

**TURKEY'S RESPONSES IN THE FACE OF THE FORMATION OF
EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

ENGİN YÜKSEL

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

MAY 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science/Arts/Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş (METU, IR) _____

Doç. Dr. Ayşegül Kibaroğlu (METU, IR) _____

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlen Çelebi (HACETTEPE, IR) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Engin Yüksel

Signature :

ABSTRACT

TURKEY'S RESPONSES IN THE FACE OF THE FORMATION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Yüksel, Engin

M.Sc., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

MAY 2007, 150 pages

The study examines Turkey's responses in the face of the formation of European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). The political responses over ESDP have two dimensions. From the viewpoint of Turkey, at the beginning she intended to participate in the process of decision making structure of the ESDP. Therefore, it can be concluded that Turkey is not against the formation of the ESDP. However, as a non-EU European NATO member, Turkey's integration into European security and defense was welcomed but she was excluded from the strategic decision making structure of ESDP. As a result of this, formation of ESDP undermined the position of Turkey who has rights inherited over European security from Western European Union Associate and NATO Memberships. As Turkey was excluded from the decision making structure of ESDP, she put reservations to the EU-NATO cooperation as a NATO member. Secondly, from the viewpoint of European Union, she is trying to keep the decision making authority of ESDP in EU itself by excluding non-EU European states. Besides, Turkey's full integration into European Security and Defense Policy was made contingent to the Turkey's European Union membership. Turkey's EU membership process should not be linked with her full participation, including decision making structure of the ESDP. European defense developments were considered to be as a challenge to NATO and US superiority in Europe. Developments in European defense and Turkey's participation in this process were also examined in this study.

Keywords: European Security and Defense Policy, decision making structure, EU membership, European defense.

ÖZ

AVRUPA GÜVENLİK VE SAVUNMA POLİTİKASININ OLUŞUMU KARŞISINDA TÜRKİYE’NİN TUTUMU

Yüksel, Engin

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

MAYIS 2007, 150 sayfa

Bu tez, Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikasının (AGSP) oluşumu karşısında Türkiye'nin tutumunu incelemektedir. AGSP karşısında siyasi tutumlar iki boyutta incelenebilir. Türkiye'nin bakış açısına göre, başlangıçtan beri Türkiye AGSP karar alma süreci içerisinde yer almak istemektedir. Bundan dolayı, Türkiye'nin AGSP sürecinin karşısında olmadığına karar verilebilir. Buna rağmen, Avrupa Birliği (AB) tarafından Türkiye'nin AGSP'ye entegrasyonu iyi karşılanmakla beraber, AB üyesi olmayan Avrupalı bir NATO üyesi olarak Türkiye, karar alma süreci içerisine dahil edilmemiştir. Bunun sonucu olarak, AGSP'nin oluşumu Türkiye'nin Batı Avrupa Birliği ve NATO üyeliği dolayısıyla Avrupa güvenliği içerisindeki pozisyonunu zayıflatmıştır. AGSP karar alma sürecinde dahil edilmeyen Türkiye bir NATO üyesi ülke olarak AB-NATO işbirliği konusunda çekincelerini belirtmiştir. İkinci olarak AB bakış açısına göre, Avrupa Birliği AB üyesi olmayan ülkeleri süreç dışında bırakarak AGSP karar alma yapısında tam hakimiyeti sağlamak istemektedir. Bunun yanında, Türkiye'nin AGSP'ye tam entegrasyonu Türkiye'nin AB üyesi olmasına bağlanmaktadır. Türkiye'nin AB üyelik süreci, karar verme süreci dahil AGSP'ye tam katılımıyla ilişkilendirilmemelidir. Avrupa savunması konusundaki gelişmeler Avrupa'daki NATO ve ABD üstünlüğüne bir meydan okuma olarak düşünülebilir. Avrupa savunmasındaki gelişmeler ve Türkiye'nin bu sürece katılımı bu çalışmada incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası, karar verme yapısı, Avrupa Birliği üyeliği, Avrupa savunması.

To My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to his supervisor Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş for his guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research.

Berna Süer, the best person I happened to know in my Masters' education, deserves all my respect and appreciation for her being always close by me whenever I needed.

Finally, I am grateful to my wife, Halise, who never quitted believing in me..

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE EUROPEAN	
SECURITY.....	12
2.1. Developments about European Security after the end of Second World War..	12
2.2. European Security Initiatives during the Cold War.....	13
2.2.1. 1950s the Failure of the European Defense Community (EDC).....	17
2.2.2. Establishment of Western European Union (WEU) as the European Pillar of NATO.....	19
2.2.3. Foundation of European Political Cooperation (EPC).....	21
2.2.4. 1960s-1970s the Period of Detente and Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)	23
2.2.5. Revival of the European Political Cooperation and Genscher-Colombo Plan.....	24

3. EUROPEAN SECURITY ARCHITECTURE AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR	27
3.1. Establishment of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).....	27
3.1.1. The Theories over European Defence in 1990's.....	29
3.1.2. From European Political Cooperation into Formation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy	34
3.1.3. Maastricht Treaty and Emergence of European Defence.....	36
3.1.4. Relations with NATO and The Concept of Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF).....	39
3.1.5. The Berlin Summit Meeting of NATO (1996)	41
3.1.6. The Treaty of Amsterdamsdam (1997).....	45
3.2. Towards an Autonomous European Defense Architecture: from European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) to European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP).....	47
3.2.1. The Turning Point for European Defense: St.Malo Political Declaration (1998).....	47
3.2.2. The Washington Summit (1999)-NATO's New Strategic Concept.....	55
3.2.3. The Cologne European Council (1999).....	57
3.2.4. The Helsinki European Council and Headline Goals (1999).....	60
3.2.5. Santa Maria de Feira Position of Non-EU Allies (2000).....	64
3.2.6. From Nice to Leaken: Operationalisation of the European Security and Defense Policy.....	68

4. TURKEY'S POSITION ON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE

POLICY	73
4.1. Turkey's Contributions to European Security in the Post Cold War.....	73
4.1.1. Turkey's Position in NATO.....	75
4.1.2. Turkey's Position in the EU/WEU.....	78
4.1.3. Turkey's Position in the EU/ESDP.....	81
4.2. Turkish Policy toward ESDP.....	87
4.2.1. Turkey's Reservations about Formation of ESDP.....	88
4.2.2. Turning Point: Ankara Agreement and Functioning of Berlin Plus.....	91
4.2.3. Strategic Balance with Greece.....	93
4.2.4. Brussels Document and Copenhagen European Council (December 2002).....	94
4.2.5. Turkey's Concerns after Copenhagen.....	98
4.3. Developments in European Defense and Impacts on Turkey.....	99
4.3.1 Capabilities Commitment Conference and European Capabilities Action Plan.....	102
4.3.2. European Defense Agency and Participation of Turkey.....	104
4.3.3 Headline Goal 2010 and Battlegroups Concept.....	109
4.3.4 Military Capability Commitment Conference.....	111

5. TURKEY’S RESPONSES IN THE FACE OF THE FORMATION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY.....	114
5.1. Historical Relations between EU and Turkey	114
5.2. Turkey’s EU Membership and Possible Implications for CFSP	118
5.3. An Interim Station or Full Membership; Turkey’s Integration.....	121
5.4. EU’s Attitude towards Turkey in EU/ESDP Membership.....	124
5.5. Turkey’s Reaction to the Developments in ESDP.....	131
5.6. Turkey’s Responses in the Face of ESDP and EU Membership.....	133
6. CONCLUSION.....	137
7. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	144

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCC	Capabilities Commitment Conference
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Forces
COREPER	Committee of Permanent Representatives.
CSCE	Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe
DCI	Defence Capabilities Initiative
D-SACEUR	Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe
ECAP	European Capability Action Plan
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EDA	European Defense Agency
EDC	European Defence Community
EEC	European Economic Community
ERP	European Recovery Program
EPC	European Political Cooperation
ESDI	European Security and Defence Initiative
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUPM	European Union Police Mission
GAC	General Affairs Council

IGC	Intergovernmental Conference
MC	Military Committee
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NRF	NATO Response Force
OSCE	Organisation on Security and Co-operation in Europe
PoCo	Political Committee
PPF	Partnership For Peace
PPEWE	Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit
QMV	Qualified Majority Voting
RRF	Rapid Reaction Force
SDI	Strategic Defence Initiative
SEA	Single European Act
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
WEAG	Western European Armaments Group
WEU	Western European Union

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Turkey and EU/ECC have had a difficult relationship about security and defense matters since 1945. Hence, Turkey's expectation for the provision of security in Aegean, Mediterranean and Middle East according to Turkey's interests which are inherited from treaties had been the source of the problem for the European powers for years. However, these difficulties were suppressed during the Cold War. Sharing a border with Russia, Turkey was accepted as an ally and a buffer for sustaining security against a Soviet threat in Europe. Cooperation on security and defense (except Cyprus) was maintained between Turkey and its Western European Allies until the end of the Cold War. Following the dismantlement of the Soviet Union, these differences surfaced and became the areas of concern. Turkey was seen as a burden for building security in Europe in some circles. Such an approach irritated Turkey, who has accepted herself as being a part of Western security architecture thorough NATO membership since 1952.

During the Cold War usually NATO was referred to as the main security organization in Western Europe. On the other side, the European Economic Community was viewed as taking care of political and economic integration of Western Europe. It is true that there evolved, during the Cold War, a division of labor between NATO and EEC. What lies behind such a division is the high/low politics issue as being the traditional characteristic of International Relations. NATO was viewed as the organization responsible for high politics (military power) whereas low politics was delegated to European Economic Community. NATO was

taking care of external defense while EEC was focused on economic integration in Europe.¹

International environment changed substantially after the end of the Cold War. In the 1990s, hopes were raised among EU policy makers for the possibility of the formation of an independent foreign and security policy. It is shared among the EU officials that European integration is a process of constructing a security community.² After the Maastricht Treaty (1991), European Union established Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as the second pillar of European Union which would function as an autonomous foreign policy and security mechanism. These developments have taken a different turn after the formation of European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). ESDP is considered as a challenge to the US hegemony in Western Europe as it is formed as an EU-led foreign policy and security mechanism.

Turkey's participation in the institutional and operational dimensions of ESDP of the European Union has been one of the most contentious issues of the Turkish foreign and security policy.³ Being the member of NATO since 1952, Turkey participated in European security for years. Bipolar international structure of the time reinforced Turkey and its Western Allies to cooperate on security and defense matters. Theoretically, the behaviors of the actors during the Cold War could only be

¹Pınar Bilgin 'Clash of cultures? Differences between Turkey and European Union on security,' in Karaosmanoglu, Ali (ed), *Europeanisation of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*, Foreign Policy Institute, (Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 2004),p.25.

² Bilgin, *op cit*, p.37.

³Hüseyin Bağcı and Ali Yıldız, 'Turkey and the European security and defense policy (ESDP): from confrontational to cooperative relationship,' in Karaosmanoglu, Ali (ed), *Europeanisation of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*, Foreign Policy Institute, (Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 2004), p.79.

explained by structural realism. The bipolar international environment of the Cold War would be the determining factor in explaining the behaviors of actors.

Turkey's importance for Europe caused it to grant Associate Membership status in Western European Union (WEU) in 20 November 1992. However, the formation of the ESDP as an EU-led foreign and security policy mechanism led to the termination of the functioning of WEU. Therefore Turkey's rights inherited from the WEU associate membership has come to an end in June 1999 (Cologne). An institutionalization in the security architecture of the Europe which was established by EU members has been observed since 1999. Since then, the relations between Turkey and EU entered a period of redefinition especially in security and defense. According to the view of EU policymakers the Turkey's role in newly emerging European security architecture should be identified with the process of EU membership.

The core question of this study is that whether Turkey could participate in all dimensions of ESDP with its enough defense capacity while her EU membership processes continue. Thus, the main concern here is that the relations between Turkey and EU in European security and defense did not continue as Turkey had expected to be when Turkey's possible inputs for European defense and its NATO and WEU Associate Membership has taken into consideration. In this thesis I will focus on Turkey's responses in the face of European Union's formation of ESDP. Defense capabilities are deemed to be the mainstream of autonomous security architecture. In this study developments in European defense and Turkey's current participation in this area will be analyzed.

When formation of ESDP is considered as a challenge to US hegemony and its hegemonic project after the end of the Cold War; Turkey's position in the middle of

hegemonic competition will be explained in this study. The study intends to provide its challenge by a comparative analysis of the transformation processes in European foreign and security developments since 1945, thorough analyzing the global historical structures and processes.

In this thesis I will use structural realism for the explanation of the developments in European security and defense until the end of the Cold War. Structural Realism prioritizes the international structure's affect to the actors in their behaviors. For structural realists, it is the structure of the international system that forces states to pursue power.⁴ Conceptually, bipolarity refers to a systematic structure where two actors (US and USSR) and their respective allies stand in a position of threat perception towards each other and control a dominant share of military capabilities in the system.

In this bipolar system, European countries permitted US involvement in European security and defense thorough NATO, politically and militarily. Formation of an alliance against a Soviet threat under the US leadership was seen as the best option for Western European states. According to structural realists, the bipolar systematic structure of the Cold War created an era of stability in which European powers could pursue absolute gains. Structural features of international system therefore created the conditions under which states rationally emphasized absolute gains and managed to cooperate extensively with one another. Economically devastated during the WW2, European powers prioritized the economic and social developments and chose to be under security provided by NATO. However, US leadership politically and militarily prevented European states to be powerful actors in foreign and security policy in the bipolar international power rivalry.

⁴John Mearsheimer, Structural Realism, in Dunne, Kurki and Smith, *International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p.72.

The changes happened after the end of the Cold War was more complex than the bipolar international structure. Structural realism as the theory explaining the era of the Cold War was deemed to be insufficient to explain the post-Cold War developments. As the bipolar structure has come to an end and with the new actors like EU and WEU was emerging, the actors (states, international organizations) rather than bipolar structure appeared to be determining factor in shaping international environment.

After the end of the bipolar system, the impacts of international institutions as the new actors of the time on world politics, particularly in contemporary Europe became apparent. There appeared the questions about; would NATO or a powerful European Union as a political and economic union be strengthened to provide stability in Europe? In order to explain the structural features of international system of the Post-Cold War era, institutionalism as the theory explaining the affects of institutions into the international system will be used. In the Post-Cold War period, international institutions like NATO and EU appeared to affect the international system in shaping world politics. However nations did not delegate all their authority into the institutions by sustaining inter-governmental character of decision-making bodies. Institutionalist structure within the inter-governmental strategy will be adopted as the theory explaining the changes in the EU/ESDP and international environment.

In order to understand the hegemonic behaviors of US and EU reactions against it, the formation of institutions which functioned for the creation of hegemonic spheres of influence will be explained in this thesis. In this study US intention to establish a political and economic structure in its area of influence and EU's reaction towards this policy will be analyzed. Establishment of ESDP as an

autonomous foreign policy and security mechanism was considered in the framework of EU's reactions towards US hegemonic order. Establishment of an autonomous ESDP should be in terms of provision of security in Europe through European ideas and means.

After the Cold War NATO, broadened its agenda to include out of area operations. In order to be affective in European security and defense, NATO initiated a process for internal adaptation of EU within the Alliance. The European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI), a NATO military project, became the framework through which a more substantial European security and defense capability could be achieved.⁵

In December 1998, during the annual Franco-British summit in St Malo, French President Jacques Chirac and Blair announced a bold and creative Franco-British defense initiative. The St Malo declaration affirmed that NATO remained the foundation of the collective defense of its members. However, it also stated that the EU should have "the capacity for *autonomous* action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises."⁶ The Franco-British declaration therefore left open the possibility that the EU could act outside of the NATO context, thus potentially providing an additional EU military capability for Europe alongside NATO.

After the St. Malo political declaration European policy makers intended to establish a European security and defense capability that would enable EU member

⁵ Peter Lange, et al.(Editor), *Unraveling the European Security and Defense Policy Conundrum*, (Zurich: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002), p.98.

⁶ Joint Declaration on European Defense, Paragraph 2, available at <http://www.info-france-usa.org/news/statmnts/1998/stmalo.asp>. (accessed on 10 February 2007)

states to act together without the US. This initiative led to the formation of European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) of European Union. By establishing ESDP, EU policy makers aimed to establish European security and defense structure which have an autonomous military and decision making capability. Starting with St. Malo declaration, this initiative could be considered as a challenge to NATO superiority in European defense.

Turkey's position in ESDP should be analyzed by taking into consideration the external factors. Hegemonic intentions of US and EU's challenge towards US in security and defense directly affect Turkey's involvement in ESDP. As a result of her application into Western European Union, Turkey was accepted as Associate member in 20 November 1992. This initiative could be seen as a reviewed strategy within which European security and defense is depended on NATO assets and capabilities. Europe's dependencies on NATO assets prioritize the position of Turkey for European Union and led it upgrade the Turkey's status in the WEU. The Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) and Berlin plus initiatives caused European security and defense to be separable but not separate from NATO. ESDI would be built within NATO, possibly drawing upon military capabilities "separable but not separate" from the alliance. On the other hand, France insisted that European defense structure should be "separable and separate" from NATO.⁷ These two views about the nature of European armed forces will be explained in this study.

The St. Malo Franco-German political declaration could be accepted as a cornerstone in Western European security architecture. For the first time European Union declared its willingness to play its full role in international stage. The defense

⁷ Robert Hunter, *European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor*, (Washington: RAND Cooperation, 2002), p.30.

dimension of this willingness declared as the Union's intention to establish a capacity for autonomous action backed up by credible military forces. This development could be considered as an expected European challenge to US political and economic order.

This development badly affected Turkey-EU relations over European security in the sense that this process led to the no full inclusion of non-EU European NATO members to the European security architecture. Thus, Turkey found herself in a process which led to loosing her rights inherited from Western European Union. As a reaction to these developments Turkey being a member of North Atlantic Council, used its right to veto EU's automatically use of NATO assets and capabilities in times of crisis where NATO as a whole is not engaged. After long negotiations the deal reached in Brussels Document (October 2002) which secured Turkey's right to approve, as a NATO member, any EU application to use NATO assets and capabilities. However, the enhanced deal did not give Turkey full membership and decision-making rights in ESDP. Turkey's ESPD membership was declared to be depended on European Union membership.

Although it is supposed that European Union should be the core institution that provides a common ground for the countries on defence related issues, its explicit role in defence industrial policy has been restricted by the Article 223 of the Rome Treaty (Article 296 of the Amsterdam Treaty)⁸. According to these articles, all kinds of armaments activities including production, trade and procurement have been deliberately put out of the scope of the European integration process by the member states, who, until the end of 90s have preferred to maintain purely national control

⁸ Article 296 (Ex article 223) of the Treaty establishing the European Community; www.europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/a29000.htm - 63. (accessed on February 2007)

mechanisms on these activities. However, despite the article's clear clauses, it is argued that the more integrative bodies of EU – the Commission and the Parliament – and member states have been unsuccessful to persuade the intergovernmentalists – the Council and, among members, the United Kingdom and France – to allow the defence related industry to be ruled by European Union regulations as is applied to every other economic sector.

The efforts to make European defense structure integrated into European Union started after the St. Malo political declaration which held in 4 December 1998. European Aeronautics, Defense and Space Company (EADS) was established in 14 October 1999 as being the first transnational defense company of Europe. Germany, France and Spain defense companies integrated themselves in order to eliminate the borders between themselves. EADS can be regarded as the first true attempt of creating a transnational defense sector despite it is not established in EU structure.

The EU's incapability for intervention to crisis in the Bosnia and Kosovo made EU became aware that without having had own defense capabilities an autonomous ESDP could become reality only in words. Therefore, as a first step European Union undertook a Capability Improvement Conference (CIC) in order to point out European Union's deficiencies on common defense structure in November, 2001. Establishment of European Defense Agency (EDA) in July 2004, in support of EU Council in security and defense could be considered as EU's willingness to make defence related industry to be ruled by European Union regulations.

In this thesis I will examine the European Union's establishment of a common defense industry and a defense structure in parallel with EU integration process. EU's member's delegations of their authority into an Agency should be understood as an important step towards institutionalization of European defense structure. With

its substantial contribution into peace support operations since 1950s, Turkey's contribution and rights in the European defense structure will be examined in this thesis.

Given the focus of research and the arguments above the study will be organized as follows.

Chapter 2 outlines an historical analysis of the Western European states' efforts and arrangements for the formation of a European security initiative just after the WW2. This chapter deals with evolution of European security and defense identity during the Cold War as a historical background.

Chapter 3 will mainly focus on the systematic change that appeared in European security and defense as the bi-polar international system ended. In this chapter formation of common European security policy, creation of ESDI and transformation into ESDP are to be examined to show how the process would pose new questions to involvement of Turkey in whole security and defense aspects in the post Cold War era.

Chapter 4 will focus on Turkey's position and response in the face of formation of ESDI and transformation into ESDP. In this chapter the main focus is that; what would be the position of Turkey in the newly emerging European security structure? Would Turkey's contribution into European security be identified in the framework of NATO or would EU integrate Turkey into European security architecture in parallel with Turkey's EU membership? Being a NATO member since 1952, Turkey's EU membership process should be taken into consideration with these arguments.

European defense is one of the most important parts of this chapter. Until the formation of ESDP, European defense had been accepted as to be in the

responsibility of member states individually. As EU appeared to be a global actor, the necessity to establish an autonomous European defense industry and military structure became apparent. Establishment of European Defense Agency in 2004 as an intergovernmental mechanism for the coordination of all efforts in European defense is important for the institutionalization of European defense. Turkey's possible contribution in the European defense industry and European Defense Agency will be analyzed in this part as well.

Chapter 5 will take up the subject in question within the context of Turkey's quest for full membership. The main focus of this chapter is that would EU integrate Turkey into its security architecture before Turkey's EU membership process finalized? Or is Turkey's integration into European security architecture dependent upon EU membership? Are there any alternatives for both sides? In the middle of these debates Turkey is offered "privileged partnership" by which Turkey will be put out of decision making structure of EU institutions. According to its proponents, it means offering Ankara everything but institutions. That is to say, a share of most EU policies and the establishment of enhanced political dialogue but without participation in the decision making bodies of economic, foreign policy and security areas.

Chapter 6 summarizes the main conclusions and the logical consequences of the Turkey's participation in all dimensions of ESDP

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY

2.1. Developments about European Security after the end of Second World

War

After the end of the Second World War, and the surrender of Germany, the heads of the governments of United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom (victors of the war) held several conferences during the closing stages. Two of the most important of them took place in Yalta (February 1945) and Potsdam (August 1945). At these conferences the noted powers did not agree on certain points and thus diverged on several key issues. These points can be summarized as the status of Germany and Eastern Europe after the end of the War. By the time of the Yalta Conference; the Soviet Union showed its intention to exercise a definite control in Eastern Europe through the presence of its advancing troops. Accordingly, the United States decided to implement *containment* policy against the Soviet Union not aiming to destroy the strength of Russia, but to unify the west and to deter Soviets from having control in Western Europe.

As categorically pointed out by Kennan, who was the founding father of containment policy and served as the first Secretary in the US embassy in Moscow, ‘the danger to the West could not come from the Soviet aggression but from Western weakness.’⁹ This point was taken up by US Secretary of State George F. Marshall, announcing his proposal for US support for a united economic recovery effort which was dubbed as the Marshall Plan. In April 1948 European Recovery Program (ERP)

⁹ Cyril E. Black and others, *Rebirth: A History of Europe Since World War 2*, (London: Westview Press, 1992), p.70.

passed from the US Congress aiming to help Western European states, militarily and financially.

2.2. European Security Initiatives during the Cold War

Despite Germany's surrender at the end of the War, France desired more specifically military protection against Germany. Therefore France and Britain signed the Treaty of Dunkirk on 4th March 1947, aiming to form an alliance against the German threat in Europe. The treaty of Dunkirk was the natural outgrowth of the Second World War and it reflected that the United Nations (UN) was not seen sufficiently powerful to solve all problems inherited from the War.

After the end of War a bipolar system occurred in Europe and the rest of the World. Political and economic rivalry between hegemonic powers (USSR and USA) was the result of the bipolar systematic structure of the time. The bipolar system which is founded upon economic and political rivalry directly affected European security and defense. European security was shaped by the necessities of the bipolar confrontation in Europe. US policy of *containment* required a close cooperation between US and Western European countries for the prevention of Soviet threat. Therefore, US and European countries' interests converged upon European security.

US hegemony in the Western world was apparent in the 1950s. During the period of hegemony, one actor appears in the system that is able to exercise strong leadership, establishing essential systematic rules and holds military and economic capabilities extensive enough to deter those actions of other actors that could potentially disrupt hegemonic leadership and systematic stability.¹⁰ US position after the end of the WWII fits the definition made above for the hegemonic powers. US

¹⁰ Thomas Volgy and Lawrence Imwalle, *Hegemonic and Bipolar Perspectives on the New World Order*, American Journal of Political Science, (Vol.39, No.4: 1995), p.823.

hegemony was powerful enough to lead the system and to create a new order after the end of the War.

In December 1947, the British Foreign Minister, Bevin, suggested creation of a spiritual federation of the West that would include the United States.¹¹ Having sacrificed so many casualties, US policy just after the end of the War towards Europe was isolationism. US isolationism policy to the political events in Europe caused US to try to persuade the Europeans to take more responsibility in Europe. However the political developments between the US and USSR caused the US to insert its hegemony in order to deter and contain Soviets. Therefore, the United States had been interested in Bevin's proposal because it seemed to imply a wider Euro-Atlantic alliance against any USSR threat.

On February 25th, 1948 a communist *coup d'etat* happened in Czechoslovakia. As a result of the coup, the French no longer saw the need for building an alliance, only for offending Germans. France understood that European countries should establish a European security initiative which would provide coordination in security and political areas between European members. Being the frontier of the Western security, European powers saw the need to form their own security initiative aiming to support US containment policy against the Soviet threat. Accordingly, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxemburg joined in the Brussels Treaty aiming to build a common foreign policy and security mechanism in Europe. The Brussels Pact of March 1948 called for economic, social, cultural collaboration and collective self defense. The treaty made provisions for a consultative Council of Foreign Ministers and a permanent commission of ambassadors meeting in London.

¹¹ Cyril, *op cit.*, p.78.

Under the direction of these bodies, a defense committee of chiefs of staff was responsible for working out a common defense policy.¹²

Hegemony requires that one central actor holds a unique combination of military and economic capabilities that matter, and is willing to lead in fashioning a world order.¹³ In the post 1945 era, the United States clearly possessed a willingness to exercise leadership without giving chance to any power. In this structure European security and defense affected by US hegemonic power. Any European security initiative could be materialized only if this initiative would serve to the interest of US world order. As a hegemonic power, US was aware that autonomous European security initiatives led by France could lead to decoupling in the Western security in which US had important interests. Accordingly, establishment of a Euro-Atlantic security organization including European members could be considered as United State's hegemonic reaction to the Brussels Pact.

As a result of the developments over European defense it seemed that a defense treaty without the commitment of the United States would be insufficient against Soviet threat. US containment policy required founding of a collective defense organization which would be responsible for providing security in the Euro-Atlantic region against any imminent Soviet threat. Accordingly, by the leadership of the United States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded on 4 April 1949 with the commitment of: United States, United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Italy, Portugal and Canada. The central trust of the treaty was that each member would consider an attack on another member in the defined North Atlantic area as an attack on itself.

¹² *Ibid.*, p.79.

¹³ Volgy, *op cit.*, p.824.

Accordingly a member should repel the attack by economically and militarily and with other means of power.

The development of NATO forces made a contribution to the security of its members during the Cold War. According to the NATO treaty, an attack against one member of NATO was to be considered an attack against them all.¹⁴ This meant that member states of the NATO had to integrate their national interest according to the aims of treaty. However there seemed to be different views about the security of Europe between US and European members of NATO. The Europeans wished to see substantial US forces deployed on the continent against any possible Soviet attack. However, the US wanted European powers to be able to provide the security of the continent with their own forces. The solution, finally reached in the North Atlantic Council, by the members, was the strategy that regarded the NATO forces to be deployed in Europe as a shield to deter the USSR from defeating the continent. This strategy proved the defensive character notion of NATO.

Even though this Atlantic choice was not made without certain questions or concerns, it seemed that only an engagement in force by the United States in the defense of Western Europe could ensure the security of Europe, faced with the gravity of the Soviet danger.¹⁵ Therefore, France welcomed the setting up a military organization that would provide the security of Europe and concretize the Atlantic Pact in the wake of the Korean War.

In spite of the Brussels treaty and the foundation of the NATO, France still had fears that any German rearmament would escalate the Cold War. Moreover, France thought that the NATO was an inadequate tool for integrating Europe, economically

¹⁴ *NATO Handbook*, North Atlantic Treaty Article 5, (Belgium, 2006), p. 372.

¹⁵ Frederick Bozo, *Two Strategies for Europe*, (Newyork: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001), p.1.

and politically. As a result, a Frenchman, Jean Monnet, put forward the idea that some form of European political union could be devised that would involve West Germany which would integrate her and avoid the critical issue of rearmament. He thought that if the custom barriers were to be broken especially for the coal and steel, Western Europe would be strengthened and joint production of these commodities would make the war between France and Germany unthinkable. As a result, in April 1951 with the signing of the treaty of Paris, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was founded with the commitment of France, German Federal Republic, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg what became known as the Europe of the six.

2.2.1. 1950's the Failure of the European Defense Community (EDC)

Integration, as confined Western Europe became intensified in the economic field with the establishment of European Coal and Steel Community under a supranational body. After the end of the WWII, the economic recovery and the prevention of the German rearmament were still on the agenda during the 1950s. Meanwhile, the imminent Korean War elevated the issue of defense to a priority in Europe. Therefore, the emphasis is shifted from economic integration to defense, and from a German threat to Soviet one. Besides, the United States believed that more troops would be needed for the protection of Europe including German soldiers. Accordingly, France proposed an alternative to West Germany's creation of its own army and joining into NATO against the Soviet threat. It would be the foundation of the EDC, and Germany's membership into this Community.

On the 27th May 1952 France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg signed the EDC treaty which was

accompanied by a mutual defense treaty with the United Kingdom. With the signing of the agreement, the Federal Republic of Germany improved its status by obtaining equal footing with its Western neighbors and without taking the official approval of the Soviets. The partition of Germany by Soviet Russia and USA was very important for both sides during the Cold War. For the United States, the participation of West Germany to European security and Alliance forces in West Germany were crucial. With the signing of EDC Treaty, occupation troops which were deployed in West Germany would be serving the European defense. United States supported the formation of the EDC because any European defense structure, including Germany, would serve to the interest of America in implementing its containment policy. Germany was crucial for the US, the German troops were formed in combat teams of 5000 to 6000 troops, a larger size than the French envisioned.¹⁶

Although France was against direct US intervention politically and militarily in Europe, it was aware that European security could only be achieved with the commitment of US military forces in the continent. Besides, France had concerns about any possible German aggression in Europe. The United States maintained balance by controlling Germany by the deployment of NATO military forces in Europe. Mutual interests legitimized the well being of NATO military forces deployed in Europe.

However, opposition to EDC appeared inside the French National Assembly. Although other countries ratified the pact, political leaders in France delayed the legislature. There were criticisms about expected loss of independent French Army units in Europe. They also believed that, only with the inclusion of the British troops,

¹⁶ Cyril, *op cit.*, p.91.

was the defense of the continent maintained. On 30th August 1954, the French National Assembly rejected the European Defense Community Treaty.

There were several reasons for the French rejection of the EDC. First there were continuous French concerns over British non-involvement.¹⁷ The Protocols signed between U.S. and British in case of a German threat did not seem to be sufficient for France. Another reason for the failure of the EDC initiative was the shift in the foreign policy of France. For the foreign policy of France the exerting influence in Europe and European integration ceased to be a priority. France now considered the French Union and the overseas territories as the centre for exerting French influence.

2.2.2. Establishment of Western European Union (WEU) as the European Pillar of NATO

The failure of the EDC initiative marked the end of the deliberations to incorporate European security cooperation into a wider framework of European integration, under the authority of a political union.¹⁸ Meanwhile, the process of European economic cooperation proceeded separately from the European security cooperation. By the time, alternative mechanisms for European defense had been developed, after the failure of the EDC initiative. Under British leadership, the members of the EDC decided to expand the Brussels Treaty by including Italy and West Germany and to admit the Federal Republic of Germany. French concerns over German aggression after the War were eased thorough the internalization of

¹⁷Gülnur Aybet, *The Dynamics of European Security and Cooperation, 1945-1991*, (London, Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), p.78.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p.82.

Germany into the European defense mechanism. Furthermore in deciding on this option, Britain was concerned at the possibility of American-German defense arrangement.¹⁹

Canada started talks on September 28th, 1954 which concluded with the signing of a basic agreement in London at the Paris conference of 22nd-23rd October. The enlarged Brussels treaty group, which decided to function as European pillar of Atlantic Alliance, was called the Western European Union (WEU). In the Paris Agreement, France accepted the entry of Germany into NATO.²⁰ The Western European Union was not a supranational organization but it had a virtue of Europeanization.

This time France accepted the WEU treaty and the NATO membership of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1954. This development opened the way for the creation of a European defense organization which would be responsible for European security and defense in cooperation with Atlantic Alliance. However the WEU agreements did not open the way for a supranational army protecting Europe. The national armies of the member states continued to serve for the protection of Europe. Each of the European members made a contribution to the NATO forces in Europe and placed them under SACEUR (Supreme Allied Commander Europe). Therefore, Germany also made its contribution to NATO. The WEU assumed the role which had been envisaged for the EDC two years before.

The importance of the commitment of US in European security was commonly shared by the Western European states. However, any European initiative concerning European defense was blocked by United States in order to prevent decoupling in the

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p.84.

²⁰ Bozo, *op cit*, p.2.

Western world. The foundation of Atlantic Alliance just after the Brussels Treaty was a good example of this. Similarly, US military commitment in Europe through the NATO shadowed the role and functions of WEU.

2.2.3. Foundation of European Political Cooperation (EPC)

The debate about whether the NATO or the project for the European political union would be effective in European security continued into the 1960s. For France: 'there could not be a European political personality if Europe did not have a personality from a defense standpoint.'²¹ France believed that NATO did not provide the defense of Europe by Europeans but by Americans. According to France construction of a political and strategic Europe was necessary.

In the middle of the 1960s, the European Community established supranational bodies in economic fields. However in political matters national priorities of member states were still more important than the Community's interests. Accordingly European Community could not be able to establish bodies inside itself which would coordinate and build common political views. An important development was France's withdrawal from the integrated military structure of NATO in 1966. The main tenet of France was that a Western Europe which was unified and autonomous was needed. France's withdrawal from the integrated military structure of the NATO showed the differentiation of policy views among the member states of the EC members. France's reaction to the US superiority in the Alliance caused new initiatives in European security structure.

After the failure of the EDC in the 1954, the idea of political cooperation, which aimed at the formation of common views on political matters, was re-launched

²¹ *Ibid.*, p.78.

at the European Community Summit at Hague, in 1969. This initiative led to the establishment of the EPC in 1972.

France's idea of construction of a political and strategic union and rebalancing of the Atlantic Alliance was the common initiator of EPC. European Community's rising economic importance was backed up by the political cooperation in which member states made coordination over political issues. The EPC turned out to be a political response to the US in the face of the rising divergences inside the EC. The objectives were to produce common understanding about major issues of international politics and to enhance solidarity among the member states by sharing and harmonizing views and actions.

EPC initiative was independent from the European Community's structure. Besides, the security and defense issues were not the concerns of the EPC. In the midst of the Cold War, establishment of an autonomous European political identity could cause decoupling between US and Europe. Creation of a European political identity based on institutions and had different agendas would harm Atlantic solidarity. Moreover, European states had no power to establish an autonomous political identity in the era of Cold War. European powers were aware of this. Accordingly, the EPC was not based on a treaty and did not have any structure or institutions. The EPC initiative is different from the EC as well. Apart from the expectations, security and foreign policy issues could not be coordinated inside EPC. Meanwhile NATO was the primary organ in which the matters about security and defense are cooperated by subordinating EPC and WEU.

During the 1970s the European Community achieved its first enlargement with the accession of Britain, Ireland and Denmark in 1973. The idea of the European Political Union including security and defense issues emerged by the Tindemans

Report of 1975.²² This report offered fundamental changes in the structure of the European Political Cooperation. Accordingly the commitments of the EPC would be binding to member states. However the report was discussed by the members of the EC and rejected by the Ireland and Holland.

2.2.4. 1960s-1970s the Period of Detente and Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

The detente period culminated in the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. A Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) met in Helsinki by the commitment of 35 states all of which are European countries except the U.S. and Canada. CSCE has grown into an impressive set of formal institutions whose area of interest is the maintenance of the security towards Eurasia. The CSCE also seeks to provide security in the broadest sense, going beyond its core military aspects to include cooperation on economic, social and human rights issues aiming cooperative security and stable international relations.²³ The Conference came up in the climate created by the willingness of West Germany to recognize East Germany as a state and by the desire for detente and disarmament. The first meeting was the conclusion of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. Although it had no binding force in international law, it was a document which has greater political importance. The principles of the Helsinki Final act decided to be compulsory for the participating states.

CSCE process gathered together three major groups: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Non-Aligned States and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, in order to put standards for the implementation and monitoring of the human rights. The CSCE

²²MA Thesis, Faruk Özköse, *European Security and Defense Policy and Implications for Turkey*, (Bilkent University, 2002), p.19.

²³ Cathal J. Nolan, 'The OSCE: Non-military dimensions of cooperative security in Europe' in Hodge, Carl C., *Redefining European Security*, (Newyork: Routledge, 1999), p.299.

process gave the small and medium size states a voice in the discussion of the European security system. It also helped to create a sense of European identity especially in East and South-Eastern Europe. CSCE process would be beneficial in the sense that it would prove to have a cooperative security forum between states no matter which bloc they were in. CSCE process would play an influential role in helping the Cold War to be peaceful and orderly.

During the 1960s and 1970s, European security and cooperation became the necessity of the Cold War. During these times the agenda was whether the US would provide the security of the continent or the WEU on behalf of European members. In spite of the France, NATO reaffirmed as the main security forum for the Western Europe and it established effective European participation inside the Alliance for the maintenance of security in the continent. Western European Allies also accepted NATO as the guarantor of the security of the Europe and with the easiness of the security they channeled their efforts into economic integration and enlargement of the EC towards Western Europe.

2.2.5. Revival of the European Political Cooperation and Genscher-Colombo Plan

By the early 1980s the EC had economic and internal difficulties. These developments led to the revision of political matters and strengthening of the institutions. The improvements in the economic field created new activities for the cooperation in the political fields. Accordingly the Foreign Ministers of the Germany and Italy, Genscher and Colombo met in 1981 to create a new initiative for European security.

The main objective of the Genscher-Colombo plan was to produce a common security approach by linking the issue of European security to the EPC process, to

strengthen the EPC by linking it more closely to EC, and to increase the political weight of EC.²⁴ The plan offered proposals designed to widen EC responsibilities and to build a linkage between economic and political aspects of the EC. In the London Report, in October 1981 security was, for the first time, declared as a legitimate concern for EPC. However, this plan could not be accepted by the member states of the EC. The result was the, the *Solemn Declaration* on European Union. In 1983 it was agreed upon, which further strengthened the role of the European Council; by giving it the task of issuing general guidelines for the EPC and the Presidency of the European Council, by giving it the powers of initiative of coordination and the representation in relations with third countries. Declaration aimed to give EC one voice in foreign policy and security matters and to contribute to the maintenance of security in Europe. It was a tuned down version of the Genscher-Colombo plan. The unwillingness of the EC member states to change the *status-quo* in European security and the fear of undermining NATO's involvement in Europe were the two main reasons for the failure.

After the failure of the Genscher-Colombo plan new Franco-German security cooperation was revived. The main dynamic behind the Franco-German security cooperation was the French concerns over an anti-nuclear tendency in Germany, following the NATO decision to deploy Pershing-2 missiles. Through this rapprochement, French intention was to provide security for Germany in case of an attack. France started to become more concerned over European security without re-entering integrated military structure of NATO. As a result, a joint Franco-German brigade was deployed in West Germany in 1987. Since the demise of the EDC in 1954, it was the most significant step in building greater cooperation with the realm

²⁴ Aybet, *op cit.*, p.134.

of European integration. For the other members of the Alliance Franco-German cooperation was a possible means to undermine the effect Alliance in Europe. However, this cooperation could not be converted into a wider framework.

CHAPTER 3

EUROPEAN SECURITY ARCHITECTURE AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR

In the late 1980s, the European security system, which was built on the grounds of the Cold War, began to change. With the end of the Cold War a power transition appeared in the international environment. Power transitions affect the fortunes of individual nations and are often associated with cataclysmic storms of world war.²⁵ Here the end of the Cold War was the main cataclysmic change in international environment.

3.1. Establishment of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)

During the Cold War there was a bipolar systemic structure between two World powers: US and USSR. Bipolarity refers to a systemic structure where two actors (US and USSR) and their respective alliances stand in a position of substantial conflict toward each other (bipolarization) and control a dominant share of military capabilities in the system (bipolarity).²⁶ During the Cold War, European security had been undertaken by US leadership through the solidarity of European powers into NATO.

The most fundamental change was the transition of the international environment from bipolar confrontation between two powers, US and USSR into a unipolar structure through the sole hegemony of US. During a period of hegemony, one actor appears in the system that is able to exercise strong leadership in fashioning the terms of world order, establishing systematic rules and holding

²⁵ Joseph Nye, 'The Changing Nature of World Power', *Political Science Quarterly*, (Volume 105, No. 2, 1990), p. 1.

²⁶ Volgy, *op cit.*, p. 283.

military and economic capabilities in order to deter the actions of other actors that would, potentially, be a challenge to hegemonic leadership.²⁷ A new systematic structure had been established just after the end of the Cold War which depends on sole US hegemony.

In the era of change there were expectations from the US to withdraw its influence from Europe due to the end of the Soviet threat. However some thought that it was time for US to enhance its efforts to establish its own political and economic hegemony in Euro-Atlantic area. US political and military influence in Europe is the direct result of this view. Would European states sustain control over political and military matters in view of developing EU's foreign policy architecture or would they let US influence to continue in the continent? It was apparent that Europe was contingent on US political and economic support in the beginning of 1990s. However, would European powers be successful in developing their political and military architecture on the way to transforming themselves into a Union?

In the era of systematic change, important alterations in the political, military and economic structure of the European system also occurred. Debates started on, what was the most appropriate institutional architecture for the provision of security of the European continent? In the middle of change, some European countries intended to develop a common foreign and security policy of the European Union as a part of the construction of a Union.²⁸ This initiative concerned Americans and some European conservatives because the formation of a European identity in security and defense would undermine the effectiveness of the Atlantic alliance in the continent.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Stuart Croft, 'The EU, NATO and Europeanisation: The Return of the Architectural Debate', *European Security*, 9:3 (2000), p.1.

3.1.1. Theories over European Security and Defense in 1990's

There were four different and mutually exclusive views put forward about the future of European security architecture in the beginning of the 1990s. The French and Belgians articulated the establishment of a defense identity for the European Union that would be *separate and separable* from that of NATO.²⁹ It was an approach which sought to develop European security structure on a West European basis and to be spread across the continent as the EU enlarged. This view accepts security taking a central role in the construction of Europe. As a result of the Franco-Belgium view WEU had to be the defense arm of the EU and it had to be used operationally in security and defense matters. Such a vision required the integration of the armed forces of the members of the EU, making them separable and separate from NATO. Such a vision would enable the EU to conduct military operations without the commitments of the US and NATO.

Another view about the future of European security came from Germans and Czechs. This view was based on the development of a pan-European security arrangement, based on the enhanced CSCE. The CSCE process has institutionalized structures based on collective security system. It would have provided a basis for pan European security incorporating not only the NATO countries but also Russia, Ukraine and the other post-Soviet states.³⁰ It would have provided small countries which were being feared of being ignored by the larger states, a voice and a place in European security. CSCE process aimed to undermine the effect NATO in European security structure.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.5.

In the period from July 1990 to the Paris summit of CSCE of November, both Germans and Czechs supported the idea but this vision collapsed. The reasons behind the collapse of the vision were, firstly, Germany was under great pressure from its Western allies who felt that this vision was insufficiently Atlanticist and insufficiently Europeanist.³¹ Also, EU members believed that European security architecture could not be shaped under the leadership of Germany. Secondly the Czechs and the other Central and Eastern European countries moved away from the CSCE process towards NATO process in the aftermath of the Soviet violence in Lithuania in January 1991. Thirdly, the unanimity principle in the decision making structure of the CSCE would make CSCE less useful in the emerging crises.

The Russian view was the *concert of powers idea* which was based on the formation of a European Security Council. Moscow wanted a system which was similar to the Concert of Europe in which the great powers meet in conference to discuss and settle major problems of European security. Moscow wanted the institutionalization of the European security structure by the modification of the CSCE process and the possible creation of the *Security Council*. The Moscow view was not supported by the European powers. Also the major NATO powers feared that it would compromise Russia a veto power over NATO actions. This debate came most clearly into the open at the Budapest summit of the OSCE at the end of 1994, when the NATO countries rejected Russian calls for NATO and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to be put under OSCE control, to be run through the directorate of the major powers.³²

³¹ *Ibid.*, p.6.

³² *Ibid.*, p.7.

The final idea was the Anglo-American view which emphasized the need to preserve the primacy of US influence over European security. The British and America feared that the importance of NATO was being threatened by the each of three ideas including; CSCE, the EU and the arguments in favor of the concert of Europe. The Anglo-American view over European security was conservative in the sense that it sought to preserve Euro-Atlantic cooperation (NATO) as the primary mechanism for the European security. This view proposed functioning of WEU as a European pillar of NATO and accordingly, European military forces should be *separable but not separate* from NATO.³³

By the elimination of the German and Russian views, Franco and Anglo-American views came to be realistic. A Europeanized NATO and autonomous European foreign and security policy appeared to be competitive view in shaping the European security structure. In the middle of these debates some developments appeared in NATO and European security architecture.

In the 1990's NATO took an important decision to enlarge and to accept Central and Eastern European Countries. It is thought that, enlargement would give NATO a purpose, in spreading stability in Central and Eastern Europe. Enlargement of NATO was considered to be an inevitable result of the power vacuum which appeared in Central and Eastern Europe. NATO's enlargement to include CEEC's to fill power vacuum shaped the future of the European security. By taking the decision to be a member of Euro-Atlantic security organization, CEEC's choose to be a part of Western World.

Accordingly, in August 1993, Russia recognized Poland's right to join NATO stating that such a membership would not be against Russian security interest.

³³ *Ibid.*

Subsequently, this led Senator Lugar - a key member of the US senate on the Foreign Relations Committee - to press for a statement for the inclusion of Visegrad³⁴ countries into NATO. Enlargement was also welcomed by Germany. It was in Germany's interest to create further stability in its Eastern borders with the inclusion of Central and Eastern European countries into NATO.

International Relations theory argues that international system has an important independent affect on the behavior of units (states) in the system. Accordingly it is thought that it is the international structure which interacts with units with each affecting the other to produce an international system.³⁵ The general view is that the behavior of units and outcomes of their interaction will vary according to the structure of an international system. As the international system changed into a unipolar structure of US hegemony, middle powers of Central and Eastern Europe adapted themselves to new international structure by participating in NATO.

As a result of the developments, on January 1994 at the NATO Brussels Summit, Allied leaders reaffirmed that the Alliance was open to membership of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Washington Treaty and to contribute to security in the North Atlantic area.³⁶ Following a decision by Allied Foreign Ministers in December 1994, the why's and how's of future admissions into the Alliance were examined by the allies during 1995. The resulting *Study on NATO Enlargement* was shared with interested Partner countries in September 1995 and

³⁴ Visegrad Countries are Czech Reublic, Poland, Hungary and Slovenia.

³⁵ David R. Mares 'Middle Powers under Regional Hegemony: to Challenge or Acquiesce in Hegemonic Enforcement', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No.4, (December 1998), p 455.

³⁶ North Atlantic Council Brussels Summit, 11 January 1994, <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940111a.htm> (accessed on 15 June 2006)

made public.³⁷ The aim of the enlargement was declared as to preserve security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

Accordingly, the US developed *Partnership for Peace* programme (PfP) as a NATO initiative in January 1994 Brussels Summit Meeting of North Atlantic Council. The aim of the PfP was to enhance stability and security throughout Europe. The Partnership for Peace Invitation was addressed to all states participating in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and other states participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) which were able and willing to contribute to the programme. The invitation has since been accepted by a total of 30 countries.

The NATO enlargement and the PfP programme proved the future victory of the Anglo-American view over European security. With the initiation of the enlargement throughout the Central and Eastern European countries, US influence thorough NATO claimed its will to provide security throughout Europe. But there was an additional factor. It was apparent that France would not accept the idea for the future of European security. The French were still concerned that the European Union should be allowed to play a significant role in the European security. At the Atlantic side, the members of NATO did not have an explanation on why the Alliance should be maintained and why it required the American leadership that had been seen during the Cold War. Enlargement thus became a convenient tool to maintain the alliance for the aim of spreading stability in Europe.

At the beginning of the 1990s European political order was exposed to some definite changes with the end of the bipolar system. Evidently, the end of the Cold War meant that Europe became less threatened than it had been for the period after

³⁷ NATO Handbook, (Brussels, 2001) p.61.

the Second World War³⁸ It is evident that Central and Eastern European countries were exposed to a security and power vacuum after the breakdown of the Warsaw Pact. Besides, the newly independent states experienced economic and social instabilities and these developments resulted in building up closer relations with Western Europe which soon open the way for *free Europe*. The primary reason in developing better relations with Western European countries is the security concerns of the newly independent countries. European countries could not be irrelevant to the changes happening in its neighborhood countries. Western organizations like NATO and EC take decisions to enlargement in order to accept the central and eastern European countries.

3.1.2. From European Political Cooperation into Formation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy

The change in international structure towards a unipolar US hegemony created the most important challenges for the European Community in general and for a common foreign and security policy in particular. Contrary to expectations, the economic, social and security instabilities came from Western Europe's own neighboring territories towards which the European Community had no foreign policy. The need to develop a common strategy for the security and foreign policy matters in general and for the central and eastern European countries in particular became apparent. The need to develop such a step was the result of the inability of the EC to built cooperation in foreign and security matters in the international environment. It was a necessity for the EC if it wanted to play a central role in maintaining peace and stability in Europe. Besides, illegal immigration, terrorism,

³⁸ Lange, *op cit*, p.96.

human right violations and ethnic disputes required a multinational approach to security which necessitated a common strategy for the EC.

The external factor, which necessitated establishment of a common foreign and security policy, was US influence on politics and security of European continent. After the Soviet threat disappeared, it was anticipated that the US would be reluctant in its commitment in Europe. Therefore there emerged a need on the part of both the Europeans and the Americans to reconsider the commitments of the Atlantic Alliance and to redefine their respective roles and obligations in the formation of the new European security architecture. At this point, a common foreign and security policy could be a mechanism within which the Member States of the EC could discuss the terms of the relationship with the United States to readdress the balance within the alliance and to voice their concerns and attitudes towards the global conflicts by a single voice.

In the middle of the future concerns about the EC's foreign and security policy, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait appeared to be a threat to regional stability of the Middle East and World security. The Gulf conflict starting in August 1990, proved the inability of the Member States of the EC to respond to the crisis because of the lack of formulation of a common policy towards the crises. The Gulf War demonstrated that the European States were dependent on the United States and NATO in terms of political leadership and military capabilities. The European Community needed to identify its security interest and had to formulate common policies accordingly.

In June 1991, as a result of the ethnic problems appearing in the post-Yugoslavia states, ethnic crises erupted in the continent. These crises were an opportunity for the European states to take action and control the escalation of the conflict and to demonstrate the ability and power of the EC in foreign policy matters.

It is expected that the EC could prevent the war which was happening in the middle of Europe. However, the Community was not ready to act in decisive manner to prevent the escalation of war. Apart from the Cold War based EPC treaty; there was not any single mechanism for the EC to handle such a crisis. It was concluded after the two crises that EPC could not be counted on for an effective and credible foreign policy-making mechanism for the European Community. It showed the EC's need for a reform in the current EPC process and the need for military structures and capabilities.

As a result of these developments Member States of the Community agreed that an Intergovernmental Conference in Rome took place between 1990 and 1991 in order to find solutions to the EU's problems on common foreign and security policy. With the Joint proposal by Germany and France, establishment of a Common European Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) put into agenda at the Conference. The importance of the US commitment to the European security was also emphasized in the Conference. WEU which is the nucleus of the European defense identity has been thought to serve and function as the European Pillar dimension of NATO structure. Besides, France and Germany decided to draft a treaty on *political union* being the initiators of the European Integration Process. With this decision, the EC's transformation into a political union started, and was resulted in the Maastricht Treaty.

3.1.3. Maastricht Treaty and Emergence of European Defence

A treaty on European Union was officially signed in Maastricht which was held in February 1992 and entered into force in November 1993. The Maastricht Treaty resulted in the formation of a political union which was constructed upon

three separate pillars. From now on the European Community had taken a decision to transform itself from a Community to a European Union.

In the Maastricht Treaty members of EU accepted CFSP to be the second pillar of the European Union. CFSP was introduced under title 5 of the Maastricht Treaty. According to title 5, article 11 of the Maastricht Treaty, the EU decided to establish a common foreign and security policy covering all areas of foreign policy. The objectives of building a CFSP are to strengthen the security of the Union and to preserve and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the UN charter, and to promote international cooperation.³⁹

The leaders of the European Union agreed on the development of a Common Foreign and Security Policy. According to the Article 17 of the Maastricht Treaty: 'the Common Foreign and Security Policy shall include all questions relating to the security of the Union, including the progressive framing of a common defense policy, which might lead to a common defense, should the European Council so decide.'⁴⁰ In this statement the EU showed its intention to take control over European security and defense by delegating the EU Council exact authority. It is also stated that the provisions of the article shall not prevent the closer cooperation between two or more member States on a bilateral level in the framework of WEU and NATO. Accordingly, the close coordination with the NATO Member States in European defense was emphasized.

³⁹ The Maastricht Treaty of European Union, February 1992, 'Title 5: Provisions on a Common Foreign and Security Policy', <http://www.europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/top.html> - 2k (accessed on 21 June 2006)

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

The Maastricht Treaty designated the WEU as the organization responsible for implementing defense aspects of the EU's decisions on foreign and security policy. The WEU members subsequently agreed in Petersberg (Germany) in 1992 that they would use WEU military forces for joint operations apart from collective defense which can be considered as non-article 5 (out of area) operations. These include:

- a) Humanitarian and rescue tasks,
- b) Peacekeeping Tasks,
- c) Tasks of Combat forces in crisis management including peacemaking.⁴¹

This agreement included reference to the Western European Union as an integral part of the development of the European Union created by the Treaty; and a request to the WEU to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the European Union which had defense implications. At the meeting of the WEU which took place in Maastricht in December 1991 concurrently with the meeting of the European Council, WEU Member states issued a declaration agreeing on the need for a genuine European security and defense identity and a greater European responsibility in defense matters.

During the implementation process of the Maastricht Treaty, discussions about the CFSP were held on three issues. First is the question of supranationality versus intergovernmentalism including majority voting, the second is the WEU's role in relations to NATO's role and the third one was the defense dimension of the European security. The member states of the EU were divided into different camps as the Europeanists on the one side, the Atlanticist on the other and the

⁴¹ Western European Union Council of Ministers, Petersberg Declaration, <http://www.weu.int/documents/920619peten.pdf> (accessed on 22 June 2006)

intergovernmentalism on the one side and supranationalist on another. The Europeanist France, Germany and Italy wanted the merge of WEU with the EU and the Atlanticist Britain, the Netherlands and Portugal wanted NATO as the key security and defense institution in Europe and wanted WEU to function as the European pillar of NATO. On the other side, federalist countries such as Belgium wanted the supranational evolution of EU and intergovernmentalist countries such as France and Britain wanted national interest taking priority.

In January 1994, NATO Member States welcomed the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty and the launching of the European Union. It is expected that European members of NATO would make greater contribution to the security of all Allies. A close cooperation between NATO and WEU was also emphasized on the principles of complementarily and transparency. NATO identified this process as the formation of European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) inside NATO. It is accepted by the NATO and EU that Western European Union was the executive agent for ESDI. By using the term ESDI, the NATO members, especially US, European security and defense should be under the strategic direction and control of the Atlantic Alliance. Accordingly in the documents of NATO, the process was identified as the European pillar of NATO. This identification was the result of the inability of the EU Member states to provide the security of the Europe.

3.1.4. Relations with NATO and The Concept of Combined Joint Task Force

CJTF

The concerns of US to prevent duplication of efforts in European defense, created the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept. The US warned Europeans in 1993 that there must be *separable but not separate* capabilities that would enable

Europeans to conduct Petersberg tasks.⁴² As a result of the developments, the CJTF concept was launched in late 1993 and endorsed at the Brussels Summit of North Atlantic Council. A CJTF is a multinational (combined) and multi-service (joint) task force, task organized and formed for the full range of Alliance's military missions requiring multinational and multi-service command and a control by CJTF headquarters.⁴³ CJTF may include soldiers from non-NATO troop contributing nations.

As a result of the Brussels Summit, the CJTF concept was developed to contribute WEU to international crisis management operations by building cooperation with NATO. This initiative was the first step to integrate WEU into Atlantic Alliance to maintain indivisibility of security. It was declared that the CJTF concept was the necessity of the changing security situation in Europe and the emergence of smaller but diverse and unpredictable risks to peace and stability.⁴⁴ It was agreed that the future security arrangements would necessitate easily deployable, multinational military formations tailored to specific kinds of operations. These operations included humanitarian relief, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement as well as the collective defense.

The CJTF initiative would aim to sustain WEU to enable Petersberg type operations. CJTF concept provided the WEU with the NATO assets and capabilities but it gave the US, through the NAC involvement, the right to approve or refuse each CJTF exercise. This proved the continuance of US affect over European defense. On

⁴² Hunter, *op cit.*, p.30.

⁴³ North Atlantic Council Brussels Summit, 11 January 1994, <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940111a.htm>. (accessed on 2 July 2006)

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

the other hand, CJTF was desirable for the Europeans. By accessing US assets and NATO's Command, Control and Communications (C3) infrastructure, they would decrease the amount of defense spending. However, operationalization of the European security and defense could not be achieved because of the dependency on US. CJTF can be seen as a move to block European autonomy and as a European recognition of the weakness of their military assets.

The ESDI was first declared in the Brussels Summit of 11th January 1994. In the Brussels declaration, it was stated that the emergence of ESDI would strengthen the European pillar of Atlantic Alliance, whilst reinforcing the transatlantic link, and would enable European allies to take greater responsibility for their common security and defense. It emphasized the separable, but not separate, capabilities to avoid duplication of efforts within WEU and created the concept of CJTF.

3.1.5. The Berlin Summit Meeting of NATO (1996)

The NATO Allies and the Members of WEU began negotiating to determine what ESDI's relations should properly be with NATO. WEU states, after the adoption of the CJTF, wanted to reach the capability to take military actions if NATO were not inclined to act (which meant the abstention of the United States).⁴⁵ On the other hand US and the other allies were seriously concerned that European countries would intend to establish defense capabilities under the WEU which could duplicate with the NATO.

The ostensible reason behind the concerns of the states was that there were not enough resources to create two sets of military forces which would create *duplication*

⁴⁵Hunter, *op cit.*, p.13.

of efforts. The main reason was that promoting a WEU that was independent of NATO influence could weaken the NATO's capacity to act.⁴⁶ Accordingly NATO alliance supported the creation of ESDI but not completely as an independent entity. Instead, ESDI would be built within NATO which would be dependent on military capabilities and assets of NATO. The WEU military capabilities had to be *separable but not separate* from the alliance according to the Atlantic Alliance. This implied that NATO assets and capabilities would be made available for use of WEU becoming European pillar rather than separate from the Atlantic Alliance.

In June 1996, in Berlin, the NATO Foreign Ministers agreed to build a European defense pillar inside NATO with the enhancement of NATO-WEU cooperation. According to the decisions of Berlin, NATO member states showed their determination to build a European Defense pillar inside NATO. Berlin decisions formalized the parameters of WEU-NATO cooperation and this is considered as a step towards realization of European defense capability. The most important decisions taken in the Berlin Summit are:

- a) There could be *WEU-led* operations, including planning and exercising of command elements and forces.
- b) NATO would identify types of *separable but not separate* capabilities, assets, support assets and HQ elements and command structures which could be made available to ESDI with the decisions of NAC.
- c) NATO agreed that its Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR) could be used by the WEU as its own strategic commander in the event of WEU military operation.
- d) All European Members of NATO would be able to take part in WEU-led operations; including European command arrangements if they chose to do so (this was in particular a reference to Turkey).⁴⁷

After the Berlin Summit Meeting, in June 1996 NATO defense ministers gathered in Brussels. After negotiations between France and the United States it is

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.16.

decided that: ‘there should be single, multinational command structure, respecting the principle of unity of command.’⁴⁸ The explanation of this decision was that whatever NATO’s assets were made available to the WEU, NATO’s capacity to act would not be impaired. Nor would there be two NATO’s: one for implementing requirements of collective defense and one for so-called non-Article 5 operations such as peacekeeping and peace enforcement.

The Berlin Summit prepared requirements and conditions of European defense in cooperation with NATO and WEU. The guiding principles for WEU-NATO cooperation in times of crisis have been set in the Berlin Summit, called as *Berlin-Plus* arrangements. The NATO ministerial Berlin decision in 1996 was designed to build up an effective European pillar of NATO. The main aim of the decision was to facilitate the release of NATO assets and capabilities for operations led by Europeans (in the framework of WEU) including the identification of command arrangements that would be separable but not separate from the NATO military structure.⁴⁹ The WEU and NATO negotiated the framework of conditions for the WEU access to NATO assets and capabilities.⁵⁰

The Berlin and Brussels agreements of June 1996 created the possibility that the WEU might become a militarily effective and sufficient organization, able to conduct Petersberg tasks without impairing the unity of NATO’s structure and

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.18.

⁴⁹ Esther Brimmer, *The EU’s Search for A Strategic Role*, (Washington: Center for Transatlantic Relations Johns Hopk, 2002), p.45.

⁵⁰ There appeared, a distinction between two terms: *assets* and *capabilities*. The distinction between two terms had the following rationale; whereas assets (defined as personnel, headquarters, headquarters elements, units and equipment) were transferred to the control of WEU, capabilities (defined as services such as airborne early warning, information, access to communications) remained under the NATO control.

missions. After Berlin and Brussels, as a result of the NATO's superiority on European security, a concept of *NATO first* developed - although this was never formally declared. The idea beyond this concept was the *separable but not separate* capabilities, assets and support assets to be made available to WEU by the decision of NAC. The decisions of the NAC members provided NATO with first right of refusal and decision to act or not to act.

After the agreements reached at Berlin and Brussels there emerged negotiations between France and the United States about some crucial points. The United States was concerned that a European country, which was not a member of NATO, might join to the WEU because of its membership to the EU. Moreover the US thought that any crisis which erupted in the territories of these states could expose NATO with risks which require multinational intervention by the WEU using NATO assets. Moreover these countries could enter NATO through the back door. Therefore, United States adopted a formal position that any WEU member would also have to be a NATO member, given that EU was embarking on a process of enlargement to include Central Europe. One of the great concerns of US was that, the EU countries which are not members of NATO, (Finland, Sweden, Austria, and Ireland) would be in a position to shape NATO policy and as being WEU member states without sharing responsibilities of the alliance. After Berlin, the question was: could WEU show its determination to engage in crises, and what military operations the European Allies could actually assume within the framework of new WEU/NATO arrangement? These questions caused concerns over some crucial points of WEU-NATO co-operation.

In March 1997 the economic and social situation in Albania degenerated and these circumstances plunged the country into chaos. The impending chaos in Albania threatened to destabilize South-eastern Europe. The chaotic situation in Albania created problems for European security organizations, which have difficulties meeting high expectations in their peacekeeping operations.⁵¹ Europeans were not being able to agree on organizing an intervention under the WEU although it was the best example of the Petersberg type tasks, if it had been done. On 28 March 1997, the United Nations Security Council in resolution 1101 (1997) authorized a multinational military and humanitarian mission in Albania. Instead of WEU force, an Italian led European oriented *coalition of willing* force, which had troops from: Austria, Denmark, Greece, Romania, Spain and Turkey intervened under the name of Operation Alba. This experience showed that WEU did not have enough capabilities to intervene in crisis, even if it was in Europe. Besides, it was accepted that EU did not have a common political will to maintain security in the Europe.

3.1.6. The Treaty of Armstersdam (1997)

As a result of the Inter-Governmental Conference on 16th-17th June 1997, in Amsterdam, EU Heads of State and Government agreed on a revision of the Maastricht Treaty with the implications for the future CFSP of the Union. The main amendments to the CFSP included the areas of redefinition of security and defense responsibilities, institutions, voting procedures and the relations with the WEU.

According to the Treaty, the common strategies are adopted as the strategies to be implemented by the Union in areas where the Member States have important

⁵¹ Marcella Favretto with Tasos Kokkinides, 'Anarchy in Albania, Collapse of European Collective Security System', *Occasional Papers on International Security Policy*, (No 21: 1997) see also in: <http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP21.htm>

interest in common, which are decided upon unanimous vote of the European Council. It is accepted that *common strategies* are the main area of concern for the CFSP of the EU. Moreover, the notions of common position and joint action are defined in the Amsterdam Treaty.

According to the Treaty, the WEU is an integral part of the development of the European Union, providing the Union with access to an operational capability in the context of Berlin, plus arrangements. Accordingly, the WEU should support the EU in framing defense aspects of CFSP. One of the most important decisions of the Treaty is that the EU should foster closer relations with the WEU with a view to the possibility of the integration of the WEU into the EU, if European Council so decide.⁵² The Amsterdam Treaty also states that: ‘The union will avail itself of the WEU to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defense implications.’⁵³

When the EU avails itself of the WEU on the Petersberg tasks, all contributing Member States of the EU will participate fully and on equal footing in planning and decision-making in the WEU. However the integration of the WEU into the EU has not been incorporated in Amsterdam. This was basically due to Britain’s resentment to the full merger of the WEU and EU, supporting NATO as the main forum for security and defense in Europe.

The Amsterdam Treaty made an institutional amendment by appointing a full time director to represent the European Union in CFSP matters. Accordingly, Javier

⁵² Treaty of Amsterdam Amending the Treaty on European Union, 10 November 1997, <http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/amsterdam.html>. (accessed on 11 July 2006)

⁵³ *Ibid.*

Solana, NATO's old General Secretary, was appointed to this position as the High Representative and took office on October 1999. High Representative, who would be the Secretary-General of the Council of Ministers, remained under the custody of the Council. Appointment of High Secretary for CFSP was a positive development in the sense that the troika system was not functioning properly. Europe has gained a single voice, which would speak for Europe as the General Secretary of the Council of Ministers.

3.2. Towards an Autonomous European Defense Architecture: from European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) to European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)

After the Amsterdam Treaty, a structural and ideological change in the idea of European defense architecture began. This change was related to the European Union's willingness to be a political union. On the way to becoming a political union, the EU was aware that, in order to establish independent foreign policy, it had to have an autonomous defense structure. The control and direction of this structure had to be on European Union members. This development more or less should be considered as a challenge to the US (NATO) superiority on defense in the continent. Accordingly a transformation process from European Security and Defense Identity into European Security and Defense Policy had begun.

3.2.1. The Turning Point for European Defense: St. Malo Political Declaration (1998)

Since 1998, Britain's approach to European security was based on anti-federalism and transatlanticism. British anti-federalism can be defined as the

reluctance to strengthen the EU level of governance at the expense of national sovereignty. British transatlanticism is defined as Britain's traditional prioritizing of the United States and NATO over other partners of the EU in security and defense.⁵⁴ Britain acceptance of NATO as the only forum for providing security in Europe lies deeply in transatlanticism. Preeminence of NATO as the indispensable organization for providing European security and pre-eminence of Britain inside NATO is the powerful tenet of Britain's policy toward CFSP. As for Britain, WEU has to play a bridge role between NATO and EU in the formation of CFSP as the second pillar of the EU. An independent European identity could easily impair NATO's effectiveness in the Europe and can unnecessarily duplicate its functions.

In the 1998, a shift and acute policy change in the framework of European security and defense has been observed in Britain. It was unexpected when Britain and France took the initiative to frame a common security and defense policy for the EU, in Saint Malo in 1998. The Saint Malo declaration has been referred to as a turning point in Britain's relationship with European security and defense.

There are several factors which led to the policy change in Britain's attitude towards European security. Firstly, the change in the government in Britain in 1997, from the conservative Major Government to Tony Blair's New Labor marked the beginning of a new area in Britain's relations with Europe. Blair's government shaped its foreign policy as more Europeanist than the previous governments of Britain. The new Labor Party declared in their 1997 elections that their goal was to give Britain leadership in Europe.⁵⁵ Blair's government did not choose to be on one

⁵⁴Marie K. Haugevik , *Strategic Adaptation or Identity Change? An Analysis of Britain's Approach to ESDP 1998-2004*, (Norwegian Institute, 2005) p.3.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p.20.

side, whether American or European, instead he chose to be with both sides. In 1997, Britain was not in the process of Common Monetary Policy of the EU. Although it was not in the process of economic integration, Britain had the potential military assets and capabilities to be a leading state in European security and defense. Accordingly, Blair decided to shape the European security and defense according to his own, and European interests.

Moreover, a French-German rapprochement without Britain in the European defense would be against Britain's interests as it would be anti-Atlanticist. Accordingly, being aware of the importance of US involvement in European security, Britain decided to control the evolution of CFSP with the participation of Germany and France.

Second, the crises in Bosnia, Albania and, then, Kosovo during the middle of the 1990's required the implementation of CFSP by EU in order to sustain and maintain peace in Europe. When the internal conflict in Kosovo deteriorated during the first months of 1998, the experiences from Bosnia put pressure on international society for intervention. Instead of seeing Kosovo as a chance to demonstrate its capabilities as a global actor, the EU was not ready to intervene. Along with the other members of the WEU, Britain decided to take lead in peace efforts. However, it is understood that lack of a Common European security and defense policy and lack of European military capabilities to intervene in crises hindered peace efforts. In the end, the organization was incapable of reaching a common position and unable to intervene, the United States-led coalition took the action in Kosovo, although its legality was in question.

Besides, there were rising concerns in Britain and in the other European Allies regarding the reluctance of US for intervention in crises in Europe. The cost of providing security in Europe was an area of concern and debate during Clinton's administration. Accordingly, Britain began to consider that an enhanced European Military capability, which is different from ESDI and CJTF, should be established by the commitment of EU members.

Thirdly, the process of creating a common security and defense policy had, at this point, already evolved for some time. The Maastricht Treaty included the CFSP as the second pillar of a three pillar system, and the Amsterdam Treaty had further developed the CFSP structures. More importantly, NATO had launched the concept of a ESDI within the structures of organization. The ESDI expressed the United State's acceptance of French sensitivities regarding NATO, as well as American willingness to let Europe take on more responsibility for its own security and defense.⁵⁶ The transatlantic acceptance of the ESDI was the most likely reason for Britain taking such an active part in Saint Malo. It could be understood that the St. Malo initiative did not conflict with British transatlaticism.

For France, the Atlantic Alliance was important to the maintenance of security throughout Europe. France had never sought to destroy the alliance instead it wanted a reform in the structure of NATO as it had benefited enormously from its stabilizing effects. The main reason for reform in the Alliance was the subordination of France and other European Allies when compared to the United States, an idea that had origins in the Gaullist tradition (the President of France during the Cold War Period).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p.21.

He was a proponent of an autonomous European security and defense identity operating separate from America.

French anti-Americanism took many forms during the Cold War, leading to the French withdrawal from the military wing of NATO in 1966. France was the pioneer of the idea of *European Europe* rather than *Atlantic Europe* regarding the European security and defense. Accordingly, France attached utmost importance to the Western European Union for the leading role Europe had to play in European security and defense during the Cold War.

France supported the intergovernmental approach in matters relating to the European security within which it could insert national preferences inside. The United States also supported the idea of intergovernmentalism. Unanimous approval of member states on decision-making led the US to have an influence over decisions. This approach guarantees that EU decisions, taken in security and defense, would be blocked in case they are against national interest. This could guarantee that EU decisions taken in security and defense would be blocked whenever they are against national interest of the member states.

After the end of the Cold War, a revision in French foreign policy regarding the European security had been observed. It was adopted as the adaptation of French foreign policy according to the necessities of 1990s in which US hegemony in economics and politics was apparent. In cases of the Bosnia and Kosovo crisis erupting in Europe, France thought that only NATO had the operational capability and political power to be able to intervene in crisis and sustain security in Europe. Accordingly, a rapprochement with NATO under the leadership of French President

Chirac came into agenda. However a *separate and separable* ESDI different from the NATO view, was maintained by France. In contrary to its' beliefs, France was aware of the inadequate capability and political unwillingness of WEU concerning European security and called for the need for a merger between WEU and EU. It was hard for Member States of the EU to invest in defense to operationalise Western European Union besides their national defense requirements. Accordingly, creation of a European security forum under the umbrella of the EU framework as the second pillar (under the CFSP) of EU would be better in establishing autonomous European security and defense identity.

As a result of the developments of the time, pioneers of two different approaches: Atlanticist Britain and Europeanist France decided to co-operate with European security and defense without subordinating their national pre-requisites. All of the ideas about cooperation between France and Britain culminated in the Saint Malo political declaration in December 1998. The Heads of State and Government of France and the United Kingdom are agreed that:

..the European Union needs to be in a position to play its full role on the international stage. It will be important to achieve full and rapid implementation of the Amsterdam provisions on CFSP. This includes the responsibility of the European Council to decide on the progressive framing of a common defense policy in the framework of CFSP.⁵⁷

As seen in the paragraph, the declaration starts with European Union's long lasting desire to be leading actor in international scene. European Union prioritizes the defense as a prerequisite for the formation of a political union rather than as a hindrance on economic integration. Establishment of an autonomous European

⁵⁷ Franco-British Summit Joint Declaration on European Defense, <http://www.atlanticcommunity.org/Saint-Malo%20Declaration%20Text.html>. (accessed on 20 July 2006)

security and defense mechanism inside European Union, concerning European security and defense matters in parallel with CFSP, was one of the objectives of declaration. Projecting a European security and defense project was accepted to be intergovernmental basis prioritizing member states' having full control over decisions. An intergovernmental approach was seen as the most appropriate way in the process of political integration of the Union.

Another paragraph in the declaration states that: to this end, the Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so in order to respond to international crises.⁵⁸

This statement is the most important part of the St. Malo declaration because of the intention to have *capacity for autonomous action* inside the Union. Until the St. Malo political declaration several arrangements were made concerning European security. The First arrangement was to enliven WEU by giving responsibilities and rights over European defense under the CFSP. The second was the establishment of ESDI inside NATO letting Europeans recourse to military assets and capabilities of NATO. These arrangements could not be operationalised effectively because of the inadequacies of WEU and the institutional difficulties of NATO. At the end, it is concluded that EU had to have autonomous military capabilities backed up by military forces, which could be used for emerging crisis appearing in Europe. By this statement, European Union showed its intent to build up ESDP in which EU has control over foreign policy and security matters.

It is evident that Britain and France didn't use the term *independence* in place of the term *autonomous* in the declaration. An independent military identity would

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

mean to be a split of the Alliance as the Europeanist and Atlanticist. Accordingly, autonomous action is emphasized which could take political decisions and to have a military capacity to intervene in times of crises.

At first, St. Malo process was understood as a call for speeding up the process of implementing what had been argued at the June 1997 Amsterdam EU Summit on CFSP, including the progressive framing of common defense policy. However, although it has no obligatory status as a political declaration, the St. Malo declaration started a new process with the decision to form an autonomous European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). Transformation of ESDI within NATO into autonomous ESDP was aimed to provide Union with autonomous political decision-making and operational capability, which is deemed to be a condition of a political union. At the same time, in the St. Malo declaration it is stated that:

..in order for European Union to take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged, the Union must be given appropriate structures and capacity for analysis of situations, sources of intelligence, and a capability for relevant strategic planning, without unnecessary duplication, taking into account of existing assets of WEU and the evolution of its relations with EU.⁵⁹

For the first time, the possibility of European military action outside of NATO framework is declared. Britain and France are well aware that in times of crises in Europe, a militarily capable EU outside NATO framework would be more appropriate. However, as declared in the statement, the United States had the *first right of refusal* in times of crises which force Europeans to make coordination with the US for consultation and exchange of ideas. In times of crises where Alliance as a whole is not engaged, an EU-led military operation came into agenda which recourse to NATO assets and capabilities with the decision of NAC. Accordingly, whether

⁵⁹Hunter, *op cit.*, p.31.

Alliance engaged or not, European Union was dependent on US in implementing ESDP.

In the declaration it is stated that, different situations of countries in relation to NATO must be respected. NATO had sixteen allies and was preparing for the fifth enlargement, including: Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as new members. WEU had 28 members, ten of which are full members (also members of the European Union). There were three non-EU NATO members (Turkey, Norway and Iceland), which are known as associate members of WEU. There were also four non-NATO EU members (Austria, Sweden, Finland and Ireland) and Denmark which had opted out from the defense dimension of the CFSP, all with *observer* status. There were also seven EU/NATO accession candidates from Central and Eastern Europe known as the *associate partners* in the structure of the WEU. The Saint Malo process would cause significant changes against non-EU members of WEU, which aimed to transform WEU into the European Union under the CFSP.

3.2.2. The Washington Summit (1999)-NATO's New Strategic Concept

After the St. Malo declaration, the negotiations about European security and defense continued between NATO and WEU. In the NATO's Washington Summit in April 1999, the Allies acknowledged the EU's resolve to have the capacity for autonomous action so that it can take decisions and approve military action where the alliance as a whole is not engaged. NATO created its Strategic Concept and in this framework by always supporting development of ESDI. It is commonly agreed that ESDI should continue to be developed inside NATO framework. Accordingly in Washington Summit of NATO, it is stated that,

Alliance will assist the European Allies to act by themselves as required through readiness of the Alliance, on a case by case basis and by consensus, to make its assets and capabilities available for operations in which Alliance is not engaged militarily under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or otherwise agreed.⁶⁰

What is spelled out in the paragraph is that NATO wanted to see ESDI to be built within the Alliance. In the NATO documents, *ESDI within the Alliance* saying about WEU-NATO cooperation was intentionally used especially after the St. Malo declaration. The reason behind this was the European Union's insistence to provide European security through the development of an autonomous ESDP rather than ESDI inside the Alliance.

In the Washington Summit a message was sent to EU members and European Allies to take necessary steps to strengthen their defense capabilities: avoiding unnecessary duplication. Showing NATO's confidence for ESDI (within Alliance) it is stated that: 'NATO will adopt necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance, for operations in which Alliance, as a whole is not engaged militarily.'⁶¹ Here NATO acknowledged that the European agent for operating ESDI would be EU rather than WEU. This shows NATO acceptance of the transformation of the WEU into the European Union. In the summit the assured access to NATO planning capabilities ability to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations was decided. This new arrangement between NATO and ESDI came to be known as *Berlin-plus* which reaffirmed NATO primacy in terms of actual military action is acknowledging that there would be no unnecessary duplication.⁶² In this summit separable, but not separate military

⁶⁰ NATO Washington Summit Communique Press Release, 24 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm>. (accessed on 23 August 2006)

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Hunter, *op cit.*, p.54.

capabilities in which non-EU NATO members can be engaged is emphasized for ESDI. It is commonly said that EU would operate only where NATO forces were not be engaged militarily.

In the Washington summit NATO acknowledged the autonomous EU action through precisely defining what that term meant. However, NATO emphasized the difference between *assured* access to NATO planning and *presumption* of access to NATO capabilities and assets. NATO emphasized the importance of NAC decisions in times of the Berlin plus arrangements in which WEU recourse to Alliance's assets and capabilities. Here the differentiation lies in the interpretation of the wording. Assured access to NATO assets and capabilities could not be thought to be a reality in the framework of the Berlin plus arrangement because of the Alliance's first right of intervention.

3.2.3. The Cologne European Council (3-4 June 1999)

The Kosovo conflict opened the way to a rapid Europeanization of the St. Malo agreement. The German Presidency worked on transforming bilateral initiative into a European reality and changing the European defense *identity* into a European security and defense *policy*.⁶³

It is commonly shared among the EU members that the EU had not pulled its weight in the air war against Serbia in the Kosovo war. This fact raised some principle issues concerning EU members. Firstly, the short-fall in European military high-technology prevents EU in action which shows lackness of EU military capabilities. Secondly, after the NATO intervention into Kosovo, there appeared some irritation

⁶³ European Defense from St. Malo to Copenhagen, *Chailot Papers* (Paris: 2004), p.47.

about the way NATO intervened, that the US had been calling most of the shots in the conflict without proportional methods, according to the law of armed conflict.

In the midst of the Kosovo conflict, the European council met at the head and government level at Cologne in 3-4 June 1999. At the summit member states decided that:

..that the European Union shall play its full role on the international stage. To that end, we intend to give European Union the necessary means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding common European policy on security and defense. The Union must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to the international crises without prejudice to actions by NATO.⁶⁴

In Cologne, NATO's primacy was absent and there was nothing about building ESDI/ESDP within NATO (only where NATO was not engaged). One of the most important phrases of Cologne was the Union's determination to intervene in crisis without prejudice to actions by NATO. It was a deliberate effort to change the formulation of NATO's role that had worked out in Washington Summit.

At Cologne, the emphasis was placed in particular on '*assured* access to planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations and on presumption of availability of the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations.'⁶⁵ The Cologne European Council Declaration put forward two alternative ways within which the EU could implement Petersberg tasks. Firstly: EU-led operations with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities in accordance with the Berlin decisions of 1996; secondly, EU-led

⁶⁴ European Council Declaration Cologne, 3-4 June 1999, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/kol2_en.htm. (accessed on 2 September 2006)

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities.⁶⁶ While in the first alternative, decisions regarding the operations have to be made through the involvement of the NATO members in the North Atlantic Council. In the second alternative, as there would be no recourse to NATO assets, the decision to engage, conduct and end an EU-led operation would be made by the EU Council. That meant that the EU could undertake operations without participation of the NATO members.⁶⁷ In the EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, the EU could use national or multi-national European means, pre-identified by member states. However, further arrangements to enhance the capacity of existing command structures and European multinational forces to respond in crisis situations are needed.

After Cologne the United States appeared to believe that EU had broken trust. At the Royal institute of International Affairs in London, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott expressed US governments fear. The United States would not want to see ESDI that comes first within NATO, but then grows out of NATO and finally grows away from NATO, since it would lead to an ESDI that initially duplicates but than could eventually compete with NATO.⁶⁸

The European Union's efforts to undermine primacy of NATO in times of crises were not welcomed by the United States. Accordingly US view was that the EU should make it clear that it would undertake an autonomous mission only after NATO had declined to undertake mission. Besides, United States wanted to see improved military capabilities, not new institutions outside of the Alliance, as the key capabilities and more influential within NATO. According to the United States, the

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Ramazan Gözen, *Turkey's Delicate Position between NATO and ESDP*, (Ankara: SAM Papers No.1,2003), p.65.

⁶⁸ Hunter, *op cit.*, p.54.

non-EU NATO members should not be discriminated against but should be fully involved when the European Union addresses issues affecting their security interest. In sum, the European Union's opinion to undertake political and security matters only with the contribution of EU members under the ESDP was criticized by the United States. The main reason behind this criticism was the net result of expelling NATO members out of European security in which the countries have interest.

3.2.4. The Helsinki European Council and Headline Goals (10-11 December 1999)

The developments over ESDP developed with the Helsinki European Council meeting in December 1999. The most important innovation at Helsinki, following a proposal by Prime Minister Blair and President Chirac, was the setting of a *Headline Goal* to create, by 2003, a capacity to deploy and sustain forces able to pursue the full range of Petersberg Tasks, including the most demanding, in operations up to corps level (up to 15 brigades or 50,000–60,000 persons) with provisions for support and rotation, in excess of 200,000 persons all told.⁶⁹ The force should be 'militarily self-sustaining and have all command and support services needed; it should be deployable within 60 days and be sustainable for at least a year.'⁷⁰ To make this Headline Goal Task Force possible, the EU decided to create a wide range of command, control, intelligence and strategic support capabilities and assets.

Furthermore, the European Council decided to create new permanent political and military bodies within the European Council in order to make ESDP operational

⁶⁹ Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusions, 10-11 December 1999, 'Common European Policy on Security and Defence', http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec99/dec99_en.htm. (accessed on 14 September 2006)

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

in all phases and aspects of crisis management. Accordingly, new institutional structure of ESDP which are responsible for planning and implementation of foreign policy and security decisions, created by European Council. These bodies are:

- a) A standing Political and Security Committee in Brussels, including national representatives at senior/ambassador level,
- b) The military committee of chiefs of defense, represented by military delegates,
- c) The military staff to provide military expertise and support to European Security and Defense Policy.⁷¹

In Helsinki, the EU's High Representative of the CFSP was appointed as the Secretary General of the WEU. This event can be understood as a step towards the WEU's being absorbed within the European Union, as envisioned by the Amsterdam Treaty. The appointment of Javier Solana to this position was significant in the sense that he had been serving, until assuming his new duties (October 1999) as NATO's Secretary General. This meant that EU's new establishment in CFSP should not be totally different from NATO's.

EU's efforts to create a *functioning of ESDP* naturally increased the intensity of US concerns about the WEU-NATO cooperation on European defense. The developments in Helsinki raised common concern in the US about: could there be the prospect of creation for a second European based integrated military command structure? Decision to establish a Headline Goal Task Force, which gained popular name as *rapid reaction force* was seen as a way toward formation of European army under the ESDP. But from the NATO's standpoint, this force could not be a competitor for NATO. The goal of up to 60.000 people could not be seen as producing a competitor for NATO at any serious military task, even factoring in the added support elements and forces that would have to be available for rotation over

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

deployment period of up to a year.⁷² Therefore, it is thought that the European Rapid reaction force could not hope to undertake a complex NATO operation and it would be always be dependent on NATO assets and capabilities.

Another issue was also immediately introduced. If the Europeans were engaged in an operation with such complex institutional arrangements; how easily and effectively could they hand over operations to NATO, when military escalation required a more capable and robust military organization take-over?⁷³ The criticisms centered upon the ineffectiveness of the European Rapid Reaction Force to undertake Petersberg Tasks. Besides, the US thought that in the establishment of the European Rapid Reaction Force, it will cause unnecessary duplication because; in the escalation of the crisis EU would choose inevitably to recourse to NATO.

However the Helsinki documents could be read from a different perspective. As a regional organization, the European Union, had rights to establish a military force which could intervene in crisis in Europe without waiting for an escalation of conflict or recourse to other military organizations. The Kosovo conflict is a pure example of the European Union's inability to intervene in crises in its region. In the formation of European Security and Defense Policy, the EU decided to create wide range of command, control, intelligence and strategic support capabilities and asset and an interoperable Rapid Reaction Force.

In Helsinki European Council, EU-NATO cooperation was also emphasized by necessary dialogue, consultation and cooperation with NATO and its non-EU members. The EU states agreed to define 'appropriate arrangements that would allow non-EU European members and other interested states to contribute to EU military

⁷² Hunter, *op cit.*, p.67.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p.68.

crisis management.’⁷⁴ EU-NATO cooperation with European security was very significant in the sense that European security and defense was dependent on NATO’s support. However these statements about EU-NATO cooperation were short of US expectations. In Helsinki it is stated that, ‘dialogue, consultation and cooperation would be done with full respect for decision-making autonomy of the EU.’⁷⁵ In Helsinki the position of non-EU European NATO members were stated as follows:

The EU did decide that the non-EU European NATO members, after a decision of by the Council to launch an operation could participate if they wish so: and states that were willing to deploy significant military forces in an EU-led operation would have the same rights and obligations as the EU participating Member States in day to day conduct of an operation. The right of participation by non-EU European NATO members would apply only in the event of an operation requiring NATO assets and capabilities. But in operations where the EU does not use NATO assets these countries would have to be invited on a decision by the Council.⁷⁶

The positions of non-EU European NATO members are dependent on the type of the operation and whether NATO assets were used or not. The relations between NATO and EU/ESDP started to focus on the new areas with the Helsinki Summit. Firstly, some sort of competitor for NATO integrated military structure could be developing with the formation of ESDP; secondly so much effort would be put into creating ESDP structures that the necessary political will and resources would not be put into building up European defense capabilities, well and interoperable with NATO; thirdly the qualifier *unnecessary* of the word *duplication* might be lost sight as Europeans sought

⁷⁴ Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusions. (accessed on 25 September 2006)

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Helsinki European Council, Presidency Conclusions, 10-11 December 1999, ‘Consultation and Cooperation with Non-EU Countries and with NATO’ , http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec99/dec99_en.htm (accessed on 25 September 2006)

to create structures that would focus on capacities that would not in fact add to the sum of allied military strength.⁷⁷

Despite the number of efforts, the EU will need NATO resources for several reasons. Firstly, most of the EU member states' assets and capabilities are assigned to NATO. In establishing ESDP their assets and capabilities have to be double-hat. Secondly, construction of similar military capabilities would cause duplication. Therefore, the EU will have to use NATO assets and capabilities for autonomous, EU-led Petersberg type operations.⁷⁸

3.2.5. Santa Maria de Feira Position of Non-EU Allies (19-20 June 2000)

After the initiatives undertaken at Helsinki, by the time of European Council summit at Santa Maria de Feira (June 19-20, 2000); the EU took new decisions regarding ESDP's military crisis management capability as well as civilian and the ESDP's relations to the third parties in Europe (NATO members and candidates to join the EU). Throughout the Portuguese Presidency Report to the Council, the decision-making autonomy of the EU was also emphasized.

Regarding ESDP's relationship to the third parties, the EU at Santa Maria de Feira set out a number of formal processes and institutional arrangements. Accordingly, in the Feira the intention of the EU to make consultation and participation with the non-EU European NATO members and other countries who are candidates for accession on EU-led crisis management is emphasized. Accordingly, a

⁷⁷ Hunter, *op cit.*, p 71.

⁷⁸ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.64.

foundation of single inclusive structure in which all 15 countries⁷⁹ concerned (the non-EU European NATO members and the candidates for accession to the EU) can undertake cooperation and consultation. In the Feira, it is stated that, ‘there will, within this structure, be exchanges with the non-EU European NATO members where the subject matter requires it, such as questions concerning the nature and functioning of EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities.’⁸⁰ In order to implement permanent consultation and cooperation, a minimum of two meetings in EU+15 format was planned to be organized in each Presidency on ESDP matters. These meetings were thought to supplement the meetings held as part of the reinforced political dialogue on CFSP matters. Within this framework, it is decided that ‘a minimum of two meetings will be organized with the six non-EU European NATO members (in EU+6 format) in each Presidency’⁸¹. Additional exchanges are planned to be organized if the need arises upon decision by the Council or the IPSC.⁸²

For the *permanent phase* of ESDP, there would be EU+15 and EU+6 meetings during any *routine phase*, when there was no crisis to be considered. During an *operational phase*, the non-EU European NATO members could take part in decision-making when EU wanted to use NATO assets and capabilities. But they would have to be invited by the Council to take part when the EU does not use NATO assets.⁸³

⁷⁹ The 15 countries are non-EU European NATO members (Turkey, Norway, Iceland, Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic) and the candidate countries (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic*, Estonia, Hungary*, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland*, Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania, Turkey*), “*” refers to the duplicate countries.

⁸⁰ Santa Maria da Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, June 19–20, 2000, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/fei1_en.htm - 56k. (accessed on 27 September 2006)

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*

Every country taking part in operation be deploying significant military forces will have the same rights and obligations as the EU participating Member States in the day to day conduct of operation.

In the Feira, the EU wanted to imply that non-EU European NATO members are ensured participation only if NATO assets and capabilities were used. In the document there is not any decision regarding cooperation and consultation with United States or Canada. The message given by EU was clear. EU/ESDP started to take full control in decision making of ESDP and any consultations would be with Europeans but not with the transatlantic world.

Besides, in the Feira, the European Union initiated a process aiming to improve EU objectives in the field of military capabilities in coordination with the countries which are non-EU European NATO members. This initiative was called as Defense Capabilities Initiative (DCI). The method chosen was to propose to NATO four *ad hoc* working groups on security issues, capabilities goals, and modalities enabling EU access to NATO assets and capabilities and the definition of permanent arrangements for EU-NATO consultation.⁸⁴ This initiative was very much focused on what the EU would want and expect from NATO, as well as on the means for the EU's control over its own processes, especially in regard to the non-EU NATO members.

As the EU Council terminated the role of WEU, the EU asked NATO to develop cooperation between two organizations to replace old mechanisms. DCI was the main result of this initiative to coordinate between NATO and EU. In this respect, the EU approached NATO in order to benefit from the Alliance's assets and capabilities as

⁸⁴ Hunter, *op cit.*, p.89.

well as from its force planning expertise at the military/technical level for the materialization of the EU Headline Goal.⁸⁵

After Feira, the agenda of the ESDP continued to be cooperation and consultation with NATO at four *ad hoc* working groups. The EU is thought to be very close to defining its proposals on cooperation with NATO and building up formal contacts. Another topical issue over European defense was the decision to grant formal commitments by EU member states to Headline Goal Task Force. For that reason, on November 20th, Capabilities Commitments Conference of EU Defense Ministers took place in Brussels. This resulted in creation of a *Force Catalogue* providing for a pool of more than 100,000 persons and approximately 400 combat aircraft and 100 vessels which was planned to be used in the Petersberg Tasks.⁸⁶ This Catalogue included contributions from 14 of the 15 EU states (Denmark did not take part). In line with the decisions made at the Helsinki and Feira European Councils, member states at the Capabilities Commitment Conference pledged to supply, on a voluntary basis, national contributions to meeting the rapid reaction capability identified for the achievement of the Headline Goal.⁸⁷

At the Capabilities Commitments Conference, Turkey informed fifteen EU member states that it was prepared to offer to the future rapid reaction force some 5000 troops; showing its intention to take part in European Security and Defense Policy. The *analysis* of the Force Catalogue showed that by 2003 the EU would be able to carry out the full range of Petersberg tasks.

⁸⁵ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.66.

⁸⁶ Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration Brussels, November 20, 2000, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Military%20Capabilities%20Commitment%20Declaration.pdf>. (accessed on 28 September 2006)

⁸⁷ Hunter, *op cit.*, p.94.

At the Feira meeting, member states also agreed to provide, by 2003, up to 5,000 police personnel, including 1,000 to be deployed within 30 days, for conflict prevention and crisis management operations. A Police Capabilities Commitment Conference was held in November 2001.

3.2.6. From Nice to Leaken: Operationalization of the European Security and Defense Policy

On 7th-10th December, the Nice European Council Summit took place. In this summit, the EU took decisions to *develop* institutions for ESDP which designed to assume the EU's responsibilities in crisis management. As a result, the efforts are concentrated on elaboration of the Political and Security Committee (PSC), and the Military Committee of the European Union (EUMC), and the Military Staff of the European Union (EUMS). The compositions, structures, duties and operations of each institution were spelled out in a great detail.

Adopting the developments undertaken in the Capabilities Commitments Conference, Nice also signaled member states' determination to make necessary efforts to improve their operational capabilities further. The areas which take priority were: command and control, intelligence and strategic air and naval transport capabilities. These areas were under the Berlin-plus, for which the Europeans would have to rely heavily on NATO.

In Nice EU laid heavily on what NATO could provide for EU operations. During the Nice Summit, the EU Council requested *permanent arrangements* from NATO in the light of NATO-EU cooperation and consultation on the implementation of Paragraph 10 of the Washington Summit Communiqué of 1999. In the Nice

Summit, it was decided that the arrangements between two organizations for the implementation of Berlin Plus should be as follows:

- a) The European Union will have guaranteed permanent access⁸⁸ to NATO's planning capabilities,
- b) Presumption of availability of pre-identified assets and capabilities,
- c) Identification of series of command options made available to the EU.⁸⁹

Indeed, in one of the complex annexes to the Nice *Presidency Conclusions*, the EU member states clearly drew a distinction between situations where NATO assets and capabilities would be involved and where they would not. In the former instance, operational planning will be carried out by the Alliance's planning bodies, but for an autonomous EU operation it will be carried out within one of the European strategic level headquarters.⁹⁰ In the former case, non-EU European allies would be involved in planning according to NATO procedures. But in the latter case, where these non-EU NATO allies are invited to take part, they (and candidates to join the EU) could send 'liaison officers for exchanges of information on operational planning and the contributions [by them] envisaged.'⁹¹

ESDP planning formulation at Nice also had particular implications for non-EU NATO members, of which Turkey was most concerned and most vocal. By the same logic as that above, the decision about whether a country like Turkey was to be engaged in an EU-led operation would come relatively late in the day, in terms of the overall process. Thus:

⁸⁸ In the Cologne European Council Declaration it had been worded as assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations.

⁸⁹ Nice European Council Presidency Conclusions, December 7–9, 2000, Annex VI European Security and Defence Policy, http://www.ec.europa.eu/nice_council/index_en.htm (accessed on 28 September 2006)

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

Once the EU begins to examine in depth an option requiring the use of NATO assets and capabilities, particular attention will be paid to consultation of the six non-EU European NATO members. Furthermore, it would only be after, the Council has chosen the strategic military option(s) [that] the operational planning work will be presented to the non-EU European NATO members . . . to enable them to determine the nature and volume of the contribution they could make.⁹²

As noted in the Nice Document, in the operational phase the non-EU European Members have no voice in building up military options. Rather the military options were presented to these states. Although the EU demanded full respect to its autonomous organization as different from NATO, it was seeking military assistance from NATO. In other words, non-EU European NATO members were asked for military participation and contribution to the EU-led operations but denied political participation and contribution to the decision-making side of the EU-led operations.

When the non-EU European Members or States Candidates for membership were invited to an operation they would be able to take part in a committee of Contributors in day to day management of operations. However Political and Security Committee has the direct control and strategic direction of an EU-led operation. Therefore it is decided that, the PSC would take into account the views expressed by the Committee of Contributors.

These developments did not satisfy Turkey like other non-European NATO members. Without full engagement in what EU was doing, Turkey would find itself in a position where operations were being conducted in a region affecting its interests, but without its active participation in all phases (preoperational and operational). Accordingly, at the NATO foreign ministers' meeting in Brussels on 14th-15th December 2000, Turkey placed a *hold on* for the development of

⁹² *Ibid*, Operational Phase

cooperative arrangements between NATO and EU being a member of North Atlantic Council. *Hold on* came after a wide range of arrangements were agreed upon and pledges made about complementing permanent arrangements between NATO and EU. Hold on of Turkey was seen as an impediment for the operationalization of ESDP as Turkey vetoed EU's assured access to the NATO's assets and capabilities.

During the spring of 2001, NATO and EU tried to find ways of resolving the outstanding issues, although they were handicapped in part by the hold on (veto on NAC). Meanwhile, Britain was the most active country in trying to find a solution to compromise. The non-EU European NATO members' role in the formation of ESDP was a concern for Turkey and Norway both being NATO members. As a result of the negotiations, it was agreed formally that the Committee of Contributors would work by consensus and EU's Political and Security Committee would rely on what the Committee of Contributors decided when the interests of any non-EU NATO member was involved.⁹³ Accordingly there would be no operations without this consensus. However the final agreement foundered just before May 2001 of meeting of NAC.

On May 29th, the Budapest meeting of NATO Foreign ministers, the Allies formally recognized what had been achieved. They stressed a number of areas in which there had been significant progress and not regarding the concerns of Turkey and Norway (to a lesser extent). The success areas of EU were: EU assured access to NATO operational planning, presumed availability of NATO assets, identification of EU command options including developing the role of Deputy Supreme Allied Commander (DSACEUR) in order for him to assume fully and effectively his

⁹³ Hunter, *op cit.*, p.126.

European responsibilities. However, Turkey and Norway sought greater assurances about their role in ESDP consultative process and continue to have doubts as to whether these arrangements were adequate for their participation in ESDP.

On June 15th-16th, the European Council gathered in Göteborg. Göteborg European Council took steps to promote ESDP's military capabilities. It is stated that, by 2003 the EU would be able to deploy rapidly and sustainable forces capable of the full of Petersberg Tasks, including the most demanding. The Council approved an EU *Exercise Policy* which would identify EU requirements for and categories of exercises including joint exercises with NATO from 2001 to 2006. Exercise Policy should be thought to be a step on the way to operationalization of ESDP. Also, at the Göteborg European Council meeting of June 2001, the following set of targets were identified; up to 200 experts of the rule of law (such as judges); a pool of experts for civilian administration; and the availability of civil protection intervention teams of up to 2,000 on short notice. A Rule of Law Capabilities Commitment Conference was held in May 2002.

These developments paved the way for decisions that would be taken in European Council at Laeken on December 2001. Laeken decisions' objective was to make EU/ESDP quickly operational: in other words the operational capacity of the EU crisis management organs.

CHAPTER 4
TURKEY'S POSITION ON EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE
POLICY

4.1. Turkey's Contributions to European Security in the Post Cold War

After the Cold War, Turkey found itself in an unstable and difficult international security environment, stretching from the Balkans to the Mediterranean, Central and Eastern Europe, the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia. Turkey's security position had been deeply affected since the bipolar structure of the Cold War era had been collapsed. Unlike the Cold War, the new security environment has brought new opportunities and challenges and even risks for Turkish security and foreign policy.

As a result, at the end of the Cold War, Turkey's security position changed fundamentally from being at the south-eastern flank of NATO to the heart of the new security environment. Unlike the Cold War, Turkey's security concerns increased, its security burden became overloaded because of the rising of ethnic disputes and instabilities inherited from the Cold War. Turkey's security is influenced more by the soft security issues surrounding Turkey than by the existence of a direct military attack by an enemy.⁹⁴ The soft security issues such as; terrorism, ethnic nationalism, social and economic instabilities, refugees, weapons of mass destruction, occupied Turkey's security agenda more than ever before.

Turkey dealt with different levels of actors in trying to handle security problems; such as international, inter-state, domestic/national and individual levels. At the international level, power politics among international organizations like EU

⁹⁴Gözen, *op cit.*, p.27.

and NATO, Russia, and other powers directly affect Turkey's security. At the interstate level bilateral relations with regional countries such as Greece, Syria, Iran, and Iraq, directly affect Turkey's security as well. Challenges from terrorist organizations would be the concern of national security. Finally Turkey has had a deteriorating Human Rights record due to growing number of applications made by ethnic, religious and other individuals to the European court of Human Rights in the 1990s.

At the time of change, 16 potential crisis regions were appointed to be common concern areas for Euro-Asian security. Most of the crisis points were situated around Turkey. These areas are; Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sandjak, Kosovo, Albania, Macedonia, Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan, Chechnya, and Abkhazia in Georgia-South Osetia, Northern Iraq, Iran, Syria, Cyprus, Vojvodina, Privilaka and Belarus. It has been pointed out that 13 of them are an area of concern for Turkey. Moreover, some of these areas were blown out on a great scale during the 1990s.

Although there is instability in these regions, they should not be considered as a direct threat to European security architecture. However in case of a crisis erupted in any of these hot spots, Turkey's security could be affected severely. Regional security should be the aim of the European Union in the era of enlargement eastwards and in trying to build a European zone of influence. Accordingly, these hot spots should be taken into consideration by the EU as a threat to regional stability.

During the Cold War NATO was the most powerful international security platform for maintenance of Turkey's security order. In the new area, although it is still the most important one, there emerged new organizations with new security agendas in addition to NATO. Accordingly, Turkey paid close attention to every international organization which has a say in European security. These organizations are; OSCE, the WEU and the EU. Turkey does not want to be out of any

international organization whose activities may have implications for Turkish security and defense policy.

Turkey's position in the European security architecture has been very important since the beginning of the Cold War. The main reason behind this is that, Turkey's connection with European security architecture had several roots which consists many international actors. Turkey's connection with developing European security architecture has three channels and dimensions. Firstly, as a full member of NATO since 1952, Turkey is at the centre of the European and Euro-Atlantic security architecture through NATO. Secondly, having started negotiations for the EU membership and being an associate member of WEU; Turkey is at the midway of the newly emerging European security architecture. Thirdly, Turkey has been put out of the European security architecture because of its marginal position in decision-making bodies of ESDP.

4.1.1. Turkey's Position in NATO

Turkey became a part of Euro-Atlantic security architecture when it became a full member of NATO on the 18th February 1952. This made Turkey automatically a part of the Western European security system. When Turkey became a member of NATO, its security and defense policy had been designed according to Alliance⁹⁵ commitments during and after the Cold War. There were reciprocal interests and benefits between Turkey and NATO. While Turkey contributed to European security and defense by being a part of the Western World in various ways, the Europeans as well as the United States promised to secure Turkey's territorial integrity against the

⁹⁵ *Alliance* used in the same meaning with NATO

Soviet threat through NATO. The Western security umbrella through NATO maintained security in Europe during the Cold War era.

After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, there appeared arguments that NATO had lost its *raison d'être* as it founded as a collective defense organization against Soviet threat. As a NATO member, Turkey was also thought to be losing its importance and position for European security. However, it is evident that neither NATO nor Turkey had lost its importance for European security because NATO had adapted itself to the new security environment in the post Cold War era. NATO had transformed itself from being purely a territorial collective defense organization into a collective security organization stretching from the Atlantic into Asia. Turkey continued to be a close member of NATO in the new security environment just as NATO appreciated Turkey's contribution to the construction of security order in Europe.

When we look from Turkey's point of view, the importance of NATO for Turkey's security can be summed up in two headings. Firstly, NATO has been the backbone of Turkey's security and defense policy since 1952.⁹⁶ This was the case during the Cold War and continues to be in the new area. In the post Cold War era, much instability appeared around Turkey which were inherited from the Cold War. Accordingly, for Turkey, NATO membership guaranteed Turkey's its stability and security in the unstable and turbulent geopolitical location. Secondly, being the most powerful international security organization, NATO provides a political and security identity for Turkey in international politics. NATO is an international security platform for Turkey to express its views and pursue its national interests in a rather critical region. Building up strong relations with European and transatlantic countries

⁹⁶ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.31.

under the framework of NATO enabled Turkey to influence international developments in the region. Most importantly, because of NATO's intergovernmental decision-making structure in which each member has a veto power in the NAC, Turkey has a strong voice on European security.

Especially after adoption of *Strategic Concept*, NATO's focus on security and defense directed towards Turkey and its environment requiring close relations and coordination with Turkey. As NATO's former Secretary, General Javier Solana, stated: 'Turkey, as an active and valued member of the Alliance, has contributed to the shaping of [NATO's] common security. Its proximity in Balkans, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Middle East and Mediterranean puts Turkey at the epicenter of change.'⁹⁷

Turkey played an active role in international peacekeeping operations in the framework of UN and NATO, for the promotion of peace, security and stability in the region. The UN Operation Force in Somalia (1992-1994), the UN Protection Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1993-1995), the Implementation and Stabilization Force in Bosnia (1996-present), the UN Preventive Deployment Force in Macedonia (1995-present), Operation Alba in Albania (1997), the Kosovo Verification Force (1998-1999) and the Kosovo Force (2001-present)⁹⁸ are the most important international peacekeeping missions to which Turkey has contributed. The Turkish Armed forces participated in and lead in the ISAF forces deployed for the purpose of the reconstruction of Afghanistan after September 11th, 2001. All these peace support operations in several areas surrounding Turkey prove that the Turkish

⁹⁷ Javier Solana 'NATO in the Twenty-First Century', *Perceptions*, (Vol.4, No.1, March-May 1999), p.21.

⁹⁸ Turkish General Staff, PfP Training Centre Course Guide , (Ankara, 2001)

Military Forces had an active role in non-Article 5 operations under the mandate of UN and NATO.

If NATO were the only organization for constructing security in Europe, Turkey's position in European security architecture would be stable. But as we mentioned the EU's quest for building a security and defense body in complement to NATO in Europe closely concerns Turkey as it was not a full member of EU. Being out of European security architecture because of EU membership would be in contrary to Turkey's security interests in Europe.

4.1.2. Turkey's Position in the EU/WEU

The developments achieved in the European security order in the framework of EU are closely related to Turkey. Turkey had historical relationships with European Union. Turkey wishes to have a full integration with the EU's economic, political and legal structures and becoming a full member of European Union in which democracy, market economy, human rights and pluralism are prevalent. Being part in the process of EU membership since 1964 and having finalized the *Custom Union* in 1996, Turkey has been getting closer to the European Union. At the EU Helsinki Summit, (1999) Turkey was accepted as one of the 13 candidate countries for EU membership. After that, Turkey and the EU took important steps in Turkey's preparation for full membership. In reply to the EU's demands in the Accession Partnership Document of December 2000 to initiate and enact reforms in several areas, Turkey presented its National Program in 2001. In this program, Turkey agreed to implement several reforms in order to fulfill the Copenhagen criteria.

Besides, Turkey rightfully wishes to have full integration with developing security, defense and foreign policy pillar of the EU. Turkey participated in the

construction of security and defense identity within the framework of the Common, Foreign and Security Policy of the Union as the second pillar⁹⁹ of EU integration as stated in Maastricht Treaty. Just like its application for EU membership, Turkey applied for full membership to the WEU in 1991. But similar to the response given to Turkey's application for full membership in the EU, Turkey was offered an Associate Membership, a position parallel to EU membership level. The EU decided that full membership in the WEU would be contingent upon the Turkey's full membership of European Union.

Turkey became an Associate member of WEU along with Norway and Iceland on 20th November 1992, both of whom are also not members of European Union. That position was an inevitable outcome of Turkey's NATO membership. As the WEU decided to function as European pillar of NATO in order to implement Petersberg tasks and develop ESDI, non-EU European NATO members given Associate Member status within the WEU. Although Turkey provided a respectable connection in the WEU, this position was not fully desirable.

The WEU associate membership provided Turkey with a place in WEU decision-making and some institutional rights. Turkey's status in the WEU granted Turkey, the right to become closely involved in European security architecture. Most importantly Turkey had the right to participate in the meetings of the WEU Council, its working groups and subsidiary bodies under certain conditions. During meetings, Turkey had the right to speak and submit proposals, but not the right to block a

⁹⁹ First Pillar: European Communities/Economic and Monetary, Second Pillar: Common Foreign and Security Policy and Third Pillar: Justice and Home Affairs.

decision that was subject of consensus among the full member states; however Turkey could adhere to such decisions later if it wanted.¹⁰⁰

Turkey was also associated with WEU planning cell through special arrangements and could nominate officers to the cell. Moreover, Turkey could take part on the same basis as full members in WEU operations to which it committed forces. Because of Turkey's NATO membership, it had a say in WEU and it was directly involved in planning and preparation of WEU operations in which NATO assets and capabilities were used within the framework of a Combined Joint Task Force. As the WEU functioned as the European pillar of NATO, Turkey would be in European security architecture thorough the NATO-WEU cooperation.

Turkey's WEU Associate Membership concerned Greece as it was a full member of WEU and EU. Greece tried to block Turkey's full participation in WEU decision-making especially in operations where WEU recourse to NATO assets and capabilities in which Associate Members are contributing. The Greek proposal was removed by the French government's compromise in April 1997, making the Associate Members part of WEU's decision making process.¹⁰¹

NATO gave a support to the positions of non-European NATO members in WEU in the NATO Washington Summit which held on the 24th April 1999. The Allies gathered in Washington to reach a consensus on the evolution of security and defense mechanisms of NATO in the changing security environment. Some points of this agreement were very important in the sense that, they supported Turkey's (along with other non-EU European NATO members) position within European security and defense structure. In the Washington summit by insisting, 'we attach the utmost

¹⁰⁰ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.49.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

importance to ensuring the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European Allies in EU-led crisis response operations, building on existing consultation arrangements within the WEU¹⁰², the Allies gave primary importance to the contribution of non-EU NATO members to European security.

However a different process has been developed in Turkey-WEU relations in security and defense after the process which started with St. Malo Franco-British political declaration. Turkey's Associated Membership status in the WEU, though not satisfactory, was ended as a result of EU's decision to terminate the WEU's role and the ensuing development of the ESDP since then. This development has the potential of undermining Turkey's position in European security in the sense that the new structure would be open only to EU members. By re-institutionalizing, the EU confined the responsibility of European security and defense only to EU Members. The US involvement in European security since 1945 and EU's resolve to an autonomous security structure after St. Malo were two of the most important initiators in the establishment of European security organization.

4.1.3. Turkey's Position in the EU/ESDP

The EU Council Declarations in Cologne (June 1999), Helsinki (December 1999), Feira (June 2000), Nice (December 2000) and Laeken (December 2001) decided to take important steps for the development of ESDP. In all these summits the EU paved the way for an autonomous European Army, along with institutional arrangements and mechanisms. EU aims to complete its three pillar integration by finalizing institutional arrangements. As a result of the developments, the European security and defense identity has changed its characteristics from being an *Identity*

¹⁰² NATO Washington Summit, Communique, 24 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm> (accessed on 12 October 2006)

within the WEU to a *Policy* within European Union.¹⁰³ Article 5 of the EU Cologne declaration urged the taking of a new step in the construction of European Union towards a Common European Policy on Security and Defense, also named as the European Security and Defense Policy. But that *Policy* was of course to be based on the European identity in terms of politics and security.¹⁰⁴ With that process the European Union members declared to have full control on European security and defense without prejudice to any NATO involvement.

The EU declared that the EU had to be functional only for Petersberg tasks, non-Article 5 tasks of NATO. To be able to undertake these operations the EU started to build up institutional, political and military structure. The EU's intention to build a new institutional and political process for the construction of ESDP had had implications for non-EU NATO members of the WEU (Turkey, Norway, Iceland, the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary) particularly for Turkey, in 1999.

The Helsinki Summit of December 1999 had a priority in the context of EU-Turkey relations. The Helsinki Summit started a new process not only for the European Union but also for Turkey's candidacy process. At the Helsinki Summit, the EU Council accepted Turkey as one of the 13 candidate countries for the EU. This development appeared to restore Turkey-EU relations which had been worsening since 1997 Luxembourg Summit where Turkey had almost been taken off the list of the next EU enlargement. At this Summit, EU officially accepted Turkey's candidacy and following this decision, a pre-accession strategy started to apply in

¹⁰³ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.55.

¹⁰⁴ Cologne European Council Presidency Conclusions, 3-4 June 1999, http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.htm - 64k - (accessed on 14 October 2006)

order to prepare Turkey for EU membership, as it has been the case in other candidate countries.¹⁰⁵

The Helsinki Summit was a big step forward in Turkey's integration into first and third pillars of EU because it confirmed Turkey's integration process into the political, economic and legal fields in line with the Copenhagen criteria. However, in the Helsinki document Turkey was distanced from the second pillar, the CFSP of the European Union. On the other hand in the Helsinki European Council it is stated that 'appropriate arrangements will be defined that would allow, while respecting the Union's decision making autonomy, non-EU European NATO members and other interested states to contribute to EU military crises management.'¹⁰⁶ By stating this, the EU put Turkey into the same basket with other non-EU European Allies. Turkey's associate membership of WEU became marginalized with the formation of the ESDP in which only European Union Members have the right to have full control on European security.

As far as the decision making mechanism was concerned the European Union terminated the WEU's role in European security. Accordingly, the WEU's decision making mechanism concerning the ESDI was put aside. As stated in the EU's Cologne Summit on the 4th June 1999, 'the Council of the European Union will be able to take decisions on a whole range of political, economic and military instruments at its disposal when responding to crisis situations and have the ability to take decisions on a full range of conflict prevention and crisis management tasks

¹⁰⁵ Other countries: Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Estonia, Slovak Republic, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus, Malta, Turkey

¹⁰⁶ Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusion, <http://ue.eu.int/en/Info/eurocouncil/index.htm>, (accessed on 17 October 2006)

defined in the Treaty on European Union, the Petersberg tasks.¹⁰⁷ With that decision at the Cologne Summit, Turkey loses its rights in the WEU Associate Membership and NATO-WEU cooperation on European security has been abolished. EU took over WEU functions and started to set up a new organizational framework in order to develop ESDP. According to the developments, the ESDP's decision making was limited to the EU's full members only, while others irrespective of their importance within the European security architecture were put in the margin of ESDP decision making mechanism.

The non-EU countries can be categorized into three groups: non-EU European NATO members; candidate countries waiting for full membership into the EU; and those countries that were related to the European security architecture such as non-EU Partnership for Peace (PfP) countries. The ESDP decision making mechanism created a structure which put the EU members at the center and the others at the margin, the latter serving only as the *contributors* to the ESDP.

The non-EU countries position in the ESDP was only consultative. During the Feira Summit (19-20 June 2000), the EU defined a single inclusive structure in which all 15 countries concerned the 6 non-EU European NATO members and 13 candidates for accession into EU, can make co-operation and consultation. In the Feira:

..a minimum of two meetings in EU+15 format will be organized in each Presidency on ESDP matters. These will supplement the meetings held as part of the reinforced political dialogue on CFSP matters. Within this framework, a minimum of two meetings will be organized with the six non-EU European NATO members (in EU+6 format) in each Presidency. Additional exchanges

¹⁰⁷ Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999, 'the European Council Declaration on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defense', [http:// www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.htm) (accessed on 17 October 2006)

will be organized if the need arises upon decision by the Council or the IPSC.

108

At the Nice Summit, the EU set up permanent consultation arrangements which will be for *non-crisis* and *crisis* periods.¹⁰⁹ During the non-crisis period the consultation on ESDP matters will be held just like stated in Cologne European Council. During the crisis periods, which are divided into pre-operational phase and operational phase, the same framework was maintained more or less. Accordingly in the pre-operational phase, a dialogue and consultation will be intensified at all levels in the period leading up to the Council decision. When a crisis develops, these intensified consultations will provide opportunity for an exchange of views on situations. The consultation and situation assessment was considered to be very important for the for the non-EU members which were directly affected from the crisis. When the possibility of an EU-led operation is under consideration, the aim of consultation will be to ensure that the countries potentially contributing to such an operation are informed by EU's intentions. In this respect, once the EU begins to examine an option requiring NATO assets and capabilities, particular attention will be paid to consultation of the six non-EU European NATO members.

In the operational phase, once the EU Council has chosen strategic military options, the operational planning work will be presented to the non-EU European NATO members and the other candidate countries that have expressed their intention to take part in operation. In sum, the non-EU European NATO members will participate, if they wish, in the event of an operation requiring NATO assets and

¹⁰⁸ Santa Maria de Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, 19-20 June 2000, <http://www.europa2002.hu/3rd/3rdm.pdf>, (accessed on 19 October, 2006)

¹⁰⁹ Nice European Council Presidency Conclusions, 7-10 December 2000, http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec2000/dec2000_en.htm (accessed on 23 October 2006)

capabilities. Where the EU does not use NATO assets, they will be invited to take part in the operation by the decision of European Council. Accordingly, the involvement of non-EU European NATO members depends first on EU's use of NATO assets and secondly on an invitation by the EU Council.¹¹⁰ In operations requiring NATO assets operational planning will be carried out by the Alliance's planning bodies and non-EU European NATO members will be involved in planning under NATO framework. In autonomous EU operations, operational planning will be carried out within one of the European strategic level headquarters.

At the Feira European Council, (June, 2000) an *ad hoc* body of *committee of contributors* was set up including all EU Member States and the other participating countries for the day to day conduct of the operation.¹¹¹ All states which contributed to the European-led crisis management operation will be gathered under the *committee of contributors*. It will be the main forum in for discussing all the problems relating the day to day management of operation. Non-EU European members and candidate countries deploying military forces under EU-led operation will have the same rights and obligations in terms of day to day management of operations. The committee of contributor's affect was in operational phase. However in the pre-operational phase they have no say in setting up strategic options and military planning of an EU-led operation. In strategic military and political decisions non-EU countries did not participated in the decision shaping

¹¹⁰ Nice European Council Explanatory Memorandum Submitted by Bakoyianni, *Contributions of non-EU Countries, Reporter*, http://www.assembly-weu.org/./sessions_ordinaires/rpt/2001/1734.php (accessed on 24 October 2006)

¹¹¹ Santa Maria de Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, 19-20 June 2000, <http://www.europa2002.hu/3rd/3rdm.pdf> (accessed on 28 October 2006)

mechanism. To sum up, the EU created an autonomous decision making structure for ESDP in which non-EU states were put at the margin.

4.2. Turkish Policy toward ESDP

Establishment of ESDP led to the marginalization of Turkey's position in European security. Consequently, Turkey-EU relations over European security became paralyzed. Being a member of NATO, Turkey shares the same ideas and concerns with some of the NATO member states regarding ESDP. Turkey is not the only country which was affected from the formation of ESDP.

These countries are divided into two groups. On the one hand, the Atlanticist countries argue that NATO should preserve its priority for European security and defense. They are led by United States, the United Kingdom, Norway and Turkey. On the other hand Europeanist countries believe that European security should be independent from NATO's strategic control, decision-making structure, operations. They are led by France and Germany.

Since the end of the Cold War, France emphasized the need to have separable and separate European armed forces in provision of European security. In 1990s Germany was supporting the idea of cooperation with Central and Eastern European countries for the provision of European security. After the formation of ESDP as an autonomous security mechanism, Germany and France met in a mutual understanding which aimed to have an autonomous political and military architecture inside EU.

4.2.1. Turkey's Reservations about Formation of ESDP

Turkey from the outset supported the European security and defense identity developing within NATO through the WEU. Turkey also supported the EU's ambitions to build a security and defense architecture which will be backed up by NATO. As a manifestation of this support Turkey has informed the EU of its readiness to send military forces for the realization of Headline Goals of the Helsinki Summit (1999). Turkey pledged to send 6000 personnel, supported by necessary air and maritime capabilities. This contribution could make Turkey the fifth largest contributor of the Headline Goal.

However, as a dedicated member of NATO, Turkey thought that NATO's role effectiveness and coherence should not be challenged by the EU or any other organization. For Turkey, NATO should be the primary organization for European security and wider Euro-Atlantic area. In the event of a crisis NATO should be the first option and the EU should intervene and take leadership of a peace-keeping operation in Europe only when NATO chooses not to do so.¹¹²

In spite of the Turkey's expectations, the EU decided to set up ESDP. The arrangements concerning the position of non-EU European NATO members within ESDP, has been marginalized in comparison with ESDI process. Turkey is concerned that if the EU's autonomous decision-making mechanisms and operations create a division leading to a decline in NATO's role in the region; this would marginalize Turkey's position in European security. NATO's membership and WEU Associate Membership provides Turkey with several advantages in Europe in the sense that the

¹¹² Onur Öymen, *The Future of European Security and NATO*, Paper delivered to the twelfth International Antalya Conference on Security and Cooperation, 11-15 April 2002. see in <http://www.insightturkey.com/is2.htm> (accessed on 01 November 2006)

crisis happening around Europe directly or indirectly has been affecting Turkey's national interests.

On the eve of NATO's Washington Summit (April 1999) Turkey was excluded from the developments in European security and defense which emerged after the conclusion of Amsterdam Treaty. Turkey thought that EU was about to set up a security and defense institution for only EU members in which non-EU members had no saying. In addition Turkey knew that in the Washington Summit, EU demanded from the Allies guaranteed access to NATO assets and capabilities. Accordingly Turkey has started negotiations to convince the Allies to take Turkey and other non-EU European NATO members into consideration. Efforts produced a consensus among the Allies. From the Turkish perspective, the Washington consensus provided important support to Turkey's position in European security in the sense that Turkey's connection to the ESDI was recognized. According to the consent, Turkey could participate in the strategic planning, operations and command of EU-led Petersberg type operations in the areas surrounding Turkey.

As the EU started to build up ESDP, the consent reached in the Washington Summit has come to an end. The main disagreement emerged from differences between Turkish and EU officials' interpretation of Washington Summit documents. The EU Council concentrated on paragraph 10 of the Washington Summit where the Allies declared that 'they stand for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance for operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged militarily.'¹¹³ However, Turkey argues that the article

¹¹³ NATO Washington Summit Communique, Paragraph 10, 23 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm> (accessed on 2 November 2006)

should be read in view of paragraph 9 which states that ‘the full participation of all European Allies in EU-led operations was essential.’¹¹⁴ Turkey’s one of the claims for NATO-WEU cooperation was stated in the NATO’s Strategic Concept of 1999.

In paragraph 30 of Strategic concept it is stated that:

It will enable all European Allies to make a more coherent and effective contribution to the missions and activities of the Alliance as an expression of our shared responsibilities; it will reinforce the transatlantic partnership; and it will assist the European Allies to act by themselves as required through the readiness of the Alliance, on a case-by-case basis and by consensus, to make its assets and capabilities available for operations in which the Alliance is not engaged militarily under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed, taking into account the full participation of all European Allies if they were so to choose.¹¹⁵

As seen in Strategic Concept, it was formulated that EU’s use of NATO assets and capabilities were dependent on North Atlantic Council’s evaluation of the crisis on *case by case* basis. Besides, Council took a decision only by consensus. Thus Turkey views the process from the Cologne Summit onwards in the construction of ESDP as a divergence from the spirit of Washington Summit. Turkey thought that EU made one side interpretation of Washington documents in trying to secure assured access to NATO planning capabilities.

Being concerned because of the formation of ESDP and being out of European security architecture and loosing the rights coming from the WEU Associate Membership, Turkey decided to veto EU’s *assured* access to NATO assets and capabilities as a member of North Atlantic Council. Turkey argued that the guaranteed access to pre-identified assets can be made only on a *case-by-case* basis by a consensus in the NAC. EU officials were aware that such a veto from a NATO

¹¹⁴ *Ibid*, Paragraph 10.

¹¹⁵ NATO Strategic Concept, 23-24 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm> (accessed on 3 November 2006)

member would block the operationalization of ESDP operations and impede NATO-EU cooperation. As a result they need a redefinition of NATO-EU cooperation including non-EU European NATO members and the arrangements including NATO assets and capabilities. The negotiations were speeded up so as to satisfy Turkey's expectations and remove its veto on the EU's demands for guaranteed access to NATO assets and capabilities. This would help the Allies and EU realize NATO-EU cooperation for a successful implementation of ESDP processes. In these negotiations Turkey's expectations from ESDP were:

- a) Having the WEU *acquis* back again,
- b) The EU should have daily consultations on a permanent and regular basis and provide Turkey with a role in decisions taken by EU,
- c) Full participation in the decision-making process of operations with NATO assets and capabilities,
- d) Respect for Turkey's national interests and security concerns in such operations without NATO assets.
- e) The right to raise Turkey's concerns in decision making mechanisms of EU-only operations in Turkey's geographic proximity and areas of national interests such as Aegean and Cyprus,
- f) Insurance that ESDP will not be involved in disputes among the Allies.¹¹⁶

4.2.2. Turning Point: Ankara Agreement and Functioning of Berlin-Plus

As a result of the negotiations only one of the attempts produces a concrete formula. The Ankara Document was accepted at the end of the diplomatic negotiations among Turkey, the United States and the United Kingdom in December 2001 and was finalized in 2002.

As we stated in the autonomous EU-led operations without recourse to NATO assets, Turkey might be totally excluded from operations because EU Council may

¹¹⁶ Foreign Minister İsmail Cem's statement, *Hürriyet* 25 May 2000.

fail to invite a non-EU country. Accordingly there is always a potential Greek and Greek-Cypriot veto (after Greek-Cypriot becomes a full member in May 2004) which would impede Turkey's participation. Such operations might be undertaken in problematic regions of Turkey and Greece or near to Turkey's abroad. Although Turkey wanted to participate in EU-led operations, it could be out of operations. Accordingly, Greece might wish to use ESDP process to increase its influence over Turkey. That is why Greece used its veto in order not to lose the advantage of ESDP process.

In the Ankara Document, Turkey was provided with additional assurances and rights in return for Turkey removing its veto on EU-NATO cooperation. Non-EU European NATO members' participation in Petersberg-type operations only after an invitation by EU Council was maintained. One of the most important points of the Ankara Document was the EU's attention to Turkey's security concerns near abroad and in areas proximal to Turkey. Accordingly, it is decided that Petersberg type operations will not be launched for the resolution of disputes between the Allies, nor will the ESDP be involved in such cases where a NATO country has vital interests. That means that the ESDP will not be used in the disputes between Turkey and Greece in the Aegean Sea and Cyprus.¹¹⁷

One of the other important points of Ankara Document was the usage of NATO assets and capabilities by the EU. In an EU-led operation, if non-strategic assets are to be used, the EU will have guaranteed, automatic access to NATO assets and capabilities. Turkey, as stated in Nice formula, will participate in operations as

¹¹⁷Ankara Document, *Turkey and ESDP: A Fact Sheet*, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/director/TurkeyESDPbkgr.do>. (accessed on 11 November 2006)

well as in meetings as a member of Committee of Contributors. But in an EU-led operation, if strategic assets are to be used, the EU demands for the use of these assets will be decided by the NATO Council on a case by case basis. Turkey, as a member of NAC, will be directly involved in the making of final decision on EU-led operations.¹¹⁸ Moreover the Ankara agreement provided Turkey with the right to have enhanced consultations in peacetime and active participation in the operational phase in operations where NATO assets are used.

4.2.3. Strategic Balance with Greece

It was time for Greece to veto the deal reached in the Ankara Document. Greece was not satisfied with the Ankara agreement and vetoed the Document at the EU's Laeken Summit and at the NATO Council meetings held in December 2001. During the Seville summit of June 2002, Greece continued its veto over the NATO-EU cooperation.¹¹⁹ Greece stated that the EU should not give guarantees to non-EU countries and non-EU countries should never participate in ESDP decision making process. Greece's aim in its veto was to prevent Turkey's participation in ESDP.

The Ankara agreement could not be put into practice, after negotiations between parties it was slightly changed and formally put into practice in the Brussels process in the second half of 2002. Because of the veto Greece imposed on the Ankara agreement, negotiations continued with the support of United States and United Kingdom. The Greek veto aimed to prevent Turkey participating in the ESDP process.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.122.

Being the member of NAC Turkey has the right to have a say as to whether NATO's assets would be used in EU operations. Turkey presented as responsible for the so called deadlock by stating that EU's use of NATO capabilities was dependent on Turkey's removal of its veto on the EU's automatic use of NATO assets and capabilities on crisis management operations. On the other hand at the EU Council in Brussels, the EU countries finally persuaded Greece to remove its objection to the Ankara agreement. In Brussels the parties reached a consensus with Turkey and Greece withdrawing their vetoes. The deal reached on the Ankara agreement with Greece lifting its veto did not mean that Greece accepted Turkey's participation in all dimensions of ESDP. Besides, the Brussels document did not mean that EU would automatically use NATO assets and capabilities in times of crisis management operations. The Brussels document provided EU to use NATO assets and capabilities in particular two cases: Bosnia and Macedonia. This document could not be considered as the agreement initiating the operationalization of ESDP.

4.2.4. Brussels Document and Copenhagen European Council (December 2002)

The Brussels document, which was accepted by the EU Council meeting in Brussels on October 24th-25th, was endorsed by the Copenhagen European Council meeting on December 12th-13th, 2002. The Brussels Document accepted the provisions reached in the Ankara Agreement. One of the most important provisions of the Brussels Document was: 'under no circumstances, nor in any crisis, will ESDP be used against an Ally, on the understanding, reciprocally, that NATO military crisis management will not undertake any action against EU or its

members'.¹²⁰ The provisions concerning EU's recourse to NATO assets and capabilities was the maintained just like in Feira European Council. One provision was complementary. 'In taking the decisions on participation, the Council will take account of the security concerns of non-EU European Allies'.¹²¹ One of the most important point of Brussels documents was:

In a specific case when any of non-EU European Allies raises its concerns that envisaged an autonomous EU operation will be conducted in the geographic proximity of a non-EU European Ally or may affect its national interests, the Council will consult with that Ally, and taking into consideration the outcome of these consultations, decide on the participation of that Ally.¹²²

Here the EU Council recognized the concerns of non-EU European Allies in crisis in geographic proximity of an Ally. However, after the consultations between parties at the end, the EU Council would decide whether or not this Ally would participate. In addition, the Copenhagen European Council decided that Berlin-Plus arrangements and implementations would apply only to those EU member states which are also either NATO members or parties to Partnership for Peace and which has consequently concluded bilateral security agreements with NATO. Thus, 'Cyprus and Malta will not take part in EU military operations conducted using NATO assets once they have become members of the EU'.¹²³ This provision banned the usage of NATO's assets and capabilities in Cyprus and Malta, thorough Berlin-

¹²⁰ Brussels European Council, 24-25 October 2002, 'Presidency Conclusions on European Security and Defense Policy, ESDP Implementation of the Nice provisions on the Involvement of the Non-EU European Allies', http://www.ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/72968.pdf (accessed on 12 November 2006)

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ Copenhagen European Council, 12-13 December 2002, 'Presidency Conclusions on European Security and Defense Policy', http://www.eu2002.dk/news/upload/conclusions_uk20021216111046.pdf. (accessed on 15 November 2006)

Plus type operations. However, this will not affect the right of their representatives to participate and vote in the EU institution and bodies.

Besides developments over ESDP, the Copenhagen European Council meeting on 12th-13th December gave Turkey an encouraging response to the future of Turkey's full membership in the EU. In Copenhagen European Council Turkey for the first time had been given a date for accession of negotiations in December 2004, since its long journey towards becoming a full member of EU. This development was considered as a *date for a date* to formally start the accession negotiations between Turkey and EU. Although this date did not live up to Turkey's expectations, it had to be considered as a concrete target to be achieved. If Turkey would be successful at the conclusion of domestic and foreign policy reforms this date could be initiator for membership.

Both the Ankara Agreement and the Brussels Documents opened the way for cooperation between EU and NATO. Turkey, by withdrawing its veto on two cases, opened the way for EU-NATO cooperation on a *case by case* base on the use of NATO assets and capabilities in Bosnia and Macedonia. EU tried to behave as if there appeared a comprehensive deal was achieved between EU and Turkey over EU-NATO cooperation. However this was not a final solution for Turkey in its relations with NATO and EU. Soon after the NATO Council accepted the Brussels Agreement and EU and NATO decided to start closer military and political cooperation between them in the areas of crisis management and conflict prevention.

With the elimination of Turkish and Greek vetoes and the conclusion of the EU-NATO cooperation on two cases, the EU was able to put the ESDP into practice

by 2003. Firstly, the EU took over the command of the UN Police Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the cessation of the UN-led International Police Task Force at the end of 2002. This is the first ESDP operation that lasted until 2005. The EU Police Force, which is made up of 900 staff members from 15 countries as well as from non-EU countries including Turkey, trained the Bosnian Police forces. After Bosnia, the EU took over the NATO-led *Amber Fox* peacekeeping mission in Macedonia on 31st March 2003 by using NATO assets and capabilities. Moreover, the EU Council stated the EU's willingness to lead military operation in Bosnia following NATO-led SFOR.

With the Brussels Document (December 2001), Turkey achieved most of its objectives in the formation of ESDP by causing the EU to make some modifications in Cologne, Helsinki and Nice provisions. It could be considered that Turkey is ensuring its security interests until it becomes a full member of ESDP through the EU membership. On the way to becoming a full member of the EU, Turkey provided important progress in telling the EU Turkey's fundamental concerns and national interests in the broader European security region.

Turkey's main concern over ESDP was that the European security could not be limited by institutional arrangements. European security could not be confined only to EU members. Turkey thought that, it is not easy to realize an EU-only security project because there is an interdependence of security actors with different agendas in the broader European security architecture.

In spite of the developments reached in Copenhagen, the Brussels Document could not be a final destination for Turkey-ESDP relations. Despite assurances given

to Turkey, it does not make Turkey and the other non-EU European Allies in full participation of ESDP. Turkey's position in ESDP is still far away from Turkey's status as an Associate Member of WEU. The Brussels document could be understood as a political and compromise solution without institutional arrangements.¹²⁴ Turkey is not allowed to participate in the ESDP decision-making process in operations with NATO assets and capabilities, nor is Turkey guaranteed that it will be invited to EU-led operations without NATO assets and capabilities. It can only be a transitional solution to give assurances for Turkey by using its veto in the North Atlantic Council for usage of NATO assets and capabilities.

4.2.5. Turkey's Concerns after Copenhagen

Turkey's main concern about the ESDP is that since it is not an EU member, it does not have a place among the formal decision-makers. The co-operation foreseen between the EU and the non-EU European NATO members in the Feira Summit and reiterated in the Presidency Report to the Nice European Council can be summarized as, *Permanent and regular consultation at peace time*. Non-EU countries can also propose meetings, on issues of security, defense and crisis management. Liaison officers can be appointed by non-EU members to the EU military staff. Other specific liaison arrangements can be organized, especially for the exercises. In times of crises, there will be pre-operational consultations to allay the fears of the non-EU Allies. However, Turkey as with other non-EU European Allies will be kept out of EU thinking on strategic military options, operations and operational plans.

¹²⁴ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.128.

During the operational phase, European members of NATO will have automatic right to participate in EU operations where NATO assets are used. However, non-EU European NATO members could be invited to participate if the operation is made without recourse to NATO assets. If these countries contribute to an EU-led operation they will have equal rights and obligations in the daily conduct of operations. Although non-EU European NATO members have equal rights and responsibilities in the daily conduct of operations, they didn't have the right to affect the strategic planning of the operations in operational and preoperational phases.

Under this procedure, the point of Turkey's objections are as follows: If the EU is conducting an operation without recourse to NATO assets in a neighboring region to Turkey, Turkey's participation is dependent on an invitation by the EU. Secondly, even if Turkey is invited to, or participates in, an operation making use of NATO assets, it is going to participate only in the daily conduct of operations, which are mainly military decisions made by professional military staff and not strategic or political reflections on the aim of the operation.¹²⁵ Especially if the EU makes use of NATO planning, Turkey feels ousted in the conduct of the operation, which it has helped plan in the first place. Evaluating these objections by Turkey to EU's mechanism of participation, it could lead operations in its neighboring regions without Turkey having an influence on it.

4.3. Developments in European Defense and Impacts on Turkey

With the conclusion of the EU-NATO cooperation on defense, the EU was able to put the ESDP into practice by 2003. However, it is mostly accepted that EU was inefficient in defense capabilities. It is a commonly accepted view that, in order to

¹²⁵Özlem Terzi 'New Capabilities, Old Relationships: Emergent ESDP and EU-Turkish Relations', *Southeast European Politics* (Vol. 3, No. 1, 2002), p.56.

undertake EU-led peace operations, whether NATO assets were used or not, the EU had to develop defense capabilities. In the process of enlargement and integration of new members, additional defense expenditures could be an area of concern for the EU. However, as commonly participated by most of the scholars, European integration could not be achieved without formation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy. In achieving CFSP, development of European defense capabilities was deemed to be very important.

Although it is supposed that European Union should be the core institution that provides a common ground for the countries on defense related issues, however, its explicit role in defense industrial policy has been restricted by the Article 223 of the Rome Treaty (Article 296 of Amsterdam Treaty)¹²⁶. According to these articles, all kinds of armaments activities including production, trade and procurement have been deliberately put out of the scope of the European integration process by the member states, who, until the end of 1990s have preferred to maintain purely national control mechanisms on these activities. However, despite the article's clear clauses, it is argued that the more integrative bodies of EU – the Commission and the Parliament – and member states have been unsuccessful to persuade the intergovernmentalists – the Council and, among members, the United Kingdom and France – to allow the defence related industry to be ruled by European Union regulations as it is applied to every other economic sector. Despite, armaments question have been left out of the scope of European integration process, there are many tools that may be used build up a strategy such as theoretical models, budgets and areas of competence.

¹²⁶ Article 296 (Ex article 223) of the Treaty establishing the European Community; www.europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/a29000.htm - 63, (accessed on February 2007)

Starting with 1994, the Commission and the Parliament started a significant support for a more explicit EU defence industrial policy. Accordingly, over the next three years three core documents were published regarding the subject; (i) The challenges facing the European defence-related industry: a contribution for action at European level (1996), (ii) Implementing European Union strategy on defence-related industries (1997), (iii) Draft action plan for the defence related industry (1997). Being the most significant of the these three documents, the last one identifies fourteen areas in which immediate EU action is required necessarily; particularly in the standardization of defence equipment and national export policies, the incorporation of the defence industry sector into the EU's competition policy and state aid regulations, and cooperation in armaments R&D and procurement.¹²⁷

NATO has always been an institution that has the greatest competence in European defense. US superiority in defense industry and European defense market necessitated EU to develop European defense industry as well. In order to compete with US defense market, Europeans must either lose or dilute their national character. In order to meet pressures from US, restructuring of a defense sector concerning aircraft, space and electronics were needed. The efforts to make European defense structure integrated into European Union started after the St. Malo political declaration which held in 4 December 1998. European Aeronautics, Defense and Space Company (EADS) was established in 14 October 1999 as being the first transnational defense company of Europe. Germany, France and Spain defense companies integrated themselves in order to eliminate the borders between them. EADS can be regarded as the first true attempt of creating a transnational defense

¹²⁷ MA Thesis, Tuğçe Özer, *European Defence Industrial Restructuring and Consolidation in the Post-Cold War Era: Defence Industrial Base, International Institutions and Complementary Actors/Variables*, (METU) p.89.

sector despite it is not established in EU structure. The EU's incapability for intervention to crisis in the Bosnia and Kosovo made EU became aware that without having had own defense capabilities, an autonomous ESDP could become reality only in words. Therefore, as a first step European Union undertook a Capability Improvement Conference (CIC) in order to point out European Union's deficiencies on common defense structure in November, 2001.

4.3.1. Capabilities Commitment Conference and European Capabilities Action Plan

After the St. Malo political declaration, the European Union decided to establish its autonomous security and defense mechanisms in order to *Europeanize* the security of the continent. The developments after St. Malo can be considered to be a challenge to the US involvement in European security. The EU was aware of the fact that, without having had its own defense capabilities an autonomous ESDP could become reality only in words. Therefore, as a first step, the European Union undertook a Capability Improvement Conference (CIC) on November 19th, 2001. At the conference the Ministers of Defense reaffirmed their responsibility for the development of the Headline Goal (being able to deploy 60,000 men in less than 60 days and to sustain them at least one year). On that occasion they emphasized their determination 'to seek solutions and new forms of cooperation in order to develop the necessary military capabilities and make good shortcomings identified, while making optimum use of resources.'¹²⁸

¹²⁸ Statement on Improving European Military Capabilities Press Release, Brussels, 19-20 November 2001, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/European%20Capability%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Excerpt%20Press%20Release> (accessed on 17 November 2006)

In the Conference, Member States of the EU reaffirmed their commitments to meet objectives set in Helsinki Headline Goals and to respond to the shortcomings when identified. This Conference was the first step which showed the EU's determination to develop defense capabilities of the Union. By the end of 2001, five of the 55 major shortfalls identified by the Conference, had been resolved. To remedy these gaps, a European Capability Action Plan (ECAP) was set-up by member states.¹²⁹

European Capability Action Plan aimed to incorporate all the efforts, investments, developments and co-ordination measures executed or planned both national and multinational level with a view to improving existing resources and gradually developing the capabilities necessary for the Union's activities.¹³⁰ The ECAP process was very important in the sense that it represents an important stage for strengthening the Union's military capabilities, with the aim of achieving, by 2003, the Headline Goal which had been set in Helsinki. In the Conference it had been estimated that by the national contributions the EU should be able to carry out the whole range of Petersberg Tasks. As had been planned, after the operationalization of the ESDP, European Union took over the command of the UN Police Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the cessation of the UN-led International Police Task Force at the end of 2002.

In the ECAP process under the heading of Contributions by the Fifteen and the Six the contributions of non-EU members were recognized. Although contributions of non EU members were initially accepted by EU, later on it was vetoed by Greece.

¹²⁹ Gustaw Lindstrom, Helsinki Headline Goal, (ISS, 2006), <http://www.iss-eu.org/esdp/05-gl.pdf> . (accessed on 17 November 2006)

¹³⁰ Statement on Improving European Military Capabilities, Press Release, Brussels, 19-20 November 2001. (accessed on 17 November 2006)

Accordingly, it is accepted that the non-EU European Member States of NATO and the other candidate countries for accession to the EU have also helped to improve European military capabilities through highly valuable contributions and in a supplement to the Forces Catalogue. The non-EU members' offers were welcomed as additional capabilities which contribute to the range of capabilities available for EU-led operations.

The ECAP process aimed to develop national contributions to European defense further and then to establish a European arms industry. The ministers agreed on restructuring European defense industries and to strengthen the industrial and technological defense base which has to be competitive and dynamic.

4.3.2. European Defense Agency and Participation of Turkey

Capabilities Commitment Conference and European Capability Action Plan were considered as the concrete steps in making ESDP autonomous and powerful. After ECAP process initiated, on the 19th-20th June 2003 European Council at Thessaloniki planned to build an intergovernmental agency in the field of defense capabilities development, research, acquisition and armaments. After this decision, under the Joint Action of the Council of Ministers in July 2004, the European Union decided to build the European Defense Agency (EDA) as endorsed by European security strategy.

The main mission of the EDA is to support the Council and Member States in their effort to improve the EU's defense capabilities in the field of crisis management and to sustain the ESDP, as it stands now and develops in the future.¹³¹ By

¹³¹ Joint Action of the Council of Ministers on 12 July 2004, [http:// europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf). (accessed on 18 November 2006)

establishing EDA, EU aimed to be sufficient in defense capabilities without depending on NATO assets and capabilities in the future, in order to undertake EU-led crisis management operations. High Representative Javier Solana is Head of the Agency and chairman of the Steering Board, its decision-making body composed of Defense Ministers of the 24 participating Member States (all EU Member States, except Denmark) and the European Commission.¹³² It is decided that the Agency should be subject to the Council's authority and open to participation by all Member States. This decision aimed to prevent the agency to having a supranational character in the formation of European defense structure.

The European Defense Agency had four functions to undertake in achieving its mission. These are; defense capabilities, development, armaments, cooperation, building up a European defense (technological and industrial base and defense equipment) market, and research and technology. As stated above, improving defense capabilities as decided in Capabilities Commitment Conference and ECAP process was the major task of the Agency. To build a European defense market with the commitment of Member states would lead to provide military requirements of ESDP in Command, Control and Communication (C3) abilities.

Accordingly on the way to gain and implement autonomous EU-led operational capability, the Agency set out *2005 and 2006 programs* in fulfilling defense deficiencies of the ESDP. The 2005 and 2006 programs pointed out the need to develop unmanned aerial vehicles, armored fighting vehicles and C3 capabilities.¹³³ At the informal meeting of the Heads of State and Government at Hampton Court,

¹³² European Defense Agency official website, <http://www.eda.europa.eu/background.htm> (accessed on 18 November 2006)

¹³³ *Ibid.*

there was discussion about Europe's place in the world. The High Representative set out the rapid increase in the EU's level of activity in the field of crisis management and associated activities.¹³⁴ The Hampton Court has identified three top priorities for European defense capabilities: Strategic lift, Air-to-Air refueling and C4ISTAR (Command, Control, Communication, Computing, Intelligence, Surveillance, Target acquisition and Reconnaissance).¹³⁵ It is decided that the agency would provide proposals on the way forward on these top priorities in the first half of 2006.

As stated in the Joint Action of the Council of Ministers, the participating member states of the Agency could only be the Member states of the European Union.¹³⁶ According to this, European Union gave a decision that only EU Member states would contribute to the European Defense procurement and improvement process. Non-EU European NATO Members and the states which are candidates to EU are excluded from this process. As EU initiated the creation of a European defense market including EU Members' defense industries, the non-EU NATO members could not take part in this process. The contribution of the non-EU states to the EDA was emphasized under the heading of *Participation of third parties*. In the Joint Action document it is stated that:

Third parties may contribute to a particular ad hoc project or programme, established in accordance with Articles 20 or 21, and to the budget associated with it. The Steering Board shall, acting by *qualified majority*, approve as necessary ad hoc arrangements between the Agency and third parties for each particular project or programme.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Hampton Court Summit, 4 November 2005, <http://www.eda.europa.eu/hamptoncourtagenda.htm>, (accessed on 17 November 2006)

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ Joint Action of the Council of Ministers on 12 July 2004, http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf. (accessed on 20 November 2006)

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

European Defense Agency operates under the authority and the political supervision of the European Council. Besides, a Steering Board composed of one representative of each participating Member State, authorized to commit its government is the decision making body of the Agency. As stated above, third parties have the possibility of participating in *ad hoc* projects led by Agency if the Steering Board of Agency gave an approval by a qualified majority for each particular programme. The EU, by issuing this document, clearly stated that EDA is under the control of EU Members and participation of non-EU countries (third parties) would depend on Steering Board decisions.

This statement proved us that, non-EU states are excluded from EDA, ECAP and European defense procurement processes. Establishment of a European defense market and Headline Goal projects of ESDP were considered to be EU-only projects excluding any participation of non-EU states. Under the (article 25) heading of *Relations with third countries, organizations and entities* it is stated that the arrangements with third parties shall respect the single institutional framework and decision-making autonomy of the EU.¹³⁸ Moreover it is stated that,

- a) The principle of a relationship between Agency and the third party;
- b) Provisions for consultation on subjects related to Agency's work, and security matters arrangements shall be concluded by the Steering Board upon the approval by the Council, acting by unanimity.¹³⁹

In the statement the decision-making autonomy of the Steering Board and Council were emphasized.

Western European Armaments Group (WEAG) was a special initiative that had been established under the WEU framework. Turkey was a member of

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

WEAG.¹⁴⁰ This initiative started with the meeting of WEU Council of Ministers in Rome in May 1993.¹⁴¹ In Rome, the Defense Ministers of WEU reaffirmed the key principles on which armaments cooperation should be based. The objectives of WEAG were; the more efficient use of resources, the opening up of defense markets, to strengthen European defense technological base and cooperation in research and development.

The Ministers of Defense of the 19 WEAG Nations held their last meeting in Brussels on the 22nd November 2004. In view of the establishment of the European Defence Agency and the intention of the Agency to assimilate or incorporate relevant principles and practices of WEAG as appropriate; the WEAG Ministers recognised that European armaments cooperation in the future would take place within the European Union and that there is no longer a need for activities in the framework of the WEAG. Therefore, it was abolished on the 23rd May 2005 and Turkey's participation in European defense activities ended as with other non-EU European Allies

After the abolition of WEAG, a Consultative Committee was set up inside EDA in order to provide transparency about the projects of Agency with non-EU Western European Armament Group (WEAG) members with a view to their participation therein as appropriate. Consultative committee was set up for this purpose, to provide a forum for exchanging views and information on matters of common interest falling within the scope of the Agency's mission. It is chaired by the Chief Executive or his representative. It includes a representative of each

¹⁴⁰ Other members of WEAG were Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

¹⁴¹ Western European Armament Group Official Website, <http://www.weu.int/weag/index.html> (accessed on 21 November 2006)

participating Member State, a representative of the Commission, and representatives of the non-EU WEAG members in accordance with modalities to be agreed with them.

In the document the Cooperation between non-EU European NATO members are finalized as follows; ‘Upon request, other non-EU European NATO members may also participate in the Consultative Committee referred to in the previous paragraphs, in accordance with modalities to be agreed with them.’¹⁴²

As seen in the paragraph, non-EU European NATO members’ commitment in EDA was accepted only in the Consultative Committee in which non-EU European NATO states are only informed about the developments over European defense developments in EDA.

4.3.3 Headline Goal 2010 and Battlegroups Concept

The EU has taken over and initiated several EU-led peace support operations since the end of 2002. Accordingly, the deficiencies of EU in crisis management operations were an area of concern .Consequently, General Affairs and External Relations Council gathered on the 17th May 2004 (endorsed by the European Council of 17th-18th June 2004) to set them *Headline Goal 2010* in order to improve EU-led crisis management (operational and planning) capabilities. Therefore, lessons learned from EU-led operations were also taken into account. As a result, when compared with the Helsinki Headline Goals of 1999, a new concept EU Battlegroups concept was formalized.

¹⁴²*Ibid.*

The ability for the EU to deploy force packages at high readiness as a response to a crisis either as a stand-alone force or as part of a larger operation was a key element of the 2010 Headline Goal. These minimum force packages must be military effective, credible and coherent and should be broadly based on the Battlegroups concept.¹⁴³ This constitutes a specific form of rapid response, and includes a combined arms battalion sized force (1,500 personnel) package with Combat Support and Combat Service Support. The EU-led peace support operations since the end of 2002 caused to create a military effective, easily deployable and flexible Battlegroups consisting 1,500 soldiers and combat support elements.¹⁴⁴

In Headline Goal 2010 a rapid reaction concept was developed to include rapid decision-making and planning as well as rapid deployment of forces. On decision making, the ambition of the EU was to take the decision to launch an operation within 5 days of the approval of the crisis management concept by the Council. On the deployment of forces, the ambition is that the forces start implementing their mission on the ground, no later than 10 days after the EU decision to launch the operation. Relevant air and naval capabilities would be included. The need for reserve forces should be taken into account. High readiness Battlegroups may require to be reshaped for a specific operation by the Operation Commander. They would have to be backed up by responsive crisis management procedures as well as adequate command and control structures available to the Union. The development

¹⁴³ Headline Goal 2010, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/2010%20Headline%20Goal.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2006), p.1.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

of EU Rapid Response elements including Battlegroups, will strengthen the EU's ability to respond to possible UN requests.¹⁴⁵

Other issues decided in Headline Goal 2010 about European defense were: the establishment of a civil-military cell with the capability to set up an operation center, to implement by 2005 a strategic lift (air, land and sea) joint coordination capability, the availability of an aircraft carrier with its associated air wing and escort by 2008.¹⁴⁶

Besides Battlegroups, EU member states have identified a list of specific areas to be developed within the 2010 horizon. These include:

- a) the establishment of a civil military cell within EUMS, with the capacity to set up an operation centre for particular operation,
- b) the implementation by 2005 of EU Strategic lift joint coordination, with a view to achieving by 2010 necessary capacity and full efficiency in strategic lift in support of anticipated operations,
- c) specifically for Airlift the transformation of the EACC (European Airlift Coordination Cell) into the EAC (European Airlift Center) by 2004 is welcomed, as is the intention on the part of some Member States who so wish to develop a European Airlift command fully efficient by 2010,
- d) the complete development by 2007 of rapidly deployable battlegroups including the identification of appropriate strategic lift, sustainability and debarkation assets,
- e) the availability of an aircraft carrier with its associated air wing and escort by 2008,
- f) to improve the performance of all levels of EU operations by developing appropriate compatibility and network linkage of all communications equipment and assets both terrestrial and space based by 2010,
- g) to develop quantitative benchmarks and criteria that national forces declared to the Headline Goal have to meet in the field of deployability and in the field of multinational training.¹⁴⁷

4.3.4. Military Capability Commitment Conference

After the establishment of EDA and Headline Goal 2010, the Military Capabilities Commitment Conference took place in Brussels in November 2004.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.3.

The Conference was made in the process of strengthening EU military capabilities for crisis management.

In the conference launching of initiatives such as Headline Goal 2010, the EU Battlegroups, the civil military cell and EDA was welcomed. These initiatives were considered to contribute to the implementation of European Security Strategy, enabling European Union to deal better with threats and global challenges. A more militarily capable Europe could be considered to provide a significant contribution to building of a more effective Common Foreign and Security Policy.

In the Conference, Member States were ‘determined to implement the objectives of the Headline Goal 2010, including the creation of Battlegroups, providing EU with the Initial Operational Capability in 2005 and with Commitments on the Full Operational Capability from 2007 onwards.’¹⁴⁸ The Ministers of Defense also agreed on improving capabilities on *deployability* of Battlegroups in times of crisis. This initiative would aim at more effective use of available assets, mechanisms for strategic transport, which were considered to be a key enabler of *Rapid Response*. Building up easily deployable and effective Battlegroups in times of crisis had great importance in the context of European defense capabilities.¹⁴⁹

In the Conference, establishment of European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) by France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain was welcomed. Public security and public order was commonly accepted to serve for European security with the capacity of military forces available for deployment.

¹⁴⁸ Military Capability Commitment Conference, 22 November 2004, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/MILITARY%20CAPABILITY%20COMMITMENT%20CONFERENCE%2022.11.04.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2006)

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

Building up an Agency, creation of Battlegroups concept for Rapid Reaction, complementing defense deficiencies in strategic airlift, deployment of forces and C3 capabilities were successful developments for EU to form an autonomous ESDP and to undertake EU-led crisis management and peace support operations in needed, without recourse to NATO. At the Conference *interoperability, deployability* and *sustainability* would be considered to be at the core of Member States efforts to improve military capabilities. It is expected that the EU will have reached its full operational capability in 2007. (At the time of Conference EU had the capacity to undertake two Battlegroups size response force).

The contribution of non-EU European NATO members into battlegroups was stated as:

In line with the Nice European Council Conclusions Member States are welcome to include the non-EU European NATO countries and other countries which are candidates for accession to the EU in their Battlegroups. In such cases this will be done without prejudice to the rights of any Member State. Member States are also welcome to consider including other potential partners in their Battlegroups.¹⁵⁰

With this statement the EU kept open the door of non-EU European NATO members contribution (personnel and combat support elements) into the formation of Battlegroups. EU confined the participation of non-EU, European NATO members for European defense only in their commitments in Battlegroups in times of crisis if they wished. When it comes to the Strategic decision-making over a decision to undertake a mission or not and strategic planning (how to conduct) the contribution of non-EU European NATO members was not needed.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 5

**IMPACT OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY TO
TURKEY'S EU MEMBERSHIP**

Turkey has been an important actor of Europe for centuries. In the bipolar atmosphere of the Cold War, Turkey developed beneficial relations with European countries, especially in political and economic matters. The beginning of these relations dates back to the beginning of the Cold War. Accordingly, it is believed that European security and defense and Turkey's contribution to it are important factors in determining Turkey-EU relations.

5.1. Historical Relations between EU and Turkey

Turkey's relation with the European Union (Community) dates back to 1959. In July 1959, shortly after the creation of the European Economic Community in 1958, Turkey made its first application to join. The EEC's response to Turkey's application in 1959 was to suggest the establishment of an association until Turkey's circumstances permitted its accession. An associate agreement (Ankara Agreement) was signed in September 1963 which was aimed to take Turkey to Customs Union and finally to full European Economic Community (EEC) membership. The Ankara Agreement envisaged the progressive establishment of a Customs Union which would bring the Parties closer together in economic and trade matters. In the meantime, the EEC would offer financial assistance to Turkey. Under the First

Financial Protocol which covered the period 1963-1970, the EEC provided Turkey with loans worth 175 million ECU.¹⁵¹

During the first half of 1980s, relations between Turkey and the European Community come to a virtual freeze following the military *coup d'etat* on September 12th, 1980. Following this development in the economic area and the multiparty elections in 1983, the relations between Turkey and the Community, which had come to a virtual freeze following the military intervention, began returning to normality. After these developments Turkey applied for full membership into EEC in 1987 but the Commission defers the assessment of its application by endorsing Turkey's eligibility for membership. Until the mid-1990s, EU-Turkish relations were mostly economic in their content. Financial cooperation constituted the crux of relations between EU and Turkey. In March 1995 Turkey-EU Association Council finalized the Customs Union, which entered into force on January 1, 1996.¹⁵² With the entry into force of the Customs Union, Turkey abolished all duties and equivalent charges on imports of industrial goods from the EU. Furthermore, Turkey has been harmonising its tariffs and equivalent charges on the importation of industrial goods from third countries with the EU's Common External Tariff and progressively adapting itself to the EU's commercial policy and preferential trade arrangements with specific third countries.

The Central and Eastern European country's and other candidate's demands for accession to the EU led the subsequent announcement of *Copenhagen criteria* by the

¹⁵¹ Turkey-EU Relations, <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/MainIssues/TurkeyAndEU/EUHistory.htm>, (accessed on 13 November 2006)

¹⁵² Relations between Turkey and European Union, Official website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.devletim.com/git.asp?link=390> (accessed on 14 November 2006)

EU Council. *Copenhagen criteria* could be accepted as the political definition of EU to be achieved in order to be an EU member. These criteria have brought a political dimension to EU's relations with candidate countries.

By 1995, EU-Turkish relations started to gain a political and security content with the emergence of the Cyprus issue. During the negotiations for the establishment of Customs Union between Turkey and EU, Greece announced that unless the other EU members accept the opening of accession negotiations with Cyprus, it would veto the Customs Union agreement.¹⁵³ As a member of European Union Greece, tried to prevent Turkey's EU membership. Turkey's political and security problems with Greece at the time appeared to be an obstacle for Turkey's membership. In 2004, with the admission of Southern Cyprus on behalf of whole Cyprus into EU as a new member, EU internalized the problem without reaching any solution in the island.

At the Luxemburg European Council, December 1997, Turkey was declined the status of candidate. The scope of relations between Turkey and EU, from now on focused on Turkey's candidacy. Again the relations between Turkey and the EU experienced a two year freeze. Afterwards, in December 1999, at the Helsinki European Council, the EU announced Turkey as a candidate country for EU membership. Since then relations between EU and Turkey have developed in terms of political reforms in Turkey according to the *National Programme* and the

¹⁵³ Terzi, *op cit.*, p.52.

Accession Partnership Document. Another topic between EU and Turkey, on the way to EU membership was EU-Turkey relations over ESDP.¹⁵⁴

At the Copenhagen European Council, in December 2002, EU decided that Turkey had positive records in fulfillment of the Copenhagen political criteria and the EU would open accession negotiations with Turkey. The Copenhagen European Council was understood by politicians as *a date for a date* for the beginning of accession negotiations. Soon after, in December 2004 European Council planned to open accession negotiations with Turkey which will be start on October 3rd, 2005.¹⁵⁵ In October 2005, accession negotiations were symbolically opened with Turkey, which has been an associate member of the EU since 1963 and an official candidate since 1999. In June 29th, the Commission presented its negotiating framework to Ankara, and after a full day of intense negotiations the EU-25's foreign ministers finalized the document on 3rd October.

Turkey has been in a process of change in foreign and domestic politics since Helsinki Summit of 1999. After it was accepted as a candidate for membership in Helsinki, Turkey concentrated on meeting *Copenhagen* political criteria for full membership. Accordingly efforts were concentrated on achieving *Copenhagen* political criteria and developments on foreign and security policy was undermined and not given so much importance.

¹⁵⁴ Relations between Turkey and European Union, *op cit*.

¹⁵⁵ EU-Turkey Relations, <http://www.euractiv.com/en/eu-turkey-relations/article-129678>, (accessed on 25 October 2006)

5.2. Turkey's EU Membership and Possible Implications for CFSP

In the Brussels summit (16th-17th December 2004), it was declared that accession negotiations would begin on October 3rd, 2005. In the process of accession negotiations, it is deemed to be very important that Turkey has to form its own foreign and security policy according to, and in parallel with, the European Union.¹⁵⁶ However, the European Union did not have criteria for a common EU foreign and security policy for candidate countries to adapt themselves. The reason was that, the EU's common foreign and security policy has continued to be an intergovernmental character since its establishment. Accordingly EU could not put any kind of concrete and technical criteria and obligations in achieving CFSP for members and candidates as well.

EU's expectations on CFSP for members could only be based on 'the common soul of loyalty and mutual cooperation' which could be considered as the least common consensus.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, as these criteria could not be put forward to the members and candidates, it would have different implications for each state. While the EU can tolerate the differences on foreign policy of member states rather easily, expectations on candidates on formation of foreign and security policy in parallel with EU was thought to be a problem. As there are no concrete criteria, in Turkey, which has a different security understanding and interest in a different region, adaptation of foreign and security policy to the EU was an area of concern.

As there are no concrete and technical criteria on CFSP, it is thought that negotiations under the heading of CFSP would be rather easy. However, in accession

¹⁵⁶ Esra Hatipoğlu, 'Müzakere sürecinde Türk dış politikasının Avrupalılaşması ve ortak dış ve güvenlik politikasına uyum tartışmaları' in Dikkaya, Mehmet ed., *AB Yolunda Türkiye: Müzakere Sürecinin Ekonomi Politikası*, (İstanbul, Alfa, 2006), p.483.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p.484.

negotiations, CFSP heading is considered to be as important as other headings. It is seen that Turkey could have problems while it is trying to adapt its foreign and security policy into CFSP of European Union.

After the Helsinki summit (1999), there appeared three important ideas about the possible affects of Turkey's membership to the EU in the framework of CFSP. Firstly, the EU thinks that when Turkey becomes an EU member, the EU will be neighbor to the problematic regions like the Middle East and Caucasus. Turkey's accession would extend the EU's borders to countries which are presently a source of tension, and bring problems of the region higher onto the agenda of the EU's external relations.¹⁵⁸ Being a neighbor to problematic regions has been thought to cause security problems for Union as the EU wants a peaceful environment to achieve formation of economic and political union.

Another view, on the contrary admits that Turkey's EU membership will be a cornerstone for EU and CFSP as the Union wants to be a global actor in the region. In December 2003 the EU issued a document: *A Secure Europe in a Better World: A European Strategy*. In this document EU stressed its intention to be a global actor economically and politically and Turkey's membership has thought to provide advantages in providing control over the Eurasia.¹⁵⁹ The last view was about Turkey's Muslim identity. This characteristic has thought to harm CFSP as Turkey has different interest and security priorities in the region. A Muslim Turkey with different political and security priorities is thought to have different implications in the decision-making

¹⁵⁸ EU Commission Staff Working Document, 'The Issues Arising from Turkey's membership', http://www.photius.com/countries/turkey/turkey_european_union_membership_issues_paper_2004.pdf, (accessed on 11 November 2006)

¹⁵⁹ *A Secure Europe in a Better world: A European Strategy*, 12 December 2003, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (accessed on 12 November 2006)

process of CFSP. In the accession process mainly three views will affect the Turkey-EU relations in general and Turkey-ESDP in particular.

Turkey is almost completely surrounded by a set of regions that represent the European Union's prime security concerns, from the residual instability of the Balkans to the West, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Iraq and Iran to the East and Israel Palestine and the Mediterranean to South. Turkey's accession would mark the end of the EU's enlargement to East, while opening at the same time new dimensions to the EU's relationship with the Middle East and Eurasia to the South and East, regions that are unstable.

One of the concerns of the EU in Turkey's EU membership was Turkey-US relations in the framework of *strategic partnership*. The EU thinks that Turkey's foreign policy was very much affected by US interests. A Turkey which put forward policies in parallel with US rather than EU would be harmful to the Union's policies. It would be dangerous when the US and EU interests clash in the region and the world when Turkey is in the middle of conflict. Turkey's relations with the US irritate the European Union and it is thought to affect Turkey-EU relations badly. This view is problematic in the sense that it considered Turkey to pursue similar policies with US in the future as in the past.

Turkey has thought to be very keen on adaptation of its foreign and security policy into the CFSP. However as a pivotal country in the region, Turkey could have different foreign policy priorities and objectives. Apart from other candidate countries, Turkey has different foreign policies when compared with EU in some specific regions and in some particular issues. Besides the European Union and Turkey had negotiated the status of Turkey in ESDP which caused a great concern on both sides. Turkey had vetoed the EU's use of NATO's assets and capabilities when

Turkey was not put in the decision-making mechanisms of ESDP as with other non-EU countries.

5.3. An Interim Station or Full Membership; Turkey's Integration

Turkey has been given the status of candidate in December 1999. The timeframe for actual accession of Turkey might be long as negotiations were expected to take ten years or more. This process raises some questions in the EU whether such a long process is sustainable without some additional arrangements or building *interim stations* for countries which are on the way to membership. The purpose of the interim stations was to enhance solidarity and cooperation with candidate countries. In this process, the candidate country can associate itself to the EU by practical arrangements but it has little possibility of influencing the decision-making mechanisms of the EU. The EU's approach to Turkey was similar in the sense that without impairing the decision-making autonomy of the EU Council, the EU has been making practical arrangements for joint action with Turkey over ESDP.

As stated in previous paragraphs, CFSP is still an intergovernmental area of the EU. On intergovernmental areas, building up interim stations for joint action is thought to be rather easy as they are not based on a treaty language. Being a candidate country and starting the accession negotiations in October 2005, Turkey has seen interest in involvement in the CFSP and ESDP. Accordingly, the EU chooses to sustain its relations with Turkey over CFSP in the context of practical arrangements for joint action in which the decision making authority of the Council wasn't impaired.

By the way the EU sustains its relations with important candidate countries by developing practical arrangements according to their proximity to the Union. As a candidate country and having served in European security for years in the framework of NATO, Turkey is thought to be an important country for European Union. Therefore, the European Union is expected to sustain its relations with Turkey in the framework of CFSP by building bilateral relations and practical arrangements in which Turkey has no right in decision-making until it becomes a member of the Union. The practical arrangements could be developed over Turkey's possible inputs to ESDP in areas where Turkey has ability and power.

Turkey's pivotal position in Eurasia was the most important area of co-operation between Turkey and the EU. For the EU, the argument that Turkey's membership would draw Europe in the conflicts in the Middle East is thought to be unconvincing. It is thought that developments in the unstable region have already had profound repercussions on Europe's stability and security. Accordingly Turkey, with its pivotal position at the heart of the Eurasian region and as a Western pillar of wider Middle East, can be an indisputable benefit to European action in this area.¹⁶⁰ The European Union needs Turkey because of its pivotal role in the region.

At a time when the European Union is set to assume greater responsibility in world politics, Turkish accession would strengthen the Union's capabilities as a foreign security actor. In the European Union's new security strategy *A Secure Europe in a Better World* (adopted in December 2003) European Commission and European Parliament puts emphasis on the importance of Southern periphery for

¹⁶⁰ Independent Commission on Turkey, *Turkey in Europe: More than a Promise*, (Belgium: 2004), p.18.

European security, stressing the need to provide stability in the region.¹⁶¹ Turkey's pivotal position and its relationships and mediator role with neighborhood countries had priority for the European Union as a global actor, in sustaining stability in the region. Moreover, Turkey's military assets and capacity have a great importance in implementing EU's intention to be a global actor. EU accepts Turkey as the sole ally in the region which would be a great contribution to European security.

When looked at from an EU perspective, having an old NATO experience and well trained, Turkish Armed Forces and its contribution into peacekeeping operations was one of the most important areas where the EU has intended to form cooperation. Turkey has made a considerable contribution to international peacekeeping operations including those in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, and has participated in EU-led military police missions in Macedonia (FYROM). Therefore, in the framework of ESDP, Turkey's military capabilities and its potential as a forward base is thought to be an important and much-needed asset for the EU.¹⁶²

The Brussels Document (October 2002) can be considered as the most important arrangement between EU and Turkey in CFSP. In this document, Turkey was given a *consultation* role in times of crisis in proximity to its region before an EU decision. Besides, it is expected by the EU that Turkey should not veto any EU-led crisis management operations in which NATO assets are used. When the Brussels Document is considered, it can easily be said that Turkey's integration into European security and defense structure is incomplete. Turkey has no participation in decision-making and decision-shaping bodies of the EU in European security and

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

defense structure. According to the Brussels Document, Turkey's participation would depend on Council approval. According to the EU, Turkey's full integration into ESDP will be finalized after it becomes an EU member.

After these, it could easily be seen that EU's expectations from Turkey over CFSP can not be compared with other non-EU European NATO members and the candidates for EU membership. It could be said that European Union needs Turkey in formation of a political Union. However, the expectations of the EU from Turkey and Turkey's position in CFSP do not match each other. One of the most important concerns of Turkey for ESDP is being in the same basket with other non-EU countries despite the EU's expectations and its importance for European security. According to the EU, Turkey's position in CFSP and ESDP will be the same with other non-EU countries until Turkey is an EU member. EU's positioning of Turkey in CFSP is seen by Turkey as unfair because of its importance for Eurasian security.

5.4. EU's Attitude towards Turkey in EU/ESDP Membership

The EU's level of ambition in foreign and security policy will continue to be an important issue for Turkey. Accordingly, Turkey's position in the European Union depends on EU's position in international environment. Does the EU aspire to become a major actor in the nearby southern and eastern neighborhoods or does it prefer to retreat into itself behind the most secure environment?¹⁶³ If the EU truly intends to play a stabilizing and modernizing role in its neighborhood, then incorporation of Turkey into the common security and foreign policy offers prospects of real advantages. In the contrary case it would be consistent for the EU to reject Turkey's future integration into the EU and ESDP. Consequently it could

¹⁶³ Michael Emerson, and Natalie Tocci, 'Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy', *CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor*, (No.7, July 2004), p.62.

be stated that the EU's position according to its role for the future would be a determining factor for Turkey's position in EU and ESDP as well.

Since 1998, the EU has issued 8 progress reports for Turkey. In each report, the efforts of Turkey to adapt its foreign and security policy into the European Union were stressed under the heading of CFSP. Also, politically and in security terms Turkey's approach to different regions in comparison with EU was issued in the reports. Besides, EU's expectations from Turkey for the CFSP were prioritized in the documents. The relationship between Turkey and neighboring countries (Mediterranean, Balkan, Middle East, Middle Asia, Caucasus, Black Sea Region, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Israel) were also emphasized in the reports. The most important subjects are ESDP, struggle with international terrorism, Turkey's capacity to implement CFSP, the future of the Middle East peace process.¹⁶⁴

In the progress reports after the Helsinki Summit (December 1999), under the heading of CFSP the EU's expectations from Turkey (which gained a candidate status) increased. Since then, EU decided that the Aegean and Cyprus problems were to be implied not under the headings of CFSP but under the heading of Copenhagen political criteria. One more subject which is always stressed in the reports was Turkey's concerns over operationalization of ESDP and NATO-ESDP cooperation over Berlin-plus. Especially after the 11th September 2001 terrorist attacks, Turkey's leadership and affective role in the Balkans and Middle East which would serve to the regional peace was emphasized.

The EU's middle and long term expectations from Turkey are issued in the Accession Partnership Document. In this document there were some points directly related with CFSP. The first document was written in May 2003. In this document,

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p.491.

EU's expectations from Turkey for the peaceful solution in Cyprus and Aegean problems were declared. The same problems were emphasized in the next Accession Partnership Document of December 2005.¹⁶⁵

As the European Union could not put forward any single concrete and technical criteria for the adaptation of candidate countries' foreign and security policy into CFSP, progress reports issued by European Commission for the candidate countries will be the main reference in understanding the Turkey-EU relations in the framework of CFSP. In November 2005 the European Commission issued a Progress Report according to European Commission 2005 regular report on Turkey. In this report foreign security and defense policy was evaluated under a single heading.

According to this report it is declared that the regular enhanced political dialogue established as a part of the accession strategy with Turkey, has continued with exchanges of views on international issues, such as Southern Caucasus, Western Balkans, the Middle East Process, the Mediterranean and Middle East regions, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan.¹⁶⁶ Turkey has shown a keen interest to continue active participation in political dialogue with the EU including ESDP developments.

Especially Turkey Foreign Ministry's administrative organization is evaluated as compatible with EU/CFSP structures. Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs' connection to the ACN information system thorough which the EU communicates

¹⁶⁵ Turkey's Accession Partnership Document of 2005, [http://europa-eu-un.org/articles/pl/article_5595_pl.htm](http://europa.eu-un.org/articles/pl/article_5595_pl.htm) (accessed on 12 November 2006)

¹⁶⁶ 2005 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Toward Accession, November 2005, http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_2005pdf/package/sec_1426_final_en_progress_report_tr.pdf. (accessed on 10 November 2006)

with the Associated Partners within CFSP was emphasized in the report. Turkey's common position on policies against terrorism and nuclear non-proliferations were implied. According to the report Turkey's contribution to ESDP operations were emphasized as:

Turkey continues to display an active interest in the development of the ESDP. In this connection, Turkey is presently participating in the EU led police missions in Kosovo (UNMIK), in Bosnia-Herzegovina (EUPM), in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Proxima) and in the Democratic Republic of Congo (EUROPOL KINSHASA). Turkey has participated in several UN and NATO missions in the Balkans beginning with UNPROFOR, IFOR, KFOR and SFOR which was replaced in December 2004 by EUFOR-ALTHEA, in which Turkey also participates. It has similarly expressed its desire to contribute to the EUJUST LEX in Iraq concerning the development the rule of law¹⁶⁷

According to the report Turkey declared its will to send its troops to the Battlegroups concept of Headline Goal 2010 at the Military Capabilities Conference which was held in Brussels in November 2004. Turkey, Italy and Romania have signed a letter of intent in May 2005 in Brussels regarding to the formation of a joint battle group that would be offered to the EU in the second half of 2010.¹⁶⁸ Also, Turkey expressed its will to take part in European Defense Agency (EDA) in the near future.

Turkey's participation in the ESDP continues to present certain difficulties. Turkey and the EU have different experiences on the implementation of Berlin-plus arrangement. As a result Turkey's insistence that Malta and Cyprus be excluded from EU-NATO strategic cooperation in crisis management has not been evaluated well by the EU. Besides Turkey also vetoed Cyprus's accession to the Wassenaar agreement concerning the Code of Conduct on Arms Export as well as dual use regulation. Turkey's veto was strictly criticized by the EU.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

In the Regular Report (Progress Report) the EU welcomed Turkey's contribution into regional peace efforts in the Balkans, the Caucasus, Middle East and Mediterranean. Since July 2003, Turkey assumed the Chairmanship of the co-ordination of the Committee of the Southeast Europe Defense Ministerial Process (SEDM/CC) as well as the Chairmanship of the Political Military Steering Committee of the Multinational Peace Force Southeast Europe (PMSC-MPFSEE)¹⁶⁹ Turkey's other initiatives in terms of providing regional stability and peace were BLACKSEAFOR, the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization and D8. Turkey invited the Black Sea neighboring states to participate in the operation called *Black Sea Harmony* which aimed to sustain cooperation between states in preventing illegal activities in the region such as illicit trafficking of weapons of mass destruction.

Under the heading of foreign and security policy chapter, Turkey's relations with neighboring countries were evaluated one by one according to regional similarities. Turkey's adaptation of its foreign and security policy into the EU in its region was the main reason of these evaluations. The EU's expectations from Turkey were clearly mentioned one by one for each region. One of the most important of these evaluations was Turkey-Greece relations in terms of Common Foreign and Security Policy. The positive development of the relations between Turkey and Greece in the fields of energy and judiciary has been welcomed by EU. In this report the other areas which were taken into consideration were Iraq, Syria, Iran, Afghanistan and Armenia. The Cyprus issue was not included under the heading of Common Foreign and Security Policy chapter. Rather, this issue was

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

evaluated under the heading of *Enhanced Political Dialogue* which is the part of Copenhagen Political criteria.

Turkey's interest in ESDP and its experience with NATO and international peacekeeping is thought to provide favorable conditions for Turkey's inclusion in CFSP/ESDP structures after accession. In the EU Commission Staff Working Document issued in October 2004 under the heading of *Issues Arising from Turkey's Possible Membership*, Turkey's contribution to European security was praised.

As of 2003 Turkey had sizeable contingents in Afghanistan (ISAF), in Bosnia (SFOR II) and in Kosovo (KFOR), and it has been entrusted with the leadership of the multinational ISAF contingents in Afghanistan. No insurmountable problems should be expected concerning its implementation capacity and institutional capabilities.¹⁷⁰

With its large military expenditure and manpower, Turkey is thought to have the capacity to contribute significantly to EU-led crisis management operations. Turkish military expenditure is among the highest of all NATO members in relative terms, accounting for 2.59 % of its Gross Domestic Product in 2004, while its 793,000 military personnel constitute 27% of the forces of NATO's European members, and represent 3.9% of Turkey's labor force (compared with 1.7% on average in other European NATO countries).¹⁷¹ Despite Turkey's powerful military capabilities, its integration into the ESDP is declared to be contingent upon EU membership. The common view in declarations of EU was that, only after Turkey's EU membership is achieved, could Turkey be committed to the decision-making mechanisms of ESDP.

¹⁷⁰ EU Commission Staff Working Document, *The Issues Arising from Turkey's membership*, www.photius.com/countries/turkey/turkey_european_union_membership_issues_paper_2004.pdf (accessed on 13 November 2006)

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

However, the EU thinks that Turkey is hesitant to align itself to EU positions on issues which it feels touch its vital foreign policy and security interests, in particular regarding its geographical neighborhood (Iraq, Caucasus, etc.), human rights and developments in Muslim countries, where it insists on a distinct national position. In the Document it is also stated that, ‘although Turkey has the capacity to make significant contributions to CSFP and ESDP, its political ability and willingness to do so will remain in doubt as long as it is unable to offer a convincing multi-annual record of alignment with the EU’s foreign policy.’¹⁷² Therefore Turkey’s alignment of its foreign and security policy to the EU was the most important precondition of EU membership. Turkey’s EU membership could only be achieved after Turkey aligns itself in fields of foreign and security policies similarly to the EU.

From the point of view of the EU’s role in foreign affairs, Turkey’s accession brings both advantages and challenges. It could help to stabilize the conflict-prone zone of the Middle East, but it would bring the EU into more direct involvement with the difficult political and security problems of the region. Turkey being a member would give the EU greater weight in regional and world affairs, but it could also make decision-making, especially under unanimity, more complicated. Summing up, Turkey could be a factor for enhancing stability and the role of the EU in the region, but its membership would present challenges as well as opportunities in the field of foreign affairs.

In the Negotiating Framework Document issued by European Union Council in October 2005, until the full membership process is achieved it is expected from Turkey that it has to align its policies towards third countries and its attitude in the

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

international organizations (including the membership of EU members to these organizations and arrangements) according to policies and positions accepted by the Union and member states. In this document, by meaning third countries, Cyprus and Muslim countries in the region have been understood as areas of concern.

5.5. Turkey's Reaction to the Developments in ESDP

Turkey was not satisfied with the position it gained in ESDP in Brussels and the decisions taken in the Copenhagen European Council (December 2002). As we stated, Turkey was not allowed to participate in the ESDP strategic planning process in operations where NATO assets and capabilities are used, nor did Turkey guarantee that it will be invited to EU-led operations without NATO assets and capabilities.¹⁷³ According to Onur Öymen¹⁷⁴ Turkey's concerns about ESDP can be classified into four categories: 'institutional concerns, with respect to preserving the integrity of NATO, concerns on how best to strengthen European security, a matter of principle to respect agreements reached at level of Heads of State and Government (Washington Summit) and national concerns with respect to protecting national interest.'¹⁷⁵

Turkey thought that the operationalization of ESDP, of which Turkey is not a member along with other non-EU European Allies, was perceived as a threat to NATO's solidarity and indivisibility of security. According to Turkey, formation of ESDP should develop in conformity with the principles of indivisibility of security and preservation of Atlantic link. With the establishment of ESDP as an EU-only

¹⁷³ Gözen, *Op cit.*, p.128.

¹⁷⁴ Turkey's Permanent representative to NATO between 1991-1995

¹⁷⁵ Terzi, *op cit.*, p.53

European security organization, European Union made “institution building” but not all inclusive formation of a security architecture which would exclude participation of non-EU European countries which are related with European security. European security should be established within the participation of the non-EU European countries according to their level of commitments.

The EU has differences with Turkey on the approach to international politics and foreign policy. It should be considered that Europe’s perception of security is different from that of Turkey. According to Ali Karaosmanoğlu: ‘the EU turned *inwards*, trying to build up a secure community in Europe per se. Turkey has turned *outwards*, trying to improve security in Eurasia.’¹⁷⁶ However this does not mean that Turkish and EU security priorities can not be reconciled. As EU confined participation of European security into EU membership, Turkey has a chance to be in European security architecture by fulfilling the Copenhagen criteria and becoming a member of the EU. According to the Terzi, Turkey’s objectives and expectations from EU about ESDP are states as follows:

- a) participate on regular basis in day to day planning and consultations on matters related to European security, as was the case within the WEU,
- b) Participate fully and equally in the process leading to decision making on all EU-led operations drawing on collective asset and capabilities of NATO and their implementation,
- c) Participate in the decision-shaping and subsequent preparation, planning and conduct of EU operations not drawing on NATO assets and capabilities.¹⁷⁷

According to the European Union, Turkey’s objectives stated above could only be achieved after Turkey’s inclusion into European Union. Full integration into ESDP was the only option of Turkey in order to achieve these objectives as it

¹⁷⁶ Karaosmanoglu, Ali, ‘Turkey’s security policy in connection with USA and EU’ in Hasan Celal Güzel et al.,(eds.) *The Turks*, Vol.5, (Ankara: 2002)

¹⁷⁷ Terzi, *op cit.*, p.55.

was impossible without an EU membership. In establishing ESDP, European Union emphasized the respect given to the decision-making mechanisms of EU. It is respectable for the EU to maintain the decision-making autonomy of the members. However, EU's expectations from Turkey on European security and defense confirmed Turkey importance for the EU when compared with any single member state. Contrary to expectations, the EU's positioning Turkey in ESDP is not related with Turkey's capabilities and dynamics in European security and defense.

5.6. Turkey's Responses in the Face of ESDP and EU Membership

Full integration into the ESDP is the main objective of Turkey in order to be equal part of European security architecture. This will open the way for Turkey to be part of security community that has been under development by the EU for so many years. However this is indeed a medium term project and contingent upon Turkey's full integration into the EU.¹⁷⁸ Due to its size, population and above all geopolitical position, Turkey's EU membership will have a great impact on EU foreign policy, perhaps even before full membership, which is why EU institutions, even at this early stage are paying considerable attention to the compatibilities between Turkish and EU foreign policies. The EU's search on these compatibilities is linked to the fact that there is an increasing interdependence between Turkey and EU's security concerns. According to Atila Eralp, Turkey's security problems have already penetrated Europe and became internal to Europe, European security problems, such as conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo, have also become Turkey's problems.¹⁷⁹ In sum

¹⁷⁸ Gözen, *op cit.*, p.132.

¹⁷⁹ Güney N.Ateşoğlu , *Contentious Issues of Security and Future of Turkey*, (Hampshire: Ashgate Publications, 2006), p.38.

neither Turkey nor the EU can face these threats alone and these challenges required a joint response in European security together with Turkey and EU.

Turkey's full integration into ESDP is important for Turkey as it is believed that Turkey is an important country for European Union and cooperation with EU in the field of European security was needed. Accordingly, at the Capabilities Commitment Conference (November 2000) Turkey proved its determination to be in the process of ESDP by informing fifteen EU member states that it was prepared to offer to the future rapid reaction force some 5000 troops; showing its intention to take part in European Security and Defense Policy.¹⁸⁰ This contribution is far more than the contributions of the most of the EU members. Consequently, full integration into ESDP would give Turkey a chance to show and confirm its contribution in European security and foreign policy.

Several European politicians including Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy have offered Turkey "special partnership" status instead of full membership. According to its proponents, it means offering Ankara everything but institutions. That is to say, a share of most EU policies and the establishment of enhanced political dialogue but without participation in the decision making bodies of economic, foreign policy and security areas. Turkey's exclusion from EU would have complicated consequences for the stability of EU neighborhood, in the Balkans, Middle East and Caucasus, and may affect the security of some EU countries such as Greece and Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus. In

¹⁸⁰ Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration Brussels, 20 November 2000, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Military%20Capabilities%20Commitment%20Declaration.pdf> (accessed on 28 September 2006)

this scenario, Turkey could also play an obstructive role in NATO in strengthening of EU defense policy.¹⁸¹

European Union has given Turkey a message that there is a common ESDP inside Union. Yet, is there any ESDP above the members of the Union. Although it is shared by many scholars that EU has developed a common European Security and Defense Policy inside Union, this policy has an intergovernmental structure. The structure of European Security and Defense Policy is intergovernmental. Therefore, it could be said that Turkey's EU membership is not the sole option for Turkey for its integration into ESDP. Before Turkey's full membership into the Union, a joint Turkey-ESDP Council could be established for the integration of Turkey into ESDP. This Council could sustain Turkey's integration into European security even before its EU membership. Establishment of a joint Council would not harm the intergovernmental structure of ESDP as well. Turkey could also participate in ESDP meetings and be in the process of decision making process with its different status. EU also would reach a chance to benefit from Turkey's geopolitical position and military capabilities in ESDP operations without harming the ESDP structure.

In the framework of Turkey-ESDP Council over European security, Turkey's integration into European defense and EDA could be provided. Turkey for years intended to take part in EDA military projects however its participation was hampered by Council's invitation and decision. Turkey's participation into European defense sector would integrate Turkey into military industry and economy. The joint projects in which Turkey will be attending would be beneficial to Turkey's other economical sectors. Turkey-EU Council would give Turkey the

¹⁸¹ Ateşoğlu, *op cit.*, p.47.

position he deserved in European security by without making his contribution be dependent upon EU membership.

Having NATO and the EU's support in security and defense, Turkey could be a powerful actor in the region, acting as a source of stability in all aspects. Such an eventuality would bring many advantages. First of all, the Turkish nation would improve its power and security in all dimensions. Turkey's alignment with EU's foreign and security policy and EU's revision of its foreign policy according to Turkey's security interests would enhance the affect of European Union in the region. Secondly, an economically and militarily integrated Turkey would enhance its military-strategic capabilities which would make Turkey a regional power. This could lead positively to the contribution of the EU to regional security efforts and cause Europe to be a global actor. Thirdly, Turkey's full integration into ESDP as an EU member would make it a more credible and influential power which led to behave as a mediator in problems such as Israel-Palestinian and Iraq. Turkey could get involved in and contribute to, not only military strategic operations but also economic-political-legal operations in all these places.¹⁸²

¹⁸² Gözen, *op cit*, p.136.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Analysis of Turkey's responses in the face of the formation of ESDP is the main focus of this thesis. Whether Turkey's participation, with her enough defense capacity, in all dimensions of European Security and Defense Policy has been possible or not is the legitimate question that is explored in this thesis. In this thesis, the underlying theme is that, being a candidate and currently negotiating actor, Turkey has the rights to involve in European security and defense architecture which had inherited from WEU Associate Membership, though denied by the EU, and she has the sufficient military capabilities to participate in all dimensions of ESDP process.

To emphasize the significance of Turkey's participation in ESDP, this thesis analyzed the background of the development of ESDP and Turkey's participation as a non-EU European NATO member. Turkey is one of the most powerful countries among non-EU European NATO members. Although it is believed that Turkey is a pivotal country in sustaining stability in its region, the ESDP process led to the exclusion of Turkey from decision making structure of ESDP. Therefore, Turkey put reservations in the process of ESDP by when necessary vetoing the EU's automatic use of NATO's assets and capabilities in times of crisis.

Developments of Turkey's relations with European countries started in the bipolar international environment of the Cold War. The relations started in the scope of European security and defense when both sides need to form an alliance against any Soviet threat. Security and defense became the subjects of partnership between EC countries and Turkey. After the end of the Cold War, European powers decided to establish a collective security architecture which would maintain the

power of European states. The structure established for the provision of coordination in European foreign policy and security matters had an institutional feature within intergovernmental character. During the early years of the establishment of political union, intergovernmental structure prevented EU to reach unanimity in several political and military matters. Thus blocked EU to enhance CFSP and therefore, US dependency on security and defense continued.

Within this context it is argued that the intention of the Western European States, notably the members of EC/EU, to launch a political cooperation in foreign policy, security and defense matters was shaped by both external and internal factors. As for the internal factors, this thesis focused on the most important actors in the European Union, especially Britain, France and Germany and tried to examine the respective positions of them towards the European security and defense cooperation. At this point, it is argued that these Member States have certain standpoints and visions concerning this field. They have revised and reproduced their foreign policy preferences according to the changing international structures.

As regards the transatlantic relations, this thesis attached utmost importance to the position of United States, which substantially committed to the European security and defense for more than fifty years by playing political and military leadership. The formation of ESDP has carried the potential to create tensions in the sense that although United States called for their European partners to take greater responsibility for the security and defense of Europe, it had suspicions about this very European initiative if it could undermine and duplicate NATO efforts, discriminate against NATO countries that are not EU members; while strengthening the European military capabilities. Accordingly, formation of the ESDP as an

autonomous security and defense initiative was considered by US as a challenge to its hegemony in Europe.

In the middle of 1990s there were questions about, would EU be politically sound and militarily powerful enough to provide European security in the newly emerging structure or would US continue to sustain its influence in Europe? In the St. Malo political declaration (1998) and Helsinki European Council (1999), EU took decisions to establish a European security and defense policy by which EU wanted to create its own foreign and security policy. Without harming solidarity in Euro-Atlantic security, EU aimed to be powerful enough to sustain security of the Union. In this process St. Malo Franco-British declaration was considered as a turning point in establishment of European security architecture. After this declaration, EU security architecture has progressed and developed other than NATO/US influence.

Turkey is an important actor in the formation of ESDP. In this thesis, Turkey's position in European security since the 1950s and its expectations from EU was examined. Formation of ESDP undermined the importance of Turkey for European security in the sense that this process exclude Turkey as it is a non-EU European NATO member. Since then, questions arouse about Turkey's participation in European security and defense. Would Turkey be participating as an equal member in ESDP even before its EU membership or would NATO membership continue to be backbone of Turkey's involvement into European security? EU officials asserted that Turkey's EU membership was a prerequisite for its full participation in ESDP. However, Turkey thinks that its participation in ESDP should not be contingent upon EU membership process.

Moreover, Turkey played a pivotal position in the process of operationalization of ESDP. Turkey was the sole supporter of the idea that usage of NATO assets and capabilities should be dependent of the decisions of NAC on a case by case basis in case of an application by EU in its crises management operations. As a member of NATO, Turkey showed its determination to veto EU's usage of NATO assets and capabilities if its participation in ESDP was impeded by EU officials. Emphasizing its importance for European security and defense, Turkey wanted to participate in all dimensions of ESDP.

European Union was aware that Turkey had enough military capabilities and military institutions to participate in all dimensions of ESDP. Turkey's contribution into European security in the WEU and NATO frameworks also proved Turkey as a loyal ally of Western World. Although Turkey has the intention and capability to participate in ESDP, European Union did not accept Turkey's full membership as she is not a member of European Union. EU emphasized that, Turkey's ESDP membership is contingent on EU membership.

As a result of the developments a deal reached between Turkey and EU on ESDP with the Ankara Agreement in December 2001. The Brussels document, which was accepted by the EU Council meeting in Brussels on October 24th-25th, was endorsed by the Copenhagen European Council meeting on December 12th-13th, 2002. The Brussels Document accepted the provisions reached in the Ankara Agreement. According to the Agreement, ESDP would not be used against any Ally and in case of an autonomous EU operation conducted in the geographic proximity of a non-EU European Ally or may affect its national interests, the Council will consult with that Ally, and taking into consideration the outcome of these consultations, decide on the participation of that Ally.

According to the deal reached in Ankara Document, Turkey is not allowed to participate in the ESDP decision-making process in operations with NATO assets and capabilities, nor is Turkey guaranteed that it will be invited to EU-led operations without NATO assets and capabilities. It can only be a transitional solution to give assurances for Turkey by using its veto in the North Atlantic Council for usage of NATO assets and capabilities.

The structure of international system had also profound affects on the formation and the nature of political cooperation. Within this context, this thesis has argued that international structure was the most important factor that compelled the both actors to revise both their own national foreign policies. Establishment of ESDP as an autonomous foreign and security policy mechanism led the EU to behave as an international actor. In the era of US hegemony, formation of EU as an international actor should be considered as a challenge to US political and economic hegemony. Therefore, Turkey's ESDP and EU membership should be considered by taking into consideration the international environment. Hegemonic intentions of US and EU's challenge towards US in security and defense directly affect Turkey's ESDP membership.

Developments in European defense in parallel with security were examined in this thesis. EU was aware of the fact that without having had own defense capabilities, an autonomous ESDP could become reality only in words. In parallel with this decision, formation of European Capability Action Plan and establishment of European Defense Agency (EDA) were achieved to point out deficiencies in European defense. By establishing EDA, EU aimed to be sufficient in defense

capabilities without depending on NATO assets and capabilities in the future, in order to undertake EU-led crisis management operations.

The contribution of Turkey in European Defense structure was examined under the heading of 'contribution of non-EU European NATO members'. Non-EU European NATO Members and the states which are candidates to EU are excluded from European defense developments. Similar with ESDP process, Turkey's contribution on European defense developments were limited by giving Turkey a consultative position. Moreover, participation of Turkey in EDA and battlegroups were decided to be contingent on EU member's unanimous approval. When comes to the strategic decision-making over a decision to undertake a mission or not and strategic planning, (how to conduct) the contribution of non-EU European NATO members was not needed.

When Turkey's WEU membership and possible contribution into ESDP was taken into consideration, it is clear that EU did not behave Turkey as it expected to be. EU was aware that Turkey's contribution into ESDP would make EU more powerful as EU wanted to be a global actor. However, accepting its importance, Turkey was offered an interim station position in which practical arrangements for joint action was preferred to be most appropriate. The main motivation behind this policy was to make ESDP decision making body under the European Union's members' control. Turkey's position is badly undermined in European security and defense in the sense that, although it promised to be part of ESDP, Turkey was put out of strategic decision making mechanism of ESDP.

Although it is shared by many scholars that EU has developed a common European Security and Defense Policy inside Union, this policy has an intergovernmental structure. Establishment of Turkey-ESDP Council could be a

solution for the integration of Turkey into European security and defense without impairing the intergovernmental structure of ESDP. Turkey could also participate in ESDP meetings and be in the process of decision making process with its different status. EU also would reach a chance to benefit from Turkey's geopolitical position and military capabilities in ESDP operations without harming the ESDP structure.

EU's efforts to keep the decision making structure of ESDP in EU itself caused non-EU European NATO members out of ESDP process. As Turkey's integration into ESDP was impeded within the EU membership contingency, she tries to slow down cooperation between EU and NATO. Consequently, from the beginning Turkey did not admit the EU claim that Turkey's full integration into ESDP should be contingent upon EU membership.

The view that Turkey's EU membership process will be fastened or may be concluded by its full participation into Common Foreign and Security Policy even before economic and political fields is thought to be incorrect. Turkey's economic development and adaptation of her foreign policy according to the Copenhagen criteria would be the determining factors in Turkey's EU membership process. Therefore, Turkey's EU membership process should not be linked with her full participation, including decision making structure, into ESDP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book and Articles

Ateşoğlu, N. Güney, *Contentious Issues of Security and Future of Turkey*, (Hampshire: Ashgate Publications, 2006)

Aybet, Gülnur, *The Dynamics of European Security and Cooperation, 1945-1991*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997)

Bağcı, Hüseyin, and Yıldız, Ali, 'Turkey and the European security and defense policy (ESDP): from confrontational to cooperative relationship,' in Karaosmanoglu, Ali (ed), *Europeanisation of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*, Foreign Policy Institute, (Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 2004), pp.79-96.

Bilgin, Pınar, 'Clash of cultures? Differences between Turkey and European Union on security,' in Karaosmanoglu, Ali (ed), *Europeanisation of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*, Foreign Policy Institute, (Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 2004)

Black, Cyril E. and others, *Rebirth: A History of Europe Since World War 2*, (London: Westview Press, 1992)

Bozo, Frederick, *Two Strategies for Europe*, (Newyork: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001)

Brimmer, Esther, *The EU's Search for A Strategic Role : ESDP and Implications for Transatlantic Relations* (Washington: Center for Transatlantic Relations Johns Hopk, 2002)

Croft, Stuart, 'The EU, NATO and Europeanisation: The Return of the Architectural Debate', *European Security*, 9:3 (2000)

Çayhan, E.; "Towards a European Security and Defense Policy: With or Without Turkey?", *Turkish Studies*, 2003, Vol.4, pp. 35-54.

Emerson, Michael, and Tocci, Natalie, 'Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy', *CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor*, (No.7, July 2004)

Emerson, Michael, and Tocci, Natalie; "Turkey as a Bridgehead and Spearhead Integrating EU and Turkish Foreign Policy", *Center for European Policy Studies*, (No.1, August, 2004), pp.1-35.

European Defense from St. Malo to Copenhagen, *Chailot Papers* (Paris: 2004)

Favretto, Marcella with Kokkinides, Tasos, 'Anarchy in Albania, Collapse of European Collective Security System', *Occasional Papers on International Security Policy*, (No 21: 1997)

Hatipoğlu, Esra, 'Müzakere sürecinde Türk dış politikasının Avrupalılaşması ve ortak dış ve güvenlik politikasına uyum tartışmaları' in Dikkaya, Mehmet ed., *AB Yolunda Türkiye: Müzakere Sürecinin Ekonomi Politikası*, (İstanbul: Alfa, 2006), pp.480-493.

Haugevik, K. Marie, *Strategic Adaptation or Identity Change? An Analysis of Britain's Approach to ESDP 1998-2004*, (Norwegian Institute, 2005)

Solana Javier, 'NATO in the Twenty-First Century', *Perceptions*, (Vol.4, No.1, March-May 1999)

Hunter, Robert, *European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's Companion or Competitor*, (Washington: RAND Cooperation, 2002)

Independent Commission on Turkey, *Turkey in Europe: More than a Promise*, (Belgium: 2004)

Gnesotto, Nicole, *AB Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası İlk Beş Yıl*, (İstanbul: Tasam, 2005)

Gözen, Ramazan, *Turkey's Delicate Position between NATO and ESDP*, (Ankara: SAM Papers, No.1, 2003)

Karaosmanoglu, Ali, 'Turkey's security policy in connection with USA and EU' in Hasan Celal Güzel et al., (eds.) *The Turks*, Vol.5, (Ankara: 2002)

Lange, Peter, et al. (Editor), *Unraveling the European Security and Defense Policy Conundrum*, (Zurich: Peter Lang Publishing 2002)

Mares, R David, 'Middle Powers under Regional Hegemony: to Challenge or Acquiesce in Hegemonic Enforcement', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No.4, (December 1998)

Mearsheimer, John, Structural Realism, in Dunne, Kurki and Smith, *International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Missiroli, A.; 'EU-NATO Cooperation in Crisis Management: No Turkish Delight for ESDP', *Security Dialogue*, (Vol. 33, No. 1, 2002), pp. 9-26.

NATO Handbook, North Atlantic Treaty Article 5, (Belgium, 2006)

Nolan, Cathal J., 'The OSCE: Non-military dimensions of cooperative security in Europe' in Hodge, Carl C., *Redefining European Security*, (Newyork: Routledge, 1999)

Nye, Joseph, 'The Changing Nature of World Power', *Political Science Quarterly*, (Volume 105, No.2, 1990), pp.1-12.

Terzi, Özlem, 'New Capabilities, Old Relationships: Emergent ESDP and EU-Turkish Relations', *Southeast European Politics* (Vol. 3, No. 1, 2002), pp.43-61.

Tocci, Nathalie and Hauben, Marc, *Accommodating Turkey in ESDP*, CEPS Policy Brief No.5, (Brussels, 2001)

Turkish General Staff, PfP Training Centre Course Guide , (Ankara, 2001)

Volgy, J. Thomas and Imwalle E. Lawrence, 'Hegemonic and Bipolar Perspectives on the New World Order', *American Journal of Political Science*, (Vol.9, No.4, 1995)

Internet Resources

North Atlantic Council Brussels Summit, 11 January 1994,
<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940111a.htm> (accessed on 15 June 2006)

The Maastricht Treaty of European Union, February 1992, *Title 5: Provisions on a Common Foreign and Security Policy*,
<http://www.europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/top.html> - 2k (accessed on 21 June 2006)

Öymen, Onur, *The Future of European Security and NATO*, Paper delivered to the twelfth International Antalya Conference on Security and Cooperation, 11-15 April 2002. see in <http://www.insightturkey.com/is2.htm> (accessed on 01 November 2006)

Western European Union Council of Ministers, Petersberg Declaration,
<http://www.weu.int/documents/920619peten.pdf> (accessed on 22 June 2006)

North Atlantic Council Brussels Summit, 11 January 1994,
<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940111a.htm> (accessed on 2 July 2006)

Treaty of Amsterdam Amending the Treaty on European Union, 10 November 1997,
<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/amsterdam.html>, (accessed on 11 July 2006)

Franco-British Summit Joint Declaration on European Defense,
<http://www.atlanticcommunity.org/Saint-Malo%20Declaration%20Text.html>
(accessed on 20 July 2006)

Ministerial Meeting of The North Atlantic Council Brussels , 8 December 1998,
<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1998/p981208e.htm> (accessed on 3 August 2006)

WEU Council of Ministers, 19 June 1992, *The Planning Arrangement (precisely for Iceland, Norway and Turkey)*,
http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2000/20001100_cli_ess_staden.pdf,
(accessed on 12 August 2006)

NATO Washington Summit Communique Press Release, 24 April 1999,
<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm> (accessed on 23 August 2006)

European Council Declaration Cologne, 3-4 June 1999,
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/kol2_en.htm (accessed on 2 September 2006)

Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusions, 10-11 December 1999,
Common European Policy on Security and Defence,
http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec99/dec99_en.htm (accessed on 14 September 2006)

Helsinki European Council, Presidency Conclusions, 10-11 December 1999,
Consultation and Cooperation with Non-EU Countries and with NATO ,
http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec99/dec99_en.htm (accessed on 25 September 2006)

Santa Maria da Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, June 19–20, 2000,
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/fei1_en.htm - 56k (accessed on 27 September 2006)

Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration Brussels, November 20, 2000,
<http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Military%20Capabilities%20Commitment%20Declaration.pdf> (accessed on 28 September 2006)

Nice European Council Presidency Conclusions, December 7–9, 2000, *Annex VI European Security and Defence Policy*,
http://www.ec.europa.eu/nice_council/index_en.htm (accessed on 28 September 2006)

NATO Washington Summit, Communique, 24 April 1999,
<http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm> (accessed on 12 October 2006)

Cologne European Council Presidency Conclusions, 3-4 June 1999,
http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.htm - 64k - (accessed on 14 October 2006)

Helsinki European Council Presidency Conclusion,
<http://ue.eu.int/en/Info/eurocouncil/index.htm>, (accessed on 17 October 2006)

Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999, *the European Council Declaration on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defense*, http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.htm (accessed on 17 October 2006)

Santa Maria de Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, 19-20 June 2000, <http://www.europa2002.hu/3rd/3rdm.pdf>, (accessed on 19 October, 2006)

Nice European Council Presidency Conclusions, 7-10 December 2000, http://www.europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/dec2000/dec2000_en.htm (accessed on 23 October 2006)

Nice European Council Explanatory Memorandum Submitted by Bakoyianni, *Contributions of non-EU Countries, Reporter*, http://www.assembly-weu.org/./sessions_ordinaires/rpt/2001/1734.php (accessed on 24 October 2006)

Santa Maria de Feira European Council Presidency Conclusions, 19-20 June 2000, <http://www.europa2002.hu/3rd/3rdm.pdf> (accessed on 28 October 2006)

NATO Washington Summit Communique, Paragraph 10, 23 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm> (accessed on 2 November 2006)

NATO Strategic Concept, 23-24 April 1999, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm> (accessed on 3 November 2006)

Ankara Document, *Turkey and ESDP: A Fact Sheet*, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/director/TurkeyESDPbkgr.do> (accessed on 11 November 2006)

Brussels European Council, 24-25 October 2002, *Presidency Conclusions on European Security and Defense Policy, ESDP Implementation of the Nice provisions on the Involvement of the Non-EU European Allies*, http://www.ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/72968.pdf (accessed on 12 November 2006)

Copenhagen European Council, 12-13 December 2002, *Presidency Conclusions on European Security and Defense Policy*, http://www.eu2002.dk/news/upload/conclusions_uk20021216111046.pdf (accessed on 15 November 2006)

Statement on Improving European Military Capabilities Press Release, Brussels, 19-20 November 2001, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/European%20Capability%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Excerpt%20Press%20Releas> (accessed on 17 November 2006)

Lindstrom, Gustaw, Helsinki Headline Goal, (ISS, 2006), <http://www.iss-eu.org/esdp/05-gl.pdf> (accessed on 17 November 2006)

Statement on Improving European Military Capabilities, Press Release, Brussels, 19-20 November 2001.

Joint Action of the Council of Ministers on 12 July 2004, [http:// europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf). (accessed on 18 November 2006)

European Defense Agency official website, <http://www.eda.europa.eu/background.htm> (accessed on 18 November 2006)

Hampton Court Summit, 4 November 2005, <http://www.eda.europa.eu/hamptoncourtagenda.htm>, (accessed on 17 November 2006)

Joint Action of the Council of Ministers on 12 July 2004, [http:// europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2004/l_245/l_24520040717en00170028.pdf). (accessed on 20 November 2006)

Western European Armament Group Official Website, <http://www.weu.int/weag/index.html> (accessed on 21 November 2006)

Headline Goal 2010, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/2010%20Headline%20Goal.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2006), p.1.

Military Capability Commitment Conference, 22 November 2004, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/MILITARY%20CAPABILITY%20COMMITMENT%20CONFERENCE%2022.11.04.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2006)

Relations between Turkey and European Union, Official website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.devletim.com/git.asp?link=390> (accessed on 14 November 2006)

EU-Turkey Relations, <http://www.euractiv.com/en//eu-turkey-relations/article-129678>, (accessed on 25 October 2006)

EU Commission Staff Working Document, *The Issues Arising from Turkey's membership*, http://www.photius.com/countries/turkey/turkey_european_union_membership_issues_paper_2004.pdf , (accessed on 11 November 2006)

A Secure Europe in a Better world: A European Strategy, 12 December 2003, <http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (accessed on 12 November 2006)

Turkey's Accession Partnership Document of 2005, http://europa-eu-un.org/articles/pl/article_5595_pl.htm (accessed on 12 November 2006)

2005 Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Toward Accession, November 2005,
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/report_2005pdf/package/sec_1426_final_en_progress_report_tr.pdf. (accessed on 10 November 2006)

EU Commission Staff Working Document, *The Issues Arising from Turkey's membership*,
http://www.photius.com/countries/turkey/turkey_european_union_membership_issues_paper_2004.pdf (accessed on 13 November 2006)

Military Capabilities Commitment Declaration Brussels, 20 November 2000,
<http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/Military%20Capabilities%20Commitment%20Declaration.pdf> (accessed on 28 September 2006)