EUROPEANIZATION OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS ISSUE UNDER THE JDP GOVERNMENT: MYTH OR REALITY

by

SEVİNÇ BODUR

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
August 2008

EUROPEANIZATION OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS ISSUE UNDER THE JDP GOVERNMENT: MYTH OR REALITY

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç …….

(Dissertation Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Öncü …….

Assist. Prof. Yaprak Gürsoy Dipşar ……..…….

DATE OF APPROVAL: …….

To my love and my family

ABSTRACT

EUROPEANIZATION OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS CYPRUS ISSUE UNDER THE JDP GOVERNMENT: MYTH OR REALITY

SEVİNÇ BODUR

M.A. in European Studies Program, Thesis, 2008

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler Baç

Keywords: Europeanization, Turkish Foreign Policy, Cyprus Issue, JDP Government, security interests vs. EU membership

After Justice and Development Party came to power on 3 November 2002 elections, the JDP government has made the EU membership as a policy priority, and tied Turkey's accession to the EU with the solution of the Cyprus problem. In this respect, this study aims to assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and if so whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. Although previous governments recognize the Cyprus issue as a vital national security interest that can not be sacrificed for the EU membership, the JDP government has developed its Cyprus policy in order to overcome the challenges against the EU membership. The external incentive for a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus is the motivation for the EU membership. In this regard, the JDP government has developed its discourse over Cyprus compatible with the EU rhetoric. However, the weakening of credibility of the EU rewards and threats slowed down the "Europeanization" process in Turkey and "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus remain solely in rhetoric despite the initial pro-activism of the JDP government in the earlier phase of accession negotiations.

ÖZET

AKP HÜKÜMETİ ALTINDA TÜRK DIŞ POLİTİKASININ KIBRIS SORUNUNA YAKLAŞIMININ AVRUPALILAŞMASI: EFSANE YA DA GERÇEK

SEVİNÇ BODUR

Avrupa Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı, Tez, 2008

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç

Anahtar kelimeler: Avrupalılaşma, Türk Dış Politikası, Kıbrıs Sorunu, AKP Hükümeti, güvenlik çıkarları AB üyeliğine karşı

3 Kasım 2002 seçimleriyle Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi iktidara geldikten sonra, AKP hükümeti AB üyeliğini politika önceliği yaptı ve Türkiye'nin AB'ye katılımını Kıbrıs sorunun çözümü ile ilintilendirdi. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma 2002'den beri Türk dış politikasının Kıbrıs'a yaklaşımında bir değişim olup olmadığını, eğer bir değişim varsa bu değişimin Türkiye'nin katılım süreciyle ilişkisini tayin etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Her ne kadar önceki hükümetler Kıbrıs'ı AB üyeliği için feda edilemeyecek bir milli güvenlik unsuru olarak kabul etse de, AKP hükümeti Kıbrıs politikasını AB üyeliği karşısındaki engelleri kaldırmaya yönelik geliştirmektedir. Türk dış politikasının Kıbrıs'a yaklaşımındaki bu değişimin arkasındaki dış teşvik AB üyeliğidir. Bu bağlamda, AKP hükümeti Kıbrıs söylemlerini AB'nin söylevlerine uyumlu bir şekilde geliştirmektedir. Fakat AB ödül ve tehditlerinin güvenilirliğinin azalması Türkiye'deki "Avrupalılaşma" sürecini de yavaşlatmaktadır ve AKP hükümetinin katılım müzakerelerinin ilk zamanlarındaki inisiyatifi ele alan tutumuna rağmen Türk dış politikasının Kıbrıs'a yaklaşımındaki Avrupalılaşma yalnızca söylevdeki değişimde kalmaktadır.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am deeply grateful to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç in providing me the necessary guidance and motivation in the process of concluding this thesis. I have to admit that without her support and valuable comments, writing of this thesis would be very difficult. I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Korel Göymen who backed me in completing the thesis. Moreover, I would like to thank Retired Ambassador Yalım Eralp for his valuable comments that shed light on my thesis and further contributed to the quality of my work. In addition, I would like to sincerely thank TÜBİTAK, the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, for its financial support which was essential to the completion of this thesis.

My special thanks go to my boyfriend Koray Mutlu both for his support of any type throughout this thesis adventure and his love and care. Last, but not the least, I would like to express my gratefulness and love to my parents and sisters for giving the necessary motivation I needed to complete my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVRIATIONS

A.D.:	Anno Domini, Latin
B.C.:	Before Christ
CTP:	The Republican Turkish Party of Northern Cyprus
DYP:	True Path Party
EOKA:	National Organization for Cypriot Fighters
EU:	European Union
İP:	Worker's Party
JDP:	Justice and Development Party
NSC:	National Security Council
RPP/CHP:	Republican People's Party
SP:	Felicity Party
TGNA:	Turkish Grand National Assembly
TRNC:	Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
TÜSİAD:	Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association
UN:	United Nations
US:	United States of America

INTRODUCTION

Turkey has been negotiating for membership in the European Union since October 2005. The impact of the accession negotiations has been felt in a number of areas in Turkish policy-including economics, politics and foreign policymaking. This is to be expected as the European Union is an important actor which encourages and promotes change in its members as well as in those countries that aim at accession. This is why there is an important body of literature that investigates the EU's impact on bringing about political change. The domestic impact of the European Union (EU) is referred to as Europeanization in European integration literature. "Europeanization" is generally defined as the adoption and implementation of EU rules and regulations. In order to become an EU member, it is necessary to make reforms in line with the *acquis communautaire*, 80,000 pages of EU legislation.[1] 'Conditionality' is at the center of "Europeanization." Membership, the ultimate reward, depends on the adoption and implementation of the EU rules and regulations.[2]

Turkey as a candidate country has been undertaking an ongoing and unprecedented political reform process since 2001. This reform process has been associated with Turkey's relations with the European Union. Many scholars have tried to analyze the link between the Turkey's reform process and its path to the EU and how this reform process has been strengthened by the external EU anchor. This stimulating discussion has engendered a growing literature questioning how Turkey has succeeded in transforming itself in order to achieve EU membership. As a result, this thesis aims to explore the impact of the European Union on policymaking in Turkey. In particular, this thesis will analyze the EU's impact on the transformation of Turkish foreign policy

[1] Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier, "Introduction: Conceptualizing the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe," in *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*, eds. Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedemeier (USA: Cornell University Press, 2005): 1-28.

[2] Kemal Kirişçi, "The limits of conditionality and Europeanization: Turkey's dilemmas in adopting the EU acquis on asylum," *EUSA Tenth Biennial International Conference*, 17-19 May 2007.

toward Cyprus. This is particularly important as Cyprus and the Turkish involvement in the Cyprus problem has been a crucial factor determining Turkey's relations with the EU as well as its accession negotiations.

This thesis aims at uncovering whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred with the Justice and Development Party's (JDP) coming to power with on the 3 November 2002 elections. This is important because the JDP has made Turkey's membership a policy priority and since Turkey's accession to the EU is ultimately tied to the solution of the Cyprus problem, radical change in traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus would be expected. As a result, the JDP has put forth a position that it claims to be as a radical break from traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. This major transformation is clearly associated with Turkish accession to the EU as there are no other internal and/or external factors giving rise to such a foreign policy change. Thus, this thesis will analyze how Turkey has been able to transform its foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government for the purposes of EU membership and the extent to which the credibility of the EU has played a role in the transformation of Turkish foreign policy toward Cyprus.

The main rationale behind policy changes is that candidate countries have to adjust their policies vis-à-vis the demands and priorities of the EU. Public policy makers of candidate countries transform domestic policies in line with the EU acquis in order to be rewarded with the EU membership. On the other hand, transformation process has worked much faster in some candidate states than in others. This unequal adaptation process has aroused interest in what drives reception and implementation of the EU acquis in candidate countries.[3] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier have asserted that the "credibility of threats and rewards is a core prerequisite" of any effective transformation process.[4] This is an important insight as one could deduce that the EU's ability to impact change is ultimately tied to its credibility in the eyes of the candidate country, in this case, in Turkey.

When one looks at the literature on Europeanization, it becomes obvious that the vast body of the research is on the adjustment of internal policies to those of the EU. In other words, in contrast to "Europeanization" of domestic policies, "Europeanization"

[3] Ibid, 2.

[4] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 33.

of foreign policies is highly problematic. This might be due to the fact that the EU itself has yet to form a unified voice in its foreign policy whereas the main standards in domestic politics are relatively more established. The main problem in terms of "Europeanization" of foreign policy is that the EU is not a unified state actor with identifiable 'Europeanized interests.' Despite practices of policy consultation and coordination, the EU still has a flexible and disaggregated series of patterns, arrangements, and institutions which express a collective yet pluralistic identity.[5] Thus, the power of the EU to affect national policy in the policy areas including foreign policy, where there is no EU directives and regulations, depends on the strength of credibility of threats and rewards.[6] Moreover, credibility of the EU is essential to be able to exercise its normative power. The widespread discourse in the EU with respect to legitimizing its policies is centers on how integration will help in overcoming conflicts and in maintaining peace and stability. However, exactly how and under what conditions integration will contribute to concluding peaceful transformation of border conflicts and the development of the good neighborly relations are important questions that need to be discussed.[7] The inconsistency between the EU's rhetoric and its behavior undermines the EU's normative power. This is why the focus of this thesis on the relationship between the uncertain future of Turkey's accession to the EU and the Europeanization process in Turkish foreign policy will be a novel contribution to the Europeanization and Turkey-EU literature as well as the normative power literature.

In order to understand the link between credibility and transformative power of the EU, this thesis intends to explore whether there is "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy in action or solely at the rhetorical level. Thus, the discursive inclinations of the JDP politicians, especially the key actors within the party and government, will be the main focus of this study. Moreover, by searching for gaps among rhetoric, stated

---

[5] Reuben Wong, "The Europeanization of Foreign Policy," in *International Relations and the European Union*, eds. Christopher Hill and Michael Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005): 134-153.

[6] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 33.

[7] Mathias Albert, Thomas Diez, and Stephan Stetter, "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration," *International Organization* 60 (2006): 563-593.

motivation, material interests, and policy outcomes, this thesis plans not only on discovering the extent to which foreign policy makers have succeeded in adopting a "Europeanized" discourse but also on exploring whether "Europeanization" in discourse has been turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes. In this regard, the impact of credibility of threats and rewards originated from the perspective EU membership on the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus both in rhetoric and in realpolitik under the JDP government will be examined.

The theoretical framework of this thesis is laid out in Chapter 1. It should be underlined that the complex nature of the relationship between the EU and Turkey as well as the long-lasting and problematic structure of the Cyprus dispute necessitates the employment of various theoretical approaches in order to reach a comprehensive understanding of the ongoing dynamics and transformations on Turkish foreign policy toward the Cyprus conflict. The thesis will assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy has occurred since 2002 and, if so, whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. In this regard, the "external incentives model" developed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier will help to understand and explain the far-reaching transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus given Turkey's desire for EU membership and to what extent credibility of the EU affects the development of "Europeanized" discourse on Cyprus issue.

On the other hand, in order to determine whether there has been a real change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus or simply a rhetorical one, it is necessary to analyze the extent to which "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes. In this respect, Smith's analysis will contribute to understanding the degree to which the "Europeanized" discourse has developed into action and how the European rules and procedures are incorporated into the JDP's policies towards Cyprus.[8] However, it is also important to see that even if changes in approach toward Cyprus are only rhetorical, this is also a major accomplishment as such change can precede and encourage policy changes. In this respect, Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transforming the border conflict will help make it clear as to whether or not the EU integration process has had a positive impact on the movement of the conflict

[8] Michael Smith, "Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy," *Journal of European Public Policy* 7 (2000): 613-631.

away from a stage of a greater conflict intensity to stages of lower intensity as a result of "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government.[9]

Chapter 2 analyzes the historical evolution of the Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus as well as the involvement of the EU in this conflict. This chapter investigates the principles and major turning points in the Turkey-Cyprus-EU triangle. In particular, it will try to understand the developments and the nationalist rhetoric in the 1990s. In Chapter 3, the thesis will conduct a rhetorical analysis of the main actors based on official speeches of the representatives of the JDP government. On the other hand, in order to understand discourse transition under the JDP government, Chapter 3 will compare the discourse developed by the JDP government with the discourse developed by the previous coalition government of the Democratic Left Party, National Action Party and Motherland Party. Moreover, Chapter 3 will carry out a brief discourse analysis of other actors who are essential to the determination of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus: the main opposition party - the Republican People's Party, the Presidency of Turkish Republic and the Turkish Armed Forces in order to understand whether there has been a divergence from traditional discourse, as well as whether a compatibility with European discourse has ensued. Moreover, by using the "external incentives model" developed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, this thesis will discuss whether policy makers of the JDP government use "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded with the EU membership or to avoid being penalized by being kept outside the EU. In this regard, rhetorical analysis will answer whether there is an equally important material need that EU membership provides which could be thought of as a trade off with the security interests in Cyprus. It is also important to assess whether all political actors in Turkey believe in the material interest that the EU accession will bring.

In addition, by using Smith's analysis, Chapter 4 will analyze to what extent "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes. According to Smith, there are four major indicators to be used in analyzing domestic adaptation with regard to foreign policy: elite socialization, bureaucratic reorganization, constitutional change, and increase in public support for the Europeanization of foreign

[9] Albert, Diez, and Stetter, 563-565.

policy. Thus, based on these indicators, this thesis will try to analyze that the extent to which a "Europeanized" discourse has turned into action.[10] On the other hand, it is also important to recognize that even if these changes vis-à-vis Cyprus are merely rhetorical, this, too, is also a major accomplishment since rhetorical change can precede and engender policy changes. In this regard, Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transform the border conflict will become particularly helpful to discovering whether the EU integration process has had a positive impact on the movement of the conflict from a stage of greater conflict intensity to stages of lower intensity. It will also be beneficial to analyze the impact of the credibility of the EU on transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. Finally, the Conclusion will summarize the findings elaborated in this thesis and try to conclude whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and if so whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. Moreover, an attempt will be made to understand the extent to which uncertainty of eventual EU membership affects the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus.[11]

In brief, the thesis aims to assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and if so whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. The involvement of Turkish government in Cyprus is explored through material security needs and interests; then a question emerges as to whether there is an equally important material need that EU membership provides – one that could be thought of as a trade off with the security interests in Cyprus. It is also important to assess whether all political actors in Turkey believe in the material interest that the EU accession will bring. In this respect, the analysis of the change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus will also testify to the impact of the credibility of the signals that come from the EU in terms of threats and rewards. Thus, the thesis will assess whether there has been a real change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus or whether any change have only been in terms of rhetoric. It is also important to understand that even if changes are simply rhetorical, this, too, can be seen as a major accomplishment since rhetoric change can precede and create policy changes.

[10] Smith, 613-631.

[11] Albert, Diez, and Stetter, 563-593.

CHAPTER ONE

EUROPEANIZATION THEORY IN PERSPECTIVE

In an analysis of Turkey's foreign policy towards Cyprus, it is necessary to adopt a theoretical framework, such as the one covered in this chapter. In order to reach a comprehensive understanding of the relations in the Turkish-Cyprus-EU triangle, it is necessary to employ various theoretical approaches, most notably Europeanization theory. Thus, in this chapter, a brief background on the theories of Europeanization will be provided. Particularly, the "external incentives model" developed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, Smith's analysis of major indicators to analyze the domestic adaptation to foreign policy, and Diez' categorization of the EU's pathways to transform the border conflict will be covered in this theoretical chapter. The concept of "Europeanization" is useful in order to understand the emergence, development and impacts of a European, institutionally-ordered system of governance.[12] The common definition of the "Europeanization" is the transformation of politics at the domestic level.[13] However, "Europeanization" does not have any single precise or stable meaning.[14] It is a process of structural change, affecting actors, institutions, ideas, and interests. It has a dynamic structure whose effects are not necessarily permanent or irreversible. On the contrary, its impact is incremental, irregular, and uneven.[15]Olsen

[12] Johan Olsen, "The Many Faces of Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2002): 921-952.

[13] Jeffrey Anderson, "Europeanization and the Transformation of the Democratic Polity, 1945-2000," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2002): 793-822.

[14] Olsen, 921.

[15] Kevin Featherstone, "Introduction: In the Name of Europe," in *The Politics of Europeanization*, eds. Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 3-26.

demonstrates the five possible uses of the term "Europeanization." First of all, "Europeanization" refers to the territorial reach of a system of governance. European transformation is not seen as limited to the EU and its member states. This usage emphasizes that an adequate understanding of the ongoing transformations requires attention to non-Member states. Second, "Europeanization" is seen as centre-building with a collective action capacity, providing some degree of coordination and coherence.[16] It is defined as the institutionalization at the European level of a distinct system of governance with common institutions and the authority to make, implement and enforce binding European-wide policies. Risse defines "Europeanization" as:

> "…the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal, and social institutions associated with the problem solving that formalize interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specializing in the creation of authoritative European rules."[17]

In the third conception, "Europeanization" refers to the central penetration of national systems of governance. It implies adapting national and sub-national systems of governance to a European political centre and European-wide norms.[18] It focuses on change in core domestic institutions of governance as a consequence of the development of European-level institutions, identities, and policies. Moreover, "Europeanization" is defined as exporting forms of political organization and governance that are typical and distinct for Europe beyond the European territory. Although the spread of European models has sometimes taken the form of colonialization, coercion, and imposition, diffusion has taken the form of imitation and voluntaristic borrowing from a successful civilization. The receivers have borrowed from the European arrangements because of their perceived functionality, utility, and legitimacy. Finally, "Europeanization" is regarded as a political unification project. It

---

[16] Olsen, 923-929.

[17] James Caporaso, Maria Green Cowles, and Thomas Risse, "Europeanization and Domestic Change," in *Europeanization and Domestic Change: Transforming Europe*, eds. James Caporaso, Maria Green Cowles, and Thomas Risse (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001), 1-20.

[18] Olsen, 932.

tries to understand the degree to which Europe is becoming a more unified political entity in terms of its territorial space, centre-building capacity, domestic adoption, and how Europe influence and is influenced. It attempts to understand the development of a European sphere that contributes to common conceptions of legitimate political organization and a shared feeling of belonging, removal of internal borders, and a clear discrimination between members and non-members.[19]

In all different approaches to the term "Europeanization," the common point is the emphasis on 'transformation.' Transformation can be an outcome of problem-solving and calculating expected consequences, or of conflict resolution and confrontations. On the other hand, it can be produced through experiential learning or competitive selection, contact and diffusion, or turnover and regeneration. There are two key dimensions of transformation. The first is the change in political organization. This change refers to the development of an organizational and financial capacity for common action and governance through processes of reorganization and redirection of resources. The second deals with the change in structures of meaning and people's minds. It focuses on the development and redefinition of political ideas, common visions and purposes, and casual beliefs. Actors appeal to a shared collective identity and its implications. They evoke common standards of truth and moral.[20]

The transformation resulting from compliance with EU rules has become firmly embedded in the 'great debate' between rationalist and constructivist institutionalism. Whereas rationalists explain it in terms of positive and negative incentives, which constrain or empower states and domestic actors by allocating differential costs to alternative courses of action, constructivist institutionalists put an emphasis on the process of international socialization, through which domestic actors change their identities and preferences as a result of imitation or argumentative persuasion. Based on different institutional theories, scholars have developed alternative arguments in order to understand the rule compliance.[21] It is within this larger debate between rational and sociological institutionalism that the concept of "Europeanization" plays a key role.

[19] Ibid, 938 & 940.

[20] Ibid, 924 & 926-927.

[21] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 5-6.

This thesis bases its main arguments on the definition of "Europeanization" offered by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier.

"Europeanization" is defined by the Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier as a process in which states adopt EU rules. "Rule adoption," which is the *institutionalization* of the EU rules at the domestic level, is the main mechanism of Europeanization. In order to achieve successful rule adoption at the domestic level, a non-member state should adopt EU rules and also should achieve the implementation and enforcement of these rules, rather than simply the legal transposition of the rules. Based on the different conceptions of norms, there are different forms of adoption. According to the *formal* conception, adoption consists of the transposition of the EU rules into national law and the establishment of formal institutions compatible with the EU rules. Based on the *behavioral* conception, adoption is measured by the extent to which states conform to the rules. On the other hand, *discursive* conception sees that adoption is indicated by the incorporation of a rule as a positive reference into discourse among domestic actors.

The "Europeanization" process can be either EU-led or domestically-led. In the EU-driven cases, the EU induces the process of rule adoption. The EU demands that new member states comply with the all parts of the *acquis communautaire*. However, in the domestically-driven cases, non-member states take the initiative. The second dimension deals with the different logics of action that rule adoption follows: "logic of consequences" and "logic of appropriateness" in line with the debates between rational institutionalism and sociological institutionalism. The "logic of consequences" assumes that strategic, instrumentally rational actors seek to maximize their own power and welfare. Bargaining over conditions and rewards, coercion, and behavioral adaptation leads the process of rule adoption. However, according to the "logic of appropriateness," actors are motivated by internalized identities, values, and norms. They tend to choose most appropriate or legitimate action among alternatives. The legitimacy of rules and the appropriateness of behavior, persuasion, and "complex" learning drive the process of rule adoption.[22]

This thesis aims to discover EU-driven transformation in the Turkish case. In order to become an EU member, Turkey has to make necessary reforms in line with the

[22] Ibid, 8-9.

acquis communautaire. In terms of foreign policy, Turkey has to solve her border conflicts and has to establish good neighborly relations. By following the rationalist-institutionalist logic, this thesis will test the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus and try to answer the question of the extent to which Turkey has succeeded in transforming its Cyprus policy in light of the demands placed on it for EU membership. In this regard, this thesis will explore the impact of "credibility of the EU threats and rewards" on transformation of Turkish Foreign Policy towards Cyprus. Since the Justice and Development Party came to power after the elections held on November 3, 2002, there has been a noticeable change in the traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus– one which has been seen as a radical break. This departure has been associated with Turkish accession. Thus, this thesis will analyze how Turkey has been able to transform its foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government in light of its application for EU membership and to what extent the credibility of the EU has played a role in the transformation of Turkish Foreign Policy towards Cyprus.

1.1. External Incentives Model

The "external incentives model" follows the "logic of consequences." According to the "external incentives model," during the bargaining process, actors exchange information, threats, and promises regarding their preferences. The end result of this bargaining process depends on the relative bargaining power of the actors. The bargaining power of actors is determined by the asymmetrical distribution of information and the benefits of a specific agreement compared to alternative options. Actors that have more and better information are able to manipulate the end result to their advantage, and actors that are least in need of a specific agreement are able to threaten others with noncooperation and thereby force them to make concessions. Based on the external incentives model, the EU sets the adoption of its rules that the non-member states have to fulfill in order to receive rewards from the EU; assistance and institutional ties. If the target government complies with the EU conditionality, the EU pays the reward. By offering reward, the EU aims to change the behavior of the target

government. However, this use of this strategy alone will do little to change the minds of governments.[23]

A government adopts EU rules if the benefits of EU rewards exceed the domestic adoption costs. The cost-benefit balance depends on the determinacy –clarity and formality- of conditions, the size and speed at which rewards are obtained, the credibility of threats and promises, and the size of adoption costs. If the behavioral implications of a rule are clearer and more legalized, its determinacy is higher. Determinacy helps the target governments know exactly what they have to do to get the rewards. It enhances the credibility of conditionality. The size and speed of the conditional rewards determines the measure of the incentive. The promise of enlargement is a more powerful incentive than the promise of assistance. The longer temporal distance to the payment of rewards reduces the willingness to comply with EU rules. Moreover, the credibility depends on the consistency of an organization's allocation of rewards. If the EU offers the rewards to candidates who do not fulfill the conditions, it creates a moral hazard problem within the target state that slows down the Europeanization process there. In addition, the stronger party of negotiations should effectively present its rewards to the target state, and this necessitates useful diffusion of information on conditions and rewards between the two sides. Moreover, the size of domestic adoption costs and their distribution among domestic actors determines whether conditions will be accepted or rejected. In this respect, the effectiveness of conditionality depends on the preferences of the government and of other veto players. Even if these conditions are conducive to rule adoption, target states may still choose the adoption form that minimizes the cost. Usually, discursive adoption is expected as the least costly option.[24]

The thesis aims to assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and if so, whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. In this regard, the "external incentives model" is essential in exploring the extent to which Turkey has transformed its Cyprus policy under the JDP government within the context of its application for EU membership and to what extent the JDP government has developed a "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded

[23] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 10-17.

[24] Ibid, 10-17.

with such membership. Moreover, the "external incentives model," which suggests the importance of credibility on the transformation of a candidate country, will contribute to analyze the impact of the EU's credibility on the development of "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus.

1.2. Transformative Power of the EU on Foreign Policy

Discourse adaptation contributes to behavioral adaptation. The thesis aims at assessing whether the changes in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus are real or simply rhetorical. Hence, it is essential to discover the extent to which "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes and it is significant to evaluate power of the EU on transforming the non-member states. In this regard, Smith's analysis is crucial to understanding the degree to which the Justice and Development Party government has been successful in transforming "Europeanized" discourse into "Europeanized" policy outcomes. According to Smith, there are four major indicators that can be used to analyze the domestic adaptation to foreign policy: elite socialization, bureaucratic reorganization, constitutional change, and increase in public support for Europeanization of foreign policy. Elite socialization is necessary in order to establish a certain level of trust in the system. Gradual internalization of cooperative habits and common views are essential contributors to elite socialization. Working groups, joint declarations, joint reporting, staff exchange among foreign ministries, and shared embassies are vital in moving from the old nation-state nation-state sovereignty model towards a collective endeavor. New national officials are also necessary to increase the cooperation with the member states. In addition, there needs to be an increase in concern among the media and interest groups over political cooperation to change the perception of the public opinion.[25]

Not only is it important to understand how European policies and procedures are incorporated into the policies of the JDP government towards Cyprus, it is crucial to understand the "Europeanization" of discourse developed by the JDP government. Therefore, in the last chapter, Smith's analysis will contribute to understanding the

[25] Smith, 617-627.

extent to which a "Europeanized" discourse has turned into action. The growing importance of European rules and procedures in the JDP's approach to the Cyprus conflict is significant in turning "Europeanized" discourse into "Europeanized" policy outcome. However, it is also important to see that even if only rhetoric changes in the Cyprus policy have occurred, this is still a major accomplishment as rhetoric change can precede and provide a stimulus to policy changes. Thus, it is essential to examine just how much Turkish accession contributes to transforming the Cyprus dispute. In this respect, Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transforming the border conflict will help to determine the extent to which the EU integration process has had a positive impact on the movement of the conflict from a stage of a greater conflict intensity to stages of lower intensity as a result of "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government. By analyzing the transformative power of the EU, it should not be forgotten that the power of the EU to impact national policy areas, such as foreign policy, where the EU directives and regulations are absent, depends on the credibility of the EU conditionality. The EU makes the membership reward conditional upon the solution of border conflicts and development of good neighborly relations. Thus, Turkey has to solve the Cyprus dispute in order to be rewarded with EU membership. As Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier have asserted, "the *credibility of threats and rewards is a core prerequisite*" of any effective transformation process, the credibility of the EU influences the transformative power of the EU. In this regard, Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transforming the border conflict will help in analyzing to what extent credibility of the EU rewards and threats has affected the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government.

According to Diez, conflicts are discursively constructed. When an actor constructs his or her identity or interests that cannot be made compatible with another actor's identity and interests, the existence of a conflict is inevitable. When the actor refers to another as an existential threat to the self, the conflict occurs.[26] There are four stages of conflicts. In the first stage, called *conflict episode*, conflict is at its weakest. In

[26] Thomas Diez, "Last exit to paradise? The European Union, the Cyprus conflict and the problematic catalytic effect," in *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union,* eds. Thomas Diez (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002a), 139-162.

this stage, although the articulation of an incompatibility occurs as a singular, isolated incidence, there is no reference to an existential threat. If the conflict communication stays limited to a particular issue, an *issue conflict* emerges. At this issue conflict stage, the actors do not invoke identities as such as part of the conflict; and issue conflicts do not contain securitizing moves. However, where securitizing moves abound and conflicting parties articulate explicitly essential threats to "self," conflicts turn into *identity conflict*. When the conflicting parties widely accept the existential threat posed by the other and need to counter this threat with extraordinary measures, the conflict enters its final stage of *subordination conflict*. In the subordination conflicts, conflict communication dominates all aspect of societal life.[27]

There are four pathways used by the EU to transform conflicts: compulsory impact, enabling impact, connective impact, and constructive impact. *Compulsory impact* works through carrots and sticks. Compelling actors change their policies vis-à-vis the other party toward conciliatory moves rather than deepening securitization. The main carrot of the EU is membership. As part of the *acquis communautaire*, the EU insists on the resolution of border disputes and developing good neighborly relations. If the conflicting party desires to become an EU member, it needs to change its policies towards the other party. This change may simply reflect strategic behavior. It does not necessarily imply that it has altered its views of the other party or its beliefs about the conflict. However, in the long run, these strategic moves can lead to deeper reforms through continuing pressure and socialization.[28]

Other EU incentives, such as financial aid and free trade agreements, are relatively minor incentives compared to membership. The success of compulsory impact of EU integration depends on three factors. The most important is pending membership negotiations. The compulsory impact loses its power when a membership offer is not made and once membership has been attained. A second crucial factor is the credibility of the membership offer. If the conflicting party considers the membership offer as an achievable option, it will engage in desecuritizing moves. Finally, the extent

[27] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 568.

[28] Ibid, 572.

to which domestic actors internalize the legal and normative framework of integration is fundamental to the pervasiveness of the compulsory impact.[29]

The compulsory impact of the EU is not sufficient to achieve pervasive transformation. In order to achieve successful long-term transformation, an *enabling impact* is essential. If specific actors within conflicting parties, such as civil society actors, link their political agendas to the EU and justify desecuritizing moves that may otherwise have not been considered legitimate, this leads to an *enabling impact*. An enabling impact is necessary to legitimize the desecuritizing moves through reference to the *acquis communautaire*. Legitimacy references should not be limited to a narrow political elite. It should reach out to a wider societal base.[30]

In order to reach a wider societal base, the *connective impact* of the EU plays a crucial role. The EU's direct support of contacts between societal actors of the conflict parties serves as an essential tool for the successful transformation.[31] Through the financial support of common activities, contact between conflicting parties can be provided. This connective impact does not only contribute to desecuritization but also leads to a broader societal effect in the form of social networks across conflicting parties and facilitates the identity change as foreseen within the constructive impact. The *constructive impact* aims at changing the underlying identity-scripts of conflicts. Thus, it supports a (re-)construction of identities that permanently sustains peaceful relations between conflict parties. The EU impact can put in place completely new discursive frameworks for creating novel ways of constructing and expressing identities within conflict regions. These new identity-scripts foster desecuritization in a virtuous circle and may ultimately lead to the eventual resolution of the conflict and the disappearance of articulations of the incompatibility of subject positions because the Europe has become an integral part of the identity (-ies) in each of the EU's member states. Integration enables actors to pursue policies that intensify conciliatory discourse. Rather than choosing securitizing moves, the parties adopt the discourse of European solution. Without the constructive impact, desecuritization is often a tactical tool for

[29] Ibid, 572-575.

[30] Ibid 573&578.

[31] Ibid, 581.

achieving EU membership.[32] However, any long-term transformation of conflicts crucially depends on a change in identity constructions in conflict societies that subject positions are no longer regarded as incompatible and the relevance of invoking previous conflict issues loses attraction.[33]

In this regard, Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transform the border conflicts will help to discover whether or not the EU integration process has had a positive impact on the movement of the conflict from a stage of a greater conflict intensity to stages of lower intensity as a result of "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government. Moreover, it will be useful to analyze the extent to which credibility of EU rewards and threats has affected the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government.

In brief, the thesis aims at analyzing how Turkey has succeeded in transforming its foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government given its desire to obtain EU membership and the extent to which the credibility of the EU has played a key role in the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. This thesis intends both to discover the degree to which foreign policy makers of the JDP government have been able to develop a "Europeanized" discourse and to explore whether a "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes. In this regard, this thesis aims to analyze the impact of the credibility of the EU rewards and threats on the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus both in rhetoric and in action under the JDP government through various theoretical approaches. Included among these are Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier's "external incentives model," Smith's indicators of domestic adaptation on foreign policy and Diez's categorization of the EU's pathways to transform border conflicts.

[32] Ibid, 573-576.

[33] Ibid, 584-585.

CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE TURKISH-CYPRUS RELATIONS

This chapter addresses the historical evolution of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. An historical analysis is crucial in order to properly contextualize the issues in the Cyprus problem. Cyprus covers a central place in the multidimensional strategic and regional balances of the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East and Southern Europe. This is why the Cyprus conflict has been at the top of the foreign policy agendas of the governments of Turkey, Greece, the US, and Russia since the 1950s. The strategic importance of Cyprus has increased dramatically in the post-Cold War era because of the geo-strategic position of the island as the crossroad between Europe and the Middle East. The Cyprus issue has become more complex with the European Union's involvement as the EU has emerged as a new actor in the Cyprus. It hopes to gain foreign policy success by solving the Cyprus issue through the reward of the EU membership. These are the main points that this chapter will analyze in line with the principles and major turning points in the Turkish-Cyprus-EU triangle.[34]

[34] Meltem Müftüler-Baç, "The Cyprus debacle: what the future holds," *Futures* 31 (1999): 559-575.

2.1. Cyprus and its History: An Overview

Throughout its history, Cyprus had been ruled by different regional powers, ranging from the Egyptians to the Hittites and the Assyrians to the Arabs. Initially, Cyprus was invaded by the ancient Egyptians in 1450 B.C. and was later conquered by the Hittites. In 350 B.C., the island came under Persian rule. Then, the control of the island passed to the Phoenicians and the Assyrians. In 58 B.C., it fell under the rule of the Eastern Roman Empire. Although the Arabs were unable to control the whole of the island, the Islamic conquest of the island began in 632 A.D. with the Syrian occupation. During the Crusades, Cyprus was controlled by the English king, Richard the Lion Heart, who subsequently left the island to the Knights Templar and then to Guy de Lusignan. Although the family of de Lusignan ruled the island until 1489 and propagated Catholicism, both the Genoese and the Mamelukes also had partial control over the island.[35]

Beginning in 1432, the influence of the Venetians gradually evolved. After the island came under the complete control of the Venetian pirates, the Ottoman Empire, which was emerging as the leading power in the Mediterranean, was concerned and Sultan Selim II believed that the conquest of Cyprus was a necessity and the landing, which commenced on 1 July 1570, resulted in the conquest of Cyprus on 1 August 1571. A turning point for the island arrived in 1878 with the Ottoman Empire losing power, and control of Cyprus being assumed by Great Britain. At the outbreak of World War I, the island was annexed formally by the United Kingdom in 1914.[36]

After Turkey signed the Lausanne Agreement in 1923, Turkey and Greece agreed that Cyprus belonged to the United Kingdom.[37] However, the situation began to change dramatically at the end of the World War II with the demise of British power. In 1955, a guerilla group, EOKA—the National Organization for Cypriot Fighters— was formed by the Greek Cypriots and declared armed struggle against British rule in order

[35] "Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations," *International Debates* 3 (2005): 66-96.

[36] Ibid, 66.

[37] Müftüler-Baç, 561.

to achieve political union, Enosis, with Greece.[38] After a particularly bloody decade (the 1950s), the armed struggle in the island was resolved through a series of international treaties. In 1960, the Zurich and London Accords were signed by Turkey, Greece, and United Kingdom in order to constitute a Republic on the basis of bi-national independence, political equality and administrative partnership of the two communities. Three Treaties- the Treaty of Establishment, the Treaty of Guarantee, and the Treaty of Alliance - were signed by Turkey, Greece, Great Britain, and the Turkish and the Greek Cypriots.[39] These treaties guaranteed the establishment of a quasi-federal Republic of Cyprus, made Turkey, Britain and Greece the guarantors of the "Republic of Cyprus," provided for stationing of troops by Greece and Turkey, and recognized the right of military intervention by the guarantors if the status of Cyprus were to be threatened. As a result, the "Republic of Cyprus" was officially declared in 1960.[40]

However, these agreements were short lived. The Greek Cypriots found the constitutional rights granted to the Turkish Cypriots unacceptable and did not accept applying most of the provisions of the Constitution.[41] In 1963, Archbishop Makarios, political leader of the Greek Cypriots and the President of "Republic of Cyprus," submitted 13 proposals to the Constitutional Court in order to abolish special status of the Republic by blocking participation of the Turkish Cypriots at all levels. After the Turkish Cypriots opposed such changes, intercommunal conflict broke out. Although Turkey tried to protect the Turkish Cypriots on the island, it refrained from using its right of intervention granted by the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee.[42]

A major breakthrough came in 1974 when the Greek junta regime attempted to annex the island to Greece. Even though the Turkish government tried to find a peaceful, diplomatic solution to the violation of the London-Zurich Accords with

---

[38] "Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations," 66. See also, Müftüler-Baç, 561.

[39] Necati Ertekün, *In search of a negotiated Cyprus settlement* (Lefkoşa: Ulus Press, 1981): 7.

[40] Müftüler-Baç, 561.

[41] Clement Henry Dodd, *The Cyprus Imbroglio* (Huntingdon: Ethen Press, 1998): 20.

[42] Müftüler-Baç, 561-562. See also "Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations," 66.

Britain's cooperation, after the failure of these efforts, the Turkish government under Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit invoked its right as guarantor and intervened unilaterally.[43] As a result, Turkish troops took control of 38% of the island. The Greeks in the north fled south and most of the Turks fled north. UN peacekeeping forces have since maintained a buffer zone between the two sides.[44] The Turkish intervention was particularly important as it was based on the nationalist sentiments in Turkey as well as the national security interests that would be threatened with the formation of a Greek Cyprus.

After that, a series of never-ending talks and meetings started between the Turkish and the Greek authorities under United Nations (UN) supervision. The ultimate aim was the establishment of an independent, non-aligned, bicommunal Federal Republic in Cyprus. As the talks went on without any major results, and with few hopes of reaching a political settlement, the Turkish Cypriots took unilateral action. On 15 November 1983, the Turkish Cypriots declared their independence and assumed the name of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).[45] Consequently, two "de facto" autonomous states - The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and The Greek Administration of Southern Cyprus came to exist on the island.[46] The United Nations' position towards the declaration of independence was negative and with its Resolution 541 adopted on 18 November 1983, the UN judged the TRNC "legally invalid" and asked for the "withdrawal" of the TRNC, called upon all states not to recognize the TRNC, and announced that the Greek Cypriot controlled the "Republic of Cyprus."[47]

---

[43] Thomas Diez, "Introduction Cyprus and the European Union as a political and theoretical problem," in *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union*, ed. Thomas Diez (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002b): 1-13. See also, Müftüler-Baç, 562.

[44] "Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations," 66.

[45] Müftüler-Baç, 562.

[46] Ali Fikret Atun, "Kıbrıs Meselesinin Görünmeyen Yüzü: Batılı Devletler," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, ed. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 31-47.

[47] Özay Mehmet, "Justice in the Global Village: Implications Emerging from the Cyprus Problem," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, ed. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 188-198.

As a result, the government of the Greek Administration, known as "Republic of Cyprus," has continued to exist as the internationally recognized authority.[48] In 1985, talks between two communities restarted with no substantive results and intercommunal talks were halted in 1990 after the Greek Cypriots announced that they did not accept the principle of equality between the two communities.[49] It seems that a resolution under the auspices of the UN that would be equitable to both sides was unlikely in the 1980s and 1990s.

2.2. Cyprus' Road to the European Union

The Cyprus question began to acquire a new character with the involvement of the European Union in the 1990s specifically due to the Greek accession to the EU. During this decade, the European Union emerged as a new actor directly involved in the Cyprus conflict. The EU aimed at solving the Cyprus dispute through a carrot and stick policy. The EU was influential in the Cyprus issue through membership prospects for Turkey and Cyprus.[50] The Greek Administration of Southern Cyprus, known as "Republic of Cyprus," applied to the EU for full membership on 3 July 1990. Greece had been already a full member of the EU since 15 November 1981. Thus, Greece had had chance to play a more effective role in the EU's policies.[51] This situation has played a key role in the attitude of the EU towards the Cyprus issue. The Greeks and the Greek Cypriots perceived that Cyprus' accession to the EU would be the catalyst for unification of the island. This would put pressure on Turkey to make concessions on the Cyprus dispute in order to be rewarded with the EU membership.[52] The EU expected to

---

[48] Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations," 66.

[49] Müftüler-Baç, 562.

[50] Ibid, 568-569.

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

[52] Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Aylin Güney, "The European Union and the Cyprus Problem 1961-2003," *Middle Eastern Studies* 41 (2005): 281-293.

unite island through the membership carrot. In 1993, the Commission declared that the EU considers Cyprus eligible for membership as soon as the political settlement is enhanced on the island.[53] However, this does not mean that all the actors in the EU (i.e., the member states) had similar positions towards Cyprus. There were certain member states that opposed the accession negotiations to start with Cyprus prior to a settlement that would come under the UN umbrella.

In 1994, when the EU included Cyprus along with Malta in the next enlargement, the EU claimed that a political settlement on the island in accordance with the UN resolutions was a precondition for Cyprus' EU membership. This decision was also repeated in the subsequent meetings of the EU in Cannes and Madrid in 1995 and in Florence in 1996.[54] The European Council confirmed the admissibility of the Greek Cypriots' candidacy in March 1995, the year the Custom Union Agreement was signed with Turkey. Ankara was willing to sign this agreement, thus the Cyprus issue would be a subject of such bargaining. Greece declared that it will use its veto power against the Custom Union Agreement between Turkey and the EU. The aim was to use its veto as a trump card against Ankara unless an acceptable date was given for the start of negotiations for the accession of Cyprus.[55] On the other side, the government in Ankara presented the Custom Union Agreement to the public as a sign of future EU membership.[56] In such an environment, the public was deliberately misled and the government "turned a blind eye" to the EU decision on admissibility of Cyprus' candidacy in return for the lifting of the Greek veto.[57]

---

[53] Ibid, 286.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid, 287.

[56] Dodd, 63.

[57] Christopher Brewin, *The European Union and Cyprus* (Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 1998): 22-23 & 87-88.

2.2.1. The Luxembourg Summit

A turning point arrived when the EU launched its new wave of enlargement in 1997. The European Commission proposed its Agenda 2000 on 16 July 1997 and the European Council adopted the Agenda 2000 in the Luxembourg Summit of December 1997. Accordingly, the European Council divided the enlargement countries into three main categories. The first category countries, including Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia and Cyprus, were accepted as candidate states, whose negotiations would be opened in 1998. However, the second category of countries, including Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Latvia, were also accepted as candidate countries, but the negotiations would be opened later. On the other hand, Turkey was the only country that was not accepted as a candidate country although it was seen eligible.[58]

In response to the EU's decision to open accession negotiations with Cyprus, Turkey speeded up the unification process with the TRNC. Both in the joint declarations and in the decisions of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) and the National Security Council (NSC), the main expression was that "Turkey's unification process with the TRNC would evolve proportional to the closeness of the EU to the Greek Administration."[59] The Turkish government had also started to accuse the EU of taking discriminatory measures. Foreign Minister Ismail Cem, had started to advocate that the partial integration of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots is a legitimate defense against the discriminatory attitude of the EU.[60] This situation has estranged the Greek Cypriots from conducting negotiations with the Turkish Cypriots and brought the Turkish Cypriots closer to a confederation model than a federative one.[61]

---

[58] European Council, "Presidency Conclusions," 1997. See also, Brewin, 1998, 134.

[59] Brewin, 1998, 134-135 & 182-183.

[60] İsmail Cem, *Turkey in the New Century Speeches and Texts Presented at International Fora (1995-2001),* (Mersin: Rüstem Bookshop, 2001), 198.

[61] İnal Batu, *Dış Politika Kıskacında Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Pegasus Yayınları, 2006), 22. See also Brewin, 1998, 184-185.

2.2.2. The Helsinki Summit

The Helsinki Summit of 1999 became one of the major turning points in Turkey, EU and Cyprus relations when the EU granted Turkey candidacy status.[62] Like at Luxembourg Summit of 1997, the triangular bargaining between Turkey, EU and Greece over Cyprus and Turkey's EU membership took a new turn in Helsinki.[63] The European Commission on Helsinki Summit in 1999 decided that in order to become an EU member, a political solution on the island was not a precondition. The main motive for this decision was that Greece might have blocked the accession of Central and Eastern European candidates. In 1996, the Greek Foreign Minister declared that Greece would veto the next enlargement if Cyprus was not admitted.[64] Thus, although Turkey was accepted as a candidate country in Helsinki, the conditionality of political settlement on the island prior to membership was removed.[65]

On 10 December 1999, the European Commission announced that the candidate countries had to meet equal conditions during the accession process. They need to share common values and interests represented in the EU Agreements and they had to solve their border conflicts. In the absence of a resolution between the parties, they needed to bring the case to the International Court of Justice. However, for the Cyprus case, the European Commission declared that the EU was the main supporter of the UN negotiations which had started in New York on 3 December 1999 and the efforts of the UN Secretary General. On the other hand, if there would be no solution on the island after accession negotiations, the political settlement on the island would not be a pre-condition for Cyprus.[66]

---

[62] Müftüler-Baç and Güney, 289.

[63] Lykke Friis, "Looming shadows The European Union's eastern enlargement and Cyprus," in *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union*, ed. Thomas Diez (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002): 17-33. See also, Müftüler-Baç and Güney, 289.

[64] Friis, 27. See also, Müftüler-Baç and Güney, 289.

[65] Müftüler-Baç and Güney, 289.

[66] Erdal Güven, *Helsinki'den Kopenhag'a Kıbrıs*, (İstanbul: Om Yayınevi, 2003), 7. See also, Ishtiaq Ahmad, "Resolving the Cyprus Conflict through EU Enlargement

Since the beginning, the Turkish government was against the membership of Cyprus without a political settlement on the island and it has repeatedly claimed that if Cyprus became an EU member without a solution on the island first having been made, the Turkish side would withdraw from any negotiations and Turkey would prefer to unify with the TRNC.[67] However, in order to gain candidacy status, Turkey acquiesced to a decision that Cyprus could become an EU member without political settlement on the island. This is similar to the bargain made in 1995 in order to sign the Custom Union Agreement; Turkey had observed the EU's decision of admissibility of Cyprus' membership passively.[68] As a result, the Cyprus issue has become one of the milestones of Turkish Foreign Policy, particularly for the Turkey's relations with the West.[69]

2.3. The Road to the Annan Plan: Negotiations between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots

In the light of changes that the Helsinki decision brought, the United Nations decided to renew its actions and begin a new round of negotiations for a political settlement in Cyprus. The UN Secretary General Kofi Annan invited Rauf Denktaş, the Turkish Cypriot leader, and Glafkos Clerides, the Greek Cypriot leader, to New York. Negotiations between two sides started in New York on 3 December 1999 under the supervision of the UN Secretary General. During 2000, negotiations between Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktaş continued; however, there was no sign of for a change in approaches or visions of both leaders.[70] The forthcoming presidency elections in Northern Cyprus could change the atmosphere in the negotiations. Rauf Denktaş, who

---

Process," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, ed. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 51-59. See also Brewin, 1998, 138-139.

[67] Güven, 14-15.

[68] Batu, 92.

[69] Hamit Ersoy, "Kıbrıs Sorunu'nun Türk Dış Politikasına Etkisi," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, ed. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 118-125.

[70] Güven, 23.

had been the President of the TRNC since 1985, and his closest competitor Derviş Eroğlu polled 43% and 30%, respectively, in the first round. If voters who chose their own candidates in the first round had voted for Mr. Eroğlu, he could have won in the second round. However, Mr. Eroğlu made public that he had withdrawn his candidacy. Turkey had always wanted to see Mr. Denktaş as President of TRNC. During these elections, a cross section of Turkey - the president, the prime minister, ministers of state and media - has continued to support Mr. Denktaş. Mr. Eroğlu could not dare to become president without the support of Turkey. As a result, Mr. Denktaş was elected as President of the TRNC.[71]

The UN's role has been largely affected by the EU's involvement. For example, the EU's Accession Partnership Document adopted on 8 November 2000 called Turkey to give 'intense' support to political dialogue for the solution of Cyprus dispute in the Accession Partnership Document and underlined that Turkey had not taken necessary steps for the solution of the dispute since the Helsinki Summit.[72] UN Secretary General Kofi Annan was also unhappy over the deadlock during the negotiations. He submitted a plan for the parties on 8 December 2000. However, because of the emphasis on the establishment of a "sovereign, unitary, and common state" in the plan, Mr. Denktaş left the negotiation table. After he consulted with Lefkoşa and Ankara, he would decide on whether he would return to the negotiation table. Ankara was also unsatisfied with both the Accession Partnership Document and the Annan Plan. As a result, the National Security Council, with the participation of Mr. Denktaş, met on 24 December 2000. The Turkish government declared that in order to restart negotiations under the UN, it had to be accepted that there were two states, two sovereign nations, and two democracies on the island. Prime Minister Ecevit also underlined the support given to Mr. Denktaş. He added that if the EU had not given the membership prospect to the Greek Cypriots, it would have been possible to come together. However, with EU support, the Greek Cypriots would not be willing to agree on a common position.[73]

---

[71] Ibid, 23-26.

[72] İsmail Cem, *Türkiye-Avrupa-Asya: Strateji-Yunanistan-Kıbrıs*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004), 265. See also, Güven, 60.

[73] Güven, 64-66.

At the beginning of 2001, international authorities, including the likes of Günter Verheugen, who was the Commissioner for Enlargement in the European Commission, Alvaro De Soto, who was the UN Secretary General's Special Adviser on Cyprus, Alfred Moses, who was the Special Representative for Cyprus during Clinton era, and Vladimir Pringin, who was the Special Representative for Cyprus in Russia, called for Mr. Denktaş to return to negotiation table.[74] However, negotiations were still deadlocked. Mr. Annan invited both leaders to New York on 5 September 2001. Although Greek leaders accepted this invitation, Mr. Denktaş refused to go, arguing that the political atmosphere was not suitable for starting negotiations.[75] In 2000, and 2001, the Turkish government's position and Denktaş's attitude created the perception that it was the Turkish side that was reluctant to arrive at a solution. On 4 September 2001, the European Parliament announced that the "Republic of Cyprus" had taken the necessary steps to acquire EU membership and that the solution of the Cyprus dispute would not be a barrier to its membership.[76] On 25 November 2001, the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, also announced that Cyprus would join the EU and underlined that if the parties were successful in reaching a solution that covered any arrangement contrary to the acquis *communautaire,* it would be accepted by the EU.[77]

Proximity talks under UN leadership had dominated attempts to find a solution in 2001.[78] However, Mr. Denktaş called on Mr. Clerides to talk face to face in order to find a common solution. Mr. Clerides accepted this offer with the condition of that negotiation would be under UN supervision.[79] Both leaders decided to start negotiations without pre-conditions. Mr. Denktaş did not raise the issues of confederation or recognition of the TRNC. Any issue, with the exceptions of political equality and

[74] Ibid, 73-74.

[75] Ibid, 92.

[76] Ersoy, 121.

[77] Güven, 92.

[78] Cem, 2004, 231.

[79] Güven, 97.

guarantorship of Turkey, could be bargaining matter.[80] Thus, a new term started with respect to over the Cyprus issue as of 16 January 2002. Leaders began meeting three times per week. Ankara and Athens were the main supporters of the negotiation process.[81] However, after Verheugen announced that the EU expected that negotiations would come to end by June, Mr. Denktaş started complaining about time limitations. On 9 April 2002, there had still been no progress in finding a solution. The EU began to blame the Turkish side and made Denktaş responsible for the deadlock. In turn, Ankara started accusing the EU of excessive intervention. As a result, the UN Security Council called on parties to sit at the negotiation table and announced that Annan would go to island on 14-15 May 2002. This visit prevented the parties from returning home and lifted the time limitation. However, despite the initiation of negotiations between two parties under UN leadership, on June 2002, MR. Denktaş announced that it was not possible to reach a settlement between two parties on basic issues.[82]

As a result of these developments, the UN Security Council made the Turkish side responsible for the deadlock and invited the leaders to come together at tripartite summits every month.[83] As a result, the leaders of both parties met on 8-9 October 2002 and decided that two committees would be established in order to evaluate technical issues. However, although Mr. Annan declared that these committees would simplify the process to find a solution, Mr. Denktaş announced that the obstacles facing the Turkish side were increasing and it was not possible to continue negotiations if Cyprus joined the EU. The Turkish government also supported the position that Mr. Denktaş held.[84] A breakthrough came when the Justice and Development Party came to power on 3 November 2002 – an event that altered the deadlock and modified the traditional Turkish national discourse.

---

[80] Ibid, 101-102.

[81] Ibid, 118-119.

[82] Ibid, 122-125.

[83] Ibid, 133 & 141-143.

[84] Ibid, 146-147 & 151.

2.4. The National Discourse in Turkish Foreign Policy towards Cyprus

The initial glimpse of possible changes in the JDP government came at the beginning with the inaugural speeches of the new government. Before the JDP government had come to power, nearly all Turkish Foreign Ministers had emphasized that "Turkey has a traditional foreign policy which will continue unchanged" in their inaugural speeches. They would promise that "the established foreign policy will not change."[85] For the Cyprus case, there had always been a general consensus in Turkey that it was a matter of "national concern." The Cyprus case is recognized as a "national issue."[86] As Candemir Önhon, Ambassador of Cyprus between 1976 and 1979, stated, Turkey has followed a "state policy" towards Cyprus. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Chief of General Staff have played the most significant role in the development of this state policy.[87] The Turkish military had also become the main supporter of this policy.[88] As a result, the Cyprus question had become an official ideology. It had turned into a 'national matter' and most probably into a 'taboo.' Although political parties had different opinions on most of the issues, all parties, including the True Path Party (DYP), the Republican People's Party (RPP/CHP), the Worker's Party (İP) and the Felicity Party (SP) expressed similar ideas regarding the Cyprus issue.[89] The first divergent voice came from the Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association (TÜSİAD) in November 2001. Until that time, the Cyprus question had not been discussed in Turkey. Thus, after Tuncay Özilhan, TÜSİAD President in 2001, said that

[85] Cem, 2001, 1-2.

[86] İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, "Giriş: 1974'ten 2001'e Kıbrıs Sorunu," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, eds. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 1-6.

[87] Gül İnanç, *Büyükelçiler Anlatıyor Türk Diplomasisinde Kıbrıs (1970-1991*), (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası; Kültür Yayınları, 2007), 74.

[88] Ibid, 15-16.

[89] Christopher Brewin, "Turkish and European Union Interests in a Cyprus Settlement," *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Mınority Issues in Europe*, 2 (2002): 1-20.

"TÜSİAD does not approve Turkey's support of the uncompromising attitude of Mr. Denktaş," this rebounded intensely in Turkey.[90]

In short, the Cyprus question had been seen as a "national issue" for forty years in Turkey. The national interests of the Turkish Republic and the TRNC had been overemphasized. The policy makers had developed a discourse in which it was argued that 'it is not possible to compromise our national interests.'[91] According to Asaf İnan, Turkey's Ambassador to Cyprus between 1970 and 1976, the policymakers had advocated that Turkey follow a Cyprus policy that was more loyalist and more appropriate to its national interests on the basis of the national documents obtained by the highest decision-making mechanisms in the TRNC and Turkish Republic.[92] As İsmail Cem said, they also argued that "*we cannot sacrifice our vital interests for the sake of peace and friendship*."[93]

Moreover, the discourse of "red lines" was used by almost all governments. Tayyibe Gülek, the Minister of State of the previous coalition government of the Democratic Left Party, National Action Party and Motherland Party, had laid out Turkey's "red lines" in Cyprus: the existence of "two states" on the island, equal existence on the island, sovereignty of the Turkish Cypriots, guarantor rights of Turkey, and the existence of Turkish Military Forces on the island.[94] İsmail Cem also clearly underlined that

> "There are two separate entities, two peoples in the island. And each has her own legitimate rights. A solution can be derived from the acceptance that they are politically equal, that they have their own sovereignty."[95]

---

[90] Güven, 88.

[91] Atilla Çilingir, *KKTC'nin 2002-2005 "ver kurtul" belgeseli… Elveda Kıbrıs Ama bir gün mutlaka!,* (İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları, 2006), 15.

[92] İnanç, 41.

[93] Cem, 2001, 71.

[94] *Hürriyet,* "KKTC 19'uncu yaşını kutluyor," 15 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[95] Cem, 2001, 153.

It had always been advocated that it would not be possible to reach a solution on the island "unless the existence of the TRNC is acknowledged; unless the equal existence of the Turkish Cypriot State on the island is accepted; unless the right to sovereignty of the Turkish Cypriot people is acknowledged; and unless the Greek Cypriot side abandons its claim of being the representative of the entire island."[96]

Until 1997, the Turkish side had supported the establishment of a federation on the island. The main argument was that a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation needed to be established and should be independent and separate.[97] However, with the developments in 1997 with respect to the EU's decision to open accession negotiations with Cyprus, Turkey began to support the formation of a confederative structure on the island.[98] The Greek side wants an independent bi-communal and bi-zonal federation, which includes single sovereignty, one international personality, and single citizenship. On the other hand, the Turkish Cypriots have demanded that the Greek Cypriots and international community recognize their independent identity as the TRNC within the framework of international law. Moreover, the Turkish side wants to achieve a two-state confederation. For the Turkish side, political equality of two communities has to be enhanced. Turkish policymakers contended that it was not possible to establish a "common state" with a "common government. They developed the argument that the creation of a superior authority over the two states should not be accepted because this type of arrangement would threaten the sovereignty and statehood of the constituent states. A confederation would maintain sovereignty and legal personality, enhance equal powers and functions, and ensure equal and effective participation.[99] İsmail Cem clearly demonstrated Turkey's support of a confederal solution on the island as follows:

> "A mutually acceptable solution in Cyprus can only be attained on the basis of reality. For years, the Turkish and Greek

[96] Ibid, 71.

[97] İnanç, 83.

[98] Güven, 82.

[99] Ertan Efegil and Özgen Görgüner, "A Survey on the Public Opinion's Concerns about the proposals of TRNC, South Cyprus, the UN, and the EU," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, eds. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), 126-150.

> Cypriots have carried their lives within the frameworks of their respective States. These two States, on the basis of sovereign equality, can lay the foundations for a final agreement. In this context, the proposal advanced by President Denktaş to create a Confederation by the two equal and sovereign States is for us as realistic and viable option."[100]

Turkish policymakers not only support Denktaş's confederation solution but also saw Mr. Denktaş as an important politician who had made impressive contributions to the "national issue" of Turkey.[101] In the words of İsmail Cem:

> "We have a great respect for President Denktaş. And he is really a politician of very high caliber. And I have told my foreign colleagues interested in Cyprus that they should not consider Denktaş as an obstacle to a mutual solution. In fact, he is the greatest asset for a mutually acceptable solution. And it is obvious now that President Denktaş has a positive approach … some foreign observers misjudge Denktaş, they consider him as an 'obstacle' to a mutual solution. On the contrary, he is the best interlocutor for a mutually acceptable solution."[102]

It is, therefore, expected that the Greek Cyprus's application for the EU membership has also dominated Turkish foreign policy both towards Cyprus and the EU. After the EU included Cyprus along with Malta in subsequent enlargement, Turkish foreign policymakers started to accuse the EU of approaching the Cyprus dispute unfairly and unlawfully. İnal Batu, Turkish Ambassador to Cyprus between 1979 and 1984, argued that by accepting the Greek Cyprus as an EU member, the EU had changed the all parameters of the Cyprus dispute. This wrong and unfair decision was also contrary to all agreements prohibiting the membership of Cyprus in any entity in which the guarantor countries were not members.[103] Similarly, İsmail Cem clearly identified, in his letter to Mr. Barsony, the Chairman of the Political Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the reasons as to why the decision of the EU was regarded as unlawful. He stated that

---

[100] Cem, 2001, 216.

[101] İnanç, 21.

[102] Ibid, 169.

[103] Batu, 21-22.

> "It is a guarantee provided for the communities and contracting parties by the 1960 treaties that constituted the 'bi-communal' Republic of Cyprus. Those treaties make it clear that the accession of the Republic of Cyprus to any international organization within which both Greece and Turkey are not members requires the consent of both communities…It is obvious that unless the legal base and the legal consent exist, the Republic of Cyprus cannot, legally and ethically, access to EU…If an accession to EU overriding the constituent legal basis created by the 1960 treaties of the Republic of Cyprus seems to be in perspective as a 'fait accompli'…"[104]

As a result, Turkish foreign policymakers accused the EU of deepening division on the island.[105] "The EU's insistence on opening negotiations with the Greek Cypriot Administration for full membership, in total disregard of the international agreements on Cyprus, is overshadowing the continuation of the UN sponsored talks between the two parties."[106] As the EU has deepened the division on the island not only has the EU become part on the problem but it has also intensified the unification process between Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots.[107]

> "As witnessed in the recent face-to-face talks, the pursuit of EU membership by the Greek Cypriot side has become the main impediment to progress. It renders the negotiating process increasingly meaningless and an agreed settlement even more elusive. Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot side firmly believe that efforts to carry forward this membership process will cast a dark shadow on the talks and can destroy the very foundation of the negotiating process."[108]

Similar to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' position, the Turkish military also accused the EU of deepening division on the island. The decision of the National Security Council on 29 May 2001 emphasized that accepting Greek Cyprus, in violation to the

[104] Cem, 2001, 146-147.

[105] Ahmad, 52.

[106] Cem, 2001, 66.

[107] Ibid, 147. & See also, İnanç, 63.

[108] Ibid, 158-159.

1960 Agreements, as an EU member would deepen the division on the island.[109] Thus, there was a general consensus in Turkey among the state elite in terms of criticizing the EU for its accession negotiations with Cyprus.

One could ask the question of why Turkey was so much opposed to Greek Cyprus' EU accession and the answer might lie in the fact that Cyprus is located in a position where it is easier to control many strategic points. It controls the transit routes leading to and from Middle Eastern oil supplies. It dominates the axis from the Middle East to Africa, from Anatolia to Middle East and to the Suez Canal. It controls sea routes passing through the Suez Canal to the Pacific Ocean. It is also a strategic platform for direct air power in all directions.[110] This is why Turkish governments have developed their Cyprus policies on the basis of these security concerns of Turkey.[111] Although EU membership had been one of the main foreign policy concerns of Turkey, Turkish governments had recognized the Cyprus issue as a vital interest that could not be sacrificed for EU membership. The developments since 1995 have clearly indicated that there might be tradeoffs between the Turkish foreign policy goal of EU membership and protecting its interests and the Turkish Cypriots' interests on the island.

As a result, Turkey took a stand towards Cyprus emphasizing that there were "two states" on the island and developed this understanding as "state policy." Particularly between 1997 and 2002, Turkey strongly supported the confederative structure on the island.[112] Turkey advocated the establishment of a "two-state confederation" in Cyprus. For the Turkish side, political equality of two communities had to be enhanced.[113] The existence of "two states" on the island, equal existence on

---

[109] Güven, 81.

[110] İsmail Bozkurt, "Kıbrıs'ın Tarihine Kısa Bir Bakış," in *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, ed. İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil (Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002), pp. 9-15.

[111] Brewin, 1998, 188-189.

[112] Güven, 82.

[113] Efegil and Görgüner, 126-129.

the island, the sovereignty of Turkish Cypriots, guarantor rights of Turkey, and existence of Turkish military on the island were sine quo non for Turkey.[114]

2.5. The JDP Government and a New Vision in Cyprus

A change in traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus occurred with the Justice and Development Party's coming to power with the 3 November 2002 elections. After the JDP government became the ruling party, the JDP Leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan announced that they wanted to solve the Cyprus question and they had adopted Belgium model in an attempt to solve this dispute. During the election campaign, it had been announced that Turkish Cypriots had the right to determine their own future, identity and entity. As in Belgium, "one state with two communities" would be beneficial for both sides. This was seen as a 'radical break' from Turkey's traditional discourse over Cyprus.[115]

2.5.1. The Annan Plan

After the 2002 general elections in Turkey, in the midst of the positive signs of change in traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan submitted a plan to two parties and three guarantor countries, Greece, Turkey, and Britain on 11 November 2002 with the intention of seeing whether the plan would be accepted as a basis for negotiations or not. According to the Annan calendar, the negotiations between parties would start on 18 November 2002 and the plan with its appendixes would be signed by 12 December 2002. The final version of the plan would be determined by 28 February 2003 and submitted to a referendum by 30 March 2003. The aim of this strict calendar was to ensure that a new united state in Cyprus would

[114] *Hürriyet,* "KKTC 19'uncu yaşını kutluyor," 15 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[115] Güven, 154.

join the EU and this new Cyprus would be able to sign the Accession Agreement with the EU on April 2003.[116]

According to the Annan Plan, as co-founders of "Republic of Cyprus" founded in 1960, the Turkish and Greek Cypriots would establish a new bi-zonal partnership in an independent and united Cyprus. The relationship between the parties would be based on political equality rather than one based on definitions of majority and minority. The balance between Turkey and Greece would be enhanced and the special friendship ties with these countries would be maintained. According to Article 1, the Treaty of Establishment, the Treaty of Guarantee, and the Treaty of Alliance would continue to remain in force, but the necessary arrangements would be made in accordance with the new state of affairs. Thus, additional protocols would be signed. The unification of island with another entity or any form of partition or secession on the island would be prohibited. According to Article 2, the United Cyprus Republic would be an independent state in which there would be one common federal state and two constituent states; the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State. The status of its federal state and its constituent states and the relationship among them would be determined according to cantons and federal government modeled on Switzerland. Under its own constitution, the basic principles of rule of law, democracy, representative republican government, political equality, bi-zonality, and equal status of the constituent states would be enhanced. Under its constitutional framework, the federal government would exercise its powers in order to ensure that Cyprus would speak with one voice internationally. The constituent states would use their own authorities freely within the limits of constitution. There would be no hierarchical structure between federal and constituent state laws. The Constitution of United Cyprus Republic could be amended with majority votes of electorates of each constituent state. According to Article 7, there would be a single Cypriot citizenship, and also all Cypriot citizens would enjoy internal constituent state citizenship status that would complement but would not replace Cypriot citizenship. [117]

---

[116] Ibid, 159-160.

[117] "Main Articles," *Annan Plan*, 6 April 2004, (2 December 2007). <http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Main_Articles/MainArticles.pdf>.

According to Article 5, there would be a bicameral legislature: the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate with its 48 members would be composed of an equal number of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. The Chamber of Deputies would be composed in proportion to persons holding internal constituent state citizenship status of each constituent state. Each constituent state would assign no less than one quarter of the seats. Decisions of Parliament would be approved by both Chambers by simple majority. One quarter of voting Senators from each constituent state would be compulsory. For specified matters, a special majority of two-fifths of sitting Senators from each constituent state would be a requirement. The Office of Head of State vested in the Presidential Council would exercise the executive power. The Presidential Council, comprised six voting members, would be elected on a single list by special majority in the Senate and approved by majority in the Chamber of Deputies for a five-year term. The composition of the Presidential Council would be proportional to the number of persons holding the internal constituent state citizenship status of each constituent state. However, at least one-third of the voting members of the Council would come from each constituent state. The Central Bank of Cyprus, the Office of the Attorney-General and the Office of the Auditor-General would be independent. According to Article 6, the Supreme Court would be composed of equal numbers of Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot judges, plus three foreign judges. It would resolve the disputes between the constituent states or between one/both of them and the federal government, and resolve the deadlocks within federal institutions on an interim basis if this is indispensable to the proper functioning of the federal government.[118]

The Greek and the Turkish contingents would be permitted to be stationed under the Treaty of Alliance in the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State. However, both the Greek and the Turkish troops would not exceed a four-digit figure (9,999). The Greek and the Turkish forces and armaments would be redeployed to agreed locations.[119] According to Article 8, there would be a UN peacekeeping operation in place to monitor and promote the implementation of the Agreement and to contribute to the maintenance of a secure environment on the island. The supply of arms to Cyprus would be prohibited in a manner that is legally binding on both importers and

[118] Ibid, 9-11.

[119] Güven, 167.

exporters. Cyprus would be demilitarized, and all Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot forces, including reserve units, would be dissolved, with their arms being removed from the island in phases synchronized with the redeployment and adjustment of Greek and Turkish forces.[120] Cyprus would not make its territory available to international military operations without the consent of Greece and Turkey.[121] According to Article 9, areas subject to territorial adjustment, which would be legally part of the Greek Cypriot State upon entry into force of this Agreement, would be administered during an interim period by the Turkish Cypriot State. Administration would be transferred under the supervision of the United Nations to the Greek Cypriot State. Special arrangements would be developed in order to safeguard the rights and interests of current inhabitants of areas subject to territorial adjustment and to provide for orderly relocation. According to Article 10, the claims of persons who were dispossessed of their properties prior to this Agreement would be resolved in a comprehensive manner in accordance with international law, respect for the individual rights of dispossessed owners and current users, and the principle of bi-zonality. Dispossessed owners who opt for compensation would receive full compensation for their property on the basis of value at the time of dispossession adjusted to reflect appreciation of property values in comparable locations.[122]

The Annan plan was an ambitious attempt by the UN to provide for a political settlement on the island before the Greek Cyprus became an EU member. Its reception by the parties of the conflict was varied. The first reactions came from the Greek side. They argued that there would be much devolution of authority to constituent states. Under these circumstances, this plan would offer a confederative structure rather than a federal one. The veto power of the Turkish side could not be accepted. Free movement of goods and freedom of settlement and circulation should not be restricted. This would also be against the EU *acquis communautaire*. The rights of guarantor countries would be opposed to independence of Cyprus. Cyprus should not be outside the European Foreign and Security Policy. The Turkish military presence on the island should be

[120] Annan Plan, 12.

[121] Güven, 168.

[122] Annan Plan, 13-14.

minimized.[123] The Turkish side also had some reservations. First, the Turkish side argued that there should be separate sovereignty for Turkish side. The number of the Greeks who would come to the Turkish side would be high, this situation could prevent political equality in the long run and many Turks would become emigrants. Despite these unfavorable conditions, both Clerides and Denktaş announced that they would approach this plan positively. However, objections from the Turkish side began to increase within a few days and on 21 November 2002; Mr. Denktaş announced that there were issues that needed to be negotiated in order to accept this plan as a basis for further negotiations.[124]

On 27 November 2002, Mr. Annan asked leaders to make necessary amendments by 30 November 2002 and suggested that the amendments be submitted to the UN on 5 December 2002.[125] On this account, Mr. Annan sent the revised plan to parties on 10 December 2002. The amendments made by Annan were not related to the core of the plan. They were mainly about numbers – for example, reducing the period of return for the Greek immigrants from 20 years to 15 years, and reducing the ratio of Greek immigrants from 33% to 28%.[126] On 12 December 2002 which was a deadline for signing the Annan Plan according to Annan's calendar, Mr. Clerides and the Greek National Council were ready in Copenhagen. However, the TRNC Foreign Minister, Tahsin Ertuğruloğlu, was representing the Turkish side. Mr. Denktaş claimed that Ertuğruloğlu was there in order to continue to negotiations and to ask for additional time rather than to sign the plan. The bargaining among the parties' representatives, Mr. De Soto, Prime Minister of Turkey Abdullah Gül, and the JDP Leader Tayyip Erdoğan was continued.[127] Mr. Denktaş announced that it would not be possible to reach an agreement under time pressure, and he asked for suspending the membership of Cyprus.[128]

---

[123] Güven, 185.
[124] Ibid, 186-187.

[125] Ibid, 191-192.

[126] Ibid, 196.

[127] Ibid, 209.

[128] Ibid, 214-215.

Simultaneously, on the EU front, the European Council, in the Copenhagen Summit of 2002, decided to conclude accession negotiations with Cyprus and accept Cyprus as a member on 1 May 2004.[129] On 11 December 2002, the EU decided that it would decide on Turkey's candidacy at the end of 2004 and would open accession negotiations in 2005 if it was thought that Turkey had been successful in adopting the EU rules.[130] Following the Copenhagen Summit, the UN continued to consult with the two sides with the goal of reaching a settlement prior to Cyprus' signing of the EU Accession Treaty on 16 April 2003. Mr. Annan had started to work on revisions.[131] On the other hand, the presidential election was carried out on the Greek side, with Tassos Papadopoulos becoming the fifth president of the Greek Administration in February 2003.[132]

After Mr. Annan completed the second revision on the plan, he submitted it to the parties for the third time and invited the two leaders to The Hague on 10 March 2003. These changes were also mainly about the numbers, but Mr. Annan also asked both leaders to put the plan to referendum in their respective communities.[133] However, Mr. Denktaş rejected putting the Annan Plan to a referendum. He said that the plan was unacceptable for the Turkish Cypriots. As a result, the UN continued to make several revisions in order to win support of the plan. However, the Turkish Cypriot side refused to conduct further talks. [134] At that time, the political environment in the TRNC had started to change. On 14 December 2003, the parliamentary election was carried out in the TRNC. The CTP, the Republican Turkish Party, became the first party and the CTP Leader Mehmet Ali Talat was charged with establishing the new government.[135] In February 2004, Mr. Papadopoulos and Mr. Denktaş accepted Annan's offer to resume

[129] European Council, "Presidency Conclusions," 12 and 13 December 2002.

[130] Güven, 201.

[131] Ibid, 213-214.

[132] Ibid, 219.

[133] Ibid, 220.

[134] Rauf Denktaş, *Yeniden 12'ye 5 kala* (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi: 2005): 30-31.

[135] Çilingir, 51-52.

negotiations on the basis of the Annan Plan and talks between two leaders began on 19 February 2004 under the supervision of De Soto. Numerous technical communities had worked to resolve outstanding issues. However, with the failure of this stage to reach an agreement, Prime Minister Mehmet Ali Talat and Serdar Denktaş attended subsequent negotiations. Yet, an agreement could not be reached. On 31 March 2004, Mr. Annan submitted to the parties the fifth revision of final UN proposal.[136]

The final version of the Annan Plan was improved by taking into consideration the sensitivities of both sides. In order to satisfy the reactions of the Turkish side over the number of the Greeks who would come to the Turkish side, restrictions on the settlement of the Greek Cypriots in the Turkish constituent state were developed. The Greek side had argued that these restrictions on free movement of goods and people would be against EU laws. In order to reduce the Greek reactions, the article stating "*To preserve its identity, Cyprus may adopt specified non-discriminatory safeguard measures in conformity with the acquis communautaire in respect of immigration of Greek and Turkish nationals*" was included. Moreover, in order to create a balance over the demands of both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots on military presence of Turkish Military Forces on the island, Mr. Annan made the necessary arrangements that would permit Greek and Turkish contingents to be stationed in the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State respectively. According to the Annan Plan, there would be limitations on the numbers of soldiers on the island and the numbers of soldiers would be reduced over time. The federal government and the constituent states would cooperate with the UN operations.[137]

Although Mr. Talat supported the plan, Mr. Denktaş immediately rejected it, to be followed by Mr. Papadopoulos' rejection a week later. However, due to the pressures coming from homelands and international community, the leaders had to hold a referendum on the plan. In this referendum, which was held on 24 April 2004, the two communities on the island were asked to either accept or reject the Annan Plan. The Greek Cypriot Community rejected the plan by 75.83% whereas 64.9% of the Turkish Cypriot Community accepted the plan. The implementation of the plan was dependent on its approval by both communities. Thus, with the rejection of the Greek Cypriot

[136] Annan Plan.

[137] Ibid.

Community, the Annan Plan became null and void and initial reactions began to appear[138] Annan argued that "*a unique and historic chance to resolve the Cyprus problem has been missed*."[139] Verheugen also announced that "*I feel cheated by the Greek Cypriot government… There is a shadow now over the accession of Cyprus. What we will seriously consider now is finding a way to end the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots*."[140]

The Greek Cypriot community perceived the Annan Plan as unbalanced and excessively pro-Turkish. The main reason for the rejection of the Annan Plan was that the Greek Cypriots argued that the plan endorsed a confederal state with a weak central state and considerably autonomous constitute states. There would be no hierarchy of laws. The Plan did not respond to the Greek demands regarding the relationship of majority and minority between two communities. Although Greeks represented 77% and Turks 18% of the island, the representation of two communities in the Senate would be equal. Annan Plan did not deal much with the question of demilitarization of northern part of Cyprus. Cyprus would be excluded from the European Foreign and Defense Policy. The Annan Plan damaged the property rights of the Greek Cypriots and other legal owners of property in the occupied area. The restrictions on the Greek Cypriots' return to their homes and properties deviated from the EU practices of free movement of goods and people. Moreover, those Greek Cypriots who would return to their homes would be under Turkish Cypriot Administration, so they would have no local civil rights because the political representatives of the Turkish Administration would be elected by the Turkish Cypriots.[141] This was more or less the summary of the Greek Cypriot position.

The Turkish Cypriots also found the Annan Plan excessively pro-Greek. However, many Turkish Cypriots accepted plan in order to end their prolonged

---

[138] Thales Chadjipalis and Ian Andreadis, "Analysis of the Cyprus referendum on the Annan Plan," *Political Studies Association*, 2007.

[139] *Hürriyet*, "Annan: Tarihi fırsat kaçtı," 23 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[140] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: Rumlar hayal kırıklığı yarattı," 23 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[141] Süleyman Koç, *Dünden Bugüne Kıbrıs Sorunu ve Stratejik Yaklaşımlar* (İstanbul: IQ Kültür-Sanat Yayıncılık, 2005): 302-303.

international isolation and exclusion.[142] Although Mr. Denktaş was against the Annan Plan, Mr. Talat and Mr. Erdoğan were in favor of accepting it. An important consideration for the Erdoğan government was that the resolution of the Cyprus problem and the reunification of the island would be a significant step leading to Turkey's EU membership. Thus, Turkey's support of the Annan Plan contributed to the acceptance of the plan on the Turkish Cypriot side. The Turkish Cypriots would also benefit from considerable constitutional power, which was disproportionate to their numbers in the population. The right of return of the Greek Cypriots to their homes would be restricted in order to eliminate the possibility of the Turkish Cypriots becoming a minority on the Turkish side. The guarantor states would continue to retain their power on the island.[143] Despite the positive impact of the Annan plan, its rejection was unlucky and ended the involvement of the UN for the time being.

2.5.2. Recent developments

Right after the referendum, in response to the Greek Cypriots' rejection of the UN plan, the Turkish Cypriots emerged in the international community as the wronged party. That is because the Greek Cypriots would accede to the EU as full members on May 1st 2004. In order to decrease the Turkish Cypriots' isolation and to reward them for their approval of the UN plan, the EU decided to take some measures. The EU announced that direct trade between the Turkish Cypriots and the EU countries would start and the EU would provide economic assistance totaling 259 million Euros to the Turkish Cypriots on 26 April 2004.[144] Moreover, the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan recommended lifting the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots. However, despite these early positive responses, in the UN, Kofi Annan's recommendatory letter to lift the isolation over the Turkish Cypriots was rejected by the UN Security Council due to the Russian

[142] Ibid, 299.

[143] Ibid, 300.

[144] Batu, 166.

veto.[145] Moreover, according to the EU acquis, the Council of European Union has to be in unanimous agreement when taking decisions on some issues, such as common foreign and security policy, asylum, and taxation. Any disagreement, even by one single country, will block the decision. Thus, the Greek Cypriots blocked the enactment of the EU's April 26 decision and direct trade between the Turkish Cypriots and the EU is still dormant and the economic aid given to the Turkish Cypriots has been lowered to 130 million Euros.[146]

On the other hand, according to the unanimity principle, the Greek Cypriots have the veto power against Turkey's accession. In this environment, the bargaining power of the JDP government was weak against the Greek Cypriots. Thus, on 17 December 2004, although the EU had decided to open accession negotiations with Turkey on 3 October 2005, it is also underlined that in order to start negotiations then, Turkey should sign the Customs Union Additional Protocol that expands the Customs Union to ten new member states, including the Greek Cypriots, who were referred to as the "Republic of Cyprus" on the Protocol.[147] Due to Greek pressure, this has made the Turkey-EU relations more complicated. In particular, after the EU failed to keep its promises to lift economic restrictions of the Turkish Cypriots, the JDP government faced intense opposition from the nationalist camp. The JDP government has been accused of making concessions with respect to the national interests of Turkey in Cyprus in exchange for EU membership.

At that time, inside Turkish Cyprus a major breakthrough came with Denktaş's decision to leave active politics after he sparred with the JDP government.[148] Mehmet Ali Talat won the presidential elections with 55.6% of the vote on 17 April 2005.[149] After Mr. Talat became the president, he announced that the nationalistic policies would no longer be promoted. The new policy envisaged two communities living in a United

[145] Ibid, 146.

[146] Ibid, 166.

[147] Ibid, 134.

[148] Çilingir, 232.

[149] Ibid, 225.

Cyprus.[150] This change in the political environment in the TRNC enabled the JDP government to make necessary changes in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus.[151] As a result, Turkey was able to sign the Additional Protocol on 29 July 2005. However, in order to take into account national sensitivities, the JDP government also published a declaration emphasizing that this did not mean the recognition of the Greek Cypriots as the "Republic of Cyprus," as appears on the Protocol and Turkey's current relations with the TRNC would not change. It is also emphasized that Turkey would not open its sea and airports to the Greek Cypriots. The term presidency at that time, Britain, and the EU Commission announced that to sign the Additional Protocol did not mean that Turkey recognized the Greek Cypriots.[152] In addition, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a press statement emphasizing that the Republic of Cyprus included in the Protocol represented only the Greek Administration located south of the Green Line. It was also emphasized that the Turkish Grand National Assembly should also ratify both the Additional Protocol and the pressed for declaration. However, this has increased the debate over whether this would mean the legal recognition of the "Republic of Cyprus" or not.[153]

Although the EU announced that signing the Additional Protocol would not mean the recognition of the "Republic of Cyprus," the EU published a counter-declaration on 21 September 2005. The declaration underlined that the recognition of all member states is a necessary requirement of the accession process. It also emphasized that if the Additional Protocol was not applied completely, the relevant negotiation chapters would not be opened and that the Greek Administration had veto power on opening and closing chapters.[154] In this regard, although the opening of the Turkish sea

---

[150] Ibid, 14.

[151] Ibid, 34.

[152] Batu, 125-126.

[153] Kamer Kasım, "Ek Protokol İmzalandı, Ya Sonrası?," *The Journal of Turkish Weekly- Yorum*, 4 August 2005, (12 February 2008). <http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/yorum.php?id=145>.

[154] Ibid.

and air ports to the Greek Cypriots is not a necessary condition for the opening up of negotiations, it is a requirement for the continuation of the process.[155]

After the EU's announcement that if Turkey did not implement the Additional Protocol, the overall negotiations would be affected and the Greek Administration would be able to use its veto power on opening and closing of chapters, a "train crash" scenario between Turkey and the EU began to be discussed. As a result, in November 2006 during Finland's EU Presidency, Finland prepared a plan for the solution of the Cyprus dispute in order to provide an uninterrupted continuation of the relations between Turkey and the EU to prevent a probable "train crash." Although there is no official explanation for the content of the Plan, this plan mainly suggests that the Famagusto port and the Maraş region would be given to the EU and UN administrations and the sea and air ports of Turkey would be opened up to the Greek Cypriots, respectively in an exchange for the start of direct trade between Turkish Cypriots and the EU countries for two years and financial aid. [156] This plan was not seen as a comprehensive solution on the island, and Mr. Talat, during his negotiations with the European Commissioner for Enlargement Olli Rehn, Vice-President of the European Commission Günter Verheugen, and High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana, announced that transfer of the Maraş region to the UN administration would be possible if a comprehensive solution on the island were achieved. Talat also added that the isolations over the Turkish side should be lifted without any conditions as promised after the Greek rejection of the Annan Plan. On the other hand, the Greek Administration announced that it was not possible to lift isolation measures taken vis-a-vis Northern Cyprus without gaining any significant privilege.[157] The Turkish side also wanted the opening of Ercan Airport to the international flights.[158]

---

[155] Batu, 136.

[156] "Finlandiya Dönem Başkanlığı Kıbrıs İçin Yeni Bir Plan Hazırladı," (12 February 2008). <http://www.ikv.org.tr/haberler2.php?ID=1558>. See also, Çilingir, 319.

[157] "Dönem Başkanlığı Kıbrıs İçin Yeni Bir Plan Hazırladı," (12 February 2008). <http://www.ikv.org.tr/haberler2.php?ID=1558>.

[158] Hüseyin Kalaycı, "Finlandiya'nın Kıbrıs Planı ve Tren Kazası," 2 Kasım 2006, (12 February 2008). <http://www.asam.org.tr/tr/yazigoster.asp?ID=1206&kat1=3&kat2=>.

In December 2006, as a result of the non-opening of Turkey's sea and air ports to the Greek Cypriots, the EU Foreign Ministers, consistent with the suggestions of the European Commission, decided to suspend the negotiations with Turkey on 8 chapters, including such issues as free movement of goods, right of establishment and freedom of movement of services, financial services, agriculture and rural development, fisheries, transport policy, customs union and external relations. Although it is possible to open negotiations on other chapters, it will not be possible to close them either. The decision of the EU Foreign Ministers also referred to the counter-declaration of the EU made on 21 September 2005. It emphasized that the normalization of the relations with the Greek side and recognition of the Republic of Cyprus was a significant issue for the continuation of the relations between Turkey and the EU.[159] Whether Turkey was able to fulfill her obligations or not remained to be evaluated in Progress Reports of 2007, 2008, 2009.[160]

2.6. Concluding Remarks

After the EU's decision on both to suspend negotiations on 8 chapters in 2006 and to make the provisional closure of each chapter dependent on the resolution of the Cyprus issue, Turkey-EU relations has entered into new era. The Greek Cypriots as an insider started to use the veto card as a bargaining tool during the opening of each chapter. This has reduced the bargaining power of the JDP government. As a result, the expectations of the JDP government of becoming an EU member have decreased. Moreover, the nationalist camp in Turkey has started to accuse the JDP government more loudly of making concessions over national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus. Nationalists have also started to claim that the EU will never accept Turkey as a member state. They have portrayed the EU as an appeaser that wants to gain

---

[159] Güven Özalp, "8 başlıkta kısmi askı," *Milliyet*, 12 December 2006, via Milliyet, http://www.milliyet.com.tr.

[160] Uğur Ergan and Zeynel Lüle, "İşte Son Türkiye Kararı," *Hürriyet*, 15 aralık 2006, via Hürriyet, www.hurriyet.com.tr.

concessions from Turkey. As a result, the support given EU membership has decreased dramatically and the domestic adaptation cost of the EU membership has increased. These challenges have also influenced the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government.

The thesis aims to assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred under the JDP government and if so, whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. In this regard, it is essential to analyze how the JDP government has responded to the challenges and how these challenges have affected the discourse of the JDP government and its Cyprus policies. Thus, the following chapters of the thesis will mainly assess whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred under the JDP government and if so whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process. In addition, in the following chapters, the focus is on how the JDP government has responded to the challenges and how the challenges have affected the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus.

CHAPTER THREE

A "EUROPEANIZED" DISCOURSE

This chapter addresses the rhetorical analysis of the main actors who shape and determine Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus during the Justice and Development Party government. By using the "external incentives model" of Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, this chapter will attempt to determine the transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus since 2002. What needs to be stressed here in that the external incentive for a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus is the motivation of EU membership. Rhetorical analysis of the discourse used by the foreign policy makers in Turkey does not only help us to determine whether there has been a "Europeanization" of discourse, but also enables us to assess whether policymakers use the "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded with EU membership or not to be penalized by being kept outside the EU. In this regard, rhetorical analysis will answer that whether there is an equally material need that the EU membership provides which could be thought of as a trade off with the security interests in Cyprus. It is also important to assess whether all political actors in Turkey perceive and equally value the material benefits EU accession would bring.

Up until 2002, there was a general consensus over the Cyprus issue in Turkey. The Cyprus case was recognized as a "national issue." Turkey followed a "state policy" towards Cyprus. Not only Turkish governments but also the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Presidency of Turkish Republic, and Turkish military played the most significant role in the development of this state policy.[161] State policy implies that the Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus was the protection of the existence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus until a just and permanent solution on the island under the UN leadership was reached.[162] This state policy became an official ideology. It was not a matter of whether a party was in government or in the opposition camp. As

[161] İnanç, 74.
[162] Armağan Kuloğlu, "Ulusal Menfaatler Işığında Kıbrıs'taki Gelişmelere Bakış," *Global Strateji Enstitüsü*, Analizler 2008.

discussed in the previous chapter, almost all parties applied a similar foreign policy towards the Cyprus dispute and developed a similar discourse.[163] However, the first radical break from this traditional discourse came during the campaigns preceding the 3 November 2002 elections. The leader of the Justice and Development Party, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, announced that "the JDP government adopted the Belgium model in order to solve the Cyprus dispute."[164] As a result, since the Justice and Development Party was elected to power on 3 November 2002, traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has started to change. This chapter aims to assess whether a discourse change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and, if so, whether this change is related to the Turkish accession process.

In this regard, first of all, this chapter will specify the discourse developed by main actors. The primary task of this chapter is to uncover the discourse developed by the JDP government and compare it to the discourse developed by the previous coalition government of the Democratic Left Party, National Action Party and Motherland Party that was in power from 1999 to 2002. This comparison should enable to understand the transition from the traditional discourse on Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus to a more "Europeanized" discourse under the JDP government. Moreover, the chapter also analyzes the political actors in Turkey – for example, the main opposition party - Republican People's Party, the Presidency of Turkish Republic and the Turkish Military. Secondly, by using the "external incentives model" of Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, this chapter will analyze whether Turkish government's position is linked to the prospect of Turkey's EU membership. Moreover, the analysis of the change in rhetoric towards Cyprus issue will also determine the impact of the credibility of the signals that come from the EU in terms of threats and rewards. Through rhetorical analysis, this chapter will also try to analyze the trade off between Turkey's security interests in Cyprus and the material benefit that the EU accession would bring.

[163] Güven, 88.

[164] Ibid, 154.

3.1. Rhetorical Analysis of Main Actors

This section analyzes the discourse developed by the JDP government towards the Cyprus dispute and compares it to the discourse developed by the previous coalition government, the Republican People's Party, the Presidency of the Turkish Republic, and Turkish military.

3.1.1. Justice and Development Party government

Since the Justice and Development Party became the ruling party in 2002, there have been four major changes in traditional foreign policy discourse towards Cyprus. First of all, the JDP government has accepted the linkage between Cyprus and EU accession. Second, the JDP government has questioned the red lines of traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. Third, it has taken different stance on the Annan Plan. Finally, it has abandoned the traditional, unconditional support of Turkish governments grant to Mr. Denktaş, the President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. When previous governments came to power, almost all of their Foreign Ministers announced that "Turkey has a traditional foreign policy which will continue unchanged" and they promised that "Turkey's established foreign policy will not change."[165] On the other hand, the Justice and Development Party government became the ruling party through the 3 November 2002 elections and Erdoğan announced that "Turkish foreign policy in Cyprus should change."[166] Moreover, Foreign Minister of the JDP government at the time, Yaşar Yakış claimed that "it is not possible to make a change within the shortest time; however, new government would make new arrangements regarding traditional Turkish foreign policy."[167] The first signals of this change came through the Cyprus policy of the JDP government. The JDP Leader, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan announced that "they want to solve the Cyprus dispute and they adopted Belgium model in order to solve it. The Turkish Cypriots have right to

[165] Ülger and Efegil, 1.

[166] Erdal Güven, "Değişimi Kıbrıs'la başlatın," *Radikal*, 24 November 2002, via Radikal, http://www.radikal.com.tr

[167] Güven, 154.

determine their own future, identity and entity. As in Belgium, "one state with two communities" will be beneficial for both sides."[168] This was seen as a radical break from Turkey's traditional discourse over Cyprus. Then, the Prime Minister of the JDP government at that time, Abdullah Gül stated that "no solution in Cyprus is a solution," and he announced that "there will not be a Minister of State responsible for Cyprus, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs will enforce the Cyprus policy."[169] This was the first visible policy change towards Cyprus. Moreover, the JDP government has announced that it is against the continuation of the status quo on the island and promised to work to find an acceptable solution within the framework of a just and permanent solution.

As stated in Chapter 2, until November 2002, Turkish politicians had insisted that there were "two states" on the island and developed this understanding as "state policy." Particularly, between 1997 and 2002, Turkey strongly supported the confederative structure on the island.[170] Turkey supported the establishment of a "two-state confederation" in Cyprus. For the Turkish side, political equality of two communities had to be enhanced. Turkish policymakers advocated that establishing a "common state" with a "common government" was not possible. A confederation would maintain their sovereignty and legal status, enhance equal powers and functions, and ensure equal and effective participation.[171]

However, after the JDP government came to power, it started giving the first signals of change in traditional state policy towards Cyprus. Erdoğan announced that "it is not possible to say that state policies never change."[172] In this regard, the JDP government changed the Turkish position towards the Annan Plan, and accepted the

---

[168] Ibid.

[169] Murat Yetkin, "Değişen Ankara," *Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği,* 21 November 2002, (February 2008). <http://www.abturkiye.org.tr/index.php?p=23369&l=1>.

[170] Güven, 82.

[171] Efegil and Görgüner, 126-129.

[172] *Hürriyet*, "Dokunulmazlık başka bahara," 24 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

document as a starting point for negotiations.[173] JDP Leader Erdoğan claimed that "if a party retreats from negotiating, this party does not have any argument and does not trust its arguments. Turkish Cypriots also need to sit at the negotiating table in order to find a compromise."[174]

Second, the JDP government did not insist on the discourse of "red lines" for the solution on the island. The red lines for the Turkish government were equal existence of "two states" on the island, sovereignty of the Turkish Cypriots, guarantor rights of Turkey, and existence of the Turkish Military Forces on the island. Cyprus was recognized as a "national issue" by previous governments. It was not acceptable to make a concession for a solution that jeopardized security, sovereignty and prosperity of the Turkish Cypriots, national interests of Turkey, and the balance between Turkey and Greece.[175] This position is reflected in the Foreign Minister of the previous coalition government, Şükrü Sina Gürel's position that "it is not possible to accept any negotiation over the issues about territory and emigration on the basis of Annan Plan."[176] On the other hand, Erdoğan announced that "the JDP government develops its Cyprus policy on the basis of "solve and make it liveable" principle. It is against the policies on the basis of that "no solution is a solution."[177] He insisted that "the JDP government was "against the status quo" on the island."[178]

---

[173] *Hürriyet,* "Ecevit: Kıbrıs planı acemice" 13 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr & See also, *Hürriyet,* "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ın şartı tarih," 26 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[174] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan'dan Denktaş'a yanıt: Dava şahıslara indirgenemez," 28 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet,* "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ın şartı tarih," 26 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[175] *Hürriyet,* "KKTC 19'uncu yaşını kutluyor," 15 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[176] Uğur Ergan, "Gürel'den Annan'a bombardıman," *Hürriyet*, 15 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[177] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan'dan Denktaş'a yanıt: Dava şahıslara indirgenemez," 28 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[178] *Hürriyet,* "Erdoğan: Statüko'dan yana değiliz," 11 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Third, policy makers of the JDP government for the first time acknowledged the linkage between the Cyprus issue and the Turkish accession.[179] Until that time, foreign policymakers of Turkey had argued that there was no link between obtaining a negotiation date and solving the Cyprus dispute. On the other hand, Gül clearly stated that "if the EU gives a negotiation date for Turkey, solution on the island will be quicker."[180] He claimed that "if there is no solution on the island, Turkey will face more challenging alternatives. The relations between Turkey and the EU will deteriorate."[181] The acceptance of this direct linkage between Turkey-EU relations and solution of the Cyprus dispute has dramatically changed the traditional foreign policy discourse of Turkey towards Cyprus. Thus, unlike previous governments, the JDP government has developed its Cyprus policy in order to overcome the challenges it faces with respect to EU membership rather than overemphasizing the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus.

This fresh approach of the Turkish government to the Cyprus issue became obvious after the collapse of traditional Turkish foreign policy that envisaged integration of northern Cyprus and Turkey if the relations between the Greek Cypriots and the EU went further. Baki İlkin, Assistant Adviser of Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the JDP government, announced that "Turkey has gone to a historical change in its Cyprus policy and has left the policy of integration between Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus."[182] Then, Gül claimed that "if there is no solution by May 1, 2004; there will be no policy that envisages the integration of northern Cyprus and Turkey."[183] Furthermore, although previous Turkish foreign policy makers accused the

---

[179] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs, AGSP ve AB tek paket olmalı," 20 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Yakış: Kıbrıs ve AGSP, tarihe bağlı," 25 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[180] Zeynel Lüle, "Müzakerelerden önce Kıbrıs'ta çözüm yok," *Hürriyet*, 17 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[181] *Hürriyet,* "Gül: Referandum ertelenirse biz yokuz," 14 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[182] *Hürriyet*, "Kıbrıs'ı ilhak ve entegrasyon bitti," 9 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[183] Ülger and Efegil, 2-3. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Gül: ABD'nin yardım isteğine ilke olarak evet," 20 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

EU of deepening the division on the island, the JDP government primarily accused previous governments of not preventing the EU membership of the Greek Cypriots.[184] According to JDP officials, previous governments had allowed the Greek side to become an EU member before Turkey.[185] The JDP government argued that the linkage between Turkey-EU relations and Cyprus issue was established due to the mistakes of the previous governments.

Fourth, the JDP government changed the traditional support given to the former President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Rauf Denktaş. The Foreign Minister of the previous coalition government, İsmail Cem, stated that "Denktaş is the best interlocutor for a mutually acceptable solution."[186] In contrast, Mr. Erdoğan stated that "Mr. Denktaş does not sit on the negotiation table in order to reach a solution.[187] He also claimed that "Mr. Denktaş should follow the roadmap that the JDP government has developed. Otherwise, the TRNC will defray the cost of his uncompromising approach."[188] This change in the Turkish government's support became obvious when the JDP government supported Mehmet Ali Talat for the parliamentary elections in the TRNC on 14 December 2003.[189]

In brief, material interests that the EU membership provides, as opposed to security interests of Turkey in Cyprus, have dominated the Cyprus policy of the JDP government. In this regard, discourse analysis of other actors who are essential to determining the Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus: main opposition party- the Republican People's Party, the Presidency of Turkish Republic and Turkish military,

---

[184] *Hürriyet*, "Bakan Gül: Rumların AB üyeliğini engellemeliydik," 8 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[185] *Hürriyet*, "AKP: Org. Tolon kime hain diyorsa açıklasın," 19 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[186] Cem, 2001, 169.

[187] Turan Yılmaz, "Denktaş'a yakışmadı," *Hürriyet*, 29 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[188] *Hürriyet*, "1 Mayıs'tan sonrasını düşünmek zorundayız," 12 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[189] Rauf R. Denktaş, *Son Çağrı* (İstanbul: Remzi Press, 2007), 81-82.

will be beneficial in understanding the divergence between the discourse developed by the JDP government and the discourse of other actors and how they see the tradeoff between security interests of Turkey in Cyprus and material interest that the EU membership provides when they are developing their Cyprus policies.

3.1.2. The Republican People's Party

A change in the Turkish foreign policy discourse becomes obvious when analyzing the discourse of the opposition party, Republican People's Party. Unlike the JDP government, security considerations of Turkey in Cyprus have dominated the Cyprus policy of the RPP. The RPP continued to support Mr. Denktaş and did not accept the Annan Plan as a basis for negotiations. According to Deniz Baykal, the leader of the RPP, "the government does not have right to say "there is policy change" individually."[190] However, Baykal agreed with Mr. Erdoğan and claimed that "there should be "one state with two communities" in Cyprus and an agreement should be based on "one workable state... the RPP is also against the division of Cyprus."[191] Yet, for the RPP, there was a significant opposition to the Annan Plan. [192] Unlike the JDP government, for the RPP, security considerations of Turkey in Cyprus are essential. According to Baykal, "the Annan Plan not only jeopardizes the future of the Turkish Cypriots but also jeopardizes the position of the Turkey in the East Mediterranean."[193] "It covers many points that will risk the security considerations of Turkey. The acceptance of the Annan Plan as a basis for negotiations is a total deviation from

[190] Şaban Sevinç, "KKTC'yi tanıyın," *Hürriyet*, 11 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[191] *Hürriyet*, "Baykal, Kıbrıs'ta 'tek devlet' istedi," 30 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[192] *Hürriyet,* "Kasımpaşalı'ysan bunları yap," 27 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[193] *Hürriyet,* "Baykal: Annan Planı ciddi sorunlar taşıyor," 22 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus."[194] Moreover, RPP Leader claimed that "Turkey's support of TRNC President Denktaş should continue."[195]

In addition, the RPP was critical of the EU's position towards Cyprus and the membership prospect. According to Baykal, "Cyprus' accession is contrary to EU norms and rules, and the Constitutional Treaty of the Cyprus. This is unjust."[196] An important point of contention between the JDP and the RPP is over the linkage between the Cyprus problem and Turkey's EU accession. Mr. Baykal did not accept the linkage between Turkey's EU accession and the Cyprus dispute. He underlined that "for 40 years, Turkey has emphasized that there is no link between Turkey-EU relations and Cyprus issue."[197] In brief, for the RPP, the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus are vital and they cannot be sacrificed for the goal of EU membership.

3.1.3. The Presidency of Turkish Republic

Even though the Presidency is not a decision maker, it lends credibility and legitimacy to government's foreign policy. This is why an analysis of the Presidency's position on Cyprus is important. Ahmet Necdet Sezer, the President from 1999 to 2007, mainly chose to remain passive on the Cyprus dispute, but he believed that "a solution on the island should be based on "two states" and take into consideration realities on the island."[198] The President's position was reinforced by his staff where the argument was that "a solution should protect the "sovereignty and equality" of the Turkish Cypriots

---

[194] *Hürriyet*, "Baykal: Bugünkü Annan Planı'ndan kaygı duyuyoruz," 17 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[195] *Hürriyet,* "Kasımpaşalı'ysan bunları yap," 27 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[196] *Hürriyet*, "Baykal: AB hata yaptı," 18 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[197] *Hürriyet*, "Baykal: Hükümet halka şantaj yapıyor," 8 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[198] *Hürriyet*, "Sezer, Kıbrıs'a ilişkin toplantı düzenleyecek," 19 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

and the "balance between motherlands."[199] Mr. Sezer also maintained that "any solution on the island should take into consideration "national interests" of Turkey and the TRNC and that the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus should be the main determinant of Turkey's Cyprus policy"[200] Thus, the Presidency's position was close to the RPP in that regard.

Sezer opposed the Annan Plan to a certain extent and emphasized Turkey's security interests on the island as the key.[201] Thus, he emphasized that "in order to remain in effect, "deviations and derogations" from the EU acquis in the Annan Plan should be the "primary law of the EU."[202] Sezer believed that it was necessary to eliminate the risk of losing the advantages gained through derogations as a result of application of the Greek Cypriots to the European Court of Justice and European Court of Human Rights.[203] Although the JDP government was against permanent derogations, President Sezer argued that "Turkey needs to take necessary steps in order to make derogations permanent and part of the EU acquis."[204] In addition, Sezer rejected any link between EU membership of Turkey and Cyprus and European Foreign and Security Policy. Rather than seeing solution on the island as a means for EU membership, he recognized the Cyprus issue as a vital national security issue.[205] Thus, Sezer's position was that Annan Plan was insufficient for reaching a solution, the accession of Cyprus to the EU was against international law and there was no connection between Cyprus and

---

[199] *Hürriyet*, "Sezer: Barış hala mümkün," 3 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[200] *Hürriyet*, "Cumhurbaşkanı Sezer'in Kıbrıs dileği," 17 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[201] *Hürriyet*, "Sezer Kıbrıs konusunda ilk kez konuştu," 14 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[202] *Hürriyet*, "MGK'da yok Davos'ta var," 15 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[203] *Hürriyet*, "Sezer Kıbrıs konusunda ilk kez konuştu," 14 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[204] Uğur Ergan, "Sezer: AB içten değil," *Hürriyet,* 23 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[205] Ibid.

Turkey's EU accession. On these points, Sezer's position was different from the JDP government.

3.1.4. Turkish Military

The military in Turkey has been an important player in Turkish foreign policy. This is, of course, an anomaly compared to European standards. However, the Turkish military has played a key role in the development of Turkish foreign policy since the establishment of the Turkish Republic. On the other hand, particularly, after the JDP government came to power and the acceleration of relations between Turkey and the EU, the Turkish military started to assume a more passive role in the establishment of both domestic and foreign policies of Turkey. It has taken a more consultative role and has not played an active role in the development of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government.[206]

Nonetheless, the Turkish military has continued to express its views and emphasized that Turkey should approach the Cyprus dispute by taking into account its own national security interests. This position was made public by the Commander for Land Forces, Aytaç Yalman. He argued that "the Annan Plan is an artificial solution that will destabilize the balance in the East Mediterranean against Turkey, jeopardize the security on the island, and make the Turkish Cypriots a minority on the island."[207] The military's position on Cyprus has become visible in the National Security Council meetings. The National Security Council is an advisory body that the military officials and the civilian government use as a forum for discussing policy-making in Turkey. According to the military, the support for Mr. Denktaş should continue and Turkey's security interests should be protected.[208] The Annan Plan should be the primary law of the EU.[209]

---

[206] Aylin Güney, "Turkey's EU Candidacy and Civil-Military Relations: Challenges and Prospects," *Armed Forces & Society* 31 (2005): 439-462.

[207] Hüseyin Alkan, "TSK size hayran," *Hürriyet*, 28 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr.

[208] *Hürriyet*, "MGK'dan Denktaş'a destek," 29 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

When the General Staff assessed the Annan Plan in terms of security concerns, it found five drawbacks of the plan. First, the maps put the Turkish Cypriots into disadvantageous and insecure position. Second, if the number of Turkish military forces remains under 10000 forces, this situation would have formidable security implications. Third, the territories which would be transferred to the Greek Cypriots are located in a highly strategic position. Morphou (Güzelyurt) is the most significant water source of the TRNC. Moreover, a transfer of the Karpaz Peninsula to the Greek Cypriots would strategically destabilize both Turkey and TRNC. Forth, the mass immigration from south to north would raise social difficulties that could result in social unrest. Finally, the guarantor rights of Turkey would be weakened.[210] It was highly important for the General Staff that after Turkey accedes to the EU, at least two thousand Turkish military forces still be deployed on the island.[211]

In addition, the most important point of contention between the JDP and the Turkish military was that the JDP government has mainly discussed the Cyprus question in terms of Turkey-EU relations; however, the Turkish military has linked the Cyprus question to security concerns of Turkey. According to General İlker Başbuğ, 2nd Chief of the General Staff, "Cyprus is not only related to the security of Turkey but also to Turkey's rights and interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. Cyprus should not be seen as a handicap respecting Turkey-EU relations."[212] In brief, although the JDP government has developed its Cyprus policy in order to overcome the challenges against the EU membership, the Turkish military has recognized the Cyprus issue as a vital security interest that cannot be sacrificed for EU membership.

---

[209] *Hürriyet,* "Kıbrıs'ta sorumluluk hükümette," 6 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[210] *Hürriyet*, "Simitis: Müzakereler için son fırsat," 28 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[211] *Hürriyet*, "KKTC'nin kader MGK'sı," 23 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[212] *Hürriyet*, "Org. Başbuğ: Laiklik demokrasinin itici gücü," 28 May 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

3.2. Discourse Analysis through the External Incentives Model

As explained in Chapter 1, with the "external incentives model," the EU establishes conditions that non-member states have to fulfill in order to receive rewards from the EU: assistance and institutional ties. If the target government complies with the conditionality the EU imposes, the EU rewards it. By offering a reward, the EU aims at changing the behavior of the target government.[213] For the Turkish case, the EU has offered the "membership" carrot to the JDP government in order to achieve transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. If the JDP government succeeds in developing a "Europeanized" discourse and policies over Cyprus that are compatible with the EU, the JDP government would be rewarded. In line with the model, this section analyzes the major turning points where the EU presented Turkey with concrete, tangible incentives.

When the JDP government came to power on 3 November 2002, Turkey was a candidate country and the main goal of the JDP government was to set a date for the opening of accession negotiations. The JDP foreign policymakers have accepted the linkage between Turkey's EU accession and the Cyprus issue. Turkey agreed to take necessary steps for the solution of the Cyprus dispute in order to be rewarded with obtaining a negotiation date from the EU.[214] The JDP government claimed that "no solution is a solution," they are "against the status quo," there should be a "just and permanent solution" on the island, and the Annan Plan is "negotiable."[215]

The first major turning point for the JDP government was April 2003, which was the date "Republic of Cyprus" would sign the Treaty of Accession. The Annan Plan had a strict calendar in order to ensure a reunified Cyprus would join the EU. According to calendar determined by Kofi Annan, the last version of the plan would be determined by 28 February 2003, and a referendum on two sides would be held on 30 March 2003. As

---

[213] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 10-17.

[214] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs, AGSP ve AB tek paket olmalı," 20 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Yakış: Kıbrıs ve AGSP, tarihe bağlı," 25 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[215] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Statüko'dan yana değiliz," 11 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

a result, a new unified Cyprus would sign the Accession Agreement in April 2003.[216] The former European Commissioner for Enlargement, Günter Verheugen, called on the parties to accept the Annan Plan and argued that if some points of the Annan Plan are contrary to EU norms, a certain number of "flexibilities" would be possible.[217] He argued that Annan Plan was the only way. It was considered to be balanced and the best basis for the negotiations.[218] He also warned Turkey by arguing that there was a linkage between Turkey's EU membership and the Cyprus issue. He underlined that although this was not a precondition for the start of negotiations, if there no solution was achieved on the island, the relations between Turkey and the EU would be affected negatively. It is not acceptable for a candidate country to not recognize a member state. Thus, for the Turkish case, it was not possible to accept Turkey as a candidate country because it does not recognize the "Republic of Cyprus," an EU member country.[219] The EU emphasized that Turkey has to understand the linkage between Turkey-EU relations and solution on the island and offered Turkey the "membership carrot" as an exchange for solution on the island.

As a response, the first signals of more "Europeanized" discourse became visible. Abdullah Gül, Prime Minister at that time, claimed that "there will be no integration of northern Cyprus and Turkey,"[220] and consequently, the JDP policymakers tried to signal that the JDP government was against the status quo and the division of the island. They preferred to reach a solution on the basis of "one-state with two communities" under UN leadership.[221] However, time was short and the JDP was a new

---

[216] Güven, 159-160.

[217] *Hürriyet*, "Türkiye'ye çifte standart uygulanmayacak," 19 November 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[218] *Hürriyet*, "AB için Kıbrıs'ta olumlu gelişme gerekli," 28 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[219] Ibid.

[220] Ülger and Efegil, 2-3. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Kıbrıs'ı ilhak ve entegrasyon bitti," 9 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr & *Hürriyet*, "Gül: ABD'nin yardım isteğine ilke olarak evet," 20 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[221] Güven, 154.

and inexperienced party. It had not been able to institute its own staff in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The JDP Leader was dealing with the hustings for the elections in Siirt to be held on 9 March 2003. Prime Minister Gül spent too much time on the question of Iraq and the opening of İncirlik bases to for the US to be used in its war with Iraq. In that respect, the JDP government was not able to haul both Iraq and Cyprus. Hence, the Greek Administration signed the Treaty of Accession on 16 April 2003.

As a result, the EU has started to underline the link between Turkey-EU relations and the solution of the Cyprus dispute. According to Günter Verheugen, "the EU does not apply a double standard against Turkey. If Turkey fulfills the political criteria, the negotiations between Turkey and the EU will be opened. Cyprus is not a pre-condition for the opening of negotiations. However, it will have a great impact on the evaluation."[222] What was important was that Turkey would not be able to bring about the opening of negotiations without finding a solution to the Cyprus issue.[223]

The second turning point came in December 2003. There was a parliamentary election on the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on 14 December 2003. The opposition among the Turkish Cypriots under Mehmet Ali Talat found the Annan Plan "negotiable" and aimed at reaching a solution by May 1, 2004, when the Treaty of Accession signed between the EU and the "Republic of Cyprus" would enter into force. Talat emphasized his readiness to negotiate everything within the framework of the Annan Plan. [224] Verheugen sided with Talat and explained to the opposition parties the support the EU was prepared to provide to reach a solution on the island.[225] In line with the EU approach, the JDP government has supported Mr. Talat. Erdoğan clearly stated "the ones who bring the sensitivities of the "national issue" to the foreground in their political discourses and the ones who are the supportive of the status quo should be

---

[222] Nur Batur, "Törene katılmamak Türkiye'nin tercihi," *Hürriyet*, 17 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[223] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: Kıbrıs tavsiye raporunu etkiler," 19 April 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[224] *Hürriyet*, "Eroğlu Annan Planı'nı tartışabiliriz," 23 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[225] *Hürriyet,* "Verheugen: Denktaş seçim hilesi yaptı," 4 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

sidelined from politics."[226]As a result, Talat's party, the Republican Turkish Party (CTP) was the leading party in the parliamentary elections and new government was established under Talat leadership.[227] This was an important step since through a loss of Turkish government's support; Mr. Denktaş finally was challenged on the island by other Turkish Cypriots.

In 2004, the Cyprus issue was acquiring increasing influence in relation to Turkey's accession. The EU decided that it would decide on Turkey's position at the end of 2004 and would open accession negotiation in 2005 if Turkey was successful in adopting the EU rules.[228] Thus, 2004 was a critical year for Turkish-EU relations. The JDP government was determined to obtain a negotiation date December 2004. In addition, the Treaty of Accession signed between EU and the "Republic of Cyprus" would enter into force on 1 May 2004. The EU policymakers had been continuing to establish a direct linkage between Turkish membership and solution in the Cyprus. Verheugen underlined that "the Cyprus issue is the biggest challenge against the Turkey's EU membership. Although the solution in the Cyprus is not a criterion for Turkey in order to start negotiations, if a candidate country does not recognize a member state, opening of negotiations would be difficult for this country."[229] Thus, the JDP government had to take the steps necessary for resolving the Cyprus problem in order to be rewarded with a negotiation date in December 2004.

The JDP government accelerated its policy in Cyprus. First, the JDP government put pressure on President and asked Annan to restart the negotiations on the basis of the Annan Plan. Turkey's initiatives were welcomed by the EU, and the EU called on the parties to sit at negotiation table.[230] As a result, the leaders of the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots, Mr. Papadopoulos and Mr. Denktaş, accepted Annan's offer to resume

---

[226] *Hürriyet,* "Erdoğan: Kıbrıslı kazanılmış haklarla AB'ye girmek istiyor," 16 December 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[227] Çilingir 51-52

[228] Ibid, 201.

[229] *Hürriyet*, "Kıbrıs'ın çözülmesini istemeyen ülkeler var," 29 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[230] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ta masadan kaçmak yok," 16 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

negotiations on the basis of the Annan Plan and talks between two leaders began on 19 February 2004 under the supervision of Mr. De Soto.[231] The JDP government claimed that although Cyprus was not a pre-condition and was not a Copenhagen criterion for Turkey's EU membership, it was a political reality and there was a "de facto" situation that needed to be taken into account.[232] Although other actors have considered the Cyprus issue in terms of the national security interests of Turkey, the JDP government has taken the Cyprus dispute into consideration in terms of Turkey-EU relations. Ali Babacan, Minister of State, emphasized that "although there is not a direct linkage between EU membership of Turkey and solution of the Cyprus dispute, Cyprus is a matter of concern in Turkey-EU relations."[233] In this regard, the JDP government has developed a discourse over the Annan Plan that is compatible with the EU rhetoric and different from the other actors in Turkey.

The President of European Commission, Romano Prodi emphasized that "the European Commission supports the Annan Plan and it is ready to give both spiritual and material support."[234] However, other actors in Turkey that are essential to determining Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus, emphasized the negative components of the Annan Plan, brought out the national sensitivities and highlighted the national security interests of Turkey. On the other hand, the JDP government argued that there are both positive and negative measures of the Annan Plan; however, the important point is to agree to reaching a "mutually acceptable, just and permanent solution."[235] Similar to the EU's call to parties to sit at negotiation table by taking into account present-day dynamics and not bringing up the fears of the past. Erdoğan argued that "Those who did

---

[231] Annan Plan for Cyprus.

[232] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ta masadan kaçmak yok," 16 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[233] *Hürriyet*, "Babacan: Türkiye'de kriz geride kaldı," 22 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[234] *Hürriyet,* "Türkiye doğru yolda," 17 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[235] *Hürriyet*, "TBMM'nin Kıbrıs gündemi tarihe geçti," 7 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

not support the Annan Plan fear change and do not understand that world is changing, Europe is changing, and Turkey needs to change."[236]

In addition, during the negotiations of the Annan Plan, the EU called upon Turkey to put pressure on the Turkish Cypriots and announced its readiness to offer the membership carrot in exchange for supporting a solution on the island.[237] As a result of these pressures and the hope of being rewarded with membership, Prime Minister Erdoğan announced, "It is not possible to go with previous passive policies and promised that Turkey would always be a cut above the Greek Cypriots."[238] The JDP government seems to have new offers to table and demonstrated its "conciliatory gestures" by developing a "constructive" approach towards the UN Secretary General's new offers. As one of the main changes in Turkish attitudes, Turkey under the JDP government never wanted to be party who left the negotiation table.[239] On the other hand, Denktaş found the last version of the Annan Plan unacceptable and not open to debate. Thus, he announced that he would not attend the negotiations in Switzerland. However, as a result of Turkey's pressure on not leaving the negotiation table, although Denktaş was against continuation of the negotiations, he sent Prime Minister Mehmet Ali Talat and Deputy Prime Minister Serdar Denktaş to attend negotiations in Switzerland on 24 March 2004.[240]

Second, the JDP government had developed a new strategy by which if the two sides - the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots – were unable to reach an agreement on every issue, then all the parties; including Greece and Turkey, would sit at the

---

[236] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ta iyi niyetimizi koruyoruz," 21 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Kıbrıs'ın çözülmesini istemeyen ülkeler var," 29 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[237] *Hürriyet,* "Kıbrıs karşılığında AB havucunu gösterecek," 16 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[238] *Hürriyet,* "ABD: Kongragel terör örgütü," 28 January 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Yapıcı olmayanlar konuşmasın," 11 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[239] Ibid.

[240] "Görüşmeci Talat," 22 March 2004, (January 2008). <http://www.kibris.net/basin/yazarlarimiz/serbest/mgunduz/arsiv/2004/mart/22_mart_2004.htm.>

negotiation table and negotiate the security issues. Then, if it was necessary, Annan would fill the unaddressed issues. Both the EU and the UN welcomed this offer, and it was decided that Greece and Turkey would attend the second part of the negotiations in Switzerland.[241]

Third, the JDP government, like the EU and the UN, had supported a referendum on the Annan Plan. After the 24 March 2004 negotiations in Switzerland, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan submitted to the fifth and final version of the Annan Plan in order put this plan to referendum.[242] Turkey approached the plan positively and convinced Mr. Denktaş to put it to referendum. Erdoğan announced "there are also negative measures in the Annan Plan. We did not gain everything about primary law. However, bi-zonality, political equality, guarantor rights of Turkey, deployment of a certain number of Turkish military forces on the island are included in the plan."[243] His position was that there should be a "win-win" situation and everybody should gain from the Annan Plan.[244]

The JDP government always saw the acceptance of the Annan Plan by the Turkish Cypriots as a major step that would be rewarded with the membership carrot by the EU. Gül and Babacan claimed,

> "If the Greek Cypriots join the EU without any solution on the island, the bargaining power of the Greek side will be strengthened and the Turkey's possible EU membership will be more difficult. Otherwise, if the Turkish Cypriots accept the plan, Cyprus will not be a handicap against Turkish side and bargaining power of the Turkish side will be higher."[245]

---

[241] Mehmet Ali Birand, "Önümüzde sadece 984 saat var," *Hürriyet*, 17 February 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[242] Annan Plan for Cyprus

[243] *Hürriyet*, "TBMM'nin Kıbrıs gündemi tarihe geçti," 7 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[244] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan'dan bakanlara ikna raporu," 5 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[245] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: Referandum ertelenirse biz yokuz," 14 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Babacan: Türkiye'de kriz geride kaldı," 22 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

The JDP government's constructive attitudes were welcomed by the EU and the EU started to modify its discourse. Rather than blaming the Turkish side, Verheugen called upon the EU to put pressure on the Greek side and criticized the Greek Cypriots for their exploiting the likelihood of their becoming an EU member without a political settlement having first been reached on the island.[246] He argued that although Mr. Papadopoulos was seen to be the main supporter of the Annan Plan, he had begun to complain about the main points of the plan, such as bi-zonality and equality and asked his community to vote against the plan.[247] Thus, Mr. Verheugen criticized the Greek side for the absence of political will to reach a solution. On the other hand, he appreciated Turkey's "constructive" attitudes.[248] Both Mr. Verheugen and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana, accused the Greek Cypriots of making small calculations. They argued that the reasons behind the opposition to Annan Plan on the Greek side were based on economic interests rather than on questions of security. They argued that the Greek Cypriots thought that Northern Cyprus would be a handicap in developing tourism sector in the south.[249]

Moreover, the EU announced that if the Greek Cypriots rejected the Annan Plan, isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriots would be lifted. Both Verheugen and European Commissioner for External Relations, Chris Patten, claimed that if the Turkish Cypriots accepted the plan and the Greek Cypriots rejected it, the EU would lift the isolating measures that had been taken because it would not be possible to punish the Turkish Cypriots.[250] In addition, Solana claimed "If the Greek Cypriots say 'no' whereas the Turkish Cypriots say 'yes,' nothing will be as it was in the past. The relations with northern Cyprus will be different. The EU is ready to help the Turkish

[246] Zeynep Lüle, "Verheugen: AB, Rumlar'a baskıya hazır," 2 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[247] Zeynep Lüle, "Verheugen: Rumlar beni aldattı," *Hürriyet*, 22 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[248] Zeynep Lüle, "Verheugen: AB, Rumlar'a baskıya hazır," 2 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[249] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: Rumlar hayal kırıklığı yarattı," 23 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[250] Zeynep Lüle, "Verheugen: Rumlar beni aldattı," *Hürriyet*, 22 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Cypriots."[251] In the end, in the referendum held on 24 April 2004, 64.9% of the Turkish Cypriot Community accepted the plan whereas the Greek Cypriot Community rejected the plan by 75.83% of the vote. The implementation of the plan was dependent on its approval by both communities. Thus, after the rejection of the Annan Plan by the Greek Cypriot Community, the Annan Plan became null and void.[252]

After these results in the referendum, Turkey, under the JDP government, has developed its discourse on the basis that isolation of the Turkish Cypriots should come to an end lifted and Cyprus should not continue to be an obstacle in Turkey-EU relations. In the evening of 24 April 2004, just after informal results of the referendum were announced, Erdoğan asserted, "It is necessary to lift the embargos on the Turkish Cypriots, to open airports in TRNC into international flights, and to start direct trade between TRNC and the EU."[253] He also added that "there is no reason to show the Cyprus dispute as an impediment to Turkey-EU relations."[254] Gül also emphasized that "Cyprus will not continue to be obstacle against Turkey-EU relations."[255] Foreign policymakers of Turkey have also argued that not only economic embargos but also political ones should be lifted. Both Erdoğan and Gül argued that "Turkey will work to lift isolation over the Turkish Cypriots and to call parties for the international recognition of the Turkish Cypriots."[256]

On the other hand, since the referendum, the EU has developed quite a different discourse than Turkey. Unlike the JDP government, the EU has announced that referendum results would make Turkey-EU relations more difficult and it was not

---

[251] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: Rumlar hayal kırıklığı yarattı," 23 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[252] Chadjipalis and Andreadis.

[253] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Güney Kıbrıs kaybetti," 24 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[254] *Hürriyet,* "Son 50 yılın zaferi," 26 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[255] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: KKTC'ye siyasi ambargo da kalkacak," 28 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[256] Erdal Sağlam, "IMF'yle ilişki kesmeyiz kur stabil olsun isteriz," *Hürriyet*, 28 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr. See also, *Hürriyet*, "Gül: KKTC'ye siyasi ambargo da kalkacak," 28 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

possible to recognize the TRNC. However, the EU also announced that the recognition of TRNC required a new UN decision and Russia would veto this decision. Thus, it would not be possible to recognize the TRNC. [257] However, the EU also promised to take the steps necessary to lift the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots.[258]

Thanks to the referendum results, on 29 April 2004, the EU passed two regulations that allowed 259 million (Euros?) of financial aid to the Turkish Cypriots and the free movement of goods and persons between northern and southern part of the island and the EU countries under the Green Line Regulation. [259] As stated in Chapter 2, this Commission Regulation requires the adoption to be accepted unanimously by the Council. Therefore,, since the "Republic of Cyprus" became a EU member on 1 May 2004, the Green Line Regulation has not turned into reality due to the Greek Cypriots' veto.[260] As a result, the JDP policymakers developed their discourse based on the position that the EU should implement the Green Line Regulation and give Turkey a negotiation date.[261] However, in order to be rewarded with a negotiation date, the JDP government has abstained from developing discourse that could be recognized as a departure from the EU discourse. The JDP government has argued that the EU aims to "lift economic embargo" on the Turkish Cypriots rather than calling for recognition of the TRNC.[262]

Furthermore, Cyprus' accession complicated Turkey's accession negotiations. The EU emphasized that the Negotiation Framework underscores that negotiations will

---

[257] *Hürriyet*, "Rumlar barışı torpilledi," 25 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[258] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: KKTC ile işbirliği yapacağız," 26 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[259] Erdal Sağlam, "Rumların üyelik töreni için Dublin'e giderim," *Hürriyet*, 29 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[260] "Council Regulation No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession," 9 June 2004, (February 2008) <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004R0866R(01):EN:HTML>.

[261] *Hürriyet*, "Başbakan Erdoğan AB'yi uyardı," 8 December 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[262] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: Türkiye müzakerelere başlamaya hazırdır," 22 May 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

take place between Turkey and the 25 EU member states. Thus, Turkey has to normalize her relations with all EU members, including "Republic of Cyprus" and Turkey should fulfill her obligations arising from the Additional Protocol.[263] Thus, although the opening of Turkish sea and air ports to the Greeks is not a necessary condition for the opening up negotiations, it is a requirement for the continuation of the process. [264] However, the JDP government has claimed that it is not possible to accept opening of ports to Greek Cypriots. The Customs Union does not cover the service sector. It is not possible to lift sanctions unilaterally.[265] Therefore, this was the first signal of departure from the increasingly "Europeanized" discourse of the JDP government.

On 3 October 2005, the EU decided to open negotiations with Turkey. However, the EU called upon Turkey to normalize her relations with the Greek Administration.[266] The President of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso announced, "The EU understands the historical difficulty of the Cyprus issue. However, Turkey has to establish relations with all member states, including the Greek Cypriots. Turkey has to establish a civilized dialogue with the Greek Cypriots. Turkey has to understand that Turkey needs to receive the approval of all member states in order to become a member of the EU."[267] Consequently, the JDP government has found itself constrained to change its position that Turkey will not open its sea and air ports to the Greek Cypriots and began to stress that Turkey is ready to open her ports to Greek Cypriot ships and planes. However, Turkey wants the embargoes imposed on the Turkish Cypriots to be lifted

---

[263] *Hürriyet*, "AB'de müzakere çerçeve belgesi ele alınıyor," 29 September 2005, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[264] Batu, 136.

[265] *Hürriyet*, "Arkamızı döner gideriz," 2 September 2005, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[266] "Negotiation Framework," 3 October 2005, (October 2005). < http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/st20002_05_TR_framedoc_en.pdf>.

[267] *Hürriyet*, "Barroso: Türkiye soykırım iddiası ile yüzleşmeli," 24 October 2005, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

once Turkey's ports are opened to the Greek Cypriots.[268] This opening up is one of the main radical breaks from traditional Turkish foreign policy discourse towards Cyprus. As a result, domestic opposition started to accuse the JDP government of making concessions over Cyprus in order to receive EU membership. This means that it became necessary for the JDP government to balance domestic opposition and to meet EU expectations. In brief, lifting sanctions simultaneously has become the core of the discourse developed by the JDP government towards the Cyprus issue after the EU opened accession negotiations with Turkey. However, but the EU has failed to keep its promises of lifting sanctions on Turkish Cypriots even though it had emphasized that there was no linkage between the opening of Turkey's sea and air ports to the Greek Cypriots' and the lifting economic sanctions on the Turkish Cypriots.[269]

The most important breakthrough over Cyprus came in December 2006 when the European Council decided to suspend negotiations with Turkey on 8 chapters.[270] As a result, the JDP government started to develop a discourse that differed from that used by the EU. Gül argued, "a new phase between Turkey and the EU relations has started. The opening of Turkish sea ports to the Greek side is related to whether the EU keeps its promises. The EU has passed two regulations designed to improve the conditions on the Turkish side. However, the EU has not yet implemented these regulations."[271] Erdoğan lashed out at the EU for not keeping its promises given before 24 April 2004 and accused the EU of rewarding the Greek Cypriots, who had rejected the Annan Plan.[272]

After negotiations were suspended, as Gül stated, Turkey-EU relations entered into a new phase. Turkey's EU process began to slow down in 2007. In particular, due

---

[268] Ferai Tınç, "Yetmiş parlamenterin imzası," *Hürriyet*, 30 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[269] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: TCK 301'de korkulan olmadı," 3 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[270] Uğur Ergan and Zeynel Lüle, "İşte Son Türkiye Kararı," *Hürriyet*, 15 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr.

[271] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: Karar kendilerinin," 29 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[272] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: Kürtlerin hak sorunu yok," 18 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

to such domestic issues as the presidency, the parliamentary elections of 2007, and the headscarf and secularism debates, the JDP government did not pay sufficient attention to Turkey-EU relations. Thus, the Cyprus dispute was removed from the agenda. However, the JDP government has continued to develop a discourse whereby the government will continue to support any attempts within the UN framework to reach a solution on the island. On the other hand, the JDP government has continued to blame the Greek Administration. Gül claimed that "the Greek side continues to maintain an "uncompromising" attitude. In order to gain one-sided concessions, the Greek Cypriots try to change the solution arena from the UN to the EU."[273] On the other hand, the EU has called for Turkey to open her sea and air ports to Greek ships and airplanes. However, Turkey has agreed to this only if sanctions are lifted at the same time..[274] Moreover, Turkey has decided to partially suspend its military relations with the EU. Although there has been no official announcement of the direct linkage between this suspension and the Cyprus dispute, Turkey has made this decision for political reasons. Not signing security agreements with the EU despite international agreements and previous commitments of the EU prevents Turkey from taking an active role in the decision-making process of the operation order. On the other hand, the Greek side is one of the active participants of this process and it is able to see any secret documents which are not available to Turkey.[275]

In 2008, the stark silence of the previous year has remained. The JDP government has developed a discourse of based on Turkey's readiness to make an "active contribution" to the attempts made by the UN to reach a "just and comprehensive solution" on the island.[276] However, the JDP government has announced that Turkey will not allow the EU to use NATO's facilities if the Greek Cypriots become part of the UN Peacekeeping Force in Kosovo even though Turkey allowed the

---

[273] *Hürriyet*, "Gül: Yunanistan'dan AB konusunda açık destek bekliyoruz," 24 June 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[274] Hürriyet, "Dışişleri: AB'nin kararı haksız," 13 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[275] *Sabah*, "AB'ye Asker Protestosu," 7 Haziran 2007, via Sabah, http://www.guncelhaber.com.

[276] *Hürriyet*, "Erdoğan: 301. Madde gündemden düşecek," 29 February 2008, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

EU Peacekeeping Forces in which the Greek Administration was a party to use NATO facilities in Afghanistan in 2007. Hence, the weakening of the credibility of the EU slowed down the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus despite the initial pro-activism of the JDP government.

In brief, as the "external incentives model" of Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier suggests, the thesis argues that the JDP government has chosen to adopt a more "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus when the EU has shown a carrot, such as providing a negotiation date or starting accession negotiations, or when the EU has showed a stick, such as suspending negotiations on 8 chapters. Each time the EU has shown a carrot or a stick, the JDP government has developed a more "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded by EU membership or not to be penalized by being kept outside the EU. Moreover, Retired Ambassador Yalım Eralp argues that the JDP has developed a "Europeanized" discourse on Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus in order to get the support of the EU, US, Turkish intellectuals and the Turkish media in order to eradicate prejudices vis-à-vis the JDP government. In this respect, it is possible to conclude that the "Europeanization" process in Turkey is not only a top-down process driven by the EU membership prospect. Domestic issues are also essential in order to affect "Europeanization" in Turkey. This is why there has been a considerable decline in the commitment of the JDP government towards Europeanization process of Turkey, which had previously been used as a support base for the JDP politicians in terms of providing their commitment to a secular regime in Turkey and its "Europeanized" vision, after the JDP strengthened its political ground by gaining the 47 percent of the votes in 2007 elections.

In that regard, it is also essential to understand the reversal of the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. According to the "external incentives model," a government adopts EU rules if the benefits of EU rewards exceed the domestic adoption costs. The cost-benefit balance depends on the determinacy –clarity and formality- of conditions, the size and speed of rewards, the credibility of threats and promises, and the size of adoption costs. If the behavioral implications of a rule are clearer and more legalized, its determinacy is higher. Determinacy helps the target governments know exactly what they have to do to get the rewards. It enhances the credibility of conditionality. The size and speed at which conditional rewards are delivered determines the strength of the incentive. The promise

of enlargement is a more powerful incentive than the promise of assistance. The longer temporal distance to the payment of rewards reduces the willingness to comply with the EU rules. Complementing a meaningful timeframe, credibility depends on the consistency of an organization's allocation of rewards. If the EU offers rewards without the conditions having been fulfilled, it creates a moral hazard problem within the target state that slows down the Europeanization process there. In addition, the stronger party of negotiations should effectively present its rewards to the target state, and this necessitates useful diffusion of information on conditions and rewards between the two sides. Moreover, the size of domestic adoption costs and their distribution among domestic actors determine whether they will accept or reject the conditions. In this respect, the effectiveness of conditionality depends on the preferences of the government and of other veto players. Even if these conditions are conducive to rule adoption, target states may still choose the form of adoption that minimizes cost. Usually discursive adoption is expected as the least costly option.[277] In this regard, the "external incentives model" is essential to analyzing the reversal of "Europeanization" process in Turkey towards Cyprus.

Since the rejection of the Annan Plan, the EU has not kept its promises of lifting sanctions on the Turkish Cypriots if they accepted the Annan Plan even if the Greek Cypriots rejected it. After the EU failed to keep its promises, criticism of the EU has increased dramatically. The credibility of the EU has started to be questioned. Those who see the Cyprus policy of the JDP government as contrary to the parameters of the "national issue," particularly, political actors who see the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus as more important material benefit than the material interests the EU membership provides, have started to accuse the JDP government of making concessions regarding Cyprus. The support for the EU membership in Turkey has also declined. Thus, the domestic adaptation cost of the new Cyprus policy has started to increase in Turkey. Moreover, the speed at which the reward will come is too slow. The earliest possible accession date will be 2014. The decision to suspending negotiations on 8 chapters, in particular, has reduced the expectations of becoming a EU member. JDP members have started to feel cheated by the EU and have accused the EU of applying a double standard towards Turkey and, therefore, has lost its reliability. Chief

[277] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 10-17.

Negotiator Ali Babacan has argued that the EU is using the Cyprus issue as an excuse to stop the negotiation process rather than contributing to the solution of the dispute.[278] Thus, the membership incentive has begun to dissipate. On the other hand, the EU made the Greek Cypriots members without political settlement having been reached on the island. Thus, this has created a moral hazard problem within Turkey. Turkish policymakers have accused the EU of applying a double standard and have questioned its reliability. As a result, this has led to a departure from the "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus and has slowed down the "Europeanization" process in Turkey.

3.3. Concluding Remarks

This chapter demonstrated that a change in discourse in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and assessed whether this change was related to the Turkish accession process. In this regard, through discourse analysis, this chapter tried to analyze whether Turkish government was involved in Cyprus for the purposes of obtaining EU membership or not. The discourse analysis demonstrated that the Justice and Development Party has developed a discourse different from the traditional discourse on Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. The JDP government has not only developed a different discourse than the previous governments but has also developed a discourse distinct from other actors who are essential in determining Turkish Foreign Policy towards Cyprus: the main opposition party - the Republican People's Party; the Presidency of Turkish Republic; and the Turkish military. The main difference is over the tradeoff between EU membership and the security interests of Turkey in Cyprus. Although other actors recognize the Cyprus issue as a vital interest that cannot be sacrificed for EU membership, the JDP government has developed its Cyprus policy in order to overcome the challenges to EU membership. In this respect, the JDP government has developed its discourse regarding Cyprus that is compatible with EU rhetoric.

In this respect, it is essential to discover the extent to which the JDP government has developed a "Europeanized" discourse designed to obtain the reward of EU

[278] *Hürriyet*, "Babacan: AB'de her saat bir gelişme olabilir," 6 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

membership or not to be penalized by being kept outside the EU. Moreover, it is necessary to analyze the impact of the credibility of the signals that come from the EU in terms of threats and rewards. Thus, the "external incentives model" of Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier is useful in demonstrating that this change is directly related to the Turkish accession process. The JDP government has developed a more "Europeanized" discourse than traditional discourse on Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus because the EU has offered Turkey under the JDP government the "membership carrot" as a reward. The aim of the EU has been to change traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. On the other hand, the JDP government aimed at EU membership. Thus, the membership carrot was a big reward for the JDP government and the JDP has started to work by changing its discourse. The JDP government has chosen to adopt a more "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus when the EU has shown a carrot, such as providing a negotiation date or starting accession negotiations, or when the EU has shown a stick, such as suspending negotiations on 8 chapters. After the EU showed a carrot or a stick, the JDP government has developed a more "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded by EU membership or not to be punished by being kept outside the EU. However, credibility of the EU has played a crucial role in this radical change. After the EU failed to keep its promise of lifting sanctions on the Turkish Cypriots if they accepted the Annan Plan even if the Greek Cypriots rejected it, credibility of the EU started to be questioned and the support given to EU membership began to decline. The JDP government has been accused of making concessions over the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus in order to obtain EU membership. As a result, the domestic adaptation cost of new Cyprus policy has increased dramatically and has led to the reversal from "Europeanized" discourse towards Turkey and slowed down the "Europeanization" process in Turkey. Thus, it is also essential to underline that although EU membership has become the main driven force behind the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus, domestic issues have also played a key role on the "Europeanization" process of Turkey.

CHAPTER FOUR

EUROPEANIZATION OF A FOREIGN POLICY

This chapter covers the "Europeanized" policies towards Cyprus developed by the Justice and Development Party government and the evaluation of the transformative power of the European Union on foreign policy matters. In order to determine whether there has been a real change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government or whether this change is only at the level of rhetoric, this chapter will try to analyze the extent to which the "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes under the JDP government. On the other hand, it is also important to see that even if there has only been rhetorical change towards Cyprus issue, this in itself is also a major accomplishment since rhetorical change could precede and motivate policy changes. Thus, it is essential to analyze the transformative power of the EU on foreign policy matters. In this regard, the extent to which Turkish accession has contributed to a transformation of the Cyprus dispute and the degree to which credibility of the rewards and threats have affected the transformative power of the EU in the Turkish case will be the main focus of discussion.

4.1. Towards "Europeanized" Policies?

In the previous chapters, an analysis of the Justice and Development Party government's "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus was provided. However, in order to achieve a "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus, it is essential to "Europeanize" the policies as well and not only the rhetoric. Thus, this chapter will focus on the extent to which the "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes towards Cyprus under the JDP government. In order to analyze the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government, the thesis will use the framework for the domestic adaptation on the foreign policy developed by Michael Smith. Elite socialization, bureaucratic

reorganization, constitutional change, and increase in public support for Europeanization of foreign policy are the four major indicators of such policy change.[279] Based on Smith's analysis, this chapter will try to discover the extent to which the JDP government has developed "Europeanized" policies.

First, elite socialization refers to the extent of socialization of relevant decision makers. Policy makers consult with the EU regarding institutional settings. Thus, elite socialization implies development of a certain level of trust among actors, gradual internalization of cooperative habits and common views, abandonment of national loyalties, and elimination of any conflict between national and European goals.[280] In the Turkish case, it seems that the JDP government did not develop trust between Turkey, the Greek Administration and the EU. In particular, after the failure of the EU to lift sanctions on the Turkish Cypriots and the suspension of negotiations on 8 chapters, the JDP government accused the EU of not keeping its promises and the Greek Administration of using its EU membership for its own national interests. Policy makers of the JDP government have claimed that the EU has lost its reliability. Erdoğan asserted that "the EU has made a mistake by accepting the Greek Administration as an EU member."[281] On the other hand, although the Turkish Cypriots accepted the Annan Plan, the EU has not taken any necessary steps towards lifting sanctions on the Turkish Cypriots. In this regard, the JDP government has started to accuse the EU of applying a double standard to Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots. Egemen Bağış, Advisor of Foreign Affairs to the Prime Ministry, argued "Some European countries, such as France and Austria, are against Turkish membership and they use the Cyprus problem as an excuse.[282] Similarly, Ali Babacan, the Chief Negotiator, expressed the view that "The EU develops new criterion as an excuse in order to suspend negotiation rather than

[279] Smith, 613.

[280] Ibid, 617-618.

[281] Nur Batur, "Erdoğan: Siyasi riski alıyorum," *Hürriyet*, 17 December 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[282] Ibid.

contributing to the solution (to the problem) on the island."[283] So, elite socialization was weak in Turkish and the EU cases.

Second, bureaucratic adaptation is an important indicator of adaptation of "Europeanized" policies. Bureaucratic adaptation requires the establishment of new national offices, expansion of new diplomatic services, and restructuring of internal administrative structures in order to increase political cooperation.[284] When we apply this to the Turkish case, we expect to see institutional changes in the Turkish bureaucracy. When the JDP government came to power, Gül announced "there will not be a Minister of State responsible for Cyprus, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs will enforce the Cyprus policy."[285] This was the first signal of a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. In addition, on 2 December 2003, the JDP government agreed to fulfill the obligations of the Loizidou case, a landmark legal case regarding the rights of refugees wishing to return to their former homes and properties. [286] The applicant, Mrs. Titina Loizidou, who is a Cypriot citizen, grew up in Kyrenia in northern Cyprus, where she had certain plots of land. In 1972, she moved to Nicosia. Since 1974, she had been prevented from gaining access to her properties in Kyrenia. On 22 July 1989, she filed a petition against Turkey to the European Court of Human Rights. The European Court of Human Rights ruled that she had the right to return her home and she should be allowed to return her home and Turkey should pay damages to her.[287] Turkey initially ignored this ruling. However, in 2003, Turkey paid Mrs. Loizidou the compensation ruled by the

---

[283] *Hürriyet*, "Babacan: AB'de her saat bir gelişme olabilir," 6 December 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[284] Smith, 619-623.

[285] Murat Yetkin, "Değişen Ankara," *Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği,* 21 November 2002, (February 2008). <http://www.abturkiye.org.tr/index.php?p=23369&l=1>.

[286] "Loizidou Davası," 2003, (22 May 2008). <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/yayinlarimiz/ANADOLUNUNSESI/210/AND9.htm>. See also, Brewin, 2002, 7.

[287] "Case of Loizidou v. Turkey," *European Court of Human Rights HUDOC Database*, 28 July 1998, (17 July 2008). <http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/Case-Law/HUDOC/HUDOC+database/>.

European Court of Human Rights.[288] This has become one of the major turning points from traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus.[289] The JDP government has become determined to solve the Cyprus dispute. Thus, it has become the main supporter of the initiatives of the TRNC government in order to build confidence between the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots. As a result, a "Compensation Commission" was established in August 2003 in order to allow the Greek Cypriots to apply for reimbursement for their real properties in Northern Cyprus. A "Special Information Centre" was opened within the Lost Persons Committee on 12 November 2004.in order to provide information about both the Greek and Turkish Cypriots were lost. Turkey gave $150,000 in financial aid to the Lost Persons Committee.[290] These were the institutional adjustments that are in line with the second dimension of Smith's Europeanization.

Third, constitutional changes are also necessary in order to develop "Europeanized" policies and reinterpret key provisions of the constitutions need to be reinterpreted to create a "Europeanized" foreign policy.[291] This thesis puts these constitutional changes into a broader framework and analyzes new regulations and statutes developed to develop the cooperation between the Turkish and the Greek Cypriots. Towards the goal of developing good neighborly relations with the Greek Cypriots, Turkey passed a new regulation on 23 May 2003 that allowed applying new and simplified visa procedures. The JDP government has supported the TRNC government in its effort to pass new laws designed to build cooperation between the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots. First of all, the Council of Ministers of the TRNC lifted the restrictions on exports from northern Cyprus to southern Cyprus. [292] After the Greek

---

[288] *BBC*, "Turkey compensates Cyprus refugee," 2 December 2003, via BBC, http://www.bbc.co.uk

[289] "Loizidou Davası," 2003, (22 May 2008). <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/yayinlarimiz/ANADOLUNUNSESI/210/AND9.htm>.

[290] *Hürriyet*, "Türkiye'nin daha önceki Kıbrıs açılımları," 24 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[291] Smith, 624-625.

[292] *Hürriyet*, "Türkiye'nin daha önceki Kıbrıs açılımları," 24 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Cypriots signed the European Union Accession Treaty, it was decided to open border gates on 23 April 2003 to secure humanitarian passes - and to rid the Buffer Zone of mines. In this regard, 23 April 2003 represented an historic day in Cyprus. Greek and the Turkish Cypriots had their first chance to visit the other side of the island since 1974. This was a revolutionary step taken to demonstrate that the easing of restrictions would be a test of whether the two sides could live together.[293] The TRNC authorities lifted the passport obligation on 25 May 2004 and adopted a new regulation allowing Greek Cypriots to enter the TRNC with ID cards. Moreover, the TRNC authorities lifted all restrictions over both imports and exports between northern and southern Cyprus. On 23 May 2005, a law regulating the legal status of schools attended by Greek Cypriots was passed. School books used by the Greek Cypriots in the TRNC were harmonized with EU standards. It also permitted the opening of a secondary school for Greek Cypriots who live in Karpaz. On 19 December 2005, the TRNC made amendments in the Compensation Commission Regulation in order to allow Greek Cypriots to apply for indemnity or exchange of their properties in Northern Cyprus. The visa application for the Greek Cypriots and Greek citizens who enter TRNC by air and sea routes was lifted on 4 January 2006.[294] These changes demonstrate that there were significant modifications of Turkey's policy towards Cyprus. These steps are essential to easing the tension and economic imbalance between the two communities; however, there are no signs that the key political issues of territory and sovereignty are any closer to being resolved.[295]

Fourth, increase in public support is essential to contribute to developing "Europeanized" policies. Public support for political cooperation with the EU will make it easier to make the policy changes necessary to attain European standards and working with civil society organizations will have the effect of increasing public support for the

---

[293] *BBC*, "Emotion as Cyprus border opens," 23 April 2003, via BBC, http://www.bbc.co.uk

[294] *Hürriyet*, "Türkiye'nin daha önceki Kıbrıs açılımları," 24 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[295] *BBC*, "Emotion as Cyprus border opens," 23 April 2003, via BBC, http://www.bbc.co.uk

development of "Europeanized" policies.[296] For the Turkish case, TÜSİAD became the main supporter of the JDP's policy towards Cyprus and welcomed the JDP's support of the Annan Plan. Like the JDP government, TÜSİAD announced that the Annan Plan was a chance for the people who live on the island and argued that it was necessary to transform Turkey's Cyprus policy so as to achieve EU membership.[297] TÜSİAD President Tuncay Özilhan claimed that EU membership should be the main goal, and all international affairs, including Cyprus, should be thought of within this framework. Turkey needs to find an optimum solution on the island for EU membership.[298] In this regard, TÜSİAD's support has been a source of support for the JDP government in its effort to take the steps necessary to develop more "Europeanized" policies towards Cyprus; it can be seen, then, that TÜSİAD and the JDP government spoke with one voice.

On the other hand, decline in public support for the EU membership has led to a departure from a "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. In 2005, 55% of the public believed that Turkey-EU relations were on the right track. However, this proportion had declined to 49% by autumn 2007 and confidence in the EU has declined to 25%. The proportion of people who saw EU membership as beneficial for Turkey has declined from 53% to 49%.[299] These drops in public support demonstrate that domestic adaptation cost of developing "Europeanized" Cyprus policies has increased dramatically.

In summary, it seems like the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus remains highly restrictive and the "Europeanized" Cyprus policies of the JDP government have been symbolic. In other words, a "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policies in very limited areas. Most of the "Europeanized" policies have been "confidence-building" measures rather than

---

[296] Smith, 625-627.

[297] Nilgün Karataş, "TÜSİAD: Lozan'a bakın Kıbrıs işini çözün," *Hürriyet*, 31 January 2003, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[298] *Hürriyet*, "TÜSİAD: Kıbrıs'ta çözüm elzem," 12 December 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[299] "Eurobarometer 2007 Türkiye Raporu," February 2008, (May 2008). <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb68/eb68_en.htm>.

contributions to a "comprehensive" solution. Moreover, as Retired Ambassador Yalım Eralp has stated, although these policies are supported by Turkey, they are mainly TRNC-driven.[300] Turkey has only given support and financial aid to these initiatives. Thus, it is possible to conclude that change in Cyprus policy mainly remains at the level of rhetoric. However, it should not be forgotten that this is also a major accomplishment as rhetorical change may precede and generate policy changes. Hence, it is necessary to analyze the transformative power of the EU in foreign policy matters, specifically; the extent to which Turkish accession contributes to the transformation of the Cyprus dispute and the degree to which of EU credibility plays a role in this transformation.

4.2. Transformative Power of the EU in the Cyprus Conflict

Conflict is defined as *mutual representations of the parties involved as an essential threat to their identity and even existence*.[301] According to Diez, there are four stages of conflict. At the first stage, called as *conflict episode*, conflict is at its weakest. At this stage, although the articulation of an incompatibility occurs as a singular, isolated incidence, there is no reference to an existential threat. If the conflict communication stays limited to a particular issue, an *issue conflict* displays. At this issue conflict stage, the actors do not invoke identities as such as part of the conflict; and issue conflicts do not contain securitizing moves. However, where securitizing moves abound and conflicting parties articulate explicitly essential threats to "self," conflicts turn into *identity conflict*. When the conflicting parties widely accept the existential threat posed by the other and need to counter this threat with extraordinary measures, the conflict enters its final stage of *subordination conflict*. In the subordination conflicts, conflict communication dominates all aspect of societal life.[302]

Although this thesis does not aim at definitively classifying the stage of the Cyprus conflict sharply, the thesis argues that the conflict is at the final stage of

[300] Sevinç Bodur, "Interview with Retired Ambassador Yalım Eralp," 22 May 2008.

[301] Diez, 2002a, 142.

[302] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 568.

subordination conflict. The conflicting parties, both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots, widely accept the existential threat posed by the other and need to counter this threat with extraordinary measures. Defense expenditures have dominated the yearly budgets. Not only securitizing moves, such as high defense expenditures or laying mines, but also extraordinary measures, such as trade restrictions or hostile approach of history books, have dominated all aspects of the societal life. However, the JDP government has aimed at "Europeanizing" its Cyprus policies, and supports the presidency of Mehmet Ali Talat in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.[303] As a result, the Cyprus dispute has been transformed from a *subordination conflict* into an *identity conflict*. Although both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots have continued to accept the other as an existential threat, securitizing moves have started to lessen. The TRNC has started to sweep mines in northern Cyprus. Border gates have started to be opened. All trade restrictions have been lifted by the TRNC. History books in the TRNC were rewritten in order to comply with EU standards.[304] However, these initiatives were mainly Turkey and the TRNC-driven. The President of the Greek Cypriots, Tassos Papadopoulos, threatened the Greek Cypriots with retribution if they went to northern Cyprus, and also vetoed the publication of new books rewritten by Greece.[305] On the other hand, since the Communist AKEL Party's Leader Demetris Christofias came to power on 24 February 2008, he has become one of the main supporters of solution on the island.[306] After he came to power, Ledra Street crossing (Lokmacı gate), which had remained closed for 45 years, was opened to pedestrian crossings on 3 April 2008.[307]

The role of the EU in this transformation from *subordination conflict,* which is a stage of greatest conflict intensity, to *identity conflict,* which is stage of lower intensity,

---

[303] Çilingir 51-52.

[304] *Hürriyet*, "Türkiye'nin daha önceki Kıbrıs açılımları," 24 January 2006, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[305] *Şok*, "Tarih kitabı krizi," 11 February 2007, via Şok, http://www.gazetesok.com

[306] "Kuzeyde 'Hristofiyas' tercihi," (28 February 2008). <http://www.yeniduzengazetesi.com/index.php/cat/1/news/12147/PageName/Haberler> . & See also, "Güney Kıbrıs Hristofyas'ı seçti," (28 February 2008). <http://www.ensonhaber.com/Dunya/112065/Guney-Kibris-Hristofyasi-secti.html>.

[307] *Hürriyet*, "Lokmacı Kapısı geçişlere açıldı," 3 April 2008, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

is essential. There are four pathways that have been taken by the EU to transform conflicts: compulsory impact, enabling impact, connective impact, and constructive impact. *Compulsory impact* works through carrots and sticks. It works by compelling actors to change their policies vis-à-vis the other party by moving towards conciliatory actions rather than deepening securitization. The main carrot of the EU is membership. As part of the *acquis communautaire*, the EU insists on the resolution of border disputes and developing good neighborly relations. If the conflicting party desires to become an EU member, it needs to change its policies towards the other party. This change may simply reflect strategic behavior. It does not necessarily imply that it has altered its views of the other party or its beliefs about the conflict. Thus, this policy change can be interpreted as a tactical tool to acquire EU membership.[308]

For the Turkish case, the thesis argues that the JDP government has chosen to adopt a more "Europeanized" Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus when the EU has shown a carrot, such as giving a negotiation date or starting accession negotiations or when the EU has shown a stick, such as suspending negotiations on 8 chapters. However, the Cyprus case has demonstrated that the credibility of the EU has played a key role on the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. The credibility of threats and promises of the EU is a key issue for the EU in its effort to enhance its compulsory impact. If the EU offers rewards without fulfilling the conditions, it creates a moral hazard problem within the target state, which slows down the "Europeanization" process there. [309] Since the rejection of the Annan Plan, the EU has not kept its promise that it would lift the sanctions imposed on the Turkish Cypriots if the Turkish Cypriots accepted the Annan Plan and the Greek Cypriots rejected it. On the other hand, the EU made the Greek Cypriots a full member without political settlement on the island having been achieved. Thus, this has created a moral hazard problem within Turkey. Furthermore, after the EU failed to keep its promises, criticism of the EU has increased dramatically. In addition, particularly after the decision to suspend negotiations on 8 chapters, expectations of becoming an EU member have decline. The JDP policy makers have started to accuse the EU of applying a double standard to Turkey. Thus, the domestic adaptation cost of developing "Europeanized"

[308] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 572.

[309] Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 10-17.

Cyprus policies has increased. As a result, the membership incentive for the JDP government has started to decrease. The European Union started to lose its transformative power after the JDP government felt that Turkey was being excluded from the EU club and perceived that the membership incentive was an arbitrary decision.[310] In this regard, the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has slowed down. As a result, all of these overshadow the transformative power of the EU in Cyprus.

The second pathway taken by the EU to contribute to the transformation of border conflicts is enabling impact. If specific actors within conflicting parties, such as civil society actors, link their political agendas to the EU and justify desecuritizing moves that may otherwise not have been considered legitimate, this leads to *enabling impact*. Enabling impact is necessary to legitimize the desecuritizing moves through reference to the *acquis communautaire*. Legitimacy references should not be limited to narrow political elite. It should reach out to a wider societal base.[311] Both in Turkey and in the TRNC, civil society organizations have played a key role in convincing governments to take the necessary steps to reach a comprehensive solution on the island. These civil society organizations have been the main supporters of EU membership. They have accepted the link between Turkey-EU relations and the solution in the Cyprus dispute and have called on governments to work for solution of Cyprus dispute in order to be rewarded with EU membership.[312] In this regard, TÜSİAD has played a key role in legitimizing the "Europeanized" Cyprus policies of the JDP government and has helped to increase the transformative power of the EU.

On the other hand, in order to reach a wider societal base, the *connective impact* of the EU plays a crucial role. The EU's direct support of contacts between societal actors of the conflicting parties serves as an essential tool for successful

---

[310] George Christou, "The European Union and Cyprus: the Power of Attraction as a Solution to the Cyprus Issue," *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 2 (2002): 1-26.

[311] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 573&578.

[312] *Hürriyet*, "TÜSİAD: Kıbrıs'ta çözüm elzem," 12 December 2002, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

transformation.[313] Through the financial support of common activities, the contact between conflicting parties can be provided. This connective impact does not only contribute to desecuritization but also leads to a broader societal effect in the form of social networks across conflicting parties and facilitates identity change.[314] In contrast for the Cyprus case, although the EU has supported direct contacts between the Turkish and the Greek Cypriots, the EU has failed to lift sanctions imposed on the Turkish Cypriots or to give financial aid to the Turkish Cypriots. As a result, the EU has failed to establish direct connection between two sides in Cyprus.[315]

Moreover, the *constructive impact* aims at changing the underlying identity-scripts of conflicting parties. Thus, it supports a (re-)construction of identities that permanently sustains peaceful relations between the conflicting parties. The EU impact can put in place completely new discursive frameworks for creating novel ways of constructing and expressing identities within conflict regions. These new identity-scripts foster desecuritization in a virtuous circle and may ultimately lead to the eventual resolution of the conflict and the disappearance of articulations of the incompatibility of subject positions because "Europe" has become an integral part of the identity/-ies in each of the EU's member states. Integration enables actors to pursue policies that intensify conciliatory discourse. Rather than choosing securitizing moves, the parties adopt the discourse of a "European solution." Without the constructive impact, desecuritization is often a tactical tool for achieving EU membership.[316] As the previous chapter indicated, like the EU, the discourse of "just and permanent solution under the UN umbrella" has been developed. However, a more "Europeanized" discourse has been developed in order to be rewarded by EU membership or not to be punished by being kept outside the EU. As a result of utility-driven calculations rather than norm-driven identity-based concerns, a "Europeanized" discourse has been adopted. Thus, the EU has failed to achieve a constructive impact in Cyprus. Desecuritization measures have been mainly taken as a tactical tool for achieving the EU membership.

---

[313] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 581.

[314] Ibid, 573-576.

[315] *Hürriyet*, "Verheugen: KKTC ile işbirliği yapacağız," 26 April 2004, via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

[316] Albert, Diez, Stetter, 573-576.

In brief, it is possible to argue that the EU has been successful in developing *compulsory and enabling impacts* in Cyprus. However, the EU has failed to achieve *connective and constructive impacts* on the island. As a result, although the EU has played a key role in the transformation of Cyprus conflict from *subordination conflict* to *identity conflict*, the EU's transformative power in Cyprus dispute has become limited. The credibility of the EU has played a key role. The EU has failed to keep its promises of lifting sanctions imposed on the Turkish Cypriots, and it has offered EU membership to the Greek Administration without a political settlement having been reached on the island. In this regard, it is possible to conclude that after the failure of the EU to fulfill its obligations, the EU's credibility has been questioned and the "Europeanization" process towards Cyprus has slowed down. Hence, the credibility of the EU rewards and threats are essential to affecting transformative power on foreign policy matters.

In this regard, it is possible to argue that the process of accession can be a positive instrument for resolving and preventing conflict, as applied to the case of Cyprus and Turkey. Although the lack of credibility has negative effects on helping to reach a solution on the island, eventual membership for Turkey still provides the necessary incentives for a solution to the Cyprus issue. Since the beginning, the EU has assumed that the negotiations would have a catalytic effect on the Cyprus conflict and help to bring about a solution.[317] The EU has hoped to put pressure on Turkey by linking the Turkish accession process with progress on the resolution of Cyprus issue, even though Turkey was against the establishment of such an explicit link between her own accession and the resolution of the Cyprus dispute.[318] However, after the JDP government came to power, the JDP has made Turkey's membership a policy priority and accepted tying Turkey's accession to the EU with the solution of the Cyprus problem. This membership prospect has provided the necessary incentive for the solution to the Cyprus dispute.[319] On the other hand, after the Greek Administration became an EU member, the Union is not an outside actor. It has become part of the conflict. As a result, the EU has been accused of putting Greek interests over Turkish

[317] Diez, 2002a, 139.

[318] Christou, 7.

[319] Ibid, 2.

ones.[320] Particularly, after the EU failed to support intercommunal grassroots activities and carrots, such as lifting economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots, offered by the EU were not turned into reality, the EU started to lose its credibility in the eyes of public.[321] Then, since the EU failed to set a precise date for accession, membership prospect has declined. [322] In particular, after the discussions over privileged partnership, which is not Turkey wants, intensified, the EU has become a less attractive prize to seek or attain, and has diminished the EU's informal power to influence domestic changes in Turkey.[323] In this regard, the transformative power of the EU on the Cyprus dispute has decreased dramatically. In brief, it is possible to argue that although the catalyst effect of the EU membership negotiations is not high as expected, the membership prospect has created a positive incentive for negotiating a solution to the Cyrus dispute.

[320] Diez, 2002a, 147.

[321] Ibid, 157.

[322] Nathalie Tocci, "The Cyprus impasse: a new opening," *Strategy Page*, 11 December 2001, (17 July 2008).
<http://www.strategypage.org/pages/articles/2001_12_11_tocci.htm.>

[323] Thomas Diez, "Conclusion: Cyprus and the European Union- an opening," in *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union,* eds. Thomas Diez (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002c), 203-212.

CONCLUSION

Turkey-EU relations have gained new momentum after Turkey was accepted as a candidate country at the Helsinki Summit of 1999. Candidacy status has accelerated the political reform process in Turkey. In particular, Turkey has been undergoing continual and unprecedented political reform process since 2001. Thus, it is essential to discuss the extent to which Turkey has managed to bring about the changes in itself that EU membership demands. In this regard, the thesis has explored the EU's impact on transformation of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. This is particularly important as Cyprus and the Turkish involvement in the Cyprus problem has been a crucial factor determining Turkey's relations with the EU as well as its accession negotiations. Particularly since the Justice and Development Party came to power on 3 November 2002, it has made EU membership a policy priority, and Turkey's accession to the EU is ultimately tied to the solution of the Cyprus problem. Thus, the thesis aimed at assessing whether a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has occurred since 2002 and, if so, whether this change was related to the Turkish accession process.

The thesis concludes that after the JDP government came to power, traditional discourse of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus started to change. The main difference between traditional discourse and the discourse developed by the JDP government concerns the tradeoff between the EU membership and the security interests of Turkey in Cyprus. Although other foreign policy actors, e.g., the main opposition party - Republican People's Party, the President of Turkish Republic, the Turkish Military Forces, to the former President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cypriots, recognize the Cyprus issue as a vital national security interest that cannot be sacrificed for EU membership, the JDP government has developed its Cyprus policy in order to overcome the challenges against EU membership. In this respect, the JDP government has developed its discourse over Cyprus compatible with EU rhetoric. By using the "external incentives model" of Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, the thesis concludes that the external incentive for a change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus is the motivation for EU membership and change in rhetoric is directly related to

the Turkish accession process. According to "external incentives model," the EU sets the adoption of its rules that the non-member states have to fulfill in order to receive rewards from the EU. The thesis demonstrated that, for the Turkish case, the JDP government has developed a more "Europeanized" discourse than a traditional one with respect to Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus because the EU has offered Turkey under the JDP government the "membership carrot" as a reward. The aim of the EU was to change traditional Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. On the other hand, the JDP government aimed at Turkey's EU membership. Thus, membership carrot was a substantial reward for the JDP government and as a consequence, the JDP has started to work by changing its discourse. The JDP government has chosen to adopt a more "Europeanized" discourse towards Cyprus when the EU has showed a carrot – this includes, for example, the giving of a negotiation date or the starting of accession negotiations. The e EU has also waved its "stick," as in the case of suspension of negotiations on 8 chapters. In either case – carrot or stick - the JDP government has developed more "Europeanized" discourse in order to be rewarded by EU membership or not to be punished by being kept outside the EU.

On the other hand, the thesis concludes that "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus has remained solely rhetorical. By using Smith's analysis, the thesis concludes that "Europeanized" discourse has turned into "Europeanized" policy outcomes in very limited areas. According to Michael Smith, there are four major indicators of policy change: elite socialization, bureaucratic reorganization, constitutional change, and increase in public support for Europeanization of foreign policy. The thesis demonstrated that, for the Turkish case, the JDP government has mainly supported the TRNC-driven "Europeanized" policies and given financial aid to these TRNC-driven policies. On the other hand, elite socialization is weak in Turkey. The JDP government has failed to contribute to the development of a certain level of trust between Turkey, the Greek Cypriots, and the EU, internalize its cooperative habits and common views, or abandon national loyalties. In addition, particularly, after the EU decided to suspend negotiations on 8 chapters, public support of EU membership began to decline. As a result, the domestic adaptation cost of adopting new Cyprus policies has increased and has made it difficult to develop "Europeanized" Cyprus policies. Although some bureaucratic and constitutional changes have been made, they are too limited. Most of them have been "confidence-

building" measures rather than true contributions to reaching a "comprehensive" solution. However, the thesis underlines that although change in Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus is mainly rhetorical, it will contribute to the formation of policy changes towards Cyprus. The Turkish accession process contributes to transforming the Cyprus dispute. In line with the Diez's findings, the thesis concludes that the EU, through the carrot of membership, has played a key role in the transformation of the Cyprus conflict, which has undergone a range of stages: from *subordination conflict,* which is a stage of greatest conflict intensity to *identity conflict*, which is the stage of lower intensity. Thus, the prospect of membership has provided the necessary incentive for the solution to the Cyprus dispute.

However, the thesis demonstrated that credibility of EU rewards and threats has become influential in the "Europeanization" of Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus under the JDP government. After the EU failed to keep its promise of lifting the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots once the Turkish Cypriots accepted the Annan Plan, even though the Greek Cypriots rejected it, credibility of the EU started to be questioned and the support given to EU membership started to decline. The JDP government has been accused of making concessions over the national security interests of Turkey in Cyprus for EU membership. As a result, domestic adaptation cost of the new Cyprus policy has increased dramatically. Thus, this has led to the reversal of a "Europeanized" discourse towards Turkey and has slowed down the "Europeanization" process in Turkey. In brief, the JDP government has been motivated to create a change in regarding the Cyprus dispute. The desire for EU membership has become the main driving force behind this change. Although the change remains solely rhetorical, the Cyprus case provides empirical evidence to the material interest argument.

However, this study opens the door for further studies with regard to the norm diffusion impact of European integration process on Turkish foreign policy towards Cyprus. Indeed, this study presents a comprehensive picture of materialistic calculations with certain implications on norm diffusion. Even though materialistic concerns dominate the mind and heart of the AKP government in relation to the Cyprus conflict, there is considerable room to discuss whether those materialistic concerns have become transformed in the direction of norm driven acts. Although this thesis touches upon whether there is elite socialization in Turkey towards Cyprus, whether European 'culture of conciliation' has been adopted by the JDP government, and whether there is

change in identity-scripts of conflicting parties, it is necessary to conduct a deeper analysis over whether the JDP government has developed a "Europeanized" discourse and "Europeanized" Cyprus policies only in order to be rewarded by EU membership or if the JDP government has accepted the EU as a valid "aspiration group" whose collective identity, values, and norms they share, whose recognition they seek, and to which they want to belong.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmad, Ishtiaq. "Resolving the Cyprus Conflict through EU Enlargement Process." In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 51-59. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Albert, Mathias & Diez, Thomas & Stetter, Stephan. "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration." *International Organization* 60 (2006): 563-593.

Alkan, Hüseyin. "TSK size hayran." *Hürriyet*. 28 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Anderson, Jeffrey. "Europeanization and the Transformation of the Democratic Polity, 1945-2000." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2002): 793-822.

Atun, Ali Fikret. "Kıbrıs Meselesinin Görünmeyen Yüzü: Batılı Devletler." In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 31-47. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Batu, İnal. *Dış Politika Kıskacında Türkiye.* İstanbul: Pegasus Yayınları, 2006.

Batur, Nur. "Törene katılmamak Türkiye'nin tercihi." *Hürriyet*. 17 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Batur, Nur. "Erdoğan: Siyasi riski alıyorum." *Hürriyet*. 17 December 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

BBC. "Emotion as Cyprus border opens." 23 April 2003. Via BBC, http://www.bbc.co.uk

BBC. "Turkey compensates Cyprus refugee." 2 December 2003. Via BBC, http://www.bbc.co.uk

Birand, Mehmet Ali. "Önümüzde sadece 984 saat var." *Hürriyet*. 17 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Bodur, Sevinç. "Interview with Retired Ambassador Yalım Eralp." 22 May 2008.

Bozkurt, İsmail. "Kıbrıs'ın Tarihine Kısa Bir Bakış." In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 9-15. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Brewin, Christopher. *The European Union and Cyprus*. Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 1998.

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

Brewin, Christopher. "Turkish and European Union Interests in a Cyprus Settlement." *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Mınority Issues in Europe* 2 (2002): 1-20.

Caporaso, James & Cowles, Maria Green & Risse, Thomas. "Europeanization and Domestic Change." In *Europeanization and Domestic Change: Transforming Europe*, edited by James Caporaso, Maria Green Cowles, and Thomas Risse, 1-20. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001.

"Case of Loizidou v. Turkey." *European Court of Human Rights HUDOC Database*. 28 July 1998. <http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/EN/Header/Case-Law/HUDOC/HUDOC+database/>. (17 July 2008).

Cem, İsmail. *Turkey in the New Century Speeches and Texts Presented at International Fora (1995-2001).* Mersin: Rüstem Bookshop, 2001.

Cem, İsmail. *Türkiye-Avrupa-Asya: Strateji-Yunanistan-Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004.

Chadjipalis, Thales & Andreadis, Ian. "Analysis of the Cyprus referendum on the Annan Plan." *Political Studies Association*, 2007.

Christou, George. "The European Union and Cyprus: the Power of Attraction as a Solution to the Cyprus Issue." *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 2 (2002): 1-26.

"Council Regulation No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession." 9 June 2004. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004R0866R(01):EN:HTML>. (February 2008).

"Cyprus Profile History, Government and International Relations." *International Debates* 3 (2005): 66-96.

Çilingir, Atilla. *KKTC'nin 2002-2005 "ver kurtul" belgeseli… Elveda Kıbrıs Ama bir gün mutlaka!.* İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları, 2006.

Denktaş, Rauf. *Yeniden 12'ye 5 kala*. İstanbul: Remzi Press, 2005.

Denktaş, Rauf. *Son Çağrı*. İstanbul: Remzi Press, 2007.

Diez, Thomas. "Last exit to paradise? The European Union, the Cyprus conflict and the problematic catalytic effect." In *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union*, edited by Thomas Diez, 139-162. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002a.

Diez, Thomas. "Introduction Cyprus and the European Union as a political and theoretical problem." In *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union*, edited by Thomas Diez, 1-13. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002a.

Diez, Thomas. "Conclusion: Cyprus and the European Union- an opening." In *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict, postmodern union,* edited by Thomas Diez, 203-212. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002c.

Dodd, Clement Henry. *The Cyprus Imbroglio*. Huntingdon: Eothen Press, 1998.

"Dönem Başkanlığı Kıbrıs İçin Yeni Bir Plan Hazırladı." <http://www.ikv.org.tr/haberler2.php?ID=1558>. (12 February 2008).

Efegil, Ertan & Görgüner, Özgen. "A Survey on the Public Opinion's Concerns about the proposals of TRNC, South Cyprus, the UN, and the EU." In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 126-150. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Ergan, Uğur. "Gürel'den Annan'a bombardıman." *Hürriyet*. 15 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Ergan, Uğur. "Sezer: AB içten değil." *Hürriyet.* 23 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Ergan, Uğur & Lüle, Zeynel. "İşte Son Türkiye Kararı." *Hürriyet*. 15 December 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Ersoy, Hamit. "Kıbrıs Sorunu'nun Türk Dış Politikasına Etkisi." In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 118-125. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Ertekün, Necati. *In search of a negotiated Cyprus settlement*. Lefkoşa: Ulus Press, 1981.

"Eurobarometer 2007 Türkiye Raporu." February 2008. <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb68/eb68_en.htm>. (May 2008).

European Council. "Presidency Conclusions." 1997.

European Council. "Presidency Conclusions." 12 and 13 December 2002.

Featherstone, Kevin. "Introduction: In the Name of Europe." In *The Politics of Europeanization*, edited by Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli, 3-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

"Finlandiya Dönem Başkanlığı Kıbrıs İçin Yeni Bir Plan Hazırladı." <http://www.ikv.org.tr/haberler2.php?ID=1558>. (12 February 2008).

Friis, Lykke. "Looming shadows The European Union's eastern enlargement and Cyprus." In *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict Modern conflict,*

postmodern union, edited by Thomas Diez, 17-33. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

"Görüşmeci Talat." 22 March 2004. <http://www.kibris.net/basin/yazarlarimiz/serbest/mgunduz/arsiv/2004/mart/22_mart_2004.htm.> (January 2008).

Güney, Aylin. "Turkey's EU Candidacy and Civil-Military Relations: Challenges and Prospects." *Armed Forces & Society* 31 (2005): 439-462.

"Güney Kıbrıs Hristofyas'ı seçti." <http://www.ensonhaber.com/Dunya/112065/Guney-Kibris-Hristofyasi-secti.html>. (28 February 2008).

Güven, Erdal. "Değişimi Kıbrıs'la başlatın." *Radikal*. 24 November 2002. Via Radikal, http://www.radikal.com.tr

Güven, Erdal. *Helsinki'den Kopenhag'a Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: Om Yayınevi, 2003.

Hürriyet. "Ecevit: Kıbrıs planı acemice." 13 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "KKTC 19'uncu yaşını kutluyor." 15 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Türkiye'ye çifte standart uygulanmayacak." 19 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs, AGSP ve AB tek paket olmalı." 20 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Dokunulmazlık başka bahara." 24 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Yakış: Kıbrıs ve AGSP, tarihe bağlı." 25 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ın şartı tarih." 26 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Kasımpaşalı'ysan bunları yap." 27 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Simitis: Müzakereler için son fırsat." 28 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "MGK'dan Denktaş'a destek." 29 November 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "TÜSİAD: Kıbrıs'ta çözüm elzem." 12 December 2002. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Sezer: Barış hala mümkün." 3 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Kıbrıs'ı ilhak ve entegrasyon bitti." 9 January 2003. Via Hürriyet. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan'dan Denktaş'a yanıt: Dava şahıslara indirgenemez." 28 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Baykal: AB hata yaptı." 18 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Verheugen: Kıbrıs tavsiye raporunu etkiler." 19 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: ABD'nin yardım isteğine ilke olarak evet." 20 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Baykal, Kıbrıs'ta 'tek devlet' istedi." 30 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Verheugen: Denktaş seçim hilesi yaptı." 4 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Statüko'dan yana değiliz." 11 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kıbrıslı kazanılmış haklarla AB'ye girmek istiyor." 16 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Sezer, Kıbrıs'a ilişkin toplantı düzenleyecek." 19 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Eroğlu Annan Planı'nı tartışabiliriz." 23 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "AB için Kıbrıs'ta olumlu gelişme gerekli." 28 December 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ta masadan kaçmak yok." 16 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Kıbrıs karşılığında AB havucunu gösterecek." 16 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Türkiye doğru yolda." 17 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "AKP: Org. Tolon kime hain diyorsa açıklasın." 19 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "KKTC'nin kader MGK'sı." 23 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "ABD: Kongragel terör örgütü." 28 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Kıbrıs'ın çözülmesini istemeyen ülkeler var." 29 January 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Baykal: Hükümet halka şantaj yapıyor." 8 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Yapıcı olmayanlar konuşmasın." 11 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "1 Mayıs'tan sonrasını düşünmek zorundayız." 12 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Baykal: Bugünkü Annan Planı'ndan kaygı duyuyoruz." 17 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Cumhurbaşkanı Sezer'in Kıbrıs dileği." 17 February 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan'dan bakanlara ikna raporu." 5 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Kıbrıs'ta sorumluluk hükümette." 6 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "TBMM'nin Kıbrıs gündemi tarihe geçti." 7 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: Referandum ertelenirse biz yokuz." 14 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Sezer Kıbrıs konusunda ilk kez konuştu." 14 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "MGK'da yok Davos'ta var." 15 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kıbrıs'ta iyi niyetimizi koruyoruz." 21 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Babacan: Türkiye'de kriz geride kaldı." 22 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Baykal: Annan Planı ciddi sorunlar taşıyor." 22 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Annan: Tarihi fırsat kaçtı." 23 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Verheugen: Rumlar hayal kırıklığı yarattı." 23 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Güney Kıbrıs kaybetti." 24 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Rumlar barışı torpilledi." 25 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Son 50 yılın zaferi." 26 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Verheugen: KKTC ile işbirliği yapacağız." 26 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: KKTC'ye siyasi ambargo da kalkacak." 28 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: Türkiye müzakerelere başlamaya hazırdır." 22 May 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Org. Başbuğ: Laiklik demokrasinin itici gücü." 28 May 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Başbakan Erdoğan AB'yi uyardı." 8 December 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Arkamızı döner gideriz." 2 September 2005. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "AB'de müzakere çerçeve belgesi ele alınıyor." 29 September 2005. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Barroso: Türkiye soykırım iddiası ile yüzleşmeli." 24 October 2005. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: TCK 301'de korkulan olmadı." 3 January 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Bakan Gül: Rumların AB üyeliğini engellemeliydik." 8 January 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Türkiye'nin daha önceki Kıbrıs açılımları." 24 January 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: Yunanistan'dan AB konusunda açık destek bekliyoruz." 24 June 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Babacan: AB'de her saat bir gelişme olabilir." 6 December 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Dışişleri: AB'nin kararı haksız." 13 December 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: Kürtlerin hak sorunu yok." 18 December 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Gül: Karar kendilerinin." 29 December 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Erdoğan: 301. Madde gündemden düşecek." 29 February 2008. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Hürriyet. "Lokmacı Kapısı geçişlere açıldı." 3 April 2008. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

İnanç, Gül. *Büyükelçiler Anlatıyor Türk Diplomasisinde Kıbrıs (1970-1991*). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası; Kültür Yayınları, 2007.

Kalaycı, Hüseyin. "Finlandiya'nın Kıbrıs Planı ve Tren Kazası." 2 Kasım 2006. <http://www.asam.org.tr/tr/yazigoster.asp?ID=1206&kat1=3&kat2=>. (12 February 2008).

Karataş, Nilgün. "TÜSİAD: Lozan'a bakın Kıbrıs işini çözün." *Hürriyet*. 31 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Kasım, Kamer. "Ek Protokol İmzalandı, Ya Sonrası?." *The Journal of Turkish Weekly-Yorum* 4 August 2005. <http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/yorum.php?id=145>. (12 February 2008).

Kirişçi, Kemal. "The limits of conditionality and Europeanization: Turkey's dilemmas in adopting the EU acquis on asylum." *EUSA Tenth Biennial International Conference*. 17-19 May 2007.

Koç, Süleyman. *Dünden Bugüne Kıbrıs Sorunu ve Stratejik Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür-Sanat Yayıncılık, 2005.

Kuloğlu, Armağan. “Ulusal Menfaatler Işığında Kıbrıs’taki Gelişmelere Bakış.” *Global Strateji Enstitüsü*. Analizler 2008.

“Kuzeyde 'Hristofiyas' tercihi.” <http://www.yeniduzengazetesi.com/index.php/cat/1/news/12147/PageName/Haberler>. (28 February 2008).

“Loizidou Davası.” 2003. <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/yayinlarimiz/ANADOLUNUNSESI/210/AND9.htm>. (22 May 2008).

Lüle, Zeynel. “Müzakerelerden önce Kıbrıs’ta çözüm yok.” *Hürriyet*. 17 April 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Lüle, Zeynel. “Verheugen: AB, Rumlar’a baskıya hazır.” 2 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Lüle, Zeynel. “Verheugen: Rumlar beni aldattı.” *Hürriyet*. 22 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

“Main Articles.” *Annan Plan*. 6 April 2004. <http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Main_Articles/MainArticles.pdf>. (2 December 2007).

Mehmet, Özay. “Justice in the Global Village: Implications Emerging from the Cyprus Problem.” In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 188-198. Ankara: Ahsen Press, 2002.

Müftüler-Baç, Meltem. “The Cyprus debacle: what the future holds.” *Futures* 31 (1999): 559-575.

Müftüler-Baç, Meltem & Güney, Aylin. “The European Union and the Cyprus Problem 1961-2003.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 41 (2005): 281-293.

“Negotiation Framework.” 3 October 2005. < http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/st20002_05_TR_framedoc_en.pdf>. (October 2005).

Olsen, Johan. “The Many Faces of Europeanization.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2002): 921-952.

Özalp, Güven. “8 başlıkta kısmi askı.” *Milliyet*. 12 December 2006. Via Milliyet, http://www.milliyet.com.tr

Sabah. “AB’ye Asker Protestosu.” 7 Haziran 2007. Via Güncel Haber, http://www.guncelhaber.com.

Sağlam, Erdal. “IMF’yle ilişki kesmeyiz kur stabil olsun isteriz.” *Hürriyet*. 28 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Sağlam, Erdal. “Rumların üyelik töreni için Dublin’e giderim.” *Hürriyet*. 29 April 2004. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Sedelmeier, Ulrich. “Introduction: Conceptualizing the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe.” In *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedemeier, 1-28. USA: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Sevinç, Şaban. “KKTC’yi tanıyın.” *Hürriyet*. 11 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Smith, Michael. “Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 7 (2000): 613-631.

Şok. “Tarih kitabı krizi.” 11 February 2007. Via Şok, http://www.gazetesok.com

Tınç, Ferai. “Yetmiş parlamenterin imzası.” *Hürriyet*. 30 January 2006. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Tocci, Nathalie. “The Cyprus impasse: a new opening.” *Strategy Page*. 11 December 2001. <http://www.strategypage.org/pages/articles/2001_12_11_tocci.htm.> (17 July 2008).

Ülger, İrfan Kaya and Efegil, Ertan. “Giriş: 1974’ten 2001’e Kıbrıs Sorunu.” In *Avrupa Birliği Kıskacında Kıbrıs Meselesi (Bugünü ve Yarını)*, edited by İrfan Kaya Ülger and Ertan Efegil, 1-6. Ankara: Ahsen Press.

Wong, Reuben. “The Europeanization of Foreign Policy.” In *International Relations and the European Union*, edited by Christopher Hill and Michael Smith, 134-153. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Yetkin, Murat. “Değişen Ankara.” *Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği*. 21 November 2002. <http://www.abturkiye.org.tr/index.php?p=23369&l=1>. (February 2008).

Yılmaz, Turan. “Denktaş’a yakışmadı.” *Hürriyet*. 29 January 2003. Via Hürriyet, http://www.hurriyet.com.tr