two countries will join EU the argument will not be anymore valid to use. Regarding the cultural identity the European vocation of Turkey has already been addressed in the previous paragraphs.

- **geographical aspects**: Only 3% of Turkey's surface is in Europe, it’s capital, Ankara, being in Asia. The situation is similar with the one from Cyprus which is historical situated in Asia. By addressing Enlargement history the same type of arguments have been used also for UK rejection by Charles de Gaulle. In that time de Gaulle was arguing that Great Britain is not on continental Europe and should no be included. In time those arguments faded and it is possible to happen the same in Turkey’s case.

- **large size and relative poverty**: It is argued that Turkey integration costs will be to high for EU and the cohesion policy and also the common agricultural policy will face difficulties in being implemented. On the other side, Turkey is no poorer now than Portugal was when it joined the EU and even compared to the Balkan Countries or Romania and Bulgaria the difference is not so consistent.

- **too much power within the EU**: Due to its size and its population of 70 million inhabitants Turkey will have the second largest number of representatives in the European Parliament, after Germany, and through this will exercise important political power in the Union. This is best argued by the enlargement process contributing, in fact, to an opposite factor of dispersing the power through more states and by this strengthening the democratic process. In the same time EP is divided along ideological lines rather than along national lines.

- **Turkish immigrants**: A wave of Turkish immigrants is predicted by the opponents but in the same time the supporters argue that, once in EU, the Turkish immigration would be easier to control.
US increased influence. Some believe that Turkey's EU membership will enable the US to manipulate the EU, and call Turkey as a 'Trojan horse'. Turkey position is considered to be similar with UK position towards USA. Despite this, even on times of difficult economic problems, Turkey denied access to the American military before the Iraq War and proved to be closer to the EU's policies.

Three main problems have to be solved when it comes to Turkey's integration in EU:

1. **Cyprus issue.** Turkey must recognize Cyprus in order to become a member of the EU. The delicate situation is probably held by the Turkish government as a good card to put on the table on the accession negotiation. Turkey position has changed in time and in the near future they will solve this issue.

2. **The Armenian Genocide.** Turkey has to recognize Armenian Genocide done by the Ottoman Empire during the World War I. Turkey position is that the events were part of the civil war during the final years of the Ottoman Empire. The events are also not recognized as genocide in other EU members and for this reason it is considered to be a secondary issue. On the other hand the economic embargo and closure of land border crossings against Armenia (based on the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh) will have to be suspended.

3. **The Kurdish population.** Probably the most important problem and in the same time the hardest to address, the situation of Kurdish from the Eastern part of Turkey is a delicate issue. Around 20 millions of Kurds live in Turkey and for a long period of time their rights have been not recognized. In the last period of time, the Turkish government has allowed the teaching of Kurdish language but still did not yet allow the use of Kurdish in regular education as required by European conventions. The gender equality and minority rights continue to be one of the problems in Turkey and for this reason focus has to be put on. On the other hand, Kurds see the prospect of EU membership as a guarantee against discrimination. Also for Turkey, the full membership will strengthen its borders and breaking of the country, desired especially by the Kurds.

The most important opponent between the actors from EU level is the population from the member states. The average support is below 35% as shown in figure 6. In order to improve the situation important efforts have to be put in practice. The current EU strategy on Turkey includes as one of the three pillars the promotion of a better understanding on Turkey. This is done because the questionnaires show that half of the population oppose from principle without really knowing the Turkey issue.
A similar situation is happening in Turkey where the support for EU accession is decreasing among the population. This is considered a normal process that happened in all the new member states.

Through the EU’s member states some can be identified as opposing the Turkey’s accession:

**Figure 7. The support for Turkey among the member states**

Source: Eurobaromenter May/June 2005

**Germany.** In the beginning Germany was one of the promoters of Turkey in the Union especially through the former chancellor Gerhard Schröder’s. Few years ago the Social Democrats and Green were voting for membership but after they lose power a new government was formed headed by Angela Merkel. In her campaign she was opposing the entrance pushing instead to give Turkey a “privileged partnership”. In time her opinion shift to a more opened one, when it comes to Turkey, based also on the fact that in the past Germany has promised that “if the criteria will have been met, Germany will vote in favor of accession talks” and also on the fact that Germany is Turkey’s most important trade partner.

**France.** The French opinion is somehow particular even if they switched in the same way as Germany. President Jacques Chirac is a supporter of Turkish entry, but the political scene is largely dominated by opponents of Turkish accession. The case is particular because the French are avoiding the problematic economic aspects connected with high unemployment rate by rotating public’s attention towards Turkey’s issue to which the population is sensitive, in order to make the public forget the internal problems. This solution worked for a time but the last events from
France have shown that the population asks for real reforms and don’t accept anymore to be tricked with artificially created problems.

Connections can be made between the constitutional referendum and Turkey’s EU issue to some extents but when it comes to France it is much more connected with the domestic problems that politicians from Paris have failed to address properly. The election from 2007 will probably change dramatically the political situation and from this it is possible also a turnover of France opinion on Turkey’s accession.

Austria. Austria is considered one of the main opponents to Turkey’s membership but some opinions argue that “Austria is really a front for France and Germany”\(^\text{27}\). On the other hand Austrian politicians, by their position on EU’s accession talks with Turkey, have tried to satisfy public from home and, most important, they tried and succeed to support Croatia. The Austrian economy is strongly oriented towards the Eastern Europe, some analysts\(^\text{28}\) discussing about a rebuilding of the Austro-Hungarian Empire on economic bases. Austria is one of the most important foreign investor in an important number of countries from Eastern Europe and of course in Croatia. On the other hand it can be argued that Austria use the Turkey card in order to help Croatia, but based in the same economical interests in the region they next step is represented by Turkey, because Turkey accession will boost the economies in countries like Romania, Bulgaria or the Western Balkans where the Austrian economical interests are well represented.

5.5. The position of other countries (USA, Israel, Russia, Muslim world)

If in the beginning Moscow’s reaction was “If you enter the EU we cannot meet frequently”\(^\text{29}\) later the government in Moscow accepted EU enlargement and even try to facilitate it. President Putin has decided that enlargement is positive and should therefore go ahead’ “We welcome Turkey’s success at the EU Brussels summit”\(^\text{30}\). This is based on the fact that Turkey and Russia have forgotten the rivalry relations for regional supremacy from the past, and they are celebrating the economic trade booming. In 2004, trade between Turkey and Russia was $11 billion and it is expected to increase to $25 billion by 2007.

When it comes to EU relations, the Russians interests are connected basically with Kaliningrad, the territory under Russian sovereignty within

27 Michael Emerson, Centre for European Policy Studies
28 Mihai Nicut and Valentina Pop in Austro-Hungarian is rebuilding over Romania
29 Putin discourse on the meeting with Prime Minister Erdogan on a visit to Ankara in 2004
30 Putin discourse on the meeting with Prime Minister Erdogan from Moscow in 2005
Lithuania which is considered to be a delicate situation. Through this territory Russia wants to gain economic advantages with the EU but also Lithuania and Poland have an important word to say in this issue.

In the past, Americans raise far more problems with the enlargement negotiations compared to the Russians, but the situation is different when it comes to Turkey, being well known that The United States, a traditionally Atlanticist and NATO partner of Turkey, are one of the biggest supporters of Turkey. When it comes to enlargement Americans accuse EU of imposing rules that harm them and their interests.

Also the Cyprus situation is connected with Americans because on one hand they are under pressure from Greece and, on the other, they have to keep the good relations with Turkey.

Israel, like Turkey, is also a democratic state which is not Christian. Israel has a clear strategic interest in Turkey’s accession to EU and for this reason Israel’s diplomacy over the years has consistently supported Turkey’s attempts to join the EU. Through Turkey and together with the inclusion of Cyprus, EU's will be much closer to Israel. The accession of Turkey will break the important cultural taboo of Christian Europe and based on that, the Jewish state might also become a potential candidate.

The Muslims countries from Middle East affect the EU by oil, terrorism, migration, human trafficking, narcotics, arms proliferation, all being problems that EU can’t address properly because it doesn’t have the proper means. One of the factors which will improve this situation is Turkey by granting the desired means and the power to affect the Middle East region. Turkey's membership will enhance the EU’s capacity to address the Palestinian question, to open Iran, Iraq and Syria to the outside world but in the same time will help fulfilling the Middle East needs in term of democracy and legitimate policies. The opinion of the Muslims countries is best expressed through Syria opinion:

"You (Turkey) follow a honorable foreign policy. We admire of you. We take you as model for our foreign policy... Turkey's EU membership process is being watched by the Arab world. We are pleased, Turkey will be EU member. This will be crucial for us and for our region. When you enter the EU we will be neighbor of Europe."31

31 Bashar al-Assad speech, Syrian President, on Erdogan’s visit at Damascus in December 2004
5.9. Possible scenarios

Based on the arguments used by the supporters and the opponents of Turkey's accession three main scenarios can be drawn:

5.9.1. Accession in 2014

This is the most optimistic scenario which is based on few assumptions:

- EU will finalize its Constitutional Treaty or find a way to legitimize the inclusion of new MS in the Union (possible a similar treaty with the one from Nice);

- Turkey will continue its reforms and successfully close all the chapters from the accession negotiations;

- The EU's population will improve its opinion on Turkey due to the current actions from the accession strategy or the MS will avoid a referendum on Turkey's accession and take a favorable decision on the political level, ignoring the population support;

- Based on the bargaining actions, all the MS will be favorable until that date taking in consideration that consensus is required;

Even if, in order for this scenario to become real, some difficult conditions have to be met it appears realistic due to the facts that in the 7 years left EU, if concentrates, can address all this issues properly.

Even if, in time the enlargement process was not linear having periods of inactivity and also that Turkey's negotiations have special stipulations, no country that has negotiated with EU being granted the candidate status has ever been rejected. Once placed at the negotiation table, EU and the CS relations had somehow a linear evolution which concluded by granting full membership for the CS, except the cases when the countries withdraw itself from the negotiations.

5.9.2. Postponement

The second scenario is often embraced by specialists who are skeptical that all the conditions underlined for the previous scenario will be addressed in time. Based on that they expect that negotiations will last many years and discuss about a more realistic term around year 2020.

A contra argument to this is the opinion on which EU can't afford to lose Turkey, speaking in terms of integration. And through the increase number of MS Turkey's accession become more problematic. Also the public opinion from Turkey is less and less interested in the European prospect and in time, correlated with a possible changing of government,
Turkey can withdraw its candidature if it has to wait too much. It is very important to understand that Turkish are proud people and they already waited a very long period in order to be accepted as a candidate and start the negotiations. A possible postponement and a deliberate delaying can trigger a switch in Turkey’s behavior.

It is argued that for Turkey it was much easier to join EU together with Greece in 1975, taking in consideration that both countries had received the same status and attitude from EU, but military coup caused severe problems and scary the Turkey’s supporters from the Union. Now, EU wants to be sure that this will not happen again and for this reason doesn’t want to hurry too much the integration of Turkey.

This scenario appears more realistic in the light of external international events that are almost impossible to predict in the current moment. Possible armed conflicts in Turkey’s proximity can extent the prospect of time necessary in order to join but in the same time can action quite opposite by hurrying the process due to geo strategically reasons which EU has to address.

5.9.3. Negative answer based on incompatibility

Starting from The Ankara Agreement from September 1963 till the start of the negotiations to join European Union on October 3, 2005 EU never denied the full membership to Turkey. Instead two times it argued that Turkey based on political and economical criteria is not ready. Even if the current negotiations are so called “open ended” this can be consider only as a measure of precaution in order to reduce the voices against Turkey for the moment and maybe wait for a proper moment. EU has promised membership for Turkey and a negative answer after such a long process is very improbable.

This negative scenario can be caused only by Turkey’s position. If Turkey will stop the reforms or will violate the human rights EU can find an excuse and stop the negotiations. On the other hand it is very hard to assume that EU is interested in a failure of the negotiation process with Turkey and it is much reliable to assume that EU is really interested in Turkey and in reality try to helps its reforms in order to be able to compete with the status of EU MS.

A particular case of this scenario is represented by the denying of the full membership and the granting of a strategic membership, idea which is supported in some MS. In this case the Turkey’s position is very important the government from Ankara stipulating several times that Turkey is interested only by a full membership and find no other form of cooperation acceptable. For this reason even if doesn’t appear as a
rejection in the beginning, this scenario, due to Turkey’s position, transform itself in a negative one similar with the stop of any negotiations.

Also one of Torreblanca’s elevens reflections on Turkey and EU\textsuperscript{32} regards the fact that a “No” vote is an inexistent option when it comes to Turkey. He also consider that by letting the discussions opened for so many time, a “no” vote from EU is “simply inconceivable based on an original position, as though the past did not exist”.

The situation is very different compared to the one from Morocco’s application, which obtained a strong negative answer based on geographically eligibility from the beginning. Turkey was always encouraged to adjust itself, the economic criteria in 1987 or the political criteria in 1999, but it was never rejected as geographical ineligible. The door left opened from the beginning can not be closed now without producing severe conflicts.

\textsuperscript{32} José Ignacio Torreblanca, \textit{Europe’s Reasons and Turkey’s Accession}
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CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS

"Turkey’s accession would offer considerable benefits both to the European Union and to Turkey. For the Union, the unique geopolitical position of Turkey at the crossroads of the Balkans, the wider Middle East, South Caucasus, Central Asia and beyond, its importance for the security of Europe’s energy supplies and its political, economic and military weight would be great assets. Moreover, as a large Muslim country firmly embedded in the European Union, Turkey could play a significant role in Europe’s relations with the Islamic world.” 33

The current paper has addressed different aspects of the EU process of enlargement and based on those, three types of conclusion rise. The first type represents general conclusions for the enlargement process, both from a theoretical and a practical perspective. The second one regards conclusions for the current step of enlargement, focused on the particular case of Turkey, and the last type represents conclusions for the future of the enlargement process.

6.1. General conclusions

EU enlargement has far-reaching implications not only for the political shape of Europe but also for the institutional structure and the major policies of the Union. In the same time enlargement affects both the Community and the candidate state to which its institutional rules are extended.

The consequences of the enlargement process can be seen also in the tough negotiations on the budget from the last years, the agricultural and regional policies or in the representation of member states in EU institutions.

One of the aspects of enlargement which is often not taken in consideration is the fact that the newcomers (new MS) seek to redefine the borders of the EU and in the same time question and interpret the current norms producing dynamics in the Union, and by this development.

From a theoretical point of view the decision making process on the EU regarding enlargement is influenced both by rationalist and by constructivist factors. Each perspective add new dimensions on the

33 Independent Commission on Turkey, Turkey in Europe: More than a promise?
process, rationalist bring the focus on economic aspects with analyze of cost/benefits and in the same time autonomy concerns, while constructivist brings the dimension of ideational based on collective identity. Through time the weight of different arguments has weighted different, the first and fourth steps using primarily rationalist arguments while the second, the third and the fifth steps are based on constructivist arguments. Also from this point of view the case of Turkey is very particular, the strong support of constructivist size, based on common identity, present in the Eastern enlargement fades in this case. Both the supporters and the opponents use simultaneously, for the first time, arguments from rationalist and constructivist approaches almost in equal measure. Turkey accession, as a case, question and force the limits of each perspective, and for this reason it is possible to give birth to a new and different approach on the subject.

Compared to other USA and USSR, EU is a special case, being the first time in the history when the enlargement is done only by voluntary annexation. Other particular aspects are represented by the backgrounds of the countries from the Union, which are all states with strong identity and long history, and also, connected with that, the attitude towards the possibility of states to leave the Union. The proposed Treaty of EU Constitution stipulates that any MS may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional requirements, while, in the case of USA, is it well known that The United States Constitution doesn’t allow the secession of a state from the union, which caused the Civil War between North and South in 1860. On the level of similarities the common values can be identified.

The enlargement process will become more difficult, due to the increased number of MS that requires consensus on the enlargement issues.

The process of enlargement is a political driven process that is influenced by a complex set of factors, not just by economic interests. The start of negotiations between Turkey and EU has a strong rationalist influence, Austria using it bargaining power in order to force the Commission to recognize also Croatia as a candidate country, together with Turkey. It is possible that this type of approach on Turkey’s accession to continue and opponents states to gain different advantages through bargain in order to accept the continuation of the process. For example France, one of the biggest opponents of Turkey can tie this process with the debate on CAP policy.
6.2. Conclusions for the current step of enlargement

The economical, social and political reforms that took place in the last years in Turkey can be explained also through the EU’s support and prospect and there is no doubt that the open of the negotiations consolidated the democracy in Turkey, but on the other hand it is a mistake to disregard the influence of other factors. Counting only EU’s “conditionality” as a reason for the changes means putting a question mark on the vulnerability of the process and there is no reason to do that. The Turkey Constitution from 1982, written mostly on the tutelage of the military regime in power, has been adapted based on the growing civil society and socialization from Turkey, and EU should be regarded as a supporter of the reforms and an important factor, but not the most decisive one.

Turkey’s eligibility for membership EU was reconfirmed many times and especially in the Copenhagen European Council, Turkey was welcomed in the Union, stating that the accession depends on the fulfillment of membership criteria. For this reason denying of the eligibility in a later time is very improbable meaning that EU hasn’t kept his word. On the other hand, based on the Union’s capacity to absorb new members in different moments and also connected with different challenges (see EU Treaty) that Union has to address, the date of accession can be postponed. However, if no important events happened in EU and if Turkey continues its reform, the year 2014 (based on the new budget) can appear as a realistic date. It is also important to underlings that with the growing number of EU’s members the enlargement process become much more difficult for the CS due to the consensus needed on enlargement issues.

Even if, not completely identical with Europe, the European Vocation of Turkey is an undeniable fact. It is well known that this area was one “of the cradles of European civilization”.

Especially when it comes to Turkey, the idea of public referendum is considered to be cynical and inappropriate because the result can be easily predicted. Some countries can use this procedure in order to legitimize their option.

On the current EU enlargement agenda Turkey is a particular case with a big importance for the future of this policy and even for the EU’s future in general. It can be argued that with Turkey’s accession EU will expend for the first time outside the Europe’s geographical borders and by this will open the door for other non European countries.

---
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6.3. Future enlargement possibilities

It is established that EU has offered the Western Balkan countries and Turkey the opportunity to gain full membership but when it comes to other countries no promise has been made. From EU perspective, for the moment, Belarus seems to be too authoritarian and Moldova too poor. When it comes to Ukraine and Russia, no temporary arguments are used, one being too big and the other one too scary for EU even in the far distant future.

Union’s legitimacy is more closely linked to its ability to reach substantive results and years of Eurobarometer surveys have shown that there is a clear relation between the unemployment and the growth rates and support for the EU. Through the idea of legitimating by results European Union performance will be judged and the results will strongly influence the future enlargement of EU.

The positive economic results will change the attitude towards the enlargement process and new enlargement opportunities can be opened. Based on the expected economic success, primarily driven by the new MS, the opponents pleading for European identity on geographical aspects can lower their voices and the enthusiasm generated can open the EU gates for countries that are not geographical in Europe.

Following the hypotheses on EU economic success and also on the continuation of the enlargement policy it can be highlighted that, in the future EU will prioritize enlargement to those states where the gain would be higher than the cost (defined economic gain and security gain) and also to those states that respect the universal principles of human rights and democracy.

In the future the enlargement process will change based on the Wider Europe (or New Neighbours) initiative from the commission. According to this, EU’s Enlargement cannot expand ad infinitum and everything has its limits. EU can’t continue to view its neighborhood from an enlargement angle and debate on prospects for each country. EU has to start supporting transition in a different way by encouraging prosperity, stability and security in neighborhood countries through the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP). The ENP Action Plans address also deeper political integration and deeper economic integration through common efforts on migration, security, energy and democratization issues. By this EU will continue supporting reform and development in neighborhood countries but without offering the prospect of membership.
By adopting the proposal on the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) EU will enter in a new phase. Probably for a long period no new members will join the Union. On the other hand this can be a strategy to avoid complains on the current enlargement strategy. Through this new policy EU will continue to prepare its neighbors and expand its influence and for this reason is very hard to figure if EU really think it has reached its limits or its just trying to trick the public opinion dressing the old enlargement policy in new clothes.

Figure 8. The European Neighborhood Policy (ENP)

Source: adapted from the European Neighborhood Policy website

Besides that, the predictions on EU enlargement are difficult due to the huge complexity of factors which affect the process and also based on the fact that in time the enlargement process was not a linear one. No analyze can address properly the new political situations, energetic issues, demographic issues or the new technologies from the future. For this reasons the predictions based on current criteria or even on the past experiences can’t obtain valid results. A good example to illustrate this is the study “The Why and How of EU Enlargement” of David Long from 1997 who was addressing the fifth step of enlargement. Almost all his scenarios used as the conclusion address primarily a limited enlargement to few countries while the scenario to include all Central and Eastern European
applicants, which happened in reality, was considered an extreme one with low degree of objectivity even compared with the scenario of No enlargement.

Regarding the future enlargement there is almost a unanimous opinion on the EU level that “there is no further enlargement with a large group of countries at the same time”35. Also for the current step, even if there is no doubt that the future of the Western Balkans lies in the EU, it is still expected that those countries will join in large time framework and not group together.
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