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What has been the most important dynamic behind the European Council decisions pertaining to Turkey’s accession to the EU? To answer this question, the present book elucidates the key determinants of 1989, 1997, 1999 and 2004 European Council decisions related to Turkey’s membership in the EU. Drawing on two major theoretical approaches towards enlargement, namely, rationalism and constructivism, the book focuses on two key dynamics particularly useful for the explanation of EU enlargement: interests and norms. In terms of rationalist approaches, a differentiation is made between realism and neoliberalism, which emphasizes the key role of security interests and economic interests, respectively. As far as the constructivist school is concerned, the book concentrates on moral norms and ethical norms.

The elucidation of dynamics behind European Council decisions related to Turkey requires a two-level analysis that focuses on both EU enlargement politics and Member States’ enlargement politics. At the Member States level, in-depth analysis is made of the formation and impact of British, French, German and Greek enlargement politics vis-à-vis Turkey. The main finding of the present book is that whereas both interests and norms affected the construction of the European Council decisions related to Turkey’s membership in the EU, the security interests of the EU and its Member States acted as the key determinant of these decisions and, thus, trumped both economic interests as well as moral and ethical norms.
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1. Introduction

1.1. The Analytical Puzzle

It all started with two signatures in 1963. In September of that year, Turkey and the European Economic Community (EEC) signed the Agreement Establishing an Association between the EEC and Turkey (also known as the “Ankara Agreement”), which foresaw the founding of a Customs Union (CU) between Turkey and the Community in order to “to promote the continuous and balanced strengthening of trade and economic relations between the Parties”\(^1\) as well as the examination of the possibility of Turkish accession to the Community as soon as “the operation of this Agreement has advanced far enough to justify envisaging full acceptance by Turkey of the obligations arising out of the Treaty establishing the Community”.\(^2\) In fact, following the signing of an association agreement between Greece and the Community in 1961, Turkey became the second country to sign an association agreement with the EEC, which is normally regarded as a “prelude to membership”.\(^3\) However, in the 1970s and 1980s, several factors such as the 1971 and 1980 military coups in Turkey, the unilateral suspension of the terms of the Ankara Agreement by the Turkish government in 1978 due to Turkey’s incapability to implement tariff reductions and to fulfill other obligations stemming from the supplementary protocol of the Association Agreement as well as major government limitations on human rights and democracy in Turkey culminated in turbulent relations between Turkey and the EEC. Following limited progress in achieving economic and democratic stability, Turkey applied for full membership in the Community in April 1987. After a long evaluation process, the European Commission (EC) recommended in December 1989 in its Opinion on Turkey’s request for accession to the Community the intensification of political and economic links between Turkey and the Community within the framework of the existing Association Agreement, rather than the opening of accession negotiations with this country, which brought along the enforcement of the CU between the two parties in 1996. Given that the realization of the CU was regarded by the Turkish political elites and in particular, by the

---

2. Ibid., General and Final Provisions, Article 28
former Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller, as the first step towards full membership in the European Union (EU), the Turkish authorities were truly shocked when the European Council opposed the candidacy of Turkey for EU membership and excluded Turkey from the next enlargement process in 1997, in line with the recommendation of the Commission. After only two years, the European Council surprised yet again, in particular, academic circles, when it officially declared Turkey’s candidacy in 1999 at the Helsinki European Council gathering by stating that “Turkey is destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States.” Turkey-EEC relations reached their peak in December 2004 when the European Council decided to open the accession negotiations with the country in October 2005.

Although the December 2004 decision to open the accession negotiations with Turkey acted as a major catalyst for Turkish enthusiasm to become an EU member and although some regarded it as an “irreversible” confirmation of Turkey’s future EU membership, EU-Turkey relations continued to lack a certain balance following the start of accession negotiations. In December 2006, the European Council decided to suspend accession talks on eight of the thirty-five negotiation chapters as a result of ongoing disputes over the Cyprus question. Although the EU resumed accession talks with Turkey in March 2007, Turkey’s EU bid entered a complicated phase marked by a clear slowdown in Turkish reform momentum, growing public debate over Turkey’s eligibility for membership as well as a gradual decrease in the pace of accession negotiations. Looking at the history and present of Turkey-EU relations, it becomes clear that the dialogue between two parties has always been marked by ebbs and flows. Nathalie Tocci and Luigi Narbone, close observers of Turkey-EU relations, point to “cyclical


5 For example, only a few months prior to the Helsinki Summit, Barry Buzan and Thomas Diez, two of the leading analysts of international relations theory and European integration, stated in an article that there had been an urgent need to reassess Turkey-EU relations in order to develop alternative scenarios related to the future relationship of the parties, since Turkey was not going to become a full member in the foreseeable future. Barry Buzan and Thomas Diez (1999), “The European Union and Turkey”, *Survival*, Vol. 41, No. 1, p. 42

6 European Council (1999a), *Presidency Conclusions Helsinki European Council*, 10 and 11 December 1999, Helsinki

7 Tevfik F. Nas (2008), *Tracing the Economic Transformation of Turkey from the 1920s to EU Accession*, (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers), p. 139
trends"\textsuperscript{8} in Turkey-EU relations, as “while generally moving toward greater levels of integration, relations have been often marred by moments of tension and crisis”\textsuperscript{9}. Since its establishment, the Union successfully completed five enlargement rounds, culminating in the EU-27. Although each enlargement round and application for full membership had its particularities, Turkey’s EU bid presents a unique case, which greatly differs from previous EU enlargements. Various political as well as academic circles in Europe refer to Turkey as an “awkward”\textsuperscript{10} and “extraordinary”\textsuperscript{11} EU candidate. Several facts indicate Turkey’s unusual EU candidacy. First, although Turkey has been waiting longest for the accession to the EU and although it was granted formal candidacy status in 1999 by the European Council, uncertainty remains about whether it will ever join the Union as a full member. As Tocci states,

surprisingly perhaps, although the political decision to grant Turkey candidacy was taken in 1999, the research interest that followed largely focused on whether Turkey should join the European Union, rather than on how Turkey’s accession could take place.\textsuperscript{12}

The vagueness in Turkey-EU relations was also transformed to the Negotiating Framework of October 2005, which sets out the guiding principles of accession negotiations with Turkey. For the first time in the history of the Union, the framework stated that “…negotiations are an open-ended process, the outcome of which cannot be guaranteed beforehand”\textsuperscript{13}, while indicating the possibility of “long transitional periods, derogations, specific arrangements or permanent safeguard clauses”\textsuperscript{14} in order to protect the interests of the Union. Second, no other candidate has so much attracted the attention of the wider public culminating in hot debates over Turkey’s eligibility for membership. European public has mostly been unenthusiastic about possible Turkish membership in the EU. In fact, according to the 2011 Transatlantic Trends survey of the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) and Compagnia di San Paolo, only 22 percent of Euro-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Luigi Narbone and Nathalie Tocci (2007), “Running around in circles? The cyclical relationship between Turkey and the European Union”, \textit{Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans}, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 238
\item \textsuperscript{9} Ibid., p. 233
\item \textsuperscript{10} Harun Arikan (2006), \textit{Turkey and the EU: an awkward candidate for membership?}, (Hants: Ashgate), p. 1
\item \textsuperscript{13} European Council (2005), \textit{Enlargement: Accession negotiations with Turkey: General EU Position}, Annex II- Negotiating Framework, p. 5
\item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 11
\end{itemize}
ean citizens think that Turkey’s accession to the EU would be a good thing.\textsuperscript{15} Third, Turkey has been the only candidate country with an overwhelmingly Muslim population and neighbors located in diverse geographic areas.

Ebbs and flows dominate the dialogue between Turkey and the EU. Whereas Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC) had a consistent and gradually developing relationship with the Union, which started with the signing of the so-called Europe Agreements (also known as association agreements) between the EU and the CEEC and ended with the accession of the CEEC to the EU, without experiencing any major difficulties, Turkey’s EU accession process has so far been based on a vicious cycle of rejections and revisions. What are the real dynamics behind EU-Turkish ties, as far as the supply side, i.e. the EU, is concerned? Are successive European Council decisions on Turkish membership in the Union affected and shaped by similar dynamics? Does the EU implement a consistent or rather seasonal policy towards the assessment of Turkish membership? Are both positive and negative decisions taken by the European Council influenced by the same motives? In order to answer the above-mentioned questions, this study seeks to elucidate the key determinants of the most important decisions of the European Council related to Turkey’s membership in the Union. In this respect, the study focuses on the following decisions of the European Council: the European Council’s endorsement of the December 1989 Commission Opinion on Turkey’s Request for Accession to the Community, which recommended the assessment of Turkey’s accession to the European Community at a later stage; the 1997 European Council decision not to grant formal candidacy to Turkey; the 1999 European Council decision to approve Turkey’s candidacy status as well as the European Council’s 2004 approval of the opening of accession negotiations with Turkey. These four decisions taken by the European Council have greatly shaped the course and content of EU-Turkey relations. This study makes recourse to a combination of qualitative methods to test hypotheses derived from two major theoretical approaches towards enlargement, namely, rationalism and constructivism. It must be stated that in recent years, debates in the fields of international relations have predominantly focused on comparisons between rationalism and constructivism as well as on the contributions of these two theoretical approaches to the study of EU enlargement.\textsuperscript{16} These two schools

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
of thought suggest two sets of factors particularly useful for the explanation of
EU enlargement, namely interests and norms. Whereas rationalism trusts in the
explanatory power of interests in order to elucidate EU’s appetite / apathy for
new members, the constructivist school of thought focuses on the implications of
the Union’s common norms for the assessment of membership applications. In
terms of rationalist theories, this study makes a differentiation between realist
and neoliberalist approaches towards European integration, which highlight the
importance of “security interests” and “economic interests”, respectively, for the
elucidation of EU enlargement. On the other hand, constructivist school predom-
inantly concentrates on two sets of norms, namely, “moral norms” that refer to
collective principles of democracy, rule of law, justice or human rights and “eth-
ical norms”, which address subjective perceptions of what is commonly ap-
proved based on collective identities as well as on cultural, social and historical
context. In order to elucidate the dynamics behind European Council decisions
related to Turkey’s accession to the Union, this study seeks to find out which hy-
potheses/hypothesis derived from the two major theoretical approaches towards
EU enlargement offer/s the best explanation for the leading European Council
decisions concerning Turkish membership in the EU. In this respect, the paper
examines the relative importance of various interest-based and norm-oriented
factors for preference formation within the European Council with regard to
Turkey’s accession to the EU and seeks to identify the “one factor” that acts as a
key determinant of European Council’s attitude towards Turkish membership in
the Union. The main finding of this study is that whereas both interests and
norms affected the European Council decisions related to Turkey’s full mem-
bership in the EU, the security interests of the Union and its Members acted as the
key determinant of these European Council decisions and thus, trumped both
economic interests and various norms such as Turkey’s adherence to liberal
democratic principles and human rights as well as Turkey’s identification with
the European civilization.

and Stephen Krasner (1998), “International Organization and the Study of World Poli-
tics”, International Organization, Vol. 52, No. 4, p. 678
1.1. Research Questions and Research Design

The study deals with the following key question: what has/have been the most important dynamic(s) behind the European Council decisions related to Turkey’s membership in the EU? By regarding the European Council decisions, which evaluate Turkish accession to the EU, as the dependent variable, this paper seeks to shed some light on motives behind the enlargement politics, as far as Turkish accession to the Union is concerned. Enlargement is regarded as “the most powerful foreign policy tool”\(^17\) of the Union. Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier define the process of enlargement as the “gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization of organizational rules and norms”.\(^18\) Horizontal institutionalization refers to the expansion of EU institutions founded on common norms and rules to actors other than the incumbents. The transfer of EU’s regulations, structures and principles to new members contributes greatly to the worldwide perception of the EU as an architect of pan-European harmonization, and thus, to the enhancement of EU’s actorness in the international arena. The conception of enlargement as a process of horizontal institutionalization has two important implications for the study of EU enlargement. First, this gradual process encloses various stages of formal and purposive actions including the very first establishment of association agreements with the third country, the Non-Member State’s formal application for full membership, the approval of candidacy and the signing of accession treaties or the withdrawal from membership.\(^19\) Hence, EU enlargement is a process that begins prior to the accession of the new Member State to the Union and continues after the approval of its membership with bilateral negotiations on transitional measures that facilitate the step-by-step adoption of community norms and regulations by the new Member State and sometimes, with bargaining over the inclusion of various clauses by the Union that are permanently available as a basis for safeguard measures for the proper functioning of the EU’s internal market. Second, the perception of enlargement as a process of horizontal institutionalization gives rise to the possibility of including third countries or candidate Member States of the EU in the mechanism of institution-building without granting full membership.\(^20\)

\(^{17}\) Olli Rehn (2008), *What’s the future for EU enlargement? AmCham EU Plenary meeting Luncheon keynote speech*, 22 January 2008
\(^{18}\) Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, op.cit., p. 503
The elucidation of key dynamics affecting the European Council decisions related to Turkey’s accession to the EU becomes of utmost importance in light of the portrayal of the EU enlargement as a process of gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization. As the supreme political body of the Union, the European Council provides the Union with “the necessary impetus for its development” and defines its “general political directions and priorities”. In this respect, the European Council functions as a strategic body that creates a vision for the future of the Union and sets goals compliant with this strategic vision. The leading functions of the European Council include the initiation of extremely sensitive policies such as Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), European Monetary System as well as Justice and Home Affairs (JHA), resolution of potential disputes and disagreements between Member States, decision-making on complex and controversial issues, development of key strategies for the future of the Union, exercising its responsibilities in the international arena as well as acting as the ultimate decision-maker in the sphere of enlargement. The summits of the European Council are the crux of decision-making on key issues such as enlargement of the EU, institutional development, important personnel decisions, economic and monetary policies, external relations and constitutionalization of European integration. All key decisions related to the enlargement of the EU including the identification of the criteria for full membership in the Union, the approval of the candidacy, the opening of new accession negotiations as well as the granting of full membership are taken at the summits of the European Council. The European Council took four significant decisions on Turkey’s EU membership bid in 1989, 1997, 1999 and 2004. Each decision gave a new direction to Turkey’s EU perspective and, consequently, shaped the course of EU-Turkish dialogue.

22 Ibid.
24 Actually the European Council took its decision related to Turkish membership in February 1990. However, as the European Council fully endorsed the December 1989 Commission Opinion on Turkey’s Request for Accession to the Community and as the other European Council decisions under examination were all taken in December, the year 1989 is recognized as the reference year for the 1990 European Council decision.
impact on the formation of these four European Council decisions related to Turkey’s accession to the Union. Even though many dynamics have been influential in the realization of previous enlargements in accordance with the decisions of the European Council, there has always been one factor, which has been crucial for each accession process and thus, each European Council decision related to this accession. For instance, as far as the Eastern enlargement of the Union is concerned, particular emphasis is put in academic circles on the primary impact of identity-related factors such as common history, culture, religion, reunification of Europe as well as the existence of so-called “we-feeling”, i.e. a feeling of closeness towards the CEEC, on the European Council decisions related to the membership of the CEEC in the EU. In order to determine the leading factor/s that had the most important impact on the European Council decisions with regard to Turkish accession to the EU, the study seeks to elucidate the “relative importance” of each factor for the formation of European Council decisions with the use of comparative analysis supported by within-case analysis. Thus, the study seeks to identify, first, unique patterns of each case, i.e. each European Council decision, and then, to make comparisons across cases, looking for similarities and differences, which may count for similar and different outcomes. In this respect, the study seeks to answer the following additional questions: *Which factors were relevant to each outcome, i.e. to each a priori selected European Council decision on Turkey’s EU accession process? If the Turkish accession is regarded as a gradual institutionalization process consisting of several key European Council decisions either on the enhancement or the suspension of this gradual institutionalization, which factor was indispensable for positive European Council decisions in this gradual process?*

The literature on EU enlargement mainly focuses on the following three aspects of enlargement: applicants’ enlargement politics, Member States’ enlargement politics and EU enlargement politics. The elucidation of the dynamics behind European Council decisions related to Turkey’s accession to the Union requires a two-level analysis that focuses on both EU enlargement politics as well as Member States’ politics. EU enlargement politics is related to the particulari-


26 Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, op.cit., p. 504
ties of the Union’s political order, i.e. its polity, that shape the organization’s preferences over the admission of further states to the Union. Helene Sjursen, for instance, differentiates between three possible political orders, as far as the EU is concerned: a problem-solving entity, a value-based community or a rights-based post-national Union. In a similar vein, Antonia M. Ruiz-Jimenez and Jose I. Torreblanca make a distinction between utilitarian, ethical and moral models of the Union. These perceptions of EU polity put emphasis on interests, ethical norms stemming from identities as well as from cultural, social and historical contexts and moral norms such as collective principles of democracy, rule of law, justice or human rights, respectively. The European Council decisions published in the form of “Conclusions of the Presidency” formally represent the strategic guidelines of the EU as a political entity, which are consequently transformed into legally binding instruments by other institutions of the Union. In this respect, they are a product of the EU qua polity. Thus, a thorough analysis of the gradual changes in EU enlargement politics as a result of the reshaping of EU qua polity by selected factors contributes to the elucidation of the conditions under which the European Council sent a positive or negative message to Turkey about its membership bid.

Next to the relation of EU enlargement politics to the formation of European Council decisions, this study furthermore makes recourse to an analysis at Member States level, since academic circles commonly emphasize the increased strength of national governments in EU’s decision-making processes with the establishment of the European Council. At the summits of the European Council, decisions are taken by the political leaders of the Member States in a unanimous fashion. Accordingly, the decision making process of the European Council obtains an intergovernmental character. Moreover, some of the leading theoretical approaches to International Relations (IR) put emphasis on the role of EU’s core countries as well as some small countries with significant veto power in the formation of European Council decisions. In this respect, the realization of an analysis at Member States level next to EU level becomes a necessity.

Thus, this study seeks to additionally answer whether some Member States of the Union had a particular impact on the content and the course of the European Council decisions related to Turkish membership in the EU, and whether the attitudes of these Member States towards Turkey’s accession to the EU were influenced by specific factors. The two-level analysis stated above seeks to explicate the key factors for the formation of Member States’ politics and EU politics with regard to Turkey’s accession to the EU, which subsequently culminate in successive European Council decisions related to this topic. As stated in the previous part of this chapter, the paper makes recourse to two major theoretical approaches towards enlargement, namely, rationalism and constructivism, in order to identify the explanatory variables that determine the course of EU enlargement. In this respect, the coming chapters of this study compare the explanatory power of interests with the elucidatory capability of norms in justifying positive and negative EU Council decisions on Turkey. After analyzing the key assumptions and concepts of rationalism and constructivism in depth, explanatory variables shaping the EU enlargement, namely security interests, economic interests, moral norms as well as ethical norms are identified and interest-oriented and norm-based hypotheses on EU enlargement are presented.

1.2. Current Explanations

In recent years, the academic circles started to pay more attention to the elucidation of the dynamics behind EU’s decisions to welcome new Member States. The analyses mainly focus on the theoretical explanations of EU enlargement and, consequently, link the study of EU enlargement to the current international relations debate between rationalism and constructivism. In this respect, various studies seek to compare as well as combine the explanations founded on interest-oriented calculations with those based on common norms. The renowned study of Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier entitled “Theorizing EU enlargement: research focus, hypotheses, and the state of research” provides any scholar striving for the elucidation of the “usefulness” of rationalist and constructivist approaches in explaining EU enlargement with a good overview of some core hypotheses derived from these two theoretical schools. In their study, Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier indicate the “usefulness” of these theoretical approaches in elucidating the dynamics behind EU enlargement by giving an overview of the current state of research on EU enlargement. However, this resume entirely focuses on analyses pertaining to EU’s Eastern enlargement, which

32 Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, op.cit.
should not be surprising given that only few studies have been conducted with a focus on factors affecting enlargement rounds and membership bids other than EU’s enlargement to the East. The work on Eastern enlargement has largely focused on the macro dimension of EU enlargement politics by seeking to examine whether at the aggregate EU level the decision to approve the membership of the CEEC was taken in light of Community interests or norm-oriented dynamics. Whilst studies on dynamics behind the accession of the CEEC to the Union mainly point to the leading impact of norms on EU’s decision to enlarge, there are some differences concerning what kind of norms played a key role in EU enlargement process, and how these norms affected EU politics.\textsuperscript{33}

Lykke Friis, for instance, places emphasis on intergovernmental negotiations - a notion usually applied by liberal intergovernmentalist approaches.\textsuperscript{34} While liberal intergovernmentalists state that the outcome of intergovernmental negotiations pertaining to EU enlargement is formed by actors’ pre-fixed preferences and their relative bargaining power, Friis emphasizes in her study the presence of actors with un-fixed preferences that can be influenced by other actors through agenda-setting / framing based on normative arguments.\textsuperscript{35} Friis mainly focuses on the way the norms influence the negotiation outcomes, rather than the nature of these norms, which are scrutinized in the works of Ulrich Sedelmeier.\textsuperscript{36} According to Sedelmeier, EU’s discursively constructed collective identity towards the CEEC includes the notion of EU’s “special responsibility” towards these countries, which acts as a catalyst for EU’s enlargement to the East.\textsuperscript{37} While scholars usually regard identity-related norms as an independent variable affecting the policy outcomes of the Union\textsuperscript{38}, Sedelmeier treats the EU’s Eastern enlargement not only as a dependent variable, but also as an explanatory variable that contributes to the reconstruction of a European identity and common foreign policy.\textsuperscript{39} Most studies on Eastern enlargement base their arguments on construc-
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tivist frameworks. However, Frank Schimmelfennig combines a rationalist theory of action with a constructivist assumption on the social environment by introducing the notion of “rhetorical action”, which points to the strategic use of norm-based arguments.\textsuperscript{40} In recent years, a considerable number of scholars draw their work on three alternative concepts of EU defined as ideal types by Helene Sjursen. By making use of rationalist and constructivist approaches to EU enlargement as well as Habermasian differentiation between moral and ethical norms, Sjursen develops three different concepts of EU polity, which are: (1) a problem-solving entity, (2) a value-based community and (3) a rights-based post national union.\textsuperscript{41} Many researchers examine the empirical compatibility of these three ideal concepts of EU qua polity with the study of EU enlargement.\textsuperscript{42} However, these works solely focus on the accession of the CEEC to the Union and, consequently, seek to determine the particularities of EU qua polity and the dynamics behind EU’s decision to integrate third countries into its horizontal institutionalization on the basis of a single case.

Although hardly any topic in the EU context has attracted so much attention like Turkey’s accession to the EU, few studies have been conducted with a focus on dynamics behind EU decisions pertaining to Turkey’s full membership in the Union. In his comprehensive work on Turkey-EU relations, which seeks to adopt an alternative approach to Turkey-EU relations, Harun Arikan conceptualizes EU’s enlargement policy by identifying the key objectives of EU’s decision to enlarge.\textsuperscript{43} Arikan makes a differentiation between four core goals of EU’s enlargement policy – i.e. the enhancement of democracy in the European periphery, the safeguarding of European security and stability, expansion of European single market as well the reunification of Europe. However, the author does not seek to elucidate the relative importance of each factor for various EU decisions to enlarge since “it is difficult to rank the importance of these stated objectives of the EU’s enlargement policy.”\textsuperscript{44} This study faces up exactly to this big challenge and seeks to elucidate the key dynamics behind European Council decisions with regard to Turkey’s accession to the EU by examining the relative importance of each dynamic for the formation of selected European Council decisions. Arikan
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concludes his study by stating that “the EU has treated Turkey differently compared to the other applicant countries in the present enlargement round”. In-

deed, some studies point to the fact that Turkey has been treated differently by the EU compared to other states striving for EU membership by for instance indi-

cating that Turkey has been excluded from various EU-sponsored cooperative programs and pan-European initiatives that had been made available to the CEEC as part of the pre-accession strategies. However, these works do not aim at elucidating the dynamics behind this foreign policy approach of the Union that differentiates between Turkey and other applicants for full membership. There are some studies with a focus on factors affecting EU’s decisions pertaining to Turkey’s accession to the EU. For instance, the starting point of Meltem Müftüler-Bac and Lauren M. McLaren is the noticeable change in EU’s policy towards Turkey between 1997 and 1999 although the Turkish government did not make any significant progress in democratizing the country during this period. The authors analyze this change of EU policy by concentrating on the preferences of Member States and the shift in EU’s enlargement policy from simultaneous negotiations with groups of Member States to separate negotiations on a case-by-case basis in light of the principle of differentiation. Whilst Müftüler-Bac and McLaren examine the effect of the change in particular Member States’ preferences with regard to Turkish candidacy on 1999 European Council decision to grant Turkey candidacy, they do not exhaustively scrutinize the dynamics behind this change. However, Müftüler-Bac points in a different study to EU’s evolving role in the protection of European security with the initiation of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and Turkey’s potential contribution to this establishment as a Community member as key factors that affected the outcome of 1999 European Council gathering. While Müftüler-Bac mainly emphasizes the significance of interest-related factors for the formation of the EU policy towards Turkey, some other scholars point to the implications of norm-oriented dynamics for Turkey-EU relations. Making use of comparative analysis of EU’s financial support and moral support for Turkey and the CEEC, Asa Lundgren finds out that “the financial and moral support given to the CEECs to help them prepare for membership has been more or less absent in the case of

45 Ibid., p. 241
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Turkey," particularly due to the EU’s perception of Turkey’s identity as less European than the Eastern neighbors. Whereas these studies make a novel attempt to solve the puzzle about the key dynamics behind EU politics with regard to Turkey’s full membership, they only partly succeeded in finding a solution to the puzzle of enlargement due to mainly concentrating on one explanatory variable. This study attempts to fill an important gap in academic knowledge of key dynamics behind EU decisions pertaining to third states’ accession to the Union by making a systematic analysis about the relative importance of selected factors for various European Council decisions with regard to Turkey’s accession to the EU and by seeking to find the “one” factor acting as a key determinant of EU politics towards Turkish membership in the Union.

Alongside an analysis realized at aggregate EU level, this study seeks to scrutinize the impact of selected Member States on the course and content of European Council decisions pertaining to Turkey’s integration to the EU, since a systematic study of various factors affecting the EU’s decision to enlarge to the Turkish terrain would be incomplete without the examination of Member States’ politics towards Turkey. The identification of interests and norms as core dynamics affecting EU decisions to enlarge in light of the two major theoretical approaches towards enlargement, namely, rationalism and constructivism, leads to the question, “whose interests and norms?” Whereas various studies scrutinize the nature of Member States’ preferences on Turkey’s EU accession process, these works concentrate either on a single case, i.e. Member State, or on only one explanatory variable affecting selected Member States’ preferences with regard to Turkish membership in the EU. Furthermore, these works do not offer a


comprehensive explanation of how key Member States’ preferences significantly contributed to the formation of European Council decisions. This study aims at filling these academic gaps by directing its attention at the unanswered questions as regards the relative importance of selected explanatory variables for the construction of Member States’ preferences with regard to Turkey’s accession to the Union and the impact of key Member States’ attitude towards Turkey on European Council decisions.

1.3. The Roadmap of the Study

Following this introductory chapter of the study chapter two focuses on the construction of a theoretical framework applicable to the study of EU enlargement. In this respect, the core arguments of the two major theoretical approaches towards enlargement, i.e. rationalism and constructivism, are comprehensively elucidated. In terms of rationalist approaches, a differentiation is made between realism and neoliberalism, which emphasizes the key role of “security” interests and “economic” interests in the construction of actors’ preferences, respectively. In a similar vein, as far as the constructivist school is concerned, the paper concentrates on two sets of “norms” that are at the crux of this approach, namely “moral” norms and “ethical” norms. The study then outlines the rationalist and constructivist interpretations of EU enlargement, identifies the explanatory variables that determine EU decisions pertaining to enlargement, and derives core hypotheses from these theoretical approaches to be tested in the coming chapters. The chapter then presents the methodological approaches to be applied for the examination of the empirical applicability of selected hypotheses to the study of European Council decisions pertaining to Turkey’s EU accession process.

As the design of this study resembles the design of a longitudinal comparative small-N analysis supported by within-case studies, the third, fourth and fifth chapters have the same structure. Each chapter seeks to elucidate the “relative” importance of selected explanatory variables, i.e. “security” interests, “economic” interests, “moral” norms and “ethical” norms for the construction of enlargement politics at two levels – aggregate EU level and Member States level, leading to the formation of a priori selected European Council decisions. This structure is applied to four different cases representing European Council decisions pertinent to Turkey’s EU accession process.
sions related to Turkey: the rejection of Turkey’s request of 1987 for accession to the Community in 1989 (Chapter 3), the refusal of Turkish candidacy in 1997 (Chapter 4), the granting of candidate status in 1999 (Chapter 4) as well as the 2004 (Chapter 5) approval to open the accession negotiations with Turkey in October 2005. As far as the 1997 and 1999 European Council decisions are concerned, this study examines these two sub-cases within the same chapter, in order to enhance the visibility of the differences related to one independent variable. At the EU level, attention is directed at aggregate systemic situation as well as changes in the internal dynamics of the Union and Turkey. At the Member States level, the study analyzes firstly the impact of selected Member States on the course and content of European Council decisions. Germany, United Kingdom (UK), France and Greece are selected as Member States to be examined. The study then examines the question whether interest-based factors or norm-related dynamics shape selected Member States’ preferences pertaining to Turkey’s accession to the Union through the implementation of a qualitative content analysis founded on the analysis of governmental framings.

The final chapter (Chapter 6) summarizes and discusses the findings of the previous chapters in light of the hypotheses derived from the two theoretical approaches to the study of EU enlargement. Significant emphasis is placed here not only on a case-by-case analysis, but also on a final comparative analysis between the findings of separate cases, in order to derive further results. The study then provides suggestions for future research in light of both answered and unanswered questions in this study and the current situation in world affairs.