

FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS SERIES-9

HOW COMMON IS THE
COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY
OF THE EUROPEAN UNION?

WHERE DOES **TURKEY** FIT IN?

PAUL LUIF
SABIHA SENYÜCEL GÜNDOĞAR
CEREN ZEYNEP AK



TESEV
PUBLICATIONS

**HOW COMMON IS THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY
POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION?**

WHERE DOES TURKEY FIT IN?

**PAUL LUIF
SABİHA SENYÜCEL GÜNDOĞAR
CEREN ZEYNEP AK**

MARCH 2009

**TESEV
PUBLICATIONS**

HOW COMMON IS THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION? WHERE DOES TURKEY FIT IN?

ISBN 978-605-5832-09-4

TESEV PUBLICATIONS

Cover Design: Umut Pehlivanoglu, Myra
Prepared for print by: Myra
Printed by: Euromat



TESEV

Türkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Vakfı

Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation

Dış Politika Programı

Foreign Policy Program

Bankalar Cad. Minerva Han No: 2 Kat: 3

Karaköy 34420, İstanbul

Tel: +90 212 292 89 03 PBX

Fax: +90 212 292 90 46

info@tesev.org.tr

www.tesev.org.tr

Copyright © 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced electronically or mechanically (photocopy, storage of records or information, etc.) without the permission of the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV).

The viewpoints in this book belong to the authors, and they may not necessarily concur partially or wholly with TESEV's viewpoints as a foundation.

TESEV would like to extend its thanks to the Open Society Foundation-Turkey, and TESEV High Advisory Board for their contributions with regard to the publication and promotion of this book.

When this project first started in mid-2007, our friend and colleague Derya Demirler was with us. We lost her in an unfortunate and untimely accident in January 2008. We know that it will not be possible to get used to her absence. The only thing, we can do as her friends is to remember her with her honest and earnest personality; and to perpetuate her in our hearts. With this publication, we would like to take the opportunity once again to remember her.

Ceren Ak & Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar

Table of Contents

TESEV's Preface, 7

Introduction, 9

Part I: Voting Patterns in the UN General Assembly, 12

- 1.1. The Legal Basis for Coordination in the UN General Assembly, 12
- 1.2. The Practice of Coordination in the UN General Assembly, 13
- 1.3. The Extent of Agreement among the EU Member States in the General Assembly, 15
- 1.4. The Distance from the "Mainstream" of the EU, 16
- 1.5. The Distance of Third Countries from the EU Consensus, 18

Part II: How 'European' is Turkish Foreign Policy?, 21

- 2.1. Europeanization and the formation of a European Foreign Policy System, 21
- 2.2. Overview of the European Approach within Turkish Foreign Policy, 24
- 2.3. Where does Turkey fit in: Voting Pattern of Turkey at the UN General Assembly, 28
 - 2.3.1 Human rights, 31
 - 2.3.2 The Middle East Question, 34
 - 2.3.3 Security Issues, 38

Conclusion, 41

Annex 1, 44

Annex 2, 58

Annex 3, 60

Bibliography, 61

Author Biographies, 64

TESEV's Preface

This study has been co-authored by Paul Luif from OIIP, Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar and Ceren Zeynep Ak from TESEV. The objective has been to examine the patterns of convergence and/or divergence within the foreign policy orientations of Turkey and the EU as well as among the European Union member states – or to put it more precisely, to look at whether Turkey and the EU are on the same page when considering the foreign policy questions that form the basis of a Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union.

TESEV has for long years worked on the issue of Turkey-EU relations. As one of the forerunner supporters of Turkey's accession to the European Union, TESEV Foreign Policy Program has sought to talk to both Turkey and the EU member states in order to facilitate the process. Thus, we have aimed at communicating the messages we convey through our research and publications to the decision making circles.

We, as the Foreign Policy Program, have until now focused on the current situation of Turkey-EU relations. However, this publication looks at the past trends in Foreign Policy decisions with a quantitative research. The research examines the past behavior of Turkey and the EU member states, and finds out that they actually converge more than what is believed. The examined behavior is derived from the voting data in the UN General Assembly over a certain period. This publication also evaluates and compares how much actual convergence existed and exists among the EU member states themselves.

The findings of the report were made public in a workshop organized by TESEV and OIIP in Vienna. Without doubt, the findings are important. The authors show that there is actual convergence between Turkey and the EU member states, and sometimes this convergence is more than the amount of convergence among the EU member states. Therefore, we as TESEV Foreign Policy Program believe that this publication should be conveyed to all EU member states, especially to those who fear that having a Common Foreign and Security Policy will be in danger once Turkey becomes a member. It obviously shows in the report that Turkish Foreign Policy had already started converging with that of the EU, at times even more than some of the member states of the Union itself.

Besides the authors, many people have spent time and energy for this publication. The entire TESEV Foreign Policy Program staff has contributed to the realization of this project. For the language editing we are thankful to William Eve. However we have also had help from many people outside of TESEV. Among these, the first that comes to mind is the entire OIIP staff – who worked closely with us during the organization of the workshop in Vienna. We would also like to thank our referees for their valuable contributions. And last but not least, we want to thank ABİG, OSIAF and TESEV High Advisory Board for their financial support.

MENSUR AKGÜN

DIRECTOR

TESEV FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM

Introduction

The focus of this study is twofold. On the one hand, it is a quantitative analysis of the voting behaviour of the members of the European Union (EU) in the United Nations General Assembly. This part looks at the development of a consensus among EU member states and analyzes the “distances” of third countries from the consensus of the EU. The second part of the study tries to explain Turkey’s position vis-à-vis the EU consensus. The reader thus gets a detailed view of important aspects of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the prospective place in this policy area of a possible future member, Turkey.

The first part of the study is based on an earlier publication of one of the authors.¹ It substantially updates this publication and in particular analyzes the effects of the 2004 enlargement on the consensus of the EU member states in UN General Assembly. Data on voting in the General Assembly of the UN is readily available, although not always in machine-readable format. It has been utilized in empirical-quantitative research in a number of ways. Here it is used first to give a broad picture of the agreement among the EU member states — to what extent and in which issue areas does the EU “speak with one voice”.²

Then the quantitative analysis is used to see which countries belong to the EU “mainstream” and which states cast their votes more “idiosyncratically”. Thirdly, distances from the EU consensus position are calculated to find out where third countries stand vis-à-vis the EU. In this section, particular emphasis is given to the analysis of the distance between the EU and the United States.

The second part of the study has a specific focus on Turkey. Turkey, having a long history both with the EU and the UN (and being one of the founding members of the UN), has already been taking part in various initiatives and playing an active role as far as foreign missions of the EU are concerned.

1 Luif, Paul. (2003). *EU cohesion in the UN General Assembly*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies. Available from <http://www.iss-eu.org/occasion/occ49.pdf>. See also Luif, Paul, and Mariyana Radeva. (2007). “EU Coordination in International Organisations: The case of the United Nations General Assembly and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe”. In *European Foreign Policy in an Evolving International System: The Road Towards Convergence*, edited by Nicola Casarini and Costanza Musu. London-New York: Palgrave Macmillan. p. 27-40.

2 Taylor, Phillip. (1979). *When Europe speaks with one voice: the external relations of the European Community*. London: Aldwych Press.

Since Turkey was given candidate status at the December 1999 European Council Summit, the country has undertaken reforms altering its legislative, administrative and legal structure. With these reform processes the dynamics of Turkish politics also changed, having a remarkable impact on foreign policy at the same time, both directly and indirectly.

Both parties – Turkey and the EU - are aware that full accession will need more time, for Turkey to fully complete the 35 chapters of the *acquis communautaire* and for the EU to complete its internal reform process in order to be able to absorb the new comers. However, this should not stop the two parties coming closer in the foreign policy field as well as in other fields.

Therefore, the arguments in this research paper build upon the assumption that after Turkey was given candidate status in 1999, the foreign policies of Turkey and the EU became somewhat more in line. Having said that, it should be noted although the EU process has been a major motive, the domestic concerns and prospects have also played a significant role in shaping Turkish foreign policy³. A full analysis of change in Turkish foreign policy requires the examination of both internal and external factors. However, the scope of this publication is limited to comparing the voting behavior of the EU member states and Turkey at the UN General Assembly, and presenting the levels of alignment in foreign policy and security matters.

The empirical research of this study examines the period between 1979 and 2006. Though it is not possible to talk about a full consensus between all EU member states, they have managed to consolidate a nice track of convergence in the UN General Assembly. And now the question is how this picture will look like when Turkey's accession process is complete? In other words how will Turkey's EU membership affect its own foreign policy and in return will Turkey's membership have an effect on EU foreign policy? The common assumption might be that a country like Turkey, having its own geopolitical realities and legacies, will want to influence the foreign policy direction of the EU.

Similar concerns were actually raised just before the enlargement in 2004. The voices raised then were focusing on the difficulty of having a single voice from twenty-five members. The Commission Staff Working Paper that was published in 2004 gives direct reference to the concerns of EU member states about Turkey's accession and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) formation. It is a

3 For a theoretical argument on the interaction of European integration and domestic factors see; Vaquer i Fanés, Jordi. (2001). "Europeanisation and Foreign Policy." *Observatori de Política Exterior Europea*. European Studies University, Institute of the Autonomous University of Barcelona. Also see; Aydın, Mustafa, and Sinem Açıkmeşe. (2007). "Europeanization through EU conditionality: Understanding the new era in Turkish foreign policy." *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*. 9(3).

mixture of examples of both convergence and divergence with respect to Turkey's foreign policy decisions and EU's position on these specific questions. It is openly stated in the Commission working paper that "Turkey's accession would be different from previous enlargements Much will depend on how the EU itself will take on the challenge to become a fully fledged foreign policy player in the medium term in regions traditionally characterized by instability and tensions, including the Middle East and the Caucasus."⁴ Another example to the concerns about Turkey's accession and what kind of transformation it would lead to is on the new borders that the EU would acquire after Turkey's accession. "With Turkish accession, the Union's borders would extend to the South Caucasus, (Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan) and to Syria, Iran and Iraq. This will increase the Union's foreign policy involvement in issues that previously would have been considered as bilateral between Turkey and its neighbours."⁵

Finally, the Commission document gives a general outline of the concerns with respect to a disalignment between Turkey and EU's foreign policy concerns. It is stated in the Commission report that although Turkey and EU have a considerable degree of convergence on CFSP issues, still when compared to other acceding and associated countries Turkey's alignment remains unsatisfactory. The Commission expresses its concern that Turkey is hesitant to align itself to EU positions on issues where it has a distinct national position. Yet along similar lines, the same concerns - and even more- apply to Turkey and to the new situation that will form when Turkey becomes a full member.⁶

4 European Union, European Commission. *Issues Arising from Turkey's Membership Perspective*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2004) 656 final. p. 4.

5 *Ibid*, p.7.

6 *Ibid*, p.11.

Part I: Voting Patterns in the UN General Assembly

1.1. THE LEGAL BASIS FOR COORDINATION IN THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

After the Federal Republic of Germany was admitted (together with the German Democratic Republic) to the United Nations in September 1973, the foreign ministers of the EC member states declared in the “Document on the European Identity” (December 1973), at point 21:

[The Nine] are also resolved to contribute to international progress, both through their relations with third countries and by adopting common positions wherever possible in international organizations, notably the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

This was the first clear expression of the EC states to coordinate their behavior in international organizations. On the other hand, the first legal basis for that coordination can be found in the Single European Act (1987). A second attempt to reach a common decision-making system on foreign policy was through the European Political Cooperation (EPC). EPC was a concept that had been under discussion since the 1960s and due to economic and political events taking place in the world, it was deemed necessary for the member states to align their foreign policies closer. In this respect, Hague Summit of 1969 served as a platform for the Foreign Ministers of the Six⁷ to come up with prospective recommendations for cooperation in foreign policy issues.

As the next step, on 27 October 1970 the Davignon Report that outlined the future of the Union’s foreign policy was accepted and member states were advised to try to speak with one voice on international problems. Davignon report is considered as a foundation for both EPC and Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. Another document that prepared the basis for EPC was the London Report. It reasserted the willingness of the member states to adopt a coherent and concerted approach to international and security issues. A final step in this regard was the Single European Act (SEA) which codified previous EPC practices and established a permanent secretariat in Brussels. It also defined European foreign policy that was extended to include security matters now.

7 The Hague Summit of 1969 included the Heads of State and Government of the countries of the EEC comprising of France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Germany and Italy.

Global and regional crises and challenges, coupled with developments within the EU, have made new demands on the EU's external activities. The Maastricht Treaty (1993) which created the EU, replaced the EPC with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). In sum, the CFSP provided a very functional dimension to the overall work of the EU. The institutions of the EU, including the Commission, were now involved in most of the traditional fields of international diplomacy.

Finally, the Amsterdam Treaty (1999) consolidated the rules on coordination of the positions of EU member states in international organizations, putting them in one place, Article 19 EU Treaty; the Nice Treaty (2003) did not change this Article:

1. Member States shall coordinate their action in international organizations and at international conferences. They shall uphold the common positions in such forums.

In international organizations and at international conferences where not all the Member States participate, those which do take part shall uphold the common positions.

2. ... Member States which are also members of the United Nations Security Council will concert and keep the other Member States fully informed. Member States which are permanent members of the Security Council will, in the execution of their functions, ensure the defense of the positions and the interests of the Union, without prejudice to their responsibilities under the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Article 19 EU Treaty clearly distinguishes between the will to “coordinate” in the United Nations General Assembly and the will only to “concert” in the Security Council.

The Treaty of Lisbon, signed in December 2007 and still to be ratified by all EU member states, makes only slight changes to these words in its Article 34. The Lisbon Treaty takes into account that it will provide the EU with a legal personality (up till now this was only the case for one part of the EU, the European Community). It stresses the position of the High Representative and does not mention the permanent members of the Security Council (i.e. France and the United Kingdom) separately. But it still underscores the “responsibilities under the provisions of the United Nations Charter” of the members of the Security Council.

1.2. THE PRACTICE OF EU COORDINATION IN THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

With the admission of Switzerland and Timor-Leste in 2002 and Montenegro in 2006, 192 states (and only states) are now members of the UN General Assembly. The (regular) sessions of the General Assembly usually start on the third Tuesday in September in New York. They end just before the Christmas holidays. The

following year meetings are held if necessary, until the next General Assembly session begins. The General Assembly first debates a number of issues of international relations each year. It then votes on resolutions which are statements by the General Assembly on these issues. In contrast to resolutions of the Security Council, the resolutions passed in the General Assembly are not binding.

Countries of the Third World (from the Non-aligned Movement and the Group of 77) usually dominate the agenda setting in the General Assembly. Therefore, the EU members find themselves obliged to react to issues for which they have not (yet) found a consensus. In general, CFSP statements and foreign policy actions by the EU can only be made, taken or implemented when a consensus exists. Therefore, the UN General Assembly can also be considered as a source to indicate instances where the EU is divided.

The large majority of resolutions and decisions (which have lesser weight than resolutions) are accepted by consensus; all states in the General Assembly accept these texts without formally voting. Only some 20 to 30 percent of the resolutions each year passed in the General Assembly are decided by a “recorded vote” where each member state openly votes with “yes”, “no” or “abstaining” (or is “absent” from the vote). These “recorded votes” can be used to analyze the voting behavior of the states in the General Assembly.

In our analysis, only recorded votes are used. They are well documented and the voting behavior of each state can be downloaded from the internet.⁸ In addition, we also use the votes on resolutions rejected, on parts of resolutions, on decisions and on motions. This latter data had to be extracted from the Official Records of the General Assembly (in the abbreviated form the “PVs” as in A/61/PV.1 etc.). With these supplementary votes, we add a qualitative element to the quantitative analysis. Since the resolution is more than once used in the calculations (when also parts of it are voted on) it gets more “weight” than resolutions only once voted on. The text of this resolution is probably more relevant.⁹

The coordination among EU countries for the upcoming General Assembly starts already in the first half of the year, when a “Priorities Paper” is compiled within CFSP framework under the Presidency. The preparation for the “Priorities Paper” is only the beginning of an intensive EU coordination for common statements, joint positions on resolutions and for negotiations with third countries during the General Assembly. This is done mostly in New York; special, important matters are also discussed in Brussels, in the working groups of the Council.

8 United Nations. *General Assembly Voting Records*. Available from: <http://www.un.org/ga/search/voting.asp>.

9 Table 1 (Annex 1) lists the number of recorded votes. It shows also the votes per issue area used here. According to the table, the number of all recorded votes was highest during the “second” Cold War in 1985 and then declined rapidly. It rose again in the early 2000s.

In the second half of each year, during the main part of the General Assembly session, there are some 600 meetings of EU representatives in New York (EU member states, Commission Delegation, Liaison Office of the EU Council). They are held at three levels: the level of the UN ambassadors of the EU member states, the deputy chief of missions level and the expert level. Between September and December, several meetings take place each day, usually before the UN bodies meet.

Most of the time, the EU coordination procedure includes not only the present member states of the EU, but also candidate countries and other associated states as well as the EFTA countries¹⁰. In general, only after the EU countries have reached a (provisional) consensus, they ask these states to support their position. Usually the Presidency (often in the Troika format which actually consists of representatives of the current and future EU Presidency, the EU Council and the European Commission) or under the responsibility of the Presidency other EU member states consult with these candidate countries and other third countries. It can happen that the representatives of the EU's partner and candidate countries get information on the EU position just minutes before a meeting starts. They then have to decide immediately if they want to align themselves with the EU position. Reaching a consensus among the many EU member states is already quite difficult; in addition, time constraints limit the possibility for inputs from third countries.

1.3. THE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE EU MEMBER STATES IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The first row in Table 2 (Annex 1) shows the percentage of identical votes cast by the EU member states in the UN General Assembly, starting with 1979. At that time, the EU member states voted identically in almost 60 percent of the disputed votes. This percentage declined as partly due to the renewed Cold War and partly Greece joining the EU.¹¹ Then the consensus started to increase, reaching its highest point in 1998 (during the Austrian EU Presidency in the second half of that year) with slightly more than 82 percent. It then declined, arriving at a low point with 67 percent in 2004, just after the enlargement of the EU by 10 new member states. In 2005 and 2006, the consensus increased again.

But the consensus among EU member states has not been consistent across all issue areas debated and voted in the General Assembly. As one can see in Table 2 (Annex 1), it has been most of the time higher in Middle East questions (here defined as all votes on the Israel-Palestine conflict). These results complement the

¹⁰ The EFTA members, except for Switzerland, are also members of the European Economic Area (EEA).

¹¹ See below for more on the position of Greece in the 1980s.

Union's attempts since the Venice declaration of 1980 to find common positions on the Israel-Palestine conflict, which also encompassed a stance often different to the United States. In the late 1990s, the EU reached full accord in this area; however the share of consensus votes declined once again with the enlargement in 2004. This is probably due to the positions of Cyprus and Malta, two non-aligned countries with slightly different views on these matters.¹²

In contrast to Middle East questions, in security matters dealt with in the General Assembly (disarmament in general, nuclear disarmament, the question of small weapons etc.), the consensus of the EU member states has consistently been below average. It was particularly low from 1983 to 1991. The steep decline in percentage terms in 2004 was quickly reversed in 2005 and 2006.

We analyzed two other issue areas from 1995 onwards; again a rather typical voting behavior of the EU states did develop over time. In the few votes on decolonization, the consensus of the EU countries has been again lower than the average; this issue will not be discussed further here. Human rights issues have become more prominent in the UN General Assembly since the early 2000s (Table 1 (Annex 1)). Here we see a much more identical voting behavior among EU member states, reaching full consensus in 2006 (Table 2 (Annex 1)).

1.4. THE DISTANCE FROM THE “MAINSTREAM” OF THE EU

The data on the EU consensus showed that the EU states do not always vote the same way. What is the position of a single member state? We propose here a rather simple measure: we look at each vote in the General Assembly and see if there is an EU majority position. The “majority” is here defined as the identical voting behavior of at least an absolute majority of the EU members.¹³ With 15 members it would be the identical vote of at least 8 states; with 25 it would be 13. In a few cases it can happen that a majority as defined here does not exist; e.g. when with 12 members the EU behavior is split 6-6, or when there is a three-way split among 25 members, like 12 “yes” votes, 10 “abstentions” and 3 “no” votes.¹⁴

From this majority position (which we regard as the EU “mainstream”) the “distance” of each EU member is calculated. A full disagreement (case of one country casting a “yes” vote and the other casting a “no” vote and vice versa) between the EU member and the EU majority position gets a value of “1”; each

12 See below for more analysis on Cyprus and Malta.

13 In this calculation, every EU member has the same weight. One could also give each member a different weight, like it is done in qualified majority voting in the EU Council. Since all states are equal in the UN General Assembly, we use an equal weight for each EU state.

14 In the tables below, the row with the “Percentage of Votes with EC/EU Majority” shows how often an absolute majority existed.

partial disagreement (yes/abstain or no/abstain) gets a value of “0.5”, a full agreement (yes/yes, no/no or abstain/abstain) gets “0”. In other words, a lower value means there is more agreement between the parties. On the other hand, as the value found increases, there is less agreement. These values are added for all the votes under consideration.

At the same time, the possible “maximum” disagreement from the EU majority for each vote is calculated and again added. The actual value obtained (the sum of all 1, 0.5 and 0) is compared with the “maximum” value. The actual value is now expressed as a percentage of the “maximum” value possible. This means that the maximum distance an EU member state can have from the EU majority is always 100, the minimum distance is always 0, independently of how many votes were analyzed.

Table 3 (Annex 1) shows the distance of the 15 “old” EU member states from the EU mainstream. The six founding members, except for France, have since the 1980s been rather close to the EU majority; their “distance index” number is almost always 0 or very close to 0. Other member states came close to the EU mainstream over time, sometimes even before they joined the EU. An exception was Greece, which after acceding to the EU increased its distance from the majority quite dramatically. It took about ten years, before Greece came close to the EU mainstream. In the General Assembly of 2006,¹⁵ many countries of Table 3 (Annex 1) voted practically always identical to the EU mainstream. Slight exceptions were the three neutrals Austria, Sweden and Ireland as well as Spain. But there are two countries which have maintained their distance (of about 10 percentage points) from the EU majority for all the years the distance index has been calculated: France and the United Kingdom.

In Table 4 (Annex 1) the countries which have joined the EU in 2004 and 2007 are listed, together with the three candidate countries. One can observe the quick adjustment to the EU mainstream after the end of the Cold War for the former communist countries. On the other hand, the adjustment of Cyprus and Malta took a longer time. Even in 2006 these two non-aligned countries voted slightly differently from the EU mainstream.

Among the candidate countries, Croatia and Macedonia were rather close to the EU majority in 2006. The position of Turkey, whose distance was smaller than the distance of e.g. Cyprus and Malta until the early 1990s, was now a bit bigger than for these two countries. Yet, Turkey’s distance from the EU majority was similar to that of France and the United Kingdom.

15 The 61st General Assembly lasted from Tuesday, 12 September 2006 (1st plenary meeting, A/61/PV.1) till Monday, 17 September 2007 (109th plenary meeting, A/61/PV.109).

For votes on Middle East questions (i.e. the Israel-Palestine conflict), Table 5 (Annex 1) shows that the distance of the 15 “old” member states has been 0 or close to 0 since the mid 1990s, when Greece and Spain finally joined the EU mainstream. The picture is slightly different with the newer member states/candidate countries (Table 6 (Annex 1)). In 2006, Cyprus and Malta still voted somewhat differently from the EU mainstream. Turkey maintained its own, slightly distant position in the votes on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

The data concerning security questions is rather different (Table 7 (Annex 1)). One can see again the difference of the neutrals (except for Finland) as well as Spain from the mainstream. As was to be expected, the two nuclear powers (and permanent members of the Security Council) among the EU states, France and the United Kingdom, have maintained a clear distance from the EU majority. In Table 8 (Annex 1) one can observe again the distance of Cyprus and Malta from the EU mainstream. In a clear contrast to these two non-aligned countries and in comparison to the Middle East issue, Turkey has been rather close to the EU mainstream in security matters since at least the mid-1990s.¹⁶

The distance index for human rights issues was calculated from 1995 on only. Table 9 (Annex 1) shows that in this year Greece still had quite some distance from the EU “mainstream”. But since then, the “old” EU members voted rather similarly on resolutions etc. dealing with human rights. Among the “new” members, Cyprus and Malta, but also Slovakia and Slovenia, have voted a bit differently from the EU majority (Table 10 (Annex 1)). Becoming EU members in 2004, they have adjusted to the EU “mainstream” over time and in 2006 voted identically with all other members. Croatia and Macedonia have also aligned their position with the EU majority since about 2003, whereas Turkey still shows a rather clear distance from the EU “mainstream”.

1.5. THE DISTANCE OF THIRD COUNTRIES FROM THE EU CONSENSUS

The same calculation of a distance index can be done for determining the differences/similarities between the EU and third countries. Here it will make more sense to take the EU consensus as the “pivot”. As long as there does not exist a consensus among the EU member states, it is difficult to speak about a foreign policy position of the EU, as already the term “Common” Foreign and Security Policy suggests. So not all (recorded) votes have been taken for this distance index, only those in which the EU members voted identically were considered.

Table 11 (Annex 1) shows the result for selected third states for all votes. In fact, there are countries which cast their votes very similar to the EU consensus such as:

■ 16 For more please see Part 2.2.

Australia, Canada, Japan and Norway. Yet for Australia and Canada the distance has increased since 2004.

Other countries have generally voted rather differently from the EU consensus such as: China, Egypt, India and Israel; Brazil, Mexico and Nigeria have been a bit closer to the EU. Then there are two special cases: USSR/Russia and the United States. As expected, the US was much closer to the EU in 1979. But already in the late 1980s, the distance between the USSR and the EU got smaller, whereas it increased towards the United States. The US and the EU were again closer in the 1990s, but comparatively the distance between Russia and the EU became even smaller. In the 2000s, the US and also Russia had once more positioned themselves at a further distance from the EU position.¹⁷

The Middle East question (the Israel-Palestine conflict) brings a rather different image of the distance between the EU consensus and the selected third countries (Table 12 (Annex 1)). The first noticeable fact is the large distance of Israel and the United States from the EU consensus. Since 1998, in each General Assembly Israel had almost the maximum distance possible from the EU. The distance of the US vis-à-vis the EU consensus has been almost as large as Israel's. The second remarkable detail is the visible increase in the distance between the EU consensus and Australia as well as Canada in recent years. The other countries¹⁸ of Table 12 (Annex 1) are rather close to the EU consensus in the voting on the resolutions concerning the Israel-Palestine conflict, closer than their average distance (as shown in Table 11 (Annex 1)). Japan and Norway have almost always cast their votes identically to the EU.

Table 13 (Annex 1) shows the distance from the EU consensus in security matters debated and voted in the UN General Assembly. Not surprisingly, during the late 1970s and early 1980s, the United States was much closer to the EU than the Soviet Union. But this changed from the mid-1980s on. The USSR/Russia was then rather close to the EU consensus. Starting in 1991, the US and the EU reduced their distance and were particularly closer to each other from 1995 to 1999. Since 2001, the distance increased considerably. In contrast to the Middle East issue, Australia and Canada have voted in security matters almost always in line with the EU consensus. Israel had also been relatively close to the EU position until the early 1990s, but has moved away from the EU position later on.

17 The distance between EU and Russia in the 2000s might be due to the wide range of differences between Russia and the EU– from accusing each other of trade protectionism, to mutually exclusive approaches on the settlement of conflicts in Moldova, Georgia and Chechnya. When it comes to EU-US relations, the visible divergence in the 2000s can be due to the different positions of EU member states on the U.S. military actions against Iraq. For more please see <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/docs/2004.english3.pdf>.

18 The other countries included in Table 12 are Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway and USSR/Russia.

According to Table 14 (Annex 1), only Norway always voted in line with the EU consensus on human rights issues. Canada and particularly Japan have several times voted differently from the EU countries. Israel has moved closer to the EU position in recent years. But there have been rather big differences with Third World countries on human rights issues. Also the distance of Russia from the EU consensus has been especially visible over time. The United States was in the past comparatively closer to the EU position, but since 2001 it has clearly moved away from the EU, at least during some years. Still, in 2006 America positioned itself much closer to the EU position in human rights issues than in security matters.



Part II: How 'European' is Turkish Foreign Policy?

1.1. EUROPEANIZATION AND THE FORMATION OF A EUROPEAN FOREIGN POLICY SYSTEM

The formation of a European Foreign and Security Policy is one of the most important issues that has occupied the agendas of the European Union member states for a long time now. There are many different viewpoints with regards to the concept of Europeanization and defining European Foreign Policy. Karen Smith in her article "Understanding the European Foreign Policy System", defines European Foreign Policy as the foreign policy of a collectivity instead of a unified system. She outlines the European Foreign Policy system with the principles of autonomy and decision-making procedure. She claims that every member state exercises some amount of autonomy when acting internationally and the EU possesses different decision-making rules and procedures for dealing with issues of international nature.¹⁹ According to Karen Smith, we must view European foreign policy as suggested by Brian White, "a system which encompasses three different strands: Community foreign policy (the foreign policy of the European community, the 'first' pillar of the EU, covering primarily trade and development policy); Union foreign policy (encompassing the Common Foreign and Security Policy, CFSP, the 'second' pillar); and the separate foreign policies of the member states"²⁰.

To be more specific, Brian White argues that the concept of European foreign policy is challenging to analyze in the first place due to its character as both the object and the subject of analysis unlike national foreign policies.²¹ By this he means that European foreign policy system cannot be analyzed through traditional state-centered theories. In line with Roy Ginsberg's definition²², White states that European foreign policy operates in at least two different policy domains; first by context and second by means of activity. Seeing the EU as a unique international actor with a distinct character, White suggests that European foreign policy has at

19 Smith, Karen. (2003). "Understanding the European Foreign Policy System." *Contemporary European History*, 12(2). p. 239-254.

20 White, Brian. (2001). *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. Houndmills: Palgrave. p. 39-41.

21 White, Brian. (2003). "Foreign Policy Analysis and European Foreign Policy." *FORNET Working Group: Theories and Approaches to the CFSP*. London School of Economics.

22 Roy Ginsberg defines European foreign policy as the universe of concrete civilian actions, policies, positions, relations, commitments and choices of the EC (and EU) in international politics. For more see Ginsberg, Roy. (2001). *The European Union in World Politics*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.

least three different types of activity.²³ One of these, according to White, is directly related to the political dimension of European foreign policy or more specifically the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

To go one step further, Brian White also classifies the approaches to European foreign policy in two antagonistic ways; European Union-as-actor versus the EU as a single actor.²⁴ White's stand is contrary to both approaches and he claims that "EU is a non-unitary or disaggregated entity in world politics"²⁵. On a final note, White suggests that "EFP²⁶ is not simply a convenient shorthand for the collective foreign policies of member states. Nor is it simply EU or EC foreign policy. EFP provides a term that encompasses them but goes beyond a narrow focus on any one of them"²⁷.

On the other hand, as Jordi Vaquer i Fanés puts it, European Foreign Policy should be depicted as "[...] a system of international relations, a collective enterprise through which national actors conduct partly common, and partly separate, international actions"²⁸. It is claimed by the author that European Foreign Policy includes parallel structures: "National Foreign Policies, EPC/CFSP and the external relations of the EC"²⁹. Therefore it can be argued that when examining the European Foreign Policy, it would not be enough to take into account the national foreign policies of different member states nor would it be satisfactory to consider the notion of common foreign policy as a set of norms and rules applicable to all member states.

Another commonly preferred term for a European foreign policy system is Europeanization. Europeanization is described as the process including "formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things', and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies"³⁰. Seeing Europeanization process as a regional manifestation of globalization, Kevin Featherstone suggests that Europeanization can be defined as the transformation when the imperatives, logic and norms of the EU become intrinsically absorbed into domestic policy, to the

23 *Ibid.*

24 *Ibid.*

25 *Ibid.*

26 In Brian White's articles EFP refers to European Foreign Policy.

27 White, Brian. (2003). "Foreign Policy Analysis and European Foreign Policy." *JORNET Working Group: Theories and Approaches to the CFSP*. London School of Economics.

28 Vaquer i Fanés, Jordi. (2001) "Europeanisation and Foreign Policy." *Observatori de Política Exterior Europea*. European Studies University, Institute of the Autonomous University of Barcelona. p. 1.

29 *Ibid*, p.1.

30 *Ibid*, p. 1.

extent that the distinction between European and domestic policy requirements progressively ceases to exist.³¹ In other words, Europeanization process is the adoption of national policies in different issue areas into the European system and reconstructing those policies in line with the principles that form the foundation of the European Union. Relatively, the Europeanization of foreign policy amounts to a foreign policy adaptation at the national level as a result of the European integration process and comes about as a byproduct of the same process which includes adaptation to European principles and regulations.

However the EU foreign policy system is not without deficiencies. The most outspoken challenge the EU faces while formulating a common foreign and security policy is the incorporation of national policies and the disagreements between different member states on specific policy areas. In fact, Karen Smith argues that although EU has a considerable presence in international affairs, it is not always able to translate this presence into the ability to function actively and deliberately in relation to other actors.³² Smith gives examples to EU's inability to act coherently including its lack of effectiveness in crises where quick action is necessary. However, the EU foreign policy system does not always remind failures. According to Smith, EU's foreign policy activity aims to shape the environment in which it operates instead of pursuing national interests. Therefore, in order to reach its objective, EU applies distinctive foreign policy principles ranging from cooperation with other international actors to concentration on non-military means.

After the enlargement wave in 2004, the specification of European Foreign Policy further emerged as an urgent need. A pressure has formed, originating from the demands to formalize the content and boundaries of a European foreign policy system. The fact that European Foreign Policy is the kind of foreign policy that exists without a state and is formed by 27 different members makes it even more challenging and complicated. Therefore, Europeanization process becomes a twofold one, both because it is a foreign policy that belongs to the European Union as an institutional structure and also since it has to go hand in hand with different national foreign policies. As a result, it becomes necessary to differentiate the number of issues in line with the number of member states and the priorities of those member states and/or candidate countries.

31 Featherstone, Kevin. (1998) "Europeanization and the Centre Periphery: The Case of Greece in the 1990s." *Southeastern Society and Politics*, 3(1). p. 23-39.

32 Smith, Karen. (2003). "The European Union: A Distinctive Actor in International Relations." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 9(2). p. 103-112.

2.2. OVERVIEW OF THE EUROPEAN APPROACH WITHIN TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY

Most of the member states think of a Common Foreign and Security Policy to be vital for the sustainability of the Union in the future. One of the obstacles before the formation of a common foreign policy is the integration of candidate countries and how to adopt their national foreign policies into a system of European Foreign Policy. Especially, with regards to countries such as Turkey that have particular reservations pertaining to specific conflicts in the region, taking a common standpoint on foreign policy issues becomes much more difficult than usual. However, the question stands. Does Turkish foreign policy really stand a part from the EU foreign policy system or CFSP as named after the Maastricht Treaty? Or did EU membership prospects really change Turkish foreign policy priorities?

As a candidate country, Turkey has always been quite controversial for its public opinion on several areas of issue. Foreign policy is obviously one of these areas that require compromise in order to find common ground between European and Turkish foreign policy. An example to the views expressed by the opponents of Turkish membership to the EU that Turkey “would damage the cohesiveness of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy”³³ is given by Charles Grant in his article “Turkey offers EU more punch”. It is argued that Turkey, being a country with “pronounced views on several contentious international questions”,³⁴ would not be willing to compromise on issues that would relate to its national interests and therefore create a certain amount of uneasiness and friction in domestic politics. As a result, it would be much more difficult to consolidate Turkish foreign policy and the European system.

Although traces of the argument that Turkey stands outside the traditional European approach to foreign policy and there are many concerns about the proximity of Turkish foreign policy to the United States can be encountered even in official documents such as Commission Staff Working Document, there is evidence that the process of Europeanization for Turkish foreign policy has already started and many steps have already been accomplished. Turkey’s domestic as well as foreign policy is going through a massive transformation and this trend is primarily driven by the prospects of EU membership.³⁵ In addition, “Turkey’s proximity to, and ties with, troubled zones”³⁶ is considered as a strong asset since

33 European Union, European Commission. *Issues Arising from Turkey’s Membership Perspective*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2004) 656 final. p. 4.

34 Grant, Charles. (2005) “Turkey offers EU more punch.” *European Voice*. p. 1.

35 Kirişçi, Kemal. *Between Europe and the Middle East: The Transformation of Turkish Policy*. Middle East Review of International Affairs: March, 2004. Vol. 8, Number 1. pp. 1.

36 Grant, Charles. (2005) “Turkey offers EU more punch.” *European Voice*. p. 1.

this geographical placement would allow the EU to be more influential in those regions. It is argued that a European Union that includes Turkey can “export security to the region and address the area’s conflicts”³⁷. Among these regions that offer opportunities for cooperation between EU and Turkey stand out the Arab Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Central Asia. In fact, Nathalie Tocci and Michael Emerson refer to Turkey both as a spearhead and a bridgehead for European interests in their paper “Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy”.

The authors, Tocci and Emerson, argue that in terms of opportunities offered by Turkish membership, there is a structural potential to enhance the credibility of EU policies towards the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Mediterranean regions.³⁸

Turkey’s alignment with EU policies is also evident from the most recent Commission Progress Report. It is stated within the progress report that during 2008 Turkey has continued to express its commitment to a comprehensive solution in Cyprus, Turkey and Greece have continued their efforts to improve bilateral relations and bilateral relations with other enlargement countries and other neighboring Member States have been developing positively. With regards to CFSP, it is suggested in the report that more convergence between Turkey and EU on CFSP issues have continued including in the troubled regions such as the Middle East or the Caucasus.

To start with, Turkey aligns closer to the viewpoint shared by the EU and the US about the nuclear warfare developments in Iran. Bülent Aras and Rabia Karakaya in their article argue that there has been a notable softening in Turkey’s foreign policy toward Iran and Syria in recent years.³⁹ The authors believe that this is due to the EU accession process and the emergence of a conducive environment for desecuritization at the regional level.⁴⁰ With regards to the new policy line in the Middle East, Aras and Karakaya state that Turkey aims to minimize problems with Iran and develop political and economic relations to foster peace and stability in the region.⁴¹ The increase in contacts between Tehran and Ankara and the facilitator role Turkey has taken with respect to the nuclear issue⁴² might be interpreted as

37 Kirişçi, Kemal. (2004). “Between Europe and the Middle East: The Transformation of Turkish Policy.” *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 8(1). p. 1.

38 Tocci, Nathalie and Michael Emerson. “Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy”, *EU-Turkey Working Paper*, No.1: August 2004.

39 Aras, Bülent, and Rabia Karakaya Polat. (2008) “From Conflict to Cooperation: Desecuritization of Turkey’s Relations with Syria and Iran.”. *Security Dialogue*, 39. p. 495-515.

40 *Ibid*, p. 496.

41 *Ibid*, p.507.

42 Turkey has recently started playing a facilitator role between Iran and the permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany.

reinforcing the perception that Turkey is accommodating a policy line closer to that of the EU's when it comes to the Iranian issue. In addition to these, Turkey's role had become further evident when in 2006, after being convinced by Former Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, Javier Solana travelled to Iran to encourage Iran for adopting a more moderate stand on the nuclear issue.⁴³

When it comes to the Balkans, Turkish foreign policy has been aligned with that of the EU member states' for long time. Providing peacekeeping forces for NATO-EU led peace-keeping missions in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan can constitute as a proof that Turkey and the EU have convergent policies in the Balkans. Erdal Tatli suggests that "Turkey has always provided an added value to European defense"⁴⁴ including its contributions to European defense during Cold War through NATO and other European formations. It is also stated by the author that Turkey has participated actively in EU-led military operations both as a lead nation or a major troop contributor in peacekeeping operations in the Balkans even after Cold War.⁴⁵ Moreover, as Charles Grant asserts Turkey's strong army on account of both size and quality can be considered as a vital aspect to reinforce the European efforts to form a common defense policy⁴⁶.

With regard to the Iraqi question, perhaps the climax point was when the Turkish parliament voted against the government's suggestion to allow the United States to enter Northern Iraq through Turkish territory. This could also be shown as a counter argument to the claims that Turkey might act as a base for American interests in Europe and might not be able to see itself in a position apart from being a long-standing ally of the United States. Although there is a wide perception that Turkey stands closer to the US than Europe, on specific issues including Iraq Turkey, has acted opposite to the US policies and aligned with Europe. It is also evident from the fact that even some EU member states aligned more closely with the US than Turkey did and partook in the process by sending troops to Iraq. In fact, EU remained divided on this particular issue, Britain, Italy and Spain deploying troops to Iraq as part of the American-led coalition while the leaders of France and Germany have pledged to intensify their co-operation against a US-led war against Iraq⁴⁷. Moreover, Turkish public opinion was very much supportive of the Parliament's decision to reject sending troops to Iraq, proving that it was not

43 Aras, Bülent, and Rabia Karakaya Polat. (2008) "From Conflict to Cooperation: Desecuritization of Turkey's Relations with Syria and Iran." *Security Dialogue*, 39. p. 507.

44 Tatli, Erdal. (2008) "Turkey turns cold to European defense: Implications for Western security." *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, Policy Watch 1376.

45 *Ibid.*

46 Grant, Charles. (2005) "Turkey offers EU more punch." *European Voice*, p. 2.

47 At a press conference in January 2003, the then presidents Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schröder have announced their opposition to approve a NATO alliance for military planning before the US-led intervention in Iraq. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2683409.stm>.

only a decision⁴⁸ at the political level but rather something which addressed the public consent.

One of the principles that the European Union is founded upon and has been considered as a ground rule for membership accession was that no border problem would be exported to the Union. Although the Republic of Cyprus' accession to the Union broke this rule and one of the founding principles of the Union was disregarded, Turkey had started its efforts to fulfill this condition for a long time. An era of rapprochement was entered into between Turkey and Greece right after the earthquakes in 1999, and Greece supported closer contacts between Turkey and the EU and changed its decision to veto the recommendation to grant Turkey candidacy status at the Helsinki summit. The Turkey-Greece rapprochement has resulted in the signing of dozens of agreements on low political issues as tourism, trade, commerce, organized crime and provided opportunities for bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the Black Sea and Southeastern Europe. Furthermore, Turkey and Greece had started cooperating closely on many issues including energy and transportation of energy with Greece supporting Turkish efforts to become an energy transportation hub through the pipelines in the region.

Not only the issues that are of priority in Turkish foreign policy have been more aligned with that of the EU's but also the style of diplomacy followed by Turkish policy makers and diplomats has been Europeanized. "As Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci observed "while in the past Turkish foreign policy has focused on the importance of military security and balance-of-power politics, it now increasingly appreciates the value of civilian instruments of law, economics and diplomacy, as well as multilateral settings in which to pursue its aims"⁴⁹. In other words, Turkish foreign policy has been more and more respectful of international regimes and treaties over the past years while coming closer to European norms and values when dealing with foreign policy questions.

Turkey-EU relations have had a longer time-span than is mostly acknowledged. Starting from 1963, there has been a visible pattern of cooperation and partnership between the EU, EU member states and Turkey. This trend of alignment also shows that Turkish policy has become closer to European foreign policy system over time and, as will be shown throughout this report, traces of alignment are relatively more when compared with the past. Although there are many debates on Turkey and whether it will change the dynamics of European foreign policy, the EU is also aware that having Turkey as an ally in the region will be important as it thrives more and more to become a global player. Although standing a part in the

48 On 1 March 2003, Turkish Parliament decided to reject the official permit to send Turkish troops to Iraq.

49 Tocci, Nathalie, and Michael Emerson. (2004) "Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy." *CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers*, 1. p.33.

minds of many European leaders, through its efforts in the neighboring region Turkey shows its commitment to become relatively more aligned with the EU member states positions on foreign policy and security issues.

2.3. WHERE DOES TURKEY FIT IN: VOTING PATTERN OF TURKEY AT THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 15 EU member states have proved a good track of convergence in the UN General Assembly as shown by the statistical data (see Table 3). The general belief was pessimistic that this harmony would not continue after the EU had enlarged to 27 members⁵⁰. However, the academic and statistical studies analyzing the trend of the eastern enlargement proved the pessimists wrong⁵¹. While the same pessimism is currently being applied to Turkey, now the question is whether this outlook will be disturbed by Turkey's full membership. The previous chapters of this study have already underlined the existence of convergence between Turkish foreign policy and the European foreign policy. The Commission Staff Working Paper (2004) highlights the alignment of Turkish foreign policy with the EU since the 1990s, while mentioning that Turkey is still hesitant to follow EU policies on certain security and foreign policy matters:

“Political dialogue between the EU and Turkey, and cooperation on European Security and Defense Policy matters has evolved since the mid-1990s. The dialogue has led to a considerable degree of convergence between the EU and Turkish views on CFSP issues. The Turkish record of alignment with the EU political declarations, common positions and joint actions and other CFSP measures demonstrates the extent of shared views. However, despite its generally satisfactory record, Turkey aligns itself to significantly fewer EU declarations than other acceding and associated countries.

.....Turkey is hesitant to align itself to EU/EC positions on issues which it feels touch its vital foreign policy and security interests, in particular regarding its geographical neighborhood (Iraq, Caucasus, etc.), human rights and developments in Muslim countries, where it insists on a distinct national position.”⁵²

The quotation above taken from the Commission document precisely emphasizes the improvement in Turkey's cooperation with the EU while at the same time addressing the need for progress. As summarized in the quotation, Turkey is reluctant to act together with the EU member states in vital foreign policy matters

50 Johansson-Nogués, Elisabeth. (2004). “The Fifteen and the Accession States in the Un General Assembly: What Future for European Foreign Policy in the Coming Together of the “Old” and the “New” Europe?” *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 9. p.75-76.

51 *Ibid.*

52 European Union, European Commission. *Issues Arising from Turkey's Membership Perspective*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2004) 656 final. Note 3.

and as well as on certain issues that would have implications on internal politics such as human rights.

The reasons for Turkey's divergence from the EU position on certain areas are analyzed in depth in this chapter of the study. There are specific reasons for Turkey's non-alignment policy in these issue areas; however there are a couple of more general motivations as well pertaining to Turkey's overall voting record. The first one is that since Turkey is not yet a member of the EU, it does not have a chance to sit in Council meetings. The EU Council of Foreign Ministers and the Political and Security Committee⁵³ do not allow non-member states to take part in the sessions. Therefore Turkey cannot have the chance to communicate its interests and/or concerns.

The second reason concerns the impact of the EU's position towards Turkey's accession. Turkey had been given the candidate status at the 1999 Helsinki Summit on the one hand, but its full accession process is a story of ups and downs. The accession negotiations formally started on the 3rd of October 2005 but were partially suspended upon the Commission's recommendation due to the deadlock in the Cyprus problem. Cyprus is one of the most important stumbling blocks in the negotiation process. The EU demands Turkey to open its ports and airports to vessels from Cyprus, which Turkey refuses in order to keep its stance on the non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus before there is a comprehensive settlement on the island that includes the Turkish Cypriots.

The negotiations have been opened in eight chapters. When compared with the accession process of Croatia⁵⁴, although both started official talks with the EU in October 2005, Turkey is moving rather slowly. Turkey's domestic turbulence and uncertainty in internal politics no doubt had a role in this slow accession. Turkey is also not performing well in fulfilling the human rights requirements including the rights of minorities as well as Kurds. The increased role of the military after 2007 is also another concern for the EU. In addition the government has been reluctant up until now to pass relevant laws and regulations necessary for harmonization such as the freedom of speech, rights of the minorities, and election laws. The Regular Reports from the Commission clearly underline this slowdown in the reform process⁵⁵.

On the other hand, the EU should be given its part in this responsibility. Turkey has yet not been given satisfactory guarantees that it will become a full member as soon as the harmonization process is completed. On the contrary, it is emphasized

53 Political and Security Committee is a permanent body of the European Union, which deals with Common Security and Foreign Policy issues.

54 Croatia has now opened 18 of the 35 chapters of the *acquis communautaire*.

55 For more see Commission Staff Working Document. Turkey 2007 Progress Report. EN. Com. (2007) 663. 6.11.2007, Brussels. Commission Staff Working Document. Turkey 2008 Progress Report. EN. Com. (2008) 674. 5.11.2008, Brussels.

over and over again that the process is open-ended and France and Austria declared to hold referenda to decide about Turkey's full membership and several others have plans to do so. According to Eurobarometer surveys support for Turkey's full membership has declined 18 points when compared with the results of 2005; when negotiations started. The skepticism within the EU about Turkey's full membership is fuelling a backlash in the reform process and is creating a setback in Turkish public opinion for support and trust in the EU. All together these affect the convergence of Turkey with the EU at the UN and other international bodies. The data displaying Turkey's overall convergence with the EU (see table 4 (Annex 1)) shows that Turkey's voting alignment with the EU declined during 1996-1998. This can be partly explained by the fact that at the time Turkey's application for accession was rejected at the Luxembourg Summit. Turkey's membership process was de facto suspended at that time which had a negative effect on the motivation for EU membership. In addition, domestic factors might have played a role in Turkey's increased divergence. There was a struggle between the military and the Islamic-led coalition at the time, which ended with the military gaining more power and security problems becoming the priority issues in foreign policy⁵⁶.

European integration is a gradual and interactive process⁵⁷. The positive messages from the EU are as equally important as the internal dynamics of any given country during the course of negotiations. Although there are different explanations at the theoretical level explaining the alignment of the candidate countries with the EU, it is underlined that EU's impact is stronger if the candidate country is given clear and credible membership perspective⁵⁸. Furthermore, even after membership individual countries continue to pursue divergent behavior at the UN General Assembly due to certain domestic, geographical cultural and international concerns. France and the United Kingdom are good examples of such. Certainly, future enlargements will make it more difficult to reach consensus, however the picture will not be a pessimistic one as the empirical research proves.

Turkey's general voting trend illustrates that although there is not full convergence between Turkey and the EU countries; Turkey's tendency to align with the EU positions is noteworthy. Given that the empirical research focused on three topics (human rights, security matters and the Middle East Question) specifically, it is worth examining Turkey's position and the reasons of divergence in these three given areas.

56 Aras, Bülent, and Salih Bıçakçı, (2006). "Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonisation Possible?" *East European Quarterly*, XL(3).

57 Hix, Simon, and Klaus H. Goetz. (2001). "European Integration and National Political Systems." In *Europeanized Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems*. London: Frank Cass Publishers. See also Robert Ladrech. (2001). "Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis." *Keele European Parties Research Unit*, Working Paper, 7.

58 Sedelmeier, Ulrich. (2006) "Europeanization in the New Member and Candidate Countries." *Living Reviews in European Governance*, 1(3): <http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2006-3>.

2.3.1 HUMAN RIGHTS

Turkey has been engaged in Westernization efforts since the establishment of the Republic in 1923. It is one of the founding members of the United Nations, became a member of the Council of Europe in 1949, joined NATO in 1952 and has had a long-standing relationship with the European Union since 1963⁵⁹. Although it is a signatory of the major international human rights declarations and conventions, Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948), European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1954), Turkey's human rights record has always been subject to ups and downs depending on the political turmoil in the history of the Republic.

Turkey's EU candidacy has been the most effective motivation behind the improvement of human rights in Turkey. The Copenhagen criteria adopted by EU member states on 22 June 1993 sets clearly the conditions the countries should meet in order to be eligible for membership to the EU:

Membership requires that a candidate country has achieved the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and the 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. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union⁶⁰.

The EU waited till the 1999 Helsinki Summit to accept Turkey as a candidate country and the full accession negotiations started on 3rd of October 2005, once Turkey had accomplished significant progress in the reform process⁶¹. The EU membership perspective had a clear impact in the advancement of human rights conditions in Turkey.

After the December 1999 decision of the EU, Turkey fastened the ratification process of UN treaties on human rights (see Annex 2). Turkey ratified sixteen of the twenty-one UN covenants on human rights; and twelve of them were ratified between 1999 and 2006. On the other hand, while ratifying international conventions, Turkey attached reservations on critical provisions. Nine of these sixteen covenants and protocols were ratified with reservations. Turkey's reservations, especially to the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), regarding the rights of minorities

59 Turkey and the ECC (European Economic Community) signed the Ankara Association Agreement on 12 September 1963.

60 European Union. European Council. *Conclusions of the Presidency*. European Council Summit in Copenhagen. 21- 22 June, 1993.

61 In 2004 European Council noted the progress Turkey made in the reform process and decided to open the accession negotiations with Turkey on 3rd October 2005. European Union. European Council. *Conclusions of the Presidency*. European Council Meeting. 17 December 2004.

and the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), regarding the right to education, are part of the reason for Turkey's diverging curve from the EU consensus on human rights voting at the UN General Assembly, shown in table 10 (Annex 1). Turkey ratified both covenants in 2003; however it declared a reservation for each. On the other hand, Turkey is not the only country to declare reservations. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France (reservation to the same article; article 27), Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom are the member states which declared reservations to the ICCPR.

Turkey's reservation concerns article 27 of the ICCPR, which says that;

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language.

Turkey placed a reservation on this article which allows for interpreting and applying the provisions of the article in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes. Article 27 of the ICCPR is regarded as the most widely binding provision on minorities.

Turkey holds reservations on paragraph 3 and 4 of article 13 of the ICESCR as well. The article concerns the right to education, including for minorities;

3. The State Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to choose for their children schools, other than those established by the public authorities, which conform to such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

4. No part of this article shall be construed so as to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject always to the observance of the principles set forth in paragraph I of this article and to the requirement that the education given in such institutions shall conform to such minimum standards as may be laid down by the State⁶².

After the ratification of the covenant text Turkey declared the following reservation: "The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of the paragraph (3) and (4) of the Article 13 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in accordance to the provisions under the Article 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey."

62 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, entry into force 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27. http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ceschr.htm

Turkey has been criticized by human rights organizations and other international bodies for not fully applying the above treaties⁶³. UN human rights monitors visiting Turkey continue to raise concerns on human rights violations in Turkey. The UN special rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Martin Scheinin, who visited Turkey in February 2006, noted his concerns about the balance between counter-terrorism measures and human rights. He expressed that “certain counter terrorism measures taken by the state may have consequences that are incompatible with human rights regulations”⁶⁴. Another UN mission visiting Turkey in October 2006, as well declared their concerns pertaining to the application of new legislative safeguards against torture and arbitrary detention that they are not applied to individuals held on suspicion of terrorist crimes⁶⁵.

The European Commission (EC) regular reports, while criticizing Turkey, underline the progress made by Turkey in the area of human rights. The progress report published in November 2006 notes that Turkey significantly improved the situation of fundamental rights in a number of areas but still needs to address the problems that minorities are facing⁶⁶. In general, Turkey displays a good record in alignment with the EU members on almost all matters including supporting the rights of disfavored communities, such as Palestinians. In a recent report by the European Council on Foreign Relations, there are four groups classified at the UN on human rights voting. Turkey is included in the wider Europe category, which means it is a country that votes together with the EU on human rights matters. Moreover, Turkey is noted as one of the three Muslim populated countries voting in line with the EU on human rights matters⁶⁷.

Having said that, it is also observed that Turkey is displaying a comparably poor alignment with the EU on human rights, mainly due to its long standing Kurdish problem. Turkey’s reservations to international agreements also feed into it. Turkey is well aware that its EU membership is very much dependent on the peaceful resolution of internal conflicts, and the EU gives special importance to the situation of the Kurdish population in Turkey. The progress Turkey has made in this field is recognized in the yearly progress reports of the Commission.

63 International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF). (2006). “Turkey: Minority Policy of Systematic Negation.”

64 Human Rights Watch World Report. (2007).

65 *Ibid.*

66 European Union. European Commission. *Turkey 2006 Progress Report*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2006) 649 final. p. 59.

67 The other two countries are Bosnia and Herzegovina and Afghanistan. Gowan, R. And F. Brantner. (2008). “A Global Forum for Human Rights. An Audit of European Power at the UN. Policy Paper.” *European Council on Foreign Relations*.

During the candidacy process Turkey has taken major steps to provide its Kurdish population civil and political rights, with the exception of the last two years which were dominated by domestic political crisis and the escalation of PKK terrorism in South-East Anatolia. Turkey firstly has intensified the ratification of international human rights treaties (see Table 1 (Annex 2)). One of the most important steps Turkey took in this respect was the recognition of the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights in 1989 (ECHR)⁶⁸. The ECHR has a major role in Turkey's reform system, although it is not an EU institution⁶⁹. And with the adoption of the National Program in 2001, Turkey took the most comprehensive step in its harmonization process. Several harmonization packages were passed in the Grand National Assembly, reforming the legislative and legal system, as well as the administrative structure. On the other hand, it is undeniable that Turkey still has a long way to go. The EU Annual Report on Human Rights (2007) notes the positive results of the past reforms, but at the same time underlines the importance of efforts to ensure full effective implementation of reforms in order to guarantee the irreversibility and sustainability of the process⁷⁰.

Since it is obvious that the EU accession process is an inevitable motivation for the continuation of the reform process in Turkey, the commitment of both sides to the process will determine the pace of the reforms in Turkey in the future. It is a proven fact that as Turkey proceeds in the negotiation process, the its alignment with the EU at the UN will increase.

2.3.2 THE MIDDLE EAST QUESTION

Turkey's EU membership has implications not only for the EU region but for the Middle East as well. The change in the Turkish foreign policy vis-à-vis the Middle East is clearly visible. Turkey started to follow a much more active foreign policy and is being involved in conflicts taking up a mediator role. This comparably new active approach in foreign policy is a result of a combination of various external and domestic factors. Turkey has been a rather passive actor in Middle Eastern affairs until recently, when compared to its current active diplomatic role⁷¹. During the last years Turkey has improved its problematic relations with Iran and Syria⁷², engaged in business relationships with Gulf countries and has been playing an

68 Arat, Zehra, and Thomas Smith. (2007) "EU and Human Rights in Turkey: Political Freedom without Social Welfare." *Presented at the 48th Annual Conference of the International Studies Association, February 28-March 4, p. 10.*

69 *Ibid.*

70 European Union. *The EU Annual Report on Human Rights, 2007.* p. 65.

71 Larrabee, Stephen. F. (2007). "Turkey Rediscovered the Middle East." *Foreign Affairs*, 86(4).

72 Turkey's relations with the Middle East were tense during the previous decades partly due to the PKK and partly to the countries' attitudes for they chose not to cooperate with Turkey on the matter.

active role in the Islamic Conference and conflicts. Turkey's relations with the Arab world have largely improved⁷³.

The EU accession process is for sure one of the reasons for the improved relations with the Middle East. The dynamics of Turkish politics have been changing since Turkey received candidate status in the December 1999 Helsinki Summit. Turkey's reform process has paved the way for legislative, economic and structural reforms, which have accelerated the change in the way foreign policy is being made. The EU harmonization process required Turkey to take certain steps in its security policies and Turkey's foreign policy environment has diversified. Since the membership talks have started, the public opinion in Turkey has evolved positively and Turkish society has become more receptive and open to debates by non-state actors such as interest groups and civil society actors.⁷⁴ The official institutions have started losing their monopoly on the decisions regarding foreign policy. Newly emerging pressure groups are very successful in using various channels to transmit their messages inside the country and at the EU institutions level.

The empirical data from the UN supports the argument that Turkey is increasingly Europeanizing its policies in problems related to the Middle East. In addition the academic research proves that Turkey has been closer to the EU on various issues unlike the common perception that Turkey aligns with the US policy in the region⁷⁵. According to the data on Table 6 (Annex 1) focusing on the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is clearly observed that Turkey has been closer to the EU since the mid 1990s, although still not as aligned as the member states and other candidate countries.

Turkey had long been supporting the Palestinians by voting in favor of them at the UN and other international platforms and by declaring official sympathy to the Palestinians and especially to the refugees. However, until the 1970s, Turkey refrained from mentioning the right of Palestinians to self-determination and independence⁷⁶.

Turkey's position changed dramatically after the defeat of the Arab states in the Arab-Israeli war. There were several proposals at the UN General Assembly to invite the PLO to participate at the deliberations at the UN in 1974, after the

73 *Ibid.*

74 Özcan, Gencer. (2004). "Turkey's Changing Neighbourhood Policy." *FES Briefing Paper*. p. 6. Also see Diez, Thomas. (2005). "Turkey, the European Union and Security Complexes Revisited." *Mediterranean Politics*, 10(2),

75 Aras, Bülent and Salih Bıçakçı. (2006). "Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonisation Possible?." *East European Quarterly*, XL(3).

76 Aral, Berdal. (2004). "Fifty Years On: Turkey Voting Orientation at the UN General Assembly 1948-97." *Middle Eastern Studies*, 40(2). p. 141.

1973 Arab-Israeli war. In all of these proposals Turkey voted in favor of the PLO, although they did not refer to UN resolution 242⁷⁷, acting together with the Arab world⁷⁸. At that time, this marked a shift from the position of the West on the Palestinian issue since all the Western countries either voted against or abstained. In 1975, there was a resolution declaring Zionism as a form of racism, for which Turkey voted in favor, although all other Western countries preferred not to endorse.⁷⁹ It was an indication confirming Turkey's independent and pro-Palestinian policy, and since then Turkey has voted in favor of Palestinians' right to self-determination and independence.⁸⁰

While voting in favor of the Palestinians at the UN voting, Turkey did not have trouble-free relations with the PLO. Turkey recognized the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, but waited three years before letting the PLO open an office in Ankara. A PLO office was opened in Ankara in 1979 but the PLO representative was given the status of *chargé d'affaires*, not an ambassador. Turkey was trying to find a balance between its relations with Israel, the West and with the Arab world. For the same purposes, in order to please its partners in the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Turkey issued a declaration in 1980 downgrading the status of the Israeli representative in Turkey to second secretary. The reason was announced as a reaction to the Israeli *fait-accompli* on the status of Israel⁸¹.

In line with this policy, Turkey recognized the independent Palestinian state immediately after it declared independence in 1988.⁸² Turkey was the first country from the West to recognize the right of Palestinians to have an independent state. The position of Turkey and the EC has come closer since the Venice Declaration of 1980 where the basic principles of the EC policy are defined. The declaration, while recognizing the Palestinians' right to self determination and the application of UN Resolutions 242 and 338, underlines Israel's right to exist. The document includes the need to engage the PLO in the negotiations and the fact that the Israeli settlements are illegal and an obstacle to the peace process. Therefore, it calls upon Israel to put an end to the territorial occupation it has maintained since 1967⁸³. The declaration also recognizes the conflict as a source of instability for the

77 UN resolution 242 recognizes the right of existence for every state in the region including Israel.

78 United Nations. Department of Public Information. *Yearbook of UN 1974*. New York: 1974.

79 Aral, Berdal. (2004). "Fifty Years On: Turkey Voting Orientation at the UN General Assembly 1948-97." *Middle Eastern Studies*, 40(2). p. 142.

80 *Ibid*, p. 142.

81 It should also be noted that the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem in 1980 played and the Golan Heights played an important role in Turkey's decision to reduce the level of diplomatic relations with Israel.

82 United Nations. Department of Public Information. *Yearbook of UN 1974*. New York: 1974.

83 European Union. European Council. *Declaration of the European Council on the Middle East in Venice*, 13 June 1980. Available from <http://www.medeia.be/index.html?page=2&lang=en&doc=52>.

Middle East region. The Venice Declaration of the EC stood more in line with the Turkish policy on the conflict. However, there still remained differences. At that time while Turkey was recognizing the right of the Palestinians to national independence, the Venice Declaration stopped short of that.

Another diverging point between the EC countries and Turkey was the involvement of USSR within the peace initiative. The Europeans were in favor of enlarging the process and of including USSR while Turkey did not feel the same way. An additional difficulty Turkey was then facing concerned domestic politics. The beginning of 1980s marked troubled years in Turkey, which ended with a military coup d'état in September 1980. During these chaotic and restless periods Turkey was struggling to keep the balance in its relations with the Arab world and the West. For this reason, Turkey was reluctant to be involved in the pro-active policy of the EC. The EC at that juncture was trying to upgrade its role on the world scene and to be involved in the conflict as a mediator. Although Turkey was in favor of taking initiatives in order to assert the rights of the Palestinians and to play an active role in the region, due to domestic security concerns it did not want to harm its relations with Israel⁸⁴ and was supportive of low profile actions.

An overall analysis demonstrates that, although having certain differences, during the 1980s Turkey pursued a closer policy with the European countries when compared with the alignment of Turkish foreign policy to the US.

On the other hand, even though both the EC and Turkey had good intentions and were constructive in supporting a peaceful settlement to the conflict, none of them have been influential actors in the process. The Venice Declaration enabled the European countries to have a more consistent policy on the conflict, however since the Israelis rejected giving a political role to the EU, its impact remained limited. Turkey would very much like the conflict to be resolved since it would no more need to maintain the difficult balance between keeping diplomatic and economic relations with Israel and showing solidarity with the Arab and Islamic world⁸⁵.

In fact, it would not be inaccurate to claim that EU's position towards the Arab-Israeli conflict would not be altered by the Turkey's accession to the EU. Indeed, as the two parties were having the same concerns regarding the conflict, their policies increasingly became convergent in the 1990s.

84 Israel's importance for Turkey was emphasized in the words of the then Prime Minister Turgut Özal; "as a window...on future events. For Turkey to play a role in solving the problems of the Middle East ...that window must be open" See Akyan, Mahmut B. (1993). "Palestinian Question in Turkish Foreign Policy from the 1950s to the 1990s." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 25(1). p. 103.

85 Sayari, Sabri. (1997). "Turkey and the Middle East in the 1990s." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 26(3). p. 50.

Even though there continues to be minor differences between Turkey and the EU, both agree on the terms of a peaceful solution and also the means to achieve such a solution⁸⁶. Since the Madrid Conference of 1991, Turkey has been actively taking part in talks with the Israelis and the Palestinians. Besides, Turkey is the only country in the region that has economic ties with both countries. Indeed, Turkey's neutral and legitimate role acknowledged by both Israel and Palestine could be complementary to the EU. Both have been trying to keep bilateral relations separate from the peace process and have managed to do so until now.

2.3.3 SECURITY ISSUES

The security issues at the UN refer to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The two related matters play a significant role among the UN peace-building and conflict prevention efforts. The EU adopted a Declaration against the weapons of mass destruction at the Thessaloniki Summit of the European Council in 2003.⁸⁷ The Union has been involved in several initiatives aimed at preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and supporting UN measures on disarmament issues. The efforts of the EU have been successful in strengthening the existing regime at multilevel platforms.⁸⁸ The EU Security Strategy⁸⁹ describes the weapons of mass destruction as one of the most important threats to peace and security. In addition, at the 58th General Assembly of the UN, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, on behalf of the EU, stated that the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a priority.⁹⁰ On the other hand, both issues are regarded as vital and the convergence between the EU member states is lower when compared with the other issues (see Table 7 (Annex 1)).

In this field Turkey, starting from the Cold War years, positioned itself together with the Western bloc. Being a NATO member, Turkey during the Cold War years aligned itself with the other NATO members and after the Cold War the same policy continued. Turkey has been more in line with the EU mainstream of voting in this specific field than some other EU countries such as France, UK, Malta, Cyprus and Spain (see Table 8 (Annex 1)).

86 Tocci, Nathalie, and Michael Emerson. (2004) "Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy." *CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers*, 1.

87 Portela, Clara. "The Role of the EU in Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: The way to Thessaloniki and Beyond." *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt Reports*, No. 65.

88 *Ibid.* Examples include the promotion of the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

89 "A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy." Brussels, 12 December 2003.

90 *Ibid*, 23

Turkey has been actively taking part in NATO operations and missions. In its priorities paper for the 60th UN General Assembly⁹¹, Turkey clearly stated that it will be supportive of all UN measures to be taken at the 60th Assembly to increase the institution's capacity in order to address the challenges better:

“Non-state actors, terrorists and states in non-compliance with non-proliferation and disarmament obligations and delays in the fulfillment of nuclear disarmament engagements and obligations, all challenge the delicate balance that the system of treaties has established over the last four decades. The UN should be able to respond to those challenges. Turkey will continue to support all efforts during the 60th General Assembly, aimed at breathing new life into the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda”.

On the issue of nuclear non-proliferation France and UK - two of the original nuclear power states - have been the two most problematic countries in terms of supporting to the coherent approach of the EU member states. The review conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)⁹² of 2005 could not accomplish any substantial steps due to the manipulations of the US and France to a lesser extent. The main disagreement broke with the US – and partly French - refusal to accept the results of the NPT Review Conference of 2000.⁹³ The decisions agreed in the year 2000⁹⁴ were reached after tough bargains and compromise was regarded as a success since it was getting more difficult each year to reach a satisfactory set of results⁹⁵. The US tried to keep all the year 2000 decisions out from the concluding report.⁹⁶ Although the EU could not have helped much to make the event a success, the division among the EU members also broke the EU coherence on the issue, France and the UK being the problematic ones. France supported the US position on the year 2000 decisions and the UK was trying to get supporters for the US position.

91 United Nations. Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations. *Turkey's Priorities for the 60th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*, September 2005. Available from <http://www.un.int/turkey/page31.html>.

92 The review conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is held at the UN headquarters every five years to have an overall review of the NPT. The NPT dates back to 1968 and has 189 signatories.

93 Müller, Harald. (2005). “A Treaty in Troubled Waters: Reflections on the Failed NPT Review Conference.” *International Spectator*. No.3.

94 The nuclear weapon states committed to a more equal and balanced treaty. The principle of irreversibility, elimination of nuclear arsenals and reductions in tactical nuclear weapons was agreed. For further information see Kuppusswamy, Chamundeeswari. (2006). “Is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Shaking at its Foundations? Stocktaking After the 2005 NPT Review Conference.” *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 11(1). Also see Müller, Harald. (2005). “A Treaty in Troubled Waters: Reflections on the Failed NPT Review Conference.” *International Spectator*, 3.

95 Kuppusswamy, Chamundeeswari. (2006). “Is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Shaking at its Foundations? Stocktaking After the 2005 NPT Review Conference.” *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 11(1).

96 Müller, Harald. (2005). “A Treaty in Troubled Waters: Reflections on the Failed NPT Review Conference.” *International Spectator*. No.3.

During that year Turkey aligning with seven other NATO members – Belgium, Canada, Germany, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, and Norway formed a group supporting nuclear disarmament by promoting a resolution at the UN for speeding up the implementation of the NPT. In the foreseeable future, it seems that Turkey will continue to be a full supporter of the disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation efforts of the UN.

In general, when it comes to foreign policy questions, Turkey aligns itself with the EU rather than the US, as its 92 % alignment with the EU statements in foreign policy issues demonstrates⁹⁷. It is closer to the EU's Security Strategy⁹⁸ as was proved very well in March 2003, when the Turkish parliament vetoed the opening of its borders to allow the passage of US troops to Iraq. This attitude was perfectly in line with the soft power approach of the EU.

97 Ülgen, Sinan. (2008). "Turkey's Role in Transatlantic Relations." *Euractive Analysis*.

98 "A Secure Europe in a Better World." *European Security Strategy*. Brussels: 12 December 2003.

Conclusion

This report started with the hypothesis that the foreign policies of the EU member states and Turkish foreign policy is getting closer and the EU accession process has had an impact on the transformation of Turkish foreign policy. Formation of a system of European foreign policy and the adjustment of candidate countries is still a disputed question. In the European integration literature more attention is paid to the influence the EU has on the transformation of domestic structures. Foreign policy is a less frequently studied subject in this respect. The reason can partly be explained by the fact that national interests still continue to dominate foreign policy choices of the member states. The clashes between the EU members surfaced with the Iraq war in 2003 and the August conflict in the Caucasus, although the rapid-reaction of the French President Sarkozy was a success, the EU could not agree on a common position. As stated in previous chapter, EU usually lacks the common will and capacity to act on a given crisis. A recent speech given by the EU Commissioner for Enlargement, Olli Rehn describes the need explicitly:

“...the Union’s foreign policy needs to be more determined and united in order for its impact to be felt. Policy towards Russia has been a cautionary tale, highlighting the need for a United front, if the EU is to have any influence in foreign relations. Even if we don’t always speak with a *single* voice, we nonetheless need a *common* voice.”⁹⁹

Yet, scholars argue that it is still possible to talk about a common EU foreign policy and its impact on the member states and candidate countries¹⁰⁰. The common acts, operations and missions together make up the EU’s foreign policy. The participation of the member countries in CFSP and ESDP mechanisms proves that there is a change in the foreign policy orientation of the Union, which might also be applied to the candidate countries¹⁰¹. The fulfillment of the CFSP necessitates the candidate countries implementing certain EU sanctions and measures, which inevitably leads to an alignment in foreign policy.

99 Speech by EU Commissioner Olli Rehn. *The EU – from civilian power to premier league security policy player?*, 27 August 2007, Helsinki.

100 Hill, Christopher. (2004). “Renationalizing or Regrouping? EU Foreign Policy since 11 September 2001.” *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(1). See also Smith, Michael. (2000). “Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Cooperation.” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7(4).

101 Winrow, Gareth. “Turkey’s Changing Role and Its Implications.” Paper presented at the *Europeanization auf Transformation: Turkey in the Post-Helsinki Era* conference, December 2005.

Still, the analysis of the EU voting behavior gives a rather complex picture. There was clearly a pattern of increasing cohesion (using the degree of identical votes as indicator) during the 1990s. Later the consensus among the EU states stagnated or decreased slightly. But the accession of 10 new member states in 2004 did not lead to any dramatic change (i.e. decrease) in the cohesion of the EU member states' positions.

Looking at different areas of issue, one could see that the security issues which are debated in the General Assembly are still a (partly) dividing topic for the EU. This brings us to the analysis of the voting behavior of individual member states. Almost all EU countries did show a convergence toward the EU "mainstream" over time — with two gleaming exceptions: France and the United Kingdom. Whereas one could see a learning/socialization/spill-over process with most of the other EU members, this was practically not the case with these two nuclear powers and permanent members of the UN Security Council.

The distance of third countries from the EU consensus also showed a clear pattern. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union was distant from the EU while the US was rather close. But in the mid-1980s this pattern changed. In 2006, the United States stood quite distant from the EU consensus. The main reason for this was the difference of opinion between the US (and Israel) and the EU on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

When it comes to Turkey, it is obvious that Turkish foreign policy has been moving significantly closer to the position of the EU member states after the late 1990s. It would not be false to argue that Turkey has been a compatible player and its role especially in the Middle East, has been complementary to the role played and desired by the EU. Turkey has already started following a path that complements the European foreign policy in the region as the EU desires to be more influential and involved in the efforts to resolve the conflicts that are considered as threats in their respective surroundings. Its active foreign policy towards the Middle East not only raises interest in European foreign and security policy circles but it also points to a convergence about the perspective on Arab-Israeli peace process. The Arab-Israeli case is an example where the EU integration is not a one way but rather a two way track. While Turkey adopted its policy to the new conditions, it is only possible to talk about a convergence after the EU began to follow a more active and balanced policy.

The partnership between Turkey and the EU will not be without problems even after Turkey becomes a member. There might always be regional and strategic sensitivities and limitations. However, there is little doubt that both parties would enjoy a stronger role in global scale with increased cooperation. No doubt, there will always remain issues of clear divergence, but this non-alignment will not be more assertive than that of the current members of the EU.

As several crises in recent years have proved, there is a need for further coordination and cooperation among the EU members and between the member states and the candidate countries. If the EU is determined to achieve its already defined goal to become a global player, the Union should continue implementing its most successful foreign policy tool, the enlargement process and internal reform processes simultaneously. The general standing of the EU might be influenced by the new comers; however it depends on the vision of the EU leaders to use this diversity as an added-value. On the one hand, the EU needs this diversity in order to better respond to new challenges, but at the same time, the mechanisms for efficient coordination should be developed and improved. The diversity dichotomy could perhaps be used to develop a more effective European foreign policy.¹⁰²

102 Tocci, Nathalie, and Michael Emerson. (2004) "Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy." *CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers*, 1. p. 6.

Annex 1

Table 1. Number of Recorded (or Roll-Call) Votes in the UN General Assembly, Including Votes on Parts of Resolutions, Motions, Decisions (Total and for Various Issue Areas)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Number of all Recorded Votes	163	151	170	203	177	143	103	89	88	77	92	97	96	90	84	99	83	88	106	97	92	106	110
Middle East****	31	35	43	51	44	37	31	34	34	20	22	21	24	25	24	22	25	25	22	25	22	21	28
Security etc.*****	23	32	53	54	41	45	32	20	20	22	43	47	42	39	42	41	34	38	39	31	27	37	46
Decolonization												8	10	11	9	8	10	11	11	13	12	10	14
Human Rights												11	13	16	10	18	13	14	31	25	29	25	23

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; no data calculated for decolonization and human rights between 1979 and 1994.

*** Middle East questions throughout the study refer to all votes on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

**** Security questions throughout the study refer to disarmament in general, nuclear disarmament, the question of small weapons etc.

Table 2. Percentage of Recorded Votes in the UN General Assembly with EU Consensus
(EU Member States Casting Identical Votes)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
All Votes	58.9	42.4	27.1	37.4	47.5	45.5	41.8	52.8	61.4	59.7	65.1	70.1	75.0	80.0	82.1	76.8	72.3	73.9	75.5	70.1	67.4	70.8	71.8
Middle East	74.2	40.0	46.5	51.0	56.8	56.8	71.0	76.5	82.4	80.0	86.4	90.5	95.8	92.0	100	100	100	84.0	95.5	96.0	81.8	85.7	71.4
Security etc.	56.5	34.4	20.8	27.8	31.7	31.1	18.8	25.0	35.0	50.0	53.5	70.2	66.7	76.9	76.2	61.0	52.9	68.4	59.0	51.6	37.0	64.9	60.9
Decolonization												37.5	70.0	45.5	55.6	50.0	50.0	45.5	45.5	30.8	50.0	50.0	64.3
Human Rights												72.7	92.3	87.5	90.0	88.9	92.3	92.9	90.3	76.0	89.7	96.0	100
Number of all Recorded Votes	96	151	170	203	177	143	103	89	88	77	92	97	96	90	84	99	83	88	106	97	92	106	110

Note: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; no data calculated for decolonization and human rights between 1979 and 1994.

Table 3. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): All votes in the UN General Assembly

	Part 1 (“Old” Members) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)																						
	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002 **	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	17	15	26	27	19	23	22	11	6	8	5	2	5	4	1	2	2	2	3	5	2	1	2
Finland	21	18	25	27	21	21	18	7	5	5	1	4	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
Sweden	20	14	21	25	21	22	21	7	6	7	5	1	6	4	2	4	2	4	4	6	4	4	3
Spain	26	20	20	20	13	13	14	10	7	7	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	3	5	2	4	3
Portugal	17	14	12	6	1	2	2	4	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	2	3	1
Greece	28	20	35	32	24	22	15	12	8	8	2	4	n/a	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1
Ireland	10	11	18	17	15	17	17	10	5	7	5	2	6	5	3	4	4	5	5	8	4	3	3
Denmark	9	14	13	11	11	11	11	4	3	2	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1
UK	9	9	12	9	9	10	15	10	10	9	10	13	7	7	10	9	9	9	8	12	10	11	10
France	13	8	8	11	7	8	14	7	6	9	12	8	7	6	10	13	13	9	8	9	8	11	9
Italy	8	3	3	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	0
Germany, FR	5	5	7	3	4	3	1	3	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	0
Netherlands	9	3	3	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0
Luxembourg	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Belgium	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	1

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002.

Table 4. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): All votes in the UN General Assembly Part 2 (“New” Members and Candidate Countries) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Czechosl./Czech R.	71	59	61	69	52	52	13	5	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	1	1
Cyprus	46	46	48	60	56	50	46	42	37	34	26	26	11	14	12	9	9	8	8	8	3	5	4
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	9	8	6	9	8	4	5	4	5	4	1	2	2	1	1
Hungary	71	59	61	69	52	41	17	7	4	4	1	6	1	3	3	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1
Latvia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	8	8	7	7	8	4	5	5	4	4	3	2	3	2	2
Lithuania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	8	7	8	6	6	4	3	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	1
Malta	42	43	43	54	33	29	28	27	14	10	3	5	23	19	10	6	5	6	7	6	7	6	5
Poland	69	58	60	67	52	48	13	4	3	2	0	3	2	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	3	2	1
Slovakia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	3	4	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Slovenia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	9	3	8	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Bulgaria	71	59	61	69	51	51	20	4	3	2	3	2	5	7	3	4	2	2	2	2	0	1	1
Romania	47	50	54	57	51	50	18	6	6	4	2	5	5	5	3	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Croatia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	17	10	16	8	7	4	12	5	4	2	2	2	1	1
Turkey	35	29	30	36	28	26	24	20	17	14	10	14	18	18	11	14	10	11	10	10	9	7	9
Macedonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	5	12	6	7	5	13	3	4	3	3	4	3	2
Percentage of Votes with EC/EU Majority	97.6	92.7	92.3	93.1	95.4	97.9	96.1	96.6	97.7	96.1	95.7	97.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	98.9	100	100	100

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes.

Table 5. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): Votes on Middle East Questions Part 1 (“Old” Members) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
Austria	7	11	17	16	12	7	9	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	6	4	10	13	8	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sweden	6	4	10	15	9	4	5	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Spain	35	44	28	22	19	12	15	12	11	13	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portugal	24	33	18	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greece	35	44	35	31	25	24	16	12	11	13	3	3	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	2	5	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denmark	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
France	11	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany, FR	2	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Belgium	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002.

Table 6. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): Votes on Middle East Questions Part 2 (“New” Members and Candidate Countries) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996 *	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001 **	2002 **	2003	2004	2005	2006
Czechosl./Czech R.	72	60	40	60	48	40	4	2	4	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
Cyprus	48	53	36	52	45	40	33	29	30	25	13	11	7	9	7	10	9	9	13	9	5	5	4
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	2	0	3	6	7	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0
Hungary	72	60	42	59	48	34	9	8	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Latvia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	2	3	5	6	7	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2	0	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Malta	46	53	36	52	24	22	20	19	19	19	8	8	9	13	9	10	9	9	13	7	8	5	8
Poland	65	58	40	59	49	37	4	2	4	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0
Slovakia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovenia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria	72	58	39	60	47	42	13	3	4	0	3	0	0	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Romania	46	55	35	48	48	36	13	7	7	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3	0
Croatia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	3	3	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	44	49	38	50	41	34	29	24	26	22	13	11	11	13	9	10	9	11	13	14	13	11	13
Macedonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	0	0
Percentage of Votes with EC/EU Majority	97.6	92.7	92.3	93.1	95.4	97.9	96.1	96.5	97.7	96.1	95.7	97.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	98.9	100	100

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece; ** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes.

Table 7. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): Votes on Security Issues

Part 1 (“Old” Members) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002 **	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	13	34	47	39	39	42	33	26	6	12	10	2	10	8	3	4	3	1	4	8	2	1	5
Finland	25	50	54	44	38	39	29	15	6	9	0	0	3	4	1	3	2	1	3	6	2	1	1
Sweden	15	32	46	41	39	41	35	18	6	12	8	2	11	8	4	8	5	7	8	17	10	6	6
Spain	10	8	19	14	11	13	6	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	8	6	4	5
Portugal	5	6	5	5	0	1	4	12	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	1	0
Greece	8	28	48	43	34	31	12	15	6	3	0	2	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Ireland	13	30	46	34	34	37	29	24	9	12	7	2	11	10	4	9	6	9	10	17	10	6	7
Denmark	3	18	28	16	23	21	17	9	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UK	10	10	13	9	15	14	31	18	32	18	17	13	8	6	13	14	11	13	15	23	21	17	15
France	15	6	8	18	25	18	37	18	9	12	18	10	10	7	14	24	23	14	15	21	19	16	14
Italy	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	0	0	0
Germany, FR	0	2	1	1	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	2	1	3	2	2	0	0
Netherlands	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002.

Table 8. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): Votes on Security Issues

Part 2 (“New” Members and Candidate Countries) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Czechosl./Czech R.	65	78	71	68	52	48	12	6	0	6	0	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cyprus	33	66	66	66	57	49	40	53	41	39	32	34	14	15	14	12	11	9	10	8	4	3	5
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	9	9	3	5	8	4	6	4	5	6	1	2	4	3	2
Hungary	65	78	71	68	52	48	23	9	6	6	1	2	1	6	4	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	1
Latvia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	6	9	7	3	10	6	4	7	2	4	4	2	8	4	4
Lithuania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	6	9	10	2	4	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2
Malta	28	58	49	51	44	38	31	35	9	3	1	5	26	23	9	5	3	4	6	8	13	6	6
Poland	65	78	71	68	52	46	13	6	0	3	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	4	4	3	1
Slovakia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Slovenia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	9	4	6	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bulgaria	65	78	71	68	52	48	23	6	0	3	3	2	5	3	4	7	2	3	1	2	0	0	0
Romania	30	64	67	59	51	46	19	6	3	6	0	5	3	1	4	3	0	0	3	2	0	1	4
Croatia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	9	13	14	5	7	4	7	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
Turkey	3	12	16	10	20	21	17	9	3	3	6	3	10	10	5	3	2	1	3	4	0	0	1
Macedonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	4	6	7	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	6	3	2
Percentage of Votes with EC/EU Majority	97.6	92.7	92.3	93.1	95.4	97.9	96.1	96.6	97.7	96.1	95.7	97.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	98.9	100	100	100

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes.

**Table 9. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”):
Votes on Human Rights Issues Part 1 (“Old” Members)**

(Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002 **	2003	2004	2005	2006
Austria	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	6	4	0	0
Finland	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Sweden	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	4	4	2	0
Spain	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	5	8	2	2	0
Portugal	0	0	4	6	3	4	4	5	6	5	2	0
Greece	14	n/a	4	6	3	4	4	5	8	2	2	0
Ireland	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	2	6	4	0	0
Denmark	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
UK	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0
France	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	3	4	0	0	0
Italy	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	6	5	0	0
Germany, FR	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	4	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
Luxembourg	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes.

Table 10. The Distance of EU States from the EU Majority (“Mainstream”): Votes on Human Rights Issues Part 2 (“New” Members and Candidate Countries) (Maximum Distance from the EU Majority = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002**	2003	2004	2005	2006
Czechosl./Czech R.	5	4	7	6	3	0	0	3	4	0	0	0
Cyprus	9	13	14	22	6	8	8	5	13	2	2	0
Estonia	5	4	4	6	6	4	4	0	2	0	0	0
Hungary	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	0
Latvia	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	3	4	2	0	0
Lithuania	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	2	0	0	0	0
Malta	5	30	18	22	6	4	4	5	8	5	2	0
Poland	5	9	4	6	3	0	0	2	0	4	0	0
Slovakia	9	9	7	6	3	4	8	5	6	5	2	0
Slovenia	5	4	4	6	3	4	4	2	8	4	0	0
Bulgaria	5	9	7	6	3	8	4	3	2	0	2	0
Romania	9	9	11	6	3	4	4	5	8	2	0	0
Croatia	9	17	7	11	16	16	15	3	4	4	0	0
Turkey	9	35	36	28	25	28	27	17	15	13	10	12
Macedonia	14	13	18	22	19	8	12	5	6	5	2	0
Percentage of Votes with EC/EU Majority	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes.

Table 11. The Distance of Selected Third Countries from the EU Consensus: All votes in the UN General Assembly

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	(Maximum Distance from the EU Consensus = 100, Minimum = 0)																						
Australia	9	3	6	6	5	5	4	0	1	4	4	13	5	2	1	1	4	5	3	10	13	15	16
Brazil	42	27	19	33	30	29	26	21	23	24	19	30	22	22	21	26	21	21	13	20	22	23	23
Canada	6	2	4	3	2	4	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	4	3	1	2	4	5	12
China	41	27	14	36	31	34	28	30	33	42	38	47	33	37	34	42	35	34	40	33	37	34	36
Egypt	38	25	12	36	30	34	24	28	24	33	29	38	27	33	31	39	39	36	40	33	39	39	42
India	45	29	19	45	37	38	29	29	28	37	40	53	44	47	44	48	40	44	38	37	44	31	39
Israel	22	38	46	35	31	37	46	45	47	30	28	35	40	40	46	39	50	45	48	44	49	35	36
Japan	14	5	6	6	5	5	3	1	1	1	4	6	5	5	6	4	4	4	5	5	6	7	7
Mexico	39	27	12	38	28	28	27	26	24	24	27	28	22	27	30	34	27	29	17	21	20	21	20
Nigeria	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	26	29	28	29	25	44	31	37	24	31	29	29	27	29	31	24	28
Norway	4	0	5	2	5	3	3	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0
USSR/Russia	70	47	41	56	35	33	23	18	14	13	18	16	14	15	15	24	19	20	25	17	26	23	32
USA	17	35	39	40	43	52	46	39	47	34	31	27	35	31	37	34	45	43	52	52	52	54	56

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes; n/d: no data calculated.

Table 12. The Distance of Selected Third Countries from the EU Consensus: Votes on Middle East Questions
(Maximum Distance from the EU Consensus = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	3	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	19	36	52	49
Brazil	25	11	10	13	8	14	14	13	14	11	9	12	12	10	9	10	11	8	11	14	9	9	8
Canada	8	0	8	4	0	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	5	3	0	2	6	15	32
China	48	11	3	17	21	13	19	21	18	14	15	15	10	12	16	13	14	11	14	17	9	9	8
Egypt	30	11	0	17	17	8	14	19	18	14	15	15	10	14	12	13	14	11	14	14	9	9	8
India	30	15	3	21	21	10	19	21	16	14	12	18	17	21	19	15	20	18	19	24	18	18	16
Israel	45	70	90	74	72	88	81	79	92	86	76	91	93	93	98	97	98	97	97	93	100	100	97
Japan	18	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico	25	19	0	19	15	8	17	17	14	11	12	12	7	10	12	13	14	11	14	12	3	6	3
Nigeria	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	17	19	22	21	18	18	12	17	12	13	14	11	14	14	9	9	11
Norway	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USSR/Russia	63	26	5	32	23	13	19	25	27	21	24	27	5	2	5	5	7	3	8	7	6	6	5
USA	20	44	65	51	53	68	60	58	73	71	73	79	79	79	86	87	86	82	86	83	94	91	89

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes; n/d: no data calculated.

Table 13. The Distance of Selected Third Countries from the EU Consensus: Votes on Security Issues

	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	(Maximum Distance from the EU Consensus = 100, Minimum = 0)																						
Australia	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	24	10	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0
Brazil	29	35	28	32	41	20	27	40	38	42	25	42	24	23	30	26	21	18	11	27	32	24	13
Canada	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	2
China	19	6	22	24	23	16	9	40	31	32	40	48	32	34	38	34	41	31	30	40	26	30	20
Egypt	24	24	22	28	32	24	18	40	31	32	40	46	26	36	39	40	56	39	32	50	42	41	35
India	19	35	56	52	45	36	27	50	54	53	53	64	54	54	54	55	47	49	43	40	63	35	33
Israel	10	6	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	5	13	24	16	16	21	26	18	22	25	17	37	13	15
Japan	0	6	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	8	13	13	13	12	8	7	17	11	7	11
Mexico	19	29	28	32	32	12	18	40	31	42	43	39	28	36	41	38	35	32	23	33	32	30	15
Nigeria	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	18	40	31	37	23	42	28	32	34	30	29	27	18	30	26	26	19
Norway	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USSR/Russia	62	59	67	48	18	12	9	20	0	11	5	15	10	14	15	11	12	14	11	17	21	15	15
USA	14	24	11	28	50	44	45	10	15	21	20	10	12	4	7	6	9	22	23	23	42	35	56

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes; n/d: no data calculated.

Table 14. The Distance of Selected Third Countries from the EU Consensus: Votes on Human Rights Issues

(Maximum Distance from the EU Consensus = 100, Minimum = 0)

	1995	1996 *	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002 **	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	5	2	2	7
Brazil	100	58	75	63	71	56	75	20	22	31	26	43
Canada	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	10	3	0	0	7
China	100	67	75	75	71	56	75	20	51	65	51	81
Egypt	45	57	54	56	50	72	69	69	46	67	55	83
India	86	83	79	83	66	76	73	52	54	61	34	67
Israel	0	25	25	38	29	44	25	80	19	18	9	12
Japan	0	4	4	0	3	0	4	7	3	6	11	7
Mexico	100	67	75	75	71	56	75	20	22	27	15	38
Nigeria	100	76	76	56	34	61	54	44	49	51	26	50
Norway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
USSR/Russia	23	48	43	50	50	60	58	56	35	49	40	79
USA	0	13	11	11	19	12	23	41	35	20	43	26

Notes: * 1996 EU without Greece;

** until 31 December 2002; n/a: absent in more than one third of the votes; n/d: no data calculated.

Annex 2

Table 1. United Nations Human Rights Documents

Name of the Convention	Ratification Status	Ratification Date	Reservations
Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide	Ratified	July 31, 1950	
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Ratified	September 16, 2002	√
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Ratified	September 23, 2003	√
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Ratified	September 23, 2003	√
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Ratified	November 24, 2006	√
Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity	Not signed or ratified		
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	December 20, 1985	√
Amendment to Article 20, Paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	December 9, 1999	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	October 29, 2002	
Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Ratified	August 2, 1988	√
Amendments to Articles 17(7) and 18(5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Not signed or ratified		
Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Ratified	September 14, 2005	

Table 1. United Nations Human Rights Documents -continued

Name of the Convention	Ratification Status	Ratification Date	Reservations
Convention on the Rights of the Child	Ratified	April 4, 1995	√
Amendment to Article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child	Ratified	December 9, 1999	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict	Ratified	May 4, 2004	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography	Ratified	August 19, 2002	√
Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of death penalty	Ratified	March 2, 2006	
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families	Ratified	September 27, 2004	√
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Signed but not ratified		
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Not signed or ratified		
International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance	Not signed or ratified		

*For detailed information about Turkey's reservations on certain conventions please see Annex 3.

Annex 3

Table 1. Turkey's Reservations to United Nations Human Rights Documents

Name of the Convention	Ratification Status	Reservations and/or Declarations
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Ratified	Article 22
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Ratified	Paragraph 3 and 4 of Article 13
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Ratified	Article 27
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Ratified	Paragraph 2(a) of Article 5
Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity	Not signed or ratified	
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	Paragraph 1 of Article 29 and Paragraph 1 of Article 9
Amendment to Article 20, Paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	Ratified	
Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Ratified	Paragraph 1 of Article 30
Amendments to Articles 17(7) and 18(5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Not signed or ratified	
Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	Ratified	
Convention on the Rights of the Child	Ratified	Articles 17, 29 and 30
Amendment to Article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child	Ratified	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict	Ratified	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography	Ratified	
Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of death penalty	Ratified	
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families	Ratified	Articles 15, 40, 45, 46, 76 and 77.
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Signed but not ratified	
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Not signed or ratified	
International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance	Not signed or ratified	

Bibliography

Akyan, Mahmut B. (1993). "Palestinian Question in Turkish Foreign Policy from the 1950s to the 1990s." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 25(1).

Aras, Bülent, and Rabia Karakaya Polat. (2008) "From Conflict to Cooperation: Desecuritization of Turkey's Relations with Syria and Iran." *Security Dialogue*, 39.

Aras, Bülent and Salih Bıçakçı. (2006). "Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonisation Possible?." *East European Quarterly*, XL(3).

Arat, Zehra, and Thomas Smith. (2007) "EU and Human Rights in Turkey: Political Freedom without Social Welfare." *Presented at the 48th Annual Conference of the International Studies Association*, February 28-March 4.

European Union, European Commission. *Issues Arising from Turkey's Membership Perspective*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2004) 656 final.

European Union. European Council. *Conclusions of the Presidency*. European Council Summit in Copenhagen. 21- 22 June, 1993.

European Union. European Council. *Conclusions of the Presidency*. European Council Meeting. 17 December 2004.

European Union. European Commission. *Turkey 2006 Progress Report*. Commission Staff Working Document, COM(2006) 649 final.

European Union. *The EU Annual Report on Human Rights*, 2007.

European Union. European Council. *Declaration of the European Council on the Middle East in Venice*, 13 June 1980. Available from <http://www.medeas.be/index.html?page=2&lang=en&doc=52>.

Featherstone, Kevin. (1998) "Europeanization and the Centre Periphery: The Case of Greece in the 1990s." *Southeastern Society and Politics*, 3(1).

Ginsberg, Roy. (2001). *The European Union in World Politics*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.

Grant, Charles. (2005) "Turkey offers EU more punch." *European Voice*.

Hill, Christopher. (2004). "Renationalizing or Regrouping? EU Foreign Policy since 11 September 2001." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(1).

Hix, Simon, and Klaus H. Goetz. (2001). "European Integration and National Political Systems." In *Europeanized Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

- Human Rights Watch World Report. (2007).
- International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF). (2006). "Turkey: Minority Policy of Systematic Negation."
- Johansson-Nogués, Elisabeth. (2004). "The Fifteen and the Accession States in the UN General Assembly: What Future for European Foreign Policy in the Coming Together of the "Old" and the "New" Europe?" *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 9.
- Ladrech, Robert. (2001). "Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis." *Keele European Parties Research Unit, Working Paper*, 7.
- Larrabee, Stephen. F. (2007). "Turkey Rediscovered the Middle East." *Foreign Affairs*, 86(4).
- Luif, Paul.(2003). *EU cohesion in the UN General Assembly*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies. Available from <http://www.iss-eu.org/occasion/occ49.pdf>.
- Luif, Paul, and Mariyana Radeva. (2007) "EU Coordination in International Organisations: The case of the United Nations General Assembly and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe". In *European Foreign Policy in an Evolving International System: The Road Towards Convergence*, edited by Nicola Casarini and Costanza Musu. London–New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Özcan, Gencer. (2004). "Turkey's Changing Neighbourhood Policy." *FES Briefing Paper*.
- Sayarı, Sabri. (1997). "Turkey and the Middle East in the 1990s." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 26(3).
- Sedelmeier, Ulrich. (2006) "Europeanization in the New Member and Candidate Countries." *Living Reviews in European Governance*, 1(3): <http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2006-3>.
- Smith, Karen. (2003). "Understanding the European Foreign Policy System." *Contemporary European History*, 12(2).
- Smith, Karen. (2003). "The European Union: A Distinctive Actor in International Relations." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 9(2).
- Smith, Michael. (2000). "Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Cooperation." *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7(4).
- Tatlı, Erdal. (2008) "Turkey turns cold to European defense: Implications for Western security." *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, Policy Watch 1376.
- Taylor, Phillip. (1979) *When Europe speaks with one voice: the external relations of the European Community*. London: Aldwych Press.
- Tocci, Nathalie, and Michael Emerson. (2004) "Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead: Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy." *CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers*, 1.
- United Nations. Department of Public Information. *Yearbook of UN 1974*. New York: 1974.
- United Nations. Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations. *Turkey's Priorities for the 60th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*, September 2005. Available from <http://www.un.int/turkey/page31.html>.

Vaquer i Fanés, Jordi. (2001). "Europeanisation and Foreign Policy." *Observatori de Política Exterior Europea*. European Studies University Institute of the Autonomous University of Barcelona.

White, Brian. (2001). *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. Houndmills: Palgrave.

White, Brian. (2003). "Foreign Policy Analysis and European Foreign Policy. *FORNET Working Group: Theories and Approaches to the CFSP*. London School of Economics.

Winrow, Gareth. "Turkey's Changing Role and Its Implications." Paper presented at the *Europeanization and Transformation: Turkey in the Post-Helsinki Era* conference, December 2005.

Author Biographies

PAUL LUIF

Paul Luif has a doctorate in “law” and is “Dozent” in political science. Between 1974-1980, he served as an assistant professor of international relations at Salzburg University and since 1980 he is a member of the scientific staff of the Austrian Institute for International Affairs (OIIP) in Vienna. He is also a lecturer at the University of Vienna. His main topics of research are the European Union (in particular the Common Foreign and Security Policy as well as Justice and Home Affairs) and the foreign policies of small states. His publications include, *On the Road to Brussels: The Political Dimension of Austria’s, Finland’s and Sweden’s Accession to the European Union*, Vienna: Braumüller, 1995, *EU cohesion in the UN General Assembly*, Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies, December 2003 and Paul Luif (ed.), *Österreich, Schweden, Finnland. Zehn Jahre Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union*, Wien - Köln - Weimar: Böhlau, 2007.

SABIHA SENYÜCEL GÜNDOĞAR

Sabiha Senyücel Gündoğar received her bachelor’s degree in International Relations and master’s degree in European Studies from Istanbul Bilgi University. She obtained her second master’s degree on European Public Administration from Leiden University, the Netherlands. She joined TESEV - Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation - in 2002 and since 2004 she has been working as a program officer for the Foreign Policy Program responsible from managing and implementing projects. She is currently a PhD candidate in Political Science at İstanbul Bilgi University and an associate researcher at the Global Political Trends Center of Istanbul Kultur University. Her main research and expertise focus covers Turkey-EU relations and EU policies.

CEREN ZEYNEP AK

Ceren Zeynep Ak obtained her bachelor’s degree in 2005 from the department of Philosophy at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul and her Master’s degree from the State University of New York at Binghamton at the department of political science. She joined TESEV Foreign Policy Program in 2007 as a project assistant. She is currently a project officer at the Foreign Policy Program. She is also a junior research fellow at the Global Political Trends Center (GPoT) within Istanbul Kultur University. Ceren Ak is currently writing as a columnist for the *Azınlıkça* journal published in Greece. Her main research areas cover Turkey-EU relations and human rights.

ISBN 978-605-5832-09-4

