

**TURKISH-GREEK RELATIONS WITHIN THE  
EUROPEAN UNION FRAMEWORK**

**ÖZLEM KILIÇ**

**Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts**

**Sabancı University  
February 2009**

**Her zaman yanımda olan,  
Bana güven ve desteklerini hissettiren;  
Babam Reşat Kılıç  
Annem Cevdan Kılıç  
Ve biricik kardeşlerim  
Meltem ve Kerem Kılıç'a sevgilerimle...**

**“TURKISH-GREEK RELATIONS WITHIN THE EUROPEAN  
UNION FRAMEWORK”**

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Üstün Ergüder .....  
(Thesis Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Evin .....

Assoc. Prof. Bahri Yılmaz .....

DATE OF APPROVAL:

© Özlem Kılıç 2009  
All rights Reserved

**ABSTRACT**  
**TURKISH-GREEK RELATIONS WITHIN**  
**THE EUROPEAN UNION FRAMEWORK**

KILIÇ ÖZLEM

M.A, in European Studies Program, Thesis

Supervisor: Prof. Üstün Ergüder

February 2009

**Keywords:** Greece-Turkey relations, Turco-Greek Disputes, Cyprus issue, Aegean disputes, European Union (EU), EU-Greece relations, EU-Turkey relations

Turko-Greek relations have been strained by a number of conflicting issues such as Cyprus, Continental Shelf, Territorial Waters, the Öcalan affair, and the S-300 Missiles crisis on Cyprus. Until the December 1999 Helsinki Summit, Greece was one of the strong opponents of Turkey's membership in the European Union (EU). However, at the Helsinki Summit of 1999, Greece dropped her negative position permitting Turkey to be declared by the EU as a candidate country. This shift in foreign policy had a direct impact on both Turkey-Greece and Turkey-EU relations. It also represents a major step forward on bilateral relations.

The research question tries to explore how did Greek-Turkish relations, disputes in the Aegean and Cyprus entanglement shape Turkey-EU relations and after the Helsinki Summit in 1999 and also with Greek-Turkish *rapprochement*, how do we expect Greek-Turkish relations to influence Turkey-EU relations. The focus of the thesis will cover a time period between the Athens Treaty of 1961 and December 2005, when Turkey reached the negotiation phase in her EU accession.

## ÖZET

### AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ ÇERÇEVESİNDE TÜRK-YUNAN

### İLİŞKİLERİ

#### KILIÇ ÖZLEM

Yüksek Lisans, Avrupa Çalışmaları Bölümü Tezi

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Üstün Ergüder

Şubat 2009

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Yunanistan-Türkiye İlişkileri, Türk-Yunan  
Münakaşası, Kıbrıs Sorunu, Avrupa Birliği, Avrupa Birliği-Yunanistan  
İlişkileri, Avrupa Birliği-Türkiye İlişkiler

Türk-Yunan ilişkilerinde Kıbrıs, kıta sahanlığı, kara suları, Öcalan vakası ve Kıbrıs'ta ki S-300 füze krizi gibi birçok ters düşen sorun mevcuttur. Aralık 1999 Helsinki Zirvesine kadar Yunanistan, Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne girmesine en güçlü karşıt olmuştur. 1999 Helsinki Zirvesinde, Yunanistan olumsuz fikrini iptal etmiş ve Türkiye'nin AB'ye aday ülkeler arasında gösterilmesine izin vermiştir. Bu izin verme hem Türk-Yunan hem de Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği ilişkilerini doğrudan değiştirmiştir. Bu, ikili ilişkilerde önemli bir adımı temsil eder. Şüphesiz ki bu olay ilişkilerde yeni ve umutlu bir başlangıç olarak değerlendirilebilir. Bu tez Avrupa Birliği ışığında Türk-Yunan ilişkilerini içermektedir. Araştırma konusu ikili ilişkilerin tarihsel gelişimini Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği adaylığı altında incelemektedir.

Tezin odaklandığı zaman aralığı 1961 Atina Antlaşması ile Aralık 2005'te Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği ile müzakere tarihi aldığı zaman sürecini kapsamaktadır. Türk- Yunan ilişkileri Ege ve Kıbrıs sorunlarına da atıfta bulunularak tartışılacaktır.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

- First of all, I would like to express my special gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Üstün ERGÜDER for his invaluable advice, endless support, and his fatherly attitude. His deep academic knowledge and independent perspective opened new horizons to me. His guidance in my studies made the completion of this thesis possible.

- My graduation to my beloved family especially my mother Cevdan KILIÇ and my father Reşat KILIÇ. If this thesis will be a step towards the realization of my dreams, it is due to their enduring support, devotion, understanding, patient and love.

- I am also very grateful to my thesis committee members, Yaprak GÜRSOY and Bahri YILMAZ for evaluating my thesis and providing valuable contributions. I am especially indebted to Mrs. Yaprak Gürsoy for sharing her comments and suggestions on my thesis.

- I also would like to express my warmest thanks to my professor in the department of European Studies at Sabancı University; Ahmet EVİN. He always tries to help me with his advice.

- I am also grateful to my dear instructor at Bilkent University in International Relations department: Assoc. Prof. Mustafa KİBAROĞLU. During my undergraduate studies, he always supported my enthusiasm for getting my master degree. I learn a lot from his lessons.

- Meltem Müftüler Baç; I want to thanks my Prof. Meltem Müftüler Baç at Sabancı University for being very tolerant especially during my peak times.

- My dear friends in the European Studies, namely, Burcu AKIN, Burcu ATALAY, Leyla ARPAÇ, Meryem KÖSEHASANOĞULARI, Ekin TÜMSAVAŞ and Engin UĞURLU who deserve my special thanks for their very friendly and amusing behaviors and for their constant support. They are the most valuable friends who I met at Sabancı University. My life in Sabancı, our adventurous trip to Germany, our enjoyable UNO games became more enjoyable with them.

- I would also like to thank my dear roommates Selin AĞAR and Mine ŞAHİN, who always have supported me during my thesis process and encouraged me to focus on my project during that stressful time. I also would like to thank my best friends Rengin SARAÇOĞLU and Ceren YENEL for encouraging me about my master process and for always being in my life, and for their friendship.

- I am also very grateful to ‘my sister’ Diler GÜLAY for her cordiality. She takes my family’s place in Istanbul. She always supported me when I missed my family in Ankara and whenever I need. We have always been stayed together.

- Last but not least, I would like to thank my lovely boyfriend Melih ALTINAY who is and will always be the most special person in my life. Since my last days of university graduation, he had encouraged me to do my master. He was with me starting from my interview day to my thesis defense day. Without his support and love, I couldn't have finished my master's degree in İstanbul with such happiness and enthusiasm. Also, this thesis could have not been completed easily without his encouragement. Thus, I want also to dedicate to him.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| ABSTRACT.....   | v        |
| ÖZET.....   | vi       |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....  | vii      |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS.....  | viii     |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATION.....   | x        |
| <b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b> |
| <b>CHAPTER II: GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS and DISPUTES IN THE AEGEAN<br/>(1976-1999) and CYPRUS ENTANGLEMENT</b> |          |
| 2.1 Aegean Crisis in 1976- 1987 and the Davos Process.....  | 4        |
| 2.2 Problems in the Aegean Sea .....  | 7        |
| 2.1.1 Continental Shelf.....  | 9        |
| 2.1.2 Territorial Waters.....   | 13       |
| 2.1.3 Airspace and FIR Line.....  | 15       |
| 2.1.4 Demilitarization of the East Aegean Islands.....  | 18       |
| 2.1.5 Status of Islets and Rocks, and the Kardak/Imia Crisis.....   | 21       |
| 2.2 Cyprus Entanglement.....  | 22       |
| <b>CHAPTER III: RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY: GREECE<br/>INSIDE EC, TURKEY OUT 1981-1990</b>         |          |
| 3.1 Karamanlis' decision to apply EEC 1959 .....  | 27       |
| 3.2 Signing of Athens Treaty 1961.....  | 29       |
| 3.3 Turkey's Associate Membership to the EEC and Ankara Agreement.....  | 30       |
| 3.4 Greece Accession to the EC in 1981.....   | 31       |
| 3.4.1 Turkey's attitude towards the Greek Membership Application.....   | 33       |
| 3.5 Özal Era in Turkey and Turkey's Application for Full Membership 1987.....                                 | 34       |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 3.6 Reaction of Greece towards Turkish Application and Turkish-Greek Relations after Greek Membership to the EC..... | 38        |
| 3.7 Agenda 2000 and Luxembourg Summit, December 1997.....  | 39        |
| <b>CHAPTER IV: EARTHQUAKE DIPLOMACY: A NEW PARADIGM?</b>   |           |
| 4.1 1999 Helsinki Summit.....  | 43        |
| 4.2 Greece position and bilateral relations.....   | 47        |
| 4.3 Economic Relations after Rapprochement.....  | 50        |
| 4.3.1 Trade Relations.....   | 51        |
| 4.4 Opening accession negotiation with Turkey on October 2005.....   | 53        |
| <b>CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....</b>  | <b>56</b> |
| APPENDIX A: BERN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TURKEY AND GREECE.....  | 60        |
| APPENDIX B: 13 PROPOSALS.....  | 62        |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY.....  | 64        |

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATION**

**EC:** the European Community

**ECC:** the European Economic Community

**EU:** the Party

**ANAP:** the Motherland Party, Anavatan Partisi

**NATO:** North Atlantic European Union

**EP:** European Parliament

**US:** United States

**PKK:** Kurdish Workers Treaty Organization

**UN:** United Nations

**TRNC:** Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

**ICJ:** International Court of Justice

**N. M.:** Nautical Miles

**FIR:** Flight Information Region

**ICAO:** International Civil Aviation Organization

**NOTAM:** Notice to Aircraft

## **CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION**

This thesis attempts to analyze Greek-Turkish relations within the European Union framework. The European Union has been an important actor in solving conflicts between Greece and Turkey – a member of the EU and a candidate for membership. This is why this thesis can provide an understanding of the role the European Union can play in resolving conflicts.

In the thesis I will analyze the advantages and disadvantages of EU membership for Greece and Turkey. In other words, I will examine how Greece used the advantages of being an EU member country in the late 1980's and 1990's. The Turkish membership application for EU membership gave Greece a strong position against Turkey. However, after the 1999 Helsinki Summit opening the EU's door to Turkey, Greece did not block Turkey's path to full membership. This is an important development that needs further investigation.

The thesis consists of five main chapters. The first chapter is the introductory chapter of the thesis.

In the second chapter, the main disputes between the two neighboring countries will be analyzed. The primary aim of this chapter is to explain the tension in bilateral relations. Core issues of the Aegean conflict; such as the continental shelf, territorial waters, airspace, the FIR Line, demilitarization of the East Aegean Islands, status of the islets and rocks, and the Kardak/Imia Crisis, will be analyzed so as to understand the tension in bilateral relations. Then, the other important point of this chapter is to analyze the Cyprus entanglement. As it is known, Cyprus is one of the major problems in the relations of the two neighboring countries

and their relations with the EU. This section aims to demonstrate the reasons why and how Cyprus became an issue of dispute between the two neighboring countries.

In formulating the thesis one must look at the role and impact of the EU right from the initial application of each country to EEC membership. The third chapter will cover the long process of Greece's EU accession in order to analyze and understand the Greek motivation behind the decision to become a full member of the European Community (EC)<sup>1</sup>. I will pay special attention to analyze the decision of Prime Minister Karamanlis to apply for membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1959. I will also look into the Athens Treaty 1961. This third chapter will also dwell on Greece's relations with the EC. Greece's membership in the EC in 1981 and Turkey's reaction to her membership will be analyzed to understand the impact of this membership on bilateral relations. Then, the Özal era in Turkey and Turkey's application for full membership in 1987, and the reaction of Greece to this application will be studied. In the same year as Turkey's application, the Aegean crisis occurred. This chapter will continue with the Aegean crisis in 1976 and 1987 and the Davos process. The chapter will try to show that Greece used her EC membership as a trump card using her veto power to stop Turkey's dialogue with the EC. There is no doubt that Turkey had to confront a Greek barrier in her relations with the EC. Then, the reflection of this tension through the EU will be explained and the Luxembourg Summit and Agenda 2000 will be discussed.

In the fourth chapter, a new era in bilateral relations will be examined. The earthquake disaster in Turkey reinforced the peace process between the two neighbors and the EU's decision concerning Turkey's status at the 1999 Helsinki Summit led to the beginning of a new period in Turkish-Greek relations. This part will be defined as a period of

---

<sup>1</sup> The EC and EU will be used interchangeably according to the time period''

*rapprochement*. Moreover, Greece's position and Turkey's EU candidacy for membership will be discussed. The position of the Greek Government will be also considered, and a section will explain Turkey's accession negotiations.

In the concluding chapter, Turkey-Greece relations within the EU framework will be studied and finally the lesson drawn from this case will be analyzed. The impact of bilateral relations on the Turkey-Greece-EU triangle and how Greece has used the advantage of EU membership will be evaluated. In other words, the importance of the role of the EU in Turkish-Greek relations will receive special attention. This thesis will analyze how and why the EU shaped the process of *rapprochement*, with the purpose of providing insights about the lessons that can be learned from this unique case.

# **CHAPTER II: GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS AND DISPUTES IN THE AEGEAN (1976-1999)**

The aim of this second chapter is to present in detail the main disputes between two neighboring countries, the Aegean and Cyprus disputes. The chapter is important to understand the main issues that underline the conflict between Greece and Turkey. As I will show in the subsequent chapters, the dispute in the Aegean has not only been the main focus in bilateral relations but also in Turkey's relations with the European Union after Greece's membership to the Club.

## **2.1 Aegean Crisis in 1976 -1987 and the Davos Process**

Although the two neighboring countries had many problems, there were three main phases in developing closer relations.<sup>2</sup> In the first phase, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Eleftherios Venizelos signed a formal 'Friendship and Cooperation Treaty' in 1933.<sup>3</sup> Then, two countries became members of NATO in 1952.<sup>4</sup> "Both Greece and Turkey were able to cooperate under the NATO banner in putting away their disagreements".<sup>5</sup> In addition, the Balkan Pact in 1953 strengthened their friendship.<sup>6</sup>

However, in 1976 and 1987 war was very close.<sup>7</sup> The main problem was the continental shelf dispute between Greece and Turkey that surfaced during those years. Since 1973 Turkey

---

<sup>2</sup> Öniş, Ziya and Yılmaz, Şuhnaz, *Greek-Turkish Rapprochement: Rhetoric or Reality*, 2007, p: 1.

<sup>3</sup> Larrabee, F. Stephen and Lesser, O. Ian, *Turkish Foreign Policy in the Age of Uncertainty*, 2003, p:73.

<sup>4</sup> Evin, Ahmet, *Pols 509 Greek-Turkish Relations Lecture Notes*, Sabancı University, unpublished, 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Aydın, Mustafa and Ifantis, Kostas, *Turkish-Greek Relations The Security Dilemma in the Aegean*, 2004, p:25.

<sup>6</sup> Evin, Ahmet, *Lecture Notes*, 2008.

<sup>7</sup> Rumelili Bahar, "The European Union's Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict", Working Papers Series in EU Border Conflict Studies, No. 6 (January 2004), p: 3.

started to challenge Greek claims of sovereignty in the Aegean. According to a Greek observer Turkey:

- “Granted oil exploration licenses on portions of the Greek continental Shelf in the Aegean
- Sent research vessels, accompanied by warship, to carry out research on the Greek continental shelf
- Proposed joint exploration of the ‘disputed’ area (that is, the Greek area).”<sup>8</sup>

The continental shelf dispute also happened because of oil.<sup>9</sup> In 1976, Greece announced oil and natural gas discoveries in the area and also claimed rights on the continental shelf in the Aegean Sea. Turkey considered the issue a *fait accompli*.<sup>10</sup> However, the negotiations between the two neighboring countries’ governments did not bring any solutions to the problem. The Greek claim for 10 nautical miles air space and the Turkish government rejection to it have since remained as one of the core problems between Athens and Ankara.<sup>11</sup>

In November 1976, the Bern Protocol was signed between Greece and Turkey.<sup>12</sup> They wanted to hold negotiations to reach an agreement on the Aegean disputes surrounding the continental shelf and air space. Both Greece and Turkey agreed that “the negotiation shall be frank, thoroughgoing and pursued in good faith, with a view to reaching an agreement based on their mutual consent with regard to the delimitation of the continental shelf as between

---

<sup>8</sup> Chircop, Aldo, and Gerolymatos, Andre and Iatrides, John, *The Aegean Sea After Cold War; Security and Law of the Sea Issues*, 2000, p:64.

<sup>9</sup> Aydın, and Ifantis, p:28.

<sup>10</sup> Bölükbaşı, Süha, “*The Turco-Greek Relations: Issues, Policies and Prospects*” cited in Dodd, Clement H., *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects*, 1992, p:34.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p:35.

<sup>12</sup> After the 1976 crisis in the Aegean, Greek and Turkish representatives came together in Bern to negotiate the continental shelf issue. On November 2, 1976, the Bern protocol was declared. In the declaration it was stated that both sides kept their views on the continental shelf issue but they would refrain from unilateral actions that may impede the resolution of their bilateral problems. This declaration was important because it confirmed the rights and interests of both sides in the Aegean Sea, and stated that these rights and interests would not be removed by unilateral actions. See Bahar Rumelili, “The European Union’s Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict”, *Working Papers Series in EU Border Conflict Studies*, No.6 (January 2004), 4; Aksu, Fuat, “Ege Sorunlarının Geleceği ve Türkiye AB Üyelik Sürecinde Türkiye’nin Seçenekleri”, *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3, Sayı 5 (Temmuz 2005), pp:16-17.

themselves”.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the Bern Agreement urged Greece and Turkey in Article 6 “to refrain from initiative or act concerning the Aegean Continental Shelf that might trouble the negotiations”.<sup>14</sup> However, the talks between the two countries did not finish with a final agreement. No progress was achieved with the agreement. In 1981, Greek Premier Papandreou cut relations with Turkey.<sup>15</sup>

In 1987, the continental shelf dispute again became a problem between the two countries. Greece wanted to nationalize the North Aegean Petroleum Consortium, which received drilling permission in the north of the Aegean Sea but the Turkish government objected.<sup>16</sup> Although the tension between Greece and Turkey did not decrease, this dispute ended with the Davos Process in 1988.

Although, the 1988 Davos Process was a ‘short lived dialogue’<sup>17</sup>, it was accepted as the second rapprochement in bilateral relations.<sup>18</sup> Both Özal and Papandreou noted “the need to avoid the kind of confrontation that, in March 1987, had brought them to the verge of war”.<sup>19</sup> They made genuine efforts to understand each other’s viewpoint, which was considered an improvement in bilateral relations.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Article 1 of the Bern Agreement 1976, the full text of the Agreement can be found in Kılıç Hulusi, 2000, p:277. See Appendix A for the text of Bern Agreement.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, Articles 8 and 9.

<sup>15</sup> Bölükbaşı, Deniz, “*Turkey and Greece Disputes A Unique Case in International Law*”, 2004, (London:Cavendish Publishing), p:287.

<sup>16</sup> Bölükbaşı, Süha, p:37.

<sup>17</sup> Bahçeli Tozun, *Turning a New Page in Turkey’s Relations with Greece? The Challenge of Reconciling Vital Interests*, in Aydın Mustafa – Ifantis Costas, (eds.) *New Perspectives in Greek-Turkish Relations*, Frank Cass, 2003. p:97.

<sup>18</sup> Öniş-Yılmaz, p:2.

<sup>19</sup> Clogg, p:20.

<sup>20</sup> Birand, Mehmet Ali, “Turkey and the Davos Process: Experiences and Prospects” in the Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences, edited by Dimitri Constanas, 1991, (New York:St. Martin’s Press), p:27-39.

As Coufoudakis emphasized “Papandreou may have wished to disprove Western and Turkish allegations as to his intransigence and of using Greek-Turkish issues for domestic purposes”.<sup>21</sup> The Davos Process was also beneficial to Turkey. The basic reason to negotiate with Greece was to eliminate “one of the obstacles to increased US military and economic assistance and to her EC membership application”.<sup>22</sup> Although both sides wanted to resume bilateral relations and implement their valid reasons, the Davos Process did not offer a solution to the serious problems between the two countries, and the failure of this Process could not be prevented. Moreover, it did not last a long time.<sup>23</sup> The politicians, officials, press and also public did not give due consideration to the Davos Process. The Turkish Prime Minister went to Greece after 35 years, however, he encountered opposition. Özal was protested not only by Greeks and Greek Cypriots but also by Kurds and Armenians. This can be shown as loss of the Davos Spirit.<sup>24</sup> The Greek press considered Davos a ‘mistake’ and blamed Papandreou because according to the press, he started negotiations without a precondition of withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, public opinion did not give importance to the Process in both countries.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, this second rapprochement did not achieve its purpose.

## **2.2 Problems in the Aegean Sea**

The Aegean Sea dispute is the main issue between Greece and Turkey. The unique geographical features of the Aegean Sea should be analyzed rigorously in order to understand

---

<sup>21</sup> Coufoudakis, Van, “Greek Political Party Attitudes Turkey: 1974-1989”, in the Turkish-Greek Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences, ed. Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: T. Martin Press), p:50.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, p:50.

<sup>23</sup> Öniş and Yılmaz, p:2.

<sup>24</sup> Pridham, Geoffrey, “Linkage Politics Theory and the Greek-Turkish Rapprochement”, in the Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences, ed. Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: St. Martin’s Press), p:83.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, p:84.

<sup>26</sup> Clogg, Richard, “Greek-Turkish Relations in the Post-1974 Period” in the Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences, edited by Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: St. Martin’s Press), p:23.

the reasons for the complex and continuing conflict.<sup>27</sup> First and foremost the Aegean Sea has a narrow width and moreover, there are lots of islands, islets and rocks.<sup>28</sup> It is a semi-closed sea bounded by Greece in the West and Turkey in the east.<sup>29</sup> Other states do not have direct access to the Aegean Sea.

The Lausanne Treaty was signed on 24 July 1923, defining sovereignty in the Aegean Sea. Article 6 of the Lausanne Treaty stated that "...islands and islets lying within 3 nautical miles of the coast are included within the frontier of the coastal state".<sup>30</sup> And in the Article 12, it was stated that "except where a provision to the contrary is contained in the present treaty, the islands situated at less than three miles from the Asiatic coast remain under Turkish sovereignty".<sup>31</sup>

In the 1930's, Turkey and Greece cooperated because of Turkish peaceful foreign policy and order within the Greek boundaries. The two neighboring countries wanted to secure the *status quo* and improve bilateral relations. As a result, the leaders of these neighbor countries met and on October 30, 1930 they signed the "Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation and Arbitration".<sup>32</sup> This Treaty was related to limitations of naval armaments, stating that the countries would have to inform each other six months before purchasing new warships.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> For socio-economic characteristics structure of the Aegean Sea and its islands, see Acer, Yücel. "The Aegean Maritime Disputes and International Law", 2003, (Wiltshire: Ashgate), pp:5-16.

<sup>28</sup> Inan, Yüksel and Acer, Yücel, "The Aegean Disputes" in Ali Kraosmanoğlu and Seyfi Tashan (ed.s), "The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls", 2004, (Ankara:Foreign Policy Institute), p:1.

<sup>29</sup> Aydın and Ifantis, p:27.

<sup>30</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:846.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, p:845. (In view of these provisions, the Lausanne Treaty implicitly recognized the status of the 3 nautical miles of territorial sea prevailing at that time).

<sup>32</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Lecture Notes, 2007.

<sup>33</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:39.

However, this cooperation between Turkey and Greece did not last. After the Cyprus conflict, disagreements over the Aegean Sea began, and have become the main source of conflict between the two countries. According to Greece, there is only one issue of dispute, which is that of the continental shelf, and the others are clear violations of her sovereign rights in the Aegean Sea. However, according to Turkey, the continental shelf issue is just one of numerous disputes, including those of the territorial waters, airspace, the FIR Line and the militarization of the Eastern Aegean.

### **2.2.1 Continental Shelf**

This issue arose when Greece announced natural gas and oil discoveries in the Aegean and claimed rights on the continental shelf in the Sea. Ankara assumed this issue as *casus belli*.<sup>34</sup>

This issue arose because of the existence of oil in the Aegean.<sup>35</sup> In 1963, Greece started to conduct research work, and granted exploration licenses in the Aegean Sea outside Greece's territorial waters. Then in 1968, Turkey began her first seismic research activities in the Aegean Sea.

The continental shelf is a new concept in international law. It was first defined in a declaration from the American President Harry Truman in September 1945.<sup>36</sup> In the declaration, Truman stated that the US government "regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control".<sup>37</sup> New arguments in the international law of the sea, and new strains in the bilateral relations of coastal countries,

---

<sup>34</sup> Bölükbaşı, Süha, p: 34.

<sup>35</sup> Aydın – Ifantis, p:28.

<sup>36</sup> Pazarıcı, Hüseyin, "Uluslararası Hukuk Dersleri II. Kitap", 1999, (Ankara:Turhan Kitabevi), p:393.

<sup>37</sup> Truman Proclamation No.2667, 10 Fed. Reg. 12303 cited in International Boudary Cases: The Continental Shelf, 1992, (Cambridge: Grotius), p:2.

were opened because this declaration created clashing claims over continental shelves. The Geneva Convention in 1958, article 1, states that:

“For the purpose of these articles, the term "continental shelf" is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas; (b) to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands”.<sup>38</sup>

This article created problems amongst coastal states depending on the development of technology. Moreover, the Convention stated that islands can also have a continental shelf, and that has become the main argument of Greece.

After the Geneva Convention, the other contribution to the issue of continental shelf was brought by the ICJ in 1969. The North Sea Continental Shelf Cases made a decision relating to Netherlands, Denmark and Germany. The term “natural prolongation” of the coastal state under the sea was used as a basic principle of the continental shelf.<sup>39</sup> This situation in turn influenced subsequent jurisprudence, changing the focus from water depth and exploitability to the geological characteristics of the seabed.<sup>40</sup> Besides, it can be appropriate to define an element of proportionality which delimitates the extent of the continental shelf areas that appertain to that state and the length of its coast which is measured in the general direction of

---

<sup>38</sup> The complete text of 1958 Geneva Continental Shelf Convention can be found at [http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8\\_1\\_1958\\_continental\\_shelf.pdf](http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_1_1958_continental_shelf.pdf) accessed December 2008

<sup>39</sup> Pazarci, p:394.

<sup>40</sup> *International Boundary Cases: The Continental Shelf*, 1992, (Grotius Publications Limited), Vol.2, pp: 4-5.

the coast line.<sup>41</sup> This is the basis of Turkey's main argument about the continental shelf issue in the Aegean Sea.

The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea gave an exact definition of the continental shelf, which should be used to better understand disputes surrounding the definition of a shelf's outer limits given in the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf in 1958.<sup>42</sup>

Article 76(1) of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea gave a more exact definition. It included the following new definition of the continental shelf:

“The continental shelf of a coastal State comprises the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond its territorial sea throughout the natural prolongation of its land territory to the outer edge of the continental margin, or to a distance of 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured where the outer edge of the continental margin does not extend up to that distance”.<sup>43</sup>

Greece was favorable to the 1958 Continental Shelf Convention and also the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea. However, Turkey was not a party to these Conventions. Also, Turkey did not ratify either of these two Conventions. However, the Law of the Sea Convention is accepted as customary international law. It is widely accepted in the international community, has a binding effect on all states, and has been approved by the ICJ.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, pp:11-12.

<sup>42</sup> The Law of the Sea: The Definition of the Continental Shelf, (1992), pp:1-2. see also [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm) accessed December 2008.

<sup>43</sup> As defined by Paragraph 3 of the Article 76, continental refers to the submerged prolongation of the land mass of a coastal state and consists of the seabed and subsoil of the continental shelf, the continental slope and the continental rise, but does not include the deep ocean floor with its oceanic ridges. For detail see [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm) accessed December 2008.

<sup>44</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Lecture Notes, 2007.

According to the Greek government, Turkey's position does not conform to international law. Since islands also have continental shelves, the Greek islands are part of the mainland. A median line between the Greek islands and Turkey should be applied.<sup>45</sup> If this approach were used, the unity of the Greek lands would be realized. However, Turkey believes Greece's intention is to make the Aegean a Greek sea. For Turkey, 'natural prolongation' should be used to solve the continental shelf dispute between Turkey and Greece. Open sea rules cannot be applied in the Aegean because the Sea is different from other seas in the world. The Aegean should be considered an area of 'special circumstances' because of its exceptional geographical characteristics.

Greece and Turkey want to solve the dispute differently. Greece accepts not only the 1958 Continental Shelf Convention, but also the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea. The provisions of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention are accepted as customary international law, with a binding effect, but Turkey does not recognize this convention as pertaining to the Aegean dispute, and Ankara did not ratify these treaties. However, Turkish government believes that the all conflicts in the Aegean Sea should be solved together so as to have a permanent peace.<sup>46</sup>

Therefore, it is clear that the two parties have incompatible positions. Greece maintains the Aegean conflict should be resolved judicially, but Turkey wants to settle it in bilateral negotiations. Ankara does not want to appeal to the ICJ unless bilateral contacts are successful. Turkey wants to solve all the conflicts over the Aegean Sea so as to create a lasting peace.

---

<sup>45</sup> Oran, Baskin, Yunanistan'ın Lozan İhlalleri, 1999, (Ankara:SAEMK Yayınları), p:85.

<sup>46</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Lecture Notes, 2007.

### 2.2.2 Territorial Waters

The waters surrounding the state's land and sovereign territories are considered its territorial waters. In the Lausanne Peace Treaty, Article 6 states that:

“In so far as concerns frontiers defined by a waterway as distinct from its banks, the phrases "course" or "channel" used in the descriptions of the present Treaty signify, as regards non-navigable rivers, the median line of the waterway or of its principal branch, and, as regards navigable rivers, the median line of the principal channel of navigation. It will rest with the Boundary Commission to specify whether the frontier line shall follow any changes of the course or channel which may take place, or whether it shall be definitely fixed by the position of the course or channel at the time when the present Treaty comes into force.

In the absence of provisions to the contrary, in the present Treaty, islands and islets lying within three miles of the coast are included within the frontier of the coastal State”.<sup>47</sup>

With the Peace Treaty, the extension of Greece's and Turkey's territorial waters to three nautical miles (n.m.) was accepted. However, this was changed by the Greek government as early as 1936. Greece extended her territorial waters to 6 nautical miles, including the Aegean. Turkey did not accept this. In 1964, Turkey also increased her territorial waters to 6 n.m. in the Aegean Sea. With Turkey's declaration, the Turkish possession of the Aegean increased to 7.47%, while Greece held 43.68% of the Aegean.<sup>48</sup> (Table 1)

Subsequently, tension escalated after the Cyprus Military Intervention in the 1970's. The two neighboring countries have taken the territorial waters issue at hand as a national security

---

<sup>47</sup> Bölükbaşı, Deniz, p:845.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, p:125.

issue.<sup>49</sup> However, the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of Sea, Article 3, states that “Every state has the right to establish the breadth of the territorial sea up to a limit not exceeding 12 nautical miles, measured from the baselines determined in accordance with this Convention”.<sup>50</sup> The Greek Parliament ratified this Convention with the Act of 31 May 1995.<sup>51</sup> Article 2 states that “Greece has an inalienable right to extend its territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles at any time”.<sup>52</sup> This statement has directly increased the tension. With 12 n.m Greece holds nearly 72% of the waters in the Aegean Sea, where Turkey holds only 8.7%. (Table 2) With 12 n.m Greece would leave very little area to Turkey. This change also affects the amount of high sea, leaving only 20% in the whole Aegean. In this case, “all ships sailing westwards from Turkish Aegean ports to the Mediterranean would be obliged to pass through Greek waters”.<sup>53</sup> Greece ignores not only the decrease in the Turkish territorial waters, but also in the high seas. There is no doubt that the Turkey’s reply to the Greek demand was to declare a *casus belli*. For Turkey, Greece increasing its territorial waters to 12 nautical miles would be reason for war against Greece.

Greece has always been in favor of 12 miles of territorial waters, but Turkey has not signed the convention, because Turkey does not accept the Greek position. As a result, Greece believes Turkey violates international law because it prevents Greece from exercising her international rights.

---

<sup>49</sup> “Karasularının Genişletilmesi Sorunu”, [www.turkishgreek.org/karasula.htm](http://www.turkishgreek.org/karasula.htm) (accessed January, 2009).

<sup>50</sup> 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention, [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm) (accessed January, 2009).

<sup>51</sup> Greek Parliament Minutes, 31 May 1995, (Praktike Vovils Olomelia), cited in Bölükbaşı, Deniz, “Turkey and Greece The Aegean Dispute A Unique Case in International Law”, p:134.

<sup>52</sup> Bölükbaşı, p:134.

<sup>53</sup> Wilson, Andrew, “The Aegean Dispute” in Greece and Turkey: Adversity in Alliance Adelphi Library 12, edited by Jonathan Alford, 1984, (Great Britain:Biddles Ltd), p:94.

| <b>Territorial Sea</b> | <b>Breadths, High</b>  | <b>Seas in the</b>      | <b>Aegean Sea %</b>     |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Breadth</b>         | <b>Turkish (%)</b>     | <b>Greek (%)</b>        | <b>International</b>    |
| 6 miles                | 7.47<br>(14.000 sq km) | 43.68<br>(81.969 sq km) | 48.85<br>(89.469 sq km) |
| 12 miles               | 8.76<br>(16.438 sq km) | 71.53<br>(34.224 sq km) | 19.71<br>(36.985 sq km) |

**Table 1:** The Sharing of Territorial Waters. The Aegean Sea would be divided as shown, based on territorial boundaries of 6 or 12 nautical miles.

### 2.2.3 Airspace and the FIR Line

In 1944 the Chicago Convention on Civil Aviation was held. In this Convention international air space above the high seas and also public international law were codified.<sup>54</sup> According to the Convention, the airspace of a state is the airspace above her territory and territorial waters, and a country has full sovereignty within it. A state's territorial airspace has the same outer limit as its territorial waters.<sup>55</sup>

As determined in the Lausanne Peace Treaty, territorial waters and airspace are the same, at 3 nautical miles. For Ankara and Athens both, the territorial limits in the Aegean are 6 miles.<sup>56</sup> However, Greece violates this rule, the sole violation in the world.<sup>57</sup> "Law No. 4141 of 26 March 1913 defined the width of the Greek territorial sea at 10 nautical miles".<sup>58</sup> Greece's claim goes against international norms and principles.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:573.

<sup>55</sup> Pazarıcı, p:442.

<sup>56</sup> Bölükbaşı, p:575.

<sup>57</sup> Heraclides, Alexis, "Yunanistan ve 'Doğu'dan Gelen Tehlike' Türkiye / Türk Yunan İlişkilerinde Çıkmazlar ve Çözüm Yolları", 2002, (İstanbul:İletişim Yayınları), p:212.

<sup>58</sup> Ephemeris Tes Kivernesos, 11 April 1913, No.68, p:204. (Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations), cited in Bölükbaşı, p:576.

<sup>59</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:573.

The Greek claim for airspace is 10 nautical and Turkey disagrees with this. Along with other Aegean disputes and the Cyprus entanglement, the airspace issue has become a heated, core problem in bilateral relations.<sup>60</sup>

Moreover, so as to keep Greece's position from becoming the custom in international law, "Turkish military crafts systematically and periodically have been entering the 4 mile zone which is not accepted as Greek airspace".<sup>61</sup> So, the territorial airspace issue is another unsolved Aegean Sea problem.

The other issue related to airspace is the Flight Information Region (FIR) line. The FIR was established so as to get necessary information to civilian aircraft. There is more international aircraft movements now, and the planes have different service requirement. As a result, providing facilities and services in national airspace was not enough, and they had to provide them for international movements too. The Chicago Convention rules could not meet the need, so the ICAO made FIRs to meet the new requirements.<sup>62</sup>

In 1952, the Aegean beyond Turkish airspace was put under Greek responsibility according to the ICAO.<sup>63</sup> However, after the Cyprus incident, tension came when Greece insisted on monitoring Turkey's movements over the Aegean Sea. To protect her security, Turkey requested, with Notice to Aircraft 714 (NOTAM), to be notified of any attack against her from the Aegean in August 1974. With this notice, Turkey unilaterally extended her area of

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, p:35.

<sup>61</sup> Fırat, Melek, "1945-1960 Yunanistan'la İlişkiler." in *Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar*, Cilt 1, edited Oran, Baskın, 2001, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları), pp:576-614.

<sup>62</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:605.

<sup>63</sup> Aydın and Ifantis, pp:29-30.

responsibility up to the middle of the Aegean through Athens FIR, asking for information in advance before the aircraft pass to the East of the new line.<sup>64</sup>

At the same time, Greece declared the air corridor between the neighboring countries unsafe for international civil aviation. In 1980, flights were resumed and the two countries withdrew their Notams.<sup>65</sup> However, the withdrawal of the NOTAMs does not deal with the underlying problem. Greece stated that “in accordance with ICAO rules and international practice, all civil and military aircraft should submit their flight plans prior to their entry into the Athens FIR for reasons of safety for civilian flights”.<sup>66</sup>

However, this requirement contradicts Article 3 of the Chicago Convention. It states that:

“Civil and state aircraft

- a) This Convention shall be applicable only to civil aircraft, and shall not be applicable to state aircraft.
- b) Aircraft used in military, customs and police services shall be deemed to be state aircraft.
- c) No state aircraft of a contradicting state shall fly over the territory of another state or land thereon without authorization by special agreement or otherwise, and in accordance with the terms thereof.
- d) The contracting States undertake, when issuing regulations for their state aircraft, that they will have due regard for the safety of navigation of civil aircraft”.<sup>67</sup>

Greece’s demand should not be applied because of Article 3 (b). Turkey wants modification of the FIR responsibilities based upon equality and national security, but Greece rejects this

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid, p:30.

<sup>65</sup> Aydın and Ifantis, p:30.

<sup>66</sup> Web Site of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.mfa.gr/www.mfa.gr/en-US/Policy/Geographic+Regions/South-Eastern+Europe/Turkey/Turkish+claims/FIR/> accessed January, 2009.

<sup>67</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:611.

request and demands Turkey's aircraft file flight plans with Greece.<sup>68</sup> The issue is still under discussion between the two neighboring countries.

#### **2.2.4 Demilitarization of the East Aegean Islands**

The militarized nature of the East Aegean islands is the one of the hottest issues in bilateral relations. According to the Lausanne Treaty, the Greek islands closest to the Turkish coasts should be demilitarized by Athens in order to maintain peace.

In the Lausanne Peace Treaty, Article 13 states that:

“With a view to ensuring the maintenance of peace, the Greek Government undertakes to observe the following restrictions in the islands of Mytilene, Chios, Samos and Nikaria:

- (1) No naval base and no fortification will be established in the said islands.
- (2) Greek military aircraft will be forbidden to fly over the territory of the Anatolian coast. Reciprocally, the Turkish Government will forbid their military aircraft to fly over the said islands.
- (3) The Greek military forces in the said islands will be limited to the normal contingent called up for military service, which can be trained on the spot, as well as to a force of gendarmerie and police in proportion to the force of the gendarmerie and police existing in the whole of the Greek territory”.<sup>69</sup>

With this article, demilitarization of the four islands, Mytilene, Chios, Samos and Nikaria, was codified.

---

<sup>68</sup> Aydın and Ifantis, p:30.

<sup>69</sup> Bölükbaşı Deniz, p:675.

In the Straits Convention of 1923, Article 4 provided for the demilitarization of Samothrace and Lemnos. In Article 4, sub-paragraph 2 refers to the demilitarization of the islands in the Aegean. It states that:

“The zones and islands indicated below shall be demilitarized:

- 1) Both shores of the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus (Strait of Istanbul) over the extent of the zones delimited.
- 2) All the islands in the Sea of Marmara, with the exception of the island of Emir Ali Adası.
- 3) In the Aegean Sea, the islands of Samothrace, Lemnos, Imbros, Tenedos and Rabbit Islands’’.<sup>70</sup>

After the Second World War, the Dodecanese Islands were also demilitarized with the Paris Treaty of 1947. Article 14 of the Paris Treaty states that:

- “1) Italy hereby cedes to Greece in full sovereignty the Dodecanese Islands indicated hereinafter, namely Stamphalia (Astropalia), Rhodes (Rhodes), Calki (Kharki), Scarpanto, Casos (Casso), Piscopis (Tilos), Misiros (Nisiros), Calemnos (Kalymnos), Leros, Patmos, Lipsos (Lipso), Simi (Symi), Cos (Cos) and Castellorizzo, as well as the adjacent islets.
- 2) These islands shall be and shall remain demilitarized.
- 3) The procedure and the technical conditions governing the transfer of these islands to Greece will be determined by agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Greece and arrangements shall be made for the withdrawal of foreign troops not later than 90 days from the coming into force of the present Treaty’’.<sup>71</sup>

In the article sub-paragraph 2 refers to the demilitarization of the Dodecanese islands, saying the islands should remain free of military forces.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, p:677.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, p:697.

The militarization of these islands began after the Cyprus intervention in the 1970s. After the Cyprus tension, Greek foreign and defense policies were shaped against the perceived Turkish threat, and Greece tried to justify it, and it is not an illegal breach of the arguments.

The arguments fall under three main groups:

“(i) Arguments and claims of a specific nature

- 1936 Montreux Convention 1923 Lausanne Strait Convention relation; abrogation by the former of demilitarization obligations imposed on Lemnos and Samothrace islands.

(ii) Assertions relying on misinterpretation and distortion of certain actions and statements from Turkey

- Statement by Turkish Foreign Minister, T. R. Aras in the Parliament on 31 July 1936.
- Letter of Turkish Ambassador in Athens on 6 May 1936.
- Remilitarization by Turkey of the islands Gökçeada (Imbros) and Bozcaada (Tenedos)

(iii) Legal argument of general nature

- Preventive right of self-defense
- Jus cogens
- Rebus sic stantibus
- Res inter alios acta’’.<sup>72</sup>

According to Athens, Turkey cannot intervene on the Dodecanese militarization because she is not a signatory to the Paris Treaty. According to Greece, the militarization of the islands was a response to the 1975 foundation of the Turkish Aegean Army outside of NATO command. Turkey founded this army in case of attack from the Aegean Sea and in reaction to America’s arms embargo after the Cyprus military intervention. Greece used the Turkish action to her advantage, arguing that it presented a threat. According to Athens, its militarization of the Dodecanese was in its legitimate defense, but this explanation was unacceptable to Turkey, and it is still a controversial issue.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid, p:757.

<sup>73</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Lecture Notes, unpublished, 2007.

### 2.2.5 Status of the Islets, Rocks, and the Kardak/Imia Crisis

In 1996, Turkey and Greece found themselves in a military confrontation. The reason was about a conflict about the sovereignty of a pair of rock islets, called *Kardak/Imia*. The islets were 3.8 n.m. away from Turkish coasts.<sup>74</sup> When Turkish coasters ran around over the islets “nobody could see that simple incident would start a series of events that brought two allies to the edge of war”.<sup>75</sup>

Kardak/Imia crisis was not the first short crisis of short and high tension that brought the two neighboring countries almost war. However, a new dimension was created within the frame of Aegean Sea disputes. Both Greece and Turkey were discussed over the sovereignty of an uninhabited islet. Therefore, this situation makes many islets and rocks in the Aegean very important. After this crisis, Turkey introduced ‘grey zones’ stated that there were islets and rocks in the Aegean Sea, whose belongings were not specified in the treaties. However, Greece did not agree to this view by stating that the signed treaties were clear enough to declare the sovereignty rights in the Aegean Sea.<sup>76</sup>

EU Commission’s attitude was clear about the Kardak crisis. The first step was taken on the way of pulling Turkish-Greek disputes within the EU.<sup>77</sup> In the declaration of the Commission after Kardak Crisis, it was stated that the southern borders of the EU were Greek borders and the Union was in solidarity with Greece. It was reminded within the Customs Union that high

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Fırat, Melek, “1945-1960 Yunanistan’la İlişkiler”, in *Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar*, edited by Oran, Baskın, 2001, Vol.1, (İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul), pp: 464, 469.

<sup>76</sup> “Egemenliği Antlaşmalarla Yunanistan’a Devredilmemiş Adacıklar ve Kayalıklar Sorunu”

[www.turkishgreek.org](http://www.turkishgreek.org) (accessed February 2009)

<sup>77</sup> Fırat, p:466.

level relations were aimed with Turkey. Also, the relations should be based on democracy, international law and peace.<sup>78</sup>

The third party intervention was effective on the Greek policy towards Turkey. Mesut Yılmaz who was the prime minister stated that “Turkey would not rule out third-party solutions in the Aegean if all the interrelated issues were treated as a package”.<sup>79</sup> Although it was a step taken towards the Greek solutions, there were no improvements on the other disagreements besides the continental shelf. Also it was clear that the Commission’s declaration pointed out the new Greek policy towards Turkey was effective.

The decision of the Commission was shared by the Council. A similar emphasis took place in the General Affairs Council Declaration of 15 July 1996. In the declaration, it was specified that Turkey-EU “relations should be based on a clear commitment to the principles and respect of international law and agreements, and that disputes created by territorial claims should be referred to the International Court of Justice”.<sup>80</sup> Since the declaration, Aegean disputes started to take place in the official documents of the EU under the title of ‘Turkey’ emphasizing the need for more efforts for the settlement of the Aegean dispute.

## **2.2 Cyprus Entanglement**

Since 1878, Cyprus had been under British government. There have been two different communities on the island. One of them was Turkish Cyprus, made up of Muslims and the other was Greek Cyprus, made of Christian Orthodox. Britain also recognized the two communities. Greek Cypriots started campaigns and demonstrations for *Enosis*, uniting the

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, p:466.

<sup>79</sup> Papahatjopoulos, Daphne, “Greek Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era, CEPS Paper No.72, Brussels: Center for European Policy Studies, 1998, P.39.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, p:52.

island with Greece, on the island after the new Archbishop Leontios was elected.<sup>81</sup> Greece also wanted to unite the island as a part of the *Megali Idea*.<sup>82</sup> According to the *Megali Idea*, the Greek state should embrace all Greeks regardless of the country of residence. During the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, the non-Muslim populations within the Ottoman Empire began to revolt against the Empire under the influence of rising nationalism. The Greek *Megali Idea* emerged as a part of this trend and the main argument behind the idea was to re-conquer the Byzantine territories and to create a Greek nation state accordingly.<sup>83</sup> Uniting the Cyprus with mainland Greece was also an important part of *Megali Idea*.

In 1954, Greece applied to the United Nations (UN). She wanted the right to self-determination to be given to the people of Cyprus. However, the UN General Assembly did not discuss the situation.<sup>84</sup> The Zurich Agreement and the London Agreement were signed after the bilateral relations so as to create the independent state of Cyprus. With Britain, Greece and Turkey were guarantor powers of the state of affairs on the island.<sup>85</sup>

“Under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, Turkey became one of the three guarantor power (along with Greece and Britain) of the island’s independence.”<sup>86</sup> “Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, taking note of the understanding of the Republic of Cyprus set out in the

---

<sup>81</sup> Hatipoğlu, Murat, “Yakın Tarihte Türkiye ve Yunanistan 1923-1954”, 1996, (Ankara:Siyasal Kitabevi), pp:301-311.

<sup>82</sup> According to K. C. Markides, Enosis was a local movement representing the heir of the Hellenic-Byzantine Empire and it was initiated by the church. As the rivalry between the church and the communists ended with the end of World War II, the church extended its influence in Greece and the idea of Enosis was embraced by the Greek people. See K.C. Markides, *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp.11-14.

<sup>83</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Lecture Notes, unpublished, 2007.

<sup>84</sup> The Greek appeal to the United Nations was rejected on the basis of the UN Charter Article 2(7), the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of states. For details see Armaoğlu, Fahir, “*Kıbrıs Meselesi 1954-1959*”, 1963, (Ankara:Sevinç Yayınevi), pp:70-94, and Crawshaw, “*The Cyprus Revolt*”, 1978, (London: William Cloves and Sons), pp:83-89.

<sup>85</sup> For further information on the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus and the terms of the London and Zurich Agreements see Ertekün, Necati, “The Cyprus Dispute and the Birth of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, 1984, (Oxford: University Press), pp:3-9.

<sup>86</sup> Larrabee and Lesser, p:77.

Article I of the present Treaty, recognize and guarantee the independence, territorial integrity and security of the Republic of Cyprus, and also the state of affairs established by the Basic Articles of its Constitution. Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom likewise undertake to prohibit, so far as concerns them, and activity aimed at promoting, directly or indirectly, either union of Cyprus with any other State or partition of the island’’.<sup>87</sup> Thus, it can be said that the Cyprus issue was solved peacefully with the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. However, for Greek Cypriots this unification meant a step towards *enosis*. Then, the harmony which has tried to maintain with the London and Zurich Agreements tried to maintain began to be destroyed. Then, Turkish Cypriots were expelled from all government organs by pressure.

Archbishop Makarios was elected as the leader of the Greek Cypriot community. However, he was strongly opposed to the London and Zurich Agreements. He thought that these treaties gave more rights to the Turkish Cypriots, especially considering their population percentage.<sup>88</sup> Therefore, he believed that the constitution was unfair and unworkable.

In November 1963, the famous 13 amendments to the constitution were introduced by Archbishop Makarios.<sup>89</sup> With those amendments, the bi-communal spirit of the Zurich and London Agreements would be abolished and an integrated, unitary state. This was considered the first step to the separation of Cyprus Republic. The process tried to create minority status rather than equal partners for Turkish Cypriots.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Chrysostomides, Kypros, *The Republic of Cyprus A Study in International Law*, London:Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2000, pp:527-528.

<sup>88</sup> The ratio of the population was 77.0 percent Greeks, 18.3 percent Turks. For further information see Necatigil, Zaim, *the Cyprus Question and the Turkish Position in International Law*, 1998, (New York: Oxford University Press), p:2.

Thirty percent in the parliament in state services and forty percent in military services were left to Turkish Cypriots who made up eighteen percent of the population of the island.

<sup>89</sup> Chrysostomides, Kypros, *The Republic of Cyprus A Study In International Law*, (London:Martinus Nijhoff Publishers), 2000, p:33. (See Appendix B for the 13 Proposals).

<sup>90</sup> Evin, Ahmet, *Pols 509 Lecture Notes*, unpublished, 2007.

On the island, there was huge inequity against Turkish Cypriots. Their human rights were violated. There is no doubt that this situation was not acceptable for both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. Besides this inequity, on July 15, 1974 there was a coup against Makarios because he had been following more independent policies, supporting the Soviet Union and diverging from the *enosis* policy. Makarios was overthrown by the military regime of Greece. Then, he was replaced by a *pro-enosis* government. It can be said that this situation was the last, but not the least, step leading to Turkish intervention on the island.<sup>91</sup>

In 1974, Turkey intervened to stop what amounted to a civil war and the forceful eviction of Cypriot Turks from their homes and violence directed to individuals. Turkish Cypriots human rights were violated and 30.000 Turkish Cypriots became homeless.<sup>92</sup>

On July 20, 1974 Turkish military intervention began.<sup>93</sup> Bülent Ecevit was the prime minister of the Turkish Republic, and he ordered the Cyprus invasion.<sup>94</sup> With the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, Turkey legitimized her invasion because the Treaty gave the right to intervene unilaterally to reestablish the constitutional arrangements.<sup>95</sup> According to Article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee, “each of the guarantor powers reserved the right to the take unilateral action, if necessary, but only with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs created by the... Treaty”.<sup>96</sup> Furthermore, Turkey also kept “the right of individual self defense under

---

<sup>91</sup> Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Lecture Notes, unpublished, 2007.

<sup>92</sup> Akalın, Hakkı, “*Turkey and Greece, On the Way to Another War?*”, 1999, (Ankara:Ümit Yayıncılık), pp:219-221.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, p:220.

<sup>94</sup> Larrabee and Lesser, p:78.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, p:77.

<sup>96</sup> Camp, Glen D., “Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus,” *Political Science Quarterly* 95, (Spring, 1980), No.1, p:47.

U.N. Charter Article 51,” since the coup on the island posed a danger to Turkey, “bringing Greek military power to a judicially independent island forty miles away”.<sup>97</sup>

After military intervention, the island was divided into two, North and South. On 13 February 1975, Turkish Cypriots declared the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus in the north part of the island as a first step. The second step was the approving unanimously the declaration of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the TRNC, which came on 15 November 1983.<sup>98</sup> However, Turkey is the sole country recognizing the TRNC. Although the TRNC is both economically and politically dependent upon Ankara, it can be considered worth the political and economical costs.<sup>99</sup> The TRNC is a security issue, her place is important for Turkey strategically. Turkey, with her 30.000 troops and military equipments, is capable of invading the area owned by the Greek Cypriots. Thus, Cyprus is crucial with reference to the strategic balance between Turkey and Greece.<sup>100</sup> “For years Ecevit argued that Cyprus should be seen not as a burden but as an important component of Turkey’s own security”.<sup>101</sup>

The Turkish military intervention was a turning point for Cyprus, Turkey and also Greece. However, it is very obvious that the Turkish intervention and establishment of the Turkish Federal State of Cyprus had not only a very negative impact on Turkey-Greece bilateral relations, but also that it complicated relations with third parties, especially with the European Community.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, p:58.

<sup>98</sup> Dodd, Clement, “The Political, Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus”, 1993, (Cambridgeshire: the Eothen Press), pp:103-218.

<sup>99</sup> Larrabee and Lesser, p:79.

<sup>100</sup> Kibaroglu Mustafa, Kıbrıs’ın Stratejik Önemi Nerede?, Milliyet: Entellektüel Bakış, 29 Ağustos 2000.

<sup>101</sup> Larrabee-Lesser, p:79. As he stressed at the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in July 1999: “ As much as Turkey is the genotor of KKTC (TRNC) security, the KKTC is the guarantee of Turkey’s security.” See “Turkey and Cyprus Not Moving An Inch From Cyprus Policy,” Turkish Probe, July 25, 1999.

<sup>102</sup> For peace efforts on the island, see the Report of the Secretary General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus

<http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:FGhldOwVUuwJ:www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/poi.nsf/A11/DFEFEA8E9DBD A510CC2256DC3002CB46/%24file/17%2520December%25201996.doc%3FOpenElement+For+peace+peace+efforts+on+the+island,+see+the+Report+of+the+Secretary+General+on+his+Mission+of+Good+Offices&hl=tr&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=tr&client=firefox-a> accessed November 2008.

## **CHAPTER III: RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY: GREECE INSIDE the EC, TURKEY OUT 1981-1990**

This chapter will analyze the first decade of Greek membership in the Community as a full member with a special emphasis on Turkish-Greek relations within the EC. Firstly, reasons behind the Greek application for membership and Turkey's place among these reasons will be discussed. Greece's application for membership forms a milestone not only in Greek history but also in the history of Turkish-Greek relations and Turkish-EU relations. Then, the Ankara Agreement and Turkish full membership application in the Özal era will be discussed. This would be helpful to have a better understanding of reasons behind Turkish application for EC membership and Greek reactions to it. Then, the two other important developments of Turkish-Greek relations in the 1980's, the Aegean dispute in 1987 and the Davos Process will be discussed. Lastly, in this chapter Agenda 2000 and Luxembourg Summit in 1997 will be explained.

### **3.1 Karamanlis' Decision to Apply to the EEC**

Constantine Karamanlis' foreign policy had a strong European emphasis. According to him, Greece belonged to the West.<sup>103</sup> Just after becoming prime minister in 1974, his speech in the parliament expressed his foreign policy aims: he announced for the first time his intention to secure full membership in the European Economic Community<sup>104</sup>. Karamanlis viewed Greece as a bridge, in his words "linking the Common Market to the Mediterranean",<sup>105</sup>.

---

<sup>103</sup> Coufoudakis, Van "Greek-Turkish Relations, 1973-1983 the View from Athens", *International Security* 9, no. 4, Spring 1985, p:205.

<sup>104</sup> Woodhouse, C. M. Karamanlis, *The Restorer of Greek Democracy*, 1982, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982, p:227.

<sup>105</sup> Speech of Constantinos Karamanlis at the signing of the Accord admitting Greece to the EEC, for the quotation see the address by the president of the European People's Party Dr. Wilfried Martens at the inauguration of the Constantinos Karamanlis hall in the European Parliament, 2003, p:1.

“Karamanlis saw membership as marking the end of a long period of political isolation, which would strengthen Greek independence and its bargaining power in relations with third parties, while allowing Greece to actively participate in the political development of Europe”<sup>106</sup>.

There is no doubt that he definitely supported EEC membership because he wanted Greece to benefit from EEC membership. According to Karamanlis’ view, EEC membership would be a great advantage for Greece. It would contribute to both Greece’s democracy and her economic development. Moreover, there are other valuable reasons for application to the EEC. One of them has been Greece’s external and internal position. “For Greece, the possibility of Community membership was seen as a way of strengthening its Western political orientation whilst distancing itself from the US”<sup>107</sup>. Greece wanted to cool relations with the USA because she did not stop the Turkish intervention in Cyprus. Greece wanted to solve her problems without any US influence. Moreover, another important factor was the perceived Turkish threat. Greece would achieve a stronger position against Turkey. EEC membership would give her big advantage in bilateral disputes. Last but not least, Karamanlis desired, as a European country, to have "presence" in, and an impact on, the process towards European integration and the European model. <sup>108</sup>

In 1959 Greece applied to become an associate member in the Community. Not long after the application, the treaty granting association membership was signed in Athens on July 10, 1961.

---

<sup>106</sup> Preston, Christopher, “*Enlargement and Integration in the European Union*”, 1997, (London and New York:Routledge), p: 49.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid, p:46.

<sup>108</sup>Greek Ministry of Foreign Ministry

<http://www.mfa.gr/www.mfa.gr/en-US/European+Policy/Greece+in+the+EU/> accessed November 2008.

### 3.2 Signing of the Athens Treaty 1961

On July 15, 1959, Greece applied for the Association Agreement, negotiations started on March 21, 1960, and the Treaty of Association was signed on July 9, 1961. It became operational in November 1962.

Article 72 shows that Greek membership to the community was possible without a timetable.

Article 72 states that:

“As soon as the operation of this Agreement has advanced far enough to justify envisaging full acceptance by Greece of the obligation arising out of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, the Contracting Parties shall examine the possibility of the accession of Greece to the Community”.<sup>109</sup>

As Hatzivassiliou states, “when they signed the Association Agreement in 1961, the Greeks regarded it as nothing less than a stepping stone for eventual full membership”<sup>110</sup>. In other words, there is no doubt that the Association Agreement in 1961 was a very important step for Greece despite the economic backwardness of the country.

The Agreement was supposed to provide future full membership for Greece. It was intended to make Greece a member of the customs union, and foresaw the harmonization of economic policies. With those goals, the long term objective of the Agreement was defined in its first article as:

---

<sup>109</sup> Iacovos S. Tsalicoglou, *Negotiating for Entry the Accession of Greece to the European Community*, (USA: Dartmouth Brookfield, 1985), p:10.

<sup>110</sup> Hatzivassiliou, Evanthis, “Security and the European Option: Greek Foreign Policy, 1952-62”, *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, January 1995, No.1, p:196.

“to promote a continuous and balanced strengthening of the commercial and economic relations between the contracting parties with full consideration of the need to ensure the accelerated development of the economy of Greece as well as the elevation of the level of employment and of the living standards of the Greek people”.<sup>111</sup>

One of the main questions about Greece-EEC relations is why Greece chose to sign an Association Agreement rather than applying directly for membership. This situation can be explained by the economic development of Greece. The disparity between Greece’s level of economic development and that of the EEC countries of that time made accession impractical for the immediate future<sup>112</sup>. “The Greek Agreement highlighted the extent to which far-reaching domestic structural reforms were necessary to develop the Greek economy”<sup>113</sup>.

### **3.3 Turkey’s Associate Membership in the EEC and the Ankara Agreement**

After the Treaty of London, Turkey became a member of the Council of Europe in 1949. Turkey made her associate membership application in the same year as Greece.<sup>114</sup> Both Turkey and Greece were among the first countries to sign the Association Agreement with the European Economic Community.<sup>115</sup> Following the acceptance of Turkey's application by the Council<sup>116</sup>, the Ankara Agreement, on which the present Turkey - EU relations are based, was signed on 12 September 1963. About Turkish membership Article 28 states;

---

<sup>111</sup> Feld, Werner, “The Association Agreements of the European Communities: A Comparative Analysis, International Organization 19, Spring 1965, No.2, p:230.

<sup>112</sup> Verney, Susannah, “ Greece and the European Community” in Political Change in Greece: Before and After the Colonels, edited by Kevin Featherstone and Dimitrios K. Katsoudas, 1987, (London:Croom Helm), p: 257.

<sup>113</sup> Preston, p: 48.

<sup>114</sup> *Turkey in Europe*, Report of the Independent Commission on Turkey September 2004, p:12.

<sup>115</sup> Müftüleri-Baç, Meltem and Stivachtic, Yannis, *Turkey-European Union Relations*, 2008, p:118.

<sup>116</sup> Erdemli, Özgül, “*Chronology : Turkey's relations with the EU*” Turkish Studies, Spring 2003, Vol.4, No.1, p:4.

“As soon as the operation of this Agreement has advanced far enough to justify envisaging full acceptance by Turkey of the obligations arising out of the Treaty establishing the Community, the contracting Parties shall examine the possibility of the Accession of Turkey to the Community”<sup>117</sup>

As Commission President Walter Halstein said, “Turkey is a part of Europe”, and the Ankara Agreement is evidence of Turkey’s eligibility for membership. The relationship between the European Union and Turkey is based on the Ankara Agreement. It is clear that without Associate Membership, it would be easier for the Community to say ‘no’ to Turkey as she rejected Morocco in 1990.<sup>118</sup>

The Ankara Agreement, under which formation of a Customs Union between the then EEC and Turkey would come in gradual stages, lasted 22 years. This Agreement was originally intended to prepare Turkey for full membership through forming closer economic and political cooperation. It failed to achieve that goal. This was largely due to Turkey’s failure to converge her economic and political system with that of the EU.<sup>119</sup>

### **3.4 Greece Accession to the EC in 1981**

Turkey-Greece relations and Greek membership in the community are interrelated. There is no doubt that Turkish-Greek disputes were affected by relations between Greece and the Community. Greece made her full membership application on June 12, 1975<sup>120</sup>. On 28 January 1976 in the Commission report, a pre-accession stage was seen as more suitable for the Greek position due to three reasons. First of all, the Greek economy was weak especially

---

<sup>117</sup> Turkey in Europe, Report of the Independent Commission on Turkey September 2004, p:13.

<sup>118</sup> Müftüler-Baç and Yannis, p:119.

<sup>119</sup> Arıkan, Harun, “*The EU- Turkey Association: A Flawed Instrument? “ in “Turkey and EU, An awkward candidate for EU membership?”*, 2003, p:47 as well as Kahraman E. S. “*Rethinking Turkey- European Relations in the light of enlargement*” Turkish Studies, Vol.1, No.1, p:3.

<sup>120</sup> Preston, p:49.

when compared with the member countries of the EC. Greece's annual GDP per capita growth of 5.5 percent was in sharp contrast to the 29 percent of the EC<sup>121</sup>. Secondly, an assumed negative impact of Greece's membership to the deepening of European integration was another reason. Turkish-Greek disputes were also used as an important reasons by the EC<sup>122</sup>. The Community had placed itself at an equal distance from Greece and Turkey. The fact that Greece had started the accession negotiations with the EC while she had a dispute with another associate member, Turkey, did not escape attention. The Commission called attention to this issue. "To avoid this situation, the Commission suggested that the Community should play an active role in helping Greece and Turkey resolve their differences in parallel with the preparatory work for Greek accession"<sup>123</sup>

Unanimously, the Commission's Opinion was rejected by the Council at the meeting on February 9, 1976. The Greek application for full membership was accepted. Three major causes could be mentioned to explain why Greece's application was favorably received. First, Greece promised that her full membership would not damage Turkey's relations with the EC<sup>124</sup>. It was thought that "full accession negotiations would help to reintegrate Greece into the Western security alliance at a time of tension in the Eastern Mediterranean"<sup>125</sup>. The EC's position in the Mediterranean was another factor because the Community wanted to have an active role in the consolidation of Greek democracy and of democracy in the region. Portuguese and Spanish membership and the positive impact of the EC on the consolidation of these democracies helped shape the positive approach of the EC Council.<sup>126</sup> In conclusion,

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, p:48.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid, p:50.

<sup>123</sup> Tsalicoglou, Iacovos, *Negotiating for Entry the Accession of Greece to the European Community*, 1995, (USA: Dortmund, Brookfield), p:30.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, p:34.

<sup>125</sup> Preston, p:53.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, p:53.

Greece's membership agreement was signed in May 1979 in Athens, and became effective on January 10, 1981.<sup>127</sup> Greece became an EC member after vigorous leadership by Karamanlis.

### 3.4.1 Turkey's attitude towards Greek Membership

It is obvious that Greece gained a big advantage both politically and economically after full membership. Turkey's dissatisfaction with this situation reflected on her relations with Brussels. Within those conditions there are arguments that the 1976 Aegean crisis had hidden agendas behind the Greek application. According to Harris C. Georgiades:

‘‘It has been maintained that the purpose of the expedition of the Turkish navy survey ship *Sismik 1* in the Aegean Sea in July 1976 was to provoke a crisis in Greek-Turkish relations and make visible to the Community the dangers involved in accepting Greece as a member state’’.<sup>128</sup>

On the other hand, there were also positive results of Greece's full membership. Greece guaranteed that the Community ignored Turkey-Greek disputes. According to Greece's assurance, the Community also tried to put Turkey at ease by assuring that ‘‘Greece's accession would not affect the development of EC-Turkey relations’’.<sup>129</sup> However, the developments and events after Greek membership did not support either the Greek assurance to the Community or the Community's assurance to Turkey. It is clear that after Greece's full membership in the EEC, relations between the Community and Turkey took on political dimensions.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Clogg, Richard, ‘‘*Modern Yunanistan Tarihi*’’, 1997, translated by Şendil, Dilek, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları), p:218.

<sup>128</sup> Georgiades, Harris C., ‘‘Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship’’, in *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, ed. Achilleas Mitsos and Elias Mossialos (England: Ashgate, 2000), p:423.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid, p:423.

<sup>130</sup> ‘‘Türkiye Avrupa İlişkilerinin Tarihçesi’’, <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=1> (accessed December, 2008).

### 3.5 Özal Era in Turkey and Turkey's Application for Full Membership, 1987

In 1975, when Greece applied for full membership, Turkey did not. This is still a matter of debate in Turkey. Ambassador Tevfik Saraçoğlu who is one of the prominent ambassadors served in Brussels as a permanent representative between 1972 and 1977.<sup>131</sup> He strongly believed that Turkey should be a member of the EC. He thought that if Turkey had applied for the EC membership at the same time as Greece, the Community would have had to accept Turkey or reject Greece's application<sup>132</sup>. "Domestic political instability and civilian unrest (...) under weak coalition governments" were the main factors that kept Turkey away from submitting an application immediately after Greece<sup>133</sup>. Until 1987, it can be said that none of the governments in Turkey could think of taking such a big step while there was political instability in Turkey<sup>134</sup>. The main causes of the delay in Turkey's EC membership were related to Turkish domestic politics. However, it is clear that Turkey missed a big opportunity in the late 1970's and early 1980's, when Greece became a full member, by staying outside the Mediterranean Enlargement.<sup>135</sup>

Both Turkey and Greece got the Marshall Aid and became NATO members in 1952.<sup>136</sup> Moreover, Turkey was also included in the Organization of European Economic Cooperation (OEEC, later OECD), the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE, later OSCE) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).<sup>137</sup> Although Turkey is a member of these European institutions, she is outside the European Community.

---

<sup>131</sup> Tüm Gazeteler <http://www.tumgazeteler.com/?a=2346502> accessed January 2009.

<sup>132</sup> Birand, Mehmet Ali, *Türkiye'nin Avrupa Macerası 1959-1999*, 2000, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık), p:318.

<sup>133</sup> Öniş, Ziya, "Greek-Turkish Relations and the European Union: A Critical Perspective", *Mediterranean Politics* 6, Autumn 2001, No.3, p:35.

<sup>134</sup> Evin, Ahmet, *Pols 509 Greek-Turkish Relations Lecture Notes*, Sabanci University, unpublished, 2007.

<sup>135</sup> Müftüler-Baç, and Yannis, p:119.

<sup>136</sup> Koliopoulous, John and Veremis, Thanos, *Greece, The Modern Sequel: From 1821 to the Present*, 2004 (London: Hurst), p: 303.

<sup>137</sup> *Turkey in Europe*, Report of the Independent Commission on Turkey, September 2004.

After the military coup d'état on 12 September 1980, the then EC decided to suspend the Ankara agreement and freeze its political relations with Turkey on January 1982.<sup>138</sup> It was only after the election of a civilian government and the shift of economic policies from an autarchic import-substitution model to an open market driven by market forces<sup>139</sup>, Turkey's relations with the EU started to normalize since maintaining relations was mutually beneficiary for political, economic and specifically security reasons, given the circumstances during the Cold War, for both of the parties.<sup>140</sup> In the light of the positive developments in relations, at 1986 Association Council meeting Turkey showed her intention to apply for full membership.

The Özal Era era started in Turkey after the 1983 elections. The Motherland Party, ANAP, won the elections of 1983 and had a majority in the parliament.<sup>141</sup> There is no doubt that after this election, with the Motherland Party and Özal, a new period began in Turkey. The policies of Özal were the main reasons for this change. Özal also saw Turkey as a European country. He believed that Turks were European Muslims, so the ties between Europe and Turkey were based on secularism and not religion. He saw this kind of relation as more solid than one based on religious ties.<sup>142</sup>

“I have the honour to inform that Turkey officially requests membership of the European Economic Community, in accordance with the disposition of Article 237 of the Treaty instituting the European Economic Community”,<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Erdemli, p:5.

<sup>139</sup> Secretariat General for EU Affairs “History of Turkey EU Relations”  
<http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=2> accessed November 2008.

<sup>140</sup> Arıkan, p:64.

<sup>141</sup> Özal, Turgut, *Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey*, 1991, (Nicosia North Cyprus: K. Rustem & Brother), p:305.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid, p:328.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid, p:1.

Following Turkey's application, the Foreign Ministers of the Council decided to refer the application to the Commission for an opinion.<sup>144</sup> The Commission stated that opening accession negotiations with Turkey were not possible on many grounds. "Turkey was not even welcomed into the waiting room, but rather was kept standing at the door".<sup>145</sup> First of all the EC was busy with the integration of three new members, Greece Portugal and Spain, and was getting ready for the Maastricht Treaty. Therefore it was in no position to handle a new member. Moreover, the Commission also referred to the disputes between Greece and Turkey as well as the Cyprus problem as obstacles.<sup>146</sup> Additionally, according to the Commission, there was a major gap between Turkey's economic and political development and that of EC,<sup>147</sup> however, it added that the Community should pursue her cooperation with Turkey<sup>148</sup>. Moreover, in economic terms, the community emphasized four kinds of difficulties to be overcome: structural disparities in agriculture and industry, macro-economic imbalances, high levels of industrial protectionism, and low levels of social protection.<sup>149</sup>

Although, Greece was shown to be "the only and main obstacle to the accession of Turkey into the Community", it cannot be said that other members were open to Turkish full membership. Moreover, they did not oppose Greece's attitude towards Turkey.<sup>150</sup> Turkey given her large population which is also largely made up of Muslims, location, economy,

---

<sup>144</sup> Erdemli, p:5.

<sup>145</sup> Arım, Reşat, Foreign Policy Concepts Conjuncture, Freedom of Action, Equality, Foreign Policy Institute, 2001, p:5.

<sup>146</sup> Report on Independent Commission on Turkey "*Turkey in Europe More than a promise?*", September 2004, <http://www.independentcommissiononturkey.org/pdfs/english.pdf> , p:25, accessed November 2008 as well as Müftüler-Baç Meltem, "*Turkey's Relations with a Changing Europe*", 1997, Manchester University Press, Ch.3, pp:63-64.

<sup>147</sup> Erdemli, p:5.

<sup>148</sup> Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community December 20, 1989 [http://www.mfa.gov.tr/commission-opinion-on-turkey\\_s-request-for-accession-to-the-community\\_-december-20\\_-1989.en.mfa](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/commission-opinion-on-turkey_s-request-for-accession-to-the-community_-december-20_-1989.en.mfa) accessed November 2008.

<sup>149</sup> Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community, Sec (89) 2290 Final/2 (20 December 1989), p:5.

<sup>150</sup> Geordiades, p:424.

security and military potential are different from other candidates.<sup>151</sup> On the other hand, the factors that effect Turkey not only emanate from Turkey itself but also derive from the European Union. However, so as to not break off relations, and to show Greece's force over Turkey, the Community preferred to show Greece as the "sole culprit" of the problematic relations.<sup>152</sup>

On 5 February 1990 the Council approved the Commission's recommendation and asked for detailed proposals on ways to strengthen EC-Turkey relations. Even though the Commission adopted, on June 7 1990, the "Matutes Package" to intensify financial cooperation and strengthen political and cultural ties, it was not approved by the Council.<sup>153</sup>

Here, particular attention should be given to the 1975 Greek application for full membership which came just after the 1974 Cyprus crisis. When Greece became a member of the EEC in 1981, she found fertile ground to Europeanize Greek Turkish disputes. So, both Greece and Cyprus have gained advantages over Turkey. Greece's strategy was to link any kind of improvement in EC-Turkey relations and Turkey's accession to the EC, to the settlement of disputes between Greece and Turkey. In this political context, the other issue emphasized was Turkey's problems with Greece and the Cyprus issue. The Commission reported:

“Examination of the political aspects of the accession of Turkey would be incomplete if it did not consider the negative effects of the dispute between Turkey and one Member State of the Community, and also the situation in

---

<sup>151</sup> “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament” Recommendation of the European Commission on Turkey's progress towards accession Brussels 6.10.2004 CON (2004) 656 Final, p:4.

<sup>152</sup> Georgiades, p:424.

<sup>153</sup> Regular Report From the Commission On Turkey's Progress Towards Accession, 1998, p:5.  
[http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/AB\\_Iliskileri/Tur\\_En\\_Realitons/Progress/Turkey\\_Progress\\_Report\\_1998.pdf](http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/Turkey_Progress_Report_1998.pdf)  
accessed November 2008.

Cyprus, on which the European Council has just expressed its concern once again’’.<sup>154</sup>

According to the Commission Report Turkey should solve the Cyprus and Aegean issues in order to become a full member.<sup>155</sup> It is clear that this action directly affected bilateral relations. Unfortunately, this report showed that Turkey’s EU membership was a weak possibility. Consequently, the bilateral Greek-Turkish conflicts have widened in scope and become an issue in EU-Turkey relations.<sup>156</sup> As mentioned above, the Commission's opinion on Turkey's application reflected Greece's individual national interests inter alia. Thereby the settlement of Cyprus and of the Aegean Sea issues have gained importance, as far as the question of Turkey's membership is concerned.

### **3.6 Reaction of Greece towards the Turkish Application and Turkish-Greek Relations after Greek Membership in the EC**

It is obvious that the most negative responses to Turkey’s application came from Greece. Greece responded negatively to Turkey’s application, “citing the poor record of Turkey on the issue of human rights, as well as the Turkish aggressive policy against Greece and the lack of progress on the issue of Cyprus”.<sup>157</sup> Greece wanted to break off Turkey-EU relations and block Turkey’s application. It can be said that Turkey’s primary desire for full membership would not come true mostly because of the Greek reaction. For Turkey, this negative position was not surprising.

---

<sup>154</sup> *Commission Opinion on ...*,7.

<sup>155</sup> Rumelili, Bahar, “The European Union’s Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict”, Working Paper Series in the European Union and Border Conflicts Series, 2004a, Vol.6, No.1, p:7.

<sup>156</sup> Arıkan, p:147.

<sup>157</sup> Georgiades, Harris C. “*Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship*”, in *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, ed. Achilleas Mitsos and Elias Mossialos (England: Ashgate, 2000), p:424.

Turkey applied to the Community later than Greece's full membership. This delay gave Greece a stronger position than Turkey. Turkey should solve bilateral relations in the way Greece wanted. Greece used her veto power on the Community's decision having the effect that "the entry visa of Ankara was in the hands of Greece, and getting it was dependent on solution of the Cyprus issue".<sup>158</sup> It is very obvious that 'the solution' means the withdrawal of Turkey's military forces from Cyprus and reunification of the island under a federation which accepted existence of two communities, but not implying separate zones. On April 1988, the Association Agreement was signed by Greece just after the Davos Process. It should be added that the Greek 'concession' came "after receiving concessions by Turkey on the issue of the Greek properties in Turkey".<sup>159</sup> The Turkish concession was a result of the Davos atmosphere reflecting Turkey's goodwill for increasing bilateral relations. Greek acceptance of the Association Agreement was an example of the policy where the EC membership card aimed to be used against Turkey concerning bilateral relations. There will be another example of it in the 1990s which would have complicated results for Turkey. By taking Cyprus into the Union picture as a member country brings more difficulties on the way to Community

### **3. 7 Agenda 2000 and the Luxembourg Summit, December 1997**

Agenda 2000 was arranged by the European Commission as a recommendation to the Council to deal for the new membership demands from the ten Central and Eastern European applicant countries. In the Luxembourg Summit of December 1997 EC did decide to open accession negotiations with six of them. In the Agenda, Turkey had been shown neither as a candidate nor as a member and this situation annoyed Turkey.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> Birand, p:461.

<sup>159</sup> Geordiades, p:424.

<sup>160</sup> Müftüleri-Baç, Meltem and Stivachtis, Yannis, p:120.

Lack of democracy and human rights, no permanent solution for the problems in Southeastern part of Turkey, unsolved Cyprus issue, and hot Greek dispute were emphasized for exclusion of Turkey from Agenda 2000.<sup>161</sup> According to this Agenda 2000, there should be accordance between Greece and Turkey especially on border conflicts. The authority of the International Court of Justice should be accepted and acted with the decision of the court acted upon. Turkey has to settle all her disputes with Greece.<sup>162</sup>

“Enlargement should not mean importing border conflicts. The prospect of accession acts as a powerful incentive for the states concerned to settle any border disputes...Today several disputes, of low intensity, among applicants remain to be resolved...The Commission considers that, before accession, applicants should make every effort to resolve any outstanding border dispute among themselves or involving third countries. Failing this, they should agree that the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice. In any event, all candidate countries should therefore, before accession negotiations are completed, commit themselves to submit unconditionally to compulsory jurisdiction, including advance ruling of the International Court of Justice in any present or future disputes.”<sup>163</sup>

The ‘exclusion’ of Ankara from the new enlargement process was not a big disappointment. Before the preparation of Agenda 2000, the Ankara’s demand to get candidacy status was expressed openly but there was an unfavorable regard towards Turkey’s membership. Especially, after German general elections the Christian Democrats Party did not want to

---

<sup>161</sup> Birand, 2000, p:501.

<sup>162</sup> Aksu, Fuat, “Confidence Building, Negotiation and Economic Cooperation Efforts in Turkish-Greek Relations (1990-2004)”, Turkish Review of Balkan Studies, 2004, Vol.3, No.5, p:47. <http://www.obiv.org.tr/2005/Balkan/faksu.pdf> accessed January 2009.

<sup>163</sup> Agenda 2000, <http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/overview/en/agenda.htm> accessed January 2009.

jeopardize their success by approving Turkey's status. The German Prime Minister Helmut Kohl expressed this to the Prime Minister in Turkey who is Mesut Yılmaz.<sup>164</sup>

The Luxembourg Summit on 12 and 13 December 1997 has been considered as a negative hallmark in Turkey-EU relationship. The new enlargement process was scheduled to start on March 1998 for the ten Central and Eastern countries including Cyprus. However, Turkey stayed out of the process. Instead of including Turkey in the group of ten, the Council stated 'A European Strategy for Turkey'. Not only the Summit but also this statement was a huge disappointment for Ankara. The Summit led to a 'massive deadlock' in the EU-Turkey relations.<sup>165</sup>

Cyprus was listed as a candidate country whereas Turkey not. According to Turkey, the Cyprus inclusion was an obvious sign that Union supported Athens on the Cyprus dispute and acting under her influence.<sup>166</sup> However, the Council also made a statement on the relations between Greece and Cyprus. It was said that:

(...) that strengthening Turkey's links with the European Union also depends on (...) the establishment of satisfactory and stable relations between Greece and Turkey; settlement of disputes, in particular by legal process, including the International Court of Justice; and support for negotiations under the aegis of the UN on a political settlement in Cyprus on the basis of the relevant UN Security Council Resolutions'.<sup>167</sup>

This is an important statement because the Aegean and Cyprus conflicts were mentioned clearly in the Presidency Council Conclusion. It also emphasized that their resolution should

---

<sup>164</sup> Birand, 2000, p:551.

<sup>165</sup> Riemer, Andrea K., The Turkish Yearbook, "Turkey and Europe at a Cross-road Drifting Apart or Approaching Each Other", 2003, Vol. XXXIV, p:148.

<sup>166</sup> Eralp, Atilla, "Turkey in the Enlargement Process: From Luxembourg to Helsinki", Perceptions, June-August 2000, p:20.

<sup>167</sup> [http://ue.eu.int/ue/Docs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/032a0008.htm](http://ue.eu.int/ue/Docs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/032a0008.htm) (accessed January, 2009).

be done for future relations. In the official declaration, it is obvious that it was a part hereafter in those issues and would even be the main respondent in the following years.

Staying out from the enlargement meant that “the doors of EU would be closed to Turkey for at least more than 20 years”.<sup>168</sup> On December 14, Ankara stated that relations with the EU would run within the context of ‘Association Partnership’, which did not implicate the political staffs declared in the 1997 December Summit conclusion, and the improvement of relations based on the behavior of the EU in the next years.<sup>169</sup> While it was specified that the integration process with the TRNC, that was development of economic integration and formation of a common defense doctrine, would be advanced as a response to the beginning of Greek Cypriot accession negotiations in name of the whole island.<sup>170</sup> The opposition of Ankara may have been impressive in softening of the discourses of the Union in next summits about the increasing European strategy to prepare Turkey for EU membership.

---

<sup>168</sup> <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/1997/12/14/hurriyet.asp> (accessed January, 2009).

<sup>169</sup> “Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkilerinin Tarihçesi”, [www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=1](http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=1) accessed January, 2009.

<sup>170</sup> <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/1997/12/15/196501.asp> (accessed January, 2009).

## CHAPTER IV: EARTHQUAKE DIPLOMACY: A NEW PARADIGM?

After Athens became a member of the EC in 1981, a new period began in Turkish-Greek relations. In the 1980s Greece used the advantages of being a member of the Community to prevent Turkish relations with the Community. However, in the 1990s, the policy of Athens changed. The core aim of this chapter is to analyze Greek policies towards Turkey and the *Rapprochement* period. While there had not been a big shift in Greece's policy towards Turkey during the first half of the 1990s, important changes had occurred in the second half of decade. Greece did not veto Turkish candidacy to the EU. The reasons behind this shift in Greek policy will be discussed.

### 4.1 1999 Helsinki Summit

There are different phases for a country to become an EU member state, and they can be classified into the application, candidacy, accession negotiations and finally membership. Depending on the phase, the obligations of the aspirant country increase along with the factors involved. During accession negotiations the country's ability to fulfill its obligations, while not the only determinant, is of utmost importance. The other determinants, influential due to the very nature of the enlargement process, are the national states' individual and collective interests, which can be defined as the impact of the candidate on EU institutions. Furthermore, given the decision of the individual member states to put a country's membership to referendum, public opinion influences the process, since governments have to take it into consideration if they want to be chosen for a second term.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> Müftüleri-Baç, Meltem, POLS 592 European Union: Politics, Policies, and Governance Lecture Notes, unpublished, 2007.

At the Luxembourg Summit, Turkey was not included in the list of candidates. However, two years later, at the 10-11 December 1999 Helsinki Summit, Turkey was officially recognized as a candidate.<sup>172</sup> Considering that Turkey did not do much for candidacy over those two years, the reasons for this turnabout lie in EU- related dynamics. The first is the reduction in Greek opposition, due to obligatory budgetary cuts required to join euro zone, which necessitated a decrease in defense spending and thus better relations with Turkey.

In late 1990s, Greece realized that it would be very difficult to solve bilateral relations if Ankara was isolated from the EU.<sup>173</sup> Greece's bargaining power *vis a vis* Turkey depends on Ankara's aspiration to become an EU member. Greece's power would be lost if Ankara stayed out from the Union like after the 1997 Luxemburg Summit.<sup>174</sup> The second reason is the change in the German government from the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), which opposed Turkey's membership on the grounds of cultural differences, to the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) which supports Turkey's membership and wants to improve relations with Turkey. Third was the decision at Luxembourg to differentiate the candidates based on their ability to fulfill their obligations (evaluate every candidate with its own merits)<sup>175</sup> rather than grouping them together and treating them as such.<sup>176</sup>

After the earth tremor, "Greece partially lifted her veto on EU aid to Turkey", which was a part of the Customs Union and vetoed by Greece because of the Aegean disputes, without

---

<sup>172</sup> Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusion 10 and 11 December 1999 (12) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm) accessed January 2009 as well as Luxembourg European Council Presidency Conclusions 12 and 13 December 1997

<sup>173</sup> Papanicolaou, Yiannis, "The EU and Turkey: A Glittering Prize or a Millstone?", Federal Thrust for Education and Research, April 2005, pp:151-163.

<sup>174</sup> Öniş, p:38.

<sup>175</sup> Harris, Georgiades "A European Parliament Perspective" in "Enlarging the European Union the Way Forward" Gower J. and Redmond J. (ed) Ashgate Publishing Ltd. Aldershot, 2000, p:27.

<sup>176</sup> Müftüleri-Bac, Meltem – McLaren, Lauren, "Enlargement preferences and policymaking in the EU: Impacts on Turkey," Journal of European Integration, Vol. 25, No.1,2000, pp:17-24.

asking concessions.<sup>177</sup> The grant of the Turkish candidacy status was one of the most important decisions of Helsinki Summit. It was stated that “Turkey is a candidate state destined to join the Union on the basis of the same criteria as applied to the other candidate States”.<sup>178</sup> In this decision not only Greek attitude but also other European countries’ decision also German decision should be mentioned. Before, there was a Greek belief which came over that “it would not be in position to settle its bilateral disputes with Turkey over Cyprus and the Aegean Sea if Turkey was left isolated and outside the orbit of the European Union”.<sup>179</sup> Bargaining power of Greece was directly related to Turkey’s will to be incorporated in the Union. Athens favored solutions could be reached through the Union mediation. With the release of the Greek veto, change in the political power in Berlin and Washington’s pressure on the EU to keep Turkey close had an important effect on the decision taken.<sup>180</sup>

One other important aspect of the 1999 Helsinki Presidency Conclusion was the removal of the precondition for settlement of the disputes surrounding the Republic of Cyprus's membership.<sup>181</sup> It is particularly important to note that both the removal of the precondition and Turkey's candidacy were stated in the same presidency conclusion which implies a tradeoff between Greece and EU. This example clearly illustrates how member states can use the EU as a tool to achieve their foreign policy objectives. In this case Greece was able to blackmail the EU, using its veto power to Europeanize the Turkish-Greek conflict. The

---

<sup>177</sup> “Branches Olive”, *Economist* 352, issue 8137, September 9, 2009.

<sup>178</sup> Article 12 of the Helsinki European Council 10 and 11 December 1999 Presidency Conclusions, [http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm) (accessed January 2009)

<sup>179</sup> Öniş, p:38.

<sup>180</sup> Before the Helsinki Summit, as a result of the general elections in Germany, the Christian Democrats were replaced with the Social Democrats. It was important for Turkish relations with the Union since the Christian Democrats were strongly against Turkish membership because of the fear of huge Turkish immigration to the country. In addition to the political change in Germany, the continuing unrests in the regions – Caucasus and Kosovo- around Turkey kept its strategic position and its close relations, a Turkey within the EU would be favored by the USA when there was initiatives for developing a mechanism besides NATO for the security and defence of Europe. For detail information see Baykal and Arat, pp:351-353.

<sup>181</sup> Helsinki Summit Presidency Conclusion 10-11 December 1999 9 (b) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm) accessed January, 2009.

removal of the condition on Republic of Cyprus inevitably led to accession of Cyprus in 2004 which further complicated relations between Turkey and EU.<sup>182</sup>

Furthermore, after the Luxembourg disappointment, the opinion supported the view that “Europe is an ethnic-religious club that will never accept a country of 65 million Muslims raised in Turkey”.<sup>183</sup> The beliefs that Turkey should turn its face to Asia and develop relations with Eastern countries and also Turkic republics.

In terms of Turkish-Greek relations, there were important points that were to affect the future relations regarding Aegean Disputes and the Cyprus issue. In the document it stated that:

“...like the other candidate States, Turkey will benefit from the pre accession strategy to stimulate and support its reforms. This will include enhanced political dialogue, with emphasis on progressing towards fulfilling the political criteria for accession with particular reference to the issue of human rights, as well as on the issues referred to in paragraphs 4 and 9(a).”<sup>184</sup>

The fourth paragraph emphasizes was on the peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes in accordance with the UN Charter. It means that candidate states should do every effort for resolutions. However, if the process fails, the EU promotes the settlement through the International Court of Justice at the latest by the end of 2004.<sup>185</sup> In the paragraph 9(a), Cyprus dispute was mentioned. It was stated that the negotiations began under the auspices of the UN for a settlement of the Cyprus issue were supported by the EU.

---

<sup>182</sup> Müftüleri-Baç, Meltem, “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2002, p:83.

<sup>183</sup> Gordon, Phil, “Europe’s Helsinki Summit: Now Make Turkey a Serious Offer”, *International Herald Tribune*, December 10 1999, <http://www.iht.com/articles/1999/12/10/edgordon.2.t.php> (accessed January 2009).

<sup>184</sup> Article 12, Helsinki European Council.

<sup>185</sup> Article 4, Helsinki European Council.

It is obvious that two paragraphs were crucial importance for Ankara not only for the full membership to the Union but also bilateral relations with Athens. So, the Aegean and Cyprus issues, namely border disputes, started to take place in the Union's documents related to Turkey's progress. The 1999 Helsinki Summit was the last step of transforming Ankara-Athens disputes into Turkey-Union disputes. Since then, Greece was the respondent of Turkey in the negotiations of settlement of disputes. However, the European Union was the main respondent with sanction power holding the policy.

#### **4.2 The Position of Greece and Bilateral Relations**

On September 1999 at the 54th UN General Assembly the Greek Foreign Minister George Papandreou enthusiastically emphasized the improvement in Greek-Turkish bilateral relations. However, he also did not ignore their divergent positions on both Aegean Sea and Cyprus. He stated that:

“If the road to peace is indeed made up of ‘a collection of moments’ then I also dare hope for our relations with Turkey. My Turkish counterpart, Ismael Cem, and I have been engaged in careful diplomacy for many months. We recently inaugurated discussion committees to address a number of bilateral concerns, including trade, tourism and the environment, where we feel our two countries have much to gain from mutual Cupertino. Peoples’ aspirations for the principles of democracy, security and prosperity can overcome historical strife. In this democratic spirit, we believe that our security is bound by the stability in the region; that our neighbors’ strength is our own strength’”.<sup>186</sup>

---

<sup>186</sup> Reuter Jürgen, “Reshaping Greek-Turkish Relations: Developments Before and After the EU Summit in Helsinki”, 1999, Occasional Papers, OP.00.01, ELIAMEP.  
<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=7&fileid=4A5AA24B-D1BD-2EA2-B13D-05DF3518F2BA&Ing=en> accessed January 2009.

A 'new' foreign policy towards Ankara began when George Papandreou replaced Theodoros Pangalos as the Foreign Minister of Greece. He became minister just after a major turning point in bilateral relations, the 'Abdullah Öcalan Case'.

This crisis came in 1999 because of Greece's protection of the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK) leader Abdullah Öcalan. Öcalan was handed over to Turkish intelligence. His presence at the Greek Embassy was considered direct interference by Greece in Turkish internal politics.<sup>187</sup>

This event hurt Greece's reputation in the international arena, especially in the EU, because it was supporting terrorist activities taken against both her neighboring country and a NATO ally.<sup>188</sup> After the 1980s the policy of Greece was 'the enemy of my enemy is my friend', and Greece supported the PKK militarily, politically and economically.<sup>189</sup> Athens' involvement in the Öcalan affair had embarrassed the Greek government, and Greece wanted to improve bilateral relations in order to repair her image. The Foreign Minister Teodoros Pangolos resigned from the Greek Cabinet,<sup>190</sup> and George Papandreou, who was elected after Pangolos, positioned himself as a conciliator between Athens and Ankara.<sup>191</sup> The departure of Pangolos and his replacement by Papandreou opened the way for more interaction between the two countries.<sup>192</sup>

After the Öcalan crisis, the principles of moderate policies and close relations guided relations between the two countries. This supports the idea that dialogue between the two neighboring

---

<sup>187</sup> Öniş, 2001, pp:31-45.

<sup>188</sup> Evin, Ahmet, 2004, p:8.

<sup>189</sup> "The Öcalan Crisis", *The Economist*, Vol. 350, February 20, 1999. issue 8107.

<sup>190</sup> Oğuzlu, Tarık, "The Lastest Turkish-Greek Detente: Instrumentalist Play for EU Membership, or Long-Term Institutional Cooperation?", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol.17, No.2. 2004b, p: 347.

<sup>191</sup> Ayman, Gülden, "Spring Time in the Aegean", *Private View*, No.8, pp:56-60.

<sup>192</sup> Evin, 2005, pp:395-404.

countries began before the earthquake. It paved the way for ‘Seismic Diplomacy’ in bilateral relations,<sup>193</sup> coming after the EU’s decision on Ankara, but before the earthquake disaster in the Marmara Region. After the September 1999 earthquake in Greece, followed by Turkey’s assistance to the Greek people, the rapprochement became stronger.<sup>194</sup>

The dual earthquakes in Greece and Turkey moved dialogue to a civil level, opening a new route through which the two countries could develop their relationship.<sup>195</sup> Ziya Onis states that:

‘The recent Greek-Turkish *rapprochement* has an important romantic or idealistic dimension, marking the start of a new relationship based on mutual trust and co-operation, originating from civil initiatives in both countries and signaling the path through which co-operation could be built in the future’.<sup>196</sup>

NATO’s intervention in the Kosovo Crisis was another good opportunity for Greece to cooperate<sup>197</sup> and improve her image in the Western eyes.<sup>198</sup> In the wake of the Kosovo Crisis, the Turkish Foreign Minister and the Greek Foreign Minister agreed to make efforts to improve bilateral relations.<sup>199</sup>

Since 1999, sixteen agreements have been signed between Greece and Turkey. The two countries have attempted to reinforce rapprochement with progress on lower-profile political issues like economics, environment, terrorism, illegal immigration, etc.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup> Akiman, Nazmi, ‘‘Turkish-Greek Relations: From Uneasy Coexistence to Better Relations?’’, *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 2002, Vol.13, No.3, pp:22-32.

<sup>194</sup> Evin, *Pols 509 Lecture Notes*, 2007.

<sup>195</sup> Evin, 2004, pp:4-15.

<sup>196</sup> Öniş, 2001, p:38.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid*, p:8.

<sup>198</sup> Heraclides, Alexis, ‘‘Greek-Turkish Relations from Discord to Detente: A Preliminary Evaluation’’, *The Review of International Affairs*, 2002, Vol. 1, No.3, p:21.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid*, p:22.

<sup>200</sup> Bilgiç, Tolga and Karatzas, Petros, *The Contraction in Greece-Turkey-EU Triangle: Rapprochements at the Edges*, March 2004, p: 5, <http://www.econturk.org/Turkischeconomy/turkeygreece.pdf> accessed January 2009.

Since 1999, this practice of building better relations with lower-profile activities has extended to non-governmental organizations and business contact.<sup>201</sup> Since 1999, economic relations have grown stronger between Athens and Ankara. Joint business councils, trade fairs, and business meetings between the two countries have increased since the second half of 1999. These activities have provided support for political rapprochement.<sup>202</sup>

In addition to these developments in lower-profile politics, there has also been cooperation on higher-level politics at the governmental level. Since 2002, diplomats from Greece and Turkey have come together to negotiate the countries' major disputes, and a group of experts was formed to exchange ideas on the issues.<sup>203</sup>

Consequently, there have been major steps in bilateral relations since the end of 1990s,<sup>204</sup> and conflicts of misunderstanding are less likely to happen. Continued tension is desired neither by the governments nor by the civilians of the two neighboring countries.<sup>205</sup>

#### **4.3 Economic Relations after *Rapprochement***

This section analyses if there has been an affirmative transformation in Greek-Turkish economic relations after *Rapprochement*. In the analysis, I will utilize trade as an indicator because it forms the major economic activity between any two countries. Trade is the most straightforward form of inter-country economic relations. Trade is the first activity to respond

---

<sup>201</sup> Siegl, Erik, "Greek-Turkish Relations-Continuity or Change", Perspectives: Central European Review of International Affairs, 2002, Vol.18, p: 47.

<sup>202</sup> Öniş and Yılmaz, 2007, p: 3.

<sup>203</sup> Oğuzlu, Tarık, "How Encouraging is the Latest Turkish-Greek Reconciliation Process?", Journal of European Studies, 2004a, Vol.12, No.1, p:95.

<sup>204</sup> Heraclides, 2002, p:17-32.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid, p:26.

to the recent political developments especially between the two neighboring countries.<sup>206</sup> For the trade relations, I will examine data on Turkey's export to Greece and import to Greece.

#### **4.3.1 Trade Relations**

Although being neighboring countries, trade relations and cooperation between Athens and Turkey is a new event. The reason is the political facts in the history.<sup>207</sup> Stronger bilateral relations between Ankara and Athens are more likely to have a positive effect on economical relations.

Trade relations between Greece and Turkey before and after 1999 is analyzed to whether there has been a transformation in the two neighboring countries' relations. Table 2 indicates total exports of Turkey and also the exports to Greece. The table covers data a decade from 1998 to 2008.

---

<sup>206</sup> Papadopoulos A. Constantine, Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation: Guarantor of Detente or Hostage to Politics?', South East European Studies at Oxford, Occasional Paper No. 8/08, March 2008, p:12.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid, p:2.

| <b>YEAR</b> | <b>Total Export</b> | <b>Exports to Greece</b> | <b>% of Exports to Greece within the total exports</b> |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>1998</b> | 26 973 952          | 370 039                  | 1,371  |
| <b>1999</b> | 26 587 225          | 406 794                  | 1,530  |
| <b>2000</b> | 27 774 906          | 437 725                  | 1,576  |
| <b>2001</b> | 31 334 216          | 476 095                  | 1,519  |
| <b>2002</b> | 36 059 089          | 590 382                  | 1,637  |
| <b>2003</b> | 47 252 936          | 920 401                  | 1,947  |
| <b>2004</b> | 63 167 153          | 1 171 203                | 1,854  |
| <b>2005</b> | 73 476 408          | 1 126 678                | 1,533  |
| <b>2006</b> | 85 534 676          | 1 602 590                | 1,873  |
| <b>2007</b> | 107 271 750         | 2 262 655                | 2,110  |
| <b>2008</b> | 132 002 612         | 2 430 549                | 1,841  |

**Table 2: Total Exports of Turkey (000 dollars)<sup>208</sup>**

Table 2 shows that both the total export of Turkey and exports from Turkey to Athens have increased 1998. Although there was an improvement in the exports to Greece, its share has not steadily increased. Before 1999 period, shares of the exports to Greece never fall down.

In 2006, imports from Greece were \$ 1, 040 m. It was the 0.8 % of Turkish total import bill. Although being neighbor country, Greece was in 32<sup>nd</sup> position in ranking of countries to Turkey. Bulgaria is the other neighbor country of Turkey. Ankara's imports to Bulgaria were %60 greater in value than Greece in 2006. On 4 May 2006, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Karamanlis agreed to more than double bilateral trade from the current \$2 bn to

<sup>208</sup> Turkish Statistical Institute, Statistic Table, Foreign Trade by Years, [http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb\\_id=12&ust\\_id=4](http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=12&ust_id=4) accessed by February, 2009.

5\$ bn.<sup>209</sup> Therefore, it can be said that with the political interaction between Athens and Ankara, economic relations have improved.

#### **4.4 Opening of Accession Negotiations with Turkey in October 2005**

In 2001, Turkey adopted 34 amendments to its Constitution in order to meet the Copenhagen political criteria for EU membership. These amendments included abolition of the death penalty and authorize greater use of languages other than Turkish in public life.<sup>210</sup> Furthermore in 2002, an EU Adaptation Law of 15 Articles was passed in order to meet obligations concerning human rights.<sup>211</sup> These efforts were intended to lead to positive decisions by the European Council at its 2002 Copenhagen Summit.<sup>212</sup> However, despite expectations, at the Copenhagen Summit Turkey's demand to set a time table for accession negotiations was rejected, and instead it was agreed to meet in December 2004 to review Turkey's candidacy.<sup>213</sup> At the December 2004 Brussels Summit, the European Council following the Commissions report and recommendation, decided that Turkey sufficiently fulfilled the Copenhagen political Criteria to open accession negotiations.<sup>214</sup> One other important aspect of the 2004 Brussels Presidency Conclusions is that the initiation of the accession negotiations would require the signing of the Protocol on the adaptation of the Ankara Agreement.<sup>215</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup> Papadopoulos, p: 13.

<sup>210</sup> Erdemli, p:7.

<sup>211</sup> "The reforms include the abolition of the death penalty, the allowance of broadcasting in different languages and dialects used traditionally by Turkish citizens in their daily lives, and the improved education possibilities for minority languages" Müftüler Baç, Meltem, *Pols 592: European Union: Politics, Policies, and Governance Lecture Notes*, Sabancı University, 2007.

<sup>212</sup> Erdemli, p:7.

<sup>213</sup> Copenhagen European Council Presidency Conclusions 12 and 13 December 2002 (19) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf) accessed January, 2009.

<sup>214</sup> Brussels European Council Presidency Conclusions 16/17 December 2004 Turkey (22) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf) accessed January, 2009.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid.

The decision to begin accession negotiations with Turkey may be historic but the timing was unfortunate, due to the low level of economic growth in the large eurozone countries, a high level of unemployment, internal disagreements ranging from the Iraq war to the EU budget, and the uncertainty caused by the French and Dutch veto of the Constitutional Treaty. At the same time, the EU is struggling to overcome the consequences of the 2004 enlargement, its largest ever.<sup>216</sup>

The Commission presented the Accession Negotiations Framework for Turkey to the Council of Foreign Ministers. However, the discussion of the framework was postponed to the unofficial meeting of the General Affairs and External Relations Council since Turkey had not signed the Additional Protocol which would extend the Customs Union to the ten new members including Cyprus. Subsequently, Turkey signed the agreement but at the same time declared that the usage of the concept of "Republic of Cyprus" did not imply recognition of the Greek Part of Cyprus since this extension of the Customs Union might mean implicit recognition (which was declaratory in design). The EU responded to this claiming that Turkey must recognize Cyprus and must give access to its ports and airports to Cypriot ships and planes, for accession negotiations to be concluded. Following that, the Council approved a framework for negotiations with Turkey thus enabling the negotiations to begin.<sup>217</sup> Since 2004 the Republic of Cyprus, not recognized by Turkey, has been one of the EU members<sup>218</sup> with veto power over Turkey's membership and has thus gained leverage over Turkey on the Cyprus issue. Thus though the Accession Negotiations have been initiated, in December 2006 the Council decided that negotiations will not be opened on eight chapters relevant to

---

<sup>216</sup> Barysch K. "Deepening, Widening and Prospects for Turkish Membership" Paper for the 6<sup>th</sup> Turkey EU membership Observatory, Centre for European Reform, Istanbul 2006 pp:1-2.

<sup>217</sup> Secretariat General for EU Affairs "Chronology of Turkey – EU relations"  
<http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=112&l=2>

<sup>218</sup> Copenhagen European Council 12-13 December 2002 Presidency Conclusions Paragraph 10 -12  
[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf) accessed January, 2009.

Turkey's restrictions on the Republic of Cyprus and that no chapter will be provisionally closed until the Commission confirms that Turkey has fully implemented the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement.<sup>219</sup>

After 1999, the rapprochement period shows that there are close relations between the two neighboring countries both on bilateral relations and within the EU framework. The fact that Athens withdrew its veto against Turkish membership in the EU, bilateral negotiations especially between İsmail Cem and Georgios Papandreou have improved , and increasing number of agreements on trade, terrorism and economic have been signed are important indicators of the rapprochement. However, still the Cyprus and Aegean conflicts have been left unsolved. Although there have been major improvements in the détente period, Athens and Ankara are still in conflict.

---

<sup>219</sup> Commission of the European Communities “Turkey 2007 Progress Report “ Brussels 6.11.2007 SEC(2007), 1436. [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2007/nov/turkey\\_progress\\_reports\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2007/nov/turkey_progress_reports_en.pdf) accessed January 2009.

## CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

This thesis aimed to analyze Turkish-Greek relations within the European Union framework. It was particularly shaped around the question of how Greece's EU membership was used in its bilateral relations with Turkey since the former became a full member of the Community, and until and after candidacy status was given to Turkey in Helsinki, in 1999.

In the Cold War period, the main Greek foreign and defense policy was to secure itself against attack from communist neighbors. Consequently, it chose to become a member of the NATO alliance with the neighboring country, Turkey. NATO membership can be considered a turning point, which brought Greece into the European alliance. After NATO membership, Greece applied to the EC with the same security problems. However, at that time the EC did not have an entity to provide military security, for economic and political reasons. Turkey was not one of the reasons for Greece's application for membership, since at that time, Turkey and Greece were 'compulsory friends' because of the common Communist threat.

Unfortunately, good relations did not continue very long. Greece managed to increase its security with NATO membership, good relations with the EC, and also with American assistance. However, Greece had some problems in bilateral relations, which directly affected the formation of its foreign and defense policies.

In addition to the economic and political reasons that came under the umbrella of Karamanlis' slogan 'we belong to West', the Turkish threat also played an important role in the EC membership application. Although it was foreseen that Turkish relations could affect the Greek membership, Greece became a full member in January 1981. Greek EC membership introduced a new dynamic to bilateral relations with Turkey. Greece strengthened her position

in the EC, and used it as a big advantage against Turkey, which had been trying to get into the EC.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, Greece used her veto tool against EC membership to force Ankara to accept her demands on disputes. During these years, the EC did not involve itself in the Cyprus and Aegean disputes. The Greek veto power became the main obstacle to improvement of relations between Turkey and the EC. Greece regularly used its full membership advantages to increase her bargaining power over Turkey.

In the early 1990s, the approach of the EU on Cyprus and the Aegean disputes started to change. In 1995, the beginning of accession negotiations with Cyprus was guaranteed, in response to lifting the Greek veto on Customs Union with Turkey. Thus, the main step towards European involvement with the Cyprus entanglement was taken. At that point, the Commission was close to Greece, and supported her arguments and solutions for the Aegean disputes. The EU is now closely concerned with Turkey, and the prerequisite to resolve both the Cyprus and Aegean disputes before Turkey can become a member has started to take its place in the official documents. The power of these kinds of individual considerations is well reflected in the European Council's presidency conclusions and the Commission's recommendations. Additionally, the Negotiation Framework for Turkey, prepared by the Commission and approved by the Council, clearly reflects the individual member states' concerns as well as the collective ones. Therefore, it can be argued that the Commission's role, as a supranational body in design, is strictly limited by the preferences of the member states.

Greece needed to cut its military expenditures so as to enter the euro zone. In Athens, curtailing the military expenditure was an urgent need which was set by the Community. And the curtailment was depending on relations with Turkey since Ankara had been perceived as the main threat against Greece. Besides this economic goal of Athens, the attitude of the Union on the Cyprus Crisis and the Aegean disputes began to shift. In 1995, in order to guarantee Cyprus' EU membership, Turkey's Customs Union membership was also accepted by Greece. Moreover, after the Kardak/Imia crisis, the Commission took the attitude of supporting Greece's argument and solutions for the Aegean disputes. After then, both Cyprus and Aegean disputes have started to take place in the official documents of the Union. Finally, the last step bringing the direct involvement of the EU into Turkey-Greece disputes was taken in Helsinki Summit. The EU accepted Turkey as a candidate, but with an important warning that full membership was dependent on finding a solution in Cyprus and in the Aegean. Having successfully transformed these disputes into an issue to be resolved according to criteria set by the EU, Greece now is one of the strongest supporters of Turkey's membership in the Union.

In the *rapprochement* era, there have been major improvements in bilateral relations. Although Greece and Turkey now cooperate in areas of tourism, trade, and terrorism, Cyprus and Aegean are still big problems, especially for Turkey on its way to Europe.

Eventually, Greece was more successful in Europeanization of its disputes with Turkey before 1990s. Taking the disputes within the framework of Union, Athens made the Community the main and official respondent of Ankara. This diplomacy brought Athens the bargaining power which it would not have had alone without EU support, given its relative economic and military power vis-à-vis Turkey. The diplomacy not only relieved Athens in terms of conflicts

with Ankara but also erased the label of ‘spoiled child of Europe’ and brought it close to core states of the Union.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **BERN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TURKEY AND GREECE**

**(11 November 1976)**

1. The two parties agree that negotiations shall be frank, throughgoing and pursued in good faith, with a view to reaching an agreement based on their mutual consent with regard to the delimitation of the continental shelf as between themselves.
2. The two parties agree that these negotiations shall by their very nature be strictly confidential.
3. The two parties reserve their respective positions with regard to the delimitation of the continental shelf.
4. The two parties undertake not in any circumstances to make use of the provisions of this document, or such proposals as may be made by either side during these negotiations, outside the context of the negotiations themselves.
5. The two parties agree that there shall be no statements or leaks to the press on the contents of the negotiations, unless they decide otherwise by common accord.
6. The two parties undertake to refrain from any initiative or act concerning the Aegean Continental Shelf that might trouble the negotiations.
7. The two parties each undertake, so far as their bilateral relations are concerned to refrain from any initiative or act likely to throw discredit on the other.
8. The two parties have agreed to study the practice of States and the international rules on the subject, with a view to eliciting such principles and practical criteria as might be of use in the case of the delimitation of the continental shelf between the two countries.
9. To that end, a mixed commission will be set up to be composed of national representatives.
10. The two parties agree to adopt a gradual rhythm in the negotiating process to be followed, after mutual consultation.

Done in Berne, in two copies, in the French language, 11 November 1976

Jean TZOUNIS,  
Head of the Hellenic delegation

Ali Suat BÖLGE,  
Head of the Turkish delegation

**Source:** Kılıç, Hulusi. Bilateral Agreements, Essential Documents and Declarations between Turkey and Greece since the Proclamation of the Turkish Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey, (Ankara: Deputy Directorate General for Maritime and Aviation Affairs, 2000)

## **APPENDIX B**

### **13 PROPOSALS**

1. The right of veto of the President and the Vice-President of the Republic to be abolished.
2. The Vice-President of the Republic to deputise for or replace the President of the Republic in case of his temporary absence or incapacity to perform his duties. In consequence, therefore, all the constitutional provisions in respect of joint action by the President and the Vice-President of the Republic to be modified accordingly.
3. The Greek President of the House of Representatives and its Turkish Vice-President to be elected by the House as a whole and not as at present the President by the Greek Members of the House and the Vice-President by the Turkish Members of the House.
4. The Vice-President of the House of Representatives to deputise for or replace the President of the House in case of his temporary absence or incapacity to perform his duties.
5. The constitutional provisions regarding separate majority for enactment of Laws by the House of Representatives to be abolished.
6. The constitutional provision regarding the establishment of separate Municipalities in the five main towns to be abolished. Provision should be made so that: (a) The Municipal Council in each of the aforesaid five towns shall consist of Greek and Turkish Councillors in proportion to the number of the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of such town by whom they shall be elected respectively. (b) In the Budget of each of such aforesaid towns, after deducting any expenditure required for common services, a percentage of the balance proportionate to the number of the Turkish inhabitants of such town shall be earmarked and disposed of in accordance with the wishes of the Turkish Councillors.

7. The constitutional provision regarding Courts consisting of Greek Judges to try Greeks and of Turkish Judges to try Turks and of mixed Courts consisting of Greek and Turkish Judges to try cases where the litigants are Greeks and Turks to be abolished.

8. The division of the Security Forces into Police and Gendarmerie to be abolished, (Provision to be made in case the Head of the Police is a Greek the Deputy Head to be a Turk and vice versa).

9. The numerical strength of the Security Forces and of the Army to be determined by Law and not by agreement between the President and the Vice-President of the Republic.

10. The proportion of the participation of Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the composition of the Public Service and of the Forces of the Republic, i.e. the Police and the Army, to be modified inproportion to the ratio of the population of Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

11. The number of the members of the Public Service Commission to be reduced from ten to either five or seven.

12. All the decisions of the Public Service Commission to be taken by simple majority. If there is an allegation of discrimination on the unanimous request either of the Greek or of the Turkish members of the Commission, its Chairman to be bound to refer the matter to the Supreme Constitutional Court.

13. The Greek Communal Chamber to be abolished.

Sources:Chrysostomides, Kypros, “*The Republic of Cyprus A Study in International Law*”, 2000, (The Hague:Martinus Nijhoff Publishers), pp:33-34.

## BIBLIOGRAHY

- Acer, Yücel. ‘‘The Aegean Maritime Disputes and International Law’’, 2003, (Wiltshire: Ashgate), pp:5-16.
- Akalın, Hakkı, ‘‘*Turkey and Greece, On the Way to Another War?*’’, 1999, (Ankara:Ümit Yayıncılık), pp:219-221.
- Akıman, Nazmi, ‘‘Turkish-Greek Relations: From Uneasy Coexistence to Better Relations?’’, *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 2002, Vol.13, No.3, pp:22-32.
- Aksu, Fuat ‘‘Ege Sorunlarının Geleceđi ve Türkiye AB Üyelik Sürecinde Türkiye’nin Seçenekleri’’, *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3, Sayı 5 (Temmuz 2005), pp:16-17.
- Arıkan, Harun, ‘‘*The EU- Turkey Association: A Flawed Instrument?* ‘‘ in ‘‘*Turkey and EU, An awkward candidate for EU membership?*’’, 2003, pp:47-64.
- Arım, Reşat, *Foreign Policy Concepts Conjuncture, Freedom of Action, Equality*, Foreign Policy Institute, 2001, p:5.
- Armaođlu, Fahir, ‘‘*Kıbrıs Meselesi 1954-1959*’’, 1963, (Ankara:Sevinç Yayınevi), pp:70-94.
- Aydın, Mustafa and Ifantis, Kostas, *Turkish-Greek Relations The Security Dilemma in the Aegean*, 2004, pp:25-28.
- Ayman, Gülden, ‘‘Spring Time in the Aegean’’, *Private View*, No.8, pp:56-60.
- Bahçeli Tozun, *Turning a New Page in Turkey’s Relations with Greece? The Challenge of Reconciling Vital Interests*, in Aydın Mustafa – Ifantis Costas, (eds.) *New Perspectives in Greek-Turkish Relations*, Frank Cass, 2003. p:97.
- Barysch K. ‘‘*Deepening, Widening and Prospects for Turkish Membership*’’ Paper for the 6<sup>th</sup> Turkey EU membership Observatory, Centre for European Reform, Istanbul 2006 pp:1-2.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali, ‘‘Turkey and the Davos Process: Experiences and Prospects’’ in *the Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences*, edited by Dimitri Constan, 1991, (New York:St. Martin’s Press), pp:27-39.
- Birand, Mehmet Ali, *Türkiye’nin Avrupa Macerası 1959-1999*, 2000, (İstanbul: Dođan Kitapçılık), p:318-461.
- Bölükbaşı, Deniz, ‘‘*Turkey and Greece Disputes A Unique Case in International Law*’’, 2004, (London:Cavendish Publishing), pp:39-846.

- Bölükbaşı, Süha, “The Turco-Greek Relations: Issues, Policies and Prospects” in Dodd, Clement H. *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects*, 1992, (London: Eothen Press), p:37.
- Bölükbaşı, Süha, “*The Turco-Greek Relations: Issues, Policies and Prospects*” cited in Dodd, Clement H., *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects*, 1992, p:34.
- “Branches Olive”, *Economist* 352, issue 8137, September 9, 2009.
- Camp, Glen D., “Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus,” *Political Science Quarterly* 95, (Spring, 1980), No.1, p:47-58.
- Chircop, Aldo, and Gerolymatos, Andre and Iatrides, John, *The Aegean Sea After Cold War; Security and Law of the Sea Issues*, 2000, p:64.
- Chrysostomides, Kypros, *The Republic of Cyprus A Study in International Law*, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2000, pp:33-528.
- Clogg, Richard, “Greek-Turkish Relations in the Post-1974 Period” in the *Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences*, edited by Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: St. Martin’s Press), p:23.
- Clogg, Richard, “*Modern Yunanistan Tarihi*”, 1997, translated by Şendil, Dilek, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları), p:20-218.
- Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community December 20, 1989 [http://www.mfa.gov.tr/commission-opinion-on-turkey\\_s-request-for-accession-to-the-community\\_-december-20\\_-1989.en.mfa](http://www.mfa.gov.tr/commission-opinion-on-turkey_s-request-for-accession-to-the-community_-december-20_-1989.en.mfa)
- Commission Opinion on Turkey’s Request for Accession to the Community, Sec (89) 2290 Final/2 (20 December 1989), p:5.
- “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament” Recommendation of the European Commission on Turkey’s progress towards accession Brussels 6.10.2004 CON (2004) 656 Final, p:4.
- Coufoudakis, Van “Greek-Turkish Relations, 1973-1983 the View from Athens”, *International Security* 9, no. 4, Spring 1985, p:205.
- Coufoudakis, Van, “Greek Political Party Attitudes Turkey: 1974-1989”, in the *Turkish-Greek Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences*, ed. Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: T. Martin Press), p:50.
- Crawshaw, “*The Cyprus Revolt*”, 1978, (London: William Cloves and Sons), pp:83-89.

- Dodd, Clement, “The Political, Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus”, 1993, (Cambridgeshire: the Eothen Press), pp:103-218.
- Eralp, Atilla, “Turkey in the Enlargement Process: From Luxembourg to Helsinki”, Perceptions, June-August 2000, p:20.
- Erdemli, Özgül, “*Chronology : Turkey's relations with the EU*” Turkish Studies, Spring 2003, Vol.4, No.1, p:4-7.
- Ertekün, Necati, “*The Cyprus Dispute and the Birth of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*”, 1984, (Oxford: University Press), pp:3-9.
- Evin, Ahmet, “Changing Greek Perspectives on Turkey: An Assessment of the Post-Earthquake Rapprochement”, Turkish Studies, April 2004, Vol. 5, No.1, p:8-10.
- Evin, Ahmet, Pols 509 Greek-Turkish Relations Lecture Notes, Sabanci University, unpublished, 2007.
- Feld, Werner, “The Association Agreements of the European Communities: A Comparative Analysis, International Organization 19, Spring 1965, No.2, p:230.
- Fırat, Melek, “1945-1960 Yunanistan’la İlişkiler.” in *Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar*, Cilt 1, edited Baskın Oran, 2001, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları), pp:576-614.
- Georgiades, Harris “A European Parliament Perspective” in “Enlarging the European Union the Way Forward” Gower J. and Redmond J. (ed) Ashgate Publishing Ltd. Aldershot, 2000, p:27.
- Georgiades, Harris C., “Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship”, in *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, ed. Achilles Mitsos and Elias Mossialos (England: Ashgate, 2000), p:423-424.
- Gordon, Phil, “Europe’s Helsinki Summit: Now Make Turkey a Serious Offer”, International Herald Tribune, December 10 1999, <http://www.iht.com/articles/1999/12/10/edgordon.2.t.php> (accessed January 2009).
- Hatipoğlu, Murat, “Yakın Tarihte Türkiye ve Yunanistan 1923-1954”, 1996, (Ankara:Siyasal Kitabevi), pp:301-311.
- Hatzivassiliou, Evanthis, “Security and the European Option: Greek Foreign Policy, 1952-62”, Journal of Contemporary History 30, January 1995, No.1, p:196.
- Heraclides, Alexis, “Greek-Turkish Relations from Discord to Detente: A Preliminary Evaluation”, The Review of International Affairs, 2002, Vol. 1, No.3, p:17-32.

- Heraclides, Alexis, ‘‘Yunanistan ve ‘Dođu’dan Gelen Tehlike’ Türkiye / Türk Yunan İlişkilerinde Çıkmazlar ve Çözüm Yolları’’, 2002, (İstanbul:İletişim Yayınları), p:17-212.
- Iacovos S. Tsalicoglou, Negotiating for Entry the Accession of Greece to the European Community, (USA: Dartmouth Brookfield, 1985), p:10.
- Inan, Yüksel and Acer, Yücel, ‘‘The Aegean Disputes’’ in Ali Kraosmanođlu and Seyfi Tashan (ed.s), ‘‘The Europeanization of Turkey’s Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls’’, 2004, (Ankara:Foreign Policy Institute), p:1.
- *International Boundary Cases: The Continental Shelf*, 1992, (Grotius Publications Limited), Vol.2, pp: 4-12.
- K.C. Markides, *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp.11-14.
- Kibarođlu Mustafa, Kıbrıs’ın Stratejik Önemi Nerede?, Milliyet: Entellektüel Bakış, 29 Ağustos 2000.
- Kahraman E. S. ‘‘Rethinking Turkey- European Relations in the light of enlargement’’ Turkish Studies, Vol.1, No.1, p:3.
- Kivernesos, Ephemeris Tes, 11 April 1913, No.68, p:204. (Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations), cited in Bölükbaşı, p:576.
- Kılıç Hulusi, *Bilateral Agreements, Essential Documents and Declarations between Turkey and Greece since the Proclamation of the Turkish Republic*, 2000, (Ankara:Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Dışışleri Bakanlığı), p:277.
- Koliopoulous, John and Veremis,Thanos, *Greece, The Modern Sequel: From 1821 to the Present*, 2004 (London: Hurst), p: 303.
- Larrabee, F. Stephen and Lesser, O. Ian, ‘‘Turkish Foreign Policy in the Age of Uncertainty’’, 2003, p:73-79.
- Markides, Constantinos, *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp.11-14.
- Müftüler-Baç Meltem, ‘‘Turkey’s Relations with a Changing Europe’’, 1997, Manchester University Press, Ch.3, pp:63-64.
- Müftüler-Baç, Meltem and Stivachtic, Yannis, Turkey-European Union Relations, 2008, p:118-120.

- Müftüler-Bac, Meltem – McLaren, Lauren, “Enlargement preferences and policymaking in the EU: Impacts on Turkey,” *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 25, No.1,2000, pp:17-24.
- Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, “Turkey in the EU’s Enlargement Process: Obstacles and Challenges”, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2002, p:83.
- Müftüler-Baç, Meltem, POLS 592 European Union: Politics, Policies, and Governance Lecture Notes, unpublished, 2007.
- Necatigil, Zaim, *the Cyprus Question and the Turkish Position in International Law*, 1998, (New York: Oxford University Press), p:2.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık, “How Encouraging is the Latest Turkish-Greek Reconciliation Process?”, *Journal of European Studies*, 2004a, Vol.12, No.1, p:95.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık, “The Latest Turkish-Greek Detente: Instrumentalist Play for EU Membership, or Long-Term Institutional Cooperation?”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol.17, No.2. 2004b, p: 347.
- Oran, Baskın, *Yunanistan’ın Lozan İhlalleri*, 1999, (Ankara:SAEMK Yayınları), p:85.
- Öniş, Ziya, “Greek-Turkish Relations and the European Union: A Critical Perspective”, *Mediterranean Politics* 6, Autumn 2001, No.3, p:31-45.
- Öniş, Ziya and Yılmaz, Şuhnaz, *Greek-Turkish Rapprochement: Rhetoric or Reality*, 2007, p: 1-2.
- Özal, Turgut, *Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey*, 1991, (Nicosia North Cyprus: K. Rustem & Brother), p:1-328.
- Pazarıcı, Hüseyin, “*Uluslararası Hukuk Dersleri II. Kitap*”, 1999, (Ankara:Turhan Kitabevi), p:393-394.
- Papanicolaou, Yiannis, “The EU and Turkey: A Glittering Prize or a Millstone?”, *Federal Thrust for Education and Research*, April 2005, pp:151-163.
- Preston, Christopher, “*Enlargement and Integration in the European Union*”, 1997, (London and New York:Routledge), pp: 46-53.
- Pridham, Geoffrey, “Linkage Politics Theory and the Greek-Turkish Rapprochement”, in *the Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990’s Domestic and External Influences*, ed. Dimitri Conostas, 1991, (New York: St. Martin’s Press), p:83-84.
- Riemer, Andrea K., *The Turkish Yearbook*, “Turkey and Europe at a Cross-road Drifting Apart or Approaching Each Other”, 2003, Vol. XXXIV, p:148

- Rumelili, Bahar, “The European Union’s Impact on the Greek-Turkish Conflict”, *Working Papers Series in EU Border Conflict Studies*, No. 6 (January 2004), p:3-7.
- Siegl, Erik, “Greek-Turkish Relations-Continuity or Change”, *Perspectives: Central European Review of International Affairs*, 2002, Vol.18, p: 47.
- “The Öcalan Crisis”, *The Economist*, Vol. 350, February 20, 1999. issue 8107.
- Tsalicoglou, Iacovos, *Negotiating for Entry the Accession of Greece to the European Community*, 1995, (USA: Dortmund, Brookfield), p:30
- Turkey in Europe, Report of the Independent Commission on Turkey September 2004, p:12-13.
- Truman Proclamation No.2667, 10 Fed. Reg. 12303 cited in *International Boundary Cases: The Continental Shelf*, 1992, (Cambridge: Grotius), p:2.
- US Congress, Senate, Turkey’s Problems and Prospects: Implications for US Interests. Report prepared by the CRS of the Library of Congress, 3 March 1980, p:35-53.
- Verney, Susannah, “ Greece and the European Community” in *Political Change in Greece: Before and After the Colonels*, edited by Kevin Featherstone and Dimitrios K. Katsoudas, 1987, (London:Croom Helm), p: 257.
- Wilson, Andrew, “The Aegean Dispute” in *Greece and Turkey: Adversity in Alliance* Adelphi Library 12, edited by Jonathan Alford, 1984, (Great Britain:Biddles Ltd), p:94.
- Woodhouse, C. M. Karamanlis, *The Restorer of Greek Democracy*, 1982, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982, p:227.

## Internet Sources

- Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği, Türkiye Avrupa İlişkilerinin Tarihçesi, <http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=1>
- Agenda 2000, <http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/overview/en/agenda.htm>
- Aksu, Fuat, “Confidence Building, Negotiation and Economic Cooperation Efforts in Turkish-Greek Relations (1990-2004)”, Turkish Review of Balkan Studies, 2004, Vol.3, No.5, p:47. <http://www.obiv.org.tr/2005/Balkan/faksu.pdf>
- Article 12 of the Helsinki European Council 10 and 11 December 1999 Presidency Conclusions, [http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm) (accessed January 2009)
- Bilgiç, Tolga and Karatzas, Petros, The Contraction in Greece-Turkey-EU Triangle: Rapprochements at the Edges, March 2004, p: 5, <http://www.econturk.org/Turkisheconomy/turkeygreece.pdf>
- Brussels European Council Presidency Conclusions 16/17 December 2004 Turkey (22) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/83201.pdf)
- Commission Opinion on Turkey’s Request for Accession to the Community, Sec (89), 2290 Final/2, Brussels 20 December 1989 [http://aei.pitt.edu/4475/01/=01842\\_1.pdf](http://aei.pitt.edu/4475/01/=01842_1.pdf) p:7
- Commission of the European Communities “Turkey 2007 Progress Report “ Brussels 6.11.2007 SEC(2007), 1436. [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2007/nov/turkey\\_progress\\_report\\_s\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2007/nov/turkey_progress_report_s_en.pdf)
- Copenhagen European Council Presidency Conclusions 12 and 13 December 2002 (19) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/73842.pdf)
- Greek Ministry of Foreign Ministry <http://www.mfa.gr/www.mfa.gr/en-US/European+Policy/Greece+in+the+EU/>
- Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusion 10 and 11 December 1999 (12) [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm)

- Helsinki Summit Presidency Conclusion 10 and 11 December 1999 9 (b)  
[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/ACFA4C.htm)
- “Karasularının Genişletilmesi Sorunu”, [www.turkishgreek.org/karasula.htm](http://www.turkishgreek.org/karasula.htm)
- Hürriyet Newspaper, <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/1997/12/15/196501.asp>
- Luxembourg European Council Presidency Conclusions 12 and 13 December 1997  
[http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/032a0008.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/032a0008.htm)
- Reuter Jürgen, “Reshaping Greek-Turkish Relations: Developments Before and After the EU Summit in Helsinki”, 1999, Occasional Papers, OP.00.01, ELIAMEP.  
<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=7&fileid=4A5AA24B-D1BD-2EA2-B13D-05DF3518F2BA&Ing=en>
- Regular Report From the Commission On Turkey's Progress Towards Accession, 1998, p:5.  
[http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/AB\\_Iiskileri/Tur\\_En\\_Realitons/Progress/Turkey\\_Progress\\_Report\\_1998.pdf](http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/AB_Iiskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/Turkey_Progress_Report_1998.pdf)
- Report of the Secretary General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus  
<http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:FGHldOwVUuwJ:www.cyprus.gov.cy/moi/poi.nsf/A11/DFEFEA8E9DBDA510CC2256DC3002CB46/%24file/17%2520December%25201996.doc%3FOpenElement+For+peace+peace+efforts+on+the+island,+see+the+Report+of+the+Secretary+General+on+his+Mission+of+Good+Offices&hl=tr&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=tr&client=firefox-a>
- Report on Independent Commission on Turkey “*Turkey in Europe More than a promise?*”, September 2004, p:25  
<http://www.independentcommissiononturkey.org/pdfs/english.pdf>
- Secretariat General for EU Affairs “*Chronology of Turkey – EU relations*”  
<http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=112&l=2>
- Secretariat General for EU Affairs “*History of Turkey EU Relations*”  
<http://www.abgs.gov.tr/index.php?p=111&l=2>
- The Law of the Sea: The Definition of the Continental Shelf, (1992), pp:1-2.  
[http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unlos/part6.htm)
- Tüm Gazeteler  
<http://www.tumgazeteler.com/?a=2346502>

- 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention,  
[http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm)
- 1958 Geneva Continental Shelf Convention  
[http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8\\_1\\_1958\\_continental\\_shelf.pdf](http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_1_1958_continental_shelf.pdf)