

EUROPEANIZATION OF FOREIGN POLICY OF A CANDIDATE COUNTRY:
AN EVALUATION OF TURKEY’S POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS (2002-2012)

A Ph.D. Dissertation

by

FULYA HİSARLIOĞLU

Department of
Political Science and Public Administration
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
July 2015

To My Family

EUROPEANIZATION OF FOREIGN POLICY OF A CANDIDATE COUNTRY:
AN EVALUATION OF TURKEY’S POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS (2002-2012)

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

FULYA HİSARLIOĞLU

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

DEPARTMENT OF

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

July 2015

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ioannis Grigoriadis
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science.

Prof. Dr. Aylin Güney
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Saime Bölükbaşı
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selver Şahin
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

EUROPEANIZATION OF FOREIGN POLICY OF A CANDIDATE COUNTRY: AN EVALUATION OF TURKEY'S POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS (2002-2012)

Hisarlioğlu, Fulya

PH.D., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ioannis Grigoriadis

July 2015

This thesis has analyzed the dynamics, conditions and determinants of the EU's transformative impact on a candidate state's foreign policy. Concerned with the question of how the process of EU accession shapes candidate states' policies, this case study questions how the machinery of Europeanization, interacting with the national factors and context, works in the transformation of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus. Inspired by the premises of the studies on Accession Europeanization, the study is designed to understand the impact of the EU external pressures in shaping Turkey's Cyprus policy between 2002 and 2012. In the light of the time processing analysis, the study suggests that the transformative impact of the EU in Ankara's approach towards the Cyprus issue in the long-run is best explained by the actor-centered "external incentives model". In this sense the study concludes that domestic actors' perception of the EU membership process and the ways in which EU adaptation pressures intervenes in the domestic institutional equilibrium determine EU's transformative power.

Key Terms: Cyprus Conflict, Europeanization, Annan Plan, Securitization, Turkey-EU Relations

ÖZET

AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ'NE ADAY BİR ÜLKENİN DIŞ POLİTİKASINDA AVRUPALILAŞMA: TÜRKİYE'NİN KIBRIS POLİTİKASI ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME (2002-2012)

Hisarlıoğlu, Fulya

Doktora, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ioannis Grigoriadis

Temmuz 2015

Bu çalışma, Avrupa Birliği'nin (AB), Birliğe aday bir ülke olan Türkiye'nin dış politikası üzerindeki dönüştürücü gücü ve bu gücü belirleyen dinamikler, koşullar ve etkenler üzerine bir inceleme sunmaktadır. AB katılım sürecinin aday ülke siyasalarında nasıl bir etki yarattığı sorusundan yola çıkarak hazırlanan bu araştırmada, ulusal faktörlerle etkileşim halinde olan Avrupalılaşma mekanizmasının, Türkiye'nin Kıbrıs politikasının şekillenmesindeki etkisi sorgulanmaktadır. Aday ülke Avrupalılaşması üzerine geliştirilen yazından ilham alınarak tasarlanan bu çalışma kapsamında, 2002- 2012 yılları arasında, AB'den kaynaklanan dış baskıların Türkiye'nin Kıbrıs politikasını nasıl şekillendirdiği tartışılmaktadır. Bu döneme ilişkin analizler ışığında, Türkiye'nin AB adaylığı sürecinde uzun vadede yaşanan politika değişikliklerini en iyi açıklayan yaklaşımın aktör-odaklı “harici teşvik modeli” (*external incentives model*) olduğu sonucuna varılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, AB'nin iç kurumsal dengeler üzerindeki etkilerinin ve ulusal aktörlerin üyelik sürecine ilişkin yaklaşımın AB'nin dönüştürücü gücünü belirlediği ileri sürülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kıbrıs Uyuşmazlığı, Avrupalılaşma, Annan Planı, Güvenikleştirme, Türkiye – Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although only my name appears on the cover page of this thesis, I would never have been able to finish my academic research without the assistance and contribution of a great many people.

Prima facie, special thanks must go in the first hand to my dear supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Ioannis Grigoriadis for his guidance and friendly and constructive criticisms. Fortunately, under his supervision I have found a great chance to freely explore on my own. Through his support and critical contributions I have overcome crisis situations and finish my dissertation.

I am grateful to the member of my thesis monitoring committee. Especially, there seems no way to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Aylin Güney who will always take a part in my life as my dear mentor and role model. She has inspired me to become an academician and to approach each and every question with optimism and through the lenses of critical thinking.

With this occasion, I would like to state my deepest thanks to H.E. Ertuğrul Apakan (Retired Diplomat, Former Undersecretary of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs) for his sincere contributions and assistance in conducting my interviews in Turkey and Northern Cyprus. I would also like to express my appreciations to H.E. Uğur Ziyal (Retired Diplomat, Former Undersecretary of the Turkish Ministry of

Foreign Affairs); H.E. Yaşar Yakış (Former Minister of Foreign Affairs); Stefano Fantorini (Delegation of the EU to Turkey); Aycan Akdeniz (Delegation of the EU to Turkey); Mehmet Ali Talat (Former President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus); Ergün Olgun (Former Member of the Negotiation Committee of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus); Osman Ertuğ (Former Member of the Negotiation Committee of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus); Esra Aygün (Columnist and Journalist in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus); Emine Çolak (Lawyer and activist in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus); Alexandros Lordos (Academician at the University of Cyprus); Charis Psaltis (Academician at the University of Cyprus) and Achilleas Demetriades (Lawyer in the Republic of Cyprus). They all provided precious input for my academic research through accepting to answer my questions.

Finally, the words would be inefficient to state my gratitude for my dear family members' patience, encouragement and unconditional support. Once more I express my apologies for the time and energy that I have spared from my family to finish this study. I am thankful to my beloved mom who never stopped her moral and material support and guidance. As the last words, it would be impossible to finish this dissertation without my beloved husband, Umut Hisarlıoğlu's understanding, everlasting encouragement and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Purpose of the Study and the Research Question.....	2
1.2 Research Design and Conceptualization.....	5
1.3 Methodology and Case Selection.....	8
1.4 Hypotheses.....	17
1.5 Structure of the Study.....	19
1.6 Expected Contributions.....	21
 CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: EUROPEANIZATION AND DOMESTIC CHANGE.....	 24
2.1 Europeanization: a Conceptual Framework.....	24
2.2 Mechanisms of Europeanization.....	29
2.3 Domains of Europeanization.....	40
2.3.1 Polity.....	40
2.3.2 Politics.....	42
2.3.3 Policy.....	43

2.4	Europeanization and Foreign Policy Convergence.....	45
2.5	Explaining Domestic Change in Candidate Countries: Europeanization through EU Conditionality.....	56
2.5.1	EU Conditionality.....	58
2.5.2	Intervening Variables and Mechanisms of Europeanization through Conditionality in Candidate States.....	62
2.5.3	Europeanization and Foreign Policy Convergence in Candidate Countries.....	71
2.6	Literature on Europeanization of Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkey's Policy towards Cyprus.....	76

CHAPTER III: TURKEY- EU AND CYPRUS TRIANGLE: A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT.....		84
3.1	Cyprus Conflict and the EU Enlargement Process.....	85
3.1.1	Brief History of Conflict and Peace Negotiations.....	85
3.1.2	Cyprus's EU Application and the EU Involvement in the Conflict.....	96
3.1.2.1	Greek Strategy.....	98
3.1.2.2	European Foreign and Security Policy Identity and Cyprus Enlargement.....	106
3.2	The Level of Misfit between EU's Cyprus Policy and Turkey's Policy towards Cyprus.....	110
3.2.1	Cyprus Problem at the EU.....	111
3.2.2	Turkey's Policy towards Cyprus.....	118
3.2.2.1	"Cyprus Issue as a National Cause".....	119

3.2.2.2 Babyland Cyprus and Turkey-Turkish Cypriot Relations.....	122
3.2.2.3 Cyprus as the “Aircraft Carrier in the Eastern Mediterranean”: Cyprus in Turkey’s Security Strategy.....	126
3.2.3 Turkey’s EU Membership Aspirations and Cyprus Policy in 1990s.....	132
3.2.4 Conclusion.....	146
 CHAPTER IV: TURKEY’S EU MEMBERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CYPRUS DISPUTE (2002-2004).....	 150
4.1 The Rise of Justice and Development Party and Cyprus Conflict..	158
4.1.1 National Political Context and Turkey’s “One Step Ahead” Policy.....	169
4.2 Conclusions: Assessing EU Impact.....	189
 CHAPTER V: CYPRUS CONUNDRUM AND TURKEY’S EU ACCESSION (2004- 2012).....	 203
5.1 Post-Referenda Political Context.....	205
5.1.1 Cyprus’s EU Accession and the Political Developments in the Island.....	205
5.2 Ankara’s New Cyprus Strategy.....	215
5.2.1 Turkey’s EU membership Perspective and Cyprus Conflict.....	217
5.3 Conclusions: Assessing EU Impact.....	242
 CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION.....	 249
6.1 Turkey’s Cyprus Policy and EU: Europeanization or EU-ization?..	251
6.2 Explanatory Mechanisms and Intervening Factors.....	260

6.3	Academic Contributions and a few Words for Future Studies.....	265
-----	--	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	269
--------------------	-----

APPENDICES	329
------------------	-----

APPENDIX I: Interview Questions.....	329
--------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX II: Call for peace from the Turkish side Rauf Denktaş Proposes Confederation in Cyprus 31 August 1998.....	331
--	-----

APPENDIX III: Turkey - TRNC Joint Declaration July 20, 1999.....	333
--	-----

APPENDIX IV: Helsinki European Council 10 And 11 December 1999 Presidency Conclusions.....	341
---	-----

APPENDIX V: Declaration by Turkey on Cyprus, 29 July 2005.....	343
--	-----

APPENDIX VI: New Initiative by Turkey on Cyprus (Action Plan on Lifting Of Restrictions in Cyprus).....	345
--	-----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims at analyzing the dynamics, conditions and determinants of the EU's transformative impact on a candidate state's foreign policy. Inspired by the premises of the studies on Accession Europeanization, the study is designed to understand the impact of the EU adaptational pressures in shaping Turkey's Cyprus policy between 2002 and 2012. Concerned with the question of how the process of EU accession shapes candidate states' policies, this case study questions how the machinery of Europeanization, interacting with the domestic institutional settings, works in the transformation of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus.

With this respect, the study concentrates on the interplay between external factors and internal- national factors that catalyze and/or hinder Europeanization process in Turkey's accession process. It perceives foreign policy Europeanization as a "two-level game" (Putnam, 1988) in which national and international sets of constraints, opportunities and challenges interact with each other in the decision making process on the issues under external pressure (Evans et al. 1993). In the light of this research design, the study suggests that the transformative impact of the EU in Turkey's approach towards the Cyprus issue in the long-run is best explained by the actor-centered

“external incentives model”. It concludes that factors what really mediate EU’s transformative impact are the domestic actors’ owning and perception of the EU membership project and the ways in which EU adaptational pressures intervenes in the domestic institutional equilibrium in addition to the size and credibility of EU rewards.

This introductory chapter aims to answer questions with respect to the purpose of the study and the search question, research design and conceptualization, methodology and case selections, hypothesis and structure of the study.

1.1 Purpose of the Study and the Research Question

According to the widespread opinion in the literature on Turkish foreign policy, Turkey’s EU membership process, which entered a new phase especially after 1999 when Turkey was officially recognized as an EU candidate country, had a serious transformative impact on the continuing foreign policy issues including Cyprus conflict, territorial disputes with Greece, relations with Armenia, normalization of Turkish-Syrian relations, civilianization of foreign policy decision-making process and de-securitization of the larger foreign policy outlook (for example, Terzi, 2012; Müftüler-Baç, 2011; Müftüler-Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Özcan, 2010; Canan, 2009; Öniş and Yılmaz, 2009; Müftüler-Baç, 2008; Akçapar, 2007; Aydın and Açıkmese, 2007; Oğuzlu, 2004; Aydın, 2003). In most academic studies on the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy, Turkish governments’ full and strong support for the UN-led negotiations and the comprehensive road map named as the “Comprehensive Settlement for

the Cyprus Problem”¹ to reach a lasting solution for Cyprus dispute between 2002 and 2004 is discussed as a text book case for foreign policy Europeanization (Kaliber, 2012; Terzi, 2012; Aydın and Açıkmeşe, 2007). Despite the increasing academic interest in the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy, apart from a few attempts (for example, Demirtaş, 2015; Eryılmaz, 2014; Kaliber, 2012; Terzi, 2012; Müftüler- Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Tocci and Diez, 2009; Ulusoy, 2008a, 2008b; Aydın and Açıkmeşe, 2007; Oğuzlu, 2012, 2010, 2004) a significant majority of academic studies that aim to explore the impact of the EU adaptational pressures on Turkish foreign policy analyze the policy change from a state centric perspective through exogenizing the changes in the national and international political context². This study aims to contribute to the literature dealing with the EU’s impact on Turkish foreign policy through applying the conceptual framework introduced by the students of Europeanization investigating the transformative impact of the EU adaptational pressures on candidate states’ specific policy areas.

In this sense, the study approaches the policy change through Europeanization as matter of linkage politics. This kind of a research design which acknowledges the links between internal and external aspects of policy area and emphasizes both horizontal (intergovernmental bargaining) and vertical-distributive (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11) aspects of Europeanization (Bache, 2007; Radaelli, 2004)

¹ The peace plan was introduced as a comprehensive proposal to solve Cyprus dispute which was arisen from the ethnic and political clashes of 1963, 1964 and 1967 between Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities living on the Cyprus Island under the Republic of Cyprus established by the 1959 Treaty of Establishment provisioning a quasi-federal united republic. The conflict was resulted with the political and physical division of the two communities and in 1974 with Turkey’s unilateral military intervention, which was conducted upon the Greek military junta regime’s declaration of the annexation of the island to Greece, division of the island turn into *status quo*.

² For critical discussions on the existing literature on Turkey’s Europeanization, please see: Bölükbaşı et al. 2011; Alpan and Diez, 2014.

would provide an alternative reading for the studies on both Turkish foreign policy and Europeanization. Inspired by the last generation Europeanization studies on candidate states' domestic politics suggesting that the EU's transformative impact on the associate or candidate states is highly determined and mediated by the external and internal conditions; this study investigates the limits and ambiguities of EU's transformative power in assessing Turkey's policy towards Cyprus and the internal and external conditions which determine the magnitude, context, sustainability and route of policy change. The analyses are organized on the basis of a case study approach- Turkey's policy towards Cyprus- with a specific focus on the ten years rule of Justice and Development Party (JDP) governments (between December 2002 and December 2012). With a bottom-up approach or "the beginning of the policy story" (Radaelli, 2004: 5), it discusses the issue at the level of domestic systems of interactions and questions the mechanisms through which EU might be effective in the policy change. This sort of a reading would enable us to understand and explain to what extent the EU intervenes into the candidate state politics as an effective anchor for policy transformation.

More concretely, following research questions are addressed through the study:

- How and to what extent did Turkey's EU membership aspirations influence Turkey's policy towards Cyprus?
- What were the factors facilitating or hindering policy change?
- Which models or mechanisms of Europeanization were effective in explaining shifts in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus?

1.2 Research Design and Conceptualization

In the literature, Europeanization is used as a useful but at the same time ambiguous term to explain the political change in member states (Radaelli and Exadaktylos, 2012). It refers to a “two-edged term” that stands for both “downloading” of EU policies and polity into national institutions and the institutionalization and integration at the EU level through the “uploading” of member states’ national preferences to the EU level (Grabbe, 2006; Börzel, 1999). In the context of foreign policy Europeanization, the term refers to (a) “downloading” of EU common foreign and security policy, decision making structure (bureaucratic adjustment) and European foreign policy identity into the national foreign policy and (b) developing European-wide foreign policy goals, practices, procedures and common identity (Ladrech, 2010; Wong and Hill, 2011). Therefore under the current EU system, Europeanization process in member countries refers to a two- edged (top-down and bottom-up) concept which resonates with the conceptual framework of the Europeanization (member states’ responses to the EU adaptation pressures) and the European integration. As Bulmer claims “arguably the greatest debate in the theoretical literature has related to whether Europeanization is exclusively a top-down phenomenon or whether it is in part horizontal” (2007: 51). Therefore the inquiry whether Europeanization is a “top-down” –policy downloading- process or a “bottom-up” –policy uploading- process located at the center of the scholarly debates on research design.

In case of Turkey like other candidate states, the power asymmetries between Union (applicant) and the candidate countries (applied) bring with a situation that the national governments of the candidate countries act as the policy downloaders with no or limited opportunities to project their foreign policy preferences and interests at the EU level. Considering this fact caused by the EU's organizational structure, resulted by the asymmetries between "applicants" and "applied", this study confines itself to understand the impact of EU at the national level rather than to discuss Turkey's impact in EU-wide foreign policy institutionalization. Acknowledging this fact, the study in the first hand adopts a "top-down" research design.

However dependence on strict top-down accounts on Europeanization "prioritizes the EU impact" and neglects "the role of domestic actors and discourses" (Alpan and Diez, 2014: 4). In addition to this, in divergent fields of policy change, where top-down researches establish causality between EU impact and domestic change, policy change might actually be driven by other factors like globalization, modernization, democratization or changes in the domestic political systems (Radaelli, 2012, 2004, 2000; Bölükbaşı et al. 2011; Haverland, 2006; Börzel and Risse, 2003; Cowles et al, 2001). Acknowledging the necessity to assess the phenomenon of Europeanization within the case specific political context of the change, this study adopts an eclectic research design in which top-down and bottom-up aspects of the EU impact are aimed to be explored.

Although the debates on "top-down" and "bottom-up" Europeanization continue their monopoly in research design, the number of eclectic researches embracing the slogan that "former (top-down) is insufficient without the latter (bottom-up), and *vice*

versa” (Börzel and Risse, 2007: 484) is increasing³ (for example, Börzel and Risse, 2012, 2009, 2003; Graziano and Vink, 2007; Diez et al. 2005; Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Cowles et al. 2001). Eclectic research designs aim to develop alternative explanations with respect to the causality between EU adaptation pressures and changes in the member or candidate states’ domestic politics (Haverland, 2006). Touching upon the domestic power relations, interest politics or normative structures, integrative approaches best explain conditions of the EU’s transformative power (Börzel and Risse, 2012, 2003) as well as “when and how the EU provides a change in any of the main components of the system of interaction” (Radaelli, 2004: 4). As Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005) point out studying Europeanization with its horizontal (top-down) and vertical (bottom-up) aspects enables us to understand why EU adaptation pressures are effective in enforcing change in some policy areas and why they are not energetic in triggering change in other policy areas. Correspondingly, this study investigates the EU impact in both national responses to the top-down adaptation pressures exercised by the EU (intergovernmental bargaining) and bottom-up domestic institutional bargaining process in which Europeanization is conceptualized and instrumentalized by domestic forces enabling or hindering change (Alpan, 2014; Yılmaz and Soyaltın, 2014; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005). With this respect, we utilize the term Europeanization as the candidate states’ responses either through domestic change or non-change to the EU adaptation pressures. More specifically the

³ For an in-depth discussion on research design in Europeanization literature please see: Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2012; 2009.

term is used as “the dimensions, mechanisms and outcomes by which European procedures and institutions affect domestic-level process and institutions” (Börzel and Risse, 2007: 485).

Despite the increasing popularity of eclectic researches that merge both top-down and bottom-up explanations of the EU impact (Börzel and Risse, 2003) in Turkish politics, polity and policies (for example, Güney and Tekin, 2015; Alpan and Diez, 2014; Börzel and Soyaltın, 2012; Nas and Özer, 2012; Bölükbaşı et al. 2010; Grigoriadis, 2009) literature on Europeanization in Turkey is mainly driven by top-down concerns (Alpan and Diez, 2014). A research design which acknowledges the links between internal and external dimensions of policy area and emphasizes both horizontal (intergovernmental bargaining) and vertical-distributive (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11) aspects of Europeanization (Bache, 2007; Radaelli, 2004) would provide an alternative reading for the studies on both Turkish foreign policy and Europeanization.

1.3. Methodology and Case Selection

This research is based on a single case study – Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus- which aims to understand the causal relationship between the external pressures exercised by the EU and candidate state’s foreign policy adaptations. As the premises of accession Europeanization researches emphasized, the process of policy Europeanization has both national –domestic incentives; cost-benefit calculations, elite socialization etc.- and international –effective use of conditionality (European leverage); credibility of rewards (specifically EU membership) and sanctions- aspects. Since foreign policy as a broad field of politics has multiple policy areas, there emerges the need to

reduce the scope of academic interest to analyze the impact of EU leverage with an intensive approach and a comprehensive research agenda touching upon the case specific variables as well as systemic analysis.

With this respect, “case study is an appropriate way to answer broad research questions, by providing us with a thorough understanding of how the process develops in this case” (Swanborn, 2010: 3). Yin defines the case study research “an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (2009: 23). Yin’s definition highlights the distinguished character of the case study by emphasizing its strength to understand phenomenon within the boundaries of social reality and political context. Thus the most critical contribution of the case study research is explaining the causality between dependent and independent variables within the case specific conditions and contexts which have serious consequences on the *explanandum*. In this sense, case studies based on phenomenological analysis are process oriented and “assumes a dynamic reality” (Bulmer, 1986: 183). Statistically speaking this approach reduces the generalizability of the research; however it introduces the alternative context based explanations for the causal inferences and different intervening variables that seem quite difficult to reach through frequenting statistics (Bennett, 2010). In other words, unlike “large-N” quantitative survey researches which rely on statistical generalizations, single case study research rely on analytical generalizations (Yin, 2009: 39). Considering in-depth, process-oriented and exploratory nature, case study research best serves the aim

of this study whose primary concern is to understand the phenomenological and dynamic realities in explaining the oscillations in a specific policy area in the process of EU integration.

In its broadest sense the study attempts to understand the limits, ambiguities and conditions of the EU's transformative impact, which takes place through EU adaptation pressures on the foreign policy issues of candidate states. Broadly speaking, it explores to what extent Turkey's EU accession process influence the foreign-policy making process, foreign policy options, foreign policy identity and foreign policy practices. At this point, Turkey's policy towards Cyprus best represents the general patterns and parameters of Turkish foreign policy. The official discourse on Cyprus conflict and policy practices reflects the key determinants that shape foreign and security policy identity, priorities, national interests and threat perceptions in its close neighborhood.

In the second hand, aiming to discuss both internal (national) and external (EU level) aspects of the policy change through Europeanization, this study approaches the foreign policy as a "two-level game". With respect to this, Cyprus case is not only a Turkish foreign policy issue but also it has deep roots in Turkish domestic politics. It is has been considered as a "national cause" that has been driven by a "securitized" policy agenda in which traditional concerns on "national interests" and "national identity" have been constantly re-constructed (Uzer, 2011) and the making of the Cyprus policy have been concentrated under the authority of a handful state elites (Kaliber, 2005; Özcan, 2010; Uzgel, 2004). Put differently, the problem exposes the power asymmetries in making Turkish foreign and security policy. With this character, the

question has always been at the center of domestic power politics. Under these circumstances, the EU anchor consolidated in post-1999 era and the EU's increasing emphasis on the relationship between Turkey's EU membership and resolution of Cyprus conflict has triggered a social and political process in which Turkey's traditional stance on Cyprus has begun to be harshly criticized by a pro-reform coalition. At this political juncture, JDP's coming to power with a significant victory in 2002 elections and the party elites' commitment for Turkey's EU membership were important political incentives which triggered Ankara's support for UN initiative (Avcı, 2011: 415). The newly established government made reference to the linkage between Turkey's prospective EU accession and the solution of the Cyprus conflict in line with the European norms. Yet "the increasing involvement of the EU in the issue was exploited by nationalist circles in Turkey to create a sense of emergency about the future of Turkish Cypriots and Turkey's geostrategic interests in the island" (Kaliber, 2012: 231). Therefore the Cyprus issue constituted one of the front-lines in which the nationalist veto players who adapted a national security-based agenda and the newly emerging political elites who aimed to re-structure the Turkish domestic and foreign relations. With its highly politicized character Cyprus issue is considered as a great research case that best serves for the purpose of this research design in the sense that it sets out the transformative impact of EU with a special interest in the role of national actors and domestic power asymmetries. In another say, the case enables us to understand the limits and capabilities of the external pressures to cause a real policy change in the inter-play between simultaneous games played at different levels.

The issue also emerges as an important bargaining chip in Turkey-EU relations. Back in early 1980s, Greece's EU accession has made for closer European involvement in the bilateral disputes between Greece and Turkey including Cyprus conflict (Esche, 1990). The Greek perception of Turkey as the "threat from East" significantly shaped Greece's foreign and security policy identity especially after Turkey's military intervention to Cyprus in 1974 (Yannas, 1994). "Since it would not be meaningful to go for a quantitative armament and defense within Greece's limited sources and capabilities, Greece used diplomatic ways to strengthen its position and bargaining power against Turkey in the Aegean disputes and the Cyprus issue" (Öztürk, 2013: 91). As a component of the Greek policy of internationalization of the Greek-Turkish disputes, Cyprus issue has been Europeanized by the successive Panhellenic Socialist Movement (*Panellino Sosialistiko Kinima*- PASOK) governments which governed Greek politics during 1980s and 1990s, (Öztürk, 2013). In this context, Greece strategically projected its national perceptions and interests through mobilizing EU to adopt a "linkage policy" (Eryılmaz, 2014) in which Turkey's progress in settlement of the disputes with Greece and contributions to the solution of Cyprus conflict under the UN auspices have been emphasized as the core issues before Turkey's EU membership⁴. In addition to this, Republic of Cyprus's EU membership application in June 1990 and Athens's success in persuading EU member states to start accession negotiations with the Republic of Cyprus without a viable solution of the conflict Europeanized the issue as it has never been in the past (Kaliber, 2003). The politics of linkage was also evident in

⁴ EU's linkage policy has been underlined in different documents on Turkey's EU membership including Agenda 2000, Progress Reports prepared by the European Commission on Turkey's EU accession since 1998, Accession Partnership and Negotiation Framework Documents and Luxembourg (1997), Helsinki (1999), Leaken (2001) and Seville (2002) European Council Conclusions.

1999 Helsinki European Council decisions in which Turkey was officially declared as an EU candidate “destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States” (Helsinki European Council, 1999: paragraph 12). In Helsinki European Council, with Greece’s decision to lift its veto on Turkey’s EU candidacy, Turkey’s EU candidacy was recognized and the European Council emphasized that Turkey’s and Cyprus’s constructive efforts for the solution of the Cyprus conflict would contribute both candidates’ EU accession process. It was also underlined that if no settlement has been reached before the finalization of the EU accession negotiations with Cyprus, the accession of Cyprus would be achieved without a political settlement (Helsinki European Council, 1999: paragraph 9 (a) (b), 12).

Following Helsinki European Council of 1999 in many assessments on Turkey’s reform performances, including European Council conclusions, reports on Turkey’s progress, reports of EU Parliament, Strategy Papers and Commission recommendations to the EU Council, Turkey has been urged to take constructive steps in the resolution of Cyprus conflict and normalize its relations with the Republic of Cyprus⁵ in line with the principles of good neighborly relations and peaceful resolution of disputes. In this framework, since late 1990s EU Commission has been discussing Turkey’s progress in the solution of Cyprus conflict under the chapter “political criteria and enhanced political dialogue” in the reports on Turkey’s progress towards EU membership (Tsakonas, 2010, 2001).

⁵ Republic of Cyprus which was established by 1960 Constitution is the only internationally recognized entity representing the island. Based on the idea that the Republic established by 1960 constitutional order collapsed in 1963 when the parliament of the Republic of Cyprus was dominated by only Greek Cypriot representatives after the withdrawal of Turkish Cypriot delegates, Turkey does not recognize the Republic as the legal representative of Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

In addition to these, following Turkey's non-fulfillment of its obligations stemming from the Additional Protocol extending Ankara Agreement to the new member states including Republic of Cyprus, on December 2006, only a year after the opening of accession negotiations with Turkey, EU announced the suspension of the negotiations on eight chapters and the provisionally non-closure of any chapters. Another shockwave occurred in December 2009 when the Greek Cypriot Administration unilaterally declared that it would block the negotiation process in six chapters. Therefore political and technical (Turkey's refusal to recognize the EU member Republic of Cyprus and to extend Customs Union to Cyprus) stalemates based on Cyprus conflict strained relations between Turkey and the EU to the point of the suspension of the newly started accession negotiations. In post-2005 era, Turkey continues to be the subject of the increasing EU adaptation pressures addressing Turkey's obligations with regard to the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus and extending Customs Union to all EU member states. Observing the continuing EU adaptation pressures and Turkey's lingering Cyprus policy, a longitudinal evaluation of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus is perceived as an appropriate case that best serves to the purpose of this study aiming at analyzing the dynamics, conditions and the context of the policy change through Europeanization.

The research covers the period between November 2002 and December 2012 which is the first ten years governing period of JDP governments. It is essential to underline that despite the legal-institutional transformation in Turkish policy was accelerated in the early 2000s, it took time to reverse its traditional position on Cyprus conflict in a way that Turkey's and Turkish Cypriot's best interests in Cyprus were protected without threatening Turkey's EU membership prospect. The JDP's coming

to power in November 2002 and the party elite's determination and venture in political reforms projected by the Europeanization prospect triggered a new incentive for change in Turkey's long-run Cyprus policy. Thus for the time-processing analysis, we start our inquiry focusing on that critical juncture (November 2002).

In the light of the preliminary findings of this research, Ankara's pro-activisms and dynamisms regarding the Cyprus peace process at the pre-Annan Referenda era was gradually subject to erosion especially after Cyprus's EU membership. At that critical juncture, Ankara reconfigured its relations with the Cyprus which had new resources and capacity to impede Turkey's EU journey. Ankara's set back from its constructive and pro-active Cyprus policy in early 2000s became evident during the era of Cyprus's Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2012. During his visit to Northern Cyprus, Turkish EU Minister Egemen Bağış declared in an interview that all options including the annexation of the Northern Cyprus to Turkey and the creation of the two independent states after an agreed divorce between two leaders were on the table in the lack of a viable, just and lasting peace based on the political equality of the two states on the island (Kıbrıs, March 3, 2012). On the upcoming EU Council Presidency of the Cyprus in 2012 Turkish politicians occasionally declared that Turkey would not recognize the EU presidency of Cyprus and that Ankara would not be represented in any meetings chaired by the Greek Cypriot EU Council presidency.⁶ Turkey's stance was evident in 2012 progress report on Turkey published by EU Commission which regretfully reported that "a government circular instructed all Turkish civil servants to abstain from meetings and contacts with the

⁶ For example see: Cumhuriyet, July 20, 2011; Hürriyet Daily News, April 30, 2012;

Cypriot Presidency of the Council of the EU” (European Commission, 2012: 36). Additionally, Commission expressed its regret that “on several occasions, statements at senior political level spoke of alternatives to a comprehensive settlement under UN auspices” (European Commission, 2012: 36). Acknowledging the importance of debates about Cyprus’s EU Presidency, we perceive the developments around the EU Council Presidency of the Cyprus in 2012 as the sign of another critical juncture which reveals that the EU is no more the normative and political context influencing Turkey’s Cyprus policy.

At the stage of data gathering, qualitative techniques are intended to be used. The first and foremost unit of data is composed by documentary information. The following variety of documents is utilized under this research:

- Legal documents:
 - Reports prepared by EU Commission regarding Turkey’s Progress towards EU membership (Progress Reports on Turkey), Commission directives and recommendations, Strategy Papers, declarations of the prominent figures in EU, reports prepared by the EU Parliament on the JDP government’s problem solving capacity in the Cyprus issue and Council declarations.
 - Reports prepared by United Nations Secretary General on the Cyprus issue, UN Secretary General declarations, UN Security Council Declarations, UN Secretary General and his special representative’s Press Statements and Special Reports prepared

by UN sub-committees on different aspects of Cyprus conflict (such as the reports of UN International Human Rights Instruments and UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus – UNFICYP-).

- Official declarations by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other involving actors, National Security Council Press Statements, minutes of meetings in Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), political parties' election declarations and government programs.
- Memoirs, autobiographies, letters written by policy relevant actors and edited studies based on the interviews with policy relevant actors.
- Archival research: news clippings and articles appeared in the mass media.
- In-depth Interviews⁷: the analyses are also supported by the interviews conducted with diplomats, bureaucrats and negotiators who are linked with the JDP government's resolution attempts.

1.4 Hypotheses

Acknowledging the explanatory power of the last generation Europeanization studies designed to understand the EU adaptation pressures' transformative impact on candidate states' divergent policy fields and policy issues (for example, Schimmelfennig, Engel and Knobel, 2003; Kubicek, 2003; Schimmelfennig et. al, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004, 2005, 2006; Uğur and Canefe, 2004; Tsardinidis and Stavridis, 2005; Vachudova, 2005; Diez, Agnantopoulos and Kaliber, 2005; Grabbe,

⁷ Please check appendices to observe the integrated set of interview questionnaire.

2006; Schimmelfennig, 2008; Lavenex, 2008; Dimitrova, 2011; Börzel, 2012; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Börzel and Soyaltın, 2012; Noutcheva and Düzgit, 2012) this study perceives the Europeanization process as a non-linear institutional change in which the external pressures are mediated by the national institutional dynamics. This approach offers an understanding of the change from a multi-dimension perspective in which agency, state traditions, political culture of the state, domestic institutional settings, norms and policy discourses determines the limits and magnitudes of the policy change through Europeanization. That is to say, EU adaptation pressures are filtered by the domestic institutional constraints (such as state traditions, political culture, and level of institutionalization that determines the mode of relationships among the national actors) and this process is resulted with diversity due to the diverse national contexts (Sedelmeier, 2011; Grabbe, 2006; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005; Börzel and Risse, 2003).

Based on these assumptions, this research traces the effects of external pressures exercised by the EU on Turkey to reformulate its policy vis-à-vis Cyprus and aims to explore dynamics, mediators and challenges that shape the process. In this way we put government and political leadership in a very strategic position. The study approaches the JDP government not only as the recipient of external pressures but as the generator of the rule adoption and political transformation. With this respect the study discusses the issue from the lenses of “external incentives model” which is an actor-centered and rationalist bargaining model concentrate on the resonance of the EU incentives with the domestic balances of power and the cost-benefit calculations of the strategic actors who co-ordinate, monitor and generate the European rule adaptation. In the light of this perspective, the following hypotheses will be tested:

- There is causality between Turkey's prospective EU accession and Ankara's abandonment of its long-run attitude denying the linkage between Turkey's EU membership and solution of Cyprus question.
- The long-run transformative impact of EU on Turkey's policy towards Cyprus differs in accordance with the credibility of rewards (whether EU provides a credible EU membership perspective) and domestic actors' owning of the process and capability to utilize those rewards.
- The shift in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus refers to thin Europeanization which is limited, context-driven and strategic adaptation rather than a form of thick and normative Europeanization.

1.5 Structure of the Study

The study is composed of six chapters named as "Introduction", "Theoretical Framework"; "Turkey- EU and Cyprus Triangle: A Historical Account"; "Turkey's EU Membership Aspirations and Cyprus Dispute (2002-2004)"; "Cyprus Conundrum and Turkey's EU Accession (2004- 2012)" and lastly "Conclusion". The chapter on theory provides the background information about the concept of Europeanization. Since the Cyprus conflict is approached as a foreign policy matter, the second half of this chapter is dedicated to discuss the impact of Europeanization in the domain of foreign policy of EU member and candidate states. Following this literature, this chapter also provides a discussion on the latest literature on Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy and Cyprus case.

The third part provides the historical background to understand the place of Cyprus question in the EU's eastern enlargement and the evaluation of Turkey's Cyprus policy in the light of its EU aspirations. It is dedicated to grasp the patterns of Turkey's traditional attitude towards Cyprus conflict as well as the national dynamics -power asymmetries, interest calculations and populist inclinations of ruling elites on the Cyprus question- in which Cyprus question had a specific place. The conclusive assessment of this chapter is the argument that the early attempts to re-orient Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in line with Ankara's endeavor to integrate Turkey with the world politics in the aftermath of Cold War goes back to Turgut Özal era. However, with 1989 European Commission decision on Turkey's membership application, it becomes clear that Cyprus conflict would be an obstacle for Turkey's further integration with Europe. Moreover, EU's failure to offer a clear membership perspective for Turkey and the Union's decision to include Republic of Cyprus into the EU enlargement agenda in 1997 Luxembourg European Council led Ankara to embrace a more hawkish discourse on both EU and the Cyprus. The analysis on this period concludes that EU impact on policy change may not produce a unilinear and progressive way but rather it may promote nationalist assumptions and Euro-sceptical feelings.

The ultimate focus of fourth chapter is the period between late 2002 and 2004. It covers the period between UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's introduction of the UN comprehensive plan for the solution of Cyprus conflict and the April 2004 referenda in which the Turkish and Greek Cypriots were asked whether they approved the final version of the UN plan for the settlement of Cyprus dispute. This chapter integrates government's problem solving efforts in Cyprus and the domestic political reactions and the power struggles. It is argued that during this era Ankara approached

Cyprus issue within the context of Turkey's prospective EU membership. In this process, at the level of intergovernmental bargaining getting a date for the opening of the EU accession negotiations emerged as the key game changer which shaped Turkish government's response.

Fifth chapter focuses on the period after April 2004 referenda. It covers the debates on Turkey's reluctance to implement the Additional Protocol to the Ankara Treaty in a way to extend its Customs Unions to all EU member states including Cyprus. It is argued that after 1 May 2004, Cyprus's EU membership has dramatically changed all parameters related to the problem solving attempts and Turkey's EU accession process. Furthermore in December 2006, EU reached the conclusion that Turkey's rejection to open its ports and airspace to Cyprus meant the violation of *acquis communautaire* and agreed on the suspension of eight chapters and the provisionally non-closure of one chapter. In post-2005 period, deadlocks in Turkey's accession process coupled with the growing Turko-sceptical discourses by the European political leaders and the increasing Euro-scepticism in Turkish public and political spaces. At this juncture, the questioned credibility of the EU's membership perspective increased political costs of further policy convergence for the government. This cost-benefit calculations pushed political elites to restructure the policy towards Cyprus.

1.6. Expected Contributions

Most of the studies on Turkish foreign policy Europeanization in general and Europeanization of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in particular analyses the policy change from a Foreign Policy Analysis perspective. Despite there is an increasing in-

terest in the mentioned literature to apply the theoretical tools and explanatory mechanisms of the Europeanization perspective (ex. Oğuzlu, 2004, 2010, 2012; Aydın and Açıkmeye, 2007; Ulusoy, 2008; Müftüler- Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Tocci and Diez, 2009; Kaliber, 2012; Terzi, 2012; Eryılmaz, 2014) Turkish foreign policy and Turkey's Cyprus policy continue to be discussed from the lenses of the studies approaching foreign policy as a domain of "nation-states". This study which aims to understand the impact of Turkey's Europeanization to the change in a key foreign policy issue (Cyprus conflict) deepens the inquiry on research subject by approaching the issue as a matter of linkage politics. This kind of a research design which acknowledges the linkage between internal and external aspects of policy area and emphasizes both direct (EU rule transformation) and indirect (domestic power re-distribution) impact of Europeanization would provide an alternative reading for the studies on both Turkish foreign policy analysis and Europeanization in Turkey.

In addition to the study's academic contributions to the literature on Turkish foreign policy, the empirical chapters' conclusions also contribute to the academic studies on foreign policy Europeanization in candidate countries. The concept of "European foreign policy" is a relatively new one due to the fact that throughout the long history of European integration foreign policy was strongly approached as a matter of national sovereignty and security (Ruano, 2013: 15). Due to the strong intergovernmental character of the policy field, foreign policy Europeanization is often considered as a field of change in which the EU's transformative impact is less visible and limited. Moreover foreign policy Europeanization is largely associated with the mechanisms of long-run socialization (Schmidt, 2002; Hill, 2003; Tonra and Christiansen, 2005) and normative transformations. Following this background in the literature specialized

on the foreign policy Europeanization; scholars are mostly interested in the Europeanization of the foreign policies of the member states. Accordingly foreign policy change through external pressures exercised by the EU institutions is considered as a post-accession and long-run norm diffusion process. Yet, as this study indicates foreign policy Europeanization may be observed in the pre-accession process. Furthermore, as this study suggests the long-run impact of the EU external pressures in the policy issues which strongly resonate with the concepts of sovereignty, ideology and the interest of the state may generate reverse Europeanization rather than a normative and cultural transformation. In this sense, this study contributes candidate state foreign policy Europeanization studies by exploring the limits and context of foreign policy change in an EU candidate state, Turkey.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: EUROPEANIZATION AND POLICY CHANGE

2.1. Europeanization: Conceptual Framework

Europeanization literature goes hand in hand with the progress in European integration. The earlier academic interest in Europeanization is primarily concentrated on the institution building efforts at the EU level⁸ (for example, Bulmer, 1983; Marks, Hooghe and Blank, 1996; Pierson, 1996; Moravcsik, 1994, 1995, 2001; Christiansen, Jorgensen and Weiner, 1999; Koslowski, 1999; Checkel, 1999, Burgess, 2000). Dynamics, mechanisms and the stages of the European integration is at the center of the scholarly debates among the early students of Europeanization studies. These early attempts to understand Europeanization inclined to approach the issue in line with the developments in European Community (EC) as a part of the larger international relations agenda. Since the end of Cold War, studies on European integration were started to be designed so that it would contribute to understanding the changing dynamics in

⁸ For technical and historical details, please see: Borchardt, Klaus-Dieter. 1986. *European Unification: the origins and growth of the European Community* European Documentation Periodical 3. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

EU politics. EC's traditional identity, as being an economic normative power, began to be evaluated in the context of a rising economic, political, security and global power in the aftermath of the bipolar world system (Larsen, 2014). This switch in the identity politics of the EU accelerated the deepening process⁹ of Europe into a more unified European political system in itself (Vachudova, 2000: 66; Nugent, 1992: 311-317).

While the political architecture of the EU improved, the Union emerged as the dominant political force in member states' daily politics as well as in the global political economy. In this political atmosphere, interactions between EU and its members and more specifically the transformative impact of Union on the member states' domestic politics located at the center of academic debates (for example, Ladrech, 1994; March and Olsen, 1998; Börzel, 1999; Börzel and Risse, 2000; Haverland, 2000; Radaelli, 2000, 2004; Cowles, et. al., 2001; Olsen, 2002; Graziano and Vink, 2007; Checkel, 2007; Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007; Flockhart, 2010). While a significant group of Europeanization students endeavored to explain the phenomenon of the Europeanization at the conceptual level (Ladrech, 1994; Rhodes, 1997; March and Olsen, 1998; Börzel, 1999; Radaelli, 2000; Olsen, 2002; Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Börzel and Risse, 2000, 2003; Bulmer, 2007) other group of scholars were more concerned with the mechanisms and conditions of EU's transformative power in member state politics, policies, and polity (institutions) (Vink, 2002; Laffan, 2007; Jordan,

⁹ Deepening process was accelerated with the signing of Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty) which merged European political and economic communities under the name of "European Union" and consolidated further EU institutionalization. As Maastricht Treaty provisioned in the new era in which the solidarity between EU member states was aimed to be promoted through the deepening of EU wide economic, political and foreign policy standards and values (Treaty on European Union (92/C 191/01)), member states' responsibility and determination for reform at the national level to achieve EU standards became a critical ingredient in the EU integration process.

2003; Goetz and Meyer-Sahling, 2008; Bache and Jordan, 2006; Börzel and Sprungk, 2007; Ladrech, 2010; Graziano, 2013).

This shift in academic interest resulted with a conceptual duality between European integration and Europeanization (Conway and Patel, 2010; Ladrech, 2014). Bulmer claims “arguably the greatest debate in the theoretical literature has related to whether Europeanization is exclusively a top-down phenomenon or whether it is in part horizontal” (2007: 51). The inquiry whether the Europeanization is a “top-down” –policy downloading- processor a “bottom-up” –policy uploading- process located at the center of the scholarly debates. Top-down approach defines Europeanization as a process of rule transfer guided by “top-down” adaptation pressures. Ladrech defines it as “an incremental process reorienting the shape and direction of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making” (1994: 69). In its broadest sense, Europeanization refers to the “extent to which EU influences domestic developments in (*member-emphasized by author*) and candidate countries in specific issue areas” (Sedelmeier, 2011: 9). Following this idea it seeks to explain the ways that EU integration affects member and candidate states’ legal-institutional modernization (Flockhard, 2010). Europeanization is equated with a longitudinal process of domestic change in line with the common EU norms, principles, rules and governance (Radaelli, 2012: 1). In another say, top-down explanations generally define the Europeanization as a process of policy downloading. As opposed to the top-down explanations, bottom-up approach focuses on the dynamics and outcomes of the EU-level institution institutionalization process (Börzel and Risse, 2000).

Many scholars approach the issue as a complex phenomenon that occurs simultaneously at both national and international –EU- level (Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009). Olsen (2002) presents “two parallel” spheres of Europeanization: the rule transfer from EU to the individual member states or the impact of European rules and procedures at the nation state level and developing European capacity at the EU level or the institutionalization of common rules and practices at the EU level. This approach offers an understanding of Europeanization as a reciprocal and circular process. Olsen introduces five process of change as “changes in external boundaries; developing institutions at the European level; central penetration of the national systems of governance; exporting forms of political organization; a political unification project” (2002: 924). In the same vein, Börzel approaches the phenomenon as the two faced process. It has a bottom-up (see also: Risse and Börzel, 2003; Radaelli, 2003; Cowles et al. 2001; Goetz and Mayer-Sahling, 2008) dimension meaning “the transfer of national policy competencies to the European level”(1999, 576) as well as a top-down dimension as member state’s downloading the EU jurisdiction, policies, norms and structures (Börzel and Risse, 2000).

Schmidt contributes this “two faced change” debate by differentiating the EU integration and Europeanization as the two interlinked, reciprocal and at the same time ontologically different issues (2002). As a bottom-up concept, she defines “European integration as the process of European Economic Community (EEC)/European Community (EC)/ EU construction and policy formulation by a wide range of actors – representative of government as well as non-government entities, of member states as well as of the EU- engaged in decision making at the EU level” (2002: 896). Further-

more this continuing integration course results with another process called Europeanization which generates the institutional incentives for change at the national level under the common rules, procedures and practices (Schmidt, 2002: 896).

In overall assessment the ontological accounts about the direction of the “causal arrow” (Ladrech, 2014: 22) are placed at the center of the duality (top-down/bottom-up or Europeanization/European integration). Having in mind the fact that unlike member states candidate countries lack the policy uploading capabilities at the supranational level, the direction of the causal arrow in dealing with the policy change through Europeanization in candidate countries is no doubt a “top-down” one. Thus acknowledging the “asymmetric interdependence” (Vachudova, 2005) between Union and candidate countries, this study is based on a “top-down” research design which is dedicated to understand the dimensions, mechanisms and outcomes of the EU impact on domestic politics at the national level. This model is “based on a chain where EU pressures, mediated by intervening variables, leads to reactions and change at the domestic level, including resistance and inertial responses” (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 40). With this respect, we utilize the term Europeanization as the candidate state responses either through domestic change or non-change to the EU adaptation pressures. More specifically the term is used as “the dimensions, mechanisms and outcomes by which European procedures and institutions affect domestic-level process and institutions” (Börzel and Risse, 2007: 485). Following these conceptual and ontological debates, it is time to elaborate on the constituents of the research question: through which mechanisms Europeanization causes domestic change (mechanisms of the EU impact), in which areas we can observe causality (domains of the EU impact) and what type of change takes place (outcomes of the EU impact).

2.2. Mechanisms of Europeanization

Scientifically speaking a theory should provide the road map to understand the causal links between variables under certain circumstances (George and Bennett, 2005). However in case of Europeanization studies, the Europeanization process does not clearly fit with “the language of dependent and independent variables and the logic of regression analysis” (Olsen, 1996: 271). Transformation occurs at different levels in different shapes and results with divergent consequences (Featherstone, 2003; Radaelli, 2012). Radaelli (2004) expresses “as *explanandum* or problem, Europeanization demands explanation of what goes on inside the process, not a simple black-box design in which one correlates the input “EU independent variables” to the output “domestic impact”” (5). Following this logic, Bulmer suggests “Europeanization is not itself a theory...Rather, (it) is the phenomenon which a range of theoretical approaches have sought to explain” (Bulmer, 2007: 47). That is to say the optimal procedure to understand the nature and rational of the Europeanization process is to approach the issue in line with the tools of prevailing theories on social phenomenon (Bulmer, 2007). In this sense, many studies on Europeanization attempted to approach the issue through the theoretical tools and causal affirmations of the Comparative Politics (New Institutionalism) rather than International Relations discipline (Börzel and Risse, 2007).

Before elaborating on the theories explaining mechanisms of domestic change, it is essential to discuss the trigger or momentum for domestic change (Ladrech, 2010).

Börzel (1999) points out that there are two conditions that trigger the expected domestic change. In the first hand, there must be a misfit or mismatch between EU-level and national-level politics, institutions and policies. This causal mechanism is based on the “goodness of fit” proposition suggesting that the governments of the targeted member and candidate countries encounter with EU adaptation pressures to transform their domestic politics if there is a significant incompatibility or misfit between European and national politics. The existence or lack of misfit between European and domestic policies, politics and institutions determines “whether we should expect domestic change in response to European policies, process and institutions” (Börzel and Risse, 2007). According to the “goodness of fit” argument when the compatibility of the European and domestic process, policies, and institutions is low, adaptation pressures exercised by the EU increases (Börzel, 1999: 5).

While misfit is the necessary condition for domestic change, it is not the sufficient one. The effect of misfit at the national level decidedly depends on the (institutional) facilitating factors which determine the mechanisms and logic of change. Therefore magnitude and mode of the domestic change is heavily dependent on the domestic institutional settings. Accordingly “a corollary is that Europeanization will produce diversity rather than convergence, because domestic institutions differ widely” (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 45). In other words, the domestic changes accelerated by the Europeanization have a path-dependent character. This matter is conceptualized as “divergence” which suggests the Europeanization process differentially affects the political systems and institutions of nation states. There is not a particular standard way of Europeanization and the process can take distinctive forms in accordance with the national patterns of targeted country (Goetz and Mayer-Sahling, 2008:

5). Bulmer and Burch (2005) clearly summarize the significance of national patterns in their study on Europeanization of British government. They argue that the existing patterns of United Kingdom governance were operative in the Europeanization process (Bulmer and Burch, 2005). Radaelli (2000, 2003) claims the process can best be understood as the change in the logic of political behavior. In this sense, the process is best defined as a non-linear, path-dependent and gradual internalization of the new norms and rules. This approach offers an understanding of the change from a multi-dimension perspective in which state traditions, political cultures of the states, norms and policy discourses determines the limits and magnitudes of the policy change through Europeanization. That is to say, EU adaptation pressures are filtered by the domestic institutional constraints (such as state traditions, political culture, and level of institutionalization that determines the mode of relationships among the national actors) and this process is resulted with diverse institutional change in different contexts. Cowles et al. best summarize this phenomenon by defining this process as “domestic adaptation with national colors in which national features continue to play a role in shaping outcomes” (2001: 1). How, why and under which conditions national governments initiate and monitor Europeanization project is definitely central in the nature, magnitude and direction of political innovations.

Based on March and Olsen’s seminal study (1984) on the role of institutional settings in exploring the causal mechanisms for political change and continuity, Europeanization students introduce two logics as “logic of appropriateness” and “logic of consequences” to explain how EU adaptation pressures effect national politics (Featherstone, 2003: 15). The first logic is developed in line with the Sociological Institutional (SI) premises that the institutions affect and constrain actor behavior through

collective norms and rules constituting socially accepted practices. The second logic offers an alternative outlook for our inquiry of the political phenomenon in accordance with the Rational Choice Institutionalism (RI) suggesting that the institutions effect and constrain actor preferences through re-distributing power, opportunities and resources (Hall and Taylor, 1996). The utilization of institutionalist accounts enables us to trace the domestic change with the social-political context which comprises enablers or disablers of the process.

Rational choice institutionalism approaches the political behavior as the outcome of the goal-oriented and rational actors who are expected to strategically interact to maximize their relative power on the basis fixed interests, preferences and concerns. (Mark and Olsen, 1989: 160- 162). Accordingly, actors “follow an instrumental rationality by weighing the costs and benefits of different strategy options taking in the account the (anticipated) behavior of other actors” (Börzel and Risse, 2000: 6). Thus Europeanization process is perceived as an emerging opportunity structure since it shifts the traditional patterns of politics; changes the domestic balance of powers; and creates external incentives for domestic change. (Cowles et al., 2001: 10). In this sense, “logic of consequentialism” suggests that redistributive impact of EU rule adaptation which offers some actors with new and additional power and resources might be utilized by the goal-oriented actors. In that case the outcome of the Europeanization will be convergence through differential empowerment (Ladrech, 2010). The EU-level institutions, which monitor the rule adoption process and provide member and candidate countries with policy advice, increase visibility of the different national groups or actors at the EU level intergovernmental bargaining. With this respect, Moravcsik (1994)

underlines that national governments are placed as the ultimate representatives of national positions and interests at the supranational level as well as they are relatively empowered due to their central power and authority to coordinate rule adaptation. To him, this process inevitably empowers the nation-state and the key agents who represent and negotiate for national interests. Accordingly, redistribution and differential empowerment might be approached as a byproduct of the EU decision-making system that can best be defined as a “two-level game” conceptualized by Putnam as the “central executives have a special role in mediating domestic and international pressures precisely because they are directly exposed to both spheres, not because they are united on all issues nor because they are insulated from domestic politics” (1988: 432).

Yet, the advocates of the multilevel governance approach assert that differential empowerment is not an automatic process. In other words, Europeanization does not systematically empower particular group of domestic actors (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 64). Differential empowerment is dependent on a set of intervening variables. To Knill domestic actors’ capacity and incentive to exploit opportunity structures offered by Europeanization process is the condition for differential empowerment (2001: 33). He underlines that the capacity of actors to exploit European policies to overcome domestic constraints is best explained by macro-institutional context and mediating factors (Knill, 2001). In this sense, veto players (the institutional and constitutional safeguards) intervene into the reform process with their monitoring, controlling and vetoing powers. Haverland stresses the centrality of multiple veto points in determining the democratic control of executives (Haverland, 2000). These veto players (national courts, parliaments, civil society organizations etc.) which are an integral part of national patterns of governance, cultures and traditions; function as the scrutiny

mechanisms that control government's legal responsibilities and liabilities (Haverland, 2000: 85). In accordance with the power and preferences of the veto forces existence of multiple veto points might hinder or retard domestic change. Börzel and Risse (2003) claim "the more power is dispersed across the political system, and the more actors have a say in political decision making, the more difficult it is to foster domestic consensus or "winning coalition" necessary to introduce changes in response to Europeanization pressures" (64).

An alternative to the RI accounts is provided by the "logic of appropriateness" that explains causality through socialization and learning enabling the diffusion and internalization of ideas at the domestic level (Smith, 2004b). Actors are guided by the collective norms which constitute socially accepted behavior and norms constructing individual actors' interests and goals. In this political context actors attempt to satisfy social expectations rather than maximize their individualistic desires and interests (Börzel and Risse, 2003). Thus like the norms and beliefs, actors perceptions on particularistic interests and goals are also shaped by the social context (Hall and Taylor, 1996). From this point of view, Europeanization refers to "the emergence of new rules, norms, practices and structures of meaning to which member states are exposed and in which they have to incorporate into their domestic practices and structures" (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 66).

The logic of appropriateness proposes both structural and normative transformation. The structural convergence between supranational and national level of institutions emerges over time since the actors struggle to transform institutions in the light of environmental shifts (March and Olsen, 1998). It implies a long process of structural homogenization in which "organizations respond to changes in their normative and

cognitive environment giving rise to institutional isomorphism” (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 66). The logic of appropriateness approach, inspired by the agency-oriented version of the SI, suggests that actors learn to internalize new norms, procedures and identities through their intense and longitudinal contacts within the EU level institutional settings (Checkel, 1999; 2005). Through the process of social learning, actors are socialized into certain rules and norms that re-structure the interest calculations and policy frameworks (Börzel and Risse, 2000: 8). Combined with the primary condition or trigger for domestic change -“goodness of fit” proposition- the more European norms and identity resonate with the national ones, the more likely to expect a domestic change. Accordingly in case there is high normative or cognitive misfit between European and the targeted country EU external pressures are unlikely to cause a substantial domestic change due to the possible resistance of the domestic actors (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 67).

At this point it is essential to highlight the mediating factors which lead domestic change or resistance for change. Societal and political agents –change agents or norm entrepreneurs- are both creators and mediators of the policy change. Their attachments to the Europeanization process affect the orientation and intensity of the Europeanization process. Knill and Lehmkuhl (2002) conceptualize this logic of institutional change as the “framing Europeanization”. Through framing Europeanization and European values, change agents legitimize the process and persuade policy makers to transform the long-run policy preferences and behavior. Börzel and Soyaltın (2012) summarize the socialization and persuasion process in which the norm entrepreneurs induce change as

Norm entrepreneurs such as epistemic communities¹⁰ or advocacy networks¹¹ socialize domestic actors into new norms and rules of appropriateness through persuasion and learning, a process through which they redefine their interests and identities accordingly. The more active norm entrepreneurs and EU allies are and the more they succeed in making EU policies resonate with domestic norms and beliefs, the more successful they will be in bringing about domestic change (8).

Another significant facilitator is the existence of a cooperative political culture that enables consensus-building and cost-sharing among the domestic actors. Culture refers to the political context or informal institutional setting in which the actors' political preferences and behaviors are ordered and added subjective (social) meanings (Ross, 2009). Börzel and Risse (2003) argue that the character of the decision making culture is a significant variable in the sense that it dramatically shapes the process itself and its outcomes. They claim "first, a consensus-oriented or cooperative decision making culture helps to overcome multiple veto points by rendering their use inappropriate for actors (and) ... second (it) allows for sharing of adaptational costs which facilitates the accommodation of pressure for adaptation" (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 68). Informal political context and the decision making culture not only compels policy actors to behave in appropriate ways but also it softens the negative redistributive impacts of the policy change through reconfiguring the material domestic structure in a way that "winners of domestic change compensate the losers" (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 68).

Before proceeding, it is essential to emphasize the difference between socialization (complex learning) and strategic adjustments (simple learning) (Schimmelfennig

¹⁰ Börzel and Risse (2003) explain the role of epistemic communities in the process of norm transformation as "they legitimate new norms and ideas by providing scientific knowledge about cause-and-effect relationship" (67).

¹¹ Inspired by the seminal study of Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993), advocacy coalitions are defined as the value and norm based social networks which mobilize and persuade policy actors to reconsider their interests and preferences (Keck and Sikkink, 1998).

and Sedelmeier, 2005). Risse et al. claim “we need to distinguish between instances in which actors merely adjust means and strategies to achieve their given goals and preferences and situations that lead actors to change these goals and preferences themselves” (2001: 12). Accordingly political elites themselves or the norms norm entrepreneurs –civil society initiatives, NGOs or grassroots organizations- which have a clear interest in the compliance with EU in specific policy issues might adopt European means and strategies to with a consequential logic (Checkel, 2001). At this point, it is meaningful to recall Hall and Taylor’s observation suggesting that the two logics of change (logic of consequentialism and logic of appropriateness) are not mutually exclusive categories. Elite learning is a complex and longitudinal process which goes hand in hand with the strategic interactions and interest making process. They are equally important in defining and determining the behavioral aspects of Europeanization. Despite the fact that it is difficult to come up with a conclusion whether an interest-based or norm-based mechanism of change causes change in a specific policy issue, research designs based on a process tracing methodology can solve the problem (Checkel, 2005). Socialization is a time consuming, identity reconstruction process which leads change not in the procedures and available strategies but also in policy identity. Therefore, process tracing analysis on the specific areas of domestic change may shed light on the essence of domestic change. In this case study, we apply this logic by tracing long-run effects of EU adaptation pressures. In this regard, in order to understand the actor preferences and ultimate logic that guides domestic actors’ incentive for Europeanization, the central questions around this study are “how do the elites approach Europeanization? Do they strategically employ the process of Europeaniza-

tion to enhance their relative power and status? Or do they sincerely continue the reform process with a full commitment to the EU perspective despite the high transition costs and the EU's lack of a consistent enlargement strategy regarding Turkey's full membership?"

The two mechanisms of domestic change produce different outcomes in terms of the extent and intensity of the change. Radaelli introduces four possible scenarios as inertia, absorption, transformation and retrenchment (2003: 37). Inertia is the condition of no change. If a certain government finds that EU policies, policy narratives, practices and models are totally destructive and too dissimilar to the domestic practices, a resistance against Europeanization may occur. This may cause interruption in the process of Europeanization by enlarging the gap between EU and member and candidate states. However, this condition is non-sustainable since it severely harms horizontal ties between EU and member and candidate states and produce crises in the long-run (Radaelli, 2003). On the contrary, policy change may take the form of transformation which brings paradigm shift. "Paradigm change occurs when the fundamental logic of political behavior changes –for example, a change in the format and mechanisms of party systems or adoption of a new orthodoxy in monetary policy" (Radaelli, 2003: 38). Therefore transformation as the shift in logic of political behavior can be considered as the most radical form of EU impact in domestic policies (Börzel and Risse, 2003). Absorption as the policy adaptation seems to be the weakest type of Europeanization. The absorption implies that the new policies are accommodated without the essence, political structures and logic of political behavior being changed (Heritier, 2001: 54). Börzel and Risse (2003) define the absorption as "member states incorpo-

rate European policies or ideas into their programs and domestic structures, respectively but without substantially modifying existing process, policies and institutions” (71). Lastly Europeanization may create paradoxical consequences by prompting retrenchment. This phenomenon is explained as “national policy becomes less European than it was” (Radaelli, 2003: 38) in case the external incentives to change domestic policy empowers coalition of reform opponents.

In overall assessment when the mediating factors match with the adaptational pressures possible outcomes of the process might include inertia (lack of domestic change) and retrenchment (resistance against the change) as well as fragile (absorption) to solid (transformation) Europeanization. According to the “logic of consequentialism” approach transformation is attainable when strong adaptational pressures, which would provide actors with new opportunities, empower reform forces to effectively mobilize domestic change by neutralizing veto points (Risse, 1999; Börzel and Risse, 2000; 2003). Additionally weak and medium adaptational pressures may lead absorption or inertia if the numbers of veto points are high and the system lacks formal supportive institutions. Furthermore strong adaptational pressures are more likely to be answered with inertia or retrenchment. Therefore external pressures exercised by the EU may trigger reverse socialization, deterioration of the bilateral dialogue and relationships and yet the increasing Euroskepticism (Diez and Tocci, 2009) as well as a radical legal-institutional reformation process. (Jordan, 2003: 267). With respect to this EU’s pressures for adaptation to the targeted government is a necessary condition for institutional adaptation. Nevertheless, as it is discussed above, despite the adaptation pressure is a necessary condition; it is not the sufficient one. The outcome of the

external pressures is determined by the domestic factors including political actors' reform capacity, framing of EU in the domestic politics, elite socialization, number and power of veto forces and the cost-benefit calculations of the domestic actors.

2.3. Domains of Europeanization

Having discussed the alternative mechanisms and possible outcomes of the EU impact at the national level, it is time to elaborate on the fields or domains in which the adaptational pressures for change are operative. This aspect of Europeanization refers the political, normative and legal-institutional domains of the rule adaption (Risse and Börzel, 2003; Diez, Agnantopoulos and Kaliber, 2005; Olsen, 2002). Diez et al. argue that the political impact of Europeanization is evident at two different levels of national politics. One is legal-institutional coordination mechanisms and the other is the systemic political actors like political parties, civil society institutions, parliaments, and the larger frame of state- society relations (2005: 5-6). Following this differentiation this study approaches the issue of political change as a two faced phenomenon which can be characterized as both institutional innovations (of the coordination mechanisms) and the wider political re-conciliations, power asymmetries and interest formations among political and societal actors.

2.3.1. Polity

The evaluation of administrative capacity to coordinate, manage and monitor the EU rule transfer is an important component of the legal-institutional adaptation. Laffan suggests "in order to live with the Brussels system, states need a cadre of EU specialists who can combine technical/sectorial expertise with European expertise" (2007: 183).

In this sense, technical and legal-institutional transfer requires further structural changes at the policy making and policy implementation levels. Goetz and Mayer-Sahling introduce certain structural models of formal institutional arrangements. They define the common process as

- de-parlamentarization, as national parliaments have ceded powers to the EU and to domestic executives, and the opposite, i.e., re-parlamentarization, as national legislatures have reasserted themselves in the integration processes;
- growing bureaucratization, as national bureaucrats dominate domestic EU-related policymaking, and the opposite, i.e., politicization, as executive politicians take control of the EU policy process; and
- increasing centralization in national governments, with the emergence of powerful EU core executives, and the opposite, i.e., progressive diffusion of integration effects throughout the political and administrative parts of the executive. (Goetz and Mayer-Sahling, 2008: 5)

As it is obvious, the legal-institutional adaptation is the technical aspect of rule transfer which is resulted with the (re)arrangements in the structural settings and emergence of new coordination mechanisms. There are alternative modes of change in accordance with the existing patterns of domestic institutions. As it is discussed in the previous part, the “level of institutionalization” (Laffan, 2003), state tradition, and formal and informal relations ruling the decision making process are frequently referred as the important explanatory variables for the mode of legal-institutional change (Börzel and Risse, 2000; Radaelli, 2000; Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999; Laffan and O’Mahony, 2007). While historical and sociological institutionalists underline the process of path-dependency and social learning as the significant explanatory mechanisms of institutional innovations, rational choice institutionalists focus on the emergence of the new political opportunity structures (Diez et al. 2005: 5-6).

2.3.2. Politics

Politics is the widest domain which includes the transformation in political actions/process and the actors (like civil society institutions, political parties, and interest groups) and these actors' interest relations (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 60). Ladrech (2010) claims Europeanization affects organized interests represented by political parties, interest group, civil society association and pressure groups which are the actors of conventional (formal decision making structure) and non-conventional (informal structures that affect decision making process) system of political action. Knill and Lehmkuhl (1999) claim that EU adaptational pressures directly or indirectly “challenges existing equilibrium” and affects traditional interest politics through imposition of the EU level policies which might re-distribute powers and resources between domestic actors. Yet, whether the new equilibriums create a democratic deficit – strengthens certain actors' power and positions in relation to the others - or they lead thick Europeanization - internalization and deepening of democratic values- depend on the domestic formal and informal political context (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999).¹²

At this point, multilevel governance approach handles the power and resource re-distribution process as a positive natural condition of the Europeanization process. According to this perspective, the conventional actors –mostly national governments- are important components of EU decision-making system, but they are not the only critical actors. The increasing transnationalization of policy areas and decision-making also strengthen the national and transnational non-governmental civil society associa-

¹² See also Featherstone, 2003; Börzel and Risse, 2003; Bulmer, 2007; Laffan and O'Mahony, 2007; Goetz and Meyer-Sahling, 2008

tions, pressure groups and others that involve in the intergovernmental bargaining between EU and targeted countries (Hooghe and Marks, 2003: 285). Thus, Europeanization causes the redistribution of power and resources among multiple actors and in multiple levels (Cowles et al. 2001: 11) in way to create new opportunities and change fixed interest perceptions. In the meanwhile, external adaptational pressures influence political action in the larger sense through diffusion of the common norms, rules, standards, interests and identities (Smith, 2000). In this sense, through the process of socialization and policy learning, different societal and political actors might identify themselves with common interests.

2.3.3. Policy

The studies on policy change concentrate on the convergence or divergence of national policy fields, standards, instruments, problem solving mechanisms and policy discourses to the larger family of EU policies (Börzel and Risse, 2003; Radaelli, 2000; Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004, Sedelmeier, 2011). As Börzel and Risse (2000) discuss changes in domestic policies may occur at different aspects and levels of policy field. EU impact may trigger the change in policy standards, instruments, and problem solving approaches, policy narratives and discourses. Treib approaches policy change by focusing on the changes in policy cycles and he claims “policy cycle may be divided into several clearly distinguishable phases, ranging from problem definition and agenda-setting to policy formulation, policy implementation, evaluation and finally to policy termination or re-formulation” (Treib, 2008: 16). Schmidt and Radaelli highlights the importance of policy discourses as “representing both the policy ideas that

speak to the soundness and appropriateness of policy programs and the interactive process of policy formulation and communication that serve to generate and disseminate those policy ideas” (2004: 193).

Radaelli underlines that EU can affect different elements of domestic policy such as the actors, policy instruments, resources, policy fields, formal policy making structures as well as policy norms, values, paradigms and discourses (Radaelli, 2003: 36). Despite the fact that EU’s influence in the member and candidate states’ domestic structures are discussed under different domains as policy, polity and politics, those fields of domestic change are intermingled (Heritier, 2001: 11). While we are discussing the policy change, we should also deal with the changes in policy-making structures that are directly related with the larger framework of polity change. Thus changes in the other domains of domestic politics –legal-institutional change and polity change- have broader repercussions on policy making structures, process and policy interests.

EU policy adaptation is the most complex field among other domains of the Europeanization due to the fact that certain policy areas are increasingly penetrated into the domestic politics of member and candidate states (Schmidt, 2000). There are basically two branches of EU policies whose categorization are discussed in line with the EU and nation state authorization. The first category is the common policies which are defined and structured in the EU *acquis*. The legal-institutional harmonization and full implementation of these policies are monitored and imposed by the Union (Radaelli and Schmidt, 2004). The second group of policies -such as immigration, foreign, security and defense policies- is left to the national domains of policy-making, regulation and monitoring. Despite the fact that EU regulative policy areas are under the

authorization of EU supranational policy making circle, European Common and Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is structured in an intergovernmental manner which is not regulated by clearly defined European laws and regulations and where the decisions are based on consensus and in which Europeanization is non-hierarchical and voluntary (Bulmer and Radaelli, 2004: 7). In other words, foreign policy refers to a policy field which is reserved to the domain of nation states. Since our concern is the Cyprus Issue as a foreign policy matter, Europeanization of foreign policy is discussed largely below.

2.4. Europeanization and Foreign Policy Convergence

The concept of “European foreign policy” is a relatively new one due to the fact that throughout the long history of European integration foreign policy was strongly approached as a matter of national sovereignty and security (Ruano, 2013: 15). Kalevi J. Holsti, who is known with his comprehensive definition of the foreign policy, defines foreign policy as “ideas or actions designed by policy makers to solve a problem or promote some change in the policies, attitudes, or actions of another state or states, in non-state actors, in the international economy, or in the physical environment of the world” (1995: 82). Such a definition points out the “state-centric” character of the foreign policy which is dominantly driven by the discourse on “national” interests and objectives. This state-centric character of the policy field poses a challenge for the creation of a solid European foreign policy under EU institutional framework in which having particular perceptions of national interest the member states are less likely to act like a unified actor with clearly defined and consistent external objectives (Allen and Smith, 1990). “Instead of a coherent and authoritative decision-making

center¹³, we observe persistent national foreign policies that operate under or alongside – and sometimes at variance with – ‘EU’ foreign policies defined by the Commission, the European Parliament and/or the Council” (Wong and Hill, 2011: 3). Apart from cooperation on certain common foreign and security policy issues and the matters that requires immediate action, member states seeks to maintain their national veto over decision making within the “Second Pillar of the European Union” (Tonra and Christiansen, 2004). The institutional structure of the Union¹⁴ also enables the policy projection in the field of foreign policy which is an intergovernmental pillar. Put differently, under the intergovernmental CFSP pillar, “member states have a choice in whether they pursue foreign policy through the EU, through other international institutions, or whether they rely on bilateral channels or even unilateral moves in pursuit of their national interests” (Gross, 2009; xii).

This particular dimension of European foreign policy making leads the emergence of the two complementary approaches in European foreign policy analysis. One group of scholars sees member states as the principal agents in designing European foreign policy while another group of researchers emphasizes the transformative role of the long-run socialization through diffusion of policy ideas and best practices to the

¹³ According to the institutional structure of the EU, which was introduced by the Treaty of Maastricht that remained until the Lisbon Treaty entered into force, the Union’s institutional structure is composed by three pillars. First pillar consists of pillar of three communities: the European Community, the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) and the former European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Second pillar devoted to the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Third pillar includes Justice and Home Affairs. Three pillars operate differently in terms of decision-making procedures. While first pillar is decided by a community method, which based on qualified majority voting and recognizes the active involvement of Commission and Parliament, second and third pillars are decided based on the intergovernmental method in which Commission’s right of initiative is limited or shared by the member states, European Parliament and Court of Justice have minor roles and member states have more room for maneuver. Although Lisbon Treaty, signed in 2010, abolished this strict pillar structure the intergovernmental method is still operative for second pillar –Common Foreign and Security Policy-.

¹⁴ Please observe note 9.

foreign policy structures (Wong, 2006:3-6). Accordingly European foreign policy is generally defined as a combination or interaction of the three dimensions: (i) national foreign policies of the EU member states (ii) EU external trade relations (iii) Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the EU (Wong and Hill, 2011; Wong, 2006, 2007; White, 2001). From this perspective Europeanization is discussed as (a) the bottom-up policy projection process of the nation states whose national objectives and interests are subjectively defined; (b) top-down policy downloading process by the nation states in accordance with the common priorities and positions of the Union and (c) a socialization process that leads to re-definition of “national” interests, security matters and priorities under CFSP (Wong and Hill, 2011).

In the context of policy projection according to the RI accounts member states prefer to proactively involve in the foreign policy cooperation due to the fact that it allows member states to “pursue their goals that they cannot attain through unilateral action” (Alec de Flers and Müller, 2010). Through externalization of national concerns and preferences to the EU level, member states might have a chance to actively shape world affairs or bilateral relations with a non-EU member state or region. Tsardinidis and Stavridis (2005) for Europeanization of Greek foreign policy in post-1995 era claim “on issues of national interest such as the Cyprus Problem, EU relations with Turkey, South Eastern states, or Mediterranean countries, Greek foreign policy increasingly reflects the wider EU positions which it has itself contributed to formulate” (228). As Tsardinidis and Stavridis point out in the context of foreign policy Europeanization while member states contribute to foreign policy cooperation at the EU level they at the same time have a chance to “nationalize” policy content. Therefore for

many member states foreign policy convergence continues to be an ongoing puzzle in the sense that it stands on the border line between European and national interests.

Although the intergovernmental nature of the CFSP enables uploading national policy agendas the success of policy projection is highly dependent on the level of convergence between Union and the member state as well as cooperation capacity and bargaining power of member state bureaucrats. In his study on Europeanization of Spanish foreign policy, Torreblanca (2001) underlines that foreign policy of a member state is best projected if member states are successful in negotiating its foreign policy agenda in a way that it is in harmony with the common standards, institutional identity, interests and founding principles of the Community and other member states' interests. He claims

Obviously, Spain could not impose its national interests and policies on the EU without changes or adaptation. Even if it could negotiate this policy transfer and exchange it for its support for other member states policy areas, success could only be based on persuading the other EU members that the EU had a distinct interest in the matter and, therefore, of the need for the EU to have a policy of its own (Torreblanca, 2001: 10).

Another best case example is the Europeanization of French foreign policy discourse on North Africa. "Instead of presenting itself as an indispensable hegemonic guarantor of stability, Paris now merely tries to cope with those regional tensions alongside its European partners" (Charillon and Wong, 2011: 23). Accordingly foreign policy Europeanization, as common to other policy fields, has both horizontal and vertical aspects (Tonra and Christiansen, 2004). In case of member state foreign policy Europeanization, the bottom-up dimension of the Europeanization leads a process of domestic change in which foreign policies of member states change arising from interactions between nation states and the Union and in accordance with common norms and values

(Ladrech, 2010: 195). Put differently what leads a change in the nation states' foreign policy is not the CFSP itself but the decision making process that creates the common positions, visions and norms.

Based on these socializing and top-down elements of European integration in the area of foreign policy, Ben Tonra (2000) defines foreign policy Europeanization as “a transformation in the way in which national foreign policies are constructed, in the ways in which professional roles are defined and pursued and in the consequent internalization of norms and expectations arising from a complex system of collective European foreign policy” (229). Thus foreign policy Europeanization is composed of two twin processes which occur simultaneously at both EU level and nation state level. On the one hand it refers to European integration in the field of common foreign and security policy, on the other hand it refers to the diffusion of common norms, practices, values and problem solving mechanism into the EU member states' foreign policy structures. Through its common standards, EU offers “a new logic of foreign and security policy making” (Miskimmon, 2007: 2).

Having discussed the conceptualization and dimensions of foreign Policy Europeanization, it is required to understand “what is changing” and “through which mechanisms policy change is materialized”. At this point Ladrech (2010) introduces three grounds -policy institutions (polity), policy contents (policy) and policy identity (politics) - in which the EU impact is evident. The changes in the first policy field denotes to the transformations in domestic decision making structures and bureaucratic coordination mechanisms in a way that the nation states can effectively project their policies at the Union level –strategic action- (Checkel, 2005) and actively participate the process of intra-state communication –bureaucratic adjustment- (Smith, 2000).

Wong and Hills (2011) associate institutional change with the member states' policy downloading reflex and define the changes at this stage as "harmonization and transformation of a member state to the needs and requirements of EU membership" (7). The necessity for coordination and bargaining leads member –candidate states as well to form new bureaucratic structures that regulates the interaction between European and national foreign ministries and other core executive actors (Smith, 2004a, 200b). Apart from structural changes the institutional reforms might also trigger a process in which the responsibilities, policy making capacities or political positions of certain domestic actors might increase or decrease relatively. In this case, Europeanization offers "new opportunity structures" for certain actors. As Börzel and Sprungk (2007) argue for the Europeanization of German decision-making structures, Europeanization has a crucial re-distributive impact which led the "deparliamentarization" and centralization of the policy making.

Europeanization process offers new policy options, practices and agendas for nation states. As Ladrech suggested "a member state may formulate new positions regarding the third countries or regions where it has historic relations, but for which EU membership now introduces new considerations". For example, Greece's active support for Turkey's EU membership since 1999 has evolved with respect to the Greek foreign policy elites' strategic choice based on the rational that Turkey's deepening EU vacation is best for the Greece's security interests (Tsakonas and Tournikiotis, 2003; Economides, 2005; Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005; Agnantopoulos, 2013). Accordingly the Europeanization of Greek foreign policy introduced new considerations and political options in dealing with its long run problems with Turkey. Policy con-

vergence might also enlarge nation states' foreign policy agendas. In his study on Europeanization of Greek foreign policy, Economides (2005) emphasizes that Greece's EU membership not only provided new options or pressure mechanisms for the country's ongoing national concerns in its bilateral relations (Greek-Turkish relations, Cyprus Conflict, relations with Balkans), but also it expanded Greek foreign policy agenda and added new foreign policy issues like involvement in humanitarian and peacekeeping operations in Southeastern Europe. Accordingly, Daenhnhardt (2011) in her study on German foreign policy, she discusses how Germany's foreign policy towards Middle East Peace Process and Iran's nuclear program -issues lacking a clear definition of German interests-. She reaches the conclusion that German foreign policy towards Middle East "became embedded in a European framework leading it to juggle between an impartial position vis-à-vis all states in the region and maintaining its special relationship with Israel" (43).

The third dimension of the policy change refers to the changes in policy preferences, interests and in its broadest sense policy identity. In their study on foreign policy and state identity, Chafetz et al. (1998) defined identity as self-schemas and "tools for managing and organizing information about oneself and the self's relationship to the environment" (4). Put differently, identity draws the cognitive borderlines between self and other, provides the appropriate road maps, and defines the best policy options for the best interests (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993). More specifically "the politics of identity refers to a particular set of ideas about political community that policy-makers use and drawn on to mobilize a sense of cohesion and solidarity to legitimate the general thrust of foreign policy" (Aggestam,1999). At this point, Smith emphasizes the interaction between institutionalization of the foreign policy identity

at the EU level and its impact on the member states' foreign policies (2004). He points out that the European legal-institutional integration has had enormous consequences in terms of emergence of the common foreign policy standards, perceptions, interests and values (Smith, 2004) which are the "outward-looking version of the EU's modern and enlightenment identity, emphasizing the rule of (international) law, multilateral and peaceful conflict resolution, as well as the promotion of human rights, democracy and a social market economy" (Risse, 2012: 90-91). Smith (2000) elaborates on the normative aspect of CFSP by suggesting that "(political co-operation in case of CFSP) is oriented toward problem-solving, which involves an appeal to *common interests* and the use of ostracism or peer-pressure to sanction potential defectors" (615). With this respect, the cooperation around common interests and the sense of common destiny hampers the use of foreign policy issues as populist acclamations by the member states' governments towards their domestic audiences (Hocking and Spencer, 2002). From this point of view the intergovernmental characteristics of European foreign policy construction emerges as an asset that opens the ground for collective reflex and socialization through consensus based problem solving mechanisms, common positions and common interests (Smith, 2000).

Same as the rational choice institutionalists, rationalist accounts emphasize the role of cost/benefit calculations, opportunity structures and size and credibility of the material incentives whereas social constructivists emphasize the transformative impact of social learning, elite socialization and norm diffusion (Checkel, 2001). Ontologically speaking according to the rationalist premises the underlying mechanism of change is "a cost/benefit choice mechanism, with agents calculating in response to putative regime benefits (material or social) or the threat of sanctions" (Checkel, 2001:

556). Accordingly, the agents' decision to compliance is mainly driven by a consequential logic which considers social context, domestic and foreign bargaining structures and the potential rewards/benefits occurring in the process of compliance. Thus the transformation is dominantly instrumental which is required to upload and pursue national or particular interests at the EU level. However Checkel (2001) points out that the incentive based accounts best explain the early stages of compliance and the critical junctures in policy change. Consequential logic fails to portray the underlying machinery that leads the long-run normative change under which the common values, interests, norms and foreign policy identity are internalized by the policy actors. At this juncture, social constructivists propose an alternative model that explains the policy compliance. Accordingly compliance is achieved through the elite socialization and learning whereby the norms provide agents with new interests and identities (Smith, 2000). At the level of agency, Europeanization occurs "through the influence of Member State representatives placed in Brussels on national preference formation" (Alecu de Flers and Müller, 2012: 24). The socialization infers a slow process of policy compliance that is structured by the dynamic interactions between EU officials and bureaucrats of the member states at the supranational level (Ladrech, 2010: 198). Opposed to the incentive based model, socialization model defines the complex negotiations at the supranational level as "reflex of coordination" rather than the bargaining (Wong, 2005).

At this point, it is essential to discuss the actors, forms and mechanisms of elite socialization or policy learning. Socialization might be owned by the political elites themselves or the norms might be internalized through the involvement of norm entrepreneurs –civil society initiatives, NGOs or grassroots organizations- which have a

clear interest in the compliance with EU in specific policy issues (Checkel, 2001). Radaelli distinguishes two forms of learning as “thin learning” and “thick learning” (Radaelli, 2003). While thin learning might be a strategic choice for the elites who comply with the procedures to effectively project national policy preferences, thick learning refers to a cognitive change in which the national foreign and security identity and perception of national interests are modified (Radaelli, 2003: 52). In the same vein, Checkel (2005) argues that there are different socializing mechanisms driven by the policy actors’ motives. As the “thin learning” argument suggests elite socialization occurs as a result of strategic calculations when the policy change provides governments with the rewards greater than the cost of policy change or “targeted societal actors expect the costs of putting pressure on the government to be lower than the benefits of conditional external rewards, and these actors are strong enough to force the government to comply with the international norms” (Checkel, 2005: 809). If this mechanism functions alone the ultimate trigger behind the elite socialization is the consequential logic in which the EU impact is limited in the sense that the national foreign policy procedures and diplomatic/communicative strategies are under transformation rather than the national identities and interests. In their study on the national representatives in Council Working Groups, Juncos and Pomorska (2006) reach the conclusion that national bureaucrats prefer to follow the code of conduct during their interactions with their counterparts mostly because of they are treated as more legitimate and credible partners in the decision making process. Therefore, at the individual level, internalization of the normative aspects of policy compliance under the CFSP umbrella is limited.

Nevertheless the EU decision making structure is also perceived as a normative context whereby the intense and longitudinal communicative actions might lead a shift towards the “noncalculative behavioral adaptation” (Checkel, 2005: 810). In this sense “role playing” emerges as an alternative mechanism of change in which the “automaticity” in individuals’ daily contacts under EU institutions gradually and slowly socializes national bureaucrats. When the role playing mechanism is active, a shift from logic of consequences to the logic of appropriateness is evident. Thus this mechanism might be approached as the first stage of thick learning or real socialization. According to this stage by stage transformation, the shift from the logic of consequences to the logic of appropriateness is completed when the ultimate mechanism of socialization becomes “normative suasion” (Checkel, 2005: 812). “When normative suasion takes place, agents actively and reflectively internalize new understanding of appropriateness” (Checkel, 2005: 812). If the driving force behind Europeanization is the normative suasion, the member states to a large extent identify their foreign policy interests with the Union’s common interests. It is essential to underline that identity reconstruction (Wong, 2005) as a result of the dense internalization is a slow process which is dependent on the sustainability, permanence and intensity of the contact between Union and the nation states. With this respect transformative impact of the Europeanization through elite socialization is further evident in explaining foreign policy Europeanization of the long-standing members of the Union.

In overall assessment, Europeanization in any policy field is not an automatic and linear process. Its impact on the national politics is highly dependent on the political context, agency and the institutional settings. All these variables determine not only the size and sustainability of the process but also the operative mechanisms –logic

of consequences and logic of appropriateness-. Europeanization of the national foreign and security policy is not exception in this sense. Yet, this section sheds light on the fact that the distinctive nature of the discussed policy field –foreign policy- involves peculiarities in terms of domains and mechanisms of change.

Based on the arguments on the domains of foreign policy Europeanization – polity (changes in national decision making and coordination structures); policy (changes in policy content and procedures) and politics (changes regarding foreign and security policy identity and interests) - the nature and intensity of the EU impact is also questioned. Additionally, in the context of enlargement bottom-up dimension of the Europeanization is missing due to the asymmetrical relationship between accession countries and the Union. Acknowledging this fact this study on accession Europeanization is based on a “top-down” research design which aimed to understand the causal mechanisms and conditions leading policy change in the context of EU membership conditionality.

2.5. Explaining Domestic Change in Candidate States: Europeanization through EU Conditionality

European Union’s decision to accept candidacy of the Central and Eastern European countries in 1997 Luxemburg and 1999 Helsinki European Councils¹⁵ provided

¹⁵ With the end of bipolar system, for many Central and Eastern Countries integration with EU emerged as the fundamental political goal to transform their state-controlled economy to a free market economy and to transform their political systems to liberal democracies. With this respect, European Council, with the decisions of 1990 Rome European Council, introduced a financial aid package for the economic recovery of those countries in the context of relations with Soviets and Central and Eastern Europe (Rome European Council, 1990). Copenhagen European Council became a critical juncture that for the first time encouraged CEEC to apply for full-membership and take a part in European family as long as they fulfill Copenhagen criteria and the responsibilities based on *acquis communautaire*. Upon full-membership applications of the ten Central and Eastern European Countries (Hungary, Poland, Estonia, the Czech Republic , Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia), in 1997

a new vantage point to academically explore the interplay between Union and the candidate states. Thus the third generation studies on Europeanization evolved parallel to the EU's eastern enlargement (Schimmelfennig, Engel and Knobel, 2003; Kubicek, 2003; Schimmelfennig et. al, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004, 2005, 2006; Uğur and Canefe, 2004; Tsardinidis and Stavridis, 2005; Vachudova, 2005; Diez, Agnantopoulos and Kaliber, 2005; Grabbe, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2008; Lavenex, 2008; Dimitrova, 2011; Börzel, 2012; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Börzel and Soylaltın, 2012; Noutcheva and Düzgit, 2012). Eastern enlargement of the Union has shifted the direction of debates from European integration to the impacts of European integration in the candidate states' domestic politics. The studies on Accession Europeanization are developed to test established approaches –logic of consequentialism and logic of appropriateness- in the enlargement context and set new variables or mediating factors that lead domestic change for candidate countries (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005). Following the analytical tools and causal mechanisms developed by second generation –member state Europeanization- scholars, these studies put emphasis on the varying impact of the EU in candidate state's domestic institutional settings. Yet, in case of candidate state Europeanization, EU conditionality for membership constitutes an additional dimension (Grabbe, 2002). Accordingly, this section is dedicated to comprehend the conceptual framework of the EU conditionality and the mechanisms of domestic change peculiar to the aspiring member states.

Luxembourg European Council, Council decided to launch the accession process comprising Cyprus, Hungary, Poland, Estonia, the Czech Republic, Slovenia. This group of countries is labeled as "Luxembourg Group". The second group of CEEC applicants including Bulgaria, Romania, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia were declared as official candidate for the EU membership in 1999 Helsinki European Council. This group of countries is named as "Helsinki Group".

2.5.1. EU Conditionality

Conditionality in its broadest sense refers to the use of economic, political or regulative conditions attached to the delivery of benefits such as aid, trade and economic privileges, technical assistance and debt relief. It is a mechanism applied by the donor country or organization to induce reform and transform political economy of the recipients (Collier et al. 1997). EU applies conditionality in conducting economic and trade relations and for the allocation of aid with the third countries and regions (Smith, 1998). Since early 1990s European Community attached political conditions –political conditionality¹⁶- to regulate its economic, trade and political relations with the third countries including Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC) declared their independence with the demise of Cold War (Grabbe, 2002). In response to the CEEC's aspirations to "Return to Europe" (Vachudova, 2005; O'Brennan, 2006), EU included eastern enlargement as a foreign policy strategy to fulfill its moral duty (Schimmelfennig, 2001) of promoting post-communist European regimes' rapid transformation to free-market economy and liberal democracy as well as to prevent possible destructive political and economic impacts of the transition period for the wider Europe (Smith, 1998; Grabbe, 2002). Enlargement emerged as a foreign policy goal to promote stability and democratic consolidation in the Eastern Europe¹⁷ (Schimmelfennig, 2008). At this juncture, the project of Eastern enlargement also contributed the EU's normative power and common foreign and security policy identity. "The EC of the early 1970s

¹⁶ Karen Smith defines political conditionality as "entailing the linking, by a state or international organization, of perceived benefits to another state (such as aid), to the fulfillment of conditions relating to the protection of human rights and the advancement of democratic principles" (1998: 256).

¹⁷ Please see: European Council, Madrid European Council Presidency Conclusion, 25 - 26 June 1990.

was a different institution from the EU of the 1990s, when the linkage between a resolution of border conflicts and entry into the EU had become part of official policies” (Diez et al. 2006: 574).

Following the membership applications raised by CEEC in early 1990s, the economic, political and administrative components of EU political conditionality were introduced to deepen the process of European integration by minimalizing the “risk of new entrants becoming politically unstable and economically burdensome to the existing EU” (Grabbe, 2006: 10) was first outlined in 1993 Copenhagen European Council. In early 1990s European Community’s traditional identity, as being an economic power, began to be evaluated into a rising economic, political, security and global power. This switch in the cognitive structures of the EU accelerated the deepening process of Europe into a more unified European political system in itself (Smith, 1998; Grabbe, 2002; Diez, 2005; O’Brennan, 2006). Deepening process was accelerated with the signing of Treaty of Maastricht on European Union which merged European political and economic communities under the name of “European Union” and initiated a new stage in European integration. While the concerns and expectations about the process of European integration were on the table, arrival of the independent post-communist regimes provided EU with both new challenges and opportunities. In order to prevent undesirable repercussions of transition process and to expand European market towards the east, EU employed an instrumental logic of enlargement toward Central and Eastern Europe (Diez et al. 2006: 576). Put it differently, EU in 1990s had been shaped by the double concern of deepening –political, economic and institutional integration to act as a unified Europe- and widening – enlarging the political, economic and territorial boundaries of Europe to promote regional security and stability to act as

a global power in the aftermath of Cold War-. By making EU membership conditional to democracy, human rights, free market economy and good neighborly relations, EU forced would-be members to comply with the European rules, norms and standards (Schimmelfennig, 2008). Therefore, in case of candidate state Europeanization, EU conditionality for membership and vertical power asymmetries between candidate states and EU add an extra dimension. Vachudova (2005) underlines that unlike member state Europeanization; candidate states' attempts for domestic change are strictly guided, monitored and evaluated by the EU institutions. Since candidate states are not subject to EU legal-institutional structure, they do not have a say in shaping EU politics. This "asymmetric interdependence" would shape all of their dealings with the EU—until they became full members and perhaps even thereafter" (Vachudova, 2005: 63).

As 1993 Copenhagen and 1995 Madrid European Council presidency conclusions emphasized, EU conditionality is constructed on twin and equally important conditionality mechanisms as political conditionality and *acquis* conditionality (accession conditionality). In the context of political conditionality European Council decides to open the accession negotiations, when the candidate states meet criteria:

- stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;
- the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;
- The ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union (Copenhagen European Council, June 21-22, 1993).

In addition to Copenhagen Council decisions, Madrid European Council strengthened and clarified the conditionality criteria by suggesting candidate states to put the EU rules (*acquis communautaire*) and legislation into effect. In the context of *acquis* conditionality, EU pushes forward the domestic change by implementing a pre-accession strategy in which EU offers the incentive if the candidate state complies with the *acquis communautaire* and withdraws its reward if the candidate state fails to comply (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004: 671). Therefore membership is not an automatic process rather the outcome is dependent on the level of EU legislation's transposition to the national legislation, and more importantly its implementation and enforcement by an efficient administrative body.

Although Copenhagen criteria introduced the path and conditions for the accession process, it did not specify the either material benefits or precise steps to be taken in response to the candidate states' effective rule adaptation. Specific conditions and technical and procedural details about pre-accession process were introduced in time. In Agenda 2000 document, European Commission reinforced its pre-accession strategy –namely Reinforced Pre-accession Strategy (SPAR) - which was aimed to offer a tangible program to prepare applicant countries for accession to Europe (European Commission, Agenda 2000, July 1997). In addition to through its conventional aid-oriented programs (The Program of Community aid to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe- PHARE), legal-institutional instrument –Accession Partnership- was introduced through mobilization of assistance to the applicant countries within a single framework to effectively prepare applicant countries for the EU accession. Additionally Council was authorized to annually prepare and submit regular reports on each candidate's progress towards accession. With this respect, “this was an innovative

move for the EU, in making an explicit linkage between benefit and specific tasks for applicants, and it may herald the start of targeted use of conditionality” (Grabbe, 2003). This renewed order of interactions between applicant countries and the Union, brings with positive liabilities and new responsibilities for the Union to improve its gate-keeping mission. Today, to secure the convergence EU implements certain strategies as (1) start negotiations and promote further stages in the accession process; (2) delivery of legislative and institutional templates; (3) financial aid and technical assistance; (4) policy guidance and twinning projects; and (5) monitoring, *démarches*, and public criticism (Grabbe, 2002: 256).

2.5.2. Intervening Variables and Mechanisms of Europeanization through Conditionality in Candidate States

Having discussed the impact of “goodness of fit” suggestion in the context of EU members, it is clear that there is a significant correlation between the degree of EU adaptational pressures and the magnitude of the mismatch between European and domestic politics, polity and policies. While the “goodness of fit” proposition is valid with respect to the candidate state Europeanization, the asymmetrical interdependence between “applicant” and the “applied” imposes additional dimension for the process. “This asymmetry of interdependence allows the European Union to set the rules of the game in the accession conditionality” (Grabbe, 2003: 318). Based on this assumption, most scholars agree on the idea that the more mismatch between European and domestic politics, polity and policies, the more effective conditionality should be used by the Union to trigger domestic change (Smith, 1998; Grabbe, 2001, 2003, 2006; Schimmelfennig et. al. 2003; Schimmelfennig, 2001, 2006, 2008, 2009; Schimmelfennig and

Sedelmeier, 2004, 2005, 2006; Hughes and Sasse, 2004; Sedelmeier, 2006, 2011). With this respect EU's capacity and commitment to effectively use enlargement conditionality emerges as a significant mediating factor.

In their pivotal study on Europeanization in CEEC, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005) discuss external incentives model suggesting that the "government adopts EU rules if the benefits of EU rewards exceeds the domestic adoption costs" (12). Based on the "logic of consequentialism" external incentives model offers a rationalist bargaining account. According to this model, the outcome of the bargaining process is determined by the actors' relative bargaining power in which the information about the next step of their counterparts and the alternative end results –material or non-material benefits- of the action are asymmetrically distributed among the actors (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005). This bargaining matrix provides the actors with better information about the other players with more advantage and manipulative power.

In the context of enlargement conditionality, EU through its relative bargaining power based on asymmetrical dependency sets rules and determines conditions in the intergovernmental bargaining between the Union and the candidate countries. At this point, Schimmelfennig (2000, 2001) argues EU's strategy to lead domestic transformation is reactive reinforcement or reinforcement by reward under which EU pays rewards when targeted government internalize community *acquis* and political conditions. Reactive reinforcement refers more than an active or positive conditionality. In the context of reactive reinforcement EU does not "intervene either coercively or by inflicting extra-costs (reinforcement by punishment) or supportively by offering extra benefits (reinforcement by support) to change the behavior of target government"

(Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11). “In other words, conditionality only works as a carrot, not as a stick” (Grabbe, 2003: 317). Moreover exclusion and suspension of the accession process are quite risky and problematic in the sense that they might lead governmental and societal actors to block the process “by using the tactic of blaming the EU for unfair discrimination and by appealing to national pride” (Grabbe, 2001: 1021).

EU conditionality regulates the bargaining process which simultaneously occurs at both intergovernmental (between EU and targeted government) and domestic (national actors) levels. As it is discussed in the section on theoretical framework of the Europeanization, EU accession process dramatically shifts the domestic institutional equilibrium (status quo), which refers to the recurrent conditions under which domestic power and preferences are distributed among the societal and political actors (Risse et al. 2001), either through differential empowerment of pro-EU societal and political actors or directly imposing a positive EU leverage on ruling elites to comply with EU norms and values (Risse et al. 2001). At this juncture, the EU emerges as the key game changer in shifting institutional equilibrium through offering additional incentives and opportunity structures. Within the intergovernmental bargaining the Union might directly and constructively affect targeted government to take necessary steps for compliance if the material and non-material benefits of EU rewards surpass the costs of compliance. Secondly parallel to the logic of consequentialism, EU conditionality in candidate countries horizontally reconfigures national institutional context and power relations. Accordingly EU conditionality indirectly triggers change through differential empowerment of the pro-reform forces which refers to the actors having particular individualistic incentives to adopt EU rules “which might stem from

the utility of EU rules in solving certain policy problems to the advantage of these domestic actors or more generally in increasing their influence in the political system” (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11). In the existence of the new opportunity structure –EU membership- the actors who have no or limited say in previous equilibrium discover an important channel to force governing elites for rule adoption.

The tentative power of external incentives model is evident in the sense that it specifies the conditions and context which enable EU to operate as the real game changer in the accession process (Sedelmeier, 2011: 12-15). In this sense, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier introduce four intervening variables –determinacy of conditions, size and speed of rewards, EU membership credibility and adoption costs- as the key mediating factors causing Europeanization in candidate countries. Determined conditions secure the flow of information between EU and applicant countries and the credibility of the membership perspective. Precisely set conditions binds both EU and candidate state in the sense that it is difficult to flee from the mutual responsibilities of both parts. With respect to the size and speed of rewards, promise of membership is more effective than the financial aid packages or technical assistance (Grabbe, 2006). Additionally if the strongest motivation –EU membership- of the candidate country is not an option for the time being, the likelihood of domestic change decreases. Credibility of the rewards and sanctions increases the prospect of domestic change. Following this logic,

- (1) the credibility of threats increases and the credibility of promises decreases as the benefits of rewarding or the costs of withholding the reward decrease;
- (2) credibility increases with the consistency of, and internal consensus about, conditionality policy;
- (3) credibility decreases with cross-conditionality and increases with parallel and additive conditionality; and
- (4) credibility decreases with information asymmetries in favor of the target government (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 16).

Sedelmeier points out that if EU membership perspective is not credible and the political costs of EU harmonization are high for the candidate states' ruling elites, they might not take necessary steps for further Europeanization (2011: 12). The absence of consensus among the EU members about the target country's EU membership causes serious risks for the future of reform process as well as discourages pro-EU reform forces to advocate for EU membership and mobilize masses for this objective (Sedelmeier, 2011). Cross-conditionality which suggests that having credible and less-costly outside options or alternatives to EU integration might lead ruling elites of the candidate countries to reconsider alternative options especially in times of the serious fluctuations.

Last but not least, adoption costs and the number of veto players are crucial determinants in structuration of the domestic incentives in response to the external incentives. Collective or individual veto players - specified in each country's formal and/or informal institutional settings - play a crucial role in shaping political action (Tsebelis, 1999; 2002). In this regard, the magnitude and orientation of institutional change is related with the number of veto players in the system and their cost-benefit calculations regarding the proposed institutional arrangements (Tsebelis, 2002). As Anastasakis underlined, in most Balkans countries, the Europeanization process has polarized political elites as pro-status quo forces who were sensitive about the national independence and westernizers who mobilized masses with a pro-EU campaign (2005, 81- 83). Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier summarize this factor as "the likelihood of rule adoption decreases with the number of veto players incurring net adoption costs (opportunity costs, welfare and power losses) from compliance" (2004: 675). If the net cost of domestic change is high for a vast majority of the socio-political community,

actors might not strive to change current institutional equilibrium. From this perspective, number and effectiveness of the veto players coupled with their cost-benefit assessments are the significant intervening factors in the sense that they organize the political context in which Europeanization is materialized. According to the adoption cost-benefit calculations, veto players support or stand against the process. That is to say the scope and scale of the process of Europeanization is dramatically contextual and dependent on the rewards' size and capacity to provide additional opportunity structures for the domestic pro-reform forces. In this study, the cost-benefit calculations of the veto players –military and civil bureaucracy-, which are actively involved in the negotiation and policy making process in the Cyprus issue, are discussed as pivotal intervening variable with a specific reference to domestic power asymmetries, and formal/informal institutional balances.

In addition to the use of conditionality to access the negotiations, EU follows socialization -“normative pressure”- strategy to mobilize convergence through establishing intensive contacts between candidate or third countries and EU and to encourage policy entrepreneurs to take further steps (Sedelmeier, 2011; Kelly, 2004, 2006). The strategy of socialization and conditionality mostly go hand in hand with respect to the EU enlargement policy and European Neighborhood Policy which governs the relations with the third countries and its neighbors. As Kelly points out the appeasement of both strategies was evident for the fifth enlargement. In addition to monitoring and reporting progress –instruments of conditionality strategy-, “EU officials travelled to candidate states to negotiate, but also to stimulate domestic debates on issues such as democracy, ethnic minority politics and human rights” (Kelly, 2006: 39). With re-

spect to the specific policy issues, EU might also prefer to establish normative coalitions with other international organization or pressure groups to empower its socializing impact. In the context of the accession of Balkan and South Eastern European countries which have serious border conflicts, EU actively supports UN initiatives and even in some cases EU involvement triggers new set of peace negotiation (Anastasakis and Bechev, 2002; Tocci, 2007).

Grabbe (2003) contributes the debates on enlargement through socialization by asserting that EU might use “shock tactic” to embarrass applicant states’ political elites “into making dramatic changes owing to the domestic repercussions of failing to meet a major foreign policy goal” (316). Criticisms in EU progress reports or speeches delivered by the core EU officials might have great impact on shaping domestic debates and public perception. Although the Union pays serious serves to harvest convergence through a synthesis of different instruments and strategies, the fate of change is dependent on existence or absence of several intervening factors.

Parallel to the EU’s socialization strategy, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier offers two alternative mechanisms - socialization and lesson drawing - to explain the domestic change in candidate and associate countries. Based on SI model of “logic of appropriateness”, socialization through EU conditionality occurs as the fundamental mechanism which triggers the long-run cognitive and normative change and internalization of EU norms and values at both political and societal level. Tocci underlines that “social learning” model is useful especially in the field of conflict resolution and neighborhood policies which are also a significant part of EU conditionality. In line with this approach, normative incentives referring to the political and societal commitment to the project of Europeanization are the crucial triggers rather than the strategic

interactions and domestic incentives. Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005) define “legitimacy of the EU rules and process, identity and resonance” as the key mediating factors. Legitimacy assumption suggest that the likelihood of transformation increases when EU considers special needs and concerns of the candidate states and relates its demands to common international and humanitarian standards and norms in its assessments and final judgments on the candidate states’ EU harmonization progress and capacity (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 19; Checkel, 2001). Normative and cultural references –identity- of the candidate country in the broadest sense and identity of the norm entrepreneurs or “aspiration groups” (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 19) and the resonance of the European values with domestic values significantly effects the success of domestic change. EU conditionality becomes an effective instrument when there is a strong societal and political identification with the EU norms and values (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 67). Papadimitriou and Phinnemore (2004) draw attention to the centrality of cultural references in their study on CEEC. They point out that in CEEC the negative consequences of EU conditionality could be tolerated by the masses due to the society’s cultural affiliation with the “European” identity. With this respect ruling elites’ Europeanization attempts supported by the “return to Europe” which at the same time provided governments with a legitimate ground to “sell reforms to the CEECs’ electorate” (2004: 622). From this perspective, change through EU conditionality occurs as a long-term deep-rooted change in which national identities, values and interests are transformed (Tocci, 2007: 16).

Last but not least, lesson-drawing model, which is generally associated with the “policy change”, might be the mechanism leading domestic change (Rose, 1991;

Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996, 2000; James and Lodge, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005; Schimmelfennig, 2009). Dolowitz and Marsh defines policy transfer through lesson-drawing as “a process in which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions etc. in one time and/or place is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements and institutions in another time and/or place” (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996: 344). In the context of Europeanization, based on Richard Rose’s (1991) “lesson-drawing” premises Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005: 20-21) defines it as a process of learning from abroad when the actors are dissatisfied with the ongoing policies and institutional equilibrium. In the case of soft policy issues – for example foreign and security policy, civil-military relations- that the member or candidate states’ appropriate policy designs or practices are not specified by the binding regulations and legal jurisdictions (Ladrech, 2010) this mechanism is largely effective. In such cases although EU conditionality draws the boundaries of appropriate norms and “best practices”, it “allows a choice among a range of EU conform rules” (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 21). Depending on the presence and degree of intervening factors – (i) policy makers’ dissatisfaction with the status quo; (ii) policy makers’ close contact with the EU-Centered epistemic communities campaign for the domestic change; (iii) transferability of the rules into a different political context- ruling elites strive to search for the success stories at the EU political system and evaluate alternative policy practices as proper for national political context (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 22).

2.5.3. Europeanization and Foreign Policy Convergence in Candidate Countries

Europeanization for many candidate countries is the “interface between domestic and foreign policy” (Grabbe, 2003: 318). As Vachudova (2005) points out for CEEC integration with the EU process was not only driven by the domestic incentives for economic and political transformation but also it was perceived as the key foreign policy goal to integrate with the global world. From this point of view compliance with the Copenhagen criteria and EU *acquis communautaire* in many aspects is projected by the national governments as a substantial foreign policy goal. Yet the stage of rule adaptation and internalization requires technical specialization which enables candidate countries to fulfill accession conditionality. Candidate countries encounter to transform their distinctive policy fields with respect to the *acquis communautaire* and political conditionality. Thus the transformation of national foreign policy as a policy field under the 31st chapter of community *acquis* is included in the agenda of national governments.

EU’s transformative power with respect to the national foreign policy is instrumentalized through political and *acquis* conditionality. In the process of downloading EU *acquis* candidate countries’ foreign policies has to be transformed in line with the Common Foreign and Security Policy. In the 31st Chapter of community *acquis* member and candidate states are invited for full compliance in the field of CFSP and Common Foreign and Defense Policy (CFDP). It is read as

Member States must be able to conduct political dialogue in the framework of CFSP, to align with EU statements, to take part in EU actions and to apply agreed sanctions and restrictive measures. Applicant countries are required to progressively align with EU statements, and to apply sanctions and restrictive measures when and where required.¹⁸

In line with this statement, the EU foreign policy convergence is a two-faced phenomenon that in the one hand requires alignment with EU positions in individual foreign policy cases and it requires on the other hand ability to conduct political dialogue in the common foreign policy framework (Ladrech, 2010). As it has broadly discussed in the foreign policy convergence part, foreign policy Europeanization includes both normative transformation –socialization- as well as alignments with foreign policy common practices and choices – rule adaptation. With this respect EU follows a two-faced strategy to lead foreign policy convergence in candidate countries. With respect to the CFSP and CSDP, EU applies conditionality mechanism through which the Commission monitors alignment with Chapter 31 of the community *acquis* and publishes reports and recommendation about the countries' progress. As Ladrech points out in the context of enlargement conditionality Commission monitoring is an additional external pressure for policy transfer (2010: 203). In addition to this technical aspect of the EU conditionality, socialization strategy is also utilized at the field of foreign policy. As Pomorska (2007) underlines the intense relationships between Poland and Union during the pre-accession period reached its highest level when the country became an “active observer” in Council meetings. The intensity of interactions between Union and the candidate countries during the pre-accession era triggers the slow process of socialization even before the EU membership. Yet the socialization process takes time,

¹⁸ Please see: European Commission, Chapters of Acquis. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/policy/conditions-membership/chapters-of-the-acquis/index_en.htm (last access: 10 May 2015)

for many candidate states socialization of policy elites continues and improves after EU accession (Lavenex and Schimmelfennig, 2009).

At this point EU political conditionality is strengthened as the critical element of norm diffusion. Tocci (2007, 2008) highlights political conditionality with its severe reference to the liberal democracy, rule of law and human rights not only targets the transformation of national domestic politics but also it targets a normative transformation in countries' relations with their neighbors, for the solution of long-run border disputes and peaceful resolution of the conflicts.

This correlation between enlargement through political conditionality and peaceful resolution of disputes at the same time emphasized in the Constitutional Treaty (Treaty of Lisbon) as the aim of Union's external action. It is read as

Consolidate and support democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law; preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, with the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and with the aims of the Charter of Paris, including those relating to external borders.¹⁹

Based on this linkage, European enlargement policy is constructed in line with its "inward-oriented" –European- identity which led Union to act as an international actor for regional and global peace and cooperation (Tocci, 2007: 7). Therefore based on the ideal that EU integration will help to solve conflict and consolidate regional peace and security (Diez et al. 2006: 563) EU legitimized its integration with Eastern Europe and Western Balkans.

¹⁹ Please see: "Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union", *Official Journal* 115 , 09/05/2008 P. 0028 – 0029: Article III- 292 (2b- 2c)

Introduction of the political conditionality as the pre-requisite for enlargement politics should also be analyzed in line with the European foreign policy identity construction affords (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004: 75). To Diez (2005) this notion of identity can never be imagined without reference to the EU's self-identification as a normative power. Apart from the interest-based divergences, EU foreign policy provides a common ground with its normative aspect. As it is clearly stated in the official web page of EU External Action Unit, "mediation is part of the EU preventive diplomacy on the ground and is seen as a component of the EU's comprehensive toolbox in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building in conflict countries."²⁰

With respect to the resolution of candidate countries' border disputes and ethno-political conflicts, Tocci (2007, 2008) claims positive and *ex ante* conditionality is the most effective strategy to force conflicting parts to actively participate and contribute peace negotiations. While positive conditionality helps to support domestic incentives, *ex ante* conditionality is helpful in mitigating the concerns on credibility of rewards and securing the process of peaceful building. Conditionality *ex ante* is a conditionality mechanism in which the proposed rewards – such as candidacy status, opening of accession negotiations, full membership, and delivery of financial and technical assistance- are delivered only after the fulfillment of conditions (Fierro, 2003: 98). Zalewski (2004) argues that *ex ante* conditionality is to a large extent associated with the legal-institutional framework of Copenhagen political criteria rather than the time consuming institutional changes or normative transformation. Fierro (2003) claims

²⁰ European Union External Action Unit, "Conflict Prevention, Peace building and Mediation" Available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/cfsp/conflict_prevention/index_en.htm (last access: 10 June 2015)

that *ex ante* conditionality is for the advantage of recipient –candidate state in the enlargement context- in the sense that the clarity of conditions diminishes donors’ –EU- discretionary actions. Opposed to the *ex ante* conditionality, EU might apply *ex post* conditionality referring “the situation where conditions appear once the parties have concluded a relationship” (Fierro, 2003: 98). *Ex post* conditionality is the common strategy applied in “human rights clause” in the association agreements with candidate countries (Tocci, 2007; Fierro, 2003).

In the same vain, Diez et al. (2006) introduces the concept of compulsory impact which works through EU (positive) political conditionality. According to this mechanism resolution of border disputes or ethno-political conflicts is driven by voluntary actions of the candidate states which have strong EU membership aspirations (572). Since the ruling elites’ motivation is highly dependent on the EU membership carrot, the change is mostly rapid and it “may simply reflect strategic behavior” (Diez et al., 2006: 572). Furthermore in case of the absence of carrot – EU membership- or any diminution in candidate country’s EU membership aspirations compulsory impact disappears. Tocci (2007) contributes the limited impact of enlargement conditionality by stating “given the EU’s limited ability to categorically prescribe laws and policies beyond its borders, conditionality generates domestic change principally by altering the domestic opportunity structure within and between conflict parties” (14). Therefore compulsory impact by itself is not effective for a long-standing peaceful settlement. Apart from strategic moves and tactical shifts of policy instruments and options, long-term conflict transformation depends on foreign and security policy identity reconstruction (Diez et al., 2006, 2008; Tocci, 2007, 2008; Rumelili, 2007, 2008, 2011). With this respect EU involvement may generate a long-term in-direct socialization

process through its constructive impact in which the EU “can put in place completely new discursive frameworks, in which novel ways of constructing and expressing identities are created within conflict regions, as the peaceful transformation of Western Europe since the end of the Second World War illustrates” (Diez et al. 2008: 28). Thus in its ideal form, EU involvement in the conflict resolution process should transform foreign and security policy identity, perceptions on self/other and national interests. In the following part, literature on the EU’s transformative impact on Turkish foreign policy is discussed in the light of the enlargement conditionality assertions.

2.6. Literature on the Europeanization of Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkey’s Policy towards Cyprus

There is increasing academic interest in explain the impact of Europeanization process in Turkish foreign policy. Despite the popularity of the research field, expect a few analyzes (for example: Aydın and Açıkmeşe, 2007; Akçapar, 2007; Özcan, 2008; Müftüler-Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Terzi, 2010, 2012; Kaliber, 2012; Oğuzlu, 2012; Ulug- Eryılmaz, 2014) majority of the studies are written from the foreign policy analysis perspective. Put it differently despite increasing academic interest a limited number of studies locate the theoretical assumptions on the mechanisms and mediating factors in the impact of EU enlargement conditionality at the center of their research. This part of the study is designed to understand the literature on Turkish foreign policy Europeanization in which the above mentioned exploratory mechanisms and theoretical assumptions are utilized.

Most studies aim to explain Europeanization process in Turkish foreign policy within the context of EU conditionality handle the issue under three policy fields fitting

with the previously explained domains of national change -polity (changes in foreign policy decision making process), policy (alignments with EU CFSP) and politics (changes in Turkish foreign policy identity)-. Aydın and Açıkmeşe claim that EU conditionality in the context of Turkish accession works as three different forms – namely “Conditionality through political criteria”, “conditionality through *de facto* political criteria” and “conditionality through CFSP (EU) *acquis*” (2007: 268). Conditionality through EU political criteria refers to the intersection between Europeanization of polity and politics. With reference to the Copenhagen political criteria and the *acquis* political criteria emphasizing the rule of state, respect for human rights, normalization of civil-military relations and accountability of the state elites and etc., since 1999 EU political conditionality has been effective in leading a procedural change in the foreign policy making process in Turkey (Aydın, 2003; Aydın and Açıkmeşe, 2007; Müftüler-Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Özcan, 2010). Thus the civilianization of Turkish foreign policy making is associated with the increasing EU impact through political conditionality. Traditionally, Turkish military bureaucracy has played a crucial role in conducting foreign and security policy. Especially after 1980 *coup d'état*, army's omnipresence in structuring Turkish foreign policy was secured and enhanced through legal-institutional arrangements in favor of military bureaucracy (Uzgel, 2003; Özcan, 2010). With the EU harmonization reforms invoked in 2001, 2002 and 2004, civil-military relations were restructured institutionally and the demilitarization (Duman and Tsarouhas, 2006) of the Turkish politics gained acceleration (Ulusoy, 2007; Gürsoy, 2012). This change in polity structures and its border repercussions in Turkish politics significantly affected foreign policy making process. In addition to the increasing decisiveness of

civilian bureaucracy and governing elites in foreign policy making process, diminishing role of military in the foreign policy, gradually extended Turkish security and foreign policy discourse to various of actors including media, public opinion and civil society initiatives (Aydın, 2003: 325; Bilgin, 2007). Demilitarization of foreign policy making may be considered as the most consistent and successful aspect of Europeanization through political conditionality.

Demilitarization in foreign policy making at the same time activated a process of policy Europeanization in which the policy styles, process outcomes and preferences had been under transformation (Oğuzlu, 2010; Müftüler- Baç and Gürsoy; 2010; Terzi, 2012). With this respect since early 2000s, Turkey's political activism in its neighborhood has been materialized through multilateralism and civilian means in which economic, diplomatic and socio-cultural contacts have been prioritized (Kirişçi, 2006; Oğuzlu, 2004, 2010; Terzi, 2012). According to the widespread notion among the Turkish academics the intensive use of civilian/soft power tools in Turkish foreign policy as the outcome of domestic democratization alongside the Europeanization process has also been supported by the globalization (Aydın, 2003; Karaosmanoğlu, 2000, 2004), the new regionalism (Kirişçi, 2009; Öniş and Yılmaz, 2009; Tür and Han, 2011; Kaliber, 2012) and the changing foreign policy outlook of the ruling elites (Oğuzlu, 2007; Terzi, 2012) in Turkish foreign policy. Therefore it is possible to claim that there is consensus in Turkish academics that the changes in Turkish foreign policy has been driven by both domestic (EU rule adaptation and foreign policy agenda of the ruling elites) and external (EU driven and regional conjuncture driven) incentives. In this sense, the methodological debates about the measuring and isolating EU impact are relevant in the context of Turkish foreign policy Europeanization.

Turkey's alignment with EU CFSP under the Chapter 31 of EU *acquis* may be considered as the second aspect of Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy within the context of conditionality through CFSP *acquis* (Aydın and Açıkmüş, 2007: 272). Since 2003 Turkey has been actively contributing and participating EU-led military operations in use of NATO assets (Akçapar, 2007; Aydın and Açıkmüş, 2007; Özcan, 2008; Müftüler-Baç and Gürsoy, 2010). This aspect of foreign policy convergence is associated with the increasing multilateralism in Turkish foreign policy (Terzi, 2012). Oğuzlu (2007) claims that Turkey's reluctance to take part in a USA-led operation in 2003 war on Iraq and Ankara's alignment with EU positions and policy preferences might be interpreted as the evidence of a significant change in terms of Turkish elites' assessment of the foreign policy instruments and options in favor of multilateral action. Müftüler- Baç and Gürsoy (2010) also underline that "increased use of diplomacy and economic instruments versus military means" (416) with regard to Middle Eastern countries is another significant indicator that Turkey aligns itself with European foreign policy procedures. Additionally governments' increasing reference to the multilateralism was supported by the Turkey's participation in UN Security Council and the country's increasing contact with Islamic states through Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) positively contributed its multilateralism (Öniş and Yılmaz, 2009). Although the convergence with CFSP *acquis* represents a success story, based on the progress reports published by EU Commission between 2007 and 2011, Terzi highlights that there is a significant setback in Turkey's alignment with EU CFSP in certain policy issues (2012, 221). With this respect Turkish foreign policy behavior is relatively presenting an independent manner departing from supporting "the EU's civilian power" in its region.

The last themes discussed under the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy are good neighborly relations and peaceful settlement of the disputes highlighted in 1999 Helsinki Council. In this context the normalization of Greek-Turkish relations, peaceful settlement of border disputes with Greece and Turkey's contributions for the settlement of Cyprus dispute are discussed as the key policy issues. Aydın and Açıkmeşe (2007) conceptualize this aspect of EU conditionality on Turkish foreign policy as conditionality through de facto political criteria. With respect to the Greek-Turkish relations Greece's EU membership in 1981 dramatically affected the EU's perception and handling of the Greek-Turkish relations. To Diez et al. (2006) in the aftermath of the Greece's EU membership, EU's compulsory impact through its political conditionality on Greece decreased. In early 1990s EU's compulsory impact on Turkey with respect to the solution of border disputes with Greece and good neighborly relations was equally limited (Diez et al., 2006). In addition to this, since Turkish political elites did not perceive a strong possibility of EU membership (Rumelili, 2004a) Greece's EU membership and Turkey's EU membership aspirations could not prevent securitization of bilateral relations (Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005). Furthermore Greece's application of the negative conditionality towards Turkey (Agnantopoulos, 2013) through blocking EU financial assistance to Turkey under the umbrella of Turkey's Customs Union with EU complicated bilateral contracts as well as Turkish EU relations. Yannas (1994) claims that for the Greek political elites EU membership was perceived as the diplomatic leverage to persuade Turkey to make concessions. Put it differently for Greece EU membership has been perceived as a significant security provider for Greece to mitigate regional threats in its neighborhood (Tsakonas and Tournikiotis, 2003). Yet an effective EU involvement in Greek-Turkish relations could

only be achieved in post-1996 era when Greek ruling elites were first aware of the fact that deepening of Turkey's EU vocation would have positive effects on Greek security interests (Economides, 2007; Tsakonas, 2010; Agnantopoulos, 2013) as well as resolution of the Cyprus conflict. Greece's strong support for Turkey's EU membership since late 1990s led a rapprochement within the EU framework. Rumelili (2004b, 2008) emphasizes that the ultimate mechanism in case of normalization of the Greek-Turkish relations is not based on a compulsory impact through political conditionality. Rather she argues "EU has made its positive impact on Greek-Turkish relations since 1999 not necessarily through the EU's independent, purposive agency but from the ways in which the EU, as a resource, symbol and a model, has been put to use by political and civil society actors in Turkey and Greece" (Rumelili, 2008: 95). At this point, Greece succeeded to project its foreign policy interests and concerns related with Aegean disputes and Cyprus conflict – *de facto* political conditions (Aydın and Açıkmeşe, 2007) - in 1999 Helsinki Council while expressing its strong support Turkey's EU membership and strengthening of bicommunal contacts. Accordingly, with respect to the Greek-Turkish rapprochement EU's transformative impact can best be explained with the form of enabling impact in which the EU provides domestic actors with constructive and legitimate grounds to support and coordinate alternative policy preferences (Diez et. al. 2008). Greece's support for the deepening of Turkey's EU vocation strengthened the position of moderate political elites and civil society groups (Tsakonas, 2010).

Europeanization of Turkey's policy vis-à-vis Cyprus is also a fertile area for the students of Europeanization. Despite the fact that this policy issue is mostly studied from a foreign policy approach perspective, there is an increasing academic interest

among the students of Europeanization to understand the EU's impact in Turkey's Cyprus policy. For example, Terzi (2010, 2012) claims that the JDP government's "one step ahead" policy vis-à-vis the UN led Cyprus peace talks between 2002- 2004 and Ankara's mobilization of the Turkish Cypriot community to vote for the Annan plan indicated a normative change in Turkey's approach to the Cyprus issue. She emphasizes that social learning model based on the logic of appropriateness approach is more relevant to explain the changes in normative and ideational changes in Turkish foreign policy (2012: 209). JDP government's cooperation-oriented approach to the Cyprus peace process with motto of "zero problems with neighbors" and the government's abandonment of the "no solution is the solution" discourse refer to not only tactical-structural shift in Turkish foreign policy but also refer to a socialization (2012: 210-214).

Another critical contribution was made by Kaliber (2012) who questioned the assumed normative change in Turkey's Cyprus discourse. He claims that JDP government's policy vis-à-vis Cyprus does not refer to a radical transformation of the foreign policy identity of Turkey rather it indicates a short-run shift which could be achieved by the Cyprus's EU membership process as being a critical juncture for Turkey's EU membership and the future of the Turkish Cypriots (230-234). Thus to him the impact is contextual. In a similar vein in recent studies by Eryılmaz (2014-2015) the premises of historical institutionalism are perceived as more relevant to explain Turkey's "one step ahead" policy. Confirming Kaliber's contextual Europeanization argument, she concludes that the assumed EU impact is limited and path dependent. She argues EU's transformative impact is largely determined by the domestic actors' preferences and their framing of the Europeanization. Ulusoy (2009) also contributed to the scholars

who claimed the limited impact of Europeanization in Turkey's Cyprus policy by claiming that the magnitude and direction of the policy change is determined by the EU's effective reinforcement by rewards strategy. Considering the growing academic interest in foreign policy Europeanization and Europeanization of Turkey's Cyprus policy, this study attempts to provide an alternative approach. In this sense, it explains the limited, contextual and path-dependent character of the JDP's Cyprus policy with the conceptual toolkit of the "external incentives model".

CHAPTER III

TURKEY- EU AND CYPRUS TRIANGLE: A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT

This chapter is designed to understand the EU's involvement in the Cyprus conflict and how it affected Turkey's policy towards Cyprus up until late 2002. In this regard, the chapter begins with a brief historical account of the Cyprus conflict, Cyprus's EU orientation and the mechanisms that shape Turkey- EU and Cyprus triangle. Following part covers the political tools, power relations, and actors and conditions in which Turkey's Cyprus policy (cies) has/have been introduced. In line with the approaches of Europeanization discussed in the previous chapter, this chapter firstly deals with the development of EU's policy towards Cyprus as a third party in the Cyprus peace process. Second part is aimed to de-construct the underlying ideological, discursive, legal-institutional and procedural aspects of the Turkey's traditional policy towards Cyprus. Final part of the chapter covers the patterns and characteristics of Turkey's Cyprus policy during 1990s and early 2000s, the era when EU entered the

scene as an active third party in the Cyprus conflict resolution process through its conditional enlargement strategy. Considering the premises of literature on Europeanization, suggesting the importance of political and legal-institutional “misfit” between EU and candidate country, this part is designed to explain the “misfit” between Turkish and EU approaches towards Cyprus question. In the concluding remarks, it is argued that up until the late 1990s the lack of positive leverage in response to the Turkey’s bid for EU membership discouraged pro-reform forces in both Cyprus and Turkey. Additionally, the emergence of new challenges in the post-Cold War security environment which led to the rise of concerns regarding the domestic and regional security of Turkey triggered the military’s increasing involvement in the domestic and foreign policy making process. That is to say, EU’s reluctance and negative leverage regarding the Turkey’s bid for EU membership, coupled with the domestic and regional security concerns, discouraged pro-EU reform forces and strengthened the hand of pro-*status quo* forces. During this era, these dynamics facilitated the dominance of security approach against liberal discourses.

3.1. Cyprus Conflict and the EU Enlargement Process

3.1.1. Brief History of the Conflict and the Peace Negotiations

The island of Cyprus was under the Ottoman rule until British took over in 1878. Under the British colonial in early 1900s and onwards, the modern ideology of ethnic nationalism began to spread among the Greek and Turkish Cypriot community (Papadakis et al. 2006) which was ruled under Ottoman *millet* system under which

each community were allowed to rule themselves under their distinctive legal-institutional religious system in a decentralized manner (İnalcık, 1998). The first organized nationalist movements emerged in early 1930s when the Greek Cypriot community openly expressed its demands for independence and self-determination (Pollis, 1973). By the 1950s, the emphasis on “distinctive Cypriot identity” which was evident in early stages of the Greek Cypriot self-determination campaign (Pollis, 1973: 588) began to be abandoned and the counter- nationalist discourses and ideologies named *enosis* –unification with Greece- by Greek community and *taksim* – partition of the island between Turkey and Greece- by the Turkish community were introduced (Bryant, 2006; Bölükbaşı, 1998; Kızılyürek, 2010; Loizides, 2007). In 1955, the Greek Cypriot organization EOKA (National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) under the political leadership of Archbishop Makarios III began to launch attacks on British targets in support of its *enosis* cause. Following the foundation of EOKA, supported by Turkish Cypriot notables headed by Fazıl Küçük and Rauf Denktaş, an anti-*enosis* armed organization – Turkish Resistance Organization (TMT)- was established in 1957 (Kızılyürek, 2010: 180). Exacerbation of the ethnic clashes between opposing camps resulted with the end of British rule and establishment of the independent Republic of Cyprus.

The Republic of Cyprus became independent in 1959-1960 with the signing of London- Zurich Agreements. 1959- 1960 international Treaties on Cyprus constituted the backbone of the basics of Cyprus Constitution (Özersay, winter 2004-2005: 32-33). The Establishment Agreement and Cyprus Constitution were both stressing the formation and preservation of a bi-communal, quasi-federal structure in the island (Özersay, winter 2004-2005: 32-33). In the Article 185 of Constitution, Republic is

characterized as a unitary state which “is one and indivisible” and any separatist attempts were constitutionally excluded. To Hannay “The 1960 Cyprus constitution is difficult to categorize in any of the commonly known definition; it was neither federal nor con-federal; it was perhaps closer to a unitary structure, but it contained elaborate checks and balances between the powers exercised by the leaders of the two communities as president and vice-president and between the other representatives of the two communities” (2005: 3-4). Therefore reaching a societal and political stability with mutual concessions and full cooperation seemed to be quite difficult. To eliminate any deadlock and frustration in the process and to promote the territorial integrity and independence of Republic of Cyprus, Treaty of Guarantee was signed by the Greece, Turkey, United Kingdom and Republic of Cyprus. In the Treaty of Guarantee “recognition and maintenance of the independence, territorial integrity and security of the Republic of Cyprus, as established and regulated by the Basic Articles of its Constitution” are defined as the common interests and responsibilities for contractual parties (Treaty of Guarantee, 1960: Article II). United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece (guarantor powers) also undertook the activities to prohibit “any activity aimed at promoting, directly or indirectly, either union of Cyprus with any other State or partition of the Island” (ibid). In the Article IV of the Treaty, in case of a breach of the provisions of the Treaty guarantor powers undertake to consult together to take a common and concerted action (Treaty of Guarantee, 1960: Article IV). However, “each of the three guaranteeing Powers reserves the right to take action with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty” in case of the common action produces no results (Treaty of Guarantee, 1960: Article IV).

Treaty of Alliance, which enabled the establishment of “a small military force composed of a specified number of Greek and Turkish troops, with a tripartite headquarters, to be stationed on the island” was also signed by Turkey, Greece and Republic of Cyprus. With this agreement Turkey, Greece and Republic of Cyprus agreed on to cooperate for their common security and defense and “to resist any attack or aggression, direct or indirect, directed against the independence or the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus” (Treaty of Alliance, 1960: Articles I and II). In the Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Alliance, 950 Greek troops and 650 Turkish troops were agreed to participate in the tripartite military headquarters (Treaty of Alliance, 1960: Additional Protocol No.1).

The internal and external protection mechanisms for the constitutional state of affairs provisioned by the Treaties on Cyprus could not be effective to preserve the governmental harmony and cooperation. The first area of disagreement between two communities was the failure in the establishment of the Turkish and Greek Cypriot municipalities in the main cities (Pericleous, 2009: 90-91; Yavuzalp, 1993). While Greek Cypriots proposed the continuation of the unitary character of the Republic at the local administrations (establishment of unified Greek and Turkish Cypriot municipal administrations), Turkish Cypriot leadership insisted on the separate local administrations which would be in line with the bi-communal structure provisioned in the Treaty of Establishment (Yavuzalp, 1993). In order to overcome the local governance crises, in 1963, Makarios proposed a number of constitutional amendments (thirteen-point amendments) which would change the nature of relationships between two communities through empowering the unitary character and the effectiveness of the Republic. According to the Turkish Cypriot leadership, Makarios’s suggestions would

reduce the Turkish Cypriots' status from equal part of Cyprus to minority status (Yavuzalp, 1993, Erim, 1975). Following this development, Turkish Cypriots declared their withdrawal from the representation in state institutions.

The political rivalries between two communities turned into a civil war in the aftermath of Greek militia attacks to the Turkish settlements (Erim, 1975). The period between 1963- 1974 witnessed the demolition of constitutional order and isolation of Turkish Cypriots with the increasing political crises and civilian clashes. "Turkish Cypriot withdrawal from the state apparatus and retraction into concentrated enclaves brought about a political, social, and demographic separation" (Michael, 2009: 27). Upon the exacerbation of ethnic clashes UN Security Council (UNSC) on March 4th 1964 provisioned the establishment of UN peace-keeping force -UN Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) - "to reserve peace and order, to prevent recurrence of fighting and to contribute to the restoration of law and order" (UNSC- S/5575, 1964). In addition, UNSC Resolution 186 reaffirmed the international legitimacy of Republic of Cyprus governed by Cypriot Government under President Makarios which had "the responsibility for the maintenance and restoration of law and order" (UNSC- S/5575, 1964). "Despite a letter from (*Turkish Vice-President of Cyprus Dr. Fazıl*) Küçük to the Secretary General, stating that the Greek Cypriot representation to the Council was unlawful without his consent, the Council preferred not to enter into the details of constitutional legitimacy" (Hoffmeister, 2006: 32). Özersay (Winter 2004-2005) claims that UNSC Res. 186 reaffirming the international legitimacy of Republic of Cyprus has been constituted the reference point for the claims supporting the legality and continuation of Republic of Cyprus and outlawing the existence of a separate Turkish ruling entity since 1963.

Within this context, on July 15th, 1974 Greek junta staged a coup, overthrew President Makarios and declared pro-enosis Nikos Sampson, who claimed the annexation of the whole island to the Greece, as the new president of the Republic. By claiming its responsibility to protect the territorial and constitutional order of the island as the guarantor power, Turkish military forces landed on the island in 20 July 1974. The declared motivation behind Turkey's military intervention was to restore peace and stability in the island which was outlined by 1960 constitution. (Birand, 1984; Erim, 1975; Girgin, 2007; Mallinson, 2005; Michael, 2009; Pericleous, 2009) Upon Turkey's unilateral intervention, UNSC adopted Res. 353 which called all parties to respect sovereignty of the legitimate government of Cyprus, to start peace negotiation and demanded an immediate end to military intervention and withdraw of foreign troops from the island (UN Security Council- Res. 353, July 20, 1974). The first round of tripartite meetings held in in Geneva between July 25th to 30th including guarantor powers Turkey, Greece and UK resulted with an official declaration noting the necessity of an urgent cease-fire and the emerge of a security zone protected by UNFICYP, calling all parties to respect the sovereignty of Republic of Cyprus and to contribute restoring the constitutional order and invited Turkish Vice-President Dr. Fazıl Küçük to resume his office (UN Security Council-S/11398, July 30, 1974). The inter-communal talks held in the aftermath of Geneva Conference broke down.²¹

²¹ Turkish journalist Mehmet Ali Birand (1984) who followed the Geneva process from the beginning reported that during the negotiations Turkish Cypriot Representative Rauf Denktaş, backed by Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Turan Güneş, passionately supported a bi-zonal and bi-communal federal state. With full support of Denktaş's proposal Güneş expressed that Turkey's suggestion for the peaceful settlement was the creation of a cantonal federal system composed by two Greek Cypriot administrative areas and six Turkish Cypriot administrative areas. According to the Turkish side's proposal Turkish Federal State would amount for the 34% of the island. Turkish committee in Geneva also objected the complete withdrawal of Turkish armed forces on account to the fact that the danger of being massacred for the Turkish population living villages under the control of Greek Cypriots forces was still a real threat. Birand also discusses the political atmosphere in Ankara which had a dramatic impact on Turkish

Following the breakdown of negotiations, Turkey conducted second military operation on August 13th, 1974 and took control of the areas corresponding to 37 per cent of the island (Milliyet, August 15, 1974). In the post-1974 order, however; the island was territorially and ethnically separated –*de facto* partition- into two zones by “green line”. 180,000- 200.000²² Greek Cypriots from the northern part of the island and 60.000 Turkish Cypriots from the southern Cyprus were displaced. According to the final data provided by Committee on Missing Persons 1508 Greek Cypriots and 493 Turkish Cypriots were reported as missing.²³ During the second phase of Turkish military operation UNSC adopted four resolutions between August 14th to 16th, 1974²⁴ calling Turkey to end the operation and withdraw its armed forces from the island to contribute further attempts for peaceful settlement.

On February 13th, 1975 Turkish Cypriot authorities unilaterally declared areas under Turkish control as the federative legal community representing Turkish Cypriots– Turkish Federated State of Cyprus-. Upon the declaration of Turkish Federal State, UNSC adopted resolution 367 that regretted the unilateral decision of the Turkish Cypriot authorities and reaffirmed that Republic of Cyprus was the only internal legal entity representing the island (UN Security Council-Res. 367, March 12, 1975).

government’s position in Geneva. He claims that Turkish government was under the parliamentary pressure by the opposition party in the parliament -National Salvation Party- which was a conservative party in favor of *taksim* and adopted a nationalist/populist discourse targeting Bülent Ecevit government’s federation thesis. In addition to this on 2 August 1974, Turkish Chief of General Staff issued a declaration read as “the duty of the Turkish armed forces did not finish in Cyprus” (Birand, 1984: 370-372).

²² Please see: European Commission Of Human Rights, Applications No. 6780/74 ; 6950/75 and 8007/77. Cyprus versus Turkey. 10 July 1976 and 2 April 1992.

²³ Please see: Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, “Figures and Statistics of Missing Persons”. Available at: http://www.cmp-cyprus.org/media/attachments/Quick%20Statistics/Copy_of_CMP_Facts_and_Figures_April_2015.pdf (last access: 10 May 2015)

²⁴ Please see: UN. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 357, 14 August 1974; Res. 358 and 359, 15 August 1974 and Res. 360 16 August 1974.

With this respect Yakinthou argues “the consequent international recognition provided the Greek Cypriots with the moral authority to speak as the sole legitimate Cypriot voice in the UN and in other forums, establishing a pattern that was to allow them to blur the line between Cypriot and Greek Cypriot interests” (2009: 124). International legitimacy puzzle complicated on November 1983 when the “Federated Turkish State” claimed its statehood and declared its independence as “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus” in the northern part of the island. This maneuver was merely greeted by Turkey and seriously criticized and condemned by international community –including UN and European Community-. Through the resolution 541/1983 United Nations Security Council outlawed this claim and called upon international community “not to recognize any Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus” (UN Security Council-Res. 541, November 18, 1983). In the following year, UNSC adopted resolution 550 which criticized and outlawed the exchange of ambassadors between Turkey and Northern Cyprus and called upon “all States not to recognize the purported state of the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus” set up by secessionist acts and called upon them not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid entity” (UN Security Council-Res. 55, May 11, 1984).

In post-1974 era, UNSC adopted successive resolutions calling all parties to settle Cyprus conflict in line with the international law and UN Charter. The first initiative in which Denktaş and Makarios agreed on a framework agreement with four points –High Level Agreement of 1977- including the nature of Republic, questions on territory, three freedoms (freedom of movement, settlement and property) and authority and functions of central and federal states. Within the parameters of High Level Agreement both parts (Greek and Turkish Cypriot Representatives) agreed on the point

that the new Republic should have a federal structure based on the principles of sovereignty, non-alignment and bi-communality²⁵. This initiative was followed by Kyprianou-Denktaş High Level Agreements of 1979 in which the two parties reaffirmed the sovereign, non-aligned and bi-communal nature of the future federal Republic; agreed on extensively discussing demilitarization of the island and the return of refugees to Famagusta; confirmed that intercommunal talks would continue.²⁶ 1977 and 1979 framework agreements marked a serious shift in both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities' political agenda with respect to the sovereignty and governance of Cyprus. The propounding and reaffirming of bi-communal federal state structure meant the abandonment of *enosis* and *taksim* claims. In early 1980s another critical UN initiative emerged. UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim initiated a process which formed a proposal -Interim Agreement- proposing the opening of Nicosia airport for the civilian flights, demilitarization of Varosha (*Maraş*)²⁷ and placing of the town under UN control and lifting of the economic restrictions imposed by the Republic on Turkish Cypriot community. Waldheim initiative did not produce any results due to the fact that different interpretations on the definition and limits of “bizonality” and “bicommunality” (Mirbagheri, 1998). Richmond (1998) claims that during the peace negotiations in post-1974 era, Greek Cypriot authorities' primary concern was the establishment

²⁵ Please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Official Website, “The Guidelines Agreed Between President Denktaş and the late Archbishop Makarios on 12 February 1977” Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-guidelines-agreed-between-president-denktas-and-the-late-archbishop-makarios-on-12-february-1977.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

²⁶ Please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Official Website, “Ten-Point Agreement of 19 May 1979” Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/ten-point-agreement-of-19-may-1979.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

²⁷ Varosha is the southern section of the city of Famagusta. Prior to Turkey's intervention the residents of the Varosha were evacuated and all entries have been forbidden. UNSC adopted Resolution 550 stating that (UNSC) “considers attempts to settle any part of Varosha by people other than its inhabitants as inadmissible and calls for the transfer of that area to the administration of the United Nations”. (UN Security Council, Official Records, S/550, 11 May 1984).

and maintenance of the sovereign character of the Republic. On the other hand proposals presented by Turkish Cypriot community leaders were based on the political equality of the two communities²⁸ and equal status of the two federated states.

After the declaration of the independence of TRNC, bi-communal talks were hardly resumed by the special efforts of the UN Secretary-General Pérez de Cuéllar who succeeded to hold a Cyprus Summit in New York in October 1984. Secretary-General proposed two sides to sign a framework agreement suggesting the establishment of a bi-communal, bi-zonal, independent federal Cyprus. According to this framework, lands under Turkish control would amount to 29 percent of the island; with respect to the legal-institutional arrangements like executive body (Greek Cypriot President and Turkish Cypriot Vice-President with veto rights, 7 Greek Cypriots and 3 Turkish Cypriots in Council of Ministers and the 70-30 ratio (70% Greek Cypriot Members of Parliament and 30% Turkish Cypriot Members of Parliament in the national Parliament) 1960 constitutional model was closely followed (Hoffmeister, 2006; 65). Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş agreed to sign the framework agreement²⁹. Greek Cypriot leader Kyprianou rejected to sign the framework agreement because Secretary-General's proposal did not answer Greek Cypriots concerns about demilitarization of the island, establishment of a new international guarantorship regime and establishment and preservation of three freedoms (Hoffmeister, 2006; Kızılyürek, 2005,

²⁸ With respect to wording, Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş as of late 1980s insisted on the use of term "people" instead of the term "community". UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali pointed out this "codification" challenge in his report submitted to UN Security Council.

²⁹ At this point, Niyazi Kızılyürek (2009) claims that Denktaş's declaration was a diplomatic maneuver showing that Turkish side was not the party preventing solution. Kızılyürek adds "a few years later, Denktaş declared that he said "yes" because he knew that Kyprianou would say "no" (77).

2009; Mirbagheri, 1998). Following failed UN attempts of 1985 and 1986, UN Secretary-General de Cuéllar, encouraged by the Turkish-Greek rapprochement backed by Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Özal and the election of a moderate Greek Cypriot George Vassiliou, initiated a new process in 1988. Despite the positive climate for the solution, UN initiative once more failed. UN Secretary-General stated in his report on Cyprus that there emerged a “set of ideas” and “the solution to the Cyprus problem is based on one State of Cyprus comprising of two politically equal communities” (UN Security Council-S/21183, March 8, 1990). Inspired by de Cuéllar’s attempts, UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposed “Ghali Set of Ideas” that reaffirmed political equality of the two communities and formation of a constitutional order resembling 1960 Constitution (UN Security Council-S/24472, August 21, 1992). Boutros-Ghali also proposed confidence-building measures including withdrawal of non-Cypriot foreign armed personnel; reducing all restrictions to the movement of Cypriots and foreigners crossing Buffer Zone, expansion of UN peacekeeping authorization area including Varosha; supporting bi-communal projects (UN Security Council-S/789, November 25, 1992). Denktaş agreed on the Set of Ideas with reservations on 9 paragraphs. Secretary General also pointed out despite Denktaş’s support for 91 of 100 paragraphs, Turkish side’s position in some issues like refugees, constitution and territorial arrangements contradicted with the overall parameters of the solution attempt³⁰ (Hoffmeister, 2006: 69). Vassiliou at the same time accepted Set of Ideas as a framework for further bi-communal talks. Since

³⁰ Please see: Report of UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Official Records, S/24830, 11 November 1992.

failed UN peace-building efforts illustrated the lack of confidence between two protagonists, UN Secretary-General preferred to pressure both sides to implement confidence-building measures. Security Council noted that in December 1994, leaders were far from implementing confidence-building measures and no constructive efforts were made with respect to withdrawal of foreign armed forces and expansion of UNFICYP authorization (UN Security Council-S/969, December 21, 1994). The failed peace building efforts in the first half of 1990s proved that Cyprus question was gradually becoming a frozen conflict which was regarded as a problem to be managed rather than to be solved (Richmond, 1998; Bölükbaşı, 1995). Furthermore in 1994 the conflict gained a new dimension when the European Council in Corfu declared that the new wave of enlargement would include Cyprus and Malta. Even in early 1990s, it was evident that the EU dimension would shape the future conflict resolution attempts as well as the EU accession of both Turkey and Cyprus.

3.1.2. Cyprus's EU Application and the EU Involvement in the Conflict

The early relations between Republic of Cyprus and EC goes back to the first years of the republic when the decision to apply to join EC was taken in 1962 with the consent of both Greek and Turkish Cypriot members of the House of Representatives (Yeşilada and Sözen, 2002: 262). In 1973, Republic of Cyprus signed an Association Agreement with European Community to create a customs union between EC and Cyprus after ten years of transition period (Redmond, 1997; 92). EC's early involvement in the Cyprus Problem was far from offering any constructive measures or policy recommendations regarding the escalating terror and violence between two communities

(Güney and Müftüler- Baç, 2005; 284). EC felt obliged to establish and improve relations with Cyprus, similar to those it had with Greece and Turkey and this choice was regarded as the strategic further step for EC's Mediterranean policy (Redmond, 1997: 92). Therefore up until 1980s – Greece's EC membership- EC followed a policy of even-handedness towards Cyprus by not directly becoming a part of conflict; by keeping its relations with Republic of Cyprus with economic terms (Christou, 2004; Diez, 2002; Oğuzlu, 2004; Demetriou, 2008). The trace of this even-handedness policy was pointed out in the Article 5 of Association Agreement underlining “the rules governing trade between the contracting parties may not give rise to any discrimination between the member states or between nationals or companies of these states or *nationals and companies of Cyprus*” (Brewin, 2000: 30).

The first stage of association period was delayed and interrupted due to Turkish military intervention in the island. Despite the territorial and political division in the island, EC continued its evenhandedness policy towards the Republic of Cyprus until the early 1980s. In line with the Association Agreement designated to build a customs union between EC and Cyprus, three financial protocols which covered requirements for financial aid were signed. The ultimate criterion for the financial aid under the first financial protocol, signed on July 15th, 1977, was the requirement “to have a bi-communal component” (Yeşilada and Sözen, 2002: 263). On the other hand neither second nor third financial protocols provided bi-communal component and with the third protocol signed in January 1989 EC declared that financial aid would only be supplied for the ventures on the Greek Cypriot part of the island (Yeşilada and Sözen, 2002: 263).

Despite the fact that EC externalized and outlawed the statehood claims of Turkish authority in the north, Community kept a “disinterested third-party position”

(Eralp and Beriker, 2005: 181) which endeavored to avoid any direct involvement in the conflict. Accordingly in response to Turkey's and Republic of Cyprus's application for Community membership, EC underlined that the resolution of the conflict prior to accession would be required for further economic and political integration with both countries. For both applicant countries compliance with Copenhagen criteria for EU membership provisioning the stability of institutions guaranteeing respect for democracy, human rights and rule of law as well as good neighborly relations (Tocci, 2007:50). Yet, starting from the midst of 1990s, the balance in EU's relations with Turkey and Cyprus began to be demolished and Cyprus's EU accession was treated in line with the political interests of the EU and its members. Greece's successful strategy to Europeanize Cyprus question and its border disputes with Turkey went hand in hand with the EU's foreign policy and security interests which were largely associated with the EU's northern and eastern enlargement (Müftüler-Baç, McLaren, 2003; Diez et.al. 2006; Tocci, 2004, 2007).

3.1.2.1. Greek Strategy

Greece's accession with EC in 1981 added a new dimension to EC's attitude towards Cyprus as well as Turkey-EC relations (Emiliou, 1996; 127). Yet, the real game changer in EC-Cyprus relations was the Greek and Greek Cypriot governments' strategy of internationalizing Cyprus conflict and the Greece's border disputes with Turkey to have a security alliance for preserving their regional security concerns and interests in 1980s (Yannas, 1994; Richmond, 1998; Tsakonas and Tournikiotis, 2003; Economides, 2005; Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005; Tsakonas, 2010). In this sense, in

the eyes of Greek political elites, EU membership was the significant security provider for Greece to mitigate regional threats in its neighborhood, balance Turkey and enforce Turkey and Turkish Cypriots to make concessions for Cyprus settlement (Tsakonas and Tournikiotis, 2003). Yannas (1994) claims that for the Greek political elites EU membership was perceived as the diplomatic leverage to persuade Turkey to make concessions. With this aim, “Papandreou’s successive governments in the 1980s, indeed, showed remarkable continuity in using the EC as a diplomatic leverage, specifically by using the Cyprus issue for blocking EU-Turkey relations” (Tsakonas, 2010: 48).

However, Greek Cypriot’s internationalization strategy did not rapidly bear fruits for the EU accession of Cyprus and it needed Greece’s effective leverage upon EU to facilitate Cyprus’s integration with EU. Greek Cypriot government under the Presidency of Vassiliou applied for EC membership in July 1990. EC hesitated to take an instant decision due to the fact that Community’s priority was the conclusion of the Maastricht Treaty -European deepening process- and northern enlargement (Hoffmeister, 2006: 86). Additionally the *de facto* division of the island was a serious concern for the EC. The emphasis on the relationship between peaceful settlement of the conflict and accession process was evident in 1993 European Commission opinion on Cyprus’ application for membership. While Commission declared Republic of Cyprus as eligible for EU membership, it pointed out its reservations with regard to *de facto* partition of the island. Commission suggested “the Commission feels that a positive signal should be sent to the authorities and the people of Cyprus confirming that the Community considers Cyprus as eligible for membership and that as soon as the prospect of a settlement is surer, the Community is ready to start the process with Cyprus that

should eventually lead to its accession” (Commission Opinion on the Application by the Republic of Cyprus for Membership, June 30, 1993). At this point it is possible to argue that in this phase of EC involvement, EC kept its “disinterested third-party position” (Eralp and Beriker, 2005: 181) which endeavored to avoid any direct involvement in the conflict and emphasized the linkage between peaceful settlement of the dispute and community membership of Cyprus as it was the case for Turkey. In other words, resolution of the Cyprus conflict, which might have crucial consequences for the stability and integrity of EC, was a condition for both Turkey’s and Cyprus’s EU accession (Diez, 2002; Christou, 2004; Tocci, 2004, 2007; Diez et al., 2008).

At this juncture, Greece’s strategic decision to lift its veto on the establishment of CUA tremendously affected the process (Müftüler- Baç, 1998; Eralp, 2000; Öniş, 2001; Birand, 2005; Bahcheli, 2006; Kazamias, 2006; Tsakonas, 2010; Agnantopoulos, 2013). In 1993 Copenhagen European Council, Turkey, like other applicants, was asked to fulfill political conditions with respect to the human rights issues to strengthen its political relations with EU (Birand, 2005). However, Copenhagen Council stated the necessity of the establishment of a customs union with Turkey laid down in 1964 Association Agreement and 1970 Protocol on customs union (Copenhagen European Council, June 21-22, 1993). According to both Ankara and Brussels advancing the economic integration was the optimal choice to keep Turkish-EU relations on track. However, the voting procedure based on the rule of unanimity strengthened Greece’s hand with a veto power over Turkey’s further attempts for EU accession. In this sense, Greece’s consent to any positive contribution regarding Turkey’s march towards Europe became conditional upon compromise in Turkey’s intransigent position on Turkish-Greek relations and Cyprus question. Greece also threatened EU to block Union’s

eastern enlargement if Cyprus's EU accession would not be guaranteed. "In this period, the EU increasingly began to resort to the strategy of linking together progress on Cyprus's and Turkey's relations with the Community... Greece lifted its veto in March 1995 only after the EU offered Greece the side-payment of pledging to start membership negotiations with Cyprus" (Rumelili, 2008: 103).

Following Greece's bargaining strategy, in 1994 Corfu and Essen European Council meetings, EU gave the first signals that EU-Cyprus relations would enter a new period of rapid development. In the final declaration of Madrid European Council, it was announced that negotiations would start with Cyprus in the aftermath of 1996 Intergovernmental Conference. Madrid Declaration was also important in the sense that it presented the general attitude of EU towards the resolution of Cyprus Conflict for its future conducts. It was re-announced that "the Council reiterates the importance which it attaches to making substantial efforts to achieve a just and viable solution to the question of Cyprus in line with the UN Security Council resolutions, on the basis of a bi-zonal and bi-community federation" (Madrid European Council, June 25-26, 1990). Following these developments, CUA between Turkey and EC was signed. As it was stated in Ankara Treaty, this was a positive development in the sense that signing of CUA meant the end of transition process in Turkey's long-lasting EC membership affords (Müftüler-Baç, 1998; Eralp, 2000; Öniş, 2001; Uğur and Canefe, 2004). Following this development, EU declared in "Agenda 2000" document "timetable agreed for the accession negotiations to start with Cyprus means that they could start before a political settlement is reached" (European Commission, Agenda 2000, July 1997). Relations with Turkey were also discussed in the Agenda 2000 and the Union urged Turkish government to take necessary steps with regard to the democratic reforms and

progress towards good-neighborly relations and achievement of a settlement in Cyprus (European Commission, Agenda 2000, July 1997). In accordance with recommendations of Commission stated in Agenda 2000, 1997 European Council in Luxembourg announced that the accession negotiations Cyprus, Hungary, Poland, Estonia, the Czech Republic and Slovenia would start in the spring of 1998 and a single accession framework would be adopted for the mentioned CEEC and Cyprus (Luxembourg European Council, December 12-13, 1997). Commission would follow a pre-accession strategy for the “slow track” (Tsakonas, 2010) EU candidates –namely Romania, Slovakia, Latvia, Lithuania and Bulgaria (Luxembourg European Council, December 12-13, 1997). While the European Council in Luxembourg specified the conditions, rewards and timetable for the accession of Cyprus and other CEEC, it did not include Turkey into the pre-accession strategy. Council rather introduced a special strategy for Turkey in which no rewards were offered in return for Turkey’s fulfillment of the Copenhagen criteria (Rumelili, 2004; Tocci, 2007).

In this sense, it is essential to touch upon the Europeanization of Greek foreign policy in late 1990s when “a major paradigmatic shift took place regarding” (Grigoriadis, 2008: 152) the Turkey-EU and Cyprus triangle. The crises over the sovereignty in the Aegean Sea between Turkey and Greece in 1996 dramatically shaped the newly elected Costas Simitis government in Greece (Tsakonas, 2010). Both countries declaration of sovereignty over a rocky islet called Imia/Kardak found in the grey areas in the Aegean Sea brought Turkey and Greece to the brink of war. For the Greek decision makers, Imia crisis proved that neither NATO nor EU would be a security provider and could play an active role in crisis management between Turkey and Greece (Tsa-

konas, 2001, 2010). Although the tension in Aegean Sea did not lead a rapid transformation in Greek foreign policy; following Imia crisis Greece vetoed Turkey's EU candidacy in Luxembourg European Council, along with Luxembourg and Germany. For Simitis government this was the sign that adopting a realist policy against its threat perception *vis-a-vis* Turkey was getting more costly for Greece (Kazamias, 2006: 143). Considering the added value of the emerging security and political character of the EU in post-Maastricht era, the new Greek foreign policy elites noticed that marginalizing Turkey by isolating it from the EU would not be sustainable in the long run due to its increasing political cost (Tsakonas, 2001). Thus "the stance *vis-a-vis* Turkey's oft-declared European option had been to move away gradually from a strategy of *conditional sanctions* and towards one of *conditional rewards*" (Couloumbis, 2003). In late 1990s, Greek political elites adopted a brand new political strategy through attaching its national preferences with regard to the long-run disputes with Turkey to the EU political conditionality. Recognizing the high cost of defense spending in the eve of country's euro-zone participation and realizing the weakening of bargaining power in the EU institutions due to the Greek diplomats' campaign to block Turkey's EU accession (Müftüler-Baç and McLaren, 2003) Greece, who resisted Turkey's candidacy in 1997 Luxembourg European Council, became the ultimate door keeper for Turkey's EU membership process since 1999 Helsinki European Council (Eralp, 2000; Müftüler-Baç and McLaren, 2003; Tsakonas and Tournikiotis, 2003; Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005; Kazamias, 2006; Ulusoy, 2008; Tsakonas, 2001, 2010; Agnantopoulos, 2013).

Having strong support of Greece, EU's active engagement to facilitate a peaceful settlement in Cyprus was constructed on its capacity to implement political leverage on Turkey to keep negotiation talks continuing (Ulusoy, 2008; Attalides, 2010). In multiple platforms EU affirmed inconsistency between Turkey's EU membership aspirations and the status quo in the island (Hannay, 2005: 76). EU confirmed the validity of this strategy in 1998 Progress Report on Turkey's Accession as "the Commission believes that Turkey, as the Turkish Cypriot community's guarantor, should exploit its special relationship to bring about a just and fair settlement of the Cyprus issue in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions, which are based notably on the establishment of a bi-zonal and bi-community federation" (European Commission, 1998). However, in order to implement this strategy EU had to reconfigure its enlargement strategy for Turkey in a way that it would encourage Turkey to take necessary steps to keep Turkish Cypriot side at the negotiation table and the same time secure its EU membership project. As Hannay underlines "if Turkey's EU candidacy was getting nowhere, then Turks were likely to camp on the status quo in Cyprus and to see no reason why they should strike the difficult compromises that Cyprus settlement would require" (2005, 76). In other words, EU had to compensate for the damage in Turkey-EU relations after the 1997 Luxembourg European Council in which the Council decided to launch the accession negotiations with Cyprus, Hungary, Poland, Estonia, the Czech Republic and Slovenia and excluded Turkey (Luxembourg European Council, December 12-13, 1997).

1999 Helsinki European Council decisions constituted a turning point both for the EU's involvement in Cyprus conflict and Turkish- EU relations. With the Helsinki summit, for the first time, Turkey was officially declared as a candidate state with full-

membership perspective. However the accession negotiation talks were dependent on the Turkey's fulfillment of EU conditionality -namely Copenhagen Criteria- and Turkey's support for the UN led Cyprus Peace process. As outlined in Helsinki decisions, (a) Turkey was officially a candidate state; (b) Turkey would start accession negotiations with EU as soon as she fulfilled Copenhagen Criteria; (c) resolution of Cyprus conflict would not be considered as a pre-condition for Cyprus' EU membership; (d) in addition to Copenhagen Criteria, Turkey's contributions to the Cyprus peace process would be considered as a pre-condition for Turkey and (e) rather than promoting its own plan for resolution of Cyprus conflict, EU continues its policy of supporting UN efforts for conflict resolution (Helsinki European Council, December 10-11, 1999). Helsinki conclusions regarding Cyprus's and Turkey's prospective EU accession indicated the end of EU's "even-handedness" approach. The wording of Helsinki Declaration was designed in a balanced way to capture the different priorities among EU member states (Hannay, 2005: 112). On the one hand, it was addressing Greek and Greek Cypriot concerns that failure in the peace process would not block any Cypriot integration with EU. On the other hand, through mentioning "the Council will take account of all relevant factors", the Council gave the message both sides that the strong preference of the EU was the accession of the re-united Cyprus and that resolution of the conflict was not a precondition for Cyprus's accession however it was not an automatic process and the Council would take into account of all relevant factors while reaching final decision for Cyprus's future in the Union (Tocci, 2007: 45). In addition to these, EU's decision to not state solution of the Cyprus conflict as a precondition for Turkey's EU accession was welcomed by Ankara (Cem, 2005). As the former Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs İsmail Cem (2005) reported in pre-Helsinki era

Ankara lobbied in EU institutions to balance Turco-sceptical camps attempts to set solution of the Cyprus conflict as a precondition before Turkey's EU membership. Thus Turkey's attempts bear fruits and the solution of Cyprus conflict was not declared as a special condition for Turkey's accession.

3.1.2.2 European Foreign and Security Policy Identity and Cyprus Enlargement

Greece's successful bargaining strategy should not be perceived as the sole denominator shaping EU's approach towards Cyprus. The change in EU's Cyprus policy should also be assessed in line with the Union's common foreign policy priorities in post-Cold War era (Brewin, 2000; Diez, 2002). Since its establishment EC developed an alternative model of security architecture which "is rooted in a broad conception of security that recognizes military and non-military threats" (Bilgin, 2004: 38). More importantly this culture emphasizes building a security network without using a 'militarized security language' (Bilgin, 2004: 38). In this sense, EU security culture put stress on soft power, non-military conflict resolution procedures and common security practices. In their pivotal study named *Regions and Powers, The Structure of International Security*, Buzan and Wæver categorizes EU as "a security community ... based on the integration project" (2003: 352). With this respect, EU security culture contains post-Westphalian character in the sense that the threat perceptions are not guided by the fragmental or nationalist fixations. Rather the critical impetus behind EU integration is the fear of atomization and fragmentation as the continent experienced during the catastrophic World Wars and Cold-War period. What makes the EU security build-

ing model different from security culture of classical Westphalian model is the common understanding that integration is an end in itself which can only provide guarantees for the societal, economic and political security of the European people (Bilgin, 2004: 38-39). As opposed to the conventional nation state security building model which is based on the defense of the territory against an “existential threat” or against “horizontal threats to one state by another” (Buzan and Wæver, 2003: 358), EU security understanding is institutionalized around the ideal of the security of community, people and the values.

The end of Cold War accelerated the process of European common foreign policy identity formation (Ian and Whitman, 2000). In 1990s EU foreign policy was shaped by the double concerns of deepening –political, economic and institutional integration to act as a unified Europe- and widening – enlarging the political, economic and territorial boundaries of Europe to promote European security, to eliminate fragmentation of Europe and to maintain stability in the aftermath of Cold War-. In the post Maastricht era, EU re-oriented its future in the global order by promoting its security identity and culture as well as externalizing its core values of liberal democracy, rule of law and cooperation (Ian and Whitman, 2000). Increasing concerns about the potential and active risks that bloody ethnic wars, frozen conflicts and failed states at the backyard of the Union entailing against the European economic and security interests led Union to expand its normative values through the transformative power of EU enlargement and integration (Gross, 2009: 8). With this respect “the EC of the early 1970s was a different institution from the EU of the 1990s, when the linkage between

a resolution of border conflicts and entry into the EU had become part of official policies” (Diez et al., 2006: 576). According to this matrix, EU enlargement would bring peace if it could be effectively linked to the UN peace-building process.

Transformative power of EU integration is the magical formula to solve ethnic clashes as well as frozen conflicts. Hence, rather than prescribing specific strategies and problem solving mechanisms, EU began to involve in the conflict resolution process by broadening its enlargement agenda in the sense that it promotes community values based on multilateralism, rule of (international) law, human rights, democracy, close cooperation with the UN in peaceful resolution of border conflicts, good neighborly relations and free market economy. In early 1990s, EU’s increasing interest in the Cyprus question was also structured around this broader strategy of enlargement (Friis, 2002; Richmond, 2002).

In post-Helsinki period, the valuable efforts of the international peace building coalition led by multiple complementary channels³¹ gave their fruits and under UN

³¹ In late 1999, the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, Secretary General’s Special Advisor on Cyprus Alvaro de Soto, the new Special envoy of USA Alfred Moses and the British envoy David Hannay prepared the ground to start a new initiative for Cyprus settlement whose underlying rationale was to force the interested actors to negotiate in good faith until a settlement was reached (Hannay, 2005). The early step was taken in G8 Cologne Summit on 20 June 1999 when the heads of G8 member states issued a joint declaration on Cyprus in which UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan was urged to “invite the leaders of the two parties to negotiations in the fall of 1999 (G8 Communiqué Köln, 1999). In the G8 declaration, the principles under which the two parties (Greek and Turkish Cypriot Community leaders) should have committed themselves were specified as

- “No pre-conditions;
- All issues on the table;
- Commitment in good faith to continue to negotiate until a settlement was reached;
- Full consideration of relevant UN resolutions and treaties”.

The G8 initiative on Cyprus prepared the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 1250 (Hannay, 2005, 102) which requested the UN Secretary General Annan to invite the two sides to negotiate in accordance with the relevant UNSC resolutions (UNSC S/RES/1250 (1999)) and requested the “two sides on Cyprus, including military authorities on both sides to work constructively with Secretary General and his Special Representative (Alvaro de Soto) to create a positive climate on island that would pave the way for negotiations in the autumn of 1999”.

Secretary General Kofi Annan's auspices, proximity talks were held between December 1999 and November 2000 and direct talks were held between November 2001 and 2002 (UN Security Council-S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). As Annan pointed out in his report submitted to the UN Security Council on 1 April 2003, in the new era, the EU involvement in the peace process, accelerated especially after 1999 Helsinki European Council decisions that opened the door for Turkey's EU candidacy, "offered a framework for incentives to reach a settlement as well as deadlines within which to reach in" (UN Security Council-S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). He also pointed out that the efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem "was undertaken in the context of a unique opportunity which had been seized would have allowed a reunited Cyprus to sign the Treaty of Accession to the European Union on 16 April 2003" (UN Security Council-S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). Thus the parallel processes of Cyprus's and Turkey's EU accession and the Union's full support for the UN initiatives added a new dimension in Cyprus peace talks. Accordingly, Cyprus conflict was discussed at the EU-Cyprus Association Committee meetings and it was specified as a short-term priority for the accession of Cyprus in the Accession Partnership with Cyprus (European Commission, 2001). The issue was also laid down as a short-term priority for Turkey's accession under the political criteria and enhanced political dialogue chapter in the Accession Partnership with Turkey of March 2001.³²

³² For more information please see: European Council, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, "Accession Partnership with the Republic of Turkey" (2001/235/EC), 8 March 2001.

3.2. Level of Misfit between EU's Cyprus Policy and Turkey's Policy towards Cyprus Dispute

As it was discussed in the theory chapter, “misfit” regarding the institutions, norms, procedures, policies and structures of EU and candidate state is the necessary but insufficient condition for the Europeanization process. Despite the degree and content of domestic transformation is heavily structured by the domestic actors and their political calculations, misfit between EU and candidate state's domestic politics introduces a demand for domestic change as well as determines the magnitude of external pressures for change (Börzel and Risse, 2002). Although the concept of “misfit” is a necessary but insufficient variable in explaining the nature of policy transformation, it is essential to analyze the major divergences between the policies of EU and Turkey with regard to the Cyprus in order to understand Turkey's progress in this specific case. To this end, this part focuses on the level of policy misfit between EU and Turkey regarding the Cyprus question. It is argued that the decisive difference between EU and Turkey on Cyprus dispute case can only be explained by analyzing the security cultures that structure the policy paradigm, discourse, actors and interests. In this sense, while EU is associated with a “post-Westphalian” (Bilgin, 2004: 36) “security community” (Buzan and Wæver, 2003) which prioritizes mutual cooperation, political and economic integration and dialogue in dealing with specific security issues including Cyprus question, Turkey has a (militarily) security oriented and nationalized policy agenda driven by the double concerns of the security and legal equality of Turkish Cypriot community and the preservation of the military balance in the Mediterranean overseeing Turkey's security interests. In the context of EU enlargement, as of midst

of 1990s EU adopted its enlargement strategy with respect to Turkey in which Turkey's EU accession course was politically connected with the just and lasting settlement in Cyprus. Yet, EU leverage was ineffective to lead change in Turkey's official stance on Cyprus question which had been predominantly structured by the concerns peculiar to the modern nation state ideology.

3.2.1. Cyprus Problem at the European Union

“European solution” should be assessed with its “catalytic effect” which aimed to produce a fertile political context for the solution through offering EU membership carrot. “While EU rhetoric emphasized the desirability of a solution and raised the expectation that the accession process would act as a catalyst for this purpose, EU actors did not articulate what kind of solution they had in mind, nor did they operationalize and implement this ‘catalytic effect’” (Tocci, 2007: 30). Especially during the period after the Community membership of Greece – an interested party in the conflict and the guarantor power- proposing a solution to the conflict would jeopardize the impartiality of EU involvement and it would automatically offend Turkish side. Hence the EU's catalytic effect has been dependent on the UN expertise in the field of peace negotiations. There was an obvious ‘division of labor’ between the Union and the UN. “While the former negotiated accession, the latter mediated inter-communal negotiations” (Tocci, 2007: 30). Therefore, from the beginning of the tension between two communities, EC's Cyprus policy has been in line with the UN peace-building efforts and legal parameters provisioned in the UN Resolutions (Christou, 2013).

However, division of labor between EU and UN did not mean that EU had no preferences or ideas on an ideal solution in the island. Tocci claims that although the Union never prescribed a solution to the conflict, “each and every EC declaration on Cyprus merely affirmed the Community’s commitment to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the island, and called for reunification in accordance with UN resolutions” (Tocci, 2007: 30). At multiple platforms EU officials declared that EU favored a federal solution for Cyprus (Carras, 2011) as it was mentioned in numerous UN resolutions. The full and strong support for UN initiative started in early December 1999 was also stated in 1999 Helsinki European Council Conclusion. With this respect, the Union expressed its full support for UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan’s initiative based on the framework and general principles reaffirmed in UN Resolution 1251(1999) read as

A Cyprus settlement must be based on a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded, and comprising two politically equal communities as described in the relevant Security Council resolutions, in a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation, and that such a settlement must exclude union in whole or in part with any other country or any form of partition or secession.

Therefore just as UN position, EU externalized any confederative model based on “two-state solution” that might mean maintenance of the status quo and that would jeopardize the international single personality of the state (Diez et. al., 2006; Tocci, 2007). This preference would not only be driven by the commitment to the UN process but also it was considered as the required condition that would answer the question regarding the representation of the State of Cyprus in the EU legal-institutional framework. In response to the international personality of the Cyprus, in his speech to the House of Representatives in Cyprus, President of EU Commission Romano Prodi

stated “I am confident that the European Union can accommodate whatever arrangements the parties themselves agree to in the context of a political settlement. As an EU Member State Cyprus will of course have to participate in the Council of Ministers with one voice”.³³ This premise had two components: (i) Commission underlined that internal arrangements of any member country did not concern the EU as long as they were in a severe inconsistency with the EU’s founding principles and thus EU acquis would never be an obstacle to the solution and (ii) political settlement should have a federal character that would enable country to “speak with one voice”.

Another significant variable shaping EU’s Cyprus policy is the Union’s perception with respect to the TRNC and the image of “Turkey in Cyprus”. With respect to the TRNC and the *de facto* division of the island, EU closely followed UN position. At this point it is essential to underline that in the aftermath of 1983 declaration of TRNC, EC began to approach Greek Cypriot community as the sole legal entity representing the whole island and promoted an economic integration on this basis. On 17 November 1983, ten Ministers of Foreign Affairs of EC countries issued a counter declaration after the proclamation of TRNC. Calling upon “all interested parties not to recognize this act, which creates a very serious situation in the area”, they declared that the only legitimate government representing the island was the Kyprianou government (Hoffmeister, 2006: 84). The question of international legitimacy became much more complicated in the era after Turkish Cypriot authorities’ unilateral declaration of independence in 1983. Furthermore Denktas’s campaign to persuade UN Secretary General in 1990 New York talks that there were two equal “people each having

³³ For more information please see: European Commission, Press Release Database, “Romano Prodi, Speech to the House of Representatives”, 25 October 2001.

a right to self-determination” (Kızılyürek, 2009: 80) consolidated international concerns about the political will of Turkish Cypriot side for the solution. This concern first reflected in UNSC Resolution 789 which openly stated “the recent joint meetings did not achieve their intended goal, in particular because certain positions adopted by the Turkish Cypriot side were fundamentally at variance with the Set of Ideas” (UN Security Council-S/789, November 25, 1992). Moreover, thanks to the Republic of Cyprus’s international recognition and legitimacy, the successive Greek Cypriot governments had “the moral authority and to speak as the sole legitimate Cypriot voice in the UN and in other forums” (Yakinthou, 2009: 124). With this respect, “the success of Greek Cypriot discursive strategy in using the UN as an instrument of national policy, in particular after 1974, further legitimized their perspective within the international legal and normative discursive space” (Christou, 2013: 122). In this discursive context, in the eyes of international community, the Cypriot government (Greek Cypriots) was depicted “as the actor in the conflict that was legally and normatively wronged” whereas “Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership were framed as “the spoilers to a solution (in the wrong) through non-withdrawal of troops and a lack of political will to negotiate a settlement within agreed UN parameter” (Christou, 2013: 122). Likewise, prior to the March 1995 General Affairs Council, European Commission official Serge Abou presented his report implying that “the lack of progress in the intercommunal talks was due to a lack of will of the Turkish Cypriot side” (Hoffmeister, 2006: 88).³⁴

³⁴ Please see: European Observers Report on Cyprus, 23 January 2005, reprinted in Dodd, Clement. 1998. *The Cyprus Imbroglia*, Huntington, N.Y.: Eothen Press. Appendix 6: 172-180.

The discourse of blame for the non-resolution was also evident in EU's perception on Turkey's responsibility in the ongoing status quo. Although the UN peace-building efforts were structured impartially by considering the fragile balance in the island, as of 1974, non-withdrawal of the Turkish armed forces deployed in the north of the island, distortion of the demographic structure due to the massive placement of the Anatolian Turks to TRNC, the distresses about territorial integrity and sovereignty of the island, restrictions against UN peacekeeping forces in the north and the issues with respect to the rights and freedoms of displaced persons were stated in many UN resolutions and reports prepared by the UN Secretary-Generals as the sources of concerns regarding the consistency of the *status quo*³⁵. These concerns stated in successive UN Resolutions largely pointed out Turkey's responsibilities and fulfillments and Turkish Cypriot authorities' legitimacy in the sight of international law. In line with the UN position, in the context of Cyprus dispute, EU perceived Turkey "as a systematic and long-run violator of international norms in Cyprus" (Verney, 2009: 134; Richmond, 2002). During the debates in European Parliament in 1990s, with reference to the continuation of the militarization of the island's North, systematically increasing number of Anatolian Turks settling in the North of the island since 1974 and Turkey's non-recognition of the UN resolutions and European Court of Justice rulings, Turkey was harshly criticized (Verney, 2009).

Additionally as of late 1990s, the rulings of European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) against Turkey upon the applications of the displaced Greek-Cypriot applicants were discussed as the negative developments degrading Turkey's overall human

³⁵ For example see: UN Security Council Resolutions No: 353 (1974); 354 (1974); 355 (1974); 357 (1974); 358 (1974); 359 (1974); 360 (1974); 361 (1974); 364 (1974); 365 (1974); 367 (1975); 383 (1975); 391 (1976); 401 (1976); 544 (1983); 789 (1992).

rights score in the reports prepared by the European Commission on Turkey's progress towards EU accession. Since early 1990s European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) emerged as the international legal platform for the individual Greek-Cypriot applicants who demanded compensation and discharge for their properties in the area under the control of TRNC. Between 1995 and 2006, ECHR delivered rulings against Turkey in which Turkey was found responsible for the breach of the European Convention on Human Rights with respect to the property rights of the displaced Greek Cypriot applicants (Özersay and Gürel, 2008). In 1996 ECHR delivered its judgment against Turkey upon the application of a Greek-Cypriot, –Titina Loizidou- who was deprived of access to her property under the control of TRNC. The Court decided on that Turkey violated Mrs. Loizidou's human rights, and that she should be allowed to return to her property on the north of the island as well as she should be paid compensation for her losses by Turkey (European Court of Human Rights, Application No: 15318/89, March 1995). However Turkey argued that the lands in question were not in the official territories of Turkish Republic but they were rather the in northern Cyprus which was under the authority of TRNC since 1983 (European Court of Human Rights, Application No: 15318/89, March 1995). The Court ruled out that considering the illegality of the self-proclaimed TRNC and the existence of 30,000 military personnel stationed throughout the northern Cyprus including the check points and communication lines, Turkey exercised effective control over the north of the island (European Court of Human Rights, Application No: 15318/89, December 1996). Furthermore, in 2001, the Court found Turkey responsible for the human rights breaches in the north of the Cyprus upon the inter-state application of Cyprus vs. Turkey (European Court of Human Rights, Application No: 25781/94, May 2001). Referring to the declarations made by

President of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in April 1999, and in July 2000, European Commission openly criticized Turkey's incompliance with the European Court of Human Rights' rulings and citing from the mentioned declarations, Council stated "the refusal of Turkey to execute the judgment of the Court demonstrates a manifest disregard for its international obligations" (European Commission, 2000). With the reference to the pending cases brought by Cypriots against Turkey, EU began to put more pressure on Turkey regarding the human rights violations in the north of the island.

The image of "Turkey in Cyprus" also deteriorated in August 1996 when two Greek Cypriots were killed during a protest against TRNC. European Parliament adopted a resolution condemning this tragic event and declared its suspicions about Turkey's possible role as

members of the Turkish extremist organization 'Grey Wolves' were brought from Turkey to Cyprus so that they could enter into conflict with unarmed demonstrators and takes the view that this policy is endangering peace and security in Cyprus (*and European Parliament*) calls on Turkey to cooperate by taking all necessary measures to identify, arrest and bring to justice all those implicated in the murders and firing at unarmed civilians (European Parliament, Resolution on the Situation in Cyprus, 19 August 1996).

These political developments took place in the Greek Cypriot elites' strategy to persuade EU that without an effective European leverage particularly on Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership it was uneasy to reach a solution.

At this juncture, Greek Cypriot political elites, motivated by the necessity to seek regional security through awakening international attention and enforcing Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership to make more concession for Cyprus settlement, adopted

“blame-game” strategy in its contacts with EU (Richmond, 1998). Greek Cypriot leader George Vassiliou (2010) writes in his memoirs

My view was that in order to keep international interest alive and in order to ensure that some kind of pressure would be exerted on Turkey, we had to be ‘in the good books of Europe and the Great Powers’ and consolidate their belief that we really wanted a solution.... In the meetings I had with all the EEC countries, I tried to convince my interlocutors about the logic of our position and the unreasonableness of Turkey. That is how the Cyprus issue became an object of discussion among the superpowers after a huge campaign to explain its intricacies and promote its solution. (106)... We also agreed with Prime Minister Mr. Mitsotakis that we ought to increase the pressure on Turkey through further internationalizing the issue. Using all available means, the Cyprus problem had to be kept in the forefront internationally, but we should at the same time keep telling Turkey that we are ready for a solution and that the door is always open for one. (107)

Thus the Greek strategy was constructed on the firm belief of the political elites that UN peacemaking efforts would be endless without an effective leverage or additional channel of diplomatic pressure on Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. Accordingly, as the then Greek Cypriot President Glafkos Clerides writes in his memoirs, reservations about the start of Cyprus’s accession process, raised by certain EU members who were hesitant to marginalize Turkey – a pivotal regional partner for EU’s foreign and security interests- (Müftüler-Baç and McLaren, 2003), would mean the punishment of Greek Cypriots who wanted solution and appeasement of Turkey and Turkish Cypriots who did not want a solution and systematically violated human rights and international law in Cyprus (Clerides, 2008).

3.2.2. Turkey’s Policy Towards Cyprus

This chapter is designed to explain the main themes and official and popular discourses on Cyprus and their impacts on Turkey’s Cyprus policy. For decades Tur-

key's concerns with respect to the security of the Turkish Cypriot community and Turkey's security interests constituted the main pillars of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus (Kazan, 2002: 59). These twin concerns were mostly shaped by the Turkish nationalist historiography and security strategy with respect to the military balance in the eastern Mediterranean. In this sense, both in Turkish foreign and domestic politics Cyprus issue has been best defined with the term "national cause" which has been a vital matter for Turkey's security interests and existence of the Turks in Cyprus (Kaliber, 2005). Moreover, nationalist and figurative construction of the Turkish Cypriot community and the Cyprus Island as the geographical and cultural extension of Anatolia contributed the emergence of a discourse which defines relationship between Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community with the metaphor of "motherland-babyland". Although, the nature of the relationships between Turkey and TRNC is beyond the scope of this study, it is essential to briefly discuss the role and influence of Turkey in TRNC to understand the mode of political interactions which seem to be a significant component of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus. Last but not least, I discuss the role of Cyprus in Turkey's security and defense strategy in line with the Buzan and Wæver's securitization approach.

3.2.2.1. "Cyprus issue as a national cause"

Starting from the early 1950s, Cyprus dispute has become a melting pot of the Turkish nationalism which was intensified during the inter-communal clashes between Greek and Turkish Cypriots (Uzer, 2010: 107- 108). While the Greek Cypriots' *enosis* claims were getting stronger under the political juncture after the Second World War, there emerged a popular interest in the situation of Turkish Cypriot community in the

Cyprus. In the midst of 1950s, discourse of “Cyprus as the national cause” which “had been the pet issue of Pan-Turkists in Turkey since the end of Second World War” (Landau, 1995: 135) expanded to the vast majority of Turkish public through the major daily newspapers’ nationalist coverage of the news about situation of the Turkish Cypriot community in Cyprus³⁶ and massive demonstrations urging Turkish government to react against the Greek Cypriot *enosis* claims (Erim, 1975; Fırat, 1997; Copeaux and Mauss-Copeaux, 2009; Uzer, 2010). Kızılyürek claims that as a result of the strong interactions between Turkish Cypriot intellectuals who “were convinced that the most effective way of opposing enosis was to involve Turkey in the Cyprus question” (Kızılyürek, 2010: 178) and Pan-Turkist groups in Turkey, “Pan-Turkist lobby succeeded, with organizations such as “Cyprus is Turkish” Association, in persuading Turkish public opinion to adopt the Cyprus question as a national cause” (Kızılyürek, 2010: 179). Kaliber summarizes the general atmosphere of these massive movements as “during those campaigns it was insistently required that the society should espouse the Cyprus question as its ‘national cause’ around which it should unify” (2003: 231). Through the discourse of “Cyprus is Turkish” which was the slogan in the anti-enosis massive demonstrations in Turkey, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot nationalism has been standardized in the sense that the Turkish speaking population of the Cyprus is a natural continuation of the motherland, Turkey and each and every Turk should have had an interest in Cyprus cause (Bora, 1995). “From 1950s on, the term has been persistently and extensively used by almost all political figures, intelligentsia, printed and

³⁶ The daily newspaper *Hürriyet* and its editor Sedat Simavi were symbolic in the sense that the newspaper led the way for the nationalist discourse against enosis in 1950s.

visual media and more importantly by the ‘ordinary man’ in some cases even interchangeably with the Cyprus question itself” (Kaliber, 2003: 231).

The popular campaigns on Cyprus gave their fruits at the level of politics and the discourse of the Cyprus as the national cause took its place in the official rhetoric in 1955 when the Adnan Menderes government for the first time stated the vitality of Cyprus issue in the program of the fourth Menderes government (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Program of the Fourth Menderes Government). Former Turkish Prime Minister Nihat Erim discusses the role of popular discourse on Cyprus in shaping the official rhetoric as

When the Greek Cypriots and Greece proposed the status of Cyprus in the agenda of UN in 1954, the governing and opposition parties of that time did not excessively interest in the Cyprus issue. With the signing of Lausanne Treaty we (Turkey) totally disengaged with the Cyprus with respect to our claims for sovereignty. Cyprus was not also within the principles of National Oath. We had the notion that we could not have any claim with respect to the Cyprus issue... Sedat Simavi (*the owner of the highly circulated daily newspaper Hürriyet*) brought issue in the agenda of the Turkish public and youth. In fact both government and other political parties entered into a rivalry with each other to take a part in this movement rather than dissociating themselves. After a while government officially owned the Cyprus issue and the opposition handled the issue as a “national cause” (1975: 4-5).

Accordingly, starting from the midst of 1950s Turkish political elites internalized discourse of Cyprus as a “national cause”. Due to its populist-nationalist connotations most political parties did not hesitate to economize discourse of Cyprus as a “national cause” to increase their electoral success. Sabri İhsan Çağlayangil, who was the Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1965- 1971 and 1975- 1977, discusses Cyprus issue in his memoirs as “the Cyprus matter is a “national cause”. No political authority can dare to solve this question in any condition by giving concessions against the will of the “nation”” (Çağlayangil, 2007: 364). With respect to this, for many political parties

making concessions in Cyprus case has been associated with abandoning Turkish Cypriots which would inevitably have high political costs due to the strong emotional attachment among Turkish electorate.

The dominant discourse on Cyprus issue as the “national cause” has been supported by the national historiography. In compliance with this, “Greeks and Greek Cypriots fostering the desire of reviving the Byzantine Empire for the materialization of *Megali Idea*, in reality to complete the encirclement of Turkey both from south and west by unifying Cyprus with Greece” (Kaliber, 2003: 191). In this sense, *enosis* did not only mean resolving the communal existence of the Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus, it also meant the cultural and physical encirclement of Turks of “motherland”. Moreover the traumatic legacy of the end of Turkish sovereignty over the Crete Island and Presence Islands has been considered as a historical reference for the nationalist circles. Erim claimed “they (Greece and Greek Cypriots) plan to dissolve Turks in Cyprus just like they did in Crete Island once upon a time. This is what they desire” (1975: 103). Therefore “the perception of Greeks as a ‘national enemy’ that had to be prevented from grabbing another strategic island off the coast of Turkey was a key factor among common people and this in turn influenced the Turkish policy makers” (Uzer, 2011: 107). Backed by this fear of encirclement, Turkish policy makers defined Turkey’s interest in Cyprus since the 1950s and the military intervention in 1974 “as saving Turkish Cypriots from genocide” and preserving the Turkish state (Uzer, 2011: 105).

3.2.2.2 Babyland Cyprus and Turkey-Turkish Cypriot Relations

Another significant component of the official discourse on Cyprus was the figurative conceptualization of Cyprus as the “babyland” in which the Turkish Cypriots

are perceived as the culturally, religiously and ethnically identical Turks extended to Cyprus Island which is the geographical and cultural continuation of Anatolia. Coşkun Kırca who was the Permanent Representative of Turkey in UN stated in his speech at UN General Assembly “there never has been and there is not now in Cyprus a single “Cypriot” nation. There have always been two separate communities, Turks and Greeks that are but microcosms of the two mother nations”.³⁷ This account has never acknowledged the presence of a Cypriot identity apart from the identities of their constitutive motherlands (Peristianis, 2006; Kızılyürek, 2010). Accordingly the official discourse on Cyprus has been based on the premises that

the identification of the security of Turkish Cypriots with that of the ‘mainland’ Turks through the metaphor of ‘motherland’ and ‘babyland’ and the inseparability of the security of Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC); representation of the island of Cyprus as ‘natural extension and/or continuation of Anatolia’ from the geological/geographical, economic and cultural perspectives (Kaliber, 2003: 183).

Moreover discourse that the people living on the island are the extension of their respective motherlands has been owned by the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. The two communities “had separate school systems guided by the motherlands, different national holidays, with Greeks celebrating the revolution of 1821 that provided independence to Greece from the Ottoman Empire and the Turks celebrating the Turkish revolution of 1923, they belonged to separate political parties and they read separate newspapers” (Uzer, 2011: 113). Thus the “Hellenocentric” policies (Peristianis, 2006) adopted by the Greek Cypriot elites were countered by the “Turkist” claims of Turkish

³⁷ Please see: Kırca, Coşkun. 1983. “Speech Delivered by Turkish Permanent Representative in UN Coşkun Kırca.” In *1983 Nisan- Kasım Döneminde Kıbrıs Sorununda Meydana Gelen Gelişmeler ve KKTC’nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Belgeler* (Developments in the era between April and November 1983 and Documents about the Foundation of the TRNC) Edited by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department on Cyprus and Greece. Ankara, 28.

Cypriot political leaders. Thus both Greek and Turkish nationalisms have been nourished by the same discourse that there is not a Cypriot identity but the extension of Greece and Turkey (Papadakis, 2006). In a speech delivered upon the self-declaration of TRNC, Denktaş defined Turkish Cypriot people with the words: “we are the children of Atatürk. We are the babyland of Atatürk’s republic”³⁸. In his famous speech prior to the 1995 elections, Denktaş said

I am a child of Anatolia. I am Turkish in every way and my roots go back to Central Asia. I am Turkish with my culture, my language, my history, and my whole being. I have a state as well as a motherland. The notions of “Cypriot culture,” “Turkish Cypriot,” “Greek Cypriot,” “a shared Republic” are all nonsense. If they have their Greece and we have our Turkey, why should we live under the roof of the same Republic? . . . Some individuals are producing fiction about the existence of “Cypriots,” “Turkish Cypriots,” “Greek Cypriots.” There is no such thing as a “Turkish Cypriot.” Don’t dare to ask us whether we are “Cypriots.” We could take this as an insult. Why? Because there is only one thing that is “Cypriot” in Cyprus, and that is the Cypriot donkey (Belge, 2002 in Navaro Yashin, 2006: 86).

With respect to this, Turkish settlers from Anatolia were considered as the fellow Turks who were there to rescue Turks of Cyprus from the ethnic and cultural cleansing (Lacher and Kaymak, 2005; Navaro-Yashin, 2006). As Copeaux and Copeaux claim in babyland Cyprus “the symbols of Turkism began to be visible among the Turkish Cypriots. The “Great Turkish Nation”, which was divided politically, was considered as united culturally” (2009: 47). With this respect the discourse on “motherland-babyland” provided the discursive background of Turkist claims of the Turkish Cypriot

³⁸ Please see: Denktaş, Rauf. 1983. “KTFD Başkanı Rauf Denktaş’ın Lefkoşa’daki Atatürk Meydanı’nda yaptığı Konuşma” (Speech delivered by the head of Turkish Federated State of Cyprus Rauf Denktaş at the Atatürk square in Nicosia) In *1983 Nisan- Kasım Döneminde Kıbrıs Sorununda Meydana Gelen Gelişmeler ve KKTC’nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Belgeler* (Developments in the era between April and November 1983 and Documents about the Foundation of the TRNC) Edited by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department on Cyprus and Greece. Ankara, 28.

leadership who was the champion of the *taksim* policy in 1950s and the independence of TRNC in post 1983 era. According to Lacher and Kaymak, the nationalist notion that Turkish Cypriots are the cultural and national extension of Turkey was politically materialized when Turkish Cypriot leadership declared sovereignty of TRNC. They claim ““self” in question was not the political community of Turkish Cypriots, but the Turkish nation, of which the Turkish Cypriots were regarded to be an extension” (Lacher and Kaymak, 2005: 155).

Yet describing Turkish-Turkish Cypriot relations through the metaphor of “motherland-babyland” generated an asymmetrical relationship between Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community in time (Güven, 2003; Balkır and Yalman, 2009). Especially after 1983, Turkish Cypriots’ political and economic dependence on Turkey dramatically increased. Turkey distributed generous transfer payments to TRNC to eliminate economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community. Moreover, since late 1990s Turkey has been criticized and defined by certain Turkish Cypriot intellectuals as an external power involving “in the running of the TRNC, through its civil and military representatives in the northern Cyprus” (Balkır and Yalman, 2009: 52). The tradition of appointing an employee from the Central Bank of Turkey to the head of Central Bank of TRNC (Balkır and Yalman, 2009: 54); the authorization of TRNC police organization under the control of Turkish armed forces on the island and the politically strong position of ambassadors of Turkey in TRNC have arose questions with respect to the “sovereignty” of TRNC (Lacher and Kaymak, 2005). The malfunctioning political regime and Turkey’s political presence resulted with a center-periphery structure in TRNC in which Turkish Cypriot leadership and Denktaş, who strongly claimed Turkish interests and “Turkish nation”, was extensively backed by

Turkish political elites. For decades successive Turkish governments which followed the populist-nationalist discourse on Cyprus matter strongly supported Rauf Denktaş. In line with this, “in the Turkish Cypriot community, the military and economic presence of the Turkish state further de-motivated the growth of civic initiatives” (CIVIL-CUS, 2005) and limited the influence of the civil society in politics.

3.2.2.3 Cyprus as the “Aircraft Carrier in the Eastern Mediterranean”: Cyprus in Turkey’s Security Strategy

Cyprus’s geographical proximity to Turkish southern costs has also contributed the discourse on “Cyprus as the natural extension of Anatolia”. At this point, the island’s proximity to Turkish southern coasts has not been articulated by “thesis that “Cyprus is geographically part of Anatolia” and thereby is “an integral part of Turkish national defense and security”” (Kaliber, 2003: 198). As former Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Erim wrote

The geographical location of Cyprus indicates that it is a part of Anatolia. Other islands in the Mediterranean closer to Turkey are also part of Anatolia... Yet the fate of those islands was determined by the treaties. No one has proposed the revision of status quo in those islands yet. But if this happens one day, Turkey would have a say for self-defense to preserve its vital interests (1975: 68).

Accordingly, while Turkey shared Turkish Cypriot worries; it also had vital interests of its own. In this sense both during the Cold War and post-Cold War era, Cyprus has always been an important component of Turkey’s national security concerns (Kazan, 2002). As Kazan underlines in traditional Turkish security discourse, geo-strategic position of the island is an integral part of Turkey’s own national security and survival,

and the balance of powers in the Eastern Mediterranean (ibid: 57- 59). What is highlighted regarding the importance of Cyprus for Turkey is the geo-strategic position of the island as the juncture among Middle East, Africa and Europe, which offers a serious advantage to control maritime routes in the Eastern Mediterranean; to control Turkish harbors in the Mediterranean Sea; to protect the national borders against the threats coming from Turkey's south and to balance the encirclement of Turkey by Greece which controls the significant amount of region in Aegean Sea especially after the granting of Dodecanese Islands in the aftermath of World War II (Kazan, ibid: Kaliber, 2003: 183- 192). At this point, it is essential to highlight that Turkey's early interest in the Cyprus conflict was also triggered by the Turkish ruling elites' concerns with respect to the balance of powers in the Eastern Mediterranean established by the Treaty of Lausanne. Erim claims that the Treaty of Lausanne was established on a delicate balance between Turkey and Greece (1975: 37). Accordingly if the ambitions of separatist Greek Cypriots are materialized this balance will be destroyed. Having deep interests to preserve "Lausanne balance" Turkey aimed to maintain military and political balance of powers in the Mediterranean.

Parallel to Turkey's approach towards Cyprus case, security concerns plays the central role. In a speech by Former Foreign Minister Fatin Rüştü Zorlu, the vitality and essentiality of the island in terms of Turkey's security interests was underlined as:

Stated from the military perspective the island of Cyprus has to be in the hands of a state, which is concerned in the fate of Turkey and the surrounding Middle Eastern states. ... The dominant power on the island would have a position of control over Turkey's harbors. If this dominant power is also the same dominant power on the islands to the west [of Turkey], Turkey would be de facto encircled by this power (mentioned in Kaliber, 2003: 190).

Thus with its geographical proximity to Turkey, Turkey's official policy towards Cyprus has been structured by the notion that change in *status quo* in the island in favor of the Greek Cypriots and Greece would pose a serious threat for Turkey's security interests. This discourse on Turkey's national security and vital interests and necessity of the guarantees preserving the presence of the Turkish military forces has led to the "securitization" of Turkey's perception towards the situation in Cyprus (Kazan, 2002; Kaliber, 2003; 2005). Buzan et al. conceptualize the term "securitization" as "the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bound of political procedure" (1998: 24). They argue:

Securitization is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics. Securitization can thus be seen as a more extreme version of politicization. In theory, any public issue can be located on the spectrum ranging from non-politicized (meaning the state does not deal with it and it is not in any other way made an issue of public debate and decision) through politicized (meaning the issue is part of public policy, requiring government decision and resource allocations or, more rarely, some other form of communal governance) to securitized (Buzan et al. 1998: 24)).

Following this categorization, it is possible to claim that the centrality of Cyprus in Turkey's security concerns and national interest calculations pushes political elites to move Cyprus policy making out of the sphere of daily politics and political bargaining. Any de-securitization attempt of Cyprus conflict would mean divergence from traditional paths of Turkish foreign and domestic politics and betrayal of the nation. Dealing with Cyprus issue within the de-securitized "normal" field of politics would jeopardize Turkey's "homeland" defense and its hardly achieved national independence.

Securitization also structured domestic power politics, configured the relations between actors and created asymmetrical relations among certain state sectors. As

Buzan et al. discuss the process of securitization is achieved, interpreted and internalized differently in different state apparatuses (1998; 27- 28). What is important in this sense is the institutional level of the securitization. They claim that in case of an ongoing military armed struggle or existence of a real threat perception regarding the state's survival the sense of emergency become institutionalized (Buzan et al. 1998). In such a case, a circle of certain state sectors internalize and institutionalize this constant sense of emergency and can easily find support from its audiences –public-. This process of institutionalization of security concerns is also evident in Turkish foreign and security policy culture. Bilgin claims “realist assumptions have been at the root of representations of Turkey as a country be-sieged by internal and external enemies and provide justification for the security rational used by the traditionalist elite to shape domestic as well as foreign policies... The conception security... has remained military focused and state-centric” (2004; 43). As a result of this security culture, foreign policy agenda, in which Cyprus conflict has always been as the case of emergency, are traditionally conducted by a limited circle of civil and military bureaucrats. Therefore securitized foreign policy culture has generated its own winner and losers.

Discourse on the “national” foreign policy led policy making process out of domestic polarizations among the ruling elites. Turkish foreign policy has been driven by the foreign and security culture which was formulated by a *realpolitik* vision, Western oriented outlook and high level of bureaucratization (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000). As one of the key actors in Turkish politics, Turkish military had a tradition to influence all aspects of Turkish politics from education to foreign policy (Uzgel, 2003). Military has involved in politics either as supervisor or as decision-maker and occasionally as ruler, in the military interventions in 1960, 1971, 1980-83 and 1996. Yet following

1980 military coup, through imposing arbitrary decrees and regulations under the military rule it secured and strengthened its presence and impact on domestic and foreign policy³⁹ (Uzgel, 2003; Özcan, 2010). Moreover, escalation of the terror and violence after 1984 as the Kurdish separatist movement PKK started its terrorist activities, “the military gradually assumed a greater role in curbing armed insurgence; this led to the legitimization of its position in the foreign policy-making process” (Özcan, 2010: 26). Yet the omnipresence of the Turkish army in Turkish foreign and domestic politics were consolidated especially after systemic changes brought about by the end of Cold

³⁹ Three military takeovers in the last half century resulted with the pro-military constitutions granted privileges and opportunities for Turkish Armed Forces (TAF). These prerogatives were first granted by the 1961 constitution which was accepted immediately after the 1960 military intervention. Following 1961 constitution, the privileged position of military in Turkish political system was reinforced by the 1971 and 1973 constitutional amendments. In the final stage with 1982 constitution which was a by-product of 1980 military coup, TAF significantly extended its institutional privileges, area of maneuver and political existence (Uzgel, 2003; Özbudun and Yazıcı, 2004). One of the most critical military prerogatives granted by 1961 constitution was the amendments on the institutional status of Chief of General Staff. With the new act, the Chief of General Staff who was responsible to the Ministry of Defense was declared as responsible to the Prime Minister. Therefore the autonomous status of Chief of General Staff was empowered and consolidated (Uzgel, 2003). Another critical organizational change enabled by 1961 Constitution was the establishment of National Security Council (NSC) which has been the crucial instrument for shaping politics (Sarigil, 2007: 45). It was established by the 1961 Constitution as legal platform to express military’s views on the matter related with national security. Until 1982 amendments, the internal composition of NSC was dominated by civilian majority and its decisions were considered as advisory opinions. However after 1982 Constitution, its decisions were given primary consideration and the composition of council were dominated by military personnel. Regarding the role NSC played in domestic politics; it is possible to claim that it was a great legal-institutional structure which enabled military to intervene in domain of civil politics. According to the article 118 (before the amendments) of 1982 Constitution:

NSC shall submit to the Council of Ministers its views on taking decisions and ensuring necessary coordination with regard to the formulation, establishment and implementation of the national security policy of the state. The Council of Ministers shall give priority consideration to the decisions of the NSC concerning measures that it deems necessary for the preservation of the existence and independence of the state, the integrity and indivisibility of the country and the peace and security of the society

Therefore, military perspective and monitoring were prioritized over the Council’s policy-making. As a result of NSC’s institutional autonomy over governing elites, military strengthened its relative power and position as a veto player in Turkish politics. In addition to this, NSC’s agenda was designed in a way that included a very large scale of issues related with national security, and survival of the state. (Michaud Emin, 2007: 26).

War which caused the regionalization of Turkey's security concerns including fight against PKK terrorism, Aegean disputes over rocky islands, and military balance in the eastern Mediterranean (Kaliber, 2009; Tür and Han, 2011; Özcan, 2010). "Furthermore, the regionalization of the Kurdish problem after the 1990 Gulf Crisis led to the further consolidation of the military's position in this field and catapulted the military authorities into the prime position of power as far as Turkey's foreign policy-making process was concerned" (Özcan, 2010: 26). Although "with the demise of the Soviet Union Turkey's perception of threat from the north was reduced" (Tür and Han, 2011: 7), Turkey came close to military confrontations with its neighbors including Syria, Greece, Iran and Iraq. The regional/international setting which influenced "the mood of the foreign policy-makers was probably best captured by a leading figure in Turkish diplomacy, Şükrü Elekdağ, a retired ambassador and former deputy undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs" (Kirişçi, 2009: 31) who advocated that Turkey should reorganize its foreign policy by considering the regional threats which could be managed through a new defense doctrine named two and a half war strategy "i.e. conducting two full scale operations simultaneously along the Aegean and southern fronts while at the same time being prepared for a "half war" that might be instigated from within the country" (Elekdağ, 1996). To Elekdağ "the threats facing Turkey are so diverse and acute" and "the geopolitical realities of the region compel Turkey to increase her defense expenditure in order to be able to protect her territorial integrity and maintain her security" (Elekdağ, 1996). The discourse on existential threat and vital security interests legitimized and consolidated military's role in structuring foreign and domestic politics as the "principle" (Sarigil, 2012).

Having a significant place in Turkey's homeland security and defense, Cyprus issue has been a policy field that "imposes a definite conception of a political order in Turkey, an order in which the pro-status quo bureaucratic establishment can sustain its privileged position particularly vis-à-vis the reform-seeking wing of the political elite". (Kaliber, 2005: 321). Therefore securitization and bureaucratization may be comprehended as the two inter-mingled processes that simultaneously produce one another and keep the ground safe against any politicization of "national" case. These processes were also defined in the boundaries of "national", which has been above politics, closed to public debates and have not changed in accordance with the government programs. Parallel to this "foreign policy making in general remained restricted to narrow elite accustomed to viewing the surrounding world from the perspective of national security considerations" (Kirişçi, 2006: 13). Decisions regarding foreign and security associated matters including Cyprus question were largely given by the "appointed state elites (Turkish military-bureaucratic establishment) rather than the elected government elites" (Sözen, 2013: 111).

3.2.3. Turkey's EU Membership Aspirations and Cyprus Policy in 1990s

Turkey-EU relations go back to 1963 when Turkey signed Association Agreement called Ankara Treaty with the European Community. With an additional protocol signed in 1970, Turkey's relations with EC were extended foreseeing an economic integration targeting customs union with EC by the end of 1995 (Müftüler-Baç. 1998). In April 1987, Turkey applied for full membership of the EC. For the Prime Minister

of the time –Turgut Özal- who had a liberal-economic outlook, Turkey’ EC membership would be asset or an opportunity structure to treat the anomalies of Turkish politics as well as it would facilitate Turkey’s economic and political integration with the free world (Birand and Yalçın, 2007; Kirişçi, 2006). It was evident in Turkey’s EC membership application that a new economically and politically proactive foreign policy perspective was in action which would be backed by economic development, liberalization and Turkey’s integration with the capitalist world (Uzgel, 2004: 312: Demir, 2007: 616- 621: Yavuzalp, 1996: 265- 266).

Upon Turkey’s application, EC declared that Turkey was not economically and politically eligible for accession. Moreover the Union also underlined that the continuation of status quo on the Cyprus would never be tolerated by EC. Opinion paper was quite significant in the sense that for the first time it highlighted the linkage between Turkey’s attempts for integration with the EC and Turkey’s responsibility for the resolution of Cyprus conflict. On Turkish-Greek relations and Turkey’s Cyprus policy, Commission declared

Examination of the political aspects of the accession of Turkey would be incomplete if it did not consider the negative effects of the dispute between Turkey and one Member State of the Community, and also the situation in Cyprus, on which the European Council has just expressed its concern once again. At issue are the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations (Commission of the European Communities, December 20, 1989).

In June 1990, European Council of Dublin reiterated

The Cyprus problem affects EC- Turkey relations and bearing in mind the importance of these relations, it stresses the need for the prompt elimination of the obstacles that are preventing the pursuit of effective inter-communal talks aimed at finding a just and viable solution to the question of

Cyprus on the basis of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General, as it was recently reaffirmed by Resolution 649/90 of the Security Council (Dublin European Council, June 25-26, 1990).

Therefore when the magnitude of the political criticisms and pressures on Turkey were concerned, especially after the TRNC's declaration of independence, Cyprus conflict seemed to be a burden on Turkey which led political marginalization of the country and limited the area of maneuver in world politics (Demir, 2007; 616). This perspective began to be more visible after Turkey applied for EU membership in 1987. In the shadow of long-lasting obsession in Turkish politics (Demir, *ibid*) such as Cyprus issue and Kurdish question, Turkey was about to be isolated from the international politics and economy. At this juncture, Özal supported the reviving intellectual movement called as "Neo-Ottomanism" (*Yeni Osmanlıcılık*) which suggested a reassessment of Turkey's traditional foreign policy perspective defined by Kemal Atatürk as "peace at home, peace in the world" which has been associated with foreign policy isolationism and reactivism (Murinson, 2006). Neo-Ottomanism "advocated Turkish pursuit of active and diversified foreign policy in the region based on the Ottoman historical heritage" (Murinson, 2006: 946). Therefore Turkey needed a new foreign policy perspective which would relocate Turkey as the central power in Muslim and Turkic world as well as world politics.⁴⁰ With this respect, Turkey should have adopted a "soft power" strategy in which economic, cultural and historical interactions were prioritized rather than "hard power" military and coercive strategies (Oğuzlu, 2007).

Observing the necessity to reassess taboo matters in Turkish domestic and foreign policy, Özal followed an economy-oriented foreign policy outlook which was

⁴⁰ For further information about Özal's projection of Turkey and Turkish-Islamic heritage please see: Özal, Turgut. 2010. *Tarih ve Miras* (History and Heritage), Istanbul: Yakın Plan.

associated as the early attempts to de-securitize Turkish foreign policy and Turkey's policy towards Cyprus (Laçiner, 2009). To normalize relations with Greece, to keep US-Turkey alliance vivid in the aftermath of Cold-War and to expand Turkey and Turkish economy to the world, Özal proposed to follow a proactive and venturous foreign policy strategy to solve Cyprus question (Demir, 2009). With this aim, Özal proposed a summit through the participation of four parties (Turkey, Turkish Cypriot leadership, Greece and Greek Cypriot leadership) to reach a just and final solution for the Cyprus question. Although a radical shift in Turkey's dual concerns shaping Turkey's Cyprus policy was not evident, he forced a change in Turkey's foreign policy strategy in which economic and civilian instruments were utilized (Uzgel, 2004). In a speech he delivered on the four-partite summit, he stated "this process cannot be executed by bureaucratic formalities anymore. Settlement will be negotiated by political actors. This is why we propose four-partite summit" (Milliyet, 20 July 1991). The debates on the continuation of Turkey's unconditional support for Denktaş constituted another hot debate. "Anxious for agreement with Greece, and for support from the United States, in June 1990 Özal excluded Denktaş, from participating in a European Democratic Union conference in Antalya, attended by Clerides: the Greek Prime Minister, and Mitsotakis, who had refused to be under the same roof with Denktaş" (Dodd, 2010: 165). Considering the prominence of Denktaş factor in Turkey's foreign policy tradition regarding Cyprus, his exclusion seemed to be another attempt to challenge the traditional veto players. Yet, Özal's pro-activism did not long lasting and by the mid-1990s, "the instability and insecurity reigning within Turkey and Turkey's immediate neighborhood culminated in the "national security-centered" understanding of foreign policy reasserting itself (Kirişçi, 2006: 12).

In early 1990s Cyprus's strengthened EU membership aspirations emerged as one of the most significant denominator in Turkey-EU and Cyprus triangle. From the beginning of Cyprus' EU integration process, Turkey did not recognize EC/EU as the correct international platform where Cyprus conflict was discussed (Sözen, 2013). As a counter-argument against Greek Cypriots' and Greece's attempts to Europeanize the issue, throughout 1990s Turkish governments emphasized "the existence of two separate people with two separate administrative units and without a just and final solution preserving the legal and communal equality of the people Cyprus can never be a part of EU" (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author). According to the Turkish thesis, there were two equal political communities in the island and "the authorities of one party do not represent the other".⁴¹ This view was evident in 1991 program of the Turkish government. In the program government emphasized the existence of two equal and sovereign entities who had an equal say for the future of the island. Government also declared its position with respect to the solution of the Cyprus question as:

Turkey approaches the Cyprus question having in mind that the two communities on the island have certain rights and statuses emanating from the international agreements and supports the solution of the question through negotiations by communities on the island as equal partners within the context of the UN Security Council Resolution 649 (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Program of the First Yılmaz Government).

⁴¹ Please see: Denktas, Rauf. 1998. *Call for peace from the Turkish side Rauf Denktas Proposes Confederation In Cyprus*. 31 August 1998. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/p_call-for-peace-from-the-turkish-side_br_rauf-denktas-proposes-confederation-in-cyprus_br_31-august-1998_p_en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Accordingly, Cyprus could not by-itself represent Turkish Cypriot people under the EU roof unless a united bi-zonal and bi-communal Cyprus, based on the legal, administrative and communal equality of the two people was reached. In line with these, immediately after Cyprus' EU application in 1990 Turkey declared this application as "illegal" in the sense that Greek Cypriots' application was against the principle of 1960 Constitution which suggested a political equality between two communities (Bozkurt and Demirel, 2004: 202).

Turkey's insistence to persuade EU for simultaneous EU membership of Cyprus and Turkey constituted the second pillar of Turkey's official policy towards Cyprus's EU accession process. In line with this policy, Turkey asserted a legal framework based on 1960 Treaties. On June 1997, in her letter addressing the Minister of Foreign Affairs of UK, Tansu Çiller -Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey- wrote that according to the Treaty of Guarantee Cyprus could never be an EU member states since the treaty prohibited the membership of Cyprus in the any international organization unless both Greece and Turkey were already members themselves.⁴² Turkey's emphasis on the Treaty of Guarantee is crucial since it clarified that Turkey would never be supporting any peaceful settlement that jeopardizes its guarantorship rights attained by 1960 arrangements "ensuring that the interests of Greece and Turkey were carefully balanced" (ibid). The ultimate concern was based on the idea that 1960 Treaties did not only target the preservation of the balance between Turkish and Greek

⁴² Please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Letter By The Minister Of Foreign Affairs Of The Republic Of Turkey To The Minister Of Foreign Affairs Of United Kingdom Concerning The Greek Cypriot Application To The EU" 17 June 1997. Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/letter-by-the-minister-of-foreign-affairs-of-the-republic-of-turkey-to-the-minister-of-foreign-affairs-of-united-kingdom-concern.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Cypriots but also aimed at preserving the regional-international balance between Turkey and Greece⁴³. Based on International Law Professor Mendelson's interpretations regarding the Cyprus's prospective EU membership, Turkey argued

The Treaty of Guarantee of 1960, along with its associated instruments, strikes a carefully constructed balance between the interests of the two Cypriot communities, and also between the three States with a particular interest in Cyprus; Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom ... Article I (2) goes on to prohibit, not just participation (in whole or in part) in an economic or political union, but even "all activity likely to promote, directly or indirectly... union with any other State..." It cannot be gainsaid that membership of Cyprus in the EU is likely to promote, directly or indirectly, union with other States, and most particularly with Greece" (Mendelson, 1997).⁴⁴

According to this formula, even if a just and lasting peace was reached in Cyprus without Turkey's EU membership, as provisioned by the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, Cyprus could never be a part of the EU family.

As opposed to Turkey's arguments, Greece and EU did not observe any illegality. To them, 1960 Treaties were aimed at prevention of enosis – unification of the island with Greece- but the Treaties did not target any integration with international organizations (Tsakonas, 2010). On the other hand, EU's increasing interaction with Cyprus in 1990s alarmed both Turkish foreign policy makers and Turkish public since "the possible membership of Southern Cyprus in the EU is considered by many Turks as enosis, that is the unification of Cyprus and Greece, through the backdoor of EU

⁴³ Please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Turkey- TRNC Joint Statement" July 4, 1997. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey---trnc-joint-statement-july-4_-1997.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

⁴⁴ Please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "EU and Cyprus: An Expert View Opinion of Professor M.H. Mendelson Q.C on the Application of "the Republic of Cyprus" to Join the European Union. Summary And Conclusions" June 6, 1997. Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/page-4--summary-and-conclusions.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

membership” (Bağcı, 1996: 162). Turkish political and military elites’ fear of encirclement strengthened the vision of securitization. According to this matrix, different from the times of hot conflict, in the new era, Greek Cypriots’ EU bid was approached as a modern instrument to reach their final aims of enosis. Cyprus’s possible EU membership would provide a secured area of maneuver to politically, militarily and economically encircle and isolate both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. Although Turkey and Turkish Cypriots did not perceive the EU as the right platform to discuss Cyprus question, Greece and Greek Cypriots successfully internationalized the issue by using the card of international legitimacy of the Republic of Cyprus as the only recognized sovereign country representing the island.

Turkey’s increasing psychology of insecurity cannot be handled without real regional developments threatening Turkey’s national security (Kut, 2002). As Buzan and Turkish- Greek relations were strained due to the Kardak/Imia crises, the signing of Joint Defense Doctrine between Greece and Cyprus and the deployment of S- 300 missiles on Cyprus and the support given by the Greek authorities and social groups for the terrorist activities conducted by PKK in Turkey (Kazan, 2002: 60). The most dramatic sign of Turkey’s sense of insecurity concerning the developments in its neighboring region was the press release given by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Greece’s and Greek Cypriots’ attempts to deploy Russian-made S-300 missiles on the island. In the press release spokesman of Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs declared that Greek Cypriot side’s attempts in the context of joint defense doctrine was the indicator of the Greek Cypriot aggressiveness and Turkey would never tolerate any attempt aimed at jeopardizing the security of the Turkish Cypriot people and upsetting

Turkish-Greek balance in the Eastern Mediterranean.⁴⁵ 1997-1999 coalition government's program reiterated that under current conditions the vitality of the security and stability of Cyprus increased not only for the survival of TRNC but also for the security of Turkey.⁴⁶ Thus, the regional developments threatening Turkey's territorial integrity and national security played a crucial role in the securitization of foreign issues.

Turkish foreign and security policy elites also perceived the EU's pro-Greek attitude regarding the enlargement process as an important factor in the shift of regional balance of powers. In the 1999 joint declaration between Turkish Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş, EU's decision to start accession negotiation talks with Greek Cypriots was severely criticized in the sense that international support encouraged Greece and Greek Cypriots to shift the security and military balance in Mediterranean. In the declaration, two leaders stated:

Because the green light given to the Greek Cypriot side for EU membership has raised expectations on the Greek Cypriot side and encouraged them to pursue a dangerous policy of tension. The Greek Cypriot Administration has been engaged in importing high-technology weapons to South Cyprus; establishing air and navy based for Greece; and openly supporting PKK terrorism against Turkey, in collaboration with Greece. These are unacceptable actions, which escalate tension in the island as well as the region, and place obstacles in the way of any process of negotiations.⁴⁷

⁴⁵For more information on Turkey's declaration, please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Press Release Regarding The S-300 Missiles"

Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/statement-by-the-turkish-ministry-of-foreign-affairs-6-january-1997_en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

⁴⁶For full account on the position of government, please see: Turkish Grand National Assembly, "III. Yılmaz Hükümeti Hükümet Programı" (Government Program of the Third Yılmaz Government". Available at: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP55.htm> (last access: 10 May 2015) (mentioned in Doğan and Asma, 2008; 180)

⁴⁷ For a full account on the joint declaration, please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs "Turkey - TRNC Joint Declaration" July 20, 1999. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey---trnc-joint-declaration-july-20-1999_en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Coupled with the Turkish concerns regarding the so-called “enosis through the back-door of EU”, EU was accused of being the facilitator of Greece’s and Greek Cypriots’ attempts to change regional security balance guaranteed by 1960 treaties. Therefore increasing involvement of the EU in the Cyprus question and the changing regional and domestic security environment of Turkey added new dimensions in the Turkish political and state elites’ assessment of Turkey-EU relations.

The expected value of EU involvement in Cyprus conflict in 1990s driven by the notion that Turkey’s increasing interest and willingness to integrate with Europe would be a political instrument to de-securitize Turkish statist elites’ Cyprus policy seemed to be catalyst of an opposite condition. Hannay pointed out “while it was possible to hope that it would act as a catalyst towards a comprehensive settlement, it was equally feared that it would lead towards the definitive partition of the island” (2005, 49). Turkish state elites were quite determined to separate Turkey’s Europeanization process and the Cyprus conflict which has been projected as the “national cause” in which vital security and defense interests of Turkey were questioned. Therefore Cyprus’ integration with EU triggered a reverse and unexpected –for Greek part– process that led Turkish political elites to integrate with Turkish Cypriots. As a response to the EU’s opinion on Cyprus’s eligibility for membership, there issued a joint declaration between Turkish Cypriots and Turkey in 1995. Declaration reiterated that Turkey continued to perceive TRNC as the sovereign and independent state and that

following a political settlement “the federal Cyprus can join the EU only simultaneously with Turkey's accession”.⁴⁸ Declaration also proposed intense relations and cooperation between Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community – TRNC- in the issues of education, science, technology and culture (ibid).

With this respect, 1997 Luxembourg Summit decisions constituted a critical juncture in Turkish-EU relations which were seriously damaged as a result of the rejection of Turkey's official membership status by EU and Cyprus's inclusion to the next EU enlargement (Eralp, 2000: 20). Eralp suggests “the decisions of the Luxembourg Summit gave Turkey a special status with a long lead time to full membership... The critical word for Turkey was “the candidate”: eleven countries, including Cyprus were characterized as candidates and Turkey was not” (2000: 20). These Luxembourg Summit decisions triggered again the rise of “anchor-credibility dilemma” as the leading psychology of Turkish political elites (Uğur, 1999). In addition to this, since 1994 the EU's approach towards Cyprus conflict turned out to be more pro-Greek (Oğuzlu, 2002). The official declaration of Cyprus Republic as the EU candidate despite there was no sign of any peaceful resolution of the conflict; and EU's non-recognition of Turkey as the candidate state resulted with the breakdown of Turkish-EU relations. The Turkish Government announced its decision to suspend political contacts with the European Union, and would no longer discuss Greek-Turkish relations, Cyprus or human rights in line with Turkey's EU accession process (Ker-Lindsey, 2007: 33). EU called another pan-European summit to appease Turkey. Yet Turkey refused to attend (Ker-Lindsey, 2007). In the meanwhile, Luxembourg Summit decisions reinforced

⁴⁸ For more information, please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs “Turkey - TRNC Joint Declaration” December 28, 1995. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey-trnc-joint-declaration-december-28_-1995.en.mfa

Euro-skeptical tendencies, which dated back to the EU's rejection of Turkey's full membership in 1987, at both political and societal levels (Eralp, 2000). Upon 1997 Luxembourg decisions, Turkey adopted a new strategy which was reactive and coercive in the sense that it was structured on the idea that any attempt of the Greek Cypriots to unite with EU would be responded with a political integration between Turkey and TRNC (Apakan, Ertuğrul. December 30, 2014, Interview with the Author). As a component of this strategy, a joint declaration between Turkey and TRNC was presented. In 1997 when it was obvious that EU would declare Cyprus as the candidate state in the first enlargement wave, Demirel and Denktaş declared a joint statement underlined "each step the Greek Cypriot administration of Southern Cyprus takes on the road to EU membership, on the basis of its unilateral application in contravention of international law, will accelerate the integration process between Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus."⁴⁹ The 1997 joint declaration between Turkey and TRNC was another greatest case in point illustrating the reality of this potential backward effect of EU involvement.

Moreover Luxembourg summit decisions facilitated the intense rapprochement between Turkish and Turkish Cypriot nationalist- statist circles (Kızılyürek, 2010: 189- 190). In each and every international platform, Turkish officials declared their full and strong support for Denktaş and his formula for a permanent peace –namely the proposal of confederation- and marginalized Turkish Cypriot opposition criticizing Denktaş and his solution formula. Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a press

⁴⁹ For more information, please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Turkey- TRNC Joint Statement" July 4, 1997. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey--trnc-joint-statement-july-4_-1997.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

release expressing its unconditional and full support for Denktaş's confederation formula and declared the existence of two equal, sovereign states representing two people of the island. To Ankara a settlement in Cyprus ought to be achieved by the two states not by the third parties and the regional balance between Turkey and Greece ought to be observed and maintained.⁵⁰ The mentioned support for the confederation proposal was quite significant in the sense that Turkey and Denktaş were introducing new parameters regarding the solution model for the future of Cyprus. The difference over Greek and Turkish sides' proposals for the structure of the future Cypriot state was the constant feature of the future inter-communal talks (Hannay, 2005: 29). The source of this division between two sides is the matter of political equality and sovereignty. Greek Cypriot authorities who were inflexibly supported the model of a unitary state, switched their position by favoring of a bi-zonal and bi-communal federation (Kızılyürek, 2009). Despite the Greek Cypriots switch from unitary state to the federative state, post-1983 developments clarified that Rauf Denktaş was no more in favor of a federal structure (Kızılyürek, 2009, 73-76). Declaration of the TRNC which was outlawed by UNSG resolution 541 was associated as a further step for the declaration of independence. Denktaş's early attempt to set new parameters apart from the federal solution was touched upon by UNSG Perez de Cuéllar in his report to UN Security Council:

Mr. Denktaş, stated that the term "communities" be used in a manner that is synonymous with the term "peoples", each having the right to "self-determination". Mr. Denktaş also proposed certain other terms for the word "communities". In the context of the inter-communal talks the introduction of terminology that is different from that used by the Security Council has thus posed more than a semantic problem (UN Security Council-S/21183, March 8, 1990).

⁵⁰ For more information, please see: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Press Release on G-8; Joint Declaration which refers to the Cyprus issue" June 21, 1999. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/press-release-on-g-8_-joint-declaration-which-refers-to-the-cyprus-issue_br_june-21_-1999.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Following this assessment, he pointed out that such kind of a shift in terminology would jeopardize the negotiation attempts based on set parameters determined by UNSC resolutions. At this point Hannay (2005) underlines that in the vocabulary of the Cyprus conflict “federal” refers to a single recognized state assigning high level of autonomy to two constituent states, whereas “confederative” signify two recognized states having extensive autonomy on many issues except a few areas like foreign and security policy. In many aspects, this model was associated with a “loosely centralized federation” (Oğuzlu, 2002) composed by two states as was the case in Switzerland (Milliyet, March 3, 1993). The proposed Switzerland model was carried out in 1998 when Denktaş presented his “call for peace: proposal for a lasting solution in Cyprus” in the press conference whose guest of honor was the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs –İsmail Cem- who expressed that his presence at the conference was an expression of the Turkish government’s support and trust for Denktaş.

Parallel to Denktaş’s statement, for the first time in Turkish politics, minority government formed by Democratic Left Party (DLP), Motherland Party (MP) and True Path Party (TPP) declared in the government program that a confederative solution would be the only realist and constructive formula for the peace in Cyprus (Doğan and Asma, 2008: 180). The government program held “it is an undeniable fact that there exist two states in Cyprus... This reality sooner or later will be recognized. Therefore, the con-federation proposal the President of the TRNC, Rauf Denktaş, has been stressing is very suitable, and it is supported by the government (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Government Program of the Fourth Ecevit Government)” (Doğan and Asma, 2008).

The themes of national and fraternal ties between Turkey and TRNC have been over-emphasized especially after the electoral success of Nationalist Action Party (NAP). NAP – the second major partner of tripartite coalition government composed of DLP, NAP and MP- manifested in its party program that “NAP considers the EU’s approach to also Greek Cypriots as one sided, coercive and unacceptable. The EU administration, must abandon its policies with regard to Turkey that have started to become antagonistic” (Doğan and Asma, 2008: 181). Moreover the electoral success of Bülent Ecevit who was known as the “Conqueror of Cyprus”⁵¹ rounded up the nationalist circle. As Yılmaz pointed out the most crucial developments in Turkish socio-political life during 1990s, was the politicization of identities, competing nationalisms and life styles (2011: 182-183). At this political environment, in which the Turkish nationalist discourse raised its volume and the political parties with nationalist outlooks had electoral success, the image of Denktaş as the “leader dear to the Turkish world” (Kızılyürek, *ibid*) and Turkey’s traditional “Cyprus question was solved in 1974” (Çongar, November 27, 2000) policy was re-visited by political and state elites.

3.2.4 Conclusion

Students of accession Europeanization are mainly concerned with “conditionality-based” models suggesting the centrality of positive political conditionality as the ultimate trigger of domestic changes (Grabbe, 2002: 256). On the hand, to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier this strategy of progress with rewards is not the sufficient

⁵¹ Since Bülent Ecevit was the Prime Minister during Turkey’s 1974 military intervention in Cyprus, he was given the name “Conqueror of Cyprus”.

criteria for the domestic change. Rather it is a longitudinal cost-benefit balancing process dependent on “(i) the determinacy of conditions, (ii) the size and speed of rewards, (iii) the credibility of threats and promises, and (iv) the size of adoption cost” (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004: 672). That is to say, the power of adaptation pressures to cause a domestic change is dependent on the external and internal incentives, cost-benefit calculations and the mutual trust between Union and the candidate state. To put it differently “EU conditionality has been particularly effective when the EU offered a credible membership incentive and when incumbent governments did not consider the domestic costs of compliance threatening to their hold on power” (Epstein and Sedelmeier, 2008: 795). In other words, EU integration is treated as an open-ended process that depends on both top-down adaptation pressures and bottom-up institutional settings and domestic bargaining. Under these circumstances success or failure of Europeanization processes are explained by the effectiveness of intervening variables. Bearing this in mind, the premises of incentive-based approaches that considers the role of both character of conditionality and the incentives and systemic political concerns of local actors.

With the Cyprus’s EU membership application the Cyprus question became an internal matter of EU. The Greek and Greek Cypriot leaders were aiming at to lead an indirect policy change in Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus under the EU membership pressures. Despite the calculations on EU’s involvement’s possible positive effects on Turkey’s Cyprus policy, EU followed a pro-Greek path and excluded Turkey from its enlargement agenda. While EU’s negative conditionality was in progress regarding its relations with Turkey, dramatic changes were occurring in Turkish domestic life. In late 1980s and early 1990s, Özal era witnessed a paradigm shift in Turkish foreign

policy which was largely associated with the domestic political and socio-economic developments in Turkey (Kirişçi, 2006; Uzgel, 2004). For the growing İstanbul-based private business sector, integration of Turkish economy with the West –EC- constituted the top priority. Thus a future EC membership would provide long-run guarantees for their sectorial interests. Özal era witnessed a close relationship and dialogue between those reformist groups that perceived the status quo in Cyprus and Greek attempts to Europeanize conflict would jeopardize economic interests. Failure of Özal's individual initiatives to ensure a long-lasting peace in Cyprus proved that economy-based foreign policy approach could not be fruitful before overthrowing statist reflects and actors. However, EC's negative conditionality regarding Turkey's application for full membership did not produce positive conditions for the pro-reform forces. The civil and military bureaucracy's harsh criticisms against Özal's Cyprus policy also illustrated that for the pro-reform forces the size and speed of rewards and the credibility of promises offered by EU was extending the possible opportunity costs of domestic change. In late 1990s, the dominant perception among Turkish foreign and security policy executives regarding the EU's involvement in the Cyprus question was based the idea that the Union failed to treat Turkey's accession process with an unbiased and inclusionary approach. Under these circumstances, EU pressures to lead the Europeanization of Turkey's discourse on Cyprus produced the adverse effect. Accompanied by the increasing regional and domestic security concerns, the role and influence of civil-military bureaucracy who followed a security-based foreign policy agenda become prominent. In the last analysis, in 1990s, neither EU conditionality nor internal incentives were strong enough to Europeanize Turkey's policy towards Cyprus.

In 1990s, security- oriented approaches towards the Cyprus conflict were owned by the period's coalition governments. This development caused the rise of traditionalist and nationalist political parties in the general elections and the rise of securitized nationalist discourse supported by pragmatist politicians who aimed to increase their electoral success. As opposed to this wave of securitization, EU perspective on Cyprus conflict was quite political and de-securitized. As Diez pointed out what sharpens the cleavages within the Turkey- EU- Cyprus triangle on Cyprus conflict is the clashing cultures and approaches. The source of cleavage is the existence of "...The Union as a polity that incorporates many postmodern features and the Cyprus conflict as being dominated by predominantly modern struggles" (2002: 10). While EU politicizes and de-centralizes the Cyprus conflict as a matter that should be discussed within the context of daily politics from a post-Westphalian perception; both Turkish and Greek parts handle the issue from a securitized, centralized and nationalized- Westphalian perspectives. Therefore during 1990s, Turkish policy-makers by declaring their commitment to the Westernization and democratization, they also expressed their distrust to West when the discussed issues were on Turkey's national security and vital interests.

CHAPTER IV

TURKEY'S EU MEMBERSHIP ASPIRATIONS AND CYPRUS DISPUTE (2002-2004)

1999 Helsinki European Council decisions on Turkey's candidacy injected a new life into Turkey's EU aspirations. For many pro-EU groups including civil society associations, political parties and bureaucratic elites, possibility to achieve Turkey's long-run aspiration for EU membership became concrete with EU's decision on Turkey's EU candidacy (Öniş, 2007). Having a concrete membership perspective, Ankara prompted a remarkable reform process in many issues. External incentives supported by active EU conditionality mechanism turned out to be effective and the Turkish government adopted EU harmonization packages regarding highly sensitive political issues including abolition of death penalty in times of peace, non-Muslim minorities' religious property rights, broadcasting languages other than Turkish and critical steps towards the normalization of civil-military relations (Özbudun and Yazıcı, 2004; Heper, 2005; Kubicek, 2005; Müftüler-Baç, 2005; Ulusoy, 2007, 2009). Furthermore, introduction of the EU harmonization packages by a politically fragmented and polarized coalition government (Kalaycıoğlu, 2013: 64) illustrated that despite the sharp

ideological difference among political elites of the ruling coalition, there was a relatively high support for the deepening of relations between Turkey and EU. On 7 June 2002 with leaders of most political parties represented in Parliament, President Ahmet Necdet Sezer conveyed an ad hoc summit on Turkey's future in EU. At the end of the summit, a declaration confirming that EU membership was a common objective for the political parties represented the domestic ownership of the Turkey's EU membership which would be for the best interest of country (Milliyet, June 8, 2002). With no doubt, national consensus on cementing ties between Turkey and EU through political and economic reforms to comply with EU accession strengthened the notion that Turkey's EU membership was a "national cause".

Although Turkey's potential EU membership was on the table, as Helsinki European Council conclusions indicated Turkey's active support for the ongoing peace talks in Cyprus was an important variable in EU's assessments on Turkey's progress towards the EU. Thus in late 2001 inevitability of the Cyprus's EU access, Greece's threat to vote eastern enlargement without the Cyprus's integration and the strong international leverage on Turkey to reformulate its Cyprus policy enforced Ankara and Nicosia to reconsider its Cyprus strategy (Tocci, 2003: 2000). It was obvious that Cyprus would be an EU member state in the next round of EU enlargement and Ankara's strategy to persuade EU to accept Turkey's position that Turkey's EU membership and Cyprus conflict were two different issues and Cypriot accession ought to be postponed pending on a viable and just settlement bore no fruits. In the light of these, in late 2001, Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership who were accused by blocking the process and delaying the peace settlement before the end of Cyprus's EU membership negotiations took a new step to revitalize direct negotiations for peaceful settlement of the Cyprus

question (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author). In November 2001, Denktaş invited Clerides to face-to-face meetings without any preconditions (UNSC- S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). An agreement was reached to resume the negotiation talks starting in January 2002 and two leaders agreed on all issues would be on the table; nothing would be agreed until everything was agreed; parties would continue to negotiate until a comprehensive settlement was reached (Council of Europe- Addendum to CM/Del/Dec(2001)776, December 6, 2001). The meetings continued until mid-February 2002 without reaching common grounds on the discussed issues including territory, sovereignty, governance and security. On 14 May 2002, Annan visited two parties and expressed his belief that there would be a significant progress until the end of June (UNSC- S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). At this point, the UN timetable to reach a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus question was attached to the delicate EU enlargement agenda and the ultimate objective of the early 2002 talks was to reach a settlement “before or at the Copenhagen European Council on 12-13 December 2002” (Tocci, 2003: 199).

However some interpreted Denktaş’s decision to move on direct talks without preconditions as a diplomatic tactic to control the process through delaying the accession of the Greek Cypriots. Tocci claims that Turkish side might have reactively responded to the developments by hoping that “if European leaders appreciated that Cyprus’ membership would have interrupted inter-communal talks, they could, accounting for “all relevant factors,” postpone Cyprus’s accession” (2003: 200). In line with this argument, Ker-Lindsay, reporting from his discussions with various diplomats, argues that despite the shadows over Denktaş’s move to restart process “it was a genuine effort that was driven by changes in Turkish politics following economic crises

that created internal and external pressures to solve the Cyprus issue” (2009: 223). Apart from discussion on whether Turkish side’s attempts to revitalize failed UN process in late 2001 were sincere or tactical; the change in Turkey’s and Denktaş’s position signifies that the early and immature seeds of a policy change were spread before JDP era.

Turkish side’s diplomatic maneuver to balance the international pressures and EU-level developments responded positively by the EU and in June 2002 Seville European Council Turkey’s prospect to start accession negotiations with EU was supported. Regarding the next phase of Turkey’s candidature, EU Council stated “new decisions could be taken in Copenhagen ... in the light of developments in the situation between the Seville and Copenhagen European Councils, on the basis of the regular report to be submitted by the Commission in October 2002” (Seville European Council, June 12-13, 2002). Seville Council decisions thus opened the door slightly for Turkey to start accession negotiations yet Council also highlighted that this was not an automatic process.

With regard to the Cyprus’s EU aspirations, Council declared “in respect of the accession of Cyprus, the Helsinki conclusions are the basis of the European Union’s position” (Seville European Council, June 12-13, 2002). Thus Council reaffirmed that if the progress in negotiations and reforms was maintained, the Union was determined to conclude the negotiations with Cyprus, by the end of 2002, along with other nine candidate states. More importantly, Council announced its preliminary timeline regarding those candidate states as the spring of 2003, Treaty of Accession would be signed with the objective that those to be members would be able to participate in the

elections for European Parliament in 2004. Thus it was once more confirmed that Cyprus would become a full member regardless of the political settlement in Cyprus and the preferred date for the settlement to be concluded in Cyprus was announced as the end of accession negotiations in December 2002. Therefore in the autumn of 2002, it was obvious that as the Helsinki European Council conclusions indicated Cyprus's EU accession was inevitable and Ankara's long-run strategy to persuade EU to accept Turkey's position that Turkey's EU membership and Cyprus conflict were two different issues and Cypriot accession ought to be postponed pending on a viable and just settlement bore no fruits. Regarding Turkey's Cyprus strategy, Tocci argues "Turkish establishment did not believe that the EU would accept a divided island into its fold... Many in Ankara failed to appreciate that, by 1999, the European choice was not between Turkey and the Cyprus, but rather between Turkey and the fifth enlargement" (2007: 46). With respect to this Seville European Council decisions gave a clear message to Ankara and Nicosia that eastern enlargement was the short-run priority of the Union and any attempts by Turkey to block or delay this process would not be constructive for Turkey's EU membership aspirations.

Council also underlined its preferred position concerning the structure of the reunified future Cyprus state. The emphasis on "to speak with a single voice" suggested that the resolution process should provide a long lasting peace that would enable Cyprus to act like a single political entity –federation- as it was the case for EU member states. Last but not least, EU's strong support for the UN Secretary General's initiative strengthened the good offices mission of Kofi Annan (Hoffmeister, 2006: 114). Following European Council conclusions De Soto briefed UN Security Council on 9 July

2002 concerning the direct talks in Cyprus between two parties. Following this briefing, the members of the UN Security Council “welcomed the support given to the talks and the Secretary General’s efforts by the heads of State and government of the EU meeting in Seville on 21-22 June (UNSC- SC/7444, July 9, 2002). It was clear that the EU was the most crucial party with its strong position to offer incentives to overcome the status quo in the island (Yakinthou, 2009:126). Members of UN Security Council also expressed their disappointment that despite Secretary General and his Special Representative on Cyprus de Soto’s constructive efforts, progress remained unacceptably slow and the June target date for agreement had not been met. In this regard, they pointed out that the Turkish Cypriot leadership was to a large extent responsible for the delay with its less constructive approach during the talks (UNSC- SC/7444, July 9, 2002). Coupled with the June 2002 Seville European Council declaration, UN Security Council press statement indicated the intense international pressures on Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. In response to the press statement, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated Turkish government’s disappointments regarding the “statement attributing responsibility to one side” which could not be considered as reflecting the facts (Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, July 12, 2002). Statement also included Turkish government’s expectations from the third parties to treat two sides equally and to refrain from the partial assessments.

In October 2002, EU Commission published 2002 regular report on Turkey’s progress. Commission reported that despite the dense timetable, there was no tangible progress to reach a settlement on the Cyprus problem before the end of 2002. With respect to Turkey’s role in the UN process Commission declared “the EU, in line with statements issued by the UN Security Council, has emphasized the need for Turkey to

take further steps to encourage the Turkish Cypriot leadership to work towards reaching a settlement before the end of accession negotiations”. Thus it was obvious that on the eve of December 2002 Copenhagen Council, Turkish side’s reluctance to follow a proactive Cyprus policy “would be extremely high for both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots since it was evident that Greek Cypriot side guaranteed its EU membership” (Birand, December 12, 2002).

Enforced by the UN and EU reports, Annan started a new initiative to accelerate the process and he held meetings with two parties in Paris on 6 September 2002 and in New York on 3-4 October 2002. In a press statement after two days of negotiations, Annan announced that the two leaders agreed to approach core issues pragmatically and they decided to establish bi-lateral technical committees with the pursuit of making recommendations on technical matters including the treaties and laws of future common state, the referendum (UN Secretary General- SG/SM/8414, October 4, 2002). While Greek Cypriot side appointed the members of the technical committees, Turkish side delayed in doing so because of Denktaş’s heart surgery in New York after the talks. On 11 November 2002, to catch up with the delicate agenda, Annan presented his plan named “Basis for Agreement on a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem” (UNSC- S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). The plan proposed that with the assistance of UN, the two leaders would sign a document confirming that they committed themselves to finalize negotiations for the “Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem” by 28 February 2003 and after revision process final version of the plan would be submitted to the separate referenda on 30 March 2003. Annan stated “this would have allowed a new state of affairs to come into being and re-united Cyprus to sign the Treaty of Accession to the European Union on 16 April 2003” (UNSC-

S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). Secretary General asked two parties to take their reaction in a week. On 18 November 2002, backed by Greece, Clerides expressed his readiness to start negotiations without delay on the basis of the UN document (Athens News Agency, November 18, 2002). However the situation in Ankara and Nicosia was quite complicated to take an immediate reaction due to Denktaş's health conditions after his heart surgery and the changeover in Turkish government after 2002 general elections (Milliyet, November 19, 2002).

In December 2002 Copenhagen Summit, European Council announced the conclusion of accession negotiations with ten EU candidates including Cyprus. Cyprus's EU membership in the next enlargement was obvious. However, it was not clear whether the island would be an EU member as a divided or a unified Cyprus. The accession of a divided Cyprus with the EU would deepen the existing status quo as well as it would seriously damage Turkey's future in the EU (Clerides, 2008: 241). Towards the end of 2002, it was obvious that Ankara's strategy and threatening EU with unification with TRNC to hinder or delay Cypriot accession until a just and long-lasting solution in Cyprus and Turkish diplomats' endeavors to persuade European governments that there was no linkage between Turkey's EU membership and the settlement of Cyprus dispute gave no results and Ankara had to adopt a fresh Cyprus strategy to secure its EU accession process.

At this critical juncture, On 3 November 2002, a young political party, Justice and Development Party (JDP) won parliamentary elections and formed the majority government. The newly elected Turkish government was on the fence about the two equally significant "national causes" –Turkey's EU membership and Cyprus issue-.

When JDP declared its determination to persuade EU to start the accession negotiations with Turkey, Cyprus's EU accession process emerged as the significant game changer at work that made a pressure on Turkish government to take courageous steps for the settlement of Cyprus conflict before the Cyprus's EU accession. Therefore Cyprus conflict was the first and foremost test case for measuring JDP's commitment for the Turkey's EU membership.

4.1. The Rise of Justice and Development Party and Cyprus Conflict

On 3 November 2002, a relatively young political party, Justice and Development Party (JDP) won parliamentary elections and formed a majority government. Many of the founders of JDP were the former members of Islamist political parties – Welfare Party (WP) and its successor Virtue Party (VP) - which were both closed by the rulings of Turkish Constitutional Court for violating the Turkey's secular state structure. After the banning of VP, a group of party members including Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, a businessman and the former mayor of Istanbul, Abdullah Gül and Bülent Arınç, veteran members of parliament since 1990s, started a new initiative by founding JDP. “Adroitly downplaying the JDP's Islamist roots, Erdoğan and Gül positioned the party as a moderate, reformist, business oriented party of center right” (Bahcheli and Noel, 2009: 237).

During election campaigns party elites declared their commitment for Turkey's EU membership and the party established itself as a vibrant supporter of EU harmoni-

zation reforms which were projected as the important components of Turkey's modernization and democratization (Öniş, 2007)⁵². A significant amount of party's 2002 election manifest was reserved for Turkish foreign policy and Turkey's EU membership bid. It was declared that Turkey under JDP rule would fulfill its commitments to meet Copenhagen criteria and "Turkey's agenda would not be occupied by the artificial problems" (Justice and Development Party, 2002: 92). For the newly elected government getting a date to start EU accession negotiations in 2002 European Copenhagen Council was the primary foreign policy goal. Party leaders also expressed that government would welcome any positive signal that would cement Turkey's EU membership perspective. Even if Turkey could not get a date for accession negotiations in Copenhagen European Council government would not make any concessions with respect to its political and economic agenda to comply with EU standards (Milliyet, November 21, 2002). In the early days of Gül government, party leader Erdoğan conducted visits to the EU member states' capitals and lobbied to get an accession date prior to 2002 Copenhagen European Council.

Yet, apart from political conditionality, Turkish government's attitude towards the UN Secretary-General's peace-building efforts would be influential in EU's final assessments with respect to the Turkey's and Cyprus's EU membership. In other words, the positive response of Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership regarding the Secretary-General's comprehensive plan for the solution of Cyprus dispute would be the "relevant factor" in advance (Bahcheli, 2006; Sözen, 2013). JDP's coming to power has led to a rhetorical change in Ankara's attitude towards UN sponsored peace

⁵² For more information about party's founding principles please see: AK Parti (Justice and Development Party). 2002. Parti Tüzüğü (Party Covenant) and AK Parti (Justice and Development Party). 2002. *Seçim Beyannamesi: Herşey Türkiye için (Election Manifest: Everything is for Turkey)*

process (Kaliber, 2003, 2005; Sözen, 2013). “The AKP government appeared favorable to an early settlement that both protected Turkish and Turkish Cypriot needs and interests and re-moved an important obstacle in Turkey's EU path” (Tocci, 2003: 202). JDP founders occasionally gave the message that their approach towards the Cyprus settlement was flexible and constructive. The early glimpse of this flexible approach was evident in the election declaration of the JDP government for November 2002 elections.

Our party believes that the Cyprus question should be resolved by all means. Undoubtedly, the existence, identity and the right of self-determination of the Turkish people living in the island can never be ruled out in the final solution. The establishment of a sovereign state based on two communities just like the Belgian model, is for the benefit of both sides. The accession of the Greek Cypriot to the EU without a peaceful resolution of the conflict would complicate the issue (Justice and Development Party, 2002: 92).

Opposed to Turkish side’s confederative solution thesis, party leaders expressed their support for a federal solution as it was the case in Belgium. Upon UN Secretary-General’s draft plan, Erdoğan stated “there is a climate of hope. There should not be any bias; (the plan) should be negotiated. Negotiations will continue but this does not mean that we will disregard our interests in return of a peace settlement”.⁵³ Furthermore, Gül stated that a concrete date for Turkey to start accession negotiations would facilitate the UN process in Cyprus (Tocci, 2003: 203). The denied link between Turkey’s EU accession and the Ankara’s support for the UN peace settlement process was first acknowledged and expressed by the top of the ruling party.

⁵³ Please see: “Erdoğan: Umut Havası Oluştı” (Erdoğan: a climate of hope has emerged), *Milliyet*, 14 November 2002; “BM’nin Kıbrıs Planı Müzakere Edilebilir” (UN’s Plan for Cyprus might be negotiated), *Milliyet*, 17 November 2002; “Erdoğan: Başımızı Kumdan Çıkaralım” (Erdoğan: Let’s take out our heads from the sand), *Milliyet*, 21 November 2002.

On the other hand the situation in Ankara and Northern Cyprus was quite complicated to take an immediate reaction. Coupled with the required transition period for the newly elected political party's formation of the government, Denktaş's convalescence following his heart surgery resulted with a delay of nine days (Milliyet, November 19, 2002). Furthermore, at the top of the Turkish state, there was a clear and visible division with respect to the certain provisions of the Annan plan. Minister of Foreign Affairs Şükrü Sina Gürel who was about to leave his office, Chief of Turkish Armed Forces Hilmi Özkök, the President of Turkish Republic Ahmet Necdet Sezer and the President of TRNC Rauf Denktaş occasionally declared that despite the plan mentioned the existence of "two equal" people in the island, provisions with respect to the territorial adjustments and the attached map would not meet the realities of the island.⁵⁴ On 27 November 2002, Turkish Cypriot side declared its acceptance of the Annan plan as the basis for further negotiations while the administration also clarified that certain provisions of the plan constituted the source of serious concerns and reservations (Milliyet, November 28, 2002). Based on Greek and Turkish sides' reservations, on 10 December 2002 Alvaro de Soto presented a revised version of the plan with an accompanying letter, signed by Secretary General Annan who asked the two parties to react instantly considering the pending European Council Copenhagen Summit (Hürriyet Daily News, December 11, 2002). Additionally he "invited the two leaders to Copenhagen on 12-13 December in the hope of achieving agreement before the European Council took decisions regarding enlargement" (UNSC- S/2003/398, April

⁵⁴ For a few articles on the topic, please see: "Orgeneral Özkök'ten KKTC'ye Güvence" (Guarante from General Özkök to TRNC), Milliyet, 15 November 2002; "KKTC'ye Destek Resepsiyonu" (Reception to support TRNC), Milliyet, 16 November 2002.

1, 2003). Denktaş rejected the invitation and sent a representative -Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu (Minister of Defense and Foreign Affairs of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus).

In December 2002, European Copenhagen Council declared that together with other nine candidate countries Republic of Cyprus concluded accession negotiations with EU and the country will be an EU member state on 1 May 2004 without the solution of the Cyprus conflict being a precondition (Copenhagen European Council, December 12-13, 2002). Regarding Turkey's progress towards EU membership, Council welcomed the determination of the new Turkish government to take further steps to fulfill Copenhagen criteria. However, rather than offering an early date for the start of accession negotiations, Council stated "if the European Council in December 2004, on the basis of a report and a recommendation from the Commission, decides that Turkey fulfills the Copenhagen political criteria, the European Union will open accession negotiations with Turkey without delay" (Copenhagen European Council, December 12-13, 2002). Turkey could not get the date for the commencement of its accession negotiations with EU. Despite intense diplomatic contacts and lobbying, even the second best option for Ankara -to get a date for the date to start accession negotiations- could not be achieved. Moreover, "EU institutions waved their stick at Ankara by lifting conditionality on the Greek Cypriot side and thus opening the prospect of Cyprus's accession as a divided island" (Tocci, 2007: 45). With this respect, EU totally renounced its leverage on Greek Cypriot side to force Greek side to sincerely own and actively support a settlement in Cyprus (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30, 2014, Interview with the Author).

Although European Council officially guaranteed Cyprus's EU membership, it also reaffirmed EU's strong preference for accession by a re-united Cyprus. Concerning the Cyprus settlement, Council stated:

The European Council confirmed its strong preference for accession to the European Union by a united Cyprus. In this context it welcomes the commitment of the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots to continue to negotiate with the objective of concluding a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem by 28 February 2003 on the basis of the UNSG's proposals (Copenhagen European Council, December 12-13, 2002).

On the Turkish Cypriot community's further progress towards EU, it was stated "the European Council has decided that, in the absence of a settlement, the application of the *acquis* to the northern part of the island shall be suspended, until the Council decides unanimously otherwise, on the basis of a proposal by the Commission" (Copenhagen European Council, December 12-13, 2002). Although EU expressed its determination to integrate with a unified Cyprus it was obvious that the delicate EU enlargement agenda, "in which the security, stability and well-being of Europe as a whole was involved"⁵⁵ as Prodi emphasized in his 2001 speech delivered at Nicosia, would never be endangered due to the situation in Cyprus. In the meanwhile the path towards EU membership for the Turkish Cypriot community was strongly related with the Turkish Cypriot leadership's constructive and active attitude towards the ongoing UN mediation.

Ambiguous attitude of Turkish side in Copenhagen had serious consequences for Turkey's EU membership process as well as for the settlement of Cyprus conflict. As David Hannay reported Turkey's attitude towards the Annan plan and settlement

⁵⁵ Please see: European Commission, Press Release Database, "Romano Prodi, Speech to the House of Representatives", 25 October 2001.

of Cyprus issue offered a significant justification for Turko-sceptics presidents of Germany and France who preferred a slower timetable and less commitment regarding the accession of Turkey (Hannay, 2005: 193-195). Moreover EU's decision to accept Cyprus despite the ongoing conflict was a success story for the Greek Cypriots in the sense that Greek Cypriot team in Copenhagen continued their strategy based on the flexibility during the negotiation talks (Clerides, 2008). Copenhagen decisions at the same time indicated the image of two sides in the eyes of international community (Hannay, 2005). While Greek Cypriot side preserved their moral and psychological superiority through their flexible diplomacy, Turkey's and Turkish Cypriot leadership's official position were portrayed as "intransigent". The EU's and UN's assessments on Turkish side as the intransigent parties strengthened the position of Greek Cypriot side which advocated asymmetrical usage of the EU leverage on Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership through the stick of Cyprus question before Turkey's EU membership (Tocci, 2007).

Copenhagen Council decisions reiterated the Union's commitment in 1999 Helsinki Summit conclusion that the solution of the Cyprus conflict was not a precondition for Cyprus's EU accession which was a part of Union's eastern expansion. Former Turkish diplomat and Minister of Foreign Affairs İltan Türkmen (Hürriyet, December 21, 2002) pointed out that the final decision on the Cyprus's EU membership was the clear evidence of the failure of Turkey's pre-Copenhagen Cyprus strategy that was based on the illusion that EU would never dare to access with Cyprus in case of no solution. Yet a concrete assessment of the whole process since 1999 Helsinki European Council decisions ought to be read as EU would never dare to risk its historical eastern

enlargement due to the Greece's threat that any deadlock in Cyprus's EU accession would be answered by Greek veto against the eastern enlargement.

At this juncture, Secretary-General Annan proposed a three-track negotiation framework composed of the trails of resumption of negotiations between leaders. As a result of the three-track negotiations process, Annan presented the third version of the "Basis for a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem" (Milliyet, February 27, 2003). Annan proposed that the leaders would put plan to the separate referenda on 30 March 2003 by signing a two-page "commitment to submit to foundation agreement to separate simultaneous referenda in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem" (UNSC- S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). He also invited two leaders to The Hague on 10 March to inform him regarding their preparedness to sign a commitment.

Under these political conditions JDP government had to formulate a new Cyprus policy that would compensate the previous governments' reactive policies denying the linkage between Turkey's EU membership and the resolution of Cyprus question at the level of intergovernmental bargaining with the Union. Considering the mentioned linkage, in post-Copenhagen era JDP government paid special efforts to encourage Denktaş to actively support UN process and accept Annan plan as the reference point for further negotiations (Ulusoy, 2008).⁵⁶ Yet, due to the harsh internal debates on the drawbacks and acquisitions of the UN plan and the strong reservations of veto players including Denktaş, Turkish Military, Republican People's Party (RPP) -opposition party in the parliament- and Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer, discouraged the

⁵⁶ This point was also mentioned in the author's interviews with the interviewees from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

newly established government to take immediate reaction. In the early periods of JDP government, Cyprus conflict emerged as a policy field which was hitched by the conflicting poles of domestic politics who asserted that stepping back from 1990s “two state” policy in return of EU’s dubious commitment for Turkey’s EU accession and the ones who advocated the necessity to revise Turkey’s Cyprus strategy in the context of Turkey’s prospective EU membership (Ulusoy, 2008: 314).⁵⁷

Additionally pre-Hague debates indicated the evolving tension between the government and Denktaş who was backed by the previous governments as the fearless defender of the Turkey’s and Turkish Cypriots’ interests. Upon Denktaş’s declaration that he would resign if Turkey and Turkish Cypriot people force him to sign current plan (Kıbrıs, December 30, 2002), Erdoğan, the chairman of successor JDP and the prime minister to be, said in a local TV channel

I am not in favor of continuing the policy that has been implemented in Cyprus for at least 30-40 years. This issue is not Mr. Denktaş’s personal issue. Mr. Denktaş is saying that the plan is negotiable but that he does not trust the other side. Here we will leave the issue of trust aside. Since we believe that this plan is negotiable, then we will negotiate (Hürriyet, January 2, 2003).

Erdoğan also urged Denktaş to observe the massive demonstrations performed in Nicosia with the participation of 30,000 Turkish Cypriots branding Denktaş as an obstacle for peaceful settlement, urging him to quit or open the way for peace with Greek Cypriot community and Northern Cyprus’s integration with the EU (Hürriyet, January 2, 2003). Erdoğan’s reference to the pro-solution protests organized by “This Country is ours” platform, which advocated the reunification of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots under the EU membership umbrella, was the sign of a shift in Turkey’s long-run policy

⁵⁷ This point was also mentioned in the author’s interviews with the interviewees from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

of supporting actors defending the maintenance of TRNC or confederative solution based on two equal states.

In this context government's priority before The Hague summit was to persuade Denktaş not to categorically reject the third version of the UN plan for Cyprus settlement and not to strike an uncompromising attitude (Zengin, 2010: 357-359). Yet despite its parliamentary majority and political position as the single party government, in pre- Hague Summit era JDP could not be able to persuade veto players in Ankara. Following an *ad hoc* Summit on Cyprus in Çankaya, Ankara declared Turkey's and TRNC's reservations with respect to the certain provisions of the current plan and Ankara reiterated its full support for Denktaş who already declared that he would attend The Hague meetings to say no (Güven, March 7, 2003).

The Hague meetings resulted with another disappointment for the UN mission of good offices. UN Secretary-General wrote in his report to the Security Council, dated 1 April 2003, "... It would clearly not be possible to achieve a comprehensive settlement before the signature of the accession treaty to the EU by Cyprus on 16 April 2003... The process had reached the end of the road... however my plan remained on the table" (UNSC- S/2003/398, April 1, 2003). Additionally he announced that the Nicosia office of his Special Adviser was closed. In the aftermath of Hague meetings, in a press statement covering the results of meetings Secretary General pointed out that during the bi-communal talks two parties were not on the same page. He expressed that his suggestion to submit third Annan plan to approval at separate simultaneous referenda before Republic of Cyprus's signing of the Accession Treaty, was answered positively by Greek side. Yet at the final stage Turkish side stated that they were not prepared to put the plan to referendum and Denktaş expressed his belief "that further

negotiations were only likely to be successful if they began from a new starting point and if the parties agreed on basic principles” (UN- SG/SM/8630, March 11, 2003). In the aftermath of The Hague meetings, Denktaş stated “the plan was unacceptable for us. This was not a plan we would ask our people to vote for” (BBC, March 11, 2003). Upon Secretary General’s report, UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1475(2003) expressing its regret that “due to the negative approach of the Turkish Cypriot leader, culminating in the position taken at the 10-11 March 2003 meeting in The Hague, it was not possible to reach agreement to put the plan to simultaneous referenda as suggested by the Secretary-General” (UNSC- Res. 1475(2003), April 14, 2003).

After the Hague meetings the precise content of the Accession Treaty with the Republic of Cyprus became clearer (Hoffmeister, 2006, 129). Since the outcome of the negotiations was not definitive before March 2003, in pre-Hague process Commission transmitted the Council two alternative draft protocols, “namely Draft Protocol A for the case of a settlement and Draft Protocol B for the event of no settlement” (Shaelou, 2010: 178) covering the specific political condition in Cyprus’s accession. Given that the worst case scenario had been reached by March 2003, Draft Protocol B was approved and annexed as Protocol 10 in the Accession Treaty signed on 16 April 2003 in Athens meeting of the Heads of States and governments of the EU (Shaelou, 2010: 178). Protocol 10 of Accession Treaty offered the suspension the implementation of *acquis* in the areas where Republic of Cyprus did not exercise control (Act of Accession with Republic of Cyprus, Protocol I, Appendix I, April 16, 2003).

4.1.1. National Political Context and Turkey's "One Step Ahead Policy"

Beyond the new momentum in Cyprus's integration with the EU, in the post-Hague era the two distracting significant political developments dominated Turkish politics. In the first half of 2003, bargaining on the Turkey's role in America's Iraq intervention and Turkish American relations were at the top of the Turkish government's foreign policy agenda. Turkey's contribution through allowing US troops to use Turkish territory that would be vital for the consolidation of northern front for the early days of US invasion against Saddam Hussein (Hürriyet Daily News, February 2, 2003). In the wake of the discussions about the possible advantages and shortcomings of Turkey's active contributions, Turkish parliament did not approve the resolution allowing the deployment of US troops to open a northern front against Iraq (Hürriyet, March 2, 2003). Following parliament's veto, Turkish-American relations "have gone through rough waters" (Kirişçi, 2006). The state of emergency of the Iraq War and related developments led government to confront with Cyprus issue and Iraq War simultaneously. At the level of domestic politics government's attitude towards Iraq War had become an important component of the domestic debates on Turkish foreign policy. In most debates on the Turkey's Iraq policy JDP government was severely criticized as being negotiating with American authorities without informing Turkish Armed Forces and Turkish Parliament (Hürriyet Daily News, March 2, 2003). In this political context as the EU Commissioner Verheugen stated "Cyprus was the first cas-

uality of looming war in Iraq” (Kannas, March 15, 2003). He continued “the new Turkish Government had initially been “very open and constructive” with regard to efforts to reunify the island, but added that the Iraq crisis had altered Turkish concerns, relegating the Cyprus Problem to a third priority” (Kannas, March 15, 2003). Verheugen’s declaration best indicated why Turkish government could not actively and timely campaign for a solution based on Annan plan in pre-Hague Summit era.

In addition to this, JDP leader Erdoğan’s political situation constituted the major concern for the government under the shadow of the critical development in Turkish foreign policy. On 31 December 2002, President Sezer approved the package of constitution change that cleared the way for the banned leader of ruling JDP, Erdoğan who exercised enormous power and influence behind the scenes since JDP government had been established by the then prime minister Abdullah Gül (Hürriyet Daily News, January 1, 2003). With the presidential approval, Article 76 of 1983 Turkish Constitution, which banned election of the deputies those who have been sentenced to a prison term of one or more years because of “being engaged in ideological or anarchic actions”, was changed. Based on the previous provision of the article, Erdoğan’s march towards Ankara was prevented since his four years of imprisonment for inciting religious hatred by reading a poem in 1997 in Siirt. The amendment changed the provision of “ideological or anarchic actions” into “terror actions” (Hürriyet Daily News, January 1, 2003).

For Erdoğan’s further struggle for power, this amendment made a real change. Based on the Supreme Elections Board’s (YSK) decision to cancel the elections in Southeastern city of Siirt (Hürriyet Daily News, December 3, 2002) elections in Siirt

were renewed. Under these circumstances, Erdoğan declared his candidacy as the deputy of Siirt. Renewed elections changed the parliamentary arithmetic and paved the way for Erdoğan to become deputy of Siirt (Milliyet, March 10, 2003). On 14 March 2003 – on the eve of Cyprus’s signing of Accession Treaty with EU-Erdoğan set up the second JDP government as the Prime Minister and Abdullah Gül, the Prime Minister of the first JDP government became Minister of Foreign Affairs (Hürriyet Daily News, March 15, 2003). The party consolidated its domestic power under Erdoğan’s rule. Therefore in the first half of 2003 due to the heavy agenda in Turkish politics and Turkey’s role in Iraq War the government had to confront with multiple cases of emergency at once and the Cyprus issue fell victim to these developments.

Apart from those national and international constrains, Ankara and Nicosia was under a serious societal pressure.⁵⁸ In the first hand, “Erdoğan government came under strong pressure by all the actors involved in the mediation process, namely the UN intermediaries, the United States, the United Kingdom and the EU, to apply sufficient pressure on Denktaş to negotiate the terms of the UN plan in good faith” (Bahcheli, 2006: 169). In the second hand, Ankara and Denktaş were under the pressure of criticism raised by Turkish and Turkish Cypriot social groups and intellectuals. For example, upon 2002 Copenhagen European Council decisions a group of Turkish intellectuals composed by the veteran journalists and columnists⁵⁹ criticized government not

⁵⁸ This point was highlighted in the author’s interviews with the interviewees from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁵⁹ For a few examples please see: Çandar, Cengiz. December 14, 2002, “Kopenhag: Türkiye’nin Yolu Açık” (Copenhagen: Turkey’s road is open) *Yeni Şafak*; Birand, Mehmet Ali. December 17, 2002 “Kıbrıs’ta Penaltı Golü Yedik” (We concede a penalty goal in Cyprus) *Posta*; Birand, Mehmet Ali. December 18, 2002, “Kıbrıs, Sürekli Karşımıza Çıkacak” (We will continuously confront with Cyprus) *Posta*; Altan, Çetin. December 13, 2002, “Kopenhag Zirvesini Kovboy Filmine Dönüştürdük” (We turned Copenhagen Summit into a western movie) *Milliyet*; Cemal, Hasan. December 13, 2002 “AB’den Olumsuz Karar Çıktı” (EU reached a negative opinion) *Milliyet*.

to take active and courageous steps to change the political stalemate in Cyprus. In addition to the criticism raised by Turkish intellectuals, slackness of Ankara and Nicosia was severely criticized by the prominent figures representing Istanbul-based civil society organizations lobbying for Turkey's membership process both at domestic and international level (İçduygu, 2013: 177). Among them Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association (TUSIAD) was very active in reaching a large audience including various business sectors, parliamentarians, academicians and civil society actors to mobilize support for Turkey's EU membership in Brussels and association also actively forced coalition government to reformulate Turkey's position with respect to Cyprus peace process in the light of the developments in Turkish-EU relations⁶⁰. In late 2001, touching upon the significance of the solution of Cyprus question for Turkey's prospective EU membership, a declaration urging Ankara to actively support UN peace talks was made by TUSIAD's Washington office. In the declaration, TUSIAD highlighted the fact that "the stalemate in Cyprus question serves the interests of Turkey's adversaries within the EU as well as anti-EU groups within Turkey, who aim to exploit the problem to block Turkey's EU membership" (TUSIAD, November 19, 2001). The association took up a firmer position towards Denktaş and Turkish government in post-Copenhagen era. In a speech given by the Chairman of

Güven Erdal. December 20, 2002, "Çözüm Olcaksa Denktaş'a Rağmen Olacak" (If there will be a solution, it will be in spite of Denktaş) *Radikal*.

⁶⁰ To have an indepth information about TUSIAD's attitude towards Cyprus and Turkey-EU relations please see: TUSIAD. *Press Release: Cyprus issue should not harm Turkey's EU membership process*. November 19, 2001: Washington DC. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/basin-bulteni-2001-11.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015); TUSIAD. *Press Release: TUSIAD invites the EU's and Turkish political authorities to adopt a more rational and constructive approach on the Cyprus question*. October 4, 2001: Brussels. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/basin-bulteni-2001-12.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015) TUSIAD. *Speech delivered by the Chairman of the Board of TUSIAD Tuncay Özilhan at the Cyprus's Accession to the EU Conference*. May 4, 2002: Istanbul, Boğaziçi University. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/2002-05-04-TheSpeechDelieveredByTOzilhancyprusAccessionEUConference.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015)

the Board of TUSIAD, Tuncay Özilhan, government was harshly criticized due to its reluctance and ambivalence to take active steps with regard to UN peace process in Cyprus and political and economic reforms that would facilitate to get an accession date to start accession negotiations (Milliyet, January 14, 2003). In another speech upon the interruption of the negotiations in The Hague, Özilhan declared:

We block our way to EU by choosing the deadlock in Cyprus. Thereby we initiated a process which will end with the annexation of Cyprus. We have chosen this way by knowing that this would mean that Turkey would be isolated from the rest of the world. We (TUSIAD) invested in Turkey's future and we will not allow a country isolated from the world (Milliyet, March 27, 2003).

Özilhan's claims reflected the discontent among Euro-supportive camp that urged government to own and actively support Turkey's EU membership process not only by rhetoric but also by the reforms (Öner, 2014; İçduygu, 2011). Yet especially for the business associations Turkey's integration with EU constituted a significant opportunity structure for the compliance with the economic standards and reforms that would annihilate the destructive impacts of the 2001 economic crises (Öniş, 2007: 252) and for the wider economic integration with the free market economy. Having deep interests in Turkey's EU integration process those social actors intensively lobbied to eliminate any deadlock in this process.

Parallel to the developments in Turkish political landscape, societal discontent in TRNC against Denktaş's attitudes in the negotiations reached its highest level in post-Copenhagen era. The EU's enhanced dialogue and relationship with Euro-supportive Turkish Cypriot civil society organizations increased the EU's enabling impact in the Cyprus peace process (Diez et al. 2006; 2008). In the eyes of the Turkish Cypriot people Denktaş's hard-line discourse with regard to the just and viable solution based on Annan plan was damaging the peace process. On the eve of the resumption of the

talks between Turkish and Greek Cypriot leaders Nicosia became the address of the protests organized by “This Country is ours” platform, which advocated the reunification of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots under the EU membership umbrella. 30,000 Turkish Cypriots who branded Denktaş as an obstacle for peaceful settlement, urging him to quit or open the way for peace with Greek Cypriot community and Northern Cyprus’s integration with the EU congregated (Hürriyet, January 2, 2003). Another wave of demonstrations named “Solution and EU” was organized in 14 January 2003 and 27 February 2003 with the participation of 50,000-60,000 Turkish Cypriots who supported the EU accession of a re-united Cyprus (Financial Times, January 15, 2003). Moreover a deeper “political upheaval –verging on regime change- was underway” (Tocci, *ibid*: 36) in the Northern Cyprus. The Euro-supportive opposition parties significantly increased their votes in December 2003 parliamentary election in Northern Cyprus. After the elections, a coalition government was formed by Republican Turkish Party (RTP) (*Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi*- RTP) and Democratic Party (DP) (*Demokrat Parti* – DP) (Dodd, 2004: 37). The victory of opposition parties who claimed the resumption of the talks on re-unification of the island before the Republic of Cyprus’s EU accession and nomination of the moderate leader of RTP, Mehmet Ali Talat as the Prime Minister were considered as positive developments that would trigger a new path for negotiations. That is to say, parliamentary election was not only approached as a usual democratic procedure but it was also regarded as a preliminary referendum presenting the willingness of Turkish Cypriots for reunification of the island based on Annan plan. This approach was also evident in UN Security Council’s declaration on the election results in northern Cyprus. In a press statement dated 18 December 2003, UN Security Council stated “the majority of Turkish Cypriots have expressed their

desire for a solution to the Cyprus problem and for accession to the EU. This result is all the more noteworthy given pressures faced by the Turkish Cypriots to support the status quo” (UN- Press Release SC/7961, December 18, 2003). Encouraged by the election results, Council also urged all parties to take required steps and called for the resumption of the direct talks based on Secretary-General’s proposals (UN- Press Release SC/7961, December 18, 2003).

The year 2004 started with a historical visit by EU Commission President Romano Prodi and Commissioner Gunther Verheugen. The visit was historical in the sense that EU Commission was represented at the highest level by Prodi who was the first Commission President visiting Turkey since the Ankara agreement was signed in 1963. Additionally, the visit went at a critical time when Turkey was seeking for the green light to start accession talks before the Summit of EU leaders in December. At this juncture, EU commission’s positive report on Turkey’s progress in meeting the membership criteria and its advise to the EU leaders on opening accession talks with Ankara would strengthen Turkey’s march towards EU. In his address to the Turkish Parliament, Prodi said “we are moving closer to our goal, the goal of Turkey taking its rightful place among the peoples of Europe” (European Commission, January 15, 2004). By pointing out commission’s sincerity and objectivity regarding the assessment of the progress Turkey made since 1999 Helsinki Summit, he underlined that one of the significant challenges on the Turkey’s EU membership road was the ongoing division in Cyprus and he declared “It’s high time to end the outdated division of Cyprus and its capital... Let me be clear. This is not a formal condition but a political reality” (European Commission, January 15, 2004).

Prodi's encouragement to start a new initiative to solve the Cyprus conflict before 1 May 2004 reinforced the hand of Turkish government whose members had already started to give messages that the Ankara had a new strategy. Indeed in post-Hague era Turkey's progress towards EU membership was underlined as the primary foreign policy objective (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Program of the First Erdoğan Government). Regarding the Cyprus conflict, in the government program it was declared:

Our government firmly believes that there has to be settlement for Cyprus conflict. We will never allow any resolution process that would jeopardize the existence of Turkish population in the island. We preserve our precision to eliminate any deadlock following Hague meeting and to research for alternative channels of communication and models for resolution (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Program of the First Erdoğan Government).

The new government program gave the first clues that the Cyprus issue would be one of the prominent foreign policy matters and Turkish government was eager to take more active steps to contribute a just and lasting peace in Cyprus. Additionally reference to the Annan plan reflected the government's support for the Annan plan despite Denktaş's reluctance to move on with a new initiative.

The December 2003 election in northern Cyprus also provided a new momentum for bi-communal negotiations. In late December, it was announced that Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs prepared a document based on Annan plan that was entitled as "Turkish side's position on a solution to the Cyprus question" (Cumhuriyet, December 29, 2003). A position paper was written by a closed circle of diplomats from Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs who took special care not to give the impression that "Turkey has a specific plan which departs from the Annan plan" (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30, 2014, Interview with the Author). Thus the crucial emphasize

was given the point that Turkey would focus on Cyprus problem within the framework of Annan plan. Following this initiative, NSC meeting held in January 2004 concluded “Turkey continues to support for the good offices’ mission of UN Secretary-General and confirms its commitment for a rapid just and lasting settlement in Cyprus through negotiations based on the realities of the island and also taking Annan plan as the reference point” (Cumhuriyet, January 24, 2004). While Ankara reached a consensus on the resumption of the Cyprus negotiations, it was obvious that declaration was prepared in a way that the red lines of Turkey’s Cyprus policy was largely preserved. In this sense, equality of the two “nations” and the existence of two “states” were strongly emphasized. The emphasis on the “realities on the island” and declaration of the Turkish Cypriot leader Denktaş as the chief negotiator who would continue to seek a solution in Cyprus “in close cooperation with” the new Turkish Cypriot coalition government, illustrated that Ankara continued to acknowledge Denktaş as the key player in the process. In the meanwhile, reference to the “close cooperation with new Turkish Cypriot government” was suggested by RTP leader Talat whose primary concern was to keep the future round of talks safe from Denktaş’s “uncompromising” attitude (Milliyet, January 9, 2004). Having full support of the key players in Ankara, in January 24 2004, Erdoğan met with the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan and presented Turkey’s new policy on Cyprus (Milliyet, January 25, 2004). Birand highlighted that by acknowledging the pre-conditions⁶¹ of Secretary-General; Erdoğan assured Ankara’s commitment to reach a just and lasting solution in Cyprus before 1 May 2004 (Birand, January 26, 2004).

⁶¹ To have a comprehensive account of the Annan’s preconditions, please see: Birand, Mehmet Ali. January 26, 2004, “Turkey’s Cyprus Surprise”, Hürriyet Daily News

In his report to the UN Security Council, Annan briefly discussed the details of Davos meeting and he reported

For its part, the Government of Turkey was putting together the elements of a new policy on Cyprus, which was conveyed to me by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan when we met in Davos on 24 January 2004. He told me that Turkey supported a resumption of negotiations. He expressed preferences for dealing with the main issues by 1 May 2004, and for a political figure to handle the negotiations, but was open to discussion on these points. He added that, as far as Turkey was concerned, it had no objection to my filling in the blanks in the plan should the parties not be able to agree on all issues. He assured me that, henceforth, the Turkish side, including the Turkish Cypriots, would be one step ahead in the effort. (UN-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004)

As Annan reported Turkey's initiative that injected a new life into the interrupted peace talks was pronounced as "one step ahead" policy.

Ankara's "one step ahead policy" was structured within the political context of Turkey's EU membership. Although the government reiterated Turkey's long-run stance that Turkey's EU membership could not be associated with a solution in Cyprus, it was at the same time underlined that Turkish government could not turn its back to the realities. In a speech at the TGNA, Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdullah Gül declared "solution of the Cyprus conflict is not a part of political criteria regarding Turkey's EU accession... Yet, considering the EU membership of Greece and Greek Cypriot administration and the general atmosphere among the EU members with respect to Turkey's EU membership, this situation has to be handled as a factor" (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Speech delivered by Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, May 23, 2003). Within these parameters, government acknowledged the relationship between Turkey's EU membership and solution of the Cyprus conflict. In the context of Turkey's EU membership, Ankara was interested in Annan plan and followed an active strategy which was delicately designed by the veteran cadres of Turkish Ministry

of Foreign Affairs. With this respect, the ideal policy option was persuading UN Secretary-General to resume direct talks based on Annan plan and continuing to negotiate for a just and lasting solution of the Cyprus dispute which would secure Turkey's interests and survival of the Turkish Cypriots within the parameters of UN mediation.⁶² Government also accepted Annan's authority to say the last words on Cyprus if two parties could not compromise. The main objective of Turkey's activism was to reach a solution in Cyprus before Cyprus's EU accession. At this point it is essential to underline that the strategy was not a totally new initiative. Yet it indicated that the JDP cadres translated "their reformist rhetoric into a substantive policy shift on Cyprus" (Kaliber, 2012: 231).

The strategy was also a reflection of the JDP government's "win-win" approach. Kirişçi (2006) stated "the introduction and the first widespread appearance of the term "win-win" in the context of Cyprus problem was very telling of the changes occurring in Turkish foreign policy- especially considering the decades old "no solution is the solution policy on Cyprus was precisely based on a "win-lose" approach to the problem" (51). Ahmet Davutoğlu, who was appointed as the Prime Minister's chief advisor on foreign policy, argued that Turkey's long-run approach towards Cyprus conflict was based on a defensive foreign policy perspective aimed to balance Turkey's military security in the eastern Mediterranean and secure the survival of Turkish Cypriot community (Davutoğlu, 2011:121-122). However, to Davutoğlu, this approach was guided by a win-lose understanding in which reaching a just and final solution in Cyprus conflict was categorically dissociated from Cyprus's strategic importance for

⁶² Yakış, Yaşar, September 12, 2014, Interview with the author, Ankara: Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author, İzmir: Ziyal, Uğur, February 18, 2015, Interview with the author, Ankara.

Turkey. He claimed “it is a total mistake to categorize people that who are in favor of a solution in Cyprus neglects the strategic importance of the island and who asserts the strategic importance of Cyprus are in favor of the maintenance of status quo” (Davutoğlu, 2011: 122). Furthermore “with respect to the Cyprus’s strategic importance for Turkey it is essential to reach a solution preserving Turkey’s interest and guarantees Turkish Cypriots’ communal existence” (Davutoğlu, 2011: 122). According to this formula, Turkey had to adopt proactive and “rhythmic diplomacy” (Davutoğlu, 2011) aiming a solution in Cyprus which would guarantee Turkey’s regional interests and survival of Turkish Cypriots.⁶³

Yet, government’s pro-activism should not be interpreted as the sign of a radical shift in Turkish policy identity which has been largely constructed on the discourses of Cyprus’s strategic importance for Turkey’s defense and security needs and the security and survival of Turkish Cypriot people. At this point, “one step ahead” policy was a reflection or continuation of the regionalist-activism of the post-Cold War Turkish foreign and security policy outlook (Kaliber, 2013).⁶⁴ Post-Cold War international system offered both challenges and opportunities for Turkey in its near neighborhood (Sayarı, 2000). The growing internal (intensification of Kurdish issue and rise of Political Islam) threats to the social and political order intermingled with the external developments (regionalization of Kurdish issue, energy and resource security). At this regional and domestic conjuncture Turkey’s sense of insecurity escalated and

⁶³ Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author. İzmir: Ziyal, Uğur, February 18 2015, Interview with the author, Ankara.

⁶⁴ For more information on Turkey’s post-Cold War foreign and security policy structure please see: Cem, İsmail. 2007. *Türkiye, Avrupa, Avrasya I,II.* (Turkey, Europe and Eurasia I, II) Istanbul: İş Bankası.

starting in early 1990s Ankara had to modify some of its “established Republican foreign policy principles” (Sayar, 2000: 169) to cope with the challenges and to exploit the opportunities of the post-Cold War regional order. In this respect “the process whereby security interest definitions and threat perceptions in Turkey have gained an increasingly regional character, and second the process whereby Turkey has increasingly defined itself as an activist regional power” (Kaliber, 2013: 25). Following this argument Kaliber (2013) points out the JDP activism is the second wave of regionalism in Turkish foreign policy. JDP government’s policy vis-à-vis Cyprus peace process was structured parallel to this grand strategy. In a speech on the Cyprus peace process Davutoğlu pointed out the necessity to handle Turkey’s approach to the Cyprus issue with a strategic and regionalist perspective. He stated “we should assess Turkey’s Cyprus policy as a component of our Eastern Mediterranean policy” (Davutoğlu, 2011b: 121). He at the same time argued that having considered the Cyprus’s proximity to the energy hubs (Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline and Yumurtalık- Kerkük Pipeline) and Turkey’s Alexandretta Bay, where the strategic energy lines intersect, the strategic importance of the Cyprus for Turkey increased since 1990s (Davutoğlu, 2011b: 122). Therefore to Davutoğlu Turkey’s Cyprus policy ought to be formulated in the context of Turkey’s regional interests and security.

Under the umbrella of new-regionalism, JDP government adopted a soft power oriented activist agenda which positioned Turkey as the “pivotal state” aspiring to be a global power (Grigoriadis, 2014). According to strategic outlook of Davutoğlu –the architecture of the foreign policy of successive JDP governments- to revitalize its strategic potential and to realize its claim for being a global actor Turkey ought to reformulate its bilateral relations with its neighbors in line with the “zero problem policy”.

Accordingly “the resolution of all pending conflicts with Turkey’s neighbors is also seen as indispensable for Turkey’s rise into a global actor” (Grigoriadis, 2010: 5). With this respect Turkey’s Cyprus initiative would consolidate country’s global actorness.

Furthermore the policy shift reflected a reformulation of Ankara’s policy practices and strategies in light of the EU-level developments that enforced Ankara to take a new position to secure two equally significant “national causes” – Turkey’s prospective EU membership and Cyprus case-. According to strategic calculations of the Turkish foreign policy elites, neither Greek Cypriot people nor Greek Cypriot leadership were ready to approve a plan preserving Turkey’s guarantorship and suggesting an equal share of the state apparatuses under the legal equality of the constituent states (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30, 2014, Interview with the Author).

Upon Ankara’s initiative, UN Secretary-General Annan wrote a letter to Denktaş and Papadopoulos inviting two leaders to New York to begin negotiations on 10 February 2004. The new rounds of talks started in New York and on 13 February 2004 both leaders agreed to resume negotiations on Cyprus. According to the New York agreement signed on 13 February 2004, a three-stage procedure was agreed on. In the first hand, the interrupted negotiations would resume in Cyprus on the basis of the third version of Annan plan, secondly the two guarantor powers -Greece and Turkey- would collaborate to agree on a finalized text by 29 March 2004 and at the final stage UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan would use his authority to fill the gaps and finalize the text to be submitted to referenda before 1 May 2004 (UN- S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). Involved parties also agreed on the establishment of the technical committees on economic and financial aspects of the solution.

After New York talks negotiations were moved to the island. Secretary-General Annan expressed his regret and disappointment that it was obvious in early March that the Nicosia negotiations would not produce any result. At the political level community leaders were far from reaching a consensus. In contrast the unproductive discussions at the political level, with the efforts of technical committees, 131 laws and co-operation agreements running to 9,000 pages were completed; serious progress was made regarding the recommendation of the anthem and flag for the United Cyprus Republic and economic, financial and legal-institutional aspects of the plan were extensively discussed (UN Security Council-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). The second phase of the negotiations started with the participation of guarantor powers in Bürgenstock/Switzerland on 24 March 2004. Turkish Cypriots were represented by Mehmet Ali Talat and Serdar Denktaş who were fully authorized by Denktaş to make the final decision on the plan on behalf of Turkish Cypriot administration⁶⁵ and Greek Cypriot side was represented by Papadopoulos as the community leader. Turkey and Greece were represented by their Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Ministers of both guarantor powers attended talks on 28 and 29 March. The planned four-partite talks were not materialized due to the Greek Cypriot side's resistance (UN-S/2004/320, April 16, 2004). To answer the concerns of two parties Secretary-General proposed the fourth version of his plan. Following Annan's proposal, Turkey and

⁶⁵ On 17 March 2004, Denktaş gave a press conference and he declared for the first time that he would not be attending the Bürgenstock meetings in the sense that he had no hope and belief that this process would produce any result (Denktaş, 2004: 157). Osman Ertuğ, the chief adviser of the President of Turkish Cypriot administration, stated that the same day when Denktaş declared his withdrawal from the bi-communal talks, he prepared and signed an official communication telling that the Talat and Serdar Denktaş were fully authorized on behalf of the TRNC to make the final decision in Bürgenstock. Ertuğ emphasized that since Turkey was in favour of the continuation of the Republic of Cyprus without any serious breakdown, Denktaş acted responsibly by fully authorizing Turkish Cypriot negotiation team not to challenge Turkey's position.

Turkish Cypriot side “made a number of comments and proposals for further amendments. Each indicated that it would be prepared to sign the plan to authenticate it as the text to be submitted to referendum” (UN-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). Whereas Annan reported that the Greek Cypriot side was dissatisfied with the new proposal and for the first time declared their interests in additional territorial adjustments. Under these circumstances, there was no last resort but to move to the third phase as envisaged in the New York agreement and Secretary-General used his will to fill the gaps and finalize the plan that would be presented to the Cypriot people on 24 April referendum. At this stage, last and final version of the “Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem” dated 31 March 2004 was introduced by the Secretary-General.

Following the talks in Bürgenstock, Prime Minister Erdoğan declared that Turkey was satisfied with the final version of the Plan and that the Turkish government would continue its “one-step-ahead” policy (Milliyet, April 1, 2004). Responding a question about the attitude of Turkish government concerning the referendum, Erdoğan claimed that Turkish government would campaign for the “yes” vote. Despite Turkish side’s gratification, Greek Prime Minister Kostas Karamanlis declared “unfortunately, it was not possible to arrive at an agreed solution. It belongs to the people of Cyprus to finally decide” (Athens News Agency, April 1, 2004). Additionally upon Erdoğan’s declaration that Turkey was ready to sign a protocol illustrating that the parties have reached a consensus, Greek side hesitated to sign a binding agreement. The clear division between two parties in Bürgenstock was interpreted as through the

final version of the Annan plan⁶⁶, Turkish side had what it desired at the negotiation table (Güven, April 2, 2004).

⁶⁶ In the final version regarding the sovereignty and international status of the United Cyprus State Annan prescribed a federal structure. The United Cyprus Republic was described as an independent and unitary state with a federal government single international legal personality and two equal constituent states. It was also underlined that “the status and relationship of the United Cyprus Republic, its federal government, and its constituent states, is modeled on the status and relationship of Switzerland, its federal government, and its cantons” (Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Annan Plan). Although Annan’s proposal prescribed a federal solution, it paid regard to the legal status and power of the two constituent states. Thus in the context of status of the two constituent states, Annan plan had a close affinity with Turkish side’s thesis. As it was discussed in the previous chapter, Denktaş’s confederative solution was based on the preservation of TRNC and Greek Cypriot administration as the two constitutive sovereign and equal states under a loosely centralized unitary state structure. With respect to this, in late 1990s, as an alternative of the European solution, Turkey and TRNC proposed a solution formula which was on the one hand inspired by the Swiss model – loosely centralized state- regarding the domestic state structure and on the other hand inspired by the Belgian model – federal unitary state- regarding the international legal entity of the federal state. This formula of loosely centralized federal solution, that was aimed to satisfy the need that Cyprus had to be represented by a unified legal entity in the international platforms, was introduced as a response to the EU’s determination to integrate with a unified Cyprus. In this sense, Turkish side’s thesis and concerns with legal status and equality of the two communities found a place in Annan plan. At this point, it is essential to underline that; as opposed to Denktaş’s confederative model, Annan’s federal solution proposed a firmer form of united Cyprus.

The final plan also included improvements inspired by both Greek and Turkish concerns. In order to answer Turkish Cypriot concerns that the bizonal character of the settlement should be strengthened and the traumatic impact of mass return of Greek Cypriots to the north should be handled, Secretary-General “introduced a modest reduction in residency ceiling” by introducing five-year residency moratorium and percentage limitation for the people moving from the other state.⁶⁶ Additionally, to provide safe guard measures for Turkish Cypriots’ demands to strengthen political equality, federal election voting procedure was renewed. The most crucial revision which was welcomed by Turkey and Turkish Cypriots was the arrangements on security and maintenance of the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. The last version allowed Turkey and Greece to keep symbolic forces as already specified in 1960 Treaty of Alliance (650 Turkish troops and 950 Greek troops) even after Turkey’s EU accession. Additionally, the provisions of the plan related to the Treaty of Guarantee did not change. However, as reported by an anonymous bureaucrat from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the provisions were in consistency with the Greek Cypriot position, which was a serious source of concern for Turkish side, that the “Treaty confers no unilateral right of military intervention” (Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Annan Plan). On security and military matters, UN officials expressed their position that the Annan Plan would be implemented in the EU membership security umbrella which provided a dramatically different political context from 1960s and 1970s. Another important achievement for the Turkish part was the recognition and maintenance of the treaties signed between Turkey and Turkish Cypriot administration.

The other crucial matters that Turkey was insistent for further arrangements were the allocation of the permanent derogations by EU, changes on the map in which the territorial re-arrangements seemed to harm bizonality and the extension of the transition periods (interview with Olgun, 18 October 2014). Both Turkey and Turkish Cypriot side had serious concerns considering the possibility that the bicomunal balance established with the property and residency regulations and restrictions could be deposed by application to the European Court of Justice on the ground that EU principles on fundamental freedoms were disregarded. Thus Turkish side demanded that the provisions of the final agreement that would found the United Cyprus State should be a part of EU primary law. However, during the Bürgenstock talks, EU officials declared that the acknowledgment of the permanent derogations for Cyprus

In the pre-referendum process, both sides carried out their separate referendum campaigns. On 7 April 2004, Greek Cypriot leader Papadopoulos called on the Greek Cypriot people to reject the Annan Plan since there were serious doubts about its functionality and security matters. He stated “with the final Annan Plan Cypriots have not been satisfied, however Turkey’s pursuit to control and dominate Cyprus has been fully met”⁶⁷ (Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Office). He described the continuous presence of Turkish troops on the island as the fifth Annan Plan provisioned would never be accepted by Greek Cypriot people and he added that “the particular plan would not lead to the reunification of the two communities but on the contrary it would promote the permanent division with restrictions on movement, settlement, the right to acquire property, the exercise of political rights and other divisive elements” (Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Office). Secretary-General expressed his regret and disappointment with Papadopoulos’s press statement and he stated “the speech challenged the wisdom of ‘doing away with our internationally recognized state exactly at the very moment it strengthens its political weight, with its accession to the European Union’...” (UN-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). He continued “I was also surprised at his interpretation of the plan, since the plan is designed to allow each side to

was not possible. Prodi stated in a press conference after the talks “exceptions lasting for a specific time period, not permanent derogations” (Turkish Daily News, April 1, 2004). It was underlined that internal arrangements of any member country did not concern the EU as long as they were not in a severe inconsistency with the EU’s founding principles. Despite permanent derogations could not be materialized; EU offered that after the unification a “Law of Adaptation” could be submitted for approval to the Council. But this formula did not guarantee permanency of the exceptions.

⁶⁷ For more information, please see: Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Office, “Declaration by the President regarding the 24 April referendum.” Available at: <http://www.moi.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/All/90CF1FEB4B93B929C225783800399C01?OpenDocument&print> (last access: 10 June 2015)

maintain its position on how the new state of affairs would come into being” (UN-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004).

The overall mode in the Greek Cypriot political and social sphere was negative to the plan. Surprisingly, Progressive Party of Working People (AKEL) which has been considered for a long time as a pro-solution and conciliatory political party did not support the plan and AKEL leader Christofias a few days before 24 April declared that there were serious concerns related to the implementation of the plan and security issues (Pericleous, 2011). Polls in the south were also alarming that the Plan was not popular for the majority of Greek people. According to a poll carried out on behalf of the state-owned broadcasting company, CyBC, a significant majority of Greek Cypriots (48 per cent of those asked) said they would definitely vote no, 9 per cent said they would probably vote no, with only 9 per cent saying they would definitely vote yes, and 6 per cent saying they would probably vote yes (Cyprus Mail, April 9, 2004).

On the other hand Turkish Cypriot government (except Serdar Denktaş- he stated his neutrality) and Turkish government strongly support the Plan and conducted their campaigns for the “yes” vote. Secretary-General warmly welcomed Turkish side’s attitude in his report by stating

Prime Minister Erdoğan spoke out strongly in favor of a “Yes” vote, as did Turkish Foreign Minister Gül. Messrs. Erdoğan, Gül and Talat also sought to convey to the Greek Cypriot public, by statements and interviews, and, in the case of Talat, by visiting the south, the determination of the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey to abide by their commitments under the plan and fully implement a settlement (UN-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004).

Turkish government continued “one step ahead” policy and illustrated its full support for the Annan plan during the campaigns prior to the referenda. Turkey’s support for the solution based on UN initiative also reflects Turkey’s ground strategy which aimed to increase Turkey and Turkish Cypriots’ moral and psychological superiority in the

internal community. According to this matrix, at this political juncture that the majority of Greek Cypriot community and political elites were against the Annan plan, Turkey's and Turkish Cypriots support was greeted by EU and UN.

As scheduled the separate referenda took place on 24 April 2004 simultaneously. 64.9 percent of Turkish Cypriots (TRNC citizens who were registered as electorates in December 2003 elections) voted in favor of the Plan and expressed their will to be a part of EU as a re-unified island. On the hand 75.8 percent of Greek Cypriot electorates voted against⁶⁸ the plan (Cyprus News Agency, April 24, 2004). Grigoriadis interpreted Greek Cypriot's no as "saying no to the Annan Plan was not tantamount with eliminating any solution prospects but provided Greek Cypriots with the opportunity to seek a more favorable solution from a vantage point". He continued "What this statement sometimes implied, however, was that perhaps the *status quo*, i.e., the *de facto* separation of the island, was an option preferable to a federal solution based on the Annan Plan or any of its variants" (Grigoriadis, 2008: 163- 164).

⁶⁸ For a few assessments about Greek Cypriot community's rejection of the plan, please see: Grigoriadis, Ioannis. 2008. "Greek and Greek Cypriot Views of Turkey's Accession to the European Union: On the Endurance of a Spectacular Paradigmatic Shift." In Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Yannis A. Stivachtis, eds., *Turkey and the European Union: Dilemmas, Constraints and Opportunities*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 151-167; Lordos, Alexandros. 2009. "Rational agent or unthinking follower? A survey-based profile analysis of Greek-Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot referenda votes." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester Univ Press: 17-47.

4.2 Conclusions: Assessing EU Impact

Europeanization simultaneously occurs at both intergovernmental (between EU and targeted government) and domestic (national actors and institutions) levels. As Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005: 11) suggest under the conceptual framework of the external incentives model EU impact “may work directly on the target government, which then calculates whether the benefits of the promised EU rewards outweigh the domestic adjustment costs of adopting the EU rule”. In line with this, at the level of intergovernmental bargaining the EU exercises its external pressures through its compulsory impact (EU attaches the allocation of rewards –such as EU candidacy, opening of accession negotiations, EU membership, financial and technical support and monitoring- to the fulfillment of EU political and *acquis* conditionality). Based on this conceptual framework, this study suggests that with regard to the solution of Cyprus conflict EU began to exercise its external pressure on Turkey in late 1990s through its linkage policy in which Turkey’s contributions for the settlement of the Cyprus dispute under the UN auspices have been emphasized as a critical issue before Turkey’s prospective EU membership. Following 1999 Helsinki European Council conclusions, in many assessments on Turkey’s reform performances, including European Council conclusions, reports on Turkey’s progress, reports of EU Parliament, Strategy Papers and Commission recommendations to the EU Council, Turkey has been urged to take constructive steps in the resolution of Cyprus conflict and normalize its relations with the Republic of Cyprus in line with the principles of good neighborly relations and peaceful resolution of disputes. Parallel to this EU emphasized that reaching a just and final solution for the Cyprus dispute before Cyprus’s EU

membership would be a significant facilitator for Turkey's EU membership aspirations. Another critical aspect of the EU's intergovernmental bargaining strategy was the EU membership of Cyprus. The asymmetries in Turkey's and Cyprus's accession process created the possibility that Turkey's long-run EU accession process might have been blocked or interrupted due to Greek Cypriots' veto power. Therefore especially after 2002 Copenhagen European Council the stick of Cyprus's prospective EU membership worked directly on JDP government. Having calculated the high cost of continuing Turkey's long-run Cyprus strategy -denying the linkage between Turkey's EU membership and the solution of the Cyprus conflict- for Turkey's prospective EU membership. These strategic calculations led government to reconfigure its Cyprus policy. With this respect, JDP's Cyprus policy is structured within the political context of Turkey's EU membership. Although the government reiterated Turkey's long-run stance that Turkey's EU membership could not be associated with a solution in Cyprus, it was at the same time underlined that Turkish government could not turn its back to the realities⁶⁹. In the context of Turkey's EU membership, the best policy option and bargaining strategy was to adopt a new diplomatic maneuver based on Annan plan and implement an active negotiation strategy for the just and lasting solution of the Cyprus dispute which would both facilitate Turkey's EU accession process and generation of security zone in Turkey's close neighborhood. Therefore a just and lasting solution of the Cyprus conflict which would preserve Turkey's guarantorship

⁶⁹ For more information, please see: Gül, Abdullah. 23 May 2003. TBMM'de Türkiye-AB İlişkileri Konusunda Genel Görüşme Açılmasına İlişkin Önerenin Görüşülmesi Vesilesiyle Yapılan Konuşma (Speech Made in TGNA Upon the Opening of General Assembly about Turkey-EU Relations).

rights, support country's EU accession process and guarantee the survival of the Turkish Cypriots within the parameters of UN mediation was the most exploitive strategy. In addition to this, according to strategic calculations of the Turkish foreign policy elites, neither Greek Cypriot people nor Greek Cypriot leadership were ready to approve a plan preserving Turkey's guarantorship and suggesting an equal share of the state apparatuses under the legal equality of the constituent states. Thus Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community would acquire international sympathy and moral superiority as the party who desired a solution under UN auspices.

The second crucial premise of Ankara's strategy was based on the cost-benefit calculations that just and final peace in Cyprus which could be reached through Turkey's proactive and constructive efforts would best serve for Turkey's security interests and communal equality and survival of Turkish Cypriot community. With this respect, Turkey advocated "win-win" perspective that stressed different aspects of Turkey's security interests in its close region. As claimed by Davutoğlu (2011a, 2011b), a just and final solution in Cyprus, preserving Turkey's guarantorship rights and interests as well as the communal existence of Turkish Cypriot community, would not only diminish Turkey's long-run threat perceptions from its south and fear of encirclement, it would also provide a security structure for Turkey's larger security needs including military, economic and energy security.

In this context, security was defined with its hard power (military security and military balance of powers in the Mediterranean) and soft power (economic benefits of a solution in Cyprus, positive consequence of the solution for Turkey's critical infrastructural security with respect to the security of energy pipelines and Turkey's strengthened bid for EU membership and being a pivotal state in regional and global

scale) aspects. Although this did not mean a true de-securitization, it should be conceptualized as the “securitizing speak” (Bilgin, 2007). Bilgin argues that the pro-reform forces “were not able or willing to challenge the securityness of existing issues they were, nevertheless, able to de-center them. This was done by identifying other issues as ‘threats to Turkey’s future’” (Bilgin, 2007: 557). In this sense, the Europeanization in Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus led ruling elites to exclude or limit the “militarized security” discourse. The process enabled de-militarization of Turkey’s foreign policy options and strategies but it failed to lead a transformation in Turkey’s securitized foreign policy identity in the sense that the ruling elites were far from discursively “challenging the securityness” of the Cyprus issue for Turkey. This aspect of Turkey’s Cyprus policy was evident throughout the bargaining process during the bi-communal negotiations. Turkey had serious concerns with respect to the continuation of its guarantorship rights and military existence in the island. With this respect, Turkish negotiation team endeavored to secure Turkey’s guarantorship rights and Turkey’s military and political existence on the island. According to Radaelli’s (2003) categorization of the degrees of Europeanization Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus is best defined as policy “adaptation” rather than a policy “transformation”.

Apart from direct adaptation pressures EU might work through differential empowerment of the domestic actors. EU’s leverage on candidate countries offers new political or economic opportunity structures for domestic actors. According to this argument Europeanization process changes existing domestic political equilibrium through offering new opportunities for certain domestic actors or groups. Thus pro-reform governments who are the national gate keepers of the EU’s transformative

power might strengthen their bargaining power vis-à-vis other societal actors or institutions (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11-13). Yet the as the external incentives model suggests governments “adopt EU rules if the benefits of EU rewards exceed the domestic adoption costs” (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 12). In this sense, the credibility of EU membership perspective and EU’s effective gate keeping strategy are the key factors that influence domestic incentives.

In the context of EU’s increased gate keeping role for Turkey’s EU accession, the emphasis on Turkey’s active and positive contributions with regard to the peace-building efforts of UN Secretary-General in Cyprus empowered political and social groups who advocated the reassessment of Turkey’s long-run Cyprus policy (Eryılmaz, 2014). In line with these, in the aftermath of 1999 Helsinki Council, a pro-EU advocacy coalition both in Turkey and in TRNC composed by liberal intellectuals, journalists, academics and NGOs became visible. These groups pressured Turkish political elites to open the way for Turkey’s EU accession through leaving aside long-run non-productive “no solution is the solution” discourse and their unconditional support for Denktaş who were known as “intransigent” by the international community (Güven, 2003; Lacher and Kaymak, 2005; Bahcheli, 2006; Balkır and Yalman, 2009; Bahcheli and Noel, 2010; Kaymak, 2011; Sözen, 2013).

The EU’s increasing emphasis on the relationship between Turkey’s EU membership and resolution of Cyprus conflict has triggered a process in which pro-EU forces criticized previous Turkish governments’ traditional policy towards Cyprus conflict (Bilgin, 2007: 557). Popular support for Turkey’s EU accession has found a new ground in the aftermath of 2002 general elections when a pro-reform single party government led by JDP came into power. JDP’s coming to power with a significant

victory in 2002 elections and the party elites' commitment for Turkey's EU membership has become an important political incentive for the attempts to reach a peaceful resolution of Cyprus conflict (Avci, 2011: 415).

During this era Cyprus conflict emerged as a discursive battle-field (Kaliber, 2005) between pro-reform forces who advocated the necessity to revise Turkey's Cyprus strategy in the context of EU membership and the veto powers who asserted that stepping back from 1990s "two state" policy in return of EU's dubious commitment for Turkey's EU accession (Ulusoy, 2008: 314). Discursive battle-field was at its highest level during the pre-referenda era. As a component of the "one step ahead" policy JDP government expressed its strong support for the Annan plan. Upon government's expression of its strong support for the plan, in a meeting in Turkish Grand National Assembly, retired diplomat and Republican Peoples Party (RPP) parliamentarian Onur Öymen severely criticized government's "yes" campaign by declaring that

if you sacrifice Cyprus for getting a date for EU accession negotiations, date is not guaranteed. The risk of giving away is huge. For the first time in Turkish history, a Turkish government does not approach Cyprus as a national cause and follows a policy which is based on its parliamentary majority (Öymen, 2012:176).

He continued "the current situation is a turning point of the Turkish foreign policy that we have been pursuing since Lausanne Treaty. The name of this policy that our fate is being sealed by others is devotion in diplomacy" (Öymen, 2012: 177). In an another special meeting on Cyprus peace process, Öymen on behalf his party stated regret and disappointment with regard to the government's affirmative attitude towards the plan despite the President of TRNC Rauf Denktaş's strict opposition (Öymen, 2012:178). He also emphasized that for the first time in Turkish history a Turkish government collided with Denktaş. Denktaş also actively conducted "no" campaign. In a meeting

held in Bursa, he said “the game of taking the state out of our hands has started. We are struggling not to lose it. We did not lose it up-to-now and we will not lose it after now. However, we are passing through dangerous waters” (Turkish Daily News, April 6, 2004). Denktaş’ support for a resounding no, was also backed by nationalist civil society organizations such as Ankara Chamber of Trade and Association of Atatürkist Thought. The Chief of General Staff Gen. Hilmi Özkök also voiced serious criticisms and said “that this was the first time ever that there were two competing opinions on a national matter like Cyprus” (Turkish Daily News, April 19, 2004). Additionally both President Sezer and Chief of General Staff Özkök expressed their inconvenience that “the results of the New York negotiations on Cyprus had gone beyond the principles agreed at the national NSC meeting on January 23” (Turkish Daily News, April 19, 2004). Thus in the eve of referendum, Annan Plan continued to be a serious source of division at the top of the Turkish state.

Prime Minister Erdoğan, speaking to JDP parliamentary group meeting, said “Turkey’s priorities are reflected in the plan” and by pointing out anti-plan campaigns especially led by Denktaş and retired diplomats, he declared “those who held political power for years but failed to show the necessary political will are now criticizing us, even though they know the truth. We will not stoop to their level and shrink from our responsibilities. As the government, we have to be committed to show this will” (Turkish Daily News, April 7, 2004). The issue also had serious reflections on Turkish civil-military relations. Turkish daily newspaper Cumhuriyet’s caption prepared by journalist Mustafa Balbay who claimed that in an *ad hoc* meeting between Özkök and Erdoğan on 22 May 2003, Özkök expressed the discontent within the military circles due to the certain activities of JDP government (Balbay, May 23, 2003). The article

implied that there was a close circle in Turkish military that was composed by certain Chiefs of armed forces and young soldiers who were quite critical about the government's attempts to reformulate state policy on certain issues including war against terror, Cyprus conflict and secularism. According to the article, Özkök reassured Erdoğan that Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) was not an obstacle for Turkey's democratization and Europeanization but certain provisions and constitutional amendments under the seventh harmonization package would jeopardize the national interests of the Turkish state (Balbay, May 23, 2003). Following this development, Özkök gave a press statement in which he expressed his regret for such a provocative news that implied that there was an indisposed group of military personnel who were about to engage in a military coup against the elected government (Bila, Milliyet, 27 May 2003).

With respect to the civil-military relations aspect of the debates on Annan plan, it is essential to underline that the reference to the Annan plan in the final conclusions of January 2004 National Security Council meeting illustrated that the key divergences between veto powers and government appeased. However it also signified that the source of tension among domestic actors was the power struggle at the top of the state.⁷⁰ The best case illustrated mentioned power struggle over the management of Cyprus peace process occurred in early 2004 upon Erdoğan's declaration that Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs prepared Turkey's position paper on Annan plan and it would be discussed in an *ad hoc* summit in which President Sezer, Prime Minister Erdoğan, Minister of Foreign Affairs Gül and Chief of General Staff Özkök would participate (Milliyet, December 30, 2003). Turkish generals reacted the proposed four-

partite summit decision and Chief of General Staff Hilmi Özkök made an unscheduled meeting with Prime Minister Erdoğan and expressed the concerns of the Chiefs of the three armed forces emphasizing the National Security Council as the right place to reformulate “state policy on Cyprus” (Milliyet, December 30, 2003). Veteran journalist Birand commented on the developments at the top of the state as the “power struggle” over Cyprus which was all about “who will have the last say on Cyprus?” (Birand, January 9, 2004). Birand claimed that regarding the policy of supporting peace in Cyprus based on a revised version of Annan plan reflecting Turkey’s and Turkish Cypriots best interests there was no serious difference among the foreign policy elites including Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkish Armed Forces and the government⁷¹. He continued:

A section of the army thinks like Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (KKTC) President Rauf Denktaş and wants alterations made in the foundations and the context of the Annan plan. For example, they want Turkish troops to stay permanently on the island (even if Turkey becomes an EU member) and demand a new guarantorship agreement. In other words, they want the continuation of the status quo. (Birand, January 9, 2004)

Considering the fact that Turkey’s attempts to reach a solution of the Cyprus problem would significantly contribute to Turkey’s EU membership process and it would boost the chance to get a date for the start of accession negotiations in late 2004, Ankara’s failure to speak with one voice would jeopardize the whole process. Additionally EU membership of the Greek Cypriots without a settlement of the dispute would have complicated results on both Turkey’s EU membership process and Turkish Cypriots legal and political condition. Having in mind these realities it was obvious that cost of

⁷¹ This point was verified in author’s interviews with the interviewees from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

incompliance would be very high for Turkey. More specifically, Turkish military's intransigence with respect to the solution of Cyprus conflict would block Turkey's EU accession process which has been associated as a further move to reach the level of civilized nations by Turkish army. Due to EU's linkage strategy, especially for Özkök, who was the passionate supporter for Turkey's EU membership, non-compromising attitude would raise questions regarding the traditional role and self-perception as the modernizer of Turkey (Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, Interview with the author).

As the external incentives model suggested EU's reinforcement by rewards strategy mitigated the discursive cleavages between veto powers and pro-reform forces and generated a new institutional equilibrium in which the civilians had the last say. During this era, "the influence of military has been deeply curbed and the government has become much more outspoken on its foreign policy preferences. There is an active involvement of civil society organizations in the foreign realm" (Terzi, 2012: 210). Therefore the vertical impact of the EU's accession differentially empowered pro-EU and pro-solution camps.

At this point, party's emphasis on its support for Turkey's EU membership perspective should be discussed as an important dimension in party's self-identification which enabled to increase party's legitimacy and power in Turkish domestic politics and define themselves for outside actors. In 2002 election declaration, Turkey's EU membership was declared as an important component of Turkey's modernization and meeting the Copenhagen criteria, independent of Turkey's EU aspirations, was announced as a move forward that would lead Turkey to take its place among the modern nations (JDP Election Declaration, 2002). Immediately after the Gül government was

established, JDP initiated a campaign to get a date for accession negotiations in December 2002 Copenhagen summit. Politically banned party leader Erdoğan conducted visits to the capitals of key EU states. The party founders' firm stance on Turkey's EU membership process and attempts to getting a reasonable date for the start of accession negotiations with Turkey was interpreted as abandonment of the "traditional Islamic Euroscepticism" (Grigoriadis, 2003).

To Yavuz, JDP's self-identification allowed party leaders to define themselves for outsiders (2011, 10) and served to overcome suspicions or stereotypes regarding the nature and agenda of this new movement. Since the early days of JDP government, a group of state and political elites including military frontrunners, members of opposition party in the parliament, senior officials of Council of Higher Education, university rectors, retired and incumbent judges of Constitutional Court, High Court of Appeals and the president himself criticized the new government's decisions for eroding the secular and republican principles of the state. Thus despite its discourse on democracy, modernization and Copenhagen criteria, the party was born with a sense of increasing insecurity. As Dağı discussed, in 2002 when the party came to power, there was a fairly meaningful relationship between JDP's EU membership perspective and its search for systemic security in a political landscape in which the party's intentions were highly questioned by state elites including security establishment and presidency (2005, 30-33). Party elites' pro-EU stand was based on an observation that the more Turkey was distanced from the West and the EU in particular; the stronger would be the tutelage of the army that treated Islamic groups as an anomaly and threat. Thus the EU emerged as a natural ally or an opportunity structure for further democratization

and civilianization of Turkish politics. The expectation was that the army's interventions in politics would be significantly lessened as a result of further democratization that had already been put as a precondition for Turkey's entry to the EU; a Kemalist state ideology guarded by the army would not be sustained in an EU-member state (Dağı, 2005: 32). As the theory suggest in the context of Europeanization, certain domestic actors or groups might have individual incentives to adopt EU rules, "which might stem from the utility of EU rules in solving certain policy problems to the advantage of these domestic actors or more generally in increasing their influence in the political system" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11). Therefore, this study suggests in the context of the Europeanization of Turkey's Cyprus policy, government's willingness to gain a political victory through enabling a just and viable settlement in Cyprus and getting date to start accession negotiations with EU coupled with its individual incentives to enhance its relative power and legitimacy at the level of national politics through EU's democratizing and civilianizing agenda.

Turkey's declaration as the EU candidate in 1999 Helsinki European Council and the country's inclusion in the EU enlargement strategy generated a new social and political climate in which the societal and political support for EU membership gradually increased (Çarkoğlu, 2004). According to the Eurobarometer survey results conducted in spring 2004, 71 percent of Turkish people participated in the survey confirmed that the country's EU membership is a good thing. In the same vein, 75 percent confirmed that the EU membership of the country would be beneficial especially for Turkish economy. According to the results indicating Turkish people's emotional stance towards EU, with a 56 percentage Turkey took the third place among the other candidate countries. In its concluding remarks regarding Turkish people's support for

EU membership it was stated that Turkish people's support for EU membership was mainly driven by the expectations that the country's EU accession would stabilize Turkish political and economic life.⁷² Thus in addition to the party's pro-EU stance, the Euro-supportive political atmosphere allowed JDP to follow the Europeanization path which was initiated by the previous government in post-Helsinki process.

Based on the content analysis and in-depth interviews, it is argued that the noticeable change in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus between 2002 and 2004, which is presented as the "one step ahead" approach, was triggered by the combination of (i) the external pressures for policy change through EU's increasing emphasis on the linkage between Turkey's EU membership and just and lasting solution in Cyprus within the context of Turkey's EU membership (external incentives); and (ii) the domestic dissatisfaction with the ongoing stalemate in Cyprus dispute due to the previous governments' policy failures (domestic pressures). It argues that tentative power of external incentives model is evident in the Turkey's policy change in response to the EU external pressures.

In this context, as the studies on Accession Europeanization point out, EU membership conditionality by itself is not the sufficient condition for domestic change. The process is to a large extent controlled by intervening variables enable EU conditional-

⁷² For full report please see: Eurobarometer. Spring 2004. "Joint Full Report of Eurobarometer 61 and CC Eurobarometer 2004.1" Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb61/eb61_en.pdf (last Access: 10 June 2015).

ity to operate as the real game changer in the accession process. Inspired by the explanatory mechanisms introduced by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, this study reaches the conclusions that Turkey's adoption of "one step ahead" policy in late 2003 is triggered by (i) EU's active reinforcement by rewards strategy which was apparent in EU's 1999 Helsinki decision to include Turkey in its enlargement process; (ii) Turkish political elites' strong willingness to get a date for the opening of accession negotiations and solving Cyprus dispute; (iii) high cost of non-solution for Turkey's EU membership aspirations and future legal and political situation of Turkish Cypriot people after Cyprus's EU accession; (iv) Turkish government's strong pro-EU stance and its discovery of political opportunity structures which would increase its relative power and legitimacy at the national domain through differential empowerment (v) and lastly political and societal discontent in Turkish Cypriot community with the failures of the Turkey's and TRNC's long-run policy towards Cyprus.

CHAPTER V

CYPRUS CONUNDRUM AND TURKEY'S EU ACCESSION

(2004-2012)

On May 1 2004, the Accession Treaty entered into force and the worst case scenario both for Turkey and Turkish Cypriot Administration – EU accession of Greek Cypriots as the legal administration representing entire island- was materialized. In post-referendum era, the two crucial political developments: (i) Greek Cypriot's empowerment by the veto right based on EU membership as the only legal representative of the island and (ii) Turkey's unstable EU accession process shaped the EU-Turkey and Cyprus triangle. Empowered by the veto right in EU decision making process, Greek Cypriots had a remarkable political leverage on Turkey. Additionally, Greek Cypriots used their veto rights to influence the relations between Turkish Cypriot community and EU institutions which aimed to take steps to alleviate isolation of Turkish Cypriots whose will and constructive efforts to reunification and integration with the world could not be denied.

Failure of the peace process monitored and mediated by the UN Secretary General also had deep repercussions for the future of UN involvement. Opposed to the enhanced mediatory role of the UN Secretary General in filling the gaps and finalizing peace plan, which was a product of Turkey's last minute efforts, in the post-referenda era, UN played a relatively passive role in the bi-communal talks. As UN Secretary General's Special Adviser Alexander Downer pointed out in June 2010 the role of UN in the peace talks "is not to exercise arbitration or mediation"⁷³. Coupled with the lack of affective EU leverage on Greek Cypriot government, the low profile role of UN in the Cyprus peace talks resulted with the loss of momentum in the peace process.

In the meanwhile, the international sympathy towards Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community which overwhelmingly supported Annan plan and reunification of the island could neither make Turkey immune from the legal challenges caused by Cyprus dispute in its relations with the EU nor end the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community. Cyprus's EU accession without a resolution aggravated the problematic relationship between Turkey and EU. The honeymoon between Turkey and EU after the EU Summit of 16-17 December 2004, when the European Council announced that Turkey fulfilled Copenhagen criteria and EU would initiate accession negotiations with Turkey, did not last long. Turkey encountered a new obstacle in its march to Europe when EU stressed that Turkey's reluctance to recognize Republic of Cyprus and to fulfill its responsibilities to implement Additional Protocol to the new member states including Republic of Cyprus were interpreted as a breach of *acquis* conditionality by the European community. Put it differently, in the post referenda era, Cyprus

⁷³ To have full account about the nature of UN initiative in post-2004 era, please see: Remarks by Special Adviser of the Secretary-General Alexander Downer, Larnaca Airport, 4 June 2010, available at: http://www.uncyprustalks.org/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=2958&tt=graphic&lang=11

conundrum, characterized as a political matter for the Turkish foreign policy circles, generated legal consequences and obstacles for Turkey's relations with the EU. The disputes between Turkey and EU on the interpretation of *acquis* strained already tense relations between two to the point of the suspension of the newly started accession negotiations. The breakdown in the negotiation process due to the Cyprus question, also coupled with the certain EU member states' hard line position on Turkey's EU membership as well as the Turkish government's reform fatigue. Under these circumstances, Turkey faced with the choice to reconsider its foreign policy options and priorities under the new conditions. This chapter is designed to understand the new dimensions and mechanisms that affected the EU-Turkey and Cyprus triangle in the aftermath of 2004 referendum.

5.1 Post-Referenda Political Context

5.1.1 Cyprus's EU Accession and the Political Developments in the Island

In post-referendum era, Ankara's last minute efforts to resume UN peace talks and Turkish Cypriot people's affirmative vote in the referenda gave its results and image of Turkey and Turkish Cypriots since 1980s as the intransigent part was being questioned by the international community for the first time (Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author). For Ankara and Nicosia referendum results were the clear indicator that Turkey and Turkish Cypriots were not the parties leaving the negotiation table. Therefore Ankara's strategy of being the part that took initiative in its hand offered a great chance to direct the attention of the international community to the current inequality between two communities as well as achieving moral superiority at the end of the process (Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, Interview

with the author). According to Ankara's perception, after Turkey's and Turkish Cypriot's affirmative attitude Turkey's diplomatic efforts to end the isolation of TRNC would fall into fertile grounds.

The early reactions of the international community affirmed Turkey's conclusion that Turkish side actively and sincerely contributed for the unification of the island. Welcoming Turkish Cypriot community's enthusiasm to reunite with the Greek Cypriots under UN auspices, UN and EU officials criticized the Greek Cypriot government in the sense that it had a huge responsibility for the continuation of status quo by mobilizing masses with the "no" campaign (UN Security Council-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). UN Secretary-General issued a press statement expressing his respect for the outcome of the referenda. He also declared his inconvenience and regret due to the fact that the island would remain divided and militarized and that Turkish Cypriots would not enjoy the benefits of EU membership (UN Security Council-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). In his report Secretary-General urged UN Security Council to reconsider the situation after Turkish Cypriots' clear and sincere call for unification. He stated that under the current political situation and considering the Turkish Cypriot's willingness to end the *status quo* in the island UN Security Council ought to "give a strong lead to all States to cooperate both bilaterally and in international bodies to eliminate unnecessary restrictions and barriers that have the effect of isolating the Turkish Cypriots and impeding their development" (UN Security Council-S/2004/437, May 28, 2004). However Annan's report suggesting the removal of the all restrictions on TRNC could not be submitted to the UN Security Council because of the veto threat of Russia (Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, interview with the author). The early reactions from the EU capitals were parallel to the Secretary-General's conclusions.

EU Commissioner for Enlargement Verheugen interpreted the results in German ARD television and said “there is a shadow now over the accession of Cyprus... What we will seriously consider now is finding a way to end the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots”. Verheugen’s remarks were pointing out a critical decision related with the isolation of Turkish Cypriots taken by the General Affairs and External Relations Council meeting in Copenhagen. On 26 April 2004 EU member states declared Council’s determinacy to put an end to the isolation of Turkish Cypriot community. It continued:

The Council invited the Commission to bring forward comprehensive proposals to this end, with particular emphasis on the economic integration of the island and on improving contact between the two communities and with the EU. The Council recommended that the 259 million euro already earmarked for the northern part of Cyprus in the event of a settlement now be used for this purpose (European Council, April 26, 2004).

Thus EU clearly expressed that legally bound by the provisions of Article 1(1) of the Protocol No 10 of the Accession Treaty with Republic of Cyprus, pending a settlement; EU *acquis* would not be extended to the areas that were not under the control of government of Cyprus. However the will of Turkish Cypriot community who demanded further integration with EU and with the world under the roof of a federal Cyprus could not be disregarded in the absence of a comprehensive solution (European Council, April 26, 2004).

Following the Council conclusion on 7 July 2004, Commission issued a draft proposal having a package protecting freedom of movement of the people, goods and services across the Green Line. For this purpose two regulations –Green Line Regulation and Direct Trade Regulation - were drafted. Facilitating the free movement of people, the Green Line Regulation specified the terms and conditions for the Green

Line⁷⁴ crossings of Greek and Turkish Cypriot citizens, who were treated as the citizens of EU under the Republic of Cyprus, and the citizens of third countries (non-EU citizens). Direct Trade Regulation was drafted to enable the crossing of goods over the Green Line. According to the Direct Trade Regulation, goods that would “be accompanied by a document issued by the Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce, duly authorized for that purpose by the Commission in agreement with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, or by another body so authorized in agreement with the latter” would not freely cross the Green Line under effective controls.⁷⁵ This initiative “was not only deregulatory in nature through the removal of trade barriers and distortions to competition, but also re-regulatory through the building of internal market” (Shaelou, 2010: 266). Therefore the aim was eliminating economic disparities between two communities on the island as well as facilitating the societal integration through economic measures.

For the Turkish Cypriot officials, EU’s incentives to end the isolation of Turkish Cypriots would only offer relief for Turkish Cypriot economy and trade; yet these attempts were far from terminating the isolations on Turkish Cypriot people (Olgun, Ergün, October 18, 2014, interview with the author). While the UN Res. 186 (1964), 541 (1983), and 550 (1984) was remaining in force due to the continuation of the legal framework for the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots; EU regulation would not make any change. On the contrary for the Greek Cypriot officials, any attempt to breach the

⁷⁴ Green Line is defined as the “line between the areas under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and those areas in which the Government of the Republic of Cyprus does not exercise effective control” Please see: European Council, Council Regulation No 866/2004, 29 April 2004.

⁷⁵ For more information, please see: Corrigendum to Council Regulation (EC) No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession (*Official Journal of the European Union* L 161 of 30 April 2004) Title III/Article 4.

UN Resolutions would mean recognition of the TRNC (Kıbrıs, March 3, 2006). Therefore the Greek Cypriot officials claimed their right and authority- as it was also stated in the Direct Trade and Financial Aid Regulation- to detect and monitor the allocation and disposal of the financial aid and trade activities (Kıbrıs, March 3, 2006). At this point, it is essential to underline that Cyprus's EU accession without the solution of the conflict severely injured the attractiveness of the European solution, based on the assumed catalytic impact of the EU accession of the island. In line with this, due to the Greek Cypriot's authority to control and monitor the EU-level developments under the EU legal-institutional framework raised serious concerns for Turkish side with respect to the credibility of the EU rewards.

In his report dated 24 September 2004, Secretary- General Annan also expressed his regret that Cyprus's EU accession could not be a catalyzer as it was hoped for the settlement of the frozen conflict and he pointed out the vitality of EU framework for the continuation of bi-communal dialogue. In the same report, he expressed his reluctance to resume his good offices mission in the sense that the fragile contacts between Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders terminated by the deep distrust and mutual blame-game (UN Security Council-S/2004/756, September 24, 2004). After Annan's call urging Greek Cypriot government to express its views and suggestions on the changes regarding the UN plan (Today's Zaman, February 12, 2005) Papadopoulos stated that the Greek Cypriot government would not continue the process with a plan which did not reflect the will of Greek Cypriot people- Annan plan- and urged UN Secretary-General and all other parties to move on with a new initiative (Athens News Agency, March 22, 2005).

Another significant message given by Papadopoulos reflected the Greek Cypriot government's concerns and expectations about the role that the UN Secretary-General would play in the future peace negotiations. He declared "we will not accept another mediating role of the UN Secretary-General... the national issues, the matters of a people can neither be solved through the mediation of a foreigner nor even with preventative mediation" (Athens News Agency, March 22, 2005). Papadopoulos's criticisms regarding the UN mediation during the Annan Plan process was an explicit indication that the Greek Cypriot side would not allow any further UN arbitration which "went beyond the notion of good offices" (Ker-Lindsay, 2009: 147). Opposed to the Greek Cypriot side, as Annan reported, Turkey and Turkish Cypriot officials repeatedly called for UN active mediation to find a solution based on Annan's peace proposal (UN Monthly Forecast, December 2005, Cyprus). Additionally, April 2005 presidential election on the north provided the evidence that the vision of the Turkish Cypriot political elites shared by the vast majority of the Turkish Cypriot community which elected Mehmet Ali Talat, the leader of pro-solution CTP, who had conducted an election campaign based on UN-sponsored federal solution (Smith, April 18, 2005).

In early 2005, it became clear that the two sides had opposite views on the role and authority of UN and the question whether bicomunal talks would continue based on the Annan Plan. Lacking an effective international pressure on both parts and the non-existence of a case of emergency to find a settlement -such as the Cyprus's EU accession process-, in the post-Annan referenda period it became clear that the huge gap between parties would complicate UN involvement as well as bilateral contacts. "Cyprus fatigue" after an era of intense diplomatic endeavors to find a lasting peace settlement, it was explicit in early 2005 that the Cyprus conflict lost its state of urgency

for the international community which had an enormous impact before the Annan referendum to motivate all interested parties to sit at the negotiation table (High ranking bureaucrat, Presidency of TRNC, 17 September 2014, Interview with the author). In this environment, Kieran Prendergast, UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, reported after his pulse taking visits to the island, that the gap between two parties was huge and the level of confidence was low and “these two factors, especially in combination, make efforts to establish common ground extremely difficult”.⁷⁶ Based on Prendergast report, UN Secretary-General announced “launching a new process prematurely would be inadvisable” (UN Security Council-S/2005/743, November 29, 2005).

In July 2006, UN Secretary-General Annan attempted another pulse taking maneuver through his Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Ibrahim Gambari (UN Security Council-S/2006/931, December 1, 2006). Gambari’s endeavors bear fruit and the Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders signed a set of principles that expressed both sides’ commitment “to the unification of Cyprus based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation and political equality, as set out in the relevant Security Council resolutions” (UN Security Council-S/2006/572, July 25, 2006). With 8 July 2006 agreement, the two leaders decided that the technical committees would start negotiations by the end of July and at the same time “the two leaders would also have exchanged a list of issues of substance and its contents to be studied by expert bi-communal working groups and finalized by the leaders” (UN Security Council-S/2006/572, July 25, 2006). Although the representatives of both community leaders

⁷⁶ To have a full account of UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs Prendergast’s observations, Please see: UN Security Council, 5211th Meeting Records, S/PV.5211.

gathered many times during 2006 and 2007, they could not reach a conclusion on the technical committees and working groups' titles, numbers and compositions.⁷⁷ The real progress could only be reached after the February 2008 Greek Cypriot Presidential elections that resulted with the victory of leader of the AKEL, Demetris Christofias.⁷⁸ Following Christofias' inauguration on 21 March 2008, two leaders agreed on to set up a number of technical committees and working groups (UN Security Council-S/2008/353, June 2, 2008). The leaders stated that they would start fully-fledge negotiations under the auspices of UN Secretary-General based on the results of the works of working groups and technical committees (UN Security Council-S/2008/353, June 2, 2008). The leaders also agreed on that the Ledra Street⁷⁹ would be "opened and functioned in accordance with the established practices at other crossings" (UN Security Council-S/2008/353, June 2, 2008). On 23 May 2008 upon their review of the reports prepared by technical committees, Talat and Christofias made a joint statement in which they reaffirmed their commitment to a bizonal, bicomunal federation with a single international personality and bases on political equality, as defined by relevant Security Council resolutions (UN Security Council-S/2008/353, June 2, 2008). Acknowledging the momentum in bi-communal negotiations, in July 2009 UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon appointed former Australian Foreign Minister Alexander Downer as his special adviser on Cyprus. In October 2009, as a sign of its commitment

⁷⁷ For a detailed coverage on bicomunal talks between 2006 and 2007, please see UN Secretary General Reports on Cyprus titled S/2006/315; S/2006/931; S/2007/328 and S/2007/699.

⁷⁸ For the election results, please see: European Election Database, "Cyprus: Presidential Elections 2008". Available at: http://www.nsd.uib.no/european_election_database/

⁷⁹ Ledra Street is the central crossing point on the Green Line between north and south Cyprus.

and determination to provide technical support to the settlement process, head of European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso appointed an EU official to act as a contact between Commission and UN good offices mission in Cyprus.

Despite the fresh start between Talat and Christofias after the elections in the south, compared to the UN peace-making efforts during Kofi Annan's General Secretary, process UN mediation was quite limited. Failure of the peace process monitored and mediated by the UN Secretary General also had deep repercussions for the future of UN involvement. Opposed to the enhanced mediatory role of the UN Secretary General in filling the gaps and finalizing peace plan, which was a product of Turkey's last minute efforts, in the post-referenda era, UN played a relatively passive role in the bicommunal talks. As UN Secretary General's Special Adviser Alexander Downer pointed out in June 2010 the role of UN in the peace talks "is not to exercise arbitration or mediation"⁸⁰. Coupled with the lack of affective EU leverage on Greek Cypriot government, the low profile role of UN in the Cyprus peace talks resulted with the loss of momentum in the peace process. In overall assessment, in the lack of active UN involvement the fragile dialogue between two soft-liner leaders Talat-Christofias did not lead a dramatic change in the Cyprus stalemate. The principle of "nothing is agreed until everything is agreed" and high uncertainties with respect to the political-electoral costs and of reaching a final solution plan which would be presented to the approval of Cypriot communities did not bear fruits.

In late 2009, the rise of popular discontent due to the ongoing isolation of northern Cyprus despite the Turkish Cypriots' strong support for solution endured to the

⁸⁰ For a full account of the UN role in the negotiations, please see: Remarks by Special Adviser of the Secretary-General Alexander Downer, Larnaca Airport, 4 June 2010, available at: http://www.uncyprustalks.org/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=2958&tt=graphic&lang=11

Turkish Cypriot politics and Turkish Cypriot parliamentary elections in 2009 resulted with the significant victory of nationalist party UBP (Sözen, 2009). It followed by the electoral success of Derviş Eroğlu who was known as a hard-liner, nationalist figure supporting the equality and existence of two states in the Cyprus during his election campaign for April 2010 presidential elections. Upon his electoral victory, Eroğlu made a speech in Turkish NTV broadcast and stated his determination and will to continue bi-communal negotiations (BBC News, April 18, 2010). Between May 2010 and May 2012 bilateral talks were held between Christofias and Eroğlu. Besides low profile issues discussed in the technical committees, the talks did not result with a solid solution formula and the dynamism of the talks between 2002 and 2004 could not be materialized. Although UBP's and Eroğlu's rise did not cause a breakdown in bi-communal talks (Akşit, 2012), the process in post 2010 era became more fragile due to the "historical baggage" (Sözen, 2009) of the rising nationalist discourse in the north. For example in a speech given by Eroğlu he stated "we have difficulties as we had in the past. Yet thanks to god we are in a better position today. We are in solidarity with our motherland, Turkey. We are free within the borders of our national borders. We created a state and an economy out of nothing".⁸¹ Thus during this era, nationalist discourse recalling "two state solution" and "strong solidarity with motherland Turkey" –the two characteristic political legacy of the Denктаş- were resounded at the top of the Turkish Cypriot administration.

⁸¹ Please see: Eroğlu, Derviş. "Cumhurbaşkanı Sayın Dr.Derviş Eroğlu'nun "Dr. Fazıl Küçük'ün Ölümünün 27. Yıldönümü Anma Töreni"nde Yaptıkları Konuşma" (Speech Delivered by President Eroğlu in Commemorative Ceremony of Dr. Fazıl Küçük's 27th anniversary of death), 11 January 2011, Nicosia.

5.2. Ankara's New Cyprus Strategy

After April 2004 referenda, JDP government endeavored to mobilize international community to reconsider the isolation of Turkish Cypriot community with a fair account of the referenda results. Uğur Ziyal, Foreign Ministry Undersecretary, briefed EU ambassadors in Ankara and proposed that Turkish Cypriots' "resounding yes" vote changed all parameters and EU should revise the terms of Cyprus's integration with the EU. Ziyal also reiterated that the sanctions imposed on the Turkish Cypriot side for decades should be lifted (Turkish Daily News, April 24, 2004). Ankara's proposal to reconsider Cyprus's EU membership in the light of the latest developments was unrealistic in the sense that in April 2003, Cyprus's EU accession process was finalized with the signing of Accession Treaty. In other words, for EU 1 May 2004 was a symbolic date for greeting the newcomers. Additionally according to the 1997 Luxembourg Summit decisions, solution of the conflict was not declared as a pre-condition for Cyprus's EU membership. At this stage Cyprus's EU membership process could not be blocked or suspended unless there was a serious breach of accession criteria. However, Ziyal's briefing was read as Ankara was aware of the fact that Cyprus's EU membership would seriously risk Turkey's EU accession process as well as the attempts to reach a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus conflict.

Ziyal's briefing was parallel to Foreign Minister Gül's assessments on referendum. In a press release he urged EU leaders and institutions to reconsider the situation after Greek Cypriot's rejection of the reunification and comprehensive solution and

give an end to the “unjust isolations implemented on Turkish Cypriots”. He also added “it became clear that Turkey and Turkish Cypriots, who were accused of being non-compromising by the international community for 30 years, do not deserve such kind of indictments” (Türkiye Bülteni⁸², May 2004).

Apart from the lifting of isolations on Turkish Cypriots and unilateral integration of Greek Cypriots with the EU, Turkey had concerns about her own EU integration process. Waiting for a positive signal for the initiation of accession negotiations in the eve of critical 17 December EU Summit, accompanied by civil society organizations, trade and business chambers, Turkish leaders accelerated their campaigns in the EU capitals. As previously underlined by EU, Turkey’s determination and efforts to reach a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus conflict would contribute to the country’s EU accession process. Based on this view, Prime Minister Erdoğan urged EU to consider Turkey’s constructive efforts in pre-referendum era when taking critical decisions which would determine Turkey’s vocation with the EU. In a party gathering he said “the stones moved in Cyprus. From now on everybody should talk by considering the new conditions”. He continued

We are expecting that the positive steps taken by the Turkish side will empower Turkey’s hand in such a matter (*Cyprus conflict*) which is not directly a precondition for the negotiations. Considering the norms and principles that the EU is based on, it is a liability of the EU to respond Turkey’s changing attitude towards the issue. We truly believe that our expectations will find a place at the EU level. (Türkiye Bülteni, May 2004)

Under these circumstances, on May 1 2004, Cyprus became an EU member state. Cyprus’s EU membership created serious question marks for the future of Turkey’s

⁸² “Türkiye Bülteni” (Bulletin of Turkey) is the official publication of JDP.

integration with EU especially when the Greek Cypriot government's threat to veto Turkey's accession unless Turkey recognizes the Republic of Cyprus and withdraw its troops in the north of the island. Considering this threat, Ankara structured its Cyprus strategy in a way to establish a balance between its EU aspiration and "red lines" in Cyprus case.

5.2.1. Turkey's EU membership Perspective and Cyprus Conflict

On May 1 2004, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs published a declaration emphasizing the official position of Turkish state regarding the EU enlargement including Cyprus. With this declaration Ankara reorganized its relations with the Cyprus which was now a member state of a Union that Turkey aimed to be a member. With respect to the Greek Cypriots EU accession, Ankara declared

The Greek Cypriots, who will join the EU on 1 May 2004, have no authority to represent the whole of Cyprus or the Turkish Cypriots. They cannot claim authority, jurisdiction or sovereignty over the Turkish Cypriots, who have equal status, or over the entire Island of Cyprus... Greek Cypriots who organized themselves under their own constitutional order and within their boundaries cannot be the legitimate government representing the whole of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriots (Press Release Regarding the EU Enlargement, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1 May 2004).

Ankara's declaration included messages for both EU and Greek Cypriots. In the first hand, responding to the Greek Cypriot's demands that Turkey should recognize "Republic of Cyprus" to secure its EU accession process, Ankara gave the message that Turkey would follow its traditional policy which was based on the principle that the Greek Cypriot establishment cannot claim authority on the entire island as the legal continuation of "Republic of Cyprus" was established by 1960 Constitution. Yet, acknowledging this fact, Ankara recognizes the existence of two separate legal entities

“who organized themselves under their own constitutional order and within their territorial boundaries”. Under these circumstances, Turkey acknowledges Southern Cyprus “who organized itself under its own constitutional order and within its territorial boundaries” as the EU member state only representing Greek Cypriot community. In addition to this, Ankara reaffirmed that its recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will remain unchanged. Ankara’s strategy of acknowledging the separate constitutional order in the south of the island was targeted to eliminate any train crash before 17 December European Council and it did properly work.

In addition to these Ankara forwarded the 24 April referenda as a new dimension for the future of the island. Reference to the “two separate referenda” held in the island simultaneously highlighted that the UN’s decision and EU’s support to held separate referenda was the sign that both institutions acknowledged the existence of two separate people and entities in the island. Furthermore Ankara pointed out that despite Turkish Cypriots’ will to have a political future in EU under the umbrella of a federal re-united Cyprus, Greek Cypriot side’s “resounding no” made division of the island consistent.

The critical decision on the start of accession negotiations with Turkey was discussed in Brussels European Council in June 2004. Presidency conclusion on Turkey underlined once more EU’s commitment that on the basis of a report and recommendation from the Commission, that Turkey fulfilled the Copenhagen political criteria, the EU would open accession negotiations with Turkey without delay. Before the final decision, The European Council also invited Turkey to finish negotiations with the Commission on the adaptation of the Additional Protocol to Ankara Agreement “to

take account of the accession of the new Member States” (Brussels European Council, June 17-18 2004).

Brussels Council conclusion related with the Additional Protocol was pointing out a crucial matter that would affect Turkish-EU relations in the long-run. Turkey’s attitude towards Cyprus was not only a matter of political conditionality under the chapter of enhanced political dialogue and political criteria but also it was a legal matter based on *acquis* conditionality whose breach by the accession countries might seriously damage the integration process.⁸³ Under these circumstances, even before the opening of accession negotiations, it was obvious that the Greek Cypriots’ EU membership would complicate the already problematic and unstable relations between EU and Turkey.

The Council’s call for Turkey to sign additional protocol of the Ankara Agreement which extended Turkey’s Custom Union with 25 EU member states without any discrimination was a reaction against the decree published in the Official Gazette in May 2004 suggesting that Turkey extended its Custom Union with the new EU member states excluding Cyprus (Hürriyet, October 2002). In order to eliminate any crises that would risk getting a date for accession negotiations, on 2 October 2004 President Sezer signed an additional decree that extended the Turkey’s Customs Union with all EU member states including Cyprus (Interview with an anonymous bureaucrat from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, October 1, 2014). Simultaneously, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a declaration read as “this decision is an adminis-

⁸³ This point was emphasized in the author’s interviews with the interviewees from European Union Delegation in Turkey.

trative act emanating from our relations with the EU as well as reciprocal legal obligations under the Customs Union...The amendment of our internal legislation as such does not imply in any way the recognition of the Greek Cypriot administration by Turkey” (Press Release No: 128, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2 October 2004⁸⁴). Turkey also reiterated its commitment to its special relationship with the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and its obligations emanating from this special relationship. On December 2, 2004, Minister of Foreign Affairs Gül finalized debates on Turkey’s recognition of the Cyprus Republic by stating that Turkey would not recognize Cyprus without a permanent just peace in the island (Cumhuriyet, 3 December 2004).

European Commission published its regular report on Turkey’s progress towards the EU membership and its advisory opinion on the initiation of the accession negotiations with Turkey. Concerning recommendation on the start of accession negotiations with Turkey, Commission declared “in view of the overall progress of reforms, and provided that Turkey brings into force the outstanding legislation mentioned above, the Commission considers that Turkey sufficiently fulfills the political criteria and recommends that accession negotiations be opened” (European Commission, 2004). Commission also urged Turkey to sign the draft protocol required for the adaptation of the Ankara Treaty in which Turkey was legally obligated to extend the Customs Union to 25 member states including the Republic of Cyprus.

⁸⁴ For more information, please see: Turkish Government's Decision to Include all new EU members in the scope of the Council of Ministers Decree No. 2002/4616 of 3 September 2002 which specifies the countries to which the Turkey-EU Customs Union applies. No:128, 2 October 2004.

At this juncture, historical 16-17 December European Council Summit congregated in Brussels. Based on Commission's recommendation, European Council stated:

Turkey sufficiently fulfills the Copenhagen political criteria to open accession negotiations provided that it brings into force these specific pieces of legislation. It invited the Commission to present to the Council a proposal for a framework for negotiations with Turkey, on the basis set out in paragraph 23. It requested the Council to agree on that framework with a view to opening negotiations on 3 October 2005. (Brussels European Council, December 16-17, 2004)

In addition to the positive assessments, Council raised two conditions which were essential to start the negotiation process. In the first hand, Turkey should adopt six additional pieces of legislation. In the second hand, Council reiterated the essentiality of the signing and implementation of additional protocol of Ankara Treaty, extending Turkey's Customs Union with all EU member states before setting the decision to open the accession negotiations (Radikal, December 17, 2004). For the Greek Cypriots and the principled opponents of Turkey's membership, any EU institution could not tolerate the accession of a candidate country which did not recognize an EU member state and fulfill its obligations based on EU *acquis*. The pre-condition of signing the Additional Protocol created a diplomatic crisis between Turkish mission in Brussels and European leaders. In a press conference in 16 December, by implying the *de facto* recognition of Cyprus through signing the additional protocol, Erdoğan declared "I would take this political risk to lay aside Turkey's EU membership process." (Hürriyet, December 17, 2004)

However, with the efforts of pro-Turkish political leaders led the way by Tony Blair and Silvio Berlusconi, European Council softened its demands on the additional protocol by allowing time for Turkey to sign the additional protocol and considering

Turkey's oral assurance as sufficient⁸⁵. In the meantime, based on Turkey's insistence, Dutch Prime Minister made a declaration emphasizing that Turkey's signature on the additional protocol would not mean the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus (Radikal, December 18, 2004). On the other hand, Ankara had to make a compromise to secure its EU integration process and on behalf of Turkish government Erdoğan declared "the Turkish Government confirms that it is ready to sign the Protocol on the adaptation of the Ankara Agreement prior to the actual start of accession negotiations and after reaching agreement on and finalizing the adaptations which are necessary in view of the current membership of the European Union" (Brussels European Council, December 16-17, 2004). Regardless of the debates on recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, Turkey's declaration affirmed that Turkey accepted the condition of signing additional protocol before 3 October 2005 by acknowledging that this condition was based on the EU legal system –*acquis communautaire*–.

As it was agreed on in Brussels Summit, Turkey signed additional protocol on 29 July 2005 and extended Ankara Treaty to all EU member states including Cyprus. On the other hand, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a declaration stating that Turkey would continue to acknowledge "the Greek Cypriot authorities as exercising authority, control and jurisdiction only in the territory south of the buffer zone, as is currently the case, and as not representing the Turkish Cypriot people and will treat the acts performed by them accordingly" (Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Declaration by Turkey on Cyprus, 29 July 2005). Ankara also reiterated that Turkey's signature did not refer to the recognition of Republic of Cyprus and the signature would

⁸⁵ For more information about the details of diplomatic bargaining please see: Akdoğan, Yalçın (2010) *Tarihe Düşülen Notlar, 17 Aralık AB Zirvesinin Perde Arkası*, İstanbul: Alfa Publication.

not mean Turkey's abandonment of its rights and obligations based on 1960 Treaties (Declaration by Turkey on Cyprus, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 29 July 2005). With this declaration Ankara differentiated the two Greek Cypriot demands: recognition of the Republic of Cyprus and implementation of Additional Protocol. First of all for Ankara asserting the principle of "reciprocity" which means the simultaneous lifting of all restrictions does not mean the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus. Legally speaking recognition requires an official declaration. However, with this formula Turkey acknowledges that there exists two separate authorities in the island "who organized themselves under their own constitutional order and within their territorial boundaries" as provisioned by the Annan Plan. Secondly, Turkey also reaffirms in many platforms that the Republic of Cyprus cannot be regarded as the extension of the Cyprus Republic established by the 1960 Constitution.⁸⁶ Under these circumstances Ankara emphasizes that Turkey's recognition of Cyprus can never be achieved before a bi-zonal, bi-communal and permanent solution which will guarantee the existence of both Turkish and Greek Cypriots as the politically equal partner states.

Upon Turkey's declaration EU issued a counter declaration stating "The European Community and its Member States make clear that this declaration by Turkey is unilateral, does not form part of the Protocol and has no legal effect on Turkey's obligations under the Protocol"(European Commission-C/05/243, September 21, 2005). In the meantime EU reiterated that the opening of negotiations on the relevant chapters depends on Turkey's implementation of its contractual obligations and failure to fulfill its obligations in full would affect the overall negotiation process. Another critical

⁸⁶ Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author. İzmir: Ziyal, Uğur, February 18 2015, Interview with the author, Ankara.

statement was about the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus. EU stressed that member of the EU recognized only the Cyprus Republic “as a subject of international law”. The Union also underlined that the recognition of Cyprus and normalization of Turkey’s relations with all member states was a component of the accession process. (European Commission-C/05/243, September 21, 2005). Upon EU’s counter-declaration spokesman of Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs Namık Tan made a press statement expressing Turkey’s disappointment that EU’s emphasis on the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus was political in nature and contained unfair additional elements which might also undermine UN settlement process on Cyprus. Statement also reiterated Ankara’s position as the first and foremost step was the simultaneous lifting of all restrictions on Cyprus by all relevant parties (Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Statement on the EU Counter Declaration).

In the shadow of these debates on the Additional Protocol, on 3 October 2005, European Council published and announced the document of Negotiating Framework for Turkey. In the framework document, EU pointed out that the advancement of negotiations with Turkey was dependent on Turkey’s further reform performance to fulfill Copenhagen political criteria and obligations of *acquis* as well as the ratification and complete implementation of the Additional Protocol to Ankara Agreement and Turkey’s progress in resolution of Cyprus conflict and the normalization of its relationships with its neighbors and all EU member states (Council of the European Union, Negotiating Framework).

Under these circumstances Turkish government had two options: it would either pressure on a new initiative under UN auspice to reach a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus conflict and extend its Customs Union with a reunified Cyprus, or it would

implement Additional Protocol with a caution highlighting, that the Turkey's signature did not mean the recognition of Republic of Cyprus, and act in accordance with this declaration. However, the second option for Ankara and Turkish Cypriot government could not be carried out when the ongoing isolation of the Turkish Cypriots was evident. In each and every declaration of Turkish ruling elites, Turkey's disappointments regarding the continuation of Turkish Cypriot's isolation, despite their will for reunification, were evident (Ziyal, Uğur, February 18, 2015, interview with the author). Therefore a new formula was needed in order to eliminate any deadlock in Turkey's EU accession process, to secure Turkey's "red lines" on Cyprus matter and to end isolation of Turkish Cypriot community. In this sense, in May 2005 and in January 2006 Ministry of Foreign Affairs proposed two action plans which pave the way for both Turkey's EU accession and solution of the Cyprus conflict when the UN's interest in the Cyprus problem was vibrant and continuing.

On 31 May 2005, Permanent Representative of Turkey to the UN, Ambassador Baki İlkin, presented Turkish Foreign Minister Gül's letter dated 30 May 2005 emphasizing Turkey's determination and strong will to resume negotiations under UN auspices and "on the basis of the plan which is being referred to as the Annan plan" (UN Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 29, A/59/820–S/2005/355). The letter also proposed that Turkey would support a new initiative paving the way for comprehensive solution whose first steps should be the lifting of all constraints on the free movement of people, goods and services between the North and the South; lifting of all restrictions applied to sea and air transportations; having special arrangement for the Turkish Cypriot community's enjoyment of economic benefits of Customs Union and removal of all restrictions preventing Turkish Cypriots from participating in the

international activities (UN Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 29, A/59/820–S/2005/355). Ankara also underlined that the removal of all isolations was in line with the Secretary-General's proposal to the UN Security Council and this critical step would enhance confidence between two parties. Turkey's initiative did not actually offer a road map for comprehensive solution. Rather it was proposing simultaneous lifting of all restrictions imposed on Cyprus (on both Turkish and Greek Cypriots) by all relevant parties in which Turkey and EU were the two of them. Ankara's May 2005 and January 2006 action plans for Cyprus issue were the open indicators that Turkey would follow "one step ahead" approach and take active steps for the resumption of peace talks. Moreover Turkey's proposals also reflected Turkey's and Turkish Cypriot people's expectations from international community to end the isolation of Northern Cyprus. At the same time Cyprus Action plans would break the deadlock in Turkey-EU relations with respect to the implementation of additional protocol. Indeed Ankara's insistence on the simultaneous lifting of all restrictions was mentioned at both UN and EU platforms.

Turkey's initiative was well-timed in the sense that in April 2005, presidential elections took place in Northern Cyprus and Mehmet Ali Talat who was known as the champion of Annan Plan came to power (Hürriyet, April 16, 2005). This development encouraged Turkey and with full consent and dialogue with Turkish Cypriot government, Turkey submitted its proposal to the UN. Moreover in the midst of 2005, UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Kieran Prendergast conducted preliminary talks and undertook consultations in Cyprus, Turkey and Greece. Under the pres-

sure of EU time table set to the implementation of Additional Protocol before 5 October 2005 and in the light of election results and UN's continuing interest in Cyprus conflict, in post-2004 era Ankara took action.

The second pillar of Turkey's policy to end the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots was based on the strategy to promote Islamic and Arab states to take necessary steps for removal of the isolation of Turkish Cypriot community. As a result of the diplomatic efforts of Turkey, in June 2004, foreign ministers of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) agreed on to lift all restrictions on Turkish Cypriots. They declared

Recalling that the UN Plan aimed to establish a new state of affairs in Cyprus in the form of a new bi-zonal partnership with two equal constituent states, it acknowledged that neither side may claim authority or jurisdiction over the other, and that the Greek Cypriots do not represent the Turkish Cypriots. The Conference urged Member States to closely associate with the Turkish Cypriots with a view to helping them materially and politically and to increase and expand their relations in all fields and, in particular direct transport, trade, tourism, culture, information, investment and sports contacts (Final Communiqué Of the 31st Session of the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, 16 June 2004).

Although OIC's decision did not mean the upgrading of the status and recognition of the TRNC by the Organization, based on the provisions of Annan Plan which defined the state of establishment as the partnership of two equal states, Turkish Cypriot community was re-named as "Turkish Cypriot State". This was not actually a development that would open up TRNC to the international community as an internationally recognized state but it could start a process of acknowledgement of the existence of two authorities in the island (Dodd, 2004)⁸⁷.

In line with this strategy, On 25 January 2006, Ankara reiterated the vitality of the lifting of isolations on Northern Cyprus to start a new initiative and proposed an

⁸⁷ Please see: Dodd, Clement, Written evidence submitted to UK House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, 21 September 2004.

action plan on lifting of restrictions in Cyprus (UN Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 19, A/60/657-S/2006/48). The action plan reiterated Turkey's demands for simultaneous lifting of all restrictions and in line with this Ankara proposed to open its airports and ports to Greek Cypriot vessels and air carriers in return of the lifting of restrictions preventing trafficking of all goods, people and services to TRNC's Gazimağusa, Girne and Gemikonağı ports as well as Ercan airport. Different than the previous initiative, the new proposal included the organization of a high level conference with the participation of representatives from Turkey, Greece and Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. Ankara's proposal for simultaneously opening of Turkish ports and airspace to the Greek Cypriot vessels and aircrafts and lifting of isolations on Turkish Cypriots was the other crucial issues included in the action plan. Supported by declarations of Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the individual declarations by Foreign Minister Gül, synchronized lifting of all restrictions on the Cypriot people by the relevant international actors did not mean the recognition of Republic of Cyprus. This foreign policy strategy was mainly motivated by three concerns: (i) the urgent need to open out isolated Turkish Cypriots and (ii) avoiding any setback in Turkey's EU accession process in the short-run and (iii) urging EU, UN and international community to increase their leverage on Greek Cypriots to resume peace process (an anonymous bureaucrat from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, October 1, 2014).

Yet, Turkey's proposal was criticized by the Greek Cypriot government in the sense that Ankara was playing a blame-game by presenting Greek Cypriot people as the responsible for the ongoing status quo. For the Greek Cypriot side "these proposals were an obvious effort by Turkey to involve the United Nations Secretary-General and

the Security Council on its side in an issue which concerns the European Union” (UN Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 19, A/60/671-S/2006/82). As Greek Cypriot government underlined, Turkey followed a strategy to de-Europeanize its responsibilities based on EU *acquis*. Ankara brought the EU Customs Union regime’s shortcomings for Turkish Cypriots to the agenda of UN. Ankara’s strategy to de-Europeanize Cyprus peace attempts was mainly driven by the fact that by using its political power and authority in the EU decision making process, Greek Cypriot government would follow a strategy to use its EU membership as a political leverage on Turkey (interview with Osman Ertuğ, TRNC Presidency, 17 October 2014). To Ankara, Greek Cypriot policy of Europeanizing Cyprus conflict was a continuation of the long-run strategy that has been effectively implemented since the early 1990s yet after Cyprus’s EU membership and its veto power the already demolished balance of powers between Cyprus and Turkey (and Turkish Cypriots as well) at the EU level exacerbated (interview with an anonymous bureaucrat, EU Ministry, 4 September 2014). The mentioned strategy was also evident in Papadopoulos’s speech in the UN General Assembly in September 2005 when he presented his government’s prospect for further peace initiative under the auspices of UN Secretary General. He declared

We have always hoped that Turkey’s accession course to the European Union would radically shift its mentality – a prospect that would mark the single biggest development on the Cyprus problem in decades. The fulfillment of Turkey’s obligations emanating from its accession course to the European Union will *ipso jure* rid the Cyprus problem of some of its most intractable components and facilitate a settlement. Simultaneously, the existence of the UN negotiating framework cannot serve as a pretext for postponing or refusing to fulfill these obligations (Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Service, 18 September 2005).

Moreover in a press release on the Annan's comments on the new state of affairs after referenda, Papadopoulos explicitly declared that EU should be a part of future initiative and government "want a more active involvement of the EU in every new effort, but the EU does not want nor would it accept to substitute the UN in their role" (Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Service, Recent Developments 2005).

As a counter policy, responding the increasing demands and efforts of Greek Cypriot government to set a role for the EU in the bi-communal negotiation to find a comprehensive solution for the Cyprus conflict, in post-May 2004 era, Ankara's insistence on the principle that solution of the question and Turkey's EU accession process are two irrelevant political issues was declared from the strongest tone. In his address to the UN General Assembly Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül reiterated Turkey's reciprocal and simultaneous lifting of all isolations proposal and criticized EU's increasing involvement of the Cyprus matter which would jeopardize future UN led initiative. More critically he argued "the Greek Cypriot administration is now trying to side-line the United Nations and to carry the issue to other fora. I urge all international actors to discourage these misguided efforts" (Statement by Abdullah Gül, UN General Assembly 60th meeting, 21 September 2005).

Despite the fact that the strategy to "dissociate Turkey's EU membership process from the solution of Cyprus conflict" has been one of the red lines of all Turkish governments including JDP government (interview with Yaşar Yakış, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs, 12 September 2014), during the Annan Plan process which was evolved around strict EU enlargement time table, Ankara had to acknowledge the link (Hürriyet, 20 November 2002). The mentioned foreign policy strategy was not a new one but in post-2004 era, it was revitalized in its strongest form. Responding Turkey's

initiative, EU Commissioner Rehn declared that what Ankara proposed deserved to be discussed and EU would always welcome efforts to achieve progress in the current stalemate. He reiterated “by signing the Additional Protocol in July 2005, Turkey has made commitments towards the EU and all its Member States, including the Republic of Cyprus, and is expected to meet them fully” (Statement by EU Commissioner Rehn on Turkey's Cyprus initiative, 24 January 2006, EC06-022EN). Rehn also gave the signals that European Commission was working on a new regulation to establish an instrument for financial aid to support Turkish Cypriot economy. Rehn’s emphasis on Turkey’s commitments under Additional Protocol and EU’s commitments for the Turkish Cypriots separately reflected the Union’s common understanding that those two issues were detached. In a speech he gave in the first half of 2007, Rehn openly declared “these are two separate issues, and as I said we expect that Turkey meets its obligations under the Ankara Protocol, without linking it to other issues” (Oli Rehn, interview with İpek Cem, January 2007).⁸⁸

The opening of accession negotiations with Turkey did not finalize the debates on Additional Protocol. George Lillikas, Greek Cypriot government’s spokesman, said “(If) Turkey continues not to implement the European *acquis communautaire*... its path towards the European Union will end,” (Cyprus Mail, 18 February 2006). In the meanwhile, during his visit to Turkey, French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy, urged Turkey to recognize Republic of Cyprus and implement Additional Protocol if Turkey was determined to continue its European vocation (Cyprus Bulletin,

⁸⁸ Available at: http://www.global-leaders.tv/en/archive/olli_rehn.asp (last access: 10 May 2015)

February 2006). Furthermore, European Parliament Foreign Affairs Committee published the first draft of its report on Turkey which declared Turkey's the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, implementation of Additional Protocol and acknowledgement of the "Armenian Genocide" as the preconditions for the continuation of the accession process. Report of EU Parliament was harshly criticized by both Turkish government and opposition parties. German reactions against Turkey's policy towards Cyprus were in line with the declarations made by French Foreign Minister and European Parliament. In October 2006, the newly elected German chancellor, Angela Merkel warned Turkey that complete implementation of Additional Protocol was standing as a pre-condition and "this issue must be resolved for the continuation of (membership) talks" (Deutsche Welle, 5 October 2006). Upon Merkel's call for opening sea ports and airports to the Republic of Cyprus, Erdoğan answered "we are absolutely not in favor of opening our air and sea ports (to Cypriot use) if the isolation (of the TRNC) is not lifted" (Deutsche Welle, 5 October 2006). On 8 November 2006, in its progress report underlining the slowdown in EU harmonization process, European Council urged Turkey to take necessary steps for the implementation of Additional Protocol. Regarding Turkey's Action Plan, in 2006 European Commission report on Turkey's progress, Commission reiterated that implementing Additional Protocol was a legal obligation and an *acquis* conditionality and there existed no linkage between EU's observance of its commitments with respect to the Turkish Cypriot community and Turkey's fulfillment of its responsibilities based on EU *acquis* (European Commission, 2006). Commission report on Turkey's progress was harshly criticized by Turkish government and Gül declared that Turkey's position related with the implementation of Additional Protocol would not change and that the recognition of Cyprus could

never imposed as a precondition for Turkey's EU integration (Radikal, November 6, 2006). At this point it is essential to underline that in post-2005 era JDP government's approach to the Cyprus issue in the context of Turkey's EU membership is mainly driven by the assessment that the implementation of Additional Protocol is possible conditional to the simultaneous lifting of all restriction of both communities. On the other hand recognition of the Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish Republic is not possible before a bi-zonal, bi-communal, just and viable settlement under UN auspices.

In November 2006, Commissioner Rehn made a speech on Turkey's accession to EU and presented the Commission's opinion. He expressed his regret that despite Commission's Finnish Presidency's constructive efforts, Turkey did not change its position on Addition Protocol (Rehn, November 27, 2006). He gave the first clues that EU train was about to go off the rails for Turkey. Following his speech, on 29 November on behalf of European Commission he represented Commission recommendation to the Council on Turkey's state of accession. Commission declared:

The Intergovernmental Conference on Accession with Turkey should not open negotiations on chapters covering policy areas relevant to Turkey's restrictions as regards the Republic of Cyprus until the Commission confirms that Turkey has fulfilled its commitments. These chapters are: Chapter 1 free movement of goods, Chapter 3 Right of establishment and freedom to provide services, Chapter 9 Financial services, Chapter 11 agriculture and rural development, Chapter 13 fisheries, Chapter 14 transport policy, Chapter 29 customs union, and Chapter 30 external relations (EU Commission presents recommendation on continuation of Turkey's accession negotiations, 29 November 2006, (EC06-368EN)).

Commission's recommendation did not propose freezing of Turkey's accession process rather it was obvious that EU was aware of the exclusion of Turkey would have political consequences for EU-Turkey strategic partnership. In the press release Rehn underlined this point as "in the light of the strategic importance of EU-Turkey relations

today we confirm that these negotiations continue, although with a slower pace” (Rehn, November 27, 2006). Based on Commission’s recommendation, on 11 December 2006, European General Affairs and External Relations Council decided to suspend negotiations on eight chapters relevant to restrictions with regard to the Republic of Cyprus. The European General External Relations Council stated that until Turkey fulfills its commitments under the Additional Protocol to the EU-Turkey Association Agreement new chapters would not be opened. In addition, European General External Relations Council stated that Council’s conclusion on the suspension of eight chapters would be revised until the end of 2009 based on Commission’s recommendations and Turkey’s progress in fulfilling its responsibilities based on Additional Protocol (European General External Relations Council, December 11, 2006).

In post-2006 era, Cyprus conflict had serious repercussions on Turkey’s EU accession negotiation process. Although the suspension of negotiation in eight chapters avoided a train crash in Turkey-EU relations, it meant that the EU train for Turkey was about to be get out of road due to the legal impact of Cyprus conflict in Turkey’s accession process (Eralp and Eralp, 2012). While the deadline by which Turkey had to implement Additional Protocol was approaching, Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership increased their pressure on UN to actively mediate within a strict timetable and urged UN Secretary-General to increase his leverage on Greek Cypriots to speed up the process. At this juncture, the Turkey’s holding a seat UN Security Council in 2008 raised expectations that the Turkey through its UN Security Council membership would have an opportunity to impose more pressure on Greek Cypriots and the balance might have change in favor of Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community (Oğuz, October

20, 2008). However, Turkey's UN Security Council membership could not be effective in mobilizing UN to end isolation of Turkish Cypriot people as it was suggested by former Secretary General Annan in his report and proposal dated May 28, 2004.

Moreover party's enthusiasm for the EU harmonization in its broadest sense and taking active steps in Cyprus peace process was overshadowed by the party's concerns for its political survival. On the eve of 2007 Presidential elections, in the big cities of Turkey massive demonstrations named as "Republic Marches" were organized by the Atatürkist civil society associations. The JDP government was at the target of the people who had serious concerns for the future of secularism and nation state (Hürriyet Daily News, April 16, 2007). The demonstrations was fired by the debates that wife of Abdullah Gül- JDP's conservative candidate for presidency- was wearing a headscarf and Gül himself did not truly internalized the values of Republic and secularism. Another pressure on the government was made by Turkish Armed Forces. On April 27 2007, in the official website of the Turkish General Staff a memorandum reminding the government that military was the guardian of the Republic and it would not tolerate anti-secular initiatives on the part of the government (Milliyet, April 28, 2007). Despite these pressures, JDP moved on with Gül and in the first round of elections in the Turkish General Assembly Gül was elected as the President. Yet the Constitutional Court declared null the election results due to the required 367 votes could not be reached (Milliyet, May 3, 2007). As the way out strategy, government declared early parliamentary elections to be held in July 2007. JDP garnered 47 percent of the Turkish votes and the party declared its second electoral victory in July 2007 elections. Yet the electoral victory did not end party elites concerns about the party's political

survival. In March 2008 party encountered with a new challenge when the top prosecutor filed a law-suit demanding the closure of JDP due to the party was the focal point of activities against the secular state. The Constitutional Court ruled against the closure of party but confirmed the prosecutor's claim that the party was the focal point of anti-secular activities. Therefore "the government's main venture after the autumn of 2005 was mere survival" (Kadioğlu, 2012: 48). At this political juncture the agenda of the JDP was mainly driven by the domestic pressures party faced.

In addition to these, empowered by the veto right in EU decision making process Greek Cypriots had a remarkable political leverage on both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. In December 2009, Republic of Cyprus declared its veto on opening of the six chapters with Turkey due to Turkey's continuing non-implementation of Additional Protocol and non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus.

In March 2010 there emerged an exit strategy for Turkey to secure Turkey's EU accession in a way that cost of further compliance might decrease for Turkish political elites who advocated simultaneous lifting of all restrictions imposed by the EU and Turkey. In March 2010 "the European Commission applied the recently acquired powers of the European Parliament to end the isolation of Turkish Cypriots through the approval of Direct Trade Regulation (DTR), which nevertheless could not be adopted because of a veto by the Cyprus Republic" (Eralp and Eralp, 2012: 170). Throughout 2010, debates on lifting Greek veto in the implementation of DTR. Since Greek Cypriots' EU membership, EU Commission's proposal to enable direct trade between EU and Turkish Cypriots at preferential custom rates has been systematically blocked by the Greek Cypriot governments who insisted that the issue "involved a

fundamental matter under Protocol 10 of the accession treaty and thus required unanimity in the Council of the EU”.⁸⁹ Upon Greek Cypriot government’s legal argument, EU legal actions service acknowledged Greek Cypriot veto. European Commission continued its determination to lift all restrictions on direct trade and suggested “with the Lisbon Treaty the proposal for the direct trade regulation falls under the co-decision procedures which implies participation of the European Parliament in the process on equal terms with the Council and the ultimate approval of the proposal by the Council will not any more require unanimity but rather qualified majority” (Eralp, 2010: 2). Yet, Greek Cypriot government rejected Commission’s position that proposing economic and trade relations with Turkish Cypriots should be handled as the relations with third countries, and kept its insistence in the discussing DTR within the boundaries of accession treaty with Cyprus which falls under the enlargement agenda. According to the calculations of Turkey, implementation of DTR would change all existing parameters through offering a significant opportunity structure to end the isolation northern Cyprus as well as diffuse the tension in Turkey-EU relations due to the implementation of additional protocol. Therefore Turkey actively lobbied for the application of the provisions of Lisbon Treaty with respect to voting procedures, to empowerment of Commission’s DTR strategy.⁹⁰ To eliminate any deadlock in the EU legislative politics, the issue was discussed by the legal affairs committee held in October 2010 and decided that with reference to the Protocol 10 of Accession Treaty with Cy-

⁸⁹ Please see: International Crisis Group, “Cyprus: Six Steps toward a Settlement”, Crisis Group Europe Briefing No. 61, 22 February 2011: 7.

⁹⁰ Ankara’s activism is emphasized in the interviews with the high ranking bureaucrats from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of EU Affairs.

prus, DTR was an enlargement issue which was a political matter that required unanimous voting procedures and thereby removed parliament from the decision making process on DTR. Accompanied by the disappointments due the non-productive bi-communal negotiations in the island, the legal opinion of the EU on DTR seriously damaged both Turkish Cypriots' expectations regarding the further EU involvement in ending isolation of the Turkish Cypriot people and Turkish political elites' accounts with respect to the EU's credibility. After all Kaliber (2012) defines the dominant psychology of the Turkish government with respect to the Cyprus issue as "Turkey is still committed to re-unification in accordance with the basic parameters of the Annan plan, however it does not need to take further steps since Turkey had already done everything it could do for a solution" (235). Thus JDP activism in post-2005 era gradually diminished and the government did not perceive *status quo* in the island as a case of emergency that ought to be handled even if the ongoing division would serious damage Turkey's EU accession process.

In 2011 general elections, JDP gained an electoral victory for the third time and consolidated its domestic power. During the election campaigns party elites adopted a more hardliner discourse with respect to core foreign and domestic policy matters (Kadioğlu, 2012). Opposed to the previous JDP governments, the third JDP government adopted a foreign policy discourse which was extensively colored by Turkey's cultural and religious communalities with the East rather than the West (Yanık, 2012). Although Turkey's EU accession was stated as the primary strategic goal, party elites emphasis on the vitality of accession process for Turkey's democratic transformation and solution of the long-run problems in Turkish politics remained limited. Furthermore a Euro-sceptic discourse was sensible in party's 2011 election manifesto. In the

election manifesto party's commitment to Turkey's EU membership was declared as the strategic target that would enable Turkey's democratic transformation, integration with the global markets and consolidate Turkey's actorness in world politics. On the other hand EU harshly was criticized as breaking its own rules and norms by setting special conditions before Turkey's EU accession. It was also stated "delaying or blocking Turkey's EU accession due to the political matters like Cyprus issue is sign of hypocrisy and double standard" (JDP election manifesto, 2011). Moreover according to party elites EU's non-fulfillment of its commitments to the Turkish Cypriot community consolidated Euro-sceptical tendencies (Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, interview with the author).

Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in post-2010 era has its share of deteriorated relations between Turkey and EU and the increasing Euroscepticism. In the official visit to TRNC in honor of the 36th anniversary of the Turkish intervention, the President of Turkish General Assembly Cemil Çiçek declared "if they are saying either Cyprus or EU we will choose Cyprus. Turkey's preference is and will always be Cyprus" (Cumhuriyet, July 21, 2010). Ankara's set back from its constructive and proactive Cyprus policy in early 2000s became evident during the era of Cyprus's Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2012. During his visit to Northern Cyprus, Turkish EU Minister Egemen Bağış declared in an interview that all options including the annexation of the Northern Cyprus to Turkey and the creation of the two independent states after an agreed divorce between two leaders were on the table in the lack of a viable, just and lasting peace based on the political equality of the two states on the island (Kıbrıs, March 3, 2012). On the upcoming EU Council Presidency of the Cyprus in 2012 Turkish politicians occasionally declared

that Turkey would not recognize the EU presidency of Cyprus and that Ankara would not be represented in any meetings chaired by the Greek Cypriot EU Council presidency.⁹¹ Turkey's stance was evident in 2012 progress report on Turkey published by EU Commission which regretfully reported that "a government circular instructed all Turkish civil servants to abstain from meetings and contacts with the Cypriot Presidency of the Council of the EU" (European Commission, 2012: 36). Additionally, Commission expressed its regret that "on several occasions, statements at senior political level spoke of alternatives to a comprehensive settlement under UN auspices" (European Commission, 2012: 36). With this respect, debates on the EU presidency of Republic of Cyprus demonstrate EU's limited and contextual effect on Turkey's Cyprus policy.

Furthermore, in 2011, Turkish ruling elites' attitude towards Cyprus resembled with Denktaş's "two state" solution approach coupled with a visible nationalist discourse. In his visit to TRNC, Erdoğan stated "1974 will never go out of our minds. We are in a different situation right now. No one can enslave the Turks of Cyprus. No one can dare to make plans in these lands. We will never allow anyone to perform an operation on the lands kneaded by our martyrs' blood." (Cumhuriyet, July 21, 2012). He continued "we have been saying that until there will be a comprehensive solution based on the existence of two equal states in the island no more steps will be taken" (Cumhuriyet, July 21, 2012). Erdoğan also criticized EU Another significant demonstrator of policy change is the deteriorated relations between Turkey and pro-solution Turkish

⁹¹ For example see: Cumhuriyet, July 20, 2011; Hürriyet Daily News, April 30, 2012;

Cypriot forces in 2011. In early 2011, upon Turkey's declaration that there was a necessity to adopt a new economic program with TRNC that would lead a serious cut in Turkey's transfer payments for certain sectors, Turkish Cypriot labor unions backed by a large scale civil society support conducted massive protests against Turkey known as "Communal Existence Meetings". Throughout the meetings held in the first half of 2011, Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership were protested due to their lack of will in the negotiation process. However Turkey's authority and political oppression on the Turkish Cypriot government was the real target of the protest (Güven, February 27, 2012). Turkish Cypriot concerns about the anomaly and anti-democratic structure of the relations were massively expressed. Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan criticized slogans during the protests and said "the ones we have been cultivated are demonstrating against us" (Hürriyet Daily News, March 2, 2011). In another an official visit to TRNC he defined protestors as the defectors and marginal who aimed to drive a wedge between Turkey and Turkish Cypriot people (Cumhuriyet, July 21, 2012). This situation illustrated that the close contact and affiliation between JDP government and pro-solution and pro-solution Turkish Cypriot opposition in early 2004 terminated. In overall assessments, split or/and fluctuations in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in post referenda era illustrates that the long-run transformation of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus is non-traceable.

5.3 Conclusions: Assessing the EU Impact

Having accomplished its largest enlargement with the integration of 10 new member states, EU's enlargement fatigue began to emerge at both political and societal level (Schimmelfennig, 2008). In its 2006 enlargement strategy, European Commission emphasized that the Union would "be cautious about assuming any new commitments" (European Commission, 2006). Moreover, In December 2004 Brussels European Council, European Council reiterated its commitments and determination to continue accession process that it has been engaged with the candidate countries. Council in the meantime, it emphasized that to secure the momentum of European integration process "the Union's capacity to absorb new members" was an important consideration for the Union (European Brussels Council, December 16-17, 2004). To Schimmelfennig (2008) 2004 Brussels European Council conclusion regarding the Union's future enlargement was the first sign of the Union's lingering membership credibility perspective and conditionality strategy in post-2004 era. The enlargement fatigue was also evident in Brussels's its existing commitments to Turkey. In the Negotiating Framework for Turkey, European Council emphasized that the negotiations were open-ended and the final outcome of the process could not be guaranteed beforehand (European Council, October 3, 2005, Annex II). It continued "including the absorption capacity of the Union, if Turkey is not in a position to assume in full all the obligations of membership it must be ensured that Turkey is fully anchored in the European structures through the strongest possible bond" (European Council, October 3, 2005, Annex II). Council's assessment on Turkey's EU accession raised questions with respect to the credibility of EU's membership perspective for Turkey. Thus for Ankara, the situation was alarming even before the process of accession negotiations. The emphasis

on EU's absorption capacity and open-ended negotiation process were treated as Brussels was paving the way for "privileged partnership" for the future of Turkey's EU integration.⁹² EU's insistence on the implementation of Additional Protocol and recognition of the Republic of Cyprus consolidated the concerns related with the credibility of the EU membership perspective. In a press release, Foreign Minister Gül openly declared "there is a point that we will say "no thanks" to EU".⁹³ Thus in post-2005 era the overarching psychology driving Turkey-EU relations has been the anchor/credibility dilemma. EU's emphasis on the open-ended nature of the accession talks, deadlocks in Turkey's EU accession negotiations due to the Cyprus conflict raised suspicions about the credibility of the EU's commitments to Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community. Yakış pointed out that "under current conditions it is possible claim that even if Turkey fulfill its responsibilities based on Additional Protocol, EU is not capable to provide a credible membership for Turkey. Domestic dynamics is not guiding EU's commitment with respect to the future enlargement. Having considered the high cost of dropping behind our priorities and gains maintained in Annan plan Ankara cannot sacrifice anymore" (Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, interview with the author). To Yakış, EU's attitude towards Turkey's prospective EU membership has being politicized even technic-rule adaptation aspects of the accession process.

Furthermore the case of Turkey's EU membership became a matter of domestic politics in many EU member states. The decision to open accession negotiations with Turkey also turned into a domestic political issue for many EU member states (Milliyet, 7 October 2004). Under the increasing domestic pressure, French President

⁹² "Ya Tam Üyelik ya hiçbir şey", Yeni Şafak, 14 December 2004.

⁹³ "Teşekkürler Almayalım Diyeceğimiz Nokta Var!", Yeni Şafak, 15 Aralık 2004.

Jacques Chirac, who was considered as a pro-Turkish political figure, on October 2004 announced that he would ask French people regarding the final decision on Turkey's EU membership and Turkey's EU membership was not an automatic process, in case of any setback in Turkey's reform process Paris could exercise its veto over Turkey's accession. Parallel to this, Australia had also serious concerns on Turkey's further integration with EU and it became the country which proposed "privileged partnership" with Turkey instead of a full membership perspective. On 11 October 2004, European foreign ministers meeting Australian foreign minister called for the EU to "honestly discuss the problems [with Turkey's application] that are still open"(Financial Times, 12 October 2004). German chancellor Gerhard Schröder was at the same under the pressure of the groups who opposed Turkey's EU accession. Chairwoman of the Christian Democrat Union Party, Angela Merkel, followed a conservative campaign against Turkey's EU accession by proposing "privileged membership" status for Turkey (Milliyet, October 7, 2004). Papadopoulos at the same time gave the first signals that the government of Cyprus was reserving its veto option in case Turkey would not act in accordance with provisions of Additional Protocol of Ankara Treaty and accordingly not recognize the only internationally recognized political entity representing Cyprus (Financial Times, 12 October 2004).

With no surprise, the ultimate motivation behind the Turko-sceptical discourse for many EU member states was the anti-enlargement tendency in the EU electorate. In the aftermath of French and Dutch referenda on the ratification of the Constitution Treaty, the results were interpreted as the European electorates' open rejection against the enlargement in general and integration with Turkey in particular (Eurobarometer, Spring 2005, Report 63). The election victory of conservative politicians in Germany

and France in post 2004 enlargement era was also associated with the raising anti-enlargement feelings in the European public opinion. According to the survey conducted by Eurobarometer between April and May 2007, immediately after the French Presidential elections in which conservative candidate Nicolas Sarkozy who followed a campaign against Turkey's EU membership and against further enlargement of the Union, a significant majority (68 %) of French people rejected further enlargement of Union (Eurobarometer, June 2007, Report 67).⁹⁴ Above all, according to the Eurobarometer's 40 years report, support for further enlargement of the Union has been significantly decreasing since year 2000.⁹⁵

Turkey's success in taking serious steps concerning the fundamental rights and freedoms, civil-military relations, judicial system, minority rights, Cyprus conflict and functioning free market economy were taken, did not convince those European leaders who opposed Turkey's EU membership (Schimmelfennig, 2009). For the anti-Turkish camp, Turkey's huge population, economic and political level of development, further questions on Turkey's Europeanness, religious and cultural orientation of the majority and geographical distance to the Europe were the sources of anxiety (Yılmaz, 2005). On the other hand, for Turkey's champions in the EU, Turkey was an indispensable strategic partner, crucial regional power and increasing economic actor whose membership would enrich cultural diversity of the EU and provide a great chance for EU to reach Islamic world. For the proponents of Turkey, opening accession negotiations

⁹⁴ Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb67/eb67_en.pdf

⁹⁵ In the report, the two peaks in the support for enlargement in 2004 and 2007 – immediately after 2004 and 2007 enlargements- are interpreted as the impact of new-comers' enthusiasm for further enlargement. For more information please see: European Commission, Eurobarometer, *40 Years Report*. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/topics/eb40years_en.pdf (last access: 10 July 2015)

was a matter of reputation that would consolidate the credibility of the Union as the reliable part for further enlargements (Schimmelfennig, 2011). Yet, in post-2005 era Turkey's strategic position became a curse for its EU accession prospects due to the civil wars in Turkey's close neighborhood. The instability in Turkey's close and larger neighborhood, civil wars in Iraq and Syria and the destabilizing impacts of the Arab uprisings resurrected the long lasting debates on the stable borders of Europe.

Another critical aspect that had crucial impacts on the government's EU stance is the diminishing Euro-supportiveness. According to the Eurobarometer's December 2012 public opinion survey, Turkish people is the most Euro-sceptical population among the other candidate countries.⁹⁶ In addition to this according to the 2011 World Value Survey report, 56,2 percent of the respondents declared that they do not have confidence with the EU.⁹⁷ Yılmaz (2007) claims that the soft and hard Euro-scepticisms prevalent among the public is a reflection of the discontent of the Turkish people with respect to the EU's dubious commitments for Turkey's EU membership, the Union's attitude towards the terrorist and separatist groups (specifically PKK), EU's claims on the Armenian genocide and especially in post-2004 era the Union's non-fulfilment of the commitments to the Turkish Cypriot community. Under these circumstances "as skepticism became prevalent among the public, the governing JDP began to understand the political costs of its commitment to enlargement" (Eralp and Eralp, 2012: 175).

⁹⁶ For full report, please see: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

⁹⁷ Please see: World Value Survey, Turkey Technical Record (v.2015.04.18), December 2011.

Last but not least, having consolidated its power and authority with its three electoral victory, party elites did not necessitate an outside ally or legitimizer for their differentially empowerment and political survival. As Cengiz and Hoffman claim in the era of post-2011 parliamentary elections among the other domestic actors, JDP consolidated its power not only because of its electoral victory but also because of the traditional state elites' decreasing leverage on Turkish politics and state institutions (2011). The power asymmetries between elected government and military bureaucracy significantly diminished and the civil-military relations normalized especially after 2010 legal amendments. Although the 2010 constitutional amendments on judiciary and civil-military relations were declared as the necessary steps to comply with the EU norms, Börzel and Soyaltın (2012) point out that the government's commitment to the EU norms was selective and addressing to the issues that would differentially empower government among other domestic players. Therefore the alleged EU anchor was only instrumental to legitimize JDP's reform package that provisioned radical changes in Turkish domestic politics. Under Ergenekon and Balyoz investigations, many soldiers including high ranking officials and former generals faced a lawsuit for being involved in a terrorist organization which aimed to overthrowing JDP government through an alleged military coup (Hürriyet Daily News, October 20, 2008). The trials of the military officials were considered as a turning point in Turkish history and the investigations were interpreted as the victory of political elites over the traditional state elites (Cengiz and Hoffman, 2011).

In post-2010 era, as a combination of the increasing regional security threats surrounding Turkey, Turkey's decreasing EU membership perspective due to the increasing anchor-credibility dilemma, deteriorated relations between Turkey and pro-

solution Turkish Cypriot social groups and the debates on the continental shelf limitations in the Mediterranean Sea, Turkey adopted a discourse close to “two-state solution” of the late 1990s. With this respect, EU’s transformative impact on Turkey’s Cyprus policy seems to be limited and ineffective in the long-run and it results with divergence and retrenchment between Turkey and EU.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This thesis has analyzed the impact of EU on Turkish foreign policy in the policy issue of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus with a specific focus on the ten years rule of JDP governments from the lenses of the Europeanization approach. Inspired by the last generation Europeanization studies on the candidate states which argue that the EU's transformative impact on candidate states is determined and mediated by a set of variables including size and credibility of EU rewards, cost-benefit calculations of the domestic actors and the elite socialization, the study aimed to understand the transformative impact of EU in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus. In the empirical chapters on Turkey's Cyprus policy, analyzing the impact of Europeanization chronologically, the questions regarding how and under which circumstances Turkish foreign policy elites responded to the incentives and constraints created by the EU accession process were explained. For this purpose, the study has discussed the issue at the level of domestic systems of interactions and questioned the mechanisms through which EU influence the policy change. Although the study approached Cyprus issue as a foreign

policy matter, it acknowledged the importance and decisiveness of domestic political context upon the foreign policy choices of the successive JDP governments in the period between 2002 and 2012. In other words, the study discussed the changes in Turkey's Cyprus policy within the political context of internal and external developments. The longitudinal analysis illustrated that the governments embraced reforms when the material and political benefits of Europeanization exceeded the cost of convergence.

In overall assessment, the study reached the conclusion that the studied "policy change" in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in late 2003, refers to a set of strategic adjustments triggered by the combination of EU conditionality for policy change (external pressures) and the domestic ownership of the Turkey's EU membership project (internal dynamics) rather than an elite socialization with respect to Turkey's long-run foreign policy interests and identity. It also acknowledges the operativeness of a simple learning process, conceptualized in this context as "lesson drawing", that emerged as a response to the political failures of the previous governments. With respect to this, inspired by Claudio Radaelli's (2003) categorization the major finding of this study is that the consequential logic of the ruling elites did not produce a "policy transformation", which is largely associated with the transformation in fundamental logic of policy behavior, rather it resulted with a "policy absorption" in which JDP government incorporated European policies or perspectives into its political agenda without substantially modifying Turkey's security interests and concerns on Cyprus. The next parts review the main findings of the empirical chapters in the light of the research questions and hypothesis provided in the introduction chapter.

6.1. Turkey's Cyprus Policy and EU: Europeanization or EU-ization?

As it has been explained in the theory chapter, the degree and content of domestic transformation is heavily structured by the domestic actors and their political calculations. Although the final outcomes of policy change are largely dependent on the interactions between external pressures and domestic settings, the level of misfit between EU and candidate state's domestic politics introduces a demand for domestic change, furthermore it determines the magnitude of external pressures for change (Börzel and Risse, 2002). With this respect, since the concept of "misfit" is the necessary but the insufficient variable in explaining the essence of policy transformation, it is essential to analyze the scope and scale of divergence and convergence between the policies of EU and candidate states (Radaelli, 2003).

Considering the premises on misfit, this study has primarily focused on the level of policy misfit between EU and Turkey regarding the Cyprus question. It has argued that the decisive difference between EU and Turkey on Cyprus dispute has been originated by the differences with regard to the security identity and culture that structure the policy paradigm, discourse, actors and interests. In this sense, while EU is associated with a "post-Westphalian" (Bilgin, 2004, 36) "security community" (Buzan and Wæver, 2003) which prioritizes the mutual cooperation, political and economic integration and dialogue in dealing with specific security issues including Cyprus question, Turkey for decades has followed a (militarily) security oriented and nationalized policy agenda driven by the double concerns of the security and legal equality of Turkish Cypriot community and the preservation of the military balance in the Mediterranean overseeing Turkey's security interests.

Apart from policy identity, there has been divergence between Union and Turkey with respect to the policy practices. In the context of EU enlargement, as of mid-1990s; EU adopted its enlargement strategy with respect to Turkey in which Turkey's EU accession course was politically connected with the just and lasting settlement in Cyprus. However, while EU rhetoric on Cyprus issue emphasized the desirability of a just and final solution with high expectations that EU involvement would catalyze a solution in Cyprus, there has always been a clear division of labor between UN and EU regarding the management and mediation of the process. Hence the EU's catalytic effect has been dependent on the UN expertise in the field of peace negotiations. Although EU had never prescribed a specific solution formula, it highlighted its full and unconditional support for the successive UN resolutions and peace proposals prepared by UN Secretary Generals who all proposed a federal, united and sovereign Cyprus and excluded any resolution attempts based on "two state solution". On the other hand, since 1983 self-proclamation of TRNC; Turkey and Turkish Cypriot authorities have gradually adopted a resolution formula based on confederative solution implying a "two state solution". Cyprus's EU candidacy declared in 1997 Luxembourg Summit was another shockwave for Ankara which embraced a more hawkish discourse on both EU and the Cyprus. In the aftermath of 1997, Turkish foreign policy elites adopted a coercive and defensive foreign policy strategy which advocated further political and economic integration with TRNC in response to the Cyprus's EU membership. The analysis on this period concludes that EU impact on policy change might not produce progressive way but it may rather promote further divergence or retrenchment which causes the escalation of nationalist assertions and Euro-sceptical feelings. In this sense, the expected value of EU involvement in Cyprus conflict in 1990s, driven

by the notion that Turkey's increasing interest and willingness to integrate with Europe would be a political instrument to de-securitize Turkish statist elites' Cyprus policy, did not lead a policy change.

1999 Helsinki European Council decisions constituted a turning point both for the EU's involvement in Cyprus conflict and Turkish- EU relations. With the Helsinki summit, for the first time, Turkey was officially declared as the candidate state with the full-membership perspective. However the accession negotiation talks were dependent on the Turkey's fulfillment of EU conditionality -namely Copenhagen Criteria- and Turkey's support for the UN led Cyprus Peace process. External incentives supported by active EU conditionality mechanism turned out to be effective and the Turkish government adopted EU harmonization packages regarding highly sensitive political issues including abolition of death penalty in times of peace, non-Muslim minorities' religious property rights, broadcasting languages other than Turkish and critical steps towards the normalization of civil-military relations. Despite these radical constitutional changes, Turkish government preserved its conservative position with respect to the Cyprus conflict. 2002 progress report prepared by the EU Commission once more highlighted the vitality of Turkey's position in Cyprus conflict for the countries accession bid. Commission urged Turkey "to take further steps to encourage the Turkish Cypriot leadership to work towards reaching a settlement before the end of accession negotiations" (European Commission, 2002).

Towards the end of 2002, it was obvious that Ankara's strategy and threatening EU with unification with TRNC to hinder or delay Cypriot accession until a just and long-lasting solution in Cyprus and Turkish diplomats' endeavors to persuade European governments that there was no linkage between Turkey's EU membership and

the settlement of Cyprus dispute produced no fruits. At this critical juncture, the newly elected Turkish government was on the fence about the two equally significant “national causes” –Turkey’s EU membership and Cyprus issue-. When JDP declared its determination to persuade EU to start the accession negotiations with Turkey, Cyprus’s EU accession process emerged as the significant game changer at work that made a pressure on Turkish government to take courageous steps for the settlement of Cyprus conflict before the Cyprus’s EU accession. Having consolidated its power in domestic politics and encouraged by the electoral victory of the pro-Annan plan political parties in TRNC, JDP reformulated Turkey’s foreign policy strategy with respect to the Cyprus peace process. During this era, within the context of Cyprus conflict, Turkey adopted a new foreign policy strategy conceptualized as “one step ahead” policy in which Ankara abandoned previous governments’ discourse on Cyprus denying the linkage between Turkey’s EU accession and the solution of Cyprus conflict. In the light of this strategic outlook Ankara acknowledged the potential of EU’s catalytic impact in the solution of Cyprus conflict and the government appreciated the notion that Turkey’s contributions for the solution of Cyprus conflict would facilitate Turkey’s prospective EU membership.

The adoption of “one step ahead” policy refers to a significant shift in terms of Turkey’s long-run discourse on Cyprus and bargaining strategy. Having in mind the 1999 Helsinki Conclusions suggesting that “the Council will take account of all relevant factors”, Greek Cypriot side preserved their moral and psychological superiority through their flexible diplomacy. Turkey’s and Turkish Cypriot leadership’s official positions were portrayed as “intransigent”. In post- 1974 era, coupled with Turkey’s reliance on its military existence on the island and the country’s increasing insistence

on the recognition of TRNC, in the eyes of international community, “Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership were framed as “the spoilers to a solution (in the wrong) through non-withdrawal of troops and a lack of political will to negotiate a settlement within agreed UN parameter” (Christou, 2013: 122) whereas the Cypriot government (Greek Cypriots) was depicted “as the actor in the conflict that was legally and normatively wronged” (Christou, 2013: 122). Throughout 1990s these concerns were stated in successive UN Resolutions largely pointed out Turkey’s responsibilities and fulfillments and Turkish Cypriot authorities’ legitimacy in the sight of international law. Especially in 1990s, this situation took a place in the Greek Cypriot elites’ strategy to persuade EU that unless an effective EU leverage particularly on Turkey and Turkish Cypriot leadership it was uneasy to reach a solution. Therefore, when the newly elected JDP government came to power the necessity to reformulate Turkey’s bargaining strategy was an urgent foreign policy matter. At this critical juncture, Turkish government announced that Turkey would actively support Annan plan, put forward its intellectual contributions, accept referendum before 1 May 2004 and recognize UN Secretary-General’s authority to have the final say. According to the “one step ahead” strategy, Turkey has to adopt a proactive diplomacy aiming a solution in Cyprus which guarantees Turkey’s regional interests and survival of Turkish Cypriots as well as secures Turkey’s and Turkish Cypriot’s EU membership bids and moral superiority. Parallel to this, this study reached the conclusion that Turkey’s “one step ahead” policy referred to a change in Turkey’s bargaining strategy and reassessment of the policy options with regard to the situation in Cyprus.

With this respect, JDP’s Cyprus policy is structured within the political context of Turkey’s EU membership. Although the government reiterated Turkey’s long-run

stance that Turkey's EU membership could not be associated with a solution in Cyprus, it was at the same time underlined that Turkish government could not turn its back to the realities. Therefore through this policy change Turkey acknowledged the relationship between Turkey's EU membership and solution of the Cyprus conflict. In the context of Turkey's EU membership, the best policy option and bargaining strategy was to adopt a new diplomatic maneuver based on Annan plan and negotiating for the just and lasting solution of the Cyprus dispute which would secure Turkey's interests with respect to its guarantorship rights and EU accession process and survival of the Turkish Cypriots within the parameters of UN mediation. In addition to this, according to strategic calculations of the Turkish foreign policy elites, neither Greek Cypriot people nor Greek Cypriot leadership were ready to approve a plan preserving Turkey's guarantorship and suggesting an equal share of the state apparatuses under the legal equality of the constituent states. Thus Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community would acquire international sympathy and psychological superiority as the party who desired a solution under UN auspices.

The second crucial premise of this strategy was based on the cost-benefit calculations that just and final peace in Cyprus which could be reached through Turkey's proactive and constructive efforts would best serve for Turkey's security interests and communal equality and survival of Turkish Cypriot community. With this respect, Turkey advocated "win-win" perspective that stressed different aspects of Turkey's security interests in its close region. As claimed by Davutoğlu (2011a, 2011b), a just and final solution in Cyprus, preserving Turkey's guarantorship rights and interests as well as the communal existence of Turkish Cypriot community, would not only diminish Turkey's long-run threat perceptions from its south and fear of encirclement, it

would also provide a security structure for Turkey's larger security needs including military, economic and energy security.

In this context, Turkey restructured its securitizing discourse in a way that security was defined with its hard power (military security and military balance of powers in the Mediterranean) and soft power (economic benefits of a solution in Cyprus, positive consequence of the solution for Turkey's critical infrastructural security with respect to the security of energy pipelines and Turkey's strengthened bid for EU membership and being a pivotal state in regional and global scale) aspects. Although this did not mean a true de-securitization, it should be conceptualized as the "securitizing speak" (Bilgin, 2007) in which a reform coalition composed by societal actors and JDP government "were not able or willing to challenge the securityness of existing issues they were, nevertheless, able to de-center them. This was done by identifying other issues as 'threats to Turkey's future'" (Bilgin, 2007: 557). In this sense, the Europeanization in Turkey's policy towards Cyprus, associated with the proactive foreign policy strategy conceptualized as "one step ahead" policy, could only lead to the exclusion of the "militarized securitization" perspective in the field of foreign policy options and strategies but it failed to lead a transformation in Turkey's securitized foreign policy identity in the sense that the ruling elites were far from discursively "challenging the securityness" of the Cyprus issue for Turkey. This aspect of Turkey's Cyprus policy was evident throughout the bargaining process during the bi-communal negotiations. Turkey has serious concerns with respect to the continuation of its guarantorship rights and military existence on the island. With respect, Turkey negotiation team endeavored to secure Turkey's guarantorship rights which referred to the continuation of the securitized real politic perspective and Turkey's military and political existence on the

island. In overall assessment, this study reaches the conclusion that EU's transformative impact regarding the identity transformation, which is conceptualized as the de-securitization of foreign policy identity, is limited. On the other hand, when the policy options and strategies specified by the "one step ahead" policy are concerned, it is possible to assert that a significant degree of convergence is evident with respect to the foreign policy options and strategies. With reference to Radaelli's (2003) categorization on the degrees of Europeanization, this study argues that Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in the period between 2002 and 2005 is best defined as "adaptation" rather than a "transformation".

In post-April 2004 referenda era, it was obvious that Cyprus conflict became legally and politically an internal matter of EU. Opposed to the early 2000s when the EU political leverage provided a crucial "peace dividend", successive bi-communal negotiations in post-2004 era did not contribute to achieving a peace plan. Cyprus's EU membership has dramatically changed all parameters related to the problem solving attempts and Turkey's EU accession process. Turkey encountered a new obstacle in its march to Europe when EU stressed that Turkey's reluctance to recognize Republic of Cyprus and to fulfill its responsibilities to implement Additional Protocol to the new member states including Republic of Cyprus were interpreted as a breach of *acquis* conditionality by the European community. The disputes between Turkey and EU on the interpretation of *acquis* strained already tense relations between two to the point of the suspension of the newly started accession negotiations. Furthermore in December 2006, EU reached the conclusion that Turkey's rejection to open its ports and airspace to the Cyprus was a violation of *acquis* conditionality and agreed on the suspension of eight chapters and the provisionally non-closure of one chapter. In December 2009,

Republic of Cyprus declared its veto on opening of the six chapters with Turkey due to Turkey's continuing non-implementation of Additional Protocol and non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus.

In addition to these, empowered by the veto right in EU decision making process, Greek Cypriots had a remarkable political leverage on both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. EU member state Cyprus used its veto rights to influence the relations between Turkish Cypriot community. Coupled with Turkey's impaired relations with EU, non-fulfillment of EU's commitment with respect to the lifting of isolations on the Turkish Cypriots and the continuing isolation of Turkish Cypriots, whose will and constructive efforts to reunification and integration with the world could not be denied, Turkey had to restructure its policy towards Cyprus. The international sympathy towards Turkey and Turkish Cypriot community which overwhelmingly supported Annan Plan and reunification of the island could neither make Turkey immune from the legal challenges caused by Cyprus dispute in its relations with the EU nor ended the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community. Under these circumstances, Turkey faced the necessity to reconsider its foreign policy options and priorities under the new conditions. Ankara's swing from its constructive and pro-active Cyprus policy in early 2004 became evident in post 2010 era. Turkey declared that she would not recognize the EU presidency of Cyprus during the era of Cyprus's Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2012 and that any official from Ankara would not attend any meetings chaired by Cypriot EU Council presidency. In 2012 progress report on Turkey published by EU Commission which regretfully reported that "a government circular instructed all Turkish civil servants to abstain from meetings and contacts with the Cypriot Presidency of the Council of the EU". Additionally, Commission

expressed its regret that “on several occasions, statements at senior political level spoke of alternatives to a comprehensive settlement under UN auspices”. In overall assessments, split or/and fluctuations in Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus in post referenda era illustrates that the long-run transformation of Turkey’s policy towards Cyprus is non-traceable. In post-2010 era, as a combination of the increasing regional security threats surrounding Turkey, Turkey’s decreasing EU membership perspective due to the increasing anchor-credibility dilemma, deteriorated relations between Turkey and pro-solution Turkish Cypriot social groups and the debates on the continental shelf limitations in the Mediterranean Sea, Turkey adopted a discourse close to “two-state solution” of the late 1990s. With this respect, EU’s transformative impact on Turkey’s Cyprus policy seems to be limited and ineffective in the long-run and it results with divergence and retrenchment between Turkey and EU.

6.2. Explanatory Mechanisms and Intervening Factors

Thus this study is based on a research design whose explanatory power is grounded on the emphasis on conditions or intervening variables in understanding the causality in policy change. In this context, as the studies on Accession Europeanization point out, EU membership conditionality by itself is not the sufficient condition for domestic change. The process is to a large extent controlled by intervening variables enabling EU conditionality to operate as the real game changer in the accession process. Inspired by the explanatory mechanisms introduced by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, this study reaches the conclusions that the external incentives model is the explanatory mechanism behind Turkey’s adoption of “one step ahead” policy in late 2003. This policy change was triggered by the following mediating factors:

- EU's active reinforcement by rewards strategy which was apparent in EU's 1999 Helsinki decision to include Turkey in its enlargement process (active reinforcement);
- Turkish political elites' strong willingness to get a date for the opening of accession negotiations and solving Cyprus dispute (existence of pro-reform forces);
- The high cost of non-solution for Turkey's EU membership aspirations and future legal and political situation of Turkish Cypriot people after Cyprus's EU accession (cost-benefit calculations);
- Turkish government's strong pro-EU stance and its discovery of political opportunity structures which would increase its relative power and legitimacy at the national domain through differential empowerment (strong domestic incentives driven by differential empowerment);
- and lastly political and societal discontent in Turkish Cypriot community with the failures of the Turkey's and TRNC's long-run policy towards Cyprus.

In addition to these variables, this study reaches the conclusion that due to the lack of transformation in Turkey's larger foreign and security policy identity, i.e. Turkish foreign policy elites are far from challenging the securityness of the Cyprus issues (Bilgin, 2007) and they have serious concerns in perceiving the EU as a security provider for Turkey's security needs in its close neighborhood, regional political developments strengthening Turkey's sense of insecurity keep alive the discourse on strategic importance of Cyprus for Turkey's defense and the necessity of Turkey's presence in Cyprus.

In line with these, up until the late 1990s the lack of positive leverage in response to the Turkey's bid for EU membership discouraged pro-reform forces in both Cyprus and Turkey. Additionally, the emergence of new challenges in the post-Cold War security environment which led to the rise of concerns regarding the domestic and regional security of Turkey triggered the military's increasing involvement in the domestic and foreign policy making process. That is to say, EU's reluctance and negative leverage regarding the Turkey's bid for EU membership, coupled with the domestic and regional security concerns, discouraged pro-EU reform forces and strengthened the hand of pro-*status quo* forces. During this era, these dynamics facilitated the dominance of security approach against liberal discourses.

1999 Helsinki European Council marked a critical juncture for Turkey-EU relations. National consensus among bureaucratic elites, political parties, civil society associations and Turkish governments, that Turkey should endeavor for its EU membership aspirations, strengthened following 1999 Helsinki European Council which acknowledged Turkey's EU candidacy and agreed on to adopt enlargement strategy for Turkey's EU accession following Turkey's fulfillment of Copenhagen criteria. National consensus on cementing ties between Turkey and EU through political and economic reforms to comply with EU accession strengthened the notion that Turkey's EU membership was a "national cause". Yet, EU's increasing emphasis on the linkage between Turkey's EU accession processes and reaching a just and final solution in Cyprus displayed the necessity to reconsider Turkey's Cyprus policy within the context of Turkey's EU membership. The increasing linkage between Turkey's EU accession and solution in Cyprus, made clearer for ruling elites that Cyprus's EU membership without a just and final solution of the Cyprus conflict would complicate both

future resolution attempts and Turkey's EU accession process which was strongly supported and embraced by a significant majority of Turkish society. According to these calculations, cost of incompletion was high and intolerable in the long-run. Despite sharp ideological divisions over the Cyprus issue, keeping the gate open for Turkey's EU membership was the common objective for the political and bureaucratic elites including government, military, presidency and parliament represented the domestic ownership of the Turkey's EU membership which would be for the best interest of the country. During this era backed by EU positive conditionality and Ankara's mission to get a date for the opening of the EU accession negotiations emerged as the key game changers for either of national foreign and security policies.

At the level of domestic politics, the dramatic policy shift resulted with the polarization between the veto powers –civil and military bureaucracy and opposition party supporting “two state solution” and Denktaş's leadership throughout the bicomunal talks- who were critical about making concessions on such a critical “national cause” and the ones who aimed to secure the way to get a date for accession negotiations. Moreover, EU's positive conditionality, coupled with the Turkey's Europeanization's potential economic and political transformative effects on Turkish politics and economics, encouraged civil society organizations in both Turkey and TRNC to force governments to reformulate Turkey's Cyprus policy in light of the developments with respect to Turkey's and Cyprus's EU accession. For those domestic groups, who perceived Turkey's EU accession as an opportunity structure, Turkey's EU accession would democratize Turkish decision making structure, provide a large space for societal actors to project their sectorial and political interests and increase their relative power and status. In the meanwhile, for the JDP government who had tense relations

with civil and military bureaucracy, EU leverage would normalize Turkish foreign domestic policy making structures through differentially empowering civilians and political parties. With this respect there emerged an advocacy coalition defending opening Turkey's way to EU through annihilating all obstacles. Therefore in the analysis, the increasing EU political leverage on Turkey, combined by the high societal and political support for the project of Turkey's EU membership, constituted an appropriate political context for the pro-reform forces to restructure Turkish foreign and security policy and to de-militarize foreign policy making process as well as legitimize and secure its position in the domestic politics. It is argued that Ankara approached Cyprus issue within the context of its EU membership perspective which indirectly provided a legitimate ground to re-organize and re-code foreign and security policy decision making as well as internal power asymmetries.

However, in post-2005 period, deadlocks in Turkey's accession process, opened membership perspective of EU with regard to Turkey's EU membership and suspension of accession talks due to Turkey's incompliance with Additional Protocol coupled with the growing Turko-sceptical discourses by the European political leaders, resurrected concerns with respect to credibility of EU membership. Moreover EU's fulfillment of its commitments for the termination of the isolation of Turkish Cypriot community due to Greek Cypriot veto damaged credibility of the EU's existing commitments to the Turkish Cypriot community. Thus in post-2005 era, European solution was not a charming option to reach a just and viable settlement in Cyprus and EU was not the right platform for the solution. At this juncture, increased political costs of further policy convergence led Turkish government to reformulate its Cyprus policy.

Additionally, having consolidated its power and civilianized the foreign policy decision making process the JDP government no more needed an EU anchor to expand its domestic power and status. Solution of a Cyprus dispute was not an urgent necessity for the political elites to publicize and mobilize Europeanization in a political context when the popular support for EU membership has been decreasing. EU's compulsory impact which works through EU (positive) political conditionality was limited and inadequate in leading a transformation of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus. As Diez et. al. point out since the ruling elites' motivation is highly dependent on the EU membership carrot, the change is mostly rapid and it "may simply reflect strategic behavior" (Diez et. al., 2006: 572). Furthermore in case of the absence of carrot – EU membership- or any diminution in candidate country's EU membership aspirations compulsory impact disappears.

6.3 Academic Contributions and a few words for Future Studies

Most of the studies on Turkish foreign policy Europeanization in general and Europeanization of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus in particular analyses the policy change from a Foreign Policy Analysis perspective. Despite there is an increasing interest in the mentioned literature to apply the theoretical tools and explanatory mechanisms of the Europeanization perspective (ex. Oğuzlu, 2004, 2010, 2012; Aydın and Açıkmeye, 2007; Ulusoy, 2008; Müftüler- Baç and Gürsoy, 2010; Tocci and Diez, 2009; Kaliber, 2012; Terzi, 2012; Eryılmaz, 2014) Turkish foreign policy and Turkey's Cyprus policy continue to be discussed from the lenses of the studies approaching foreign policy as a domain of "nation-states". This study which aims to understand

the impact of Turkey's Europeanization to the change in a key foreign policy issue (Cyprus conflict) deepens the inquiry on research subject by approaching the issue as a matter of linkage politics. This kind of a research design which acknowledges the linkage between internal and external aspects of policy area and emphasizes both direct (EU rule transformation) and indirect (domestic power re-distribution) impact of Europeanization would provide an alternative reading for the studies on both Turkish foreign policy analysis and Europeanization in Turkey.

In addition to the study's academic contributions to the literature on Turkish foreign policy, the empirical chapters' conclusions also contribute to the academic studies on foreign policy Europeanization in candidate countries. The concept of "European foreign policy" is a relatively new one due to the fact that throughout the long history of European integration foreign policy was strongly approached as a matter of national sovereignty and security (Ruano, 2013: 15). Due to the strong intergovernmental character of the policy field, foreign policy Europeanization is often considered as a field of change in which the EU's transformative impact is less visible and limited. Moreover foreign policy Europeanization is largely associated with the mechanisms of long-run socialization (Schmidt, 2002; Hill, 2003; Tonra and Christiansen, 2005) and normative transformations. Following this background in the literature specialized on the foreign policy Europeanization; scholars are mostly interested in the Europeanization of the foreign policies of the member states. Accordingly foreign policy change through external pressures exercised by the EU institutions is considered as a post-accession and long-run norm diffusion process. Yet, as this study indicates foreign policy Europeanization may be observed in the pre-accession process. Furthermore, as

this study suggests the long-run impact of the EU external pressures in the policy issues which strongly resonate with the concepts of sovereignty, ideology and the interest of the state may generate reverse Europeanization rather than a normative and cultural transformation. In this sense, this study contributes candidate state foreign policy Europeanization studies by exploring the limits and context of foreign policy change in an EU candidate state, Turkey.

Observing the limited number of studies on the Europeanization of the candidate countries' foreign policies, it seems possible to claim that EU's influence in the candidate states' foreign policy issues requires academic interest. Case studies touching upon the internal and external factors which trigger policy change in the EU accession process of the candidate countries may offer an alternative inquiry for the scholars interested in Europeanization. Furthermore case specific and country specific variables may enrich our conceptual framework and analytical tools in understanding the external and internal aspects of the policy change.

Furthermore the explanatory tools of the Europeanization studies may also be utilized to trace the impact of EU integration on the foreign policies of the new member countries. More specifically a case study on the Europeanization of the foreign policy of EU member Republic of Cyprus which is designed to understand the national and EU-level constraints, dynamics and incentives may provide alternative insight to understand the existing stalemate in Turkey-EU relations.

In addition to this, research design of this study may be employed to understand the EU's transformative impact on the other themes or issues of Turkish foreign policy. With respect to this, multiple case studies on Turkish foreign policy Europeanization will deepen our understanding to explore the contextual and case specific variables

that cause or hinder policy change. In divergent fields of policy change, where we establish causality between EU impact and domestic change, policy change may actually be driven by other factors like globalization, modernization, democratization or changes in the domestic political systems. Thus utilizing the conceptual tools of the Europeanization studies may lead us to question assumed causal links between Europeanization of Turkey and the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamson, Fiona B. 2001. "Democratization and the domestic sources of foreign policy: Turkey in the 1974 Cyprus crisis," *Political Science Quarterly* 116(2): 277-303.
- Aggestam, Lisbeth. 1999. "Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Foreign Policy," *ARENA Working Papers* 99/8.
- Akçapar, Burak. 2007. *Turkey's New European Era*. USA: Rowman and Little Field Publication.
- Akdoğan, Yalçın. 2010. *Tarihe Dışülen Notlar, 17 Aralık AB Zirvesinin Perde Arkası* (Make a note of history, Backstage of 17 December EU Summit)İstanbul: Alfa Publication
- Akşit, Sait. 2012. "The Turkish Cypriot presidential election of April 2010: normalisation of politics," *South European Society and Politics* 17.2: 175-194.
- Alexander Murinson .2006. "The strategic depth doctrine of Turkish foreign policy," *Middle Eastern Studies*, 42(6): 945-964.
- Allen, David, and Michael Smith. 1990. "Western Europe's presence in the contemporary international arena," *Review of international studies* 16.01: 19-37.
- Altan, Çetin. December 13, 2002, "Kopenhag Zirvesini Kovboy Filmine Dönüştürdük" (We turned Copenhagen Summit into a western movie) *Milliyet*.
- Aktar, Ayhan, Niyazi Kızılyürek and Umut Özkırımlı. 2010. *Nationalism in Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey* (eds.) London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Alpan, Başak. 2014. "'Europe-as-Hegemony' and Discourses in Turkey after 1999: What has 'Europeanization' Got to Do with It?," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 16(1): 65-85.
- Alpan, Başak and Diez Thomas. 2014. "The Devil is in the 'Domestic'? European Integration Studies and the Limits of Europeanization in Turkey," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 16(1):1-10.
- Anastasakis, Othon. 2005. "Europeanization of the Balkans" *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 12(1): 77-88.
- Anastasakis, Othon. 2008. "The EU's political conditionality in the Western Balkans: towards a more pragmatic approach." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 8.4: 365-377.
- Anastasakis, Othon and Dimitar Bechev. "EU conditionality in South East Europe: bringing commitment to the process." Paper Presented at workshop in St. Anthony's Collage *South East European Studies Programme* titled "EU and the Balkans: The Implications of EU conditionality". Oxford, April 2002.
- Anderson, Stephanie .2008. *Crafting EU Security Policy, In Pursuit of a European Identity*. Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Apostolos Agnantopoulos .2013. "The Europeanization of national foreign policy: explaining Greek support for Turkey's EU accession," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 13(1): 67-87.
- Attalides, Michael. 2010. "The Accession of Cyprus to the EU and the 'Acquis' of the Intercommunal Negotiations," *The Cyprus Review* 22(2): 159-174.
- Avcı, Gamze. 2011. "The justice and development party and the EU: Political pragmatism in a changing environment," *South European Society and Politics* 16(3): 409-421.
- Aydın, Mustafa. 2003. "The Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy, and Turkey's European Vocation," *The Review of International Affairs* 3(2): 306-331.
- Aydın, Mustafa and Açıkmeşe, Sinem. 2007. "Europeanization through EU Conditionality: Understanding the new era in Turkish Foreign Policy," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 9(3): 263-274.

- Bache, Ian. 2007. *Europeanization and multilevel governance: cohesion policy in the European Union and Britain*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Bache, Ian and Andrew Jordan. 2006. *The Europeanization of British Politics*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bahcheli, Tözün. 2001. "Turkey's Cyprus Challenge: Preserving the Gains of 1974." In , Dimitris Keridis and Dimitrios Triantaphyllou, eds., *Greek-Turkish Relations In the Era of Globalization*. Massachusetts: Fidelity Press, 208- 222.
- Bahcheli, Tözün. 2006. "Turkey's Quest for EU Membership and the Cyprus Problem." in Joseph S. Joseph, ed., *Turkey and the European Union: Internal Dynamics and External Challenges*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 161- 178.
- Bahcheli, Tözün, and Sid Noel. 2010. "The Political Evolution of Northern Cyprus and its Effect on Turkish-Cypriot Relations with Turkey." *The Cyprus Review* 22(2): 139-148.
- Bahcheli, Tözün and Sid Noel. 2011. "The Rise of AK Party and Ankara's Changing Role: Paving the way for the 'Yes'." In Andrekos Varnava and Hubert Faustmann, eds., *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*. New York and London: I.B. Tauris, 236-251.
- Balbay, Mustafa. May, 23, 2003. "Genç Subaylar tedirgin", *Cumhuriyet*.
- Balbay, Mustafa. January 5, 2004. "Anadolu'ya Hapsoluruz", *Cumhuriyet*.
- Balkır, Canan, and Galip Yalman. 2009. "Economics and politicisation of civil society: The Turkish Cypriot case." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: a conflict at the crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 71-95.
- Belge, Murat. 1995. "Türk Milliyetçiliği ve Kıbrıs" (Turkish Nationalism and Cyprus) *Birikim* No: 75. Available at: <http://www.birikimdergisi.com/sayi/77/turk-milliyetciligi-ve-kibris> (last access: 10 June 2015)
- Barkey, Henri J. 2003. "Cyprus: Between Ankara and a hard place." *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10(1): 229.

- Bennett, Andrew. 2010. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. (2nd ed.) USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: 207-221.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2004. "A Return to 'Civilizational Geopolitics' in the Mediterranean? Changing Geopolitical Images of the European Union and Turkey in the Post-Cold War Era," *Geopolitics* 9(2): 269-291.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2004. "Clash of cultures? Differences between Turkey and the European Union on security." In Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu and Seyfi Taşhan, eds., *The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*. Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 25-52.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2007. "Making Turkey's Transformation Possible: Claiming 'Security - speak'—not Desecuritization!," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 7(4): 555-571.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. 1984. *30 Sıcak Gün* (30 Hot Days) İstanbul: Milliyet Publications.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. December 12, 2002. "Europe at a crossroads with Turkey," *Turkish Daily News*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. December 17, 2002 "Kıbrıs'ta Penaltı Golü Yedik" (We concede a penalty goal in Cyprus) *Posta*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. December 18, 2002. "Kıbrıs, Sürekli Karşımıza Çıkacak" (We will continuously confront with Cyprus) *Posta*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. March 12, 2003. "Denktash Wins Again," *Turkish Daily News*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. January 9, 2004. "Who will have the last say on Cyprus?" *Turkish Daily News*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. January 26, 2004. "Turkey's Cyprus Surprise," *Turkish Daily News*.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali. 2005. *31 Temmuz 1959'dan 17 Aralık 2004'e Türkiye'nin Büyük Avrupa Kavgası*, İstanbul: Doğan.

- Birand Mehmet Ali. and Soner Yalçın. 2007. *The Özal: Bir Davanın Öyküsü* (The Özal Story of a Cause) (10th ed.) Istanbul: İletişim.
- Bölükbaşı, Süha. 1995. "Boutros -Ghali's Cyprus initiative in 1992: why did it fail?," *Middle Eastern Studies* 31(3): 460-482.
- Bölükbaşı, Süha. 1998. "The Cyprus dispute and the United Nations: Peaceful non-settlement between 1954 and 1996," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 30(3): 411-434.
- Bölükbaşı, Deniz. 2011. *Dışişleri İskelesi. Dışişleri'nde 34 Yıl* (Pier of Foreign Affairs. 34 Years in the Foreign Affairs). Istanbul: Doğan Publications.
- Bölükbaşı, H. Tolga, Ertugal, Ebru, & Özçürümez, Saime. 2011. "Avrupa Entegrasyonu Kuramlarıyla Türkiye'yi Konu Alan Yazının Etkileşimi: Avrupa-lılaşıma Araştırma Programını Türkiye Özelinde Yeniden Düşünmek," (The Interaction between Theories of European Integration and the Literature on Turkey: Rethinking the Europeanization Research Program through the Case of Turkey) *Uluslararası İlişkiler* 8(30): 77-102.
- Bora, Tanıl. 1995. "Türk Milliyetçiliği ve Kıbrıs" (Turkish Nationalism and Cyprus), *Birikim* 77: 18-26.
- Börzel, Tanja. 1999. "Towards Convergence in Europe?," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(4): 573-596.
- Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2000. "When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change," *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 4(15): 1-24.
- Börzel, Tanja. 2002. "Pace Setting, Foot-Dragging and Fence-Sitting: Member State Responses to Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(2): 193-214.
- Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2003. "Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe." In Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli, eds., *Politics of Europeanization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 57-80.
- Börzel, Tanja and Carina Sprungk. 2007. "Undermining Democratic Governance in the Member States? The Europeanization of National Decision-Making." In

Ronald Holzhaacker and Erik Albaek, eds., *Democratic Governance and European Integration: Linking Societal and State Processes of Democracy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 113-136.

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2007. "Europeanization: The Domestic Impact of European Union Politics", in Knud Erik Jørgensen, Mark A. Pollack and Ben Rosamond, eds., *Handbook of European Union Politics*. London: Sage Publication, 483- 504.

Börzel, Tanja. 2009. "Transformative Power of Europe – The EU and Diffusion of Ideas" *KFG Working Paper Series*, Freie Universität Berlin- Kolleg-Forscherguppe (KFG).

Börzel, Tanja. 2010. "The Transformative Power of Europe Reloaded- Limits of External Europeanization" *KFG Working Paper Series*, Freie Universität Berlin- Kolleg-Forscherguppe (KFG).

Börzel, Tanja. 2012. "Europeanisation Meets Turkey. A Case Sui Generis?," In Çiğdem Nas and Yonca Özer, eds., *Turkey and the European Union, Processes of Europeanisation*. UK and USA: Ashgate Publishing, 9-21.

Börzel, Tanja and Diğdem Soyaltın. 2012. "Europeanization in Turkey. Stretching a Concept to its Limits?" *KFG Working Paper Series*, Freie Universität Berlin- Kolleg-Forscherguppe (KFG).

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2012. "From Europeanization to Diffusion: Introduction" *The Western Balkans and Turkey*, *West European Politics* 35(1): 1-19.

Bozkurt, Enver and Havva Demirel. 2004. *Birleşmiş Milletler ve Avrupa Birliği Kapsamında Kıbrıs Sorunu* (Cyprus Question in the Context of EU and UN) Istanbul: Nobel.

Brady, Henry E. and David Collier. 2010. (eds.) *Rethinking social inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. (2nd ed.) USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brewin, Christopher. 2000. "European Union perspectives on Cyprus accession," *Middle Eastern Studies* 36(1): 21-34.

- Bryant, Rebecca. 2006. "On the Condition of Post-Coloniality in Cyprus." In Yiannis Papadakis, Nicos Peristianis and Gisela Welz, eds., *Divided Cyprus: Modernity and an Island in Conflict*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 47-66.
- Buhari-Gülmez, Diğdem. 2012. "Europeanization of Foreign Policy and World Culture: Turkey's Cyprus Policy." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 12(1): 81-95.
- Bulmer, Simon. 1983. "Domestic Politics and European Community Policy -Making." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 21(4): 349-364.
- Bulmer, Martin. 1986. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bulmer, Simon, and Martin Burch. 2005. "The Europeanization of UK Government: from Quiet Revolution to Explicit Step -Change?." *Public Administration* 83(4): 861-890.
- Bulmer, Simon .2007. 'Theorizing Europeanization.' In Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink P., eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 46-58.
- Burgess, Michael. 2000. *Federalism and European Union: Building Europe 1950-2000*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap De Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. USA and UK: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Buzan, Barry, and Ole Wæver. 2003. *Regions and Powers: the Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canan, Fuat. 2009. *The Impact of Europeanization on Turkish Foreign Policy*. Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Canefe, Nergis, and Mehmet Uğur. 2004. *Turkey and European integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Carras, Costa. 2011. "The International Relations Aspect of Annan Plan." In Andrekos Varnava and Hubert Faustmann, eds., *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*. New York and London: I.B. Tauris, 55-68.
- Cemal, Hasan. December 13, 2002 "AB'den Olumsuz Karar Çıktı" (EU reached a negative opinion) *Milliyet*.
- Cem, İsmail. 2005. *Avrupa'nın Birliği ve Türkiye* (Union of Europe and Turkey) Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.
- Cem, İsmail. 2007. *Türkiye, Avrupa, Avrasya I, II*. (Turkey, Europe and Eurasia I, II) Istanbul: İş Bankası.
- Cengiz, Fırat and Lars Hoffman. 2011. "The 2011 General Elections in Turkey: Potential Implications on Domestic and International Politics in the Shadow of a Discourse Change?" *Parliamentary Affairs* (2011): 1-15.
- Chafetz, Glenn, Michael Spirtas and Benjamin Frankel. 1998. "Introduction: tracing the influence of identity on foreign policy." *Security Studies* 8(2-3): 7-22.
- Charillon, Frederic and Reuben Y. Wong. 2011. "France: Europeanization by Default?" In Reuben Wong and Christopher Hill, eds., *National and European Foreign Policies: towards Europeanization*. USA and Canada: Routledge, 19-34.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. 1999. "Social Construction and Integration," *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4): 545-560.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2001. "Why comply? Social Learning and European Identity Change," *International Organization* 55(3): 553-588.
- Checkel, Jeffrey 2005. "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework," *International Organization* 59(4): 801- 826.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2007. "Whither Europeanization" *International Studies Review* 9(2): 307-309.
- Christiansen, Thomas, Knud Erik Jorgensen and Antje Wiener. 1999. "The Social Construction of Europe," *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4): 528-544.

- Christou, George. 2004. *The European Union and enlargement: the case of Cyprus*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Christou, George. 2010. "The European Union, borders and conflict transformation: the case of Cyprus," *Cooperation and Conflict* 45(1):55-79.
- Christou, George. 2013. "The European Commission as an actor in the Cyprus conflict," *Journal of European Integration* 35(2): 117-133.
- Collier, Paul *et al.* 1997. "Redesigning Conditionality," *World Development* 25(9): 1399-1407.
- Conway, Martin and Kiran Patel, K. 2010. *Europeanization in the Twentieth Century: Historical Approaches*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Couloumbis, Theodore. 2003. "Greek Foreign Policy: Debates and Principles." In Theodore A. Couloumbis, Theodore C. Kariotis, and Fotini Bellou, eds., *Greece in the Twentieth Century*. UK: Frank Cass Publisher: 31-42.
- Cowles, Maria Green, James A. Caporaso and Thomas Risse. 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Çakırözer, Utku, April 25, 2004. "Ada'yı Rumlar Böldü" (Greek Cypriots divided the Island) *Milliyet*.
- Çandar, Cengiz. December 14, 2002. "Kopenhag: Türkiye'nin Yolu Açık" (Copenhagen: Turkey's road is open) *Yeni Şafak*.
- Çarkoğlu, Ali. 2004. "Societal Perceptions of Turkey's EU Membership." In Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe, eds., *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*. London and New York: Routledge, 19-47.
- Çarkoğlu, Ali and Çiğdem Kentmen. 2011. "Diagnosing Trends and Determinants in Public Support for Turkey's EU Membership," *South European Society and Politics* 16(3): 365-379.
- Çelenk, Ayşe Aslıhan. 2007. "The restructuring of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus: The Justice and Development party's struggle for power," *Turkish Studies* 8(3): 349-363.

- Çongar, Yasemin. November 27, 2000. "Türkiye'nin Avrupa Sancıları ve ABD," *Milliyet*.
- Daehnhardt, Patricia. 2011. "Germany in the European Union." In Reuben Wong and Christopher Hill, eds., *National and European Foreign Policies: towards Europeanization*. USA and Canada: Routledge, 35-57.
- Dağı, İhsan. 2005. "Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization" *Turkish State* 6(1): 21-37.
- Dağı, İhsan. 2011. "The Justice and Development Party: identity, politics and discourse of human rights in the search for security and legitimacy" In Hakan Yavuz, ed., *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*. (Published in English with the title: *The emergence of a new Turkey: democracy and the AK Parti*). Istanbul: Kitap.
- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. 2011a. *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu* (Strategic Depth: Turkey's International Position). (65th Edition). Istanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. 2011b. *Teoriden Pratiğe: Türk Dış Politikası Üzerine Konuşmalar* (From Theory to Practice: Speeches on Turkish Foreign Policy) Istanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- De Flers, Nicole Alecu and Patrick Müller. 2010. "Applying the Concept of Europeanization to the Study of Foreign Policy: Dimensions and Mechanisms." Paper Presented at GARNET Conference named "The European Union in International Affairs". Brussels, 22-24 April.
- De Flers, Nicole Alecu and Patrick Müller. 2012. "Dimensions and Mechanisms of the Europeanization of Member State Foreign Policy: State of the Art and New Research Avenues," *Journal of European integration* 34(1): 19-35.
- Demetriou, Olga. 2008. "Catalysis, Catachresis: the EU's impact on the Cyprus conflict." In Thomas Diez, Mathias Albert and Stephan Stetter, eds., *The European Union and Border Conflicts: the power of integration and association*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 64-93.
- Demir, Ali Faik. 2007. *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler* (Leaders in Turkish Foreign Policy) Istanbul: Bağlam.

- Demirtaş, Birgül. 2015. "Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Balkans: A Europeanized Foreign Policy in a De-Europeanized National Context?," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 17(2): 123-140.
- Denktaş, Rauf. 1983. "KTFD Başkanı Rauf Denktaş'ın Lefkoşa'daki Atatürk Meydanı'nda yaptığı Konuşma" (Speech delivered by the head of Turkish Federated State of Cyprus Rauf Denktaş at the Atatürk square in Nicosia) In *1983 Nisan- Kasım Döneminde Kıbrıs Sorununda Meydana Gelen Gelişmeler ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Belgeler* (Developments in the era between April and November 1983 and Documents about the Foundation of the TRNC) Edited by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department on Cyprus and Greece. Ankara
- Denktaş, Rauf R. 2004. *19-22 Mart 2004- Anılar, Belgeler ve Değerlendirmelerle Müzakereler* (19-22 March 2004- Negotiations with Memories, Documents and Assessments) Nicosia: Akdeniz.
- Denktaş, Rauf R. 2005. *Yeniden 12'ye 5 Kala* (Again 5 to 12). Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Diez, Thomas. 2000. *Last Exit to Paradise?: The EU, the Cyprus Conflict, and the Problematic Catalytic Effect*. Copenhagen and Denmark: Copenhagen Peace Research Institute.
- Diez, Thomas. 2002. *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict: Modern conflict, Post-modern Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Diez, Thomas. 2005. "Constructing the Self and Changing Others: Reconsidering "Normative Power Europe," *Millennium* 33(3): 613-636.
- Diez, Thomas, Apostolos Agnantopoulos and Alper Kaliber. 2005. "File: Turkey, Europeanization and Civil Society: Introduction," *South European Society and Politics* 10(1):1-15.
- Diez, Thomas, Stetter Stephan and Albert Mathias. 2006. "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration," *International Organization* 60(3): 563-593.
- Diez, Thomas, Stetter, Stephan and Albert, Mathias (eds.) 2008. *The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Power of Integration and Association*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Diez, Thomas and Tocci, Nathalie (eds.) 2009. *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Diez, Thomas and Nathalie Tocci. 2010. "The Cyprus Conflict and the Ambiguous Effects of Europeanization," *The Cyprus Review* 22 (1): 175–86.
- Dimitrova, Antoaneta. 2011. "Speeding up or slowing down? Lessons from the last enlargement on the dynamics of enlargement-driven reform," *South European Politics and Societies*, 16(2): 221-233.
- Dodd, Clement. 1998. *The Cyprus Embroglio*. Huntington: Eothen Press.
- Dodd, Clement, Written evidence submitted to UK House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, 21 September 2004.
- Dodd, Clement H. 2010. *The History and Politics of the Cyprus conflict*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dolowitz, David and David Marsh. 1996. "Who Learns What from Whom: a Review of the Policy Transfer Literature," *Political Studies* 44: 343–57.
- Dolowitz, David and David Marsh. 2000. "Learning from Abroad: the Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making," *Governance* 13 (1): 5–24.
- Duman, Özkan and Dimitris Tsarouhas. 2006. "'Civilianization' in Greece versus 'Demilitarization' in Turkey A Comparative Study of Civil-Military Relations and the Impact of the European Union." *Armed Forces & Society* 32(3): 405-423.
- Economides, Sypros. 2005. "The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy," *West European Politics* 28(2): 471-491.
- Emiliou, Nicolas. 1996. "Cyprus and the European Union: Problems and Prospects." Paper presented at the Halki International Seminars. Halki, Istanbul, 7-14 September.
- Eralp, Arısan Nilgün. 2010. "Direct Trade Regulation: An Exit Strategy For All Parties?" *Economy Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV) Policy Note*.

- Eralp, Arısan Nilgün and Atila Eralp. 2012. "What went wrong in the Turkey-EU Relations?." In Kerem Öktem, Ayşe Kadioğlu and Mehmet Karlı, eds., *Another Empire? A Decade of Turkey's Foreign Policy Under the Justice and Development Party*. Istanbul: Bilgi University Publications, 163-185.
- Eralp, Atila. 2000. "Turkey in the enlargement process: From Luxembourg to Helsinki," *Perception* 5(2): 17-32.
- Eralp, Doğa Ulaş, and Nimet Beriker. 2005. "Assessing the conflict resolution potential of the EU: The Cyprus conflict and accession negotiations," *Security Dialogue* 36(2): 175-192.
- Erim, Nihat. 1975. *Bildiğim ve Gördüğüm Ölçüler içinde Kıbrıs (Cyprus in the Dimensions that I knew and experienced)*. Ankara: Ajans Türk.
- Esche, Matthias. 1990. "A History of Greek-Turkish Relations." In Ahmet Evin and Geoffrey Denton, eds., *Turkey and the European Community*. Germany: Leske Verlag and Budrich, 101-116.
- Exadaktylos, Theofanis and Claudio Radaelli. 2009. "Research Design in European Studies: Case of Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47(3): 507-530.
- Exadaktylos, Theofanis and Radaelli, Claudio. 2012. (eds.), *Research Design in European Studies: Establishing Causality in Europeanization*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Evans, Peter B., Jacobson, Harold K., and Putnam, Robert D. (eds.) 1993. *Double-edged diplomacy: International bargaining and domestic politics*. California: University of California Press.
- Eylem, Eraydın. March 3, 2012. "KKTC Türkiye'ye Bağlanabilir- AB Bakanı Egemen Bağış'la Röportaj," (TRNC Might be Annexed to Turkey- Interview with the EU Minister of Turkey, Egemen Bağış) Kıbrıs Gazetesi.
- Featherstone, Kevin. 2003. "Introduction" In Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli, eds., *Politics of Europeanization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Featherstone, Kevin and Radaelli, Claudio (eds.) 2003. *Politics of Europeanization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Feron, Elise, and Fatma Güven Lisaniler. 2009. "The Cyprus conflict in a comparative perspective: Assessing the Impact of European Integration." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fierro, Elena. 2003. *The EU's Approach to Human Rights Conditionality in Practice*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Flockhart, Trine. 2010. 'Europeanization or EU-ization?' The Transfer of European Norms Across Time and Space,' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(4)787-810.
- Friis, Lykke. 2002. "Looming Shadows: The European Union's Eastern Enlargement and Cyprus." In Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict: Modern Conflict, Post-modern Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 17-33.
- George, Alexander and Bennett, Andrew. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in Social Sciences*, USA: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- Girgin, Kemal. 2007. *Diplomatik Anılarla Dışilişkilerimiz (50 Yıl: 1957-2007) (Foreign Affairs with the Diplomatic Memories (50 Years: 1957-2007))* Istanbul: İlgi Culture and Arts.
- Glenn Chafetz, Michael Spirtas and Benjamin Frankel. 1998. "Introduction: Tracing the influence of identity on foreign policy," *Security Studies*, 8(2-3): 7-22.
- Goetz, Klaus H. and Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling. 2008. "The Europeanisation of National Political Systems: Parliaments and Executives." *Living Reviews in European Governance*. 3(2).
- Goldstein, Judith, and Robert O. Keohane. 1993. "Ideas and foreign policy: an analytical framework." In Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, eds., *Ideas and foreign policy. Beliefs, institutions, and political change*. USA: Cornell University Press, 3-30.
- Grabbe, Heather. 2001. "How does Europeanization affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(6): 1013-1031.

- Grabbe, Heather. 2002. "European Union Conditionality and the Acquis Communautaire," *International Political Science Review* 23(3): 249-268.
- Grabbe, Heather. 2003. "Europeanization Goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process." *The Politics of Europeanization*. 27: 303-329.
- Grabbe, Heather. 2006. *The EU'S Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Graziano, Paolo R. and Maarten Peter Vink. 2013. "Europeanization: Concept, Theory, and Methods." In Simon Bulmer and Christian Lesquene, eds., *The Member States of the European Union* (2nd ed.) Oxford : Oxford University Press, 31-54.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2003. "The Changing Role of the EU Factor in Greek-Turkish Relations." Paper presented at the 1st Symposium on Modern Greece. London, June 21.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2006. "Turkey's Accession to the European Union: Debating the most Difficult Enlargement Ever," *SAIS Review* 26(1): 147-160.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2008. *Trials of Europeanization*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2008. "Greek and Greek Cypriot Views of Turkey's Accession to the European Union: On the Endurance of a Spectacular Paradigmatic Shift." In Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Yannis A. Stivachtis, eds., *Turkey and the European Union: Dilemmas, Constraints and Opportunities*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 151-167.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2010. "The Davutoğlu Doctrine and Turkish Foreign Policy" *ELIAMEP Working Papers* 8/2010: 1-12.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2014. "Turkish Foreign Policy Activism: Vision Continuity and Reality Checks," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 14(2): 159-173.
- Gross, Eva. 2009. *The Europeanization of national foreign policy: continuity and change in European crisis management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gül, Abdullah. 23 May 2003. TBMM’de Türkiye-AB İlişkileri Konusunda Genel Görüşme Açılmasına İlişkin Önergenin Görüşülmesi Vesilesiyle Yapılan Konuşma (Speech Made in TGNA Upon the Opening of General Assembly about Turkey-EU Relations).
- Güney, Aylin and Tekin, Ali (eds.) 2015. *Europeanization of Turkey, Polity and Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Gürpınar, Doğan. 2011. Ulusalçılık- İdeolojik Önderlik ve Takipçileri (Neo-Nationalism- Ideological Leadership and Followers) İstanbul: Kitap.
- Gürsoy, Yaprak. 2012. “The Changing Role of the Military in Turkish Politics: Democratization through Coup Plots?,” *Democratization*, 19(4): 735-760.
- Güven, Erdal. December 20, 2002, “Çözüm Olcaksa Denктаş’a Rağmen Olacak” (If there will be a solution, it will be in spite of Denктаş) *Radikal*.
- Güven, Erdal. 2003. Helsinki’den Kopenhag’a Kıbrıs (*Cyprus from Helsinki to Copenhagen*) İstanbul: OM.
- Güven, Erdal. March 7, 2003. “Karar Vakti” (Time to decide) *Radikal*.
- Güven, Erdal April 2, 2004. “Türkiye Bir Adım Önde” (Turkey is one step ahead) *Radikal*.
- Güven, Erdal. February 27, 2011. “Kıbrıslı Türkler ne ister?” (What do the Turkish Cypriots want?) *Radikal*.
- Hall, Peter A. and Taylor, Rosemary C. R. (1996) “Political Science and the Three New Institutionalism” *MPIFG Discussion Paper*. 96/6.
- Hannay, David. 2005. *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Haverland, Markus. 2000. “National Adaptation to European Integration: The Importance of Institutional Veto Points,” *Journal of Public Policy* 20 (1): 83-103.

- Haverland, Markus. 2006. "Does the EU cause domestic developments? improving case selection in Europeanisation research," *West European Politics* 29(1): 134-146.
- Heper, Metin. 2005. "The European Union, the Turkish Military and Democracy," *South European Society and Politics* 10(1): 33-44.
- Héritier, Adrienne. "Institutional Change in Europe: Co -decision and Comitology Transformed," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(1): 38-54.
- Hill, Christopher. 2003. *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. London, UK: Palgrave.
- Hocking, Brian, and David Spence. 2002. *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Hoffmeister, Frank. 2006. *Legal aspects of the Cyprus problem: Annan plan and EU Accession*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Holsti, Kalevi J. 1995. *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis* (7th ed.) Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall.
- Hughes, James and Gwendolyn Sasse. 2004. "Conditionality and Compliance in the EU's Eastward Enlargement: Regional Policy and the Reform of Sub-national Government," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 42(3): 523–551.
- İçduygu, Ahmet. 2011. "Interacting Actors: The EU and Civil Society in Turkey," *South European Society and Politics* 16(3): 381-394.
- İdiz, Semih. April 19, 2010. "EU main cause of Eroğlu's victory in Cyprus," *Hürriyet Daily News*.
- İnalcık, Halil. 1998. *Essays in Ottoman History*, Istanbul: Eren.
- James, Oliver and Martin Lodge. 2003. "The Limitations of 'Policy Transfer' and 'Lesson Drawing' for Public Policy Research," *Political Studies Review* 1(2): 179–193.

- Jordan, Andrew. 2003. "The Europeanization of National Government and Policy: A Departmental Perspective," *British Journal of Political Science* 33(2): 261-282.
- Juncos, Ana E., and Karolina Pomorska. 2006. "Playing the Brussels game: strategic Socialisation in the CFSP Council Working Groups." *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 10(11).
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 2012. "Limits of Conservative Change: Reform Choreography of the Justice and Development Party." In Kerem Öktem, Ayşe Kadioğlu and Mehmet Karlı, eds., *Another Empire? A Decade of Turkey's Foreign Policy Under the Justice and Development Party*. Istanbul: Bilgi University Publications, 33-59.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin. 2013. "Turkish party system: leaders, vote and institutionalization," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 13(4): 483-502.
- Kaliber Alper. 2003. "Rearticulation of Turkish Foreign Policy Its Impacts on State/national Identity and State Society Relations in Turkey: the Cyprus Case" Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. Ankara: Bilkent University Political Science Department.
- Kaliber Alper. 2005. "Securing the Ground through Securitized 'Foreign' Policy: The Cyprus Case Revisited," *Security Dialogue* 36(3): 297-315.
- Kaliber Alper. 2009. "Turkey's Cyprus Policy: A Case of Contextual Europeanization." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci. *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester Univ Press, 225-241.
- Kaliber Alper. 2012. "Contextual and Contested: Reassessing Europeanization in the Case of Turkey" *International Relations* 27(1): 52-73.
- Kaliber, Alper. 2013. "The Post-Cold War Regionalisms of Turkish Foreign Policy" *Journal of Regional Security* 8(1): 25-48.
- Kanlı, Yusuf. March 2, 2011. "Self-governance," *Hürriyet Daily News*.
- Kannas, Sophia. "Verheugen: Cyprus was the first casualty of looming war in Iraq", *Cyprus Mail*, 15 March 2003.

- Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2000. "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey." *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1): 199-216.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2004. "Globalization and its Impact on Turkey's Security." In Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L., and Seyfi Taşhan, eds., *The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*. Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute. 11-24.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2011. "Transformation of Turkey's Civil-Military Relations Culture and International Environment." *Turkish Studies* 12(2): 253-264.
- Kazamias, Alexander. 2006. "The Greek Variable in EU-Turkish Relations" in Joseph Joseph (ed.) *Turkey and the European Union. Internal Dynamics and External Challenges*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 138-161.
- Kazan, Işıl. 2002. "Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, Seen From Turkey." In Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 54-69.
- Keck, Margret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders. Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kelley, Judith G. 2004. "International Actors on the Domestic Scene: Membership Conditionality and Socialization by International Institutions," *International Organization*, 3(58): 425-457.
- Kelley, Judith G. 2006. "New Wine in Old Wineskins: Promoting Political Reforms through the New European Neighborhood Policy," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(1): 29-55.
- Ker-Lindsay, James. 2009. "United Nations peace-making in Cyprus: from Mediation to Arbitration and Beyond." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci (eds.) *Cyprus: a Conflict at the Crossroads*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Ker-Lindsay, James. 2007. *Crisis and Conciliation: A Year of Rapprochement Between Greece and Turkey*. IB Tauris.

- Ker-Lindsay, James. 2009. "Deceiving Shadow of the EU? Contradictory Perceptions of The European Solution for Cyprus." In Othon Anastasakis, Kalypso Nicolaidis and Kerem Öktem (eds.) *In the Long Shadow of Europe- Greeks and Turkey in the era of Postnationalism*, Leiden and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. 219-238.
- Kirişçi, Kemal. 2006. *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Turbulent Times*. Chaillot Papers, No: 92.
- Kirişçi, Kemal. 2009. "The End of the Cold War and Changes in Turkish Foreign Policy Behaviour," *Dış Politika* (Foreign Policy) 1: 266-309.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi. 2005. *Doğmamış Bir Devletin Tarihi: Birleşik Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti* (History of an Unborn State: United Cyprus Republic) Istanbul: İletişim.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi. 2009. *Daha önceleri neredeydiniz?: Düünden Bugüne Kıbrıs Müzakereleri* (Where have you been: Cyprus Negotiations from Yesterday to Today) Istanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi. 2010. "Rauf Denktaş: Fear and Nationalism in the Turkish Cypriot Community." In Aktar, Ayhan, Niyazi Kızılyürek and Umut Özkırımlı, eds., *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi. 2011. *Paşalar ve Papazlar: Kıbrıs ve Hegemonya* (Pashas and Priests: Cyprus and Hegemony) Istanbul: Kalkedon.
- Klerides, Glafkos. 2008. *Bir Dönemin Anıları 1993-2003* (printed in English "My Depositions"). Nicosia: GKY.
- Knill, Christophe. 2001. *The Europeanisation of National Administrations: Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knill, Christophe and Dirk Lehmkuhl. 2002. "How Europe Matters. Different Mechanisms of Europeanization," *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 3(7).
- Knill, Christophe and Lenschow, Andrea. 2005. "Compliance, Competition and Communication: Different Approaches of European Governance and their Impact on National Institutions," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 43(3): 583-606.

- Kohen, Sami. August 15, 2000. "Eşitlik Artık BM Belgesinde" (Equality is in the UN Document now) *Milliyet*.
- Koslowski, Rey. 1999. "A Constructivist Approach to Understanding the EU as a Federal Polity," *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4): 561-578.
- Kubicek, Paul. 2005. "The European Union and Grassroots Democratization in Turkey", *Turkish Studies*, 6(3): 361-377.
- Kubicek, Paul. 2011. "Political Conditionality and European Union's Cultivation of Democracy in Turkey," *Democratization* 18(4): 910-931.
- Kut, Şule. 2002. "The Contours of Turkish foreign policy in the 1990s." In Barry Rubin and Kemal Kirişçi, eds., *Turkey in World Politics, Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press*, 5-13.
- Kyris, George. 2012. "The European Union and the Cyprus problem: a story of limited impetus," *Eastern Journal of European Studies* 3(1): 87-99.
- Lacher, Hannes, and Erol Kaymak. "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," *Mediterranean Politics* 10(2): 147-166.
- Laçiner, Sedat. 2009. "Turgut Özal Period in Turkish Foreign Policy: Özalism," *USAK Yearbook of International Politics and Law* 2: 153-205.
- Ladrech, Robert. 1994. "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 32 (1): 69-88.
- Ladrech, Robert. 2010. *Europeanization and National Politics*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ladrech, Robert. 2014. "Rethinking the Relationship between Europeanization and European Integration". In Ramona Coman, Thomas Kostera and Luca Tomini, eds., *Europeanization and European Integration: From Incremental to Structural Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 15-28.
- Laffan, Brigid. 1996. "The Politics of Identity and Political Order in Europe." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(1): 81-102.

- Laffan, Brigid. 2003. "Managing Europe from home: Impact of the EU on Executive Government: A Comparative Analysis." *Organising for EU Enlargement Project, OEUE Phase 1*.
- Laffan, Brigid. 2007. "Core executives." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink P., eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 128-140.
- Laffan, Brigid and Jane O'Mahony. 2007. "Managing Europe from an Irish Perspective: Critical Junctures and the Increasing Formalization of the Core Executive in Ireland." *Public Administration* 85(1): 167-188.
- Landau, Jacob M. 1995. *Pan-Turkism: from Irredentism to Cooperation*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Larsen, Henrik. 2014. "The EU as a Normative Power and the Research on External Perceptions: The Missing Link," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(4): 896-910.
- Lavanex, Sandra. 2008. "A Governance Perspective on the European Neighborhood Policy: Integration beyond Conditionality?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(6): 938-955.
- Lavanex, Sandra and Frank Schimmelfennig. 2009. "EU Rules beyond EU Borders: Theorizing External Governance in European Politics," *Journal of European Public Policy* 16(6): 791-812.
- Levy, J.S. 1994. "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield," *International Organization*, 48(2): 279-312.
- Loizides, Neophytos G. 2007. "Ethnic Nationalism and Adaptation in Cyprus," *International Studies Perspectives* 8(2): 172-189.
- Lordos, Alexandros. 2009. "Rational agent or unthinking follower? A survey-based profile analysis of Greek-Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot referenda votes." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester Univ Press: 17-47.
- Mallinson, Bill. 2005. *Cyprus: A Modern History*. London and New York: IB Tauris.

- Mango, Andrew. 1990. "Introduction: Turkish Foreign Policy." In Ahmet Evin and Geoffrey Denton, eds., *Turkey and the European Community*. Germany: Leske Verlag and Budrich, 95-100.
- Manners, Ian, and Richard Whitman. 2000. *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life," *American Political Science Review* 78:734-49.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. 1998. "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders," *International Organization* 52 (4): 943-969.
- Marks, Gary, Liesbet Hooghe, and Kermit Blank. 1996. "European Integration from the 1980s: State -Centric v. Multi -level Governance," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(3): 341-378.
- Mauss Copeaux, Claire and Etienne Copeaux Copeaux. 2009. *Taksim! Bölünmüş Kıbrıs 1964-2005* (Taksim! Divided Cyprus 1964-2005) Istanbul: İletişim.
- Michael, M. Stavrou. 2009. *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Michaud -Emin, Linda. 2007. "The Restructuring of the Military High Command in the Seventh Harmonization Package and its Ramifications for Civil-Military Relations in Turkey," *Turkish Studies* 8(1): 25-42.
- Mirbagheri, Farid. 1998. *Cyprus and International Peace Making*. England and New York: Routledge.
- Miskimmon, Alister. 2007. *Germany and EU Foreign Policy: Between Europeanization and National Adaptation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1994. "Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation," *Center for European Studies Working Paper* No: 52. Cambridge: Harvard University.

- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1995. "Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Integration: A Rejoinder," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 33(4): 611-628.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2001. "Constructivism and European Integration: A Critique," In Thomas Christiansen, Knud Erik Jorgensen and Antje Wiener, eds., *The Social Construction of Europe*, London: Sage, 176-188.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem. 1998. "The Never -Ending Story: Turkey and the European Union," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34(4): 240-258.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem and Lauren McLaren. 2003. "Enlargement preferences and policy-making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey," *Journal of European Integration* 25(1): 17-30.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem. 2005. "Turkey's political reforms and the impact of the European Union," *South European Society and Politics* 10(1):17-31.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem and Aylin Güney. 2005. "The European Union and the Cyprus Problem 1961–2003," *Middle Eastern Studies* 41(2): 281-293.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem. 2008. "The European Union's Accession Negotiation with Turkey from a Foreign Policy Perspective," *Journal of European Integration* 30(1): 63-78.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem and Yaprak Gürsoy. 2010. "Is there a Europeanization of Turkish Foreign Policy? An Addendum to the Literature on EU Candidates," *Turkish Studies* 11(3): 405-427.
- Müftüler -Baç, Meltem. 2011. "Turkish Foreign Policy, its Domestic Determinants and the Role of the EU" *South European Society and Politics* 16(2): 279-291.
- Müller, Patrick. 2011. "The Europeanization of Germany's Foreign Policy toward the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict: Between Adaptation to the EU and National Projection," *Mediterranean Politics* 16(3): 385-403.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2006. "De-Ethnicizing the Ethnography of Cyprus: Political and Social Conflict between Turkish-Cypriots and Settlers from Turkey." In Yiannis Papadakis, Nicos Peristianis, and Gisela Welz, eds., *Divided Cyprus: Modernity and an Island in Conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 84-99.

- Noutcheva, Gergana and Aydın- Düzgit, Senem. 2012. "Lost in Europeanization: The Western Balkans and Turkey," *West European Politics*, 35(1): 59- 78.
- Nugent, Neill. 1992. "The Deepening and Widening of the European Community: Recent Evolution, Maastricht and Beyond," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 30(3): 311-328.
- O'Brennan, John. 2006. *The Eastern Enlargement of the European Union*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Oğuz, Mustafa. October 20, 2008. "Security Council membership to reinforce Turkey's moderate position," *Hürriyet Daily News*.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2002. 'The clash of security identities: The question of Turkey's membership in the European Union,' *International Journal*, 57(4): 579/603.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2004. "Changing Dynamics of Turkey's US and EU Relations," *Middle East Policy*, 11(1): 98-105.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2004. "The Impact of "Democratization in the Context of the EU Accession Process" on Turkish Foreign Policy," *Mediterranean Politics* 9(1): 94-113.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2007. "Soft Power in Turkish Foreign Policy." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 61(1): 81-97.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2010. "Turkey and Europeanization of Foreign Policy?," *Political Science Quarterly* 125(4): 657-683.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. 2012. "Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization without Membership," *Turkish Studies* 13(2): 229-243.
- Olsen, Johan P. 1996. "Europeanization and Nation State Dynamics." In Sverker Gustavsson and Leif Lewin, eds., *The Future of the Nation States: Essays on Cultural Pluralism and Political Integration*. Stockholm: Nerenius and Santerus Publishers.
- Olsen, Johan P. 2002. "The Many Faces of Europeanization" *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(5): 921-952.

- Öniş, Ziya. 2001. "Greek-Turkish relations and the European Union: a critical perspective," *Mediterranean Politics* 6(3): 31-45.
- Öniş, Ziya. 2007. "Conservative globalists versus defensive nationalists: political parties and paradoxes of Europeanization in Turkey," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 9(3): 247-261.
- Öniş, Ziya and Şuhnaz Yılmaz. 2008. "Greek-Turkish Rapprochement: Rhetoric or Reality?," *Political Science Quarterly* 123(1): 123–149.
- Öniş, Ziya and Şuhnaz Yılmaz. 2009. "Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism: Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey during AKP Era" *Turkish Studies* 10(1): 7-24.
- Öniş, Ziya. 2011. "Multiple Faces of the New Turkish Foreign Policy: Underlying Dynamics and a Critique," *Insight Turkey* 13(1): 47-65.
- Öymen, Onur. 2012. *Uçurumun Kenarında Dış Politika (Foreign Policy at the Cliff Edge)* İstanbul: Remzi.
- Ovalı, Şevket. 2012. "From Europeanization to Re-nationalization: Contextual Parameters of Change in Turkish Foreign Policy," *European Index for Humanities* 57(3): 17-38.
- Öner, Selcen. 2012. "Europeanization of Civil Society in Turkey during the Accession Process to the European Union." In Yonca Özer and Çiğdem Nas, eds., *Turkey and the European Union: Processes of Europeanisation*. UK: Ashgate Publishing, 100- 118.
- Öner, Selcen. 2014. "Internal factors in the EU's transformative power over Turkey: the role of Turkish civil society," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 14(1): 23-42
- Özal, Turgut. 2010. *Tarih ve Miras (History and Heritage)*, İstanbul: Yakın Plan Publications.
- Özbudun, Ergun and Serap Yazıcı. 2004. *Democratization Reforms in Turkey 1993–2004*. İstanbul: TESEV.

- Öztürk, Duygu. 2013. "The Greek Factor on Turkey's Way To EU Membership," *International Journal of Turcologia* 8(16): 69-97.
- Özcan, Gencer. 2004. "Turkey's Changing Neighborhood Policy," *Dialogue on Civilizations Briefing Paper*.
- Özcan, Gencer. 2009. "Facing Its Waterloo in Diplomacy: Turkey's Military in Foreign Policy Making Process," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 40: 85-104.
- Özcan, Gencer. 2010. "The Changing Role of Turkey's Military in Foreign Policy Making," *UNISCI Discussion Papers* No: 23.
- Özcan, Mesut. 2008. *Harmonizing Foreign Policy: Turkey, the EU and the Middle East*. UK and USA: Ashgate.
- Özer, Yonca, and Çiğdem Nas. eds. *Turkey and the European Union: processes of Europeanisation*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2012.
- Özersay, Kudret. Winter 2004-2005. "The Excuse of State Necessity and its Implications on the Cyprus Conflict" *Perceptions* 4: 31- 70.
- Özersay, Kudret and Ayla Gürel. 2008. "Property and Human Rights in Cyprus: The European Court of Human Rights as a Platform of Political Struggle," *Middle Eastern Studies* 44(2): 291-321.
- Papadimitriou, Dimitris and David Phinnemore. 2004. "Europeanization, Conditionality and Domestic Change: The Twinning Exercise and Administrative Reform in Romania," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 42 (3): 619–639.
- Pericleous, Chrysostomos. 2009. *Cyprus Referendum: A Divided Island and the Challenge of the Annan Plan*. London and New York: IB Tauris.
- Peristianis, Nikos. "Cypriot Nationalism, Dual Identity, and Politics." In Yiannis Papadakis, Nicos Peristianis and Gisela Welz, eds., *Divided Cyprus- Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 100-121.
- Pierson, Paul. 1996. "The Path to European Integration A Historical Institutionalist Analysis," *Comparative Political Studies* 29(2): 123-163.

- Pollis, Adamantia. 1973. "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," *Comparative Politics* 5(4): 575-599.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1998. "Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games," *International organization* 42(3): 427-460.
- Radaelli, Claudio M. 2000. "Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change," *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 4(8).
- Radaelli, Claudio M. 2003. "The Europeanization of public policy." In Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli, eds., *Politics of Europeanization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 27-56.
- Radaelli, Claudio M. 2004. "Europeanization: Solution or Problem?," *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 8(16).
- Radaelli, Claudio M. and Romain Pasquier. 2007. "Conceptual Issues." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink, eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agenda*. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 35-45.
- Radaelli, Claudio M. 2012. "The Challenge of Establishing Causality." In Theofanis Exadaktylos and Claudio Radaelli, eds., *Research Design in European Studies: Establishing Causality in Europeanization*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-16.
- Redmond, John. 1997. "From Association towards the Application for Full Membership: Cyprus' Relations with the European Union." In Heinz-Jurgen Axt and Hansjorg Brey, eds., *Cyprus and the European Union: New Chances for Solving an Old Conflict?* Munchen: Sudosteuropa-Gesellschaft.
- Rhodes, Rod. 1997. *Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Richmond, Oliver. 1998. *Mediating in Cyprus: The Cypriot Communities and the United Nations (Peacekeeping)*. London and Portland: Frank Cass.
- Richmond, Oliver. 2002. "Multiple Dimension of International Peace Making: UN and EU Involvement in Cyprus Conflict." In Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict: Modern Conflict, Post-modern Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 117-136.

- Risse, Thomas, Maria Green Cowles, and James Caporaso. 2001. "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction." In Maria Green Cowles, James A. Caporaso and Thomas Risse, eds., *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1-10.
- Risse, Thomas. 2012. "Identity Matters: Exploring the Ambivalence of EU Foreign Policy," *Global Policy* 3(1): 87-95.
- Rose, Richard. 1991. "What is Lesson Drawing?," *Journal of Public Policy* 11 (1): 3–30.
- Ross, Marc Howard. 2009. "Culture in Comparative Political Analysis" In Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, eds., *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*. USA: Cambridge University Press, 134-161.
- Ruano, Lorena, 2013. (ed.) *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policies towards Latin America*. New York: Routledge.
- Ruano, Lorena. 2013. *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policies towards Latin America*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2004a. "The European Union's Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict", *Working Paper Series in EU Border Conflict Studies*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2004b. 'The European Union's Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict: A Review of the Literature' *Working Paper Series in EU Border Conflicts Series*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2004c. "The Talkers and the Silent Ones: The EU and Change in Greek Turkish Relations" *Working Paper Series in EU Border Conflicts Series*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2007. "Transforming Conflicts on EU Borders: The Case of Greek-Turkish Relations," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45(1): 105-126.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2008. "Negotiating Europe: EU-Turkey Relations from an Identity Perspective," *Insight Turkey* 10(1): 97-110.

- Rumelili, Bahar. 2008. "Transforming the Greek-Turkish Conflicts: the EU and 'what we make of it'!" In Thomas Diez, Mathias Albert and Stephan Stetter, eds., *The European Union and Border Conflicts: the power of integration and association*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 94-128.
- Rumelili, Bahar. 2011. "Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy, and Socialization in post-Enlargement Europe," *Journal of European Integration* 33(2): 235-249.
- Sabatier, Paul A., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sarigil, Zeki. 2007. "Europeanization as Institutional Change: the Case of the Turkish Military," *Mediterranean Politics* 12(1): 39-57.
- Sarigil, Zeki. 2012. "The Turkish Military: Principal or Agent?." *Armed Forces & Society* 00(0): 1-23.
- Sayarı, Sabri. 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in post-Cold War era: the Challenges of Multi-regionalism" *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1): 169- 182.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. "The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union," *International Organization* 55(1): 47-80.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2008. "EU Political Accession Conditionality after the 2004 Enlargement: Consistency and Effectiveness," *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(6): 918-937.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2009. "Europeanization beyond Europe", *Living Reviews in European Governance* 4(3). Online Journal, item available at: <http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2009-3> (last access: 1 July 2015).
- Schimmelfennig, Frank and Stefan Engert and Heiko Knobel. 2003. "Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey" *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 41(3): 495-518.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2004. "Governance by conditionality: EU Rule Transfer to the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe," *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4): 661-679.

- Schimmelfennig, Frank and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (eds.) 2005. *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2006. "Candidate Countries and Conditionality." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink P., eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 88-101.
- Scott, W. Richard and John W. Meyer. 1994. *Institutional Environments and Organizations: Structural Complexity and Individualism*. London: Sage Publication.
- Sedelmeier, Ulrich. 2006. "Europeanization in New Member and Candidate States," *Living Reviews in European Governance* 1(3). Online Journal, item available at: <http://europeangovernance.livingreviews.org/Articles/lreg-2006-3/> (last access: 1 July 2015).
- Sedelmeier, Ulrich. 2011. "Europeanization in New Member and Candidate States," *Living Reviews in European Governance* 6(1). Online Journal, item available at: <http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2011-1> (last access: 1 July 2015).
- Shaelou, Stéphanie Laulhé. 2010. *The EU and Cyprus: Principles and Strategies of Full Integration*. Leiden and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Smith, Helena. April 18, 2005. "Turkish Cypriots elect Reunification Leader", *The Guardian*. Online Source, item available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/apr/18/cyprus.helenasmith> (last access: 1 July 2015).
- Smith, E. Karen. 1998. "The Use of Political Conditionality in the EU's Relations with Third Countries: How Effective?," *European Foreign Affairs Review* 3:253-274.
- Smith, Michael E. 2000. "Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Cooperation," *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(4): 613-631.
- Smith, Michael E. 2001. "Diplomacy by Decree: The Legalization of EU Foreign Policy." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(1): 79-104.
- Smith, Michael E. 2004a. *Europe's Foreign and security policy: the Institutionalisation of Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, Michael E. 2004b. "Institutionalisation, Policy Adaptation and European Foreign Policy Cooperation," *European Journal of International Relations* 10(1): 95–136.
- Schmidt, Vivien A. 2002. "Europeanization and the mechanics of economic policy adjustment," *Journal of European Public Policy* 9(6): 894-912.
- Schmidt, Vivien A., and Claudio M. Radaelli. 2004. "Policy change and discourse in Europe: Conceptual and methodological issues," *West European Politics* 27(2): 183-210.
- Sokullu, Ebru Canan (ed.) 2013. *Debating Security in Turkey*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Sonyel, Salahi R. 1998. "The European Union and the Cyprus Imbroglio," *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* 3(2): 1-6.
- Sözen, Ahmet. 2006. "Turkey's Quest for EU Membership and the Cyprus Problem." In Joseph S. Joseph, ed., *Turkey and the European Union, Internal Dynamics and External Challenges*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 161-177.
- Sözen, Ahmet. 2009. "The Turkish Cypriot Legislative Election of April 2009: Towards the 'Last Roll of the Dice' in the Cyprus Conflict?," *South European Society and Politics* 14(3): 337-350.
- Sözen, Ahmet. 2013. "Turkey's New Cyprus Policy: Transforming a Military Base into a Basin of Cooperation." In Ebru Canan Sokullu (ed.) *Debating Security in Turkey*. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 109-122.
- Şükrü Elekdağ, 1996. "2½ War Strategy," *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* 1(1): 33-57.
- Swanborn, Peter. 2010. *Case Study Research: What, Why and How?* London: Sage.
- Talat, Ali. M. 2005. "Turkish Cypriots Expectations from the European Union," *Turkish Policy Quarterly* 4(3): 1-5.

- Terzi, Özlem. 2008. "Is a Europeanized Turkish Foreign Policy Possible? The Role of the Contested EU Perspective in Bringing About A Transformation in Turkish Foreign Policy", IES Conference on The European Union in International Affairs.
- Terzi, Özlem. 2010. *The Influence of the European Union on Turkish Foreign Policy*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Terzi, Özlem. 2012. "Europeanization of Turkish Foreign Policy after more than Ten Years of EU Conditionality." In Yonca Özer and Çiğdem Nas, eds., *Turkey and the European Union: Processes of Europeanisation*. UK: Ashgate Publishing, 205-224.
- Tocci, Nathalie. 2003. "Towards Peace in Cyprus: Incentives and Disincentives," *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10(1): 199-212.
- Tocci, Nathalie. 2004. *EU Accession Dynamics and Conflict Resolution: Catalyzing Peace or Consolidating Partition in Cyprus?* London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Tocci, Nathalie. 2005. "Europeanization in Turkey: Trigger or Anchor for Reform?," *South European Society and Politics* 10(1): 73-83.
- Tocci, Nathalie. 2007. *The EU and Conflict Resolution, Promoting Peace in the Backyard*. USA & Canada: Routledge.
- Tocci, Nathalie (ed.) 2008. "Who is a normative foreign policy actor? The European Union and its global partners." (*CEPS Paperback Series* 3) Brussels: Center for European Policy Studies.
- Tonra, Ben. 2000. "Denmark and Ireland" In Ian Manners and Richard G. Whitman, eds., *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 224-242.
- Tonra, Ben. 2003. "Constructing the Common Foreign and Security Policy: The Utility of a Cognitive Approach," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 41: 731-56
- Tonra, Ben and Thomas Christiansen (eds.) 2004. *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

- Torreblanca, Jose. 2001. "Ideas, Preferences and Institutions: Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy," *Arena Working Papers*, WP 01/26: 1-38.
- Treib, Oliver. 2008. "Implementing and complying with EU governance outputs," *Living Reviews in European Governance* 3.5: 1-30.
- Tsakonas, Panayotis. 2001. "Turkey's Post-Helsinki Turbulence: Implications for Greece and the Cyprus Issue," *Turkish Studies* 2(2): 1-40.
- Tsakonas, Panayotis and Antonis Tournikiotis. 2003. "Greece's Elusive Quest for Security Providers: The 'Expectations-Reality Gap'," *Security Dialogue* 34(3): 301-314.
- Tsakonas, Panayotis. 2010. *The Incomplete Breakthrough in Greek-Turkish Relations: Grasping Greece's Socialization Strategy*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsardanidis, Charalambos and Stelios Stavridis. 2005. "The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy: a Critical Appraisal," *European Integration* 27(2): 217-239.
- Tsarouhas, Dimitris. 2009. "The Political Economy of Greek-Turkish Relations," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 9(1-2): 39-57.
- Tsebelis, George. 1999. "Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.
- Tsebelis, George. 2002. *Veto players: How political institutions work*. UK: Princeton University Press.
- Tür, Özlem and Ahmet Han. 2011. "A Framework to Understanding the Changing Turkish Foreign Policy of the 2000s." In Özden Zeynep Oktav, ed., *Turkey in 21st Century, England and USA*: Ashgate Publishing, 7-31.
- Türkmen, İlter, "Vahim Hata" (Perilous Mistake), *Hürriyet*, 21 December 2002.
- International Crisis Group (ICG). August 17, 2007. *Turkey and Europe: The Way Ahead*. Europe Report No.184

- Uğur, Mehmet. 1999. *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye- Bir Dayanak/İnandırıcılık İkilemi (European Union and Turkey- an Anchor/Credibility Dilemma)* Istanbul: Everest.
- Uğur, Mehmet. 2000. "Europeanization and Convergence via Incomplete Contracts? The case of Turkey," *South European Society and Politics* 5(2): 217-242.
- Uğur, Mehmet and Canefe, Nergis. 2004. *Turkey and European Integration: Accession Prospects and Issues*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Uğur, Mehmet, and Dilek Yankaya. 2008. "Policy entrepreneurship, policy opportunism, and EU conditionality: The AKP and TÜSİAD experience in Turkey," *Governance* 21(4): 581-601.
- Uğur, Mehmet. 2010. "Open -Ended Membership Prospect and Commitment Credibility: Explaining the Deadlock in EU–Turkey Accession Negotiations," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(4): 967-991.
- Uluğ-Eryılmaz, Burçin. 2014. "The myth of 'Europeanization' of Turkish Foreign Policy: the Cyprus Debacle as a Litmus Test," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 14(3): 431-462.
- Uluğ-Eryılmaz, Burçin. 2015. *Europeanization or not? Turkish Foreign Policy and Cyprus Problem, 1999-2014*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. Ankara: İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University International Relations Department.
- Ulusoy, Kıvanç. 2007. "Turkey's Reform Effort Reconsidered, 1987–2004," *Democratisation* 14(3): 472-490.
- Ulusoy, Kıvanç. 2008a. "The Europeanization of Turkey and its Impact on the Cyprus Problem" *Journal of Southern Europe and Balkans* 10(3): 309-329.
- Ulusoy, Kıvanç. 2008b. "Turkey and the EU: Democratization, Civil-Military Relations and the Cyprus Issue," *Insight Turkey* 10(4): 51-76.
- Ulusoy, Kıvanç. 2009. "The changing challenge of Europeanization to politics and governance in Turkey," *International Political Science Review* 30(4): 363-384.

- Uzer, Umut. 2010. *Identity and Turkish foreign policy: The Kemalist influence in Cyprus and the Caucasus*. New York: IB Tauris.
- Uzgel, İlhan. 2003a. "Between Praetorianism and Democracy: the Role of the Military in Turkish Foreign Policy." *Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*. 34: 177-212.
- Uzgel, İlhan. 2003b. "The Paradox of Modernisation and Securitisation: The Turkish Military vs. the European Union." *EU-Turkish Relations Dossier, Observatory of European Foreign Policy*.
- Uzgel, İlhan. 2004. *Ulusal Çıkar ve Dış Politika* (National Interest and Foreign Policy) Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Vachudova, Milada Anna. 2000. "EU Enlargement: An Overview," *East European Constitutional Review* 9(4): 64-69.
- Vachudova, Milada Anna. 2005. *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage and Integration after Communism*. New York; Oxford University Press.
- Verney, Susannah. 2009. "From Consensus to Conflict: Changing Perceptions of the Cyprus Question in the European Parliament, 1995–2006." In Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*. Manchester: Manchester Univ Press: 124-146.
- Vink, P. Maarten. 2002. "Negative and Positive Integration in European Immigration Policies" *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 6(13) Online Journal, item available at: <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-013a.htm> (last access: 1 July 2015).
- Vink, Maarten P. and Paolo Graziano. 2007. "Challenges of a New Research Agenda." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink P., eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 3-20.
- White, Brian. (2001) *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Windhoff-Héritier, Adrienne and et al. 2001. *Differential Europe: the European Union Impact on National Policymaking*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Wong, Reuben and Hill, Christopher (eds.) 2011. *National and European Foreign Policies: towards Europeanization*. USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Wong, Y. Reuben. 2005. "The Europeanization of Foreign Policy." In Christopher Hill and Michael Smith (eds.) *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 134-153.
- Wong, Y. Reuben. 2006. *The Europeanization of French Foreign Policy: France and the EU in East Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wong, Y. Reuben. 2007. "Foreign Policy." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink P., eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 321-336.
- Yakinthou, Christalla. 2009. *Consociational Democracy and Cyprus: The House that Annan Built*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yalvaç, Faruk. 2014. "Approaches to Turkish Foreign Policy: A Critical Realist Analysis," *Turkish Studies* 15(1): 117-138.
- Yanık, Lerna K. 2012. "Foreign Policy During 2011 Parliamentary Elections in Turkey: Both an Issue and Non-issue," *Turkish Studies* 13(2): 213-227.
- Yannas, Prodromos. 1994. "The Greek Factor in EC–Turkey Relations." In P. Kazakos and P. Ioakimidis, eds., *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*. London: Pinter, 215–221.
- Yavuz, Hakan. Ed., 2011. *AK Parti: Toplumsal Değişimin Yeni Aktörleri*. (Published in English with the title: *The emergence of a new Turkey: democracy and the AK Parti*). Istanbul: Kitap.
- Yavuzalp, Ercüment. 1993. *Kıbrıs Yangınında Büyükelçilik*. (Embassy during the Cyprus Fire). Ankara: Bilgi Publications.
- Yeşilada, Birol A. and Ahmet Sözen. 2002. "Negotiating a Resolution to the Cyprus Problem: Is Potential European Union Membership a Blessing or a Curse?," *International Negotiation* 7(2): 261-285.

- Yılmaz, Gözde and Diğdem Soyaltın. 2014. "Zooming into the 'Domestic' in Europeanization: Promotion of Fight against Corruption and Minority Rights in Turkey," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 16(1): 11-29.
- Yılmaz, Hakan. 2011. "Euroskepticism in Turkey: Parties, elites, and public opinion," *South European Society and Politics* 16(1): 185-208.
- Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zalewski, Piotr. 2004. "Sticks, Carrots and Great Expectations: Human Rights Conditionality and Turkey's Path towards Membership of the European Union," *Center for International Relations: Reports and Analyses* No: 9.
- Zengin, Gürkan. 2010. *Hoca-Türk Dış Politikasında Davutoğlu Etkisi* (Master-Davutoğlu Effect in Turkish Foreign Policy) Istanbul: Inkılap Yayınları.

Interviews

- Akdeniz, Aycan, September 11, 2014, Interview with the Author, Ankara.
- Apakan, Ertuğrul, December 30 2014, Interview with the Author, İzmir.
- Aygın, Esra. March 3, 2015, Online Interview with the author.
- Buluñ, Ahmet Zeki, September 9, 2014, Interview with the author, Ankara.
- Çolak, Emine. February 5, 2015, Online Interview with the author.
- Demetriades, Achilleas, December 27, 2014, Online interview with the author.
- Ertuğ, Osman, October 17, 2014, Interview with the author, Nicosia.
- Fantorini, Stefano, September 11, 2014, Interview with the Author, Ankara.

High ranking bureaucrat, Ministry of EU Affairs, October 17, 2014, Interview with the Author, Ankara.

High ranking diplomat, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, October 1, 2014, Interview with the Author, Ankara.

High ranking bureaucrat, Presidency of TRNC, 17 September 2014, Interview with the author, Nicosia.

Lordos, Alexandros, February 27, 2015, Online Interview with the author.

Olgun, Ergün, October 18, 2014, Interview with the author, Nicosia.

Psaltis, Charis. January 9, 2015, Online Interview with the author.

Talat, Mehmet Ali, October 15, 2014, Interview with the author, Nicosia.

Yakış, Yaşar, October 5, 2014, Interview with the Author, Ankara.

Ziyal, Uğur, February 18, 2015, Interview with the Author, Ankara.

Newspaper Articles

April 1, 2004. "Greek PM Karamanlis says it is up to the Cypriot people 'to finally decide'", *Athens News Agency*.

April 1, 2004. "Last tango at Buergenstock", *Turkish Daily News*.

April 1, 2004. "Referandumda Tavrımız Evet" (Our attitude is yes in referendum) *Milliyet*.

April 16, 2007. "Head of Ataturk Foundation: Turkish people showed their true feelings on Saturday," *Hürriyet Daily News*.

April 17, 2004. “Kartlarını iyi oynadılar” (They played well) *Milliyet*.

April 17, 2005. “KKTC’de bir devrin sonu” (End of an era in TRNC) *Hürriyet*.

April 18, 2003. “Batu’dan eleştiri: vaad edilen bu değil” (Criticism by Batu: this is not we were promised) *Milliyet*.

April 18, 2010. “Nationalist Dervis Eroglu wins northern Cyprus election”, *BBC News*.

April 19, 2004. “United Cyprus Divides Turkey” *Hürriyet Daily News*.

April 20, 2010. “Eroğlu: Müzakere masasından kaçmayacağım” (Eroğlu: I will not leave the negotiation table) *Zaman*.

April 22, 2003. “Turkish Cypriots to allow Green Line crossings,” *Cyprus Mail*.

April 24, 2004. “Ankara urges EU to revise Cyprus entry rules”, *Turkish Daily News*.

April 24, 2004. “Cyprus 'spurns historic chance'”, *BBC News*.

April 24, 2004. “Final Results”, *Cyprus News Agency*.

April 24, 2008. “Sarkozy seeks to drop mandatory referendums on EU enlargement”, *Hurriyet Daily News*.

April 28, 2007. “Genelkurmay’dan sert açıklama” (Harsh declaration from the General Staff), *Milliyet*.

April 30, 2012. “Bağış Warns on Greek Cypriots’ Term Presidency”, *Hürriyet Daily News*.

April 4, 2004. “Gül: Sıkıntılar Yaşanacak” (Gül: There will be difficulties) *Cumhuriyet*.

April 6, 2004. “Denктаş: They are taking to take our state”, *Turkish Daily News*.

April 7, 2004. “Erdogan: Annan plan reflects our priorities”, *Turkish Daily News*.

April 9, 2004. “Poll points to resounding no”, *Cyprus Mail*.

April, 18, 2003. “Bizi Ecevit’le Karıştırma” (Don not confuse us with Ecevit) *Milliyet*.

August 15, 1974. “Lefkoşa Sarıldı Magosa’ya Varıldı” (Nicosia was besieged, Magusa was arrived) *Milliyet*.

August 2, 2002. “Türkiye artık bizden” (Turkey is one of us now) *Hürriyet*.

Cem, İpek, Interview with Oli Rehn, January 2007. Available at: http://www.global-leaders.tv/en/archive/olli_rehn.asp (last access: 10 June 2015)

December 10, 1991. “Dörtlü Zirveye Ret” (For partite summit rejected) *Milliyet*.

December 11, 2002. “Annan Corners Sides on Cyprus,” *Turkish Daily News*.

December 14, 2004. “Ya Tam Üyelik ya hiçbir şey” (Either membership or nothing) *Yeni Şafak*.

December 15, 2003. “Turkish Cyprus election stalemate”, *BBC News*.

December 15, 2004. “Teşekkürler Almayalım Diyeceğimiz Nokta Var!” (There is a point that we will say that is enough) *Yeni Şafak*.

December 17, 2004. “AB ile Kıbrıs Krizi” (Cyprus Crisis with EU) *Radikal*.

December 17, 2004. “Erdoğan: Siyasi Riski Alıyorum” (Erodğan: I take political risk) *Hürriyet*.

December 18, 2004. “Kolay Gelsin Türkiye” (Turkey may it be easy) *Radikal*.

December 2, 2004. “Ankara Yön Belirliyor” (Ankara orients) *Cumhuriyet*.

December 28, 2002. “KKTC rally demonstrates dangerous polarization”, *Turkish Daily News*.

December 29, 2003. “Annan Planı’na rötuşlu evet” (Retouched yes for Annan plan) *Cumhuriyet*.

December 3, 2002. “YSK cancels elections in Southeastern city of Siirt”, *Turkish Daily News*.

December 30, 2002. “Denktaş: İstifa ederim” (Denktaş: I resign) *Kıbrıs*.

December 30, 2003. “Annan Planı’na Rötüş” (Retouching Annan plan) *Milliyet*.

December 30, 2003. “Dörtlü Zirve sıkıntısı” (Four partite Summit distress) *Milliyet*.

December 5, 2001. “Haydi Hayırlısı” (Here goes nothing) *Milliyet*.

February 12, 2005. “S. Cypriot Urge ‘Substantial Changes’ in UN Plan”, *Today’s Zaman*.

February 18, 2006. “Cyprus says could veto Turkey if EU duties not met”, *Cyprus Mail*.

February 18, 2006. “Cyprus says could veto Turkey if EU duties not met”, *Cyprus Mail*.

February 19, 2004. “New effort for solution begins under UN auspices”, *Cyprus News Agency*.

February 2, 2003. “US leans on Different Sets of Allies againsts Iraq”, *Turkish Daily News*.

February 2006. “French Foreign Minister calls on Turkey to Recognize Cyprus”, *Cyprus Bulletin*, Week 5.

February 26, 2003. “Denktaş: Referandum için Referandum Yapabilirim” (Denktaş: I can arrange a referendum for referendum) *Milliyet*.

February 27, 2003. “Annan 3. Planı Liderlere Sundu,” *Milliyet*.

January 25, 2004. “Kıbrıs’ta yeni film” (The New Movie in Cyprus) *Milliyet*.

January 1, 2003. “New Year Gift to AK Party (JDP) Leader: Sezer Clears Way for Erdoğan to be PM”, *Hürriyet Daily News*.

January 1, 2003. “New Year Gift to AK Party (JDP) Leader: Sezer Clears Way for Erdoğan to be PM”, *Turkish Daily News*.

January 14, 2003. “Totaliter bir rejimin yanında yer almayın” (Do not take side with a totalitarian regime) *Milliyet*.

January 15, 2003. “Kıbrıs AB için sokağa döküldü”, *Milliyet*.

January 15, 2003. “Turkish Cypriots push for UN peace proposal”, *Financial Times*.

January 19, 2003. “Cumhurbaşkanı Denktaş: Mevcut plana referandumda evet çıksa bile imzalamam” (President Denktaş: I will not sign the current plan even if the conclusion is yes in the referendum), *Kıbrıs*

January 2, 2003. “Denktaş’ın değil halkın meselesi” (It is not the matter of Denktaş, it is the matter people) *Hürriyet*.

January 24, 2004. “MGK: Annan Planı referans” (NSC: Annan plan is the reference) *Cumhuriyet*.

January 24, 2004. “MGK’da olmazsa olmaz 20 madde” (20 essentials at NSC) *Milliyet*.

January 25, 2004. “Kıbrıs’ta yeni film” (The new movie in Cyprus) *Milliyet*.

January 27, 2003. “Hükümet hazırlıksız çıktı 50 yıl geriye gidebiliriz” (Government is unprepared, we might waste 50 years of progress) *Milliyet*.

January 29, 2004. “Annan: Cyprus needs end of March deal to meet EU deadline,” *Cyprus Mail*.

January 5, 2004. “Ortak Çalışma Erozyona Uğradı” (Common work failed) *Cumhuriyet*.

January 9, 2004. “Annan’a ayar” (Adjustmen for Annan) *Milliyet*.

January 9, 2004. “Masadan Kalkmayın” (Do not leave the table) *Milliyet*.

July 1, 2003. “Abdullah Gül Powell’dan Destek İstedi” (Abdullah Gül asked for support from Powell) *Milliyet*.

July 12, 2003. “Siz havaalanını biz Maraş’ı açalım” (You open your airport, we will open Maraş) *Milliyet*.

July 20, 1991. “Kıbrıs’ta Çözüm Türkiye’nin Yararına” (Solution in Cyprus is for the best interest of Turkey) *Milliyet*.

July 20, 2011. “Denктаş gibi Konuştu,” (He spoke as Denктаş) *Cumhuriyet*.

July 20, 2012. “AB bize dürüst davranmadı” (EU did not treat us honestly) *Cumhuriyet*.

July 20, 2012. “Erdoğan: Kıbrıs diye bir devlet yok” (Erdoğan: There is not a state called Cyprus) *Cumhuriyet*.

- July 21, 2010. “Kıbrıs’ı Tercih ederiz” (We will prefer Cyprus) *Cumhuriyet*.
- July 21, 2012. “Kıbrıs’ta AB’ye yüklendi” (He criticized EU in Cyprus) *Cumhuriyet*.
- July 22, 2011. “Erdogan comments irk EU officials,” *Cyprus Mail*.
- June 25, 2003. “Gül: Kıbrıs sorunu yaz sonuna biter” (Gül: Cyprus conflict will be resolved in the end of this summer) *Milliyet*.
- June 8, 2002. “Saat saat AB Zirvesi” (EU Summit hourly) *Milliyet*.
- Kasım 20, 2002. “Erdoğan: Kıbrıs, AGSP ve AB tek paket olmalı” (Erdoğan: There should be a single package including Cyprus, ESDP and EU) *Hürriyet*.
- March 1, 2003. “Rauf Denктаş: Önce Ankara, sonra Lahey” (Rauf Denктаş: Ankara First and then The Hague) *Milliyet*.
- March 10, 2003. “Tam İktidar Oldu” (He has the full authority) *Milliyet*.
- March 11, 2003. “Cyprus Peace process collapses,” *BBC*. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2838535.stm> (last access: 10 July 2015)
- March 15, 2003. “Erdoğan government era opens”, *Turkish Daily News*.
- March 2, 2003. “Responsibility Discussion at the MGK”, *Hürriyet Daily News*.
- March 2, 2003. “Sonuç Evet, Karar Ret” (Result is Yes, Decision is No) *Hürriyet*
- March 20, 2006. “Mali yardımını biz denetleyeceğiz” (We will monitor financial aid). *Kıbrıs*.
- March 22, 2005. “President Papadopoulos wants new UN initiative for Cyprus settlement”, *Athens News Agency*.

March 3, 1993. “Ankara’nın Kıbrıs Taktiği” (Ankara’s Cyprus tactic) *Milliyet*.

March 4, 2012. “Turkish Cyprus might be annexed to Turkey, minister says”, *Today’s Zaman*.

May 10, 2003. “Erdoğan: Ambargoyu karşılıklı kaldıralım”(Erdoğan: lift embargo simultaneously) *Milliyet*.

May 2, 2003. “MGK holds meeting amid growing tensions”, *Turkish Daily News*,

May 23, 2003. “Denktash: karar sürpriz olmadı” (Denktash: decision is not a surprise) *Milliyet*.

May 4, 2003. “Gül: Rumları tanıyabiliriz” (We may recognize Greek Cypriots) *Milliyet*.

May 9, 2003. “Erdoğan ‘herkesi’ kucaklayacak” (Erdoğan will embrace everyone) *Milliyet*.

May, 2004. “Kıbrıs’ta yeni dönem” (New era in Cyprus) *Türkiye Bülteni* (Bulletin of Turkey)

November 14, 2002. “Erdoğan: Umut Havası Oluştı” (Erdoğan: a climate of hope has emerged), *Milliyet*, 14 November 2002

November 15, 2002. “Orgeneral Özkök’ten KKTC’ye Güvence” (Guarante from General Özkök to TRNC), *Milliyet*.

November 16, 2000. “Klerides Masaya Geri Döndü” (Clerides returned negotiation table) *Milliyet*.

November 16, 2002. “KKTC’ye Destek Resepsiyonu” (Reception to support TRNC), *Milliyet*.

November 17, 2002. “BM’nin Kıbrıs Planı Müzakere Edilebilir” (UN’s Plan for Cyprus might be negotiated), *Milliyet*, 17 November 2002;

November 18, 2002. “Clerides confers with Greek leadership over crucial UN Cyprus plan” *Athens News Agency*. Available at: <http://www.hri.org/news/greek/ana/2002/02-11-18.ana.html>

November 18, 2002. “Clerides confers with Greek leadership over crucial UN Cyprus plan”, *Athens News Agency* (ANA),.

November 19, 2002. “KKTC, BM’den Zaman İstedi” (TRNC asks for time from the UN), *Milliyet*.

November 21, 2002. “Erdoğan: Başımızı Kumdan Çıkaralım” (Erdoğan: Lets take out our heads from the sand), *Milliyet*.

November 21, 2002. “Tarih için Tarihe Razı” (He is ready for the date for a date) *Milliyet*.

November 25, 2000. “Kıbrıs’a Şahin Çözüm” (Hawkish solution for Cyprus) *Milliyet*

November 25, 2000. “Rumlara Yeter Artık” (Enough is enough) *Milliyet*.

November 28, 2002. “Denктаş: Görüşelim” (Denктаş: we may negotiate) *Milliyet*.

November 29, 2000. “Denktash: decision has nothing to do with us”, *Cyprus Mail*.

November 9, 2000. “Annan: Cyprus talks move into substance,” *BBC*. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1014439.stm> (last access: 10 July 2015)

November 9, 2006. “Gül: Baskı Yanlış” (Gül: pressure is wrong) *Radikal*.

October 12, 2004. “Cyprus refuses to rule out Turkey EU membership veto”, *Financial Times*.

October 2, 2004. “Tarihi Karar” (Historical Decision) *Hürriyet*.

October 5, 2006. “Turkey’s EU bid hinges on resolving Cyprus issue”, *Deutsche Welle*.

October 7, 2004. “Türkiye iç mesele oldu” (Turkey has become the domestic matter) *Milliyet*.

October, 20, 2008. “Trial of the century begins,” *Hürriyet Daily News*.

Oli Rehn, interview with İpek Cem, January 2007. Available at: Available at: http://www.global-leaders.tv/en/archive/olli_rehn.asp (last access: 10 June 2015)

Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Office, “Recent Developments: Declaration by the President regarding the 24 April referendum” Available at: <http://www.moi.gov.cy/moi/pio/pio.nsf/All/90CF1FEB4B93B929C225783800399C01?OpenDocument&print> (last access: 10 June 2015)

Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Service, Recent Developments, 2005.

September 6, 2006. “Bu Rapor Düzeltisin” (Fix this report) *Hürriyet*.

September 18, 2005. Republic of Cyprus Press and Information Service.

Official Documents and Declarations

“Agenda 2000: for a Stronger and Wider Union”, Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Union, Supplement 5/97, 15 July 1997.

“Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal* 115, 09/05/2008 P. 0028 – 0029: Article III- 292 (2b- 2c)

“Cyprus Issue”, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/cyprus-issue-_summary_.en.mfa

“Situation in Cyprus”, Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers- 776th Meeting, 6 December 2001 (Addendum to CM/Del/Dec(2001)776).

Act of Accession with Republic of Cyprus, Protocol I, Appendix I

AK Parti (Justice and Development Party). 2002. *Seçim Beyannamesi: Herşey Türkiye için (Election Manifest: Everything is for Turkey)*

Commission of the European Communities. Commission opinion on Turkey’s request for accession to the Community, SEC (89) 2290 final. Brussels: December 20, 1989.

Commission Opinion on the Application by the Republic of Cyprus for Membership – Extracts doc/93/5 , 30 June 1993.

Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, “Figures and Statistics of Missing Persons”. Available at: http://www.cmp-cyprus.org/media/attachments/Quick%20Statistics/Copy_of_CMP_Facts_and_Figures_April_2015.pdf (last access: 10 May 2015)

Community, SEC (89) 2290 final. Brussels: 20.12.1989.

Conclusion of European General External Relations Council, Brussels, December 11, 2006

Corrigendum to Council Regulation (EC) No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession ([*Official Journal of the European Union L 161 of 30 April 2004*](#)) Title III/Article 4.

Council of Europe. Resolution adopted by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers on the Titina Loizidou case. July 24, 2000.

Council of Europe. Resolution adopted by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers on the Titina Loizidou case. July 24, 2000.

Council of the European Union, “Negotiating Framework” 12823/1/05 REV 1, October 5, 2005.

Denktaş, Rauf. 1998. *Call for peace from the Turkish side Rauf Denktaş Proposes Confederation In Cyprus*. 31 August 1998. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/p_call-for-peace-from-the-turkish-side_br_rauf-denktas-proposes-confederation-in-cyprus_br_31-august-1998_p_en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Downer, Alexander. Remarks by Special Adviser of the Secretary-General Alexander Downer, Larnaca Airport, 4 June 2010, available at: http://www.uncyprustalks.org/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=2958&tt=graphic&lang=11 (last access: 10 May 2015)

Eroğlu, Derviş. “Cumhurbaşkanı Sayın Dr.Derviş Eroğlu’nun “Dr. Fazıl Küçük’ün Ölümünün 27. Yıldönümü Anma Töreni”nde Yaptıkları Konuşma” (Speech Delivered by President Eroğlu in Commemorative Ceremony of Dr. Fazıl Küçük’s 27th anniversary of death), 11 January 2011, Nicosia

EU Commission presents recommendation on continuation of Turkey’s accession negotiations, 29 November 2006, EC06-368EN.

Eurobarometer. Spring 2004. “Joint Full Report of Eurobarometer 61 and CC Eurobarometer 2004.1” Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb61/eb61_en.pdf (last Access: 10 June 2015).

European Commission Of Human Rights, Applications No. 6780/74 ; 6950/75 and 8007/77. Cyprus versus Turkey. 10 July 1976 and 2 April 1992.

European Commission, Chapters of Acquis. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/policy/conditions-membership/chapters-of-the-acquis/index_en.htm (last access: 10 May 2015)

European Commission, Lecture by Olli Rehn, Turkey's accession process to the EU, 27 November 2006 (SP06-327EN)

European Commission, Press Release Database, “Romano Prodi, Speech to the House of Representatives”, 25 October 2001

European Commission, Press Release Database, “Romano Prodi, Speech at the Turkish Grand National Assembly”, 15 January 2004.

European Commission, “Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal* 115 , 09/05/2008 P. 0028 – 0029

European Commission. 1998. Regular Report 1998 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 1999. Regular Report 1999 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2000. Regular Report 2000 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2001. Regular Report 2001 on Cyprus’s Progress Towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2001. Regular Report 2001 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2002. Regular Report 2002 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2003. Regular Report 2003 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2004. Regular Report 2004 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2005. Regular Report 2005 on Turkey’s Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2006. “Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2006–2007,” COM (2006) 649 final, 8 November.

European Commission. 2006. Regular Report 2006 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2007. Regular Report 2007 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2008. Regular Report 2008 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2009. Regular Report 2009 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2010. Regular Report 2010 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2011. Regular Report 2011 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission. 2012. Regular Report 2012 on Turkey's Progress towards Accession. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Council, Brussels European Council Presidency Conclusion, 17-18 June 2004.

European Council, Copenhagen European Council Presidency Conclusion, 21 - 22 June 1993.

European Council, Corrigendum to Council Regulation No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession ([Official Journal of the European Union L 161 of 30 April 2004](#))

European Council, Council Conclusions on Cyprus, DG E I 8907/04. Brussels: Council of the European Union, 4 April 2004.

European Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 866/2004, 29 April 2004.

European Council, Dublin European Conclusion Presidency Conclusion, Reproduced from the Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 6/1990, 25 - 26 June 1990.

European Council, Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusion, 10 - 11 December 1999.

European Council, Luxembourg European Council Presidency Conclusion, 12-13 December 1997.

European Council, Madrid European Council Presidency Conclusion, 25 - 26 June 1990.

European Council, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, "Accession Partnership with the Republic of Turkey" (2001/235/EC), 8 March 2001.

European Council, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, "Act of Accession with Republic of Cyprus, Protocol I.

European Court of Human Right, "Case of Cyprus vs. Turkey", Application no: 25781/94. Strasbourg. 10 May 2001.

European Court of Human Right, "Case of Cyprus vs. Turkey", Application no: 25781/94. Strasbourg. 10 May 2001.

European Court of Human Right, "Case of Loizidou vs. Turkey", Application no: 15318/89. Strasbourg. 23 March 1995.

European Court of Human Right, "Case of Loizidou vs. Turkey", Application no: 15318/89. Strasbourg. Paragraphs 55-56. 23 March 1995.

European Court of Human Right, "Case of Loizidou vs. Turkey", Application no: 15318/89. Strasbourg. Paragraphs 16. 18 December 1996.

European Election Database, "Cyprus: Presidential Elections 2008". Available at: http://www.nsd.uib.no/european_election_database/

European Observers Report on Cyprus, 23 January 2005, reprinted in Dodd, Clement. 1998. The Cyprus Imbroglio, Huntingdon. Appendix 6: 172-180.

European Observers Report on Cyprus, 23 January 2005, reprinted in Dodd, Clement. 1998. *The Cyprus Imbroglio*, Huntington, N.Y.: Eothen Press. Appendix 6: 172-180.

European Parliament, Resolution on the Situation in Cyprus, 19 August 1996.

European Union External Action Unit, “Conflict Prevention, Peace building and Mediation”. Available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/cfsp/conflict_prevention/index_en.htm (last access: 10 June 2015)

European Union External Action, “Conflict Prevention, Peace building and Mediation”. Available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/cfsp/conflict_prevention/index_en.htm (last access: 10 June 2015)

Final Communiqué of The 31st Session of The Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, 16 June 2004, Istanbul

G8 Communiqué Köln, 20 June 1999. Available at: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1999koln/finalcom.htm>

International Crisis Group, “Cyprus: Six Steps toward a Settlement”, Crisis Group Europe Briefing No. 61, 22 February 2011.

Justice and Development Party, 2011 Election Manifesto. Available at: <http://www.ak-parti.org.tr/site/dosyalar#!25.-donem-milletvekili-aday-listesi> (last access: 10 July 2015).

Kırca, Coşkun. 1983. “Speech Delivered by Turkish Permanent Representative in UN Coşkun Kırca”. In *1983 Nisan- Kasım Döneminde Kıbrıs Sorununda Meydana Gelen Gelişmeler ve KKTC’nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Belgeler*. Edited by Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department on Cyprus and Greece. Ankara

Rome European Council Presidency Conclusion. 14-15 December 1990. Bulletin of the European Communities, No. 12/1990

Statement by Abdullah Gül, UN General Assembly 60th meeting, 21 September 2005

Statement by EU Commissioner Rehn on Turkey's Cyprus initiative, 24 January 2006, EC06-022EN

Treaty of Alliance between the Kingdom Of Greece, the Republic Of Turkey and the Republic Of Cyprus. No. 5712. Nicosia, On 16 August 1960

Treaty of Guarantee, No. 5475, Article II, 16 August 1960.

Turkish Government's Decision to Include all new EU members in the scope of the Council of Ministers Decree No. 2002/4616 of 3 September 2002 which specifies the countries to which the Turkey-EU Customs Union applies. No:128, 2 October 2004.

Turkish Grand National Assembly, “III. Yılmaz Hükümeti Hükümet Programı” (Government Program of the Third Yılmaz Government”. Available at: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP55.htm> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Grand National Assembly, “IV. Ecevit Hükümeti Hükümet Programı” (Government Program of the Fourth Ecevit Government) Available at: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP56.htm> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Grand National Assembly, “Program of the First Erdoğan Government”, available at: <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP59.htm> (last access: July 10, 2015)

Turkish Grand National Assembly. 1955. “VI. Menderes Hükümeti Programı” (Program of the Fourth Menderes Government). Available at: <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP22.htm>

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs , “Press Release Regarding The S-300 Missiles”

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs “Turkey - TRNC Joint Declaration” July 20, 1999. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey---trnc-joint-declaration--july-20_-1999.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs “Turkey - TRNC Joint Declaration” December 28, 1995. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey-trnc-joint-declaration-december-28_-1995.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “BM Kapsamlı Çözüm Planı (Annan Planı)” (“UN Plan for the Settlement for Cyprus” (Annan Plan)). Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/bm-kapsamli-cozum-plani-annan-plani.tr.mfa> (Last access: 10 July 2015).

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “EU and Cyprus: An Expert View Opinion of Professor M.H. Mendelson Q.C on the Application of “the Republic of Cyprus” to Join the European Union. Summary And Conclusions” June 6, 1997.

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Letter By The Minister Of Foreign Affairs Of The Republic Of Turkey To The Minister Of Foreign Affairs Of United Kingdom Concerning The Greek Cypriot Application To The EU” 17 June 1997. Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/letter-by-the-minister-of-foreign-affairs-of-the-republic-of-turkey-to-the-minister-of-foreign-affairs-of-united-kingdom-concern.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Press Release on G-8; Joint Declaration which refers to the Cyprus issue” June 21, 1999. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/press-release-on-g-8-joint-declaration-which-refers-to-the-cyprus-issue_br_june-21_-1999.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Statement of Namık Tan, the Spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the EU Counter Declaration”, September 22, 2005. Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/september-22nd-2005-state-ment-of-mr-namik-tan-the-spokesman-of-the-ministry-of-foreign-affairs-on-the-eu-counter-declaration-unofficial-translation.en.mfa> (last access: 10 July 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Statement regarding the press statement of the President of the United Nations Security Council on Cyprus”, 12 July 2002. Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/statement-regarding-the-press-state-ment-of-the-president-of-the-united-nations-security-council-on-cyprus---12-july-2002.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015).

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Turkey- TRNC Joint Statement” July 4, 1997. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey---trnc-joint-statement-july-4_-1997.en.mfa (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Official Website, “Ten-Point Agreement of 19 May 1979” Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/ten-point-agreement-of-19-may-1979.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Official Website, “The Guidelines Agreed Between President Denktas and the late Archbishop Makarios on 12 February 1977” Available at: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-guidelines-agreed-between-president-denktas-and-the-late-archbishop-makarios-on-12-february-1977.en.mfa> (last access: 10 May 2015)

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Press Release Regarding the EU Enlargement, 1 May 2004

TUSIAD. *Press Release: Cyprus issue should not harm Turkey’s EU membership process.* November 19, 2001: Washington DC. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/basin-bulteni-2001-11.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015)

TUSIAD. *Press Release: TUSIAD invites the EU’s and Turkish political authorities to adopt a more rational and constructive approach on the Cyprus question.* October 4, 2001: Brussels. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/basin-bulteni-2001-12.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015)

TUSIAD. *Speech delivered by the Chairman of the Board of TUSIAD Tuncay Özilhan at the Cyprus’s Accession to the EU Conference.* May 4, 2002: Istanbul, Boğaziçi University. Available at: http://www.tusiad.org/_rsc/shared/file/2002-05-04-TheSpeechDelieveredByTOzilhancyprusAccessionEUConference.pdf (last access: July 10, 2015)

U. N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. S/1250/1999, 29 June 1999.

U.N. Media Coverage and Press Release, “Statement of Secretary-General on Cyprus”, SG/SM/8418, 4 October 2002.

U.N. Monthly Forecast, December 2005, Cyprus). Available at: http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2005-12/lookup_c_glKWLeMTIsG_b_1203195.php (last access: 10 May 2015)

U.N. Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 19, A/60/657-S/2006/48

U.N. Security Council General Assembly, Agenda Item: 29, A/59/820-S/2005/355.

U.N. Security Council Resolutions No: 353 (1974); 354 (1974); 355 (1974); 357 (1974); 358 (1974); 359 (1974); 360 (1974); 361 (1974); 364 (1974); 365 (1974); 367 (1975); 383 (1975); 391 (1976); 401 (1976); 544 (1983); 789 (1992); 1251(1999)

U.N. Security Council, “Report of the Secretary General on his Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus” S/21183 March 8, 1990.

U.N. Security Council, Media Coverage and Press Release, “Press Statement on Cyprus by President Of Security Council”, SC/7444, 9 July 2002.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus”, Res. S/2003/398, 1 April 2003.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on the UN operation in Cyprus”, S/2005/743, 29 November 2005.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on the UN operation in Cyprus”, S/2006/931, 1 December 2006.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on the UN Operations in Cyprus”, S/2004/756, 24 September 2004.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus”, Res. S/2003/398, 1 April 2003

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 186 in doc. S/5575, 4 March 1964.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. S/789, 25 November 1992.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 1475(2003), 14 April 2003

U.N. Security Council, Report of UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Official Records, S/24472, 21 August 1992.

U.N. Security Council, Report of UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Official Records, S/24830, 11 November 1992.

U.N. Security Council, Report of UN Secretary-General Pérez de Cuéllar, Official Records, S/21183, 8 March 1990.

U.N., Meetings Coverage and Press Release, “Secretary-General Says ‘End of Road’ Reached Concerning Current Cyprus Talks, But ‘Plan Remains on the Table’”, SG/SM/8630, 11 March 2003.

U.N. Security Council, 5211th Meeting Records, S/PV.5211.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Annex I to the letter dated 25 July 2006 from the Secretary General addressed to the President of the Security Council”, S/2006/572, 25 July 2006.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus”, S/2008/353, 2 June 2008. Annex II

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus”, Res. S/2004/437, 28 May 2004.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus”, Res. S/2004/320, 16 April 2004

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Report of the Secretary-General on the UN Operations in Cyprus”, S/2004/756, 24 September 2004.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. S/969, 21 December 1994.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, “Declaration by the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain And Northern Ireland” in Doc. S/11398, July 30 1974.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 353. July 20, 1974.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 357, 14 August 1974; Res. 358 and 359, 15 August 1974 and Res. 360 16 August 1974.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 367, 12 March 1975.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 541, 18 November 1983.

U.N. Security Council, Official Records, Res. 550, 11 May 1984.

U.N. "Press Statement by Security Council President on Cyprus", Press Release SC/7961. 18 December 2003.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Interview Questions

1. In early 2004, Turkish government announced that Turkey would follow “one-step- a head” policy regarding the UN led resolution attempts in Cyprus. This was associated as a critical juncture in Turkey’s traditional stand on Cyprus issue. It has been argued that the most significant motivation behind Turkey’s change in Cyprus policy was the idea that after Papadopoulos’s election, the Greek Cypriot side would not be supportive for “yes” vote for the Annan Plan. In other words Turkey aimed to strategically restructure its political position in a way that Turkey and Turkish Cypriot side would gain the sympathy of international community by supporting the process and at the same time marginalize Greek Cypriot side as the responsible of the ongoing status quo. Do you agree with this claim?
2. In the post-2004 era, the most challenging issue in the Cyprus conundrum was Turkey’s determination not to implement the provisions of additional protocol to the Greek Cypriot side. How do you approach Turkey’s Cyprus policy when you analyze the processes before and after 24 April Cyprus referendums? Do you agree with the assessments that in the post-Annan Plan Referendum era, Turkey turned back its position during the 1990s which prioritizes a con-federal solution in the Cyprus (unlike Annan Plan)?
3. One of the “red lines” for Turkey and Turkish Cypriot side was the permanent derogations. In March 2004, Commissioner Verheugen ended this debate by declaring that permanent derogations could not be a part of EU law. On the other hand, Turkey and Turkish Cypriot side strongly emphasized the necessity of such kind of a special regulation to provide additional legal guarantees for the future of “United Cyprus State” (as it was pronounced in the Annan Plan). How do you approach this debate on derogations?
4. Under the current circumstances, how do you define the EU’s position towards the resolution attempts? Do you agree with the criticisms that after

2004 Referendum, EU lost its enthusiasm and determination to place the resolution of the Cyprus conflict as one of the top priorities in its agenda? Accordingly, regarding the post 2004 bi-communal negotiations in Cyprus (Talat- Papadopoulos; Talat-Hristofyas and Eroğlu-Anastasiadis dialogues) was the EU willing to be at the negotiation table as an external actor?

5. How do you approach Turkey's policy to simultaneous lifting of all restrictions in return of Turkey's full implementation of Additional Protocol to the Customs Union?
6. Since 1995, Greece changed its policy towards Turkey's EU membership. To what extent Greece's socialization strategy has been effective in Turkey's support for Annan Plan?
7. Could you please explain the main contributions (and challenges - if there is any) that the EU involvement in the Cyprus conflict resolution process provided?
8. Hypothetical question: Do you think that Turkey would be an EU member state when the Cyprus conflict was solved in April 2004?
9. Apart from Cyprus issue, do you agree with the hot debates on Turkey's EU aspiration suggesting that in the new era Turkey is distancing itself from the EU?

APPENDIX II

CALL FOR PEACE FROM THE TURKISH SIDE AUGUST 31, 1998

Mr. Denktaş, President of the TRNC, made a peace call to the Greek Cypriot side and proposed "to establish together a Confederation in Cyprus".

Turkish Foreign Minister, Mr. İsmail Cem, who was present at the press conference held by President Denktaş this morning, said "My presence here is the expression of the Turkish Government's support and trust for President Denktaş."

President Denktaş's five point proposal is as follows:

"PROPOSAL FOR A LASTING SOLUTION IN CYPRUS"

As a final effort to achieve a mutually acceptable lasting solution in Cyprus I propose the establishment of the Cyprus Confederation based on the following arrangements:

1. A special relationship between Turkey and TRNC on the basis of agreements to be concluded.
2. A similar special relationship between Greece and the Greek Cypriot Administration on the basis of symmetrical agreements to be concluded.

3. Establishment of a Cyprus Confederation between TRNC and GCA.
4. The 1960 guarantee system shall continue.
5. The Cyprus Confederation may, if both parties jointly agree, pursue a policy of accession to the EU. Until Turkey's full membership to the EU, a special arrangement will provide Turkey with the full rights and obligations of an EU member with regard to the Cyprus Confederation.

The ultimate aim of the negotiations will thus be a partnership settlement which will be a confederated structure composed of two peoples and of two states of the island supported by symmetrical agreements with the two respective motherlands and guarantor states. All rights and powers which are not referred to the confederal entity will reside with the two confederated states. Any agreement to be reached as a result of the negotiations will be submitted for approval in separate referenda.

By participating in these negotiations the parties will acknowledge that the Greek and Turkish Cypriot sides are two sovereign and equal states, each with its own functioning democratic institutions and jurisdiction, reflecting the political equality and will of their respective peoples. They will also acknowledge that the authorities of one party do not represent the other.

We believe that only this structure

- a) Will provide for the security of both sides,
- b) Will safeguard their identity and well-being.

If the Greek Cypriots agree to this final basis, we are ready to begin negotiations to establish the Cyprus Confederation."

APPENDIX III

TURKEY - TRNC JOINT DECLARATION JULY 20, 1999

At the invitation of H.E. Rauf R. Denktaş, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, H.E. Mr. Bülent Ecevit, Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey, paid an official visit to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on 20 July 1999.

Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit was accompanied by Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Energy and Natural Resources Mr. Cumhur Ersümer, Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. İsmail Cem, Minister of State Mr. Şükrü S. Gürel, Minister of State Prof. Dr. Tunca Toskay Minister of State Mr. Hasan Gemici, Minister of National Defense Mr. Sabahattin Çakmakoglu, Minister of Tourism Mr. Erkan Mumcu, Undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ambassador Mr. Korkmaz Haktanır and Deputy Undersecretary of Prime Ministry Mr. Selçuk Polat.

Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and the accompanying high-level delegation attended, on 20 July 1999, Celebrations of the 25th Anniversary of Peace and Freedom Day.

During this visit, Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit held consultations with President Rauf R. Denktaş, Prime Minister Dr. Derviş Eroğlu and members of the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

During these consultations, the parties;

Reaffirming the contents of their Joint Declarations of 20 January 1997, 20 July 1997 and 23 April 1998;

Reiterating their mutual desire and determination to develop and deepen the relations between the two countries in every field; and

Having reviewed the current situation in the light of the statement by the G-8 countries at their Summit in Cologne; the United Nations Secretary-General's report on his mission of good offices; and the UN Security Council resolution 1250, deemed it useful to make the following common views and decisions known to the public:

- Today is the 25th Anniversary of a day which marks the end of a dark period of suffering for the Turkish Cypriot people.

- The Turkish Cypriot people, who, through great sacrifice, have reached the present day, fully appreciate the value of living under the roof of their own independent and sovereign State, enjoying the right to determine their own future. We commemorate, with respect, our Martyrs, who have sacrificed their lives to this end, and extend our gratitude to our veterans.

- There will never be a return to those dark days and there is no question of tolerating any fait accompli which would leave the door open to such a development. All such aspirations should be abandoned.
- Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus expect that their sensitivity and determination in this respect are recognized by all and, unlike in the past, their views are carefully taken into account.
- It is of vital importance that both for the security and well-being of the two peoples of the island as well as for the stability of the Eastern Mediterranean, the prevailing peace in Cyprus is not disrupted.
- The way to ensure this is to recognize the realities and to achieve a peace agreement between the Turkish Cypriot state in the North and the Greek Cypriot state in the South.
- The 36 years old chain of injustice against the Turkish Cypriot people must be broken.
- With their pre-planned armed attacks in 1963, the Greek Cypriots destroyed the 1960 Republic, which had been established jointly by the two peoples of the island by exercising their separate right to self-determination, and tried to annihilate the Turkish Cypriot people.
- Since then there has not been a state, government, parliament, or administration with the authority or competence to represent the two equal peoples in Cyprus, and to take any decision for the island as a whole.

- The Turkish Cypriot people have never accepted the usurpation by the Greek Cypriots of their rights and the titles emanating from the partnership Republic, by force of arms. They resisted the Greek Cypriot attacks and oppression for years and, continuing their struggle for survival, established their own administration and finally their own state.

- The intervention by Turkey under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, upon the coup d'etat carried out by Greece in 1974 with the aim of annexing Cyprus to Greece, not only put an end to this illegal act but also saved the Turkish Cypriot people from mass extermination and 11-year- long acts of oppression.

- After 1974, a new situation has come about in Cyprus, ending a period of continuous strife and bloodshed. The tranquility ensuing from this enabled the two sides to live within their respective territories and states, and to search for ways to settle their disputes created after 1963.

- The Turkish Cypriot side has, for years, made serious and constructive proposals for the creation of conditions which would preserve the environment of security in Cyprus and enable the two sides to resolve their disputes. It has spent efforts, in good faith, for the formation of a framework for a comprehensive settlement. The Greek Cypriot side, however, has not contributed to these efforts in a genuine manner; has not changed its attitude towards the Turkish Cypriot people; and has not abandoned its unfounded claims and prejudices.

- At the root of the 36-year-old impasse in Cyprus lie the failure of the Greek Cypriot side to abandon its obsession with converting Cyprus into a Greek island and, in that

connection, its attempt to continue to hold onto its illegitimate title and claims. Greece primarily carries grave responsibility in the continuation of this negative and adventurous attitude of the Greek Cypriot side.

- It is abundantly clear that none of these claims of the Greek Cypriot side have a legal or justified basis or a legitimate purposes that they are of an aggressive nature, and that they openly violate international agreements.

- The imposition, as an extension of these aggressive policies, of embargoes on the Turkish Cypriot people in all fields, and the propaganda war waged in the international arena cannot, in any way be justified or accepted.

- The EU, by opening accession negotiations with the Greek Cypriot side, has taken a totally wrong turn. It is not possible to consider the balance between the two peoples of Cyprus as well as between Turkey and Greece, established and guaranteed by the 1960 Agreement, as non-existent. This has no validity in international law. Despite our objections and admonitions, the EU, by taking such an irresponsible step, has destroyed the established framework and parameters for a settlement, and by deepening the crisis of confidence, led to the further estrangement of the two peoples from one another.

- An approach which regards the Greek Cypriot side as the sole interlocutor authorized to negotiate on behalf of the island as whole, and which purports to ignore the equal political status and sovereign rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, is totally invalid and is bound to fail. The Greek Cypriots and the EU should realize that the future of the island cannot be built on such an approach.

- The emergence of a new awareness on the part of the EU in this direction is welcome but not sufficient. The Union must show the will to abandon the wrong path it has embarked upon, and the accession negotiations conducted with the Greek Cypriot side under the banner of Cyprus must be stopped.

- Because the green light given to the Greek Cypriot side for EU membership has raised expectations on the Greek Cypriot side and encouraged them to pursue a dangerous policy of tension. The Greek Cypriot Administration has been engaged in importing high-technology weapons to South Cyprus; establishing air and navy bases for Greece; and openly supporting PKK terrorism against Turkey, in collaboration with Greece. These are unacceptable actions, which escalate tension in the island as well as the region, and place obstacles in the way of any process of negotiations.

- Turkey, as motherland and a guarantor country, has treaty rights and obligations towards the Turkish Cypriot people, and has national security interests over the island of Cyprus. The erosion, directly or indirectly, of the 1960 Treaties of Guarantee and of Alliance will not be allowed under any circumstances. The balance established between Turkey and Greece over the island and in the Eastern Mediterranean, through the 1960 Agreements, will be carefully maintained, in political, military, economic and all other fields, particularly in the light of developments in the EU's relations with the Greek Cypriot side.

- We are aware of the existence, within the international community, of circles who acknowledge the mistakes of the past and properly evaluate the situation in Cyprus, sincerely desiring an agreed settlement. As many past experiences show, talks which are undertaken without creating the necessary prerequisites and basis for achieving a

reliable outcome end in failure, each failure deepening the mistrust and tensions in the island and pushing the parties further apart.

- The point has been reached where it is not possible to start a new process of negotiations, without accepting the equality of status between the two sides, and without manifesting, with the necessary legal and political clarity, the existence in Cyprus of two equal and sovereign states representing the two peoples, and the fact that neither of these two states can claim sovereignty or authority over the other. The acceptance of the separate sovereign existence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus has become the key to reconciliation based on agreement between the two states of the island.

- Avoiding the realities in the island is not in the interest of anyone, including the Greek Cypriot side. A new Cyprus can only be founded on these realities. Third parties can only contribute to the preservation and further consolidation of peace in Cyprus by encouraging the Greek Cypriots along this path and by adopting an attitude which would make them abandon their obsessions. A settlement can only be lasting if it is freely negotiated between the two equal states in the island; if the balance between the two motherlands, namely Turkey and Greece, is maintained; and if the differences between the two sides are reconciled on a comprehensive and mutually acceptable basis.

- The confederation proposal put forward by President Rauf R. Denktaş on 31 August 1998 draws up a framework for opening the door to a lasting peace based on agreement between the two peoples and the two states of the island on the basis of equality and sovereignty. If the aim is to secure lasting peace in the island of Cyprus and in the

region, the proposal for a Cyprus Confederation should be considered with utmost care and seriousness.

- The relations between Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will be developed and deepened in line with the target of integration set at the highest level. Projects which are important for speeding up the economic development of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will be put into effect and completed. With the aim of protecting their common interests in all their aspects, Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will sign a special relationship agreement, in the period ahead.

APPENDIX IV

HELSINKI EUROPEAN COUNCIL 10 AND 11 DECEMBER 1999

PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS

(Paragraphs on Turkey's Accession and Cyprus)

9. (a) The European Council welcomes the launch of the talks aiming at a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem on 3 December in New York and expresses its strong support for the UN Secretary-General's efforts to bring the process to a successful conclusion.

(b) The European Council underlines that a political settlement will facilitate the accession of Cyprus to the European Union. If no settlement has been reached by the completion of accession negotiations, the Council's decision on accession will be made without the above being a precondition. In this the Council will take account of all relevant factors.

12. The European Council welcomes recent positive developments in Turkey as noted in the Commission's progress report, as well as its intention to continue its reforms

towards complying with the Copenhagen criteria. Turkey is a candidate State destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States. Building on the existing European strategy, Turkey, like other candidate States, will benefit from a pre-accession strategy to stimulate and support its reforms. This will include enhanced political dialogue, with emphasis on progressing towards fulfilling the political criteria for accession with particular reference to the issue of human rights, as well as on the issues referred to in paragraphs 4 and 9(a). Turkey will also have the opportunity to participate in Community programs and agencies and in meetings between candidate States and the Union in the context of the accession process. An accession partnership will be drawn up on the basis of previous European Council conclusions while containing priorities on which accession preparations must concentrate in the light of the political and economic criteria and the obligations of a Member State, combined with a national program for the adoption of the *acquis*. Appropriate monitoring mechanisms will be established. With a view to intensifying the harmonization of Turkey's legislation and practice with the *acquis*, the Commission is invited to prepare a process of analytical examination of the *acquis*. The European Council asks the Commission to present a single framework for coordinating all sources of European Union financial assistance for pre-accession.

APPENDIX V

DECLARATION BY TURKEY ON CYPRUS, 29 JULY 2005

1. Turkey remains committed to finding a political settlement of the Cyprus issue and has clearly demonstrated its resolve in this regard. Accordingly, Turkey will continue to support the efforts of the UN Secretary-General towards achieving a comprehensive settlement which will lead to the establishment of a new bi-zonal partnership State. A just and lasting settlement would greatly contribute to peace, stability and harmonious relations in the region.
2. The Republic of Cyprus referred to in the Protocol is not the original Partnership State established in 1960.
3. Turkey will thus continue to regard the Greek Cypriot authorities as exercising authority, control and jurisdiction only in the territory south of the buffer zone, as is currently the case, and as not representing the Turkish Cypriot people and will treat the acts performed by them accordingly.

4. Turkey declares that signature, ratification and implementation of this Protocol neither amount to any form of recognition of the Republic of Cyprus referred to in the Protocol; nor prejudice Turkey's rights and obligations emanating from the Treaty of Guarantee, the Treaty of Alliance, and the Treaty of Establishment of 1960.

5. Turkey reaffirms that its existing relationship with the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus remains unchanged by becoming a party to the Protocol.

6. Pending a comprehensive settlement, the position of Turkey on Cyprus will remain unchanged. Turkey expresses its readiness to establish relations with the new Partnership State which will emerge following a comprehensive settlement in Cyprus.

APPENDIX VI

NEW INITIATIVE BY TURKEY ON CYPRUS

ACTION PLAN ON LIFTING OF RESTRICTIONS IN CYPRUS

(26 January 2006)

The UN Secretary General is kindly invited to consider holding consultations with the parties concerned with a view to implementing the Action Plan, the principal elements of which are outlined here below:

1. Opening of the sea ports of Turkey to Greek Cypriot vessels serving the trade of goods in accordance with the EC-Turkey Customs Union.
2. Allowing Greek Cypriot air carriers to use the Turkish air space for over-flights and to land at the Turkish airports in accordance with relevant international rules and procedures.

3. Opening of the ports in North Cyprus, including Gazimagosa, Girne, and Gemikonağı to international traffic of goods, persons and services under Turkish Cypriot management.
4. Opening of Ercan airport for direct flights under the Turkish Cypriot management.
5. Special arrangements for the practical inclusion of North Cyprus, as an economic entity, into the European Union's customs union. Unhindered direct trade between both sides of the Island as well as with the outside world.
6. Participation of the Turkish Cypriot side in international sports, cultural and other social activities.

We propose the following procedural steps for the implementation:

7. A high level meeting is to be convened no later than May/June 2006 under the auspices of the UN with the participation of Turkey, Greece, the Turkish Cypriot side and the Greek Cypriot side with a view to finalizing the draft action plan which will be implemented as an integrated whole within an agreed time frame.
8. The action plan and outcome of the meeting are to be submitted by the UN Secretary General to the UN Security Council. The UN Secretary General may wish to establish a mechanism to keep the implementation of the plan under review, with a view to regularly reporting any development to the Security Council.
9. The assistance, particularly to the Turkish Cypriot side, of the UN and the EU Commission will help facilitate the implementation of the proposed measures.

10. The action plan will, in no way, prejudice legal and political positions of the parties concerned. It is aimed at bringing about an environment of cooperation and mutual trust with a comprehensive settlement perspective to the Cyprus issue.

In this respect, Turkey remains committed to the efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem within the framework of UN Secretary-General's mission of good offices and on the basis of the UN Secretary General's settlement plan. Turkey earnestly hopes that an agreement on the comprehensive settlement will be reached in 2006.