



CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE FORMATION EUROPEENE
INSTITUT EUROPEEN DES HAUTES ETUDES INTERNATIONALES
DIPLOME DES HAUTES ETUDES EUROPEENNES ET
INTERNATIONALES
Trilingual Branch



Security Aspect of Turkey – EU Relations

Ceyhun Emre DOĞRU

Research Directors:

Claude Nigoul

Dr. Matthias Waechter

Nice, May 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DEVELOPMENT OF SECURITY RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT	3
A. Turkish Foreign Policy and Its Founding Principles	3
B. Cold War: A Pragmatic Rapprochement	5
C. The Post-Cold War Period	7
I. Transformation of the Turkish Security Policy	7
II. Re-Emergence of Europe and the ESS	10
a. Implications of the Maastricht Treaty	10
b. An Appraisal of the ESS: The Context and Nature	11
D. Assessment of the History: Changing Form of the Permanent Interdependence	20
SECURITY POLICIES AND MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS	22
A. Comparison of Security Understandings of the EU and Turkey	22
I. Europe: Human Security	22
II. Turkey: Traditional State Security	25
B. Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU	27
I. How to Analyse the CFSP	27
II. CFSP: In Search of Politisation	28
III. Efficiency – Consistency	31
C. Turkey and CFSP: An Interaction in Progress	32
I. Europeanization of the Turkish Security Policy	32
II. Turkey’s Contribution to CFSP	33
MUDDLING THROUGH IN DEFENCE AND MILITARY ASPECT	36
A. Turkey in NATO	36
I. Transformation of NATO and Turkey	36
II. Turkey and Different NATO Policies	39
B. NATO – EU Relations	41
I. EU in NATO: ESDI and ESDP	41
a. Establishment of ESDP: What Autonomy vis-à-vis NATO?	41
b. European Pillar within NATO: the Building of ESDI	43
II. Legal Basis of Current Relationship and its Outcomes	43
a. From WEU Agreements to Berlin Plus	43
b. Berlin Plus in Practice	44
III. Competition or Co-operation: Challenges and Opportunities for NATO-EU Partnership	46
a. Is There Still a Common Understanding?	46
b. Hard Power or Soft Power: A Question of Subsidiarity	48
c. The US and an Autonomous ESDP	50
d. Different Approaches within the EU	51
e. The EU as a Defence Alliance?	52
IV. Turkey’s Perspective on NATO – EU Cooperation	53
C. Turkey and ESDP	55
I. An Appraisal of ESDP and Operations	56
II. Turkey’s Contribution to ESDP and Challenges	58
D. Clearing Up the Opportunities	59
CONCLUSION	61

Abbreviations

ASEAN - The Association of Southeast Asian Nations

CFSP – Common Foreign and Security Policy

EDA – European Defence Agency

ENP – European Neighborhood Policy

EPC – European Political Co-operation

ESDI – European Security and Defence Identity

ESDP – European Security and Defence Policy

ESS – European Security Strategy

EU – the European Union

IAEA – International Atomic Energy Agency

Mercosur - Southern Common Market (*Mercado Común del Sur*)

NAC – North Atlantic Council

PSC – Political and Security Committee

NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization

PfP – Partnership for Peace

PKK – Kurdistan Workers' Party (*Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan*)

UN – the United Nations

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNSC – United Nations Security Council

US – United States of America

WEU – Western European Union

WMD – Weapons of Mass Destruction

INTRODUCTION

Relations between political organizations touch upon, if are not totally based on, the security domain. The reason that this research is undertaken is to analyse this part of Turkey – EU relations. Started in 1963, the relationship between Turkey and the EU has undergone significant changes throughout years and covered various domains, such as political, economic, and cultural. This work, however, confines itself to explore the security aspect of this process and aims at contributing to the general debate about Turkey’s EU bid. To this end, two main questions are posed in order to shed light on the subject matter: To what extent do the EU and Turkey need each other to pursue their security goals? Can Turkey bring an added value to EU’s ambition of becoming a global security actor?

By researching the answers to these questions, this work argues that the security considerations of Turkey and the EU are highly compatible and an interdependent approach is therefore needed to address common risks and threats that they are confronted with. Corollary, a cost and benefit analysis is inevitable whose sequence will be included in the decision making process for Turkey’s EU membership. To this aim, impediments and incentives for advancing the co-operation are duly analysed and necessary points are discussed for further analysis.

The structure of this work is divided into three main parts. First, historical development of Turkey – EU security relations is handled. The founding principles of Turkish foreign and security policy are explained to understand the deep rooted ideological basis of Turkey’s

Westernism choice. Subsequently, reasons of mutual engagement and transformations of the relationship are analysed in the Cold War and post-Cold War contexts. The second part begins with a comparative analysis of security understandings of both Turkey and the EU and highlights the distinction between traditional state security and human security respectively. Next, Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU is assessed and Turkey's position in CFSP considerations is pointed out from various perspectives. In the third part, the military and defence domain of relations is put forward. Therefore, the relationship within NATO is examined from a legal aspect and different arguments are discussed. Afterward, European Security and Defence Policy and Turkey's contributions as well as reservations are separately argued. In the end of every main chapter, a general assessment section takes place to emphasize the most important points of casual links.

The methodology which is followed in this work is the collection and interpretation of mostly primary sources (legal provisions, institutional reports, government declarations, speeches of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs etc.). The political nature of the subject and its covering of ever changing dynamics compelled to scrutinize news sources. The inputs of the library and internet research are inserted into the examination to enrich the discussion points. These discussions are based on normative explanations and do not necessarily aim at finding concrete results but precisely pointing out political choices and their potential outcomes.

I greatly acknowledge the assistance of the supervisors of this research, Mr. Claude Nigoul and Dr. Matthias Waecheter in determining the proper structure and pertinent questions to explore the subject matter. Prof. Matthias Jopp and Ms. Elfreide Regelsberger bestowed their valuable advises for the further research on CFSP and ESDP issues.

DEVELOPMENT OF SECURITY RELATIONS IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

From Principles to 21st Century

A. Turkish Foreign Policy and Its Founding Principles

Established in 1923 with the Lausanne Treaty, the modern Republic of Turkey is the biggest inheritor of multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. The foundations of the new Republic were laid at the final phases of the XIX. Century with constitutionalist movements. However, Turkey as a nation-state was born after the costly War of the Independence (1919 – 1923), whose hero, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, became the founder of Turkey and overwhelmingly regarded as the most ambitious reformist leader of his period.

To understand the foreign and security policy of Turkey, examination of domestic and external factors is imperative, thus both have decisive impacts on decision making processes. Therefore, domestically, national identity building of the state, founding principles of the foreign policy and determination of interests through this identity perspective are interlinked. As to external factors, geographical situation, neighboring countries and international developments give a clear perspective for foreign policy outcomes and periodical state behaviors.

State identity of the Republic has been formed by two main principles: *Secularism* and *Westernism*.¹ The former concept implies both domestic and external repercussions. In order to preserve the modern republic's contemporary political system, secularism had to be protected against religious influence of Ottoman heritage. In external relations, secularism approach was considered as the basis of rationalist decision making, which has no affiliation with religious concerns and provides a large scale of political choices for governments. The latter concept, Westernism, enlightens the whole course of Turkish foreign policy until today. Since its founding, Westernism points out the outright acceptance by the western community through taking part in their organisations. *Kemalist* ideology aims 'to reach the contemporary civilisations'. These principles, from a realistic perspective, comply with the requirements of conjunctural developments at the early stages of the XX. Century. In a world, dominated by Western powers, Turkey made a rational choice by accepting their basic principles.

Since its establishment, Turkey's security has been shaped by two main determinants: its geography and historical background.² As regards the geopolitical situation, Turkey has always been in an uncomfortable area; surrounded by regions with protracted conflicts, Middle East, Caucasian and Balkans and has obliged Ankara to make critical choices. As to the historical background, Turkish people carried the feelings of being reduced from an Empire to a nation state. By the same token, the War of Independence entailed the strong emphasis of national sovereignty and fight against foreign intervention.

Based on these principles, in the inter-war period, Turkey's foreign and security policy molded four outcomes³: Preserving the *status quo*, shunning joining any alliances and attending conferences with religious agenda, building strong relations with the West and rejecting imperial or irredentist policies. Disputed border with Iraq, which was a British colony at that time, has been fixed by the decision of the League of Nations in 1926 at the expense of Turkish interests. In the pre-war period, Turkey had to follow a more active policy. The establishment of *Balkan Entente*, was signed between Turkey, Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia in 1934. Similarly, *Saadabad Pact*, in 1937 was established among Iran, Iraq,

¹ Hasan Ulusoy, *One Policy, Many Identities – The Consistency of Turkey's Foreign Policy with Special Emphasis on its Security Dimension in the Post-Cold War Era*, (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2007), 75 -82.

² Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Turkey's Security Perspective, Historical and Conceptual Background*

³ Ulusoy *Opcit.*, p. 87 - 93

Afghanistan and Turkey. These pacts can be seen as the first examples of collective security approach of modern Turkey.

During the Second World War, Turkey absented from the war. However, its policy can be best described as active neutrality.⁴ Thus, according to its geopolitical situation Turkish decision makers had to balance pressures from both warring sides and Turkey could stay without having been implicit in the war. However, Ankara declared war at the end against Third Reich and Japan in order to be invited to the United Nations.

B. Cold War: A Pragmatic Rapprochement

Devastating effects of the Second World War and decline of the European Empires, namely colonial powers, compelled Europe to back down the international system and cede the place to new superpowers of the bi-polar world. The main determinant of Turkey – Europe relations in this period was the common threat perception, which had been embodied in the Soviet Union. To confront this threat, they deepened relations between themselves and within NATO.

After the Second World War, Soviet threat became the main concern to Turkish decision makers and non-alignment policy has been abolished. Soviet claims in Bosphorus, abrogation of the 1925 Friendship Pact and border revision demands from Moscow aggravated security concerns of Turkey. In 1947, Turkey was included to Truman Doctrine, together with Greece and this constituted the clear choice of Turkey to be a part of the Western side. Ankara decided to send soldiers to Korean War between 1947 and 1952, the first troops outside of its borders since the foundation of the Republic. In 1952, Turkey was invited to NATO and since then, Turkey's national security has been fostered by NATO's collective security. Turkey involved in regional security pacts, such as Balkan Pact in 1954, again with Greece and Yugoslavia and Baghdad Pact in 1955 (transformed to Central Treaty Organization in 1958 after the withdrawal of Iraq and lasted until 1979 with the participation of Great Britain).

At this point, Turkey's NATO adhesion can be understood by a two-pronged approach: On the one hand, being a part of the Western - indeed USA - alliance and on the other hand, belonging to a security community were at the stake. Security Community, coined by Karl W.

⁴ **Idem.**

Deutsch⁵, points out an engagement between a number of states, in which an armed conflict becomes inconceivable. Basic principles are to possess a sense of community – “we-feeling” - which facilitates peaceful settlement of disputes, integration of values and mutual predictability of behaviors. This understanding is particularly valuable for Turkey as far as its relations with Greece are concerned. It is wise to say that, even during the most tensed periods between two states, a war could be hardly imagined thus these two countries have been constituting the Southeastern wing of NATO’s security umbrella. Moreover, political dialogue within the ally contributed to the prevention of misinterpretations by both sides.

Turkey’s application to the European Economic Community in 1959 and its acceptance as an associate member in 1963 can be interpreted in the same vein. For Turkey, although Europe was not providing a security guarantee, it was still intriguing to anchor its identity as a modern state and affirm its profound links with the Western alliance. As to Europe, Turkey’s attachment was of utmost importance for three reasons⁶: firstly, Turkey has been playing a role as a barrier against Soviet expansionism. Secondly, it was a bridge between Europe and the Middle East and hence, was a factor to impede Soviet influence in the Middle East. Finally, due to its control over Bosphorus, Turkey could monitor Soviet naval mobilization in the Black Sea. Another aspect of Turkey’s importance to the EU was that a stable and prosperous democracy in the region. The Westernization process of Turkey was providing a fertile ground for the sake of the EU’s security interests.

However, this consolidation period *Westernism* was questioned in early 1960s. Turkey was isolated with the beginning of *Détente* period and ‘the Johnson Letter’ was a cornerstone in Turkey’s security consideration. When Ankara decided to intervene to Cyprus in order to stop the violence as the guarantor state, the US President Johnson enunciated to its Turkish counterpart that if Turkey intervened without its NATO allies’ consent, it should not have relied on its collective security umbrella in case of Soviet aggression. Moreover, it was declared that Turkey had no right to use arms which were sold by the US in such an operation. These developments created the underlying causes of Turkey’s multi-dimensional policy approach between 1960 and 1970. The questioning of NATO support led to gradual rapprochement with the Soviet Union and constructing bridges with Muslim countries.

⁵ Karl W. Deutsch, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, (Princeton - New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), 23.

⁶ Harun Arikian, “Security Aspect of the EU’s Relations with Turkey”, in *Turkey and the EU: an Awkward Membership?*, (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 183 – 189.

Nevertheless, these behaviors must be seen as tactical decisions rather than a strategic shift. Even in this period, Turkey never thought about a complete withdrawal from NATO and Western alliance. This is due to stringent dynamics of the Cold War, which were impediments of an autonomous stance in a bi-polar world. In 1974 Turkey intervened in Cyprus with its own capacity which entailed the alienation and isolation in international area. This isolation was aggravated with due to its abstention in voting for the independence of Algeria and Tunisia in 1960s and rough rejection of Third World involvement in Brandenburg Conference.

The bargaining power of Turkey due to its strategic importance played such an important role during these developments that even after the coup d'état in 1980, the EU did not interrupt its relations with Turkey. Turkey's application for full membership was motivated by two reasons⁷: first, to offset the relationship with Greece, whose accession to the EU started to affect the balance of two countries. Second, the revitalization of the Western European Union employed the security idea behind this application. In sum, Turkey has secured its territory and independence of State by, and contributed to Western alliance. Moreover, this affiliation reinforced its Western identity.

C. The Post-Cold War Period

I. Transformation of the Turkish Security Policy

The dissolution of the bi-polar world has inevitably brought its effects to Turkey and to its foreign and security policy. NATO – Warsaw Pact confrontation faded away and the *raison d'être* of long-lasting alliances started being questioned. Disappearance of traditional threats necessitated a new conception of security risks and challenges after 1991. In this conception, borders became blurred and actors' behaviors became imponderable.

For Turkey, this period was marked by identity crisis.⁸ NATO's staunch ally which has the longest border with the Soviet Union and contributed to Western security for decades found itself with unclear definition of foreign policy and international isolation to some degree. Moreover, rejection of the EU full membership application of Turkey by the European Commission in 1989 aggravated concerns about the role of Turkey in the post-Cold War era.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 193

⁸ Ulusoy, *Opcit.*, p. 105 - 109

The major event which shaped the international system in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War was the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and the eruption of first Gulf War in 1991. The first significant conflict in the new era of international politics occurred in the vicinity of Turkey, thus Ankara had to consider the Middle East as an area of interest, if not influence for the moment. Turkey chose to move in line with the UN by participating in sanctions against the political regime of Iraq and underlined several times joint international action, referring to UN Security Council decision.

However, the most harmful outcome of this war was what it left afterwards. Thousands of people had to flee their homes and mass immigration created demographic risks in Turkish territory. Instability appeared next to the Southeastern border of Turkey and provided futile ground for terrorist activities conducted on Turkish soil for two more decades. Therefore, Ankara securitized⁹ developments in this region and corollary to this, Turkish army launched incursions to make the region safe from terrorist shelter.

Disintegration of the Soviet Union led to the appearance of new states in the Caucasus and Central Asia. These countries are considered as Turkic and have strong historical ties with Turkey. The term 'Eurasia' was coined by Turkish politicians in this period to underscore Turkey's possible influence over concerned countries. However, pan-Turkism has been definitely ruled out since Ankara has never been keen on presenting itself as an irredentist State.

Another major overhaul in foreign policy was to create a new identity for Turkey, which found itself disappointed as far as its Westernism ambition was concerned. This concern was aggravated at Luxembourg Meeting of the EU in 1997, when Turkey once again received negative reply for its membership candidacy. The new role of Turkey, which still subsists today, would be to bridge West and East, namely the European Union and Islamic world. This is progressively adopted as a policy and the idea that 'Turkey could be a model for her neighbors to plant the seeds of secular democracy' is put forward.

⁹ 'Securitization' and 'desecuritization' refers to the analysis of Ole Waever. Ole Waever, "Securitization and Desecuritization" in *On Security*, ed. Ronnie D. Lipschutz, (Newyork: Columbia Univ. Press, 1995), 70.

Turkey also actively participated in peacekeeping and peace support operations in various parts of the world under the auspices of international organizations.¹⁰

In order to overcome the identity crisis¹¹, Turkey constantly underlined its strong ties with various surrounding regions, which is plausible in geopolitical terms. The Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East and Turkic countries became progressively the area of interest for Ankara. At the same time, the EU granted the candidate status to Turkey at Helsinki Meeting in 1999 and definitely anchored Turkey to Western alliance. One can argue that the main reason of this breakthrough which occurred just in two years is the realization of the cost of leaving Turkey outside of the EU.

9/11 attacks brought fundamental changes to the context. A country like Turkey, having suffered from terrorism since decades, now could make its voice heard among global stake holders. The principal grievance of Turkey has been the difficulty to convince some of its European partners, who tolerated PKK terrorism under the pretext of ‘freedom fighters’ or its neighbours such as Syria, to not to support directly or indirectly the aforementioned terrorist attacks. After 9/11, terrorism dominated the world scene as the major risk to security.

Article V of the NATO Charter was invoked for the first time in 2001. Through the emergence of common enemy, Turkey redefined its position in the collective identity. Turkey contributed significantly to the operation in Afghanistan and took the lead twice afterwards. War on terrorism enhanced Turkey’s strategic importance due to its experience on the issue and geographic proximity to the troubled areas. On the other hand, Turkey’s participation in these joint operations highlighted their characteristic as a struggle against extremism and not a specific religion. This is also mentioned by Ankara, as former Minister of Foreign Affairs Ismail Cem expressed, the war in Afghanistan is not a Christian – Muslim confrontation.

Probably the sharpest devastation of Turkish foreign policy since decades occurred on the eve of the Iraq War, when the Parliament of Turkey turned down the request of the US to open northern front from Turkish soil for American troops. Due to the internal-divisions in the EU over the war on Iraq, some European Members perceived the stance of Turkey as the eventual

¹⁰ Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Relations with the UN*

¹¹ Ulusoy, *Opcit.*, p. 132 - 140

Europeanization of its foreign policy.¹² However, this policy cannot be understood unless the PKK terrorism is taken into account. Hesitation from plunging into a region with severe instability and lack of US's promise to fight against PKK in the northern part of Iraq can be argued as the main decisive factor of this rejection by the Turkish side.

II. Re-Emergence of Europe and the ESS

a. Implications of the Maastricht Treaty

The collapse of the bi-polar world brought opportunities and disadvantages for Europe. The affirmation of the United States' position as the only superpower of the world yielded unilateral political initiatives as pervasive fact of international arena. This has been clearly demonstrated by first Gulf War and Strategic Concept of NATO in 1991.

As to the EU, disappearance of the Soviet menace paved the way of future enlargement and a more significant role for its Member States. First, nuclear and conventional threat over Europe has vanished to a large extent and Europe's sphere of influence expanded to introduce liberal democracy and human rights, the fundamental values that the EU advocates for. Second, dismantlement of communist ideology facilitated the expansion of market economy, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, despite severe political vacuum and corruption. Finally, Europe realized that to bolster its stance in international politics, a coherent common foreign policy is needed.

These factors have been embodied in the Maastricht Treaty, under the Chapter V. The establishment of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was a milestone in Europe's way towards an emerging global player. Political signification of CFSP and its scope will be discussed in detail under the subsequent chapters. However, its reasons and repercussions are of highest importance to understand EU's security challenges in the post-Cold War period until 2003, elaboration of the European Security Strategy.

In this context, objectives stipulated in Article J.1, 'to promote international co-operation; to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms', comply with the developments mentioned in precedent paragraphs.

¹² Thomas S. Mowle, "Transatlantic Relations and Turkey", in *Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey*, ed. Nursin Atesoglu Guney, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 20 – 24.

These aspirations must be reached with means listed in Article J.2, ‘common position of European Council and joint action decided by the Council on general principles proposed by the European Council’ demonstrate the willingness of the EU to acquire necessary instruments to act in international system. Article J.4, which refers to the scope of CFSP that ‘shall include all questions related to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence’ is a groundbreaking advance and preliminary improvement towards ‘an EU as a security actor’.

Nevertheless, sorrowful experiences in Balkans showed that Europe was still incapable to secure its immediate neighborhood and claim itself as an autonomous security actor.

b. An Appraisal of the ESS: The Context and Nature

Without a strategy, a political organization can only be reactive rather than active. Every social or political institution, which is keen on pursuing its own interests and assuring its survival, has to have a strategy to confront challenges and to achieve its goals in the long-term.

European Security Strategy, which has been adopted at the European Council Meeting in December 2003 carries, no doubt, this objective. The EU Member States, having decided to task Javier Solana, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, agreed on the fact that if the EU had the ambition to be a global player, it had to have a general framework within which it could conduct its external relations according to tangible guiding principles.

In retrospect, many of European security scholars estimate that five years before the ESS, a common foreign strategy of the EU was unimaginable and even European Council’s decision to mandate Solana for the elaboration of the strategy was surprising.¹³ However, the EU member states have adopted *A Secure Europe in a Better World – European Security Strategy* (European Council 2003a) in 2003. The underlying reasons of this breakthrough can be considered as basic stimuli to explain why Europe embraced such a holistic approach: post 9/11 era and the division in Europe over Iraq War.

¹³ Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, “Introduction”, in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 4.

For the first, terrorist attacks to the World Trade Center in the US opened a new era in international politics, which is dominated by war on terrorism and unilateral actions of the US. The whole planet had to adjust according to this new challenge and take necessary measures with strategic partners. So did Europe.

For the latter, one can argue that the main imperative derived from the intergovernmental relations within the EU. The intra-European division over the Iraq War provided the necessary justification of the ESS. On the one hand, for those who supported the invasion in Iraq, this document demonstrated clearly that the Transatlantic alliance is still viable. On the other hand, others made use of this opportunity to show that threats perceived by the United States and Europe are largely shared.¹⁴

Is the ESS a codification of already existing strategic orientations or a fundamental shift in terms of foreign policy? First and foremost, this strategy must be seen as a general framework which includes all dimensions of foreign policy, from trade to diplomacy and military intervention. Prior to the ESS, member states were similar to have a common strategy, but none these of previous attempts could build a comprehensive approach. European Council decisions, such as *European Strategy Against the Proliferation of WMD* (2003b) and *European Union Counter-Terrorism Strategy* (2005c) carry the word ‘strategy’ in their titles but did not present a holistic framework.

Secondly, the ESS constituted a reference document for almost every foreign policy rhetoric. The ESS and its provisions included into many other policy papers and revised by both European officials and academics. The name and content of the ESS have been uttered several times in foreign policy speeches. Therefore, the document has kept its visibility in various areas.

Before going into details of the ESS, an assessment of its general nature is necessary to understand strengths and weaknesses of the document. The basic question is: Does the ESS answer the question of what should be the EU’s role in the new security context?

¹⁴ Sven Biscop, “The European Security Strategy in Context”, in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 12.

The most striking characteristic of the strategy can be the fact that the document does not bring forward anything new but outlines existing established guidelines during the past ten years experience of the CFSP. Another criticism should point out its peculiarity that there is no real choice concerning the autonomy of the EU as an international security actor and the nature of its transatlantic partnership.¹⁵ Member states preserved notably their essential competence to determine the degree of cooperation on a case by case basis.

On the threats side, the lack of the document to emphasize and to deal with their root causes renders the strategic foresight feeble.¹⁶ The increasing inequality on the world and poor countries are not perceived as global threats and linked only with their possibility to provide safe heavens for fundamental movements and WMD proliferation.

The absence of a clear reference to human rights is surprising in terms of European identity construction and its ambition to promote this identity in external relations. Only the term ‘well governed states’ could find a place in the document, which is an obvious deficiency taking into account the political agenda that the EU projects.

What general perception should be drawn from the ESS? The EU, the most supranational regional engagement in the world, offers a political model which can be summarized as ‘European Added Value’.¹⁷ That is to say, a cooperative security understanding, rather than to compete with the military strength of the United States of America. As a general framework the ESS does not only a document concerned with security issues but it also codifies driving forces and guidelines of EU’s external relations for further development of ‘Europe as a global actor.’

Threat Assessment

The main assessment concerning threats perceived by the EU would be to assert that the distinction between internal and external security is increasingly blurred. The borders merely can no longer hamper the infiltration of global security challenges into Europe and keep

¹⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 17

¹⁶ Cristina Churrua, “Criticizing the EU Security Strategy: The EU as a Regional Cooperative Security Provider”, *Revista Electronica de Estudios Internacionales*, 2005

¹⁷ **Idem.**

European people immunized from security concerns. Hence, the EU considered a threat perception in accordance with this fundamental development.

Five key threats have been identified in the ESS; international terrorism, proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), regional conflicts, failed states and organised crime. By adopting such a comprehensive range of menace, the EU points out the incapability of territorial defence understanding of the Cold War to address today's challenges. This is clearly expressed by 'the first line of defence now lies abroad'. In other words, Europe will confront threats beyond its borders before their impacts reach to Europe.

To distinguish traditional threats; namely regional conflicts, organised crime and failed states from new ones; proliferation of WMD and international terrorism is self-explanatory as far as their sources and impacts are concerned. However, a ranking among these threats would be misleading because some of them have indirect effects on European security, whereas new conceptions might cause direct insecurity. The entanglement of these threats, that is to say, the linkage between WMDs and failed states, their incapability to prevent organised crime and international terrorism, and the possibility of terrorists to acquire WMDs clearly shows the vicious circle of security.

An analysis of old threats is therefore seems plausible if they are duly inserted into changing context of the globalised world. To which degree do failed states pose threat to European security, unless they are situated in Europe's immediate neighbourhood? A three-ponged analytical answer can comprehend its link with the EU.¹⁸ Failed states, which is terminologically different than *rogue states* preached by the US, aggravating internal and external security risks. The absence of a stability and robust authority entail non-governmental actors to perpetuate outrageous events. Intra-regional conflicts, civil wars; arm, drogue and human trafficking, ethnic and sectarian violence are to be amplified in failed states. This mostly distorts the political regime and provides comfortable seats for corrupted politicians.

Therefore, the first impetus for the EU is related to its values to be promoted. In accordance with its security paradigm, violence of human security – including severe human rights

¹⁸ Jean-Jves Haine, "The European Security Strategy Coping with Threats: Is Europe Secure?", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 27.

infringements – triggers EU’s intervention into troubled areas aiming at preventing ethnic cleansing and genocide. Rwanda, Congo and Darfur are ominous examples of international community’s inaction and its consequences. The EU thus considers stabilizing these areas as a contribution to the security of the concerned population and that of its own. Second dimension is in essence an issue linked to governance. A government deprived of popular concerns cannot protect the well-being of its society. Social and economic equality, political rights, rule of law and fundamental civil freedoms are prone to be discarded by those authorities. This might easily lead to social uprisings, international fundamental movements and civil unrest. Thirdly, international terrorism comes forward at this point with the case of Afghanistan, which was the safe base for terrorist, who perpetrated 9/11 attacks.

Regional conflicts can have same impacts on security issues. These events cause mass immigration, severe insecurity and necessary conditions for smuggling, including destructive arms. Conflicting interests in those areas ‘can fuel the demand for WMD’. The ESS namely calls the Middle East, a region which undermines global stability due its protracted feuds and natural resources.

The third ‘old’ threat, organised crime is to flourish under those circumstances, where political authority looms. The ESS considers ‘Europe is a prime target of organised crime’. This is to threaten people’s every day life and has internal as well as external dimensions. Illegal drugs, immigrants and weapons are provided by country with weak states. Its possible link with terrorism is not neglected.

9/11 attacks turned all danger and risks analysis upside down and introduced new threats into the political agenda. This means¹⁹, what was previously the worst case is now the possibility. The main concern is ‘to prevent the world’s most dangerous terrorists to acquire world’s most dangerous weapons’. Europe could not stay out of this scope and therefore, proliferation of WMDs is a security concern to the EU as well.

The reasons why Europe entered into nuclear diplomacy can be understood in the context of the period after the Berlin Wall’s collapse and 9/11 attacks. If the EU conducts intensive diplomatic talks with the countries that have nuclear ambitions, this aims both at balancing

¹⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 36

the US' unilateral discourse with Europe's multi-lateral approach and avoiding the nuclear threats over its territory. More countries acquired nuclear weapons after the Cold War armament race led to regional tensions and put the global security in danger by amplifying sources and targets to an unpredictable extent. Researches on nuclear technology rendered the nuclear armament relatively easier but some states cannot assure the security of their nuclear arsenals. Hence, countries like Iran, North Korea and Libya – which renounced later on – became matter of concern for their nuclear ambitions, although the first one claims that the uranium enrichment aims nothing but peaceful energy. However, rough stance of the United States and lack of international cooperation of concerned states did not help to mitigate the tension. The EU has been involved in negotiations with Iran and bolsters efforts of IAEA to assure the transparency of its uranium enrichment program. This is also important to maintain the credibility of international non-proliferation regime and political status quo.

The most asymmetrical threat came to world's political agenda following the 9/11 attacks. The unprecedented 'war on terror' of the US has been started and the NATO invasion in Afghanistan aimed to deprive Al-Qaeda of its training camps and munitions. Terrorism considered in the ESS as a threat against whole Europe and which is 'willing to use unlimited violence to cause massive casualties'. Moreover, the document calls for a 'concerted European action' to uncover the terrorist bases in Europe and make the continent apart from this threat. Madrid and London bombings showed sorely the vicious face of terrorism. Today, terrorist cells in Europe and in other parts of the world possess strategic threat to Europe and put lives at risk.

Grass-root Islamism is widely considered as the main cause of terrorism. Therefore, to encounter fundamentalist movements and to mitigate resentments, social policies and counter-terrorism activities must be contemplated with synchronization. Integration of Muslim minority to the European culture by social and economic means will dwarf their seclusion and prevent them to be exploited by terrorist groups. This will hamper further recruitment and phase out homegrown terrorism in the long-term. However, concerted intelligence gathering and joint police actions are needed in European wide to uncover terrorist cells and to suppress their activities.

Challenging the Insecurity in Co-operation

The strategy to confront these challenges is divided into three parts in the ESS: addressing the threats, securing the neighbourhood and effective multilateralism. Europe has responded to the 21. Century's issues and to the post- 9/11 area by taking rough measures, such as European Arrest Warranty, close co-operation with the US and strengthening multi-lateral agreements. The importance of a regional actor can be best measured by assessing its success to promote stability in its neighbourhood. Hence, enlargement process and European Neighbourhood Policy has played a vital role in stabilizing former-Soviet Union countries. Thorough efforts have been made to prevent corruption, organised crime and to increase social and political life in this geography.

However, the argument which is being examined in this chapter aims to explore the particularity of the EU in tackling with global crisis: multi-lateralism. The political project that Europe presents to the world passes through this conception, both theoretically and practically. This is articulated in the ESS as 'There are few in any problems we can deal with on our own. The threats described above are common threats, shared with all our closes partners. International cooperation is a necessity'. Those repercussions of Europe's relations with its immediate environment, international organisations and its strong alliance with the US in the ESS are to be handled now.

Firstly, European identity is being built by its contribution to security in the neighbourhood. Europe has enlarged towards East and adhesion of former socialist countries into liberal system has been widely regarded as the biggest achievement of the EU. This can be considered as the foundation of Europe's global role.²⁰ Europe has to develop stability and prosperity in its own region and more importantly, according to its own model of security understanding. The success of this process is the success of the EU as a political model.

In the same vein, the EU has developed European Neighbourhood Policy in 2004 to enhance its relations with various countries and to address strategic objectives set out in the ESS.²¹ Unlike enlargement process, where the EU unilaterally indicates its requirements and

²⁰ Roberto Menotti and Francesca Vencanto, "The European Security Strategy and the Partners", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 105.

²¹ European Commission, *European Neighbourhood Policy*

observes the concerned country's compliance, the ENP bases on bi-lateral agreement with the partner country.

Regarding the regional co-operation with other parts of the world, Europe has made significant progress. Strong trade relations with Africa has yielded political rapprochement. Establishment of Peace and Security Council of the African Union, its functioning and model are inspired by the European Union.²² Southeastern Asia has a soaring role both politically and economically. The EU has increasingly supported activities of ASEAN and involved through the membership in the ASEAN Regional Forum and in the Council for Security Cooperation in Asia-Pacific.²³ Engagements in Mediterranean Basin and Middle-East Region carry the stabilizing objective of the EU. Russia, as the Union's third biggest trade partner and major gas-supplier, has an important role in EU's Eurasia policies since Partnership and Co-operation Agreement in 1994. These co-operation areas cover economic issues & the environment; Freedom, Security & Justice; External Security; and Research & Education.²⁴

Secondly, EU's strong commitment to reinforce multi-lateral relations is to be explored within the EU – UN context. The UN constitutes the main centerpiece of multi-lateral understanding in terms of values and institutions. Therefore, the EU needs the UN to beef up its complex policy understanding and the UN needs the EU Member States' engagement for its own purposes.

In draft text of the ESS, Solana proposed 'Strengthening the UN, equipping it to fulfil its responsibilities and to act effectively' statement,²⁵ in which what is meant with responsibilities and 'act' remained obviously unclear. As it is articulated in the final text, under the 'effective multi-lateralism' heading, 'the United Nations Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security' was stated. EU's ostensible link to UN's activities stated as 'the EU is committed to reinforcing its cooperation with the UN to assist countries emerging from conflicts, and to enhancing its support for the UN in short-term crisis management situations.' To bolster UN's overarching institutional position in international politics and assure its strength particularly in the UNSC,

²² Menotti and Vencanto, *Op cit.*, p. 112

²³ *Idem.*

²⁴ European Commission, *External Relation Divisions, Russia*

²⁵ Richard Gowan, "The European Security Strategy's Global Objective: Effective Multilateralism", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 25.

the EU needs a more coherent and active stance in order to broaden its multi-lateralism project.

Finally, the third dimension of Europe's co-operative security understanding lies in its long-lasting partnership with the US. The irreplaceable position of the US in the European security is reaffirmed by the statement; 'The United States has played a critical role in European integration and European security, in particular through NATO'. In drafting sessions of the ESS, Solana and his aids had several meetings with their American counterparts for view exchange; these interactions were widely welcomed by Washington.²⁶ For Americans, the main concern was to keep transatlantic partnership within NATO and increase Europe's operational capability together with military expenditure. This conviction surfaced due to experiences in Bosnia and Kosovo. One can argue that, slight differences between National Security Strategy of the United States and the ESS about threats, principles and means, the basic approach to global security issues are in accordance to a large extent. Both sides of the Atlantic worked together on fragile issues, such as Iran, Afghanistan, Kosovo and Russia. The outstanding question of the US raises to what the specific operational implementation of the ESS will be.

Review of the ESS and Future Perspectives

How did the ESS shape EU's foreign and security policy outcomes since 2003 and what is to be reconsidered according to today's security requirements? In the Implementation Report of the ESS in 2008, Javier Solana tried to shed light on this question.²⁷ The main responsible of the CFSP points out the increasing importance of the EU on the global scale and, first and foremost, underscores the success of EU enlargement process and that of the ENP. He further calls for deeper coordination between the EU and the UN to address global and regional risks in the multi-lateral context.

While key threats listed in the ESS, particularly terrorism, remain same, new challenges must be inserted into the EU's security agenda. Hence, the report introduces energy security, cyber security and climate change issues and calls for coherent action given the complexity of these

²⁶ Catherine Kelleher, "The European Security Strategy and the United States", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, (London: Routledge, 2008), 142.

²⁷ *Providing Security in a Changing World, Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 2008

risks. For the energy security, attention is drawn to the EU's dependency and the increase in the short-term, which reaches to 75% of its oil-gas importation. As far as cyber security concerned, the EU Strategy for a Secure Information Society is adopted in 2006 to tackle with internet-based crimes. Climate change is considered as 'threat-multiplier' by the High Representative Report in 2008.

However, some key issues at the stake must be contemplated in accordance with necessary conditions. Victory in Afghanistan is to be defined, doubts about further enlargement must be tackled and nexus between values and interests must be better articulated.²⁸ The European Security Strategy provides a common ground for member states to consider their security risks together and to address them by basing on common values and interests. Only a coherent and active Europe can tackle with the challenges of the globalised world and its threats and risks discussed above.

D. Assessment of the History: Changing Form of the Permanent Interdependence

The historical context discussed above, which starts from the foundation of the modern Turkish Republic and ends with a projection on the 21st Century, highlights the fact that Turkey and the EU are doomed to engage due to security reasons. This engagement which derived from Turkey's policy orientation at the outset implied Turkey's attachment to the West and provided a preliminary ground for the second half of the Century. When the Cold War started, both sides approached each other against common enemy. Turkey anchored its identity in the Western World while defending its territory by NATO. Europe considered Turkey as a reliable partner in a troubled region, which has been muddling through as far as its democratic regime was concerned.

In the post-Cold War era, the importance of this co-operation has not been debilitated but changed its parameters. Today, few doubt that Turkey has adopted a multi-dimensional proactive foreign policy, particularly in its neighborhood. This is mainly due to two major developments, which strengthened Turkey's position in international politics: The Capture of Abdullah Ocalan, the leader of PKK, in 1999 and the kick-off of EU Accession Talks in 2005.

²⁸ "Revisiting the European Security Strategy – beyond 2008", *European Policy Centre*, Brussels, 2008

As Minister of Foreign Affairs indicates,²⁹ Turkey endorsed Annan Plan in Cyprus to solve protracted dispute in 2004, has been mediating between Israel and Syria for peace talks, started negotiations with Armenia which is likely to bear fruits concerning closed border since 1993³⁰. In the aftermath of Georgian War in summer 2008, Turkey initiated ‘Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform’ mostly to tackle with territory occupation of Armenia in Nagorno-Karabakh. Turkey has been elected to the United Nations Security Council as non-permanent member between 2008 and 2010. This multi-dimensional approach is interpreted by some analysts as a fundamental perversion of Turkish foreign policy, mostly arguing that Turkey abandons secular and Westernist orientation in favor of Islamism³¹, even though government consistently reiterates its strong commitment to the EU Membership process.

²⁹ Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Speech of H.E. Mr. Ali Babacan the 45. Munich Security Conference, 7 February 2009.

³⁰ “Turkey and Armenia Pave Way for Historical Accords”, *The Wall Street Journal*, 03.04.2009

³¹ Soner Cagaptay, “Secularism and Foreign Policy in Turkey”, *Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, April 2007

SECURITY POLICIES AND MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

From Understandings to Outcomes

A. Comparison of Security Understandings of the EU and Turkey

I. Europe: Human Security

Perceptions shape actions. Interpretation of a fact strictly depends on the understanding and the value that one confer to objects, actors and events. The definition of a threat and means to confront it thus differ according to decision-maker's perception. Therefore, utmost important must be attached to reasons of the change in perceptions and the tendency towards new ones.

Fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War brought new security paradigms to Europe, mostly by questioning the traditional approach of state security. Since decades, the main threat perceived by States had been external menaces against their borders and societies. National security had been conceived as an object which must to be protected against rivals without examining its internal dynamics and needs. The holistic approach to national security and its protection could hardly put the human at the center of the security conception because the natural superiority of State had to eclipse individual's main concerns. However, even during the tough times of the nuclear armament between two superpowers, populations raised their voice en masse and especially in late 1960s and 1970s, upheavals of educated youngsters in the United States and in Europe clearly demonstrated the fact that political organizations can hardly succeed in removing the insecurity of its concerned sphere by neglecting people.³² The mobilization of youth brought some concepts into the light, such as gender equality, individual's blooming and recognition of social disparities which are intrinsic

³² Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes*, (Newyork: Vintage Books, 1996), 287 – 320.

to human life and could shake the solid ground on which the social order and political authority based.

Nevertheless, admittance of the individual as an actor of the security consideration had to wait the collapse of the Soviet Union. This was mostly due to the peculiarity of the Cold War, which had political and economic repercussions in daily life and constrained populations by urging them to be concerned with primordial needs. Tensed relations fostered the fear and therefore confined the freedom to the limits defined by political authority. The ideological consolidation within two blocs was rather strong that stratification of the society and personal diversifications were nearly invisible. National borders were so entrenched by nuclear deterrence that transnational mobilizations were very rare and therefore, threats had been expected from outside of the borders. These acceptances have undergone to major changes by early XX. Century.

Today, the understanding of security defined by the EU converges overwhelmingly with, and is inspired by the conception of human security. Dynamics of the post-Cold War area and more specifically concerns expressed in the European Security Strategy (ESS) in 2003 imply involvement of human security in Europe's area of interest. Consequences of a shift from state security to human-centered security are various both for object concerned and instruments to be mobilized.

Human security conception has been proposed by Dr. Mahbub ul Haq, in the United Nations Human Development Report of 1994³³ with its emphasis on “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want”. In this report, it has been proposed that the security paradigm has to be expanded to include various areas, such as; economic, food, health, environmental, political, personal, community security. The insecurity has to be considered as a concept which includes every hurdle which impedes the individual to realize its own potential. Former Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, describes human security in its broadest sense and points out that it embraces far more than the absence of a violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care.³⁴ The human security brings together the human elements of security, rights and development.

³³ “Human Development Report”, *United Nations Development Programme* (1994)

³⁴ Kofi Annan, “Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia.” Two-Day Session in Ulaanbaatar, May 8-10, 2000. Press Release SG/SM/7382.

Therefore, HIV/AIDS, climate change, diseases, political inequity, organized crime, terrorism and deprivation of commodities are considered menaces against human security.

The reason why a human-centered security understanding is needed lays in the very nature of globalisation. Since the end of bi-polar world, threats to populations that come from outside of the borders conspicuously reduced and most of the civilian casualties have been caused within the states. The notion of national security has become blurred thus civilian wars, international terrorism, intrastate conflicts, epidemics, human and arm smuggling and climate change have created human disasters particularly in notoriously instable regions. Globalised world brought these calamities closer to each other and politicians of Europe recognized that to secure the homeland is only possible by contributing to the global security.

A last point to be raised about human – state security distinction is that these two understandings do not necessarily replace each other. Security between states remains a basic condition for the security of people, but national security is not sufficient to guarantee people's security.³⁵ Thus, human and state security must be seen mutually dependent.

After this brief explanation, it seems highly relevant to associate EU's security perspective with the human security. The obvious link between peace and prosperity underlined in the ESS demonstrates that states must be in service of their people's well-being and assure the absence of violence in human life by doing so. Five key threats listed in the ESS; terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, failing states, and organised crime are interlinked and related to human security in terms of its causes and affects which go far beyond of national borders. Therefore, an understanding of asymmetric challenges which may endanger individual is of paramount importance in EU's security agenda.

Objectives and strategic approaches stipulated in the ESS in order to cope with these challenges also converge with the understanding of human security. Europe's aspiration to promote its values and introduce its political project in its immediate neighborhood and in troubled areas is the basic sign of this perspective. Assuring a multi-lateral understanding of relationship among nations, protection of human rights and democracy, establishment of

³⁵ "Human Security Now", *Final Report of the Commission on Human Security*

liberal economic system and peace agreements through regionalism are key elements of this policy. These means overwhelmingly comply with the requirements of removing the threats perceived by Europe.

Moreover, High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana, makes clear references to the willingness of the EU to build human security in the world. Mr. Solana also estimates that all activities that the EU undertakes, including ESDP missions, are coherent with the concept of human security.³⁶ Also academic debates that pledge for European human security doctrine mainly focuses on three points to explain why Europe needs to adopt completely this approach.³⁷ Firstly, the moral belief that all human beings deserve the prosperity and every life is equally worth. Secondly, legal obligations deriving from Art. 55 and 56 of the United Nation's Charter which saddle to the nations to respect human rights in their relations. Finally, the idea which is related to the self-interest of Europe advocates that Europe cannot be secure while others live in severe insecurity.

II. Turkey: Traditional State Security

Given the historical background and the political culture, it is not surprising that a country like Turkey has kept its state security conception since decades. Established in 1923, modern Turkish Republic turned its face towards Europe although situated on geography with severe instability and insecurity around. The famous phrase of the founder of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, formulated the basic principle of Turkish foreign policy: 'Peace at home, peace in the world.'

Nevertheless, as the inheritor of a multi-national Empire and survivor of the national independence war, Turkey's social and cultural pattern generated the general framework of political life; which can be summarized as weak society, strong state. The reason of sublimity of the Turkish State can be understood by examining two different factors. Firstly, internal factors of Turkish political life are determinant. The state centric perception has been fostered by bureaucratic elites and army to preserve the secular and republican political regime of the country and to cement the national cohesion. Even today, the indistinct line between political

³⁶ Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy, *Providing Security in a Changing World*, Brussels, 11.12.2008

³⁷ "A Human Security Doctrine for Europe", *The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities*, Barcelona, 15.9.2004

and social spheres entails the intervention of political authority in almost every realm of the daily life at the expense of individual's autonomy. The guardian of the secular system, Turkish army, plays a decisive role in the definition of national security and national interests. The army reaffirmed its historical strength by having ousted four times democratically elected governments since 1960. The notorious coup d'état in 1980 aimed at suppressing all civil political movements by using all coercive instruments. Its crop, the Constitution of 1982, is still in force and provides the solid ground of military political environment in Turkey, despite fundamental amendments brought by the EU reforms. Article 118 of the Constitution³⁸ which indicates the form and the competences of the National Security Council is an explicit evidence of this fact. The General Staff, unlike other NATO Member States, is directly responsible to the prime minister and not to the ministry of defence. The ascendancy of armed forces in the Turkish political life thus impedes democratic accountability of political decisions and, as a consequence, integration of civil concerns to the security paradigm.

Secondly, external factors constrain Turkey's political choices. The disquieting geopolitical position of the country led to feud relations with its neighbors and kept the forces embattled in some regions, such as Aegean Sea and in the Southeast. During the Cold War, the permanent threat of Soviet expansionism and its influence in the southern part has impelled Turkish decision-makers to take an outright stance beside Western alliance, without any room for autonomy. The challenges that Turkey has to deal with, such as Cyprus conflict and eventual Turkish intervention in 1974, the Islamic revolution of Iran in 1979, the tension over Aegean Sea with Greece, PKK's (Kurdistan's Workers Party) terrorist attacks since 1984, Syria's support to terrorism, problems over borders and distribution of water resources have been – some of them still are – inevitable components of national security concerns. These conventional threats can be met mostly with conventional means. They constitute the basic argument of Turkish army's strength in political life, as an instrument of its justification.

Hence, the combination of these internal and external factors created the understanding of security in Turkey has, as defined by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, three-fold

³⁸ An important part of this article is: "The National Security Council shall submit to the Council of the Ministers its views on the advisory decisions that are taken and ensuring the necessary condition with regard to the formulation, establishment, and implementation of the national security policy of the state. The Council of Ministers shall evaluate decisions of the National Security Council concerning the measures that it deems necessary for the preservation of the existence and independence of the state, the integrity and indivisibility of the country and the peace and security of society."

nature: ensuring the survival of the population; protecting territorial integrity and preserving the basic identity of a nation, as shaped by political, economic, social and cultural traits.³⁹ These key elements can be preserved by national and collective security means, which have been conspicuously intertwined following the Cold War.

B. Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU

I. How to Analyse the CFSP

Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union has been established with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and constituted the second pillar of the Union ever since. The CFSP, however, is a complex structure which can be analyzed by referring to four points. Therefore, a multi-dimensional approach is needed to handle this structure.

To this aim, four key points are to be explored.⁴⁰ The first point is to examine the EU as an international actor; with its own policies, identity and interests. The extent to which the EU can be considered as a genuine actor is the central question of the unit analysis. Another important ordeal is to understand whether there is a distinction between the own interests of the EU and those of Member States. It is overwhelmingly argued that the EU foreign and security policy is nothing but a sum of its member states' national interests. However, despite diverging interests among them, liberal values (democracy, rule of law, individual freedom) that are preached by the EU provides the common ground for a concerted foreign policy as a prevailing factor in some areas and asserts an 'identity of the EU' on the global scale, thus upgrades the EU to an international unit.

This brings us to the second point; policies. The EU has various policies (Development, neighborhood, environment, trade) at different levels. The capacity to elaborate and to conduct a policy in a certain area is one of the determinants of a given actor. The EU, in the context of the CFSP, is totally dependent of the Member States, because in the domain of foreign and security policy, countries are fiercely opposing to cede their sovereignty to a supranational structure. However, when it comes to trade relations with third countries, the

³⁹ Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Turkey's Security Perspective, Historical and Conceptual Background*

⁴⁰ Knud Erik Jørgensen, "Overview: The European Union and the World", in *Handbook of European Union Politics*, ed. Knud Erik Jørgensen, (London: Sage Publ., 2006), 508 – 520

EU Member States are represented as a whole and align themselves with the common policy of the EU.

The third point to refer is foreign relations of the Union. The EU has developed a network of relations with third countries (U.S., Canada, Russia), international organisations (Mercosur, ASEAN) and is being involved in various regions (Central and Eastern Europe, Middle East), as well as specific problems (Arab – Israeli Conflict).⁴¹ Particularly, creating and fostering multilateral structures has been a clear aim of the EU. From an outside-in approach, it is also important for third actors to have relations with the EU, which contributes their recognition and credibility.

The fourth approach is to analyse the polity of the CFSP. Institutions, legal basis and organizational issues between member states are of utmost importance to understand the conduction of the Union's foreign and security policy.

However, it is needed to be admitted that all those levels of analysis are inter-related and a holistic approach is compulsory if one is eager to examine the CFSP.

II. CFSP: In Search of Politisation

The commencement of the European integration was fundamentally an economic integration despite political and security concerns behind. Thus, the EU has been an economic giant but a political dwarf since its inception in terms of its effectiveness in international political system. The establishment of the CFSP is meant the *politisation* of the EU's potential which has been garnered since decades particularly in economic domain. Community capacity of the EU is to be transformed and bear political fruits within the CFSP. Establishment of a common foreign and security policy is to be seen as an ambition to wield the community power of the EU, that is to say its profound economic engagement with third countries, development aids, commercial relations, cultural affairs etc.

Why the EU could not assert its political identity before? Most of the works about the EU is intended to focus on internal dynamics of the European integration. However, the perspective of this work takes into account the international system and its predominance on actors'

⁴¹ Council of the European Union, Foreign Policy - *Third Countries and Regions*

behaviors. Hence, if one is willing to explain the awkwardness of the EU as a political actor, constraints of the bi-polar world, nuclear armament, de-colonisation period which means the decline of the European empires⁴² and the shift of the center of gravity from Europe to the US and the Soviet Union must be included into the examination.

Why did Europe need a concerted foreign policy? A plausible argument is that European countries could not play significant roles separately as they did before. Coordination of member states' foreign policies has been kicked off in early 1970s to encounter the oil crisis, which also coincided with détente period of the Cold War.⁴³ The European Political Dialogue facilitated this coordination until it was superseded by the CFSP in 1992. The EPC provided the ground for the consultation between member states concerning their unilateral restrictive measures.

Established with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the CFSP expanded its institutional structure throughout the years. The end of the Cold War and the need of a more assertive Europe became clear due to the Balkan Wars. The EU incorporated the WEU's tasks in 1999 and created a high representative post for foreign and security policy. Today, the High Representative, his special envoys and External Relations DG of the Commission are conducting the Union's foreign and security policy in coordination with, and under the auspices of the member states. The structure and various policies are outside of this work's scope. However, measures and goals are needed to be examined insofar as they touch upon the security issues.

Politisisation of community methods is restrictive measures. Art. 215⁴⁴ (ex Art. 301 TEC) states in the para 1 that:

'Where a decision, adopted in accordance with Chapter 2 of Title V of the Treaty on European Union, provides for the interruption or reduction, in part or completely, of economic and financial relations with one or more third countries, the Council, acting by a qualified majority on a joint proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Commission, shall adopt the necessary measures. It shall inform the European Parliament thereof.'

⁴² Hobsbawm, *Opcit.*, p.207

⁴³ Jørgensen, *Opcit.*, p. 511

⁴⁴ Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

According to this provision, a mechanism exists to implement a community regulation in order to impose a decision of the second pillar. The measures taken may aim at different purposes, such as encouragement of establishing a functioning democracy (Eastern European Countries after 1989), to settle an armed conflict or to put pressure on a dictatorial state. In case of disagreement in the Council, states may take unilateral decisions. Therefore, a decision about an economic sanction depends on the intergovernmental cooperation in the Council. Due to the political motives in the Council and its decisions in the CFSP, the EU can decide to block its relationship with a third country, reject to sign an agreement or suspending an agreement.

Restrictive measures taken by the EU in the framework of Bosnian Conflict is an example⁴⁵: Community sanctions and political position within the Council were implemented even before the Maastricht Treaty entered into force. After having suspended the aid for Yugoslavia, the ministers for foreign affairs stated in a political declaration in August 1991 that restrictive measures were to be taken unless the conflict was not settled down immediately. Economic sanctions were taken by establishing restrictive measures and suspending commercial co-operation. These measures remained effective after the Maastricht Treaty entered into force and based upon the resolution 757 of the Security Council. In 1994, when the conflict was heading towards a resolution, the EU repealed these sanctions progressively.

On the other hand, the EU wields these measures as a means of incentive for concerned countries. Sustaining the diplomatic or economic relations with a third country is always a political choice. Hence, the EU provides these incitations on the condition of a political engagement. In other words, interrupted relations due to the heavy human rights violations with a given country can be reestablished if it takes necessary measures to meet the obligations that are required in a political statement of the EU.⁴⁶

These political decisions are instruments of the CFSP. Traditional ones are declarations, demarches, political dialogue and joint reports from diplomatic missions in third countries. The legal instruments are joint actions and common positions. The latter defines a general

⁴⁵ Fabien Terpan, *La politique étrangère et de sécurité commune de l'Union Européenne* (Bruxelles: Bruylant, 2003), 36.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38

outline for a common foreign policy whereas the first defines the mandate, objective, extent, financial implications and the duration of operations.

III. Efficiency – Consistency

Whether the above mentioned means and goals are satisfactory to become an international actor is a pure political question. Two opposite arguments can be assessed⁴⁷: the EU is moving towards an efficient and coherent actor on the global scale, particularly after having established its operational ambition with the ESDP. As the most profound political engagement, it still maintains its civilian character but takes important initiatives in peacekeeping and crisis-management, if necessary. The pessimistic argument holds the position that the EU is still a political and military dwarf by putting forward the rifts that surfaced during the Iraqi crisis. National interests prevail and thus, hamper a coherent and efficient foreign and security policy.

The ambition of the EU ‘to assert its identity on the international scene’⁴⁸ is related to the promotion of its liberal values, which are enlisted in the Chapter V of the TEU. The problematic here is; can Europe be a liberal power?⁴⁹

CFSP is neither a failure nor a success. It is a process with that the EU is or is being able to conduct a foreign policy. Military instrument is of vital importance if one has to use coercive means to impose its own choice on another actor. In this context, the capacity of the EU is lacking. Nevertheless, one can argue that ‘to speak is to act’, which means that to utter a united position on an issue, is not totally ineffective. However, the complex multilevel system of the EU and cumbersome procedures are regarded as the biggest hurdle in the way of an assertive Europe. That is to say, overlapping competences, voting procedures, multiple levels of bureaucracy hamper the execution of authority, which is needed to address traditional threats, such as terrorism. Thus, the argument that the EU has an institutional structure to recognize various threats in their early phases but is unable to encounter them with political and military means seems pertinent, particularly in the context of Bosnian conflict which demonstrated the results of Europe’s ineffectiveness.

⁴⁷ Sten Rynning, “The European Union: Towards a Strategic Culture?”, *Security Dialogue* 34, no. 4, (December 2003): 482

⁴⁸ Art. 2 of the TEU

⁴⁹ Rynning, *Opcit.*, p. 486

C. Turkey and CFSP: An Interaction in Progress

I. Europeanization of the Turkish Security Policy

The clear distinction between the EU's human security and Turkey's state security understandings which was discussed in the first section of this chapter might lead to the diversification in various areas of security policy. Bearing in mind that these conceptions would stamp out policy outcomes, Turkey and the EU need more rapprochement in terms of security paradigms. This is more likely to happen since the official candidacy of Turkey in 1999 and the start of accession negotiations in 2005.⁵⁰

One can argue that democratic authority on foreign policy choices made triumph when the Turkish parliament took the decision on Iraqi War. The endorsement given to the settlement of long-lasting Cyprus dispute through the UN Plan and the positive outcome of the referendum in the Turkish side implied Turkey's willingness to normalize its relations within the EU. Probably, admittance of Turkey's historical and geographical ties is the main achievement of this process, which is likely to bring the understanding of 'having zero problems with neighbours', including Armenia, Syria, Greece and Iraqi Kurds.⁵¹ The EU perspective became salient in this context, when Turkey slightly shifted towards a 'soft policy' approach in its region.⁵²

Do these developments duly imply the *Europeanization* of Turkey's foreign policy? The EU Progress Report states that Turkey mostly aligned itself with 109 out of 204 CFSP declarations in 2008. However, there was no progress as regards the restrictive measures. It would be overrating to assess this alignment as Europeanization because this term requires a broad agreement on principles, objectives and instruments. Nevertheless, it is true to argue that multi-dimensional foreign policy is being adopted progressively while the ambition of being a part of the European Union remains as the centerpiece. The EU would find value in Turkish foreign and security policy, as far as the latter provides security in the regions which are also direct concern to Europe.

⁵⁰ Art. 118 of the Constitution has been amended in 2001 by EU reforms. Since then, the Secretary General of the National Security Council is an former ambassador. Also, decisions of the Council are reduced to be "advise" for the Council of Ministers.

⁵¹ For more details, see the book of the former Chief Foreign Policy Advisor to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs since April 2009, Ahmet Davutoğlu, 'Strategic Depth'.

⁵² Ziya Onis, "The New Wave of Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey", *DIIS Report*, January 2009

Another argument is that *Europeanization* of Turkish security policy would be to its detriment and will lessen its importance as a regional player. This argument holds the position that one cannot completely adopt a Europe like foreign and security policy in a region where traditional interstate relations, border disputes, nuclear armament, non-state violence and terrorism prevail. Thus, geographical constraints and conjuncture compel Turkey to maintain its conventional instruments.

In sum, it is not wise to argue that Turkey would adopt a European perception over night as far as its foreign and security policies are concerned. On the other hand, during this process and due to EU reform packages which are introduced into the Turkish legislation, a more human-centered approach will be established in Turkish political life – in which civilians will have more competence - and this will be reflected in its external relations as well.

II. Turkey's Contribution to CFSP

The fact that Turkey is a candidate country and has to comply with the requirements of the EU renders the relationship unequal. As regards the political dialogue, Turkey has the right of consultation at best, whereas the EU monitors Turkish foreign policy and its alignment with the CFSP. As an example, the dispute over Cyprus is overwhelmingly considered as the main conundrum. The full implementation and non-discrimination of Ankara Protocol (which means opening the ports to Cypriot ships) is the most important demand of the EU.⁵³ This issue is to be imposed on Turkey as a precondition for the membership, which gives the EU to implement its normative power. Moreover, Cyprus challenge comes forward as well as far as NATO – EU relations concerned.⁵⁴

The political dialogue with Turkey continues to cover the issues of common interests, including Iraq, Iran, South Caucasus and the Middle East peace process. According to the Progress Report⁵⁵, in addition to these subjects (which will be discussed in the last chapter with regards to the Turkey's contribution), good neighborhood and more particularly, Turkey's relations with Armenia is scrutinized by the EU⁵⁶. For the same token, there is no

⁵³ Annual Report from the Council to the Parliament on the main aspects and the basic choices of the CFSP 2007

⁵⁴ Javier Solana's congratulation message to Ahmet Davutoglu on his appointment as Minister of Foreign Affairs, 5.5.2009

⁵⁵ Turkey Progress Report 2008

⁵⁶ Javier Solana's message on the announcement by Turkey and Armenia of a framework to normalise relations, 23.4.2009

doubt that Turkey's role in diversification of energy transportation from Eurasia to Europe is one of the main points in the CFSP.

As far as Turkey's geographical position and its regional impact are concerned, two questions seem pertinent to understand why Turkey's role is important to the EU security concerns⁵⁷: First, why Turkey's surrounding region is important and what issues are at stake according to the ESS (see *Supra*)? Second, to which degree can Turkey play a stabilizing role in these regions with its foreign policy as well as its political regime?

The Middle-East, the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia are considered as Turkey's sphere of influence. The first threat which would be considered as a concern by the EU is armed conflicts. As the Israel – Lebanon War in 2006, Russia – Georgia War in 2008 and Israel's assault in Gaza Strip in 2009 demonstrated clearly, frozen conflicts could abruptly flare up and cause casualties. Nationalism, ethnic and religious motivated conflicts, competition over the share of energy sources are underlying causes of the instability in those regions. The supply water is also likely to be a reason of rivalry in the forthcoming decades. It is true that no state can solely resolve the entangled problems of those regions. However, Turkey's stance towards the Middle-East overwhelmingly converges with that of the EU, regarding the two-state solution of the Israel – Palestinian Conflict. Turkey has been brokering between Israel and Syria for a peace deal. In the same vein, Turkey and Syria forged ahead in their relations since 1999, when Syria cut its support to PKK. As a broader perspective, Ankara initiated the meetings between the leaders of Pakistan and Afghanistan last year. As to the border disputes in the Caucasus, Turkey took the lead of a 'Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform' to show its willingness to be involved in Georgia dispute as well as border problems with Armenia. All those developments signify the fact that Turkey is eager to assert its foreign policy as a security provider in the region.

As the second concern, main threat appears with the emergence of political Islam or any form of religious authoritarianism as an ideological threat to regional security. In those countries where political regimes are repressive and unrepresentative, social upheavals are highly likely to surface and cause political instability. Terrorism and organized crime find sound ground in those areas. Turkey, as the only secular and democratic country whose population is largely

⁵⁷ Arikan, *Opcit.*, p. 195

Muslim may represent a model of people oriented political regime and functioning market economy. Its historical, cultural and linguistic ties may strengthen this influence and will prevent humanitarian crisis and mass flows of refugees. The value of the domestic system of Turkey is to put forward that Western values and Islam are reconcilable. Turkey’s presence in organizations of both the Western and Eastern world, such as the Islamic Conference and Economic Cooperation Organization, would make it an appropriate country to use its good offices to mediate between conflicting parties those regions.

The last point which is peculiar to the geographical position of Turkey lies in the importance of energy security. Turkey is geographically located in close proximity to 72 % of the world’s proven gas and 73 % of oil reserves, in particular those in the Middle East and the Caspian basin.⁵⁸ On the European side, the enormous dependence on Russian gas and the difficulty to guarantee an uninterrupted energy corridor makes the way over Turkey highly valuable.



Source: Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Deputy Directorate General for Energy, Water and Environment Turkey’s Energy Strategy, January 2009

Turkey already became an energy hub by hosting Baku – Tbilisi – Ceyhan (BTC) energy pipeline⁵⁹ transporting crude oil from Caspian Basin to Mediterranean towards Europe. The construction of Nabucco natural gas pipeline is underway and the agreement has been signed up recently. This

route will diversify Western energy consumers’ need if its viability is proven.⁶⁰ However, intra-European rifts concerning energy demand from third countries, namely Russia, renders very difficult to elaborate a coherent European energy policy. As to Turkey, in order to decrease its energy dependence (which is even bigger than Europe) construction of a nuclear energy plant is foreseen in the forthcoming years.

⁵⁸ Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Deputy Directorate General for Energy, Water and Environment, Turkey’s Energy Strategy, January 2009
⁵⁹ EU Energy Policy and Turkey, MEMO/07/219, 1.6.2007
⁶⁰ “Boost for Nabucco from Iraqi Gas Deal”, *Financial Times*, 17.5.2009

MUDDLING THROUGH IN DEFENCE AND MILITARY ASPECT

Turkey – EU Relations within NATO and Turkey’s Role in ESDP

A. Turkey in NATO

As we have seen in the first chapter, NATO has been the central component of Turkey’s national security since 1952. Since Soviet threat, which had been the main reason of taking part in NATO disappeared with the collapse of bi-polar world, both the nature of NATO alliance and Turkey’s approach underwent significant changes in the post-Cold War era.

I. Transformation of NATO and Turkey

International security system after the Cold War needed to be analysed to understand Turkey’s response to the transformation of NATO in 1990s. The evolution of NATO following the Cold War had to address to main questions: Is there still a *raison d’être* for NATO? If yes, what kind of risks and threats must be confronted with appropriate means? For the first, the rapprochement between two blocs started in 1989. At the London Summit in 1990, Gorbachev was invited to the meeting and proposed a ‘non-aggression act’. The situation of nuclear arms was also examined and in the new strategy and it was made clear that while they would stay as the main element of deterrence, use of nuclear arms could be a possibility of last instance. The evolution from massive retaliation to flexible response during the Cold War ceded its place to ‘reduced forward presence’, which highlighted Turkey’s importance as a conventional power.⁶¹

⁶¹ Mireille Sadège, *La France et la Turquie dans l’Alliance atlantique*, (Paris: Les Éd. CVMAG, 2005), 92.

Probably, the first Gulf War was the first major ordeal that Turkey had to deal with at the beginning of this period. An armed conflict in its immediate neighborhood entailed a significant concern in Ankara. Moreover, Turkey's demand of NATO backing along its border with Iraq and reluctance of European allies to do so aggravated the aforementioned perception.

The major overhaul of NATO's strategic understanding came in 1999. The adoption of 'non-Article V' (*hors de zone*) operations ushered in a new era in international politics. This was due to the changing security environment in Transatlantic sphere. Europe's inertia during Balkan crisis reaffirmed the need of Transatlantic link to preserve peace and security in the region. The Concept set out the *Alliance's Approach to Security in the 21st Century*⁶² which outlined the road map of NATO for the forthcoming years. NATO's intervention Kosovo crisis and the shelling without the consent of UN Security Council signed up the new rules of the game. NATO's capabilities, which were hitherto restricted to the reaction in case of armed attack in Transatlantic area, are transformed to an active autonomous structure. Naturally, these developments were direct concern to Turkey. 1999 Strategic Concept evoked re-examination of its traditional approach. Nevertheless, Turkey adapted itself easily to the changing conditions, for instance, contributed to Kosovo intervention and opened its military airport in *Çorlu* to allies for this operation.

One of the main determinants, which have shaped Turkey's security concerns and therefore its approach to NATO in 1990s, was its fight against terrorism. Ankara pointed out this issue several times within the alliance and called for joint action against this scourge. While seeking to raise the awareness among member states, Turkey had to convince European States to impose strict sanctions on separatist activities within their own borders. At this point, Turkey faced two major difficulties: first, terrorism could be accepted as a threat against territorial integrity and thus, Article V of the Washington Treaty could be invoked. In this case, whether allies would be eager to send assistance remained unclear. Second, PKK is not regarded as a terrorist group by all member states and even defined as freedom fighters by some of them. This precluded establishing a common understanding about the nature of

⁶² NATO Handbook

terrorism. This fact became duly clear when the leader of PKK was captured in Greek Embassy to Kenya.⁶³

Divergent positions concerning terrorism and its sources are reflected in the NATO Summit Declarations. Nevertheless, due to the efforts of Turkey, terrorism is considered as ‘threat’.

Summits	Terrorism separately mentioned	Risk / Threat	Terrorism mentioned as a security threat for territorial integrity
1991	No	Risk	No
1994	Yes	Threat	No
1997	Yes	Threat	No
1999	Yes	Threat	No

(Source: NATO Web Site)

In 2001, NATO invoked Art. V for the first time after the September 11 attacks. Terrorism came into the alliance’s agenda as the biggest threat and paved the way of military campaign in Afghanistan as a means to address terrorism. In this context, Turkey’s strategic importance has been increased in the eyes of its western allies. First, geographic proximity to the concerned area made Turkey a valuable base for military transportation and contribution to operations. Second, Turkey’s participation in this campaign highlighted its treat to ‘fight against terrorism’ and not to humiliate any specific country or religion. Corollary to this, Turkey’s position in fight against PKK has been strengthened in terms of political legitimacy by the Afghanistan Campaign. Due to the geographical hindrances in its Southeastern part, Turkey had to conduct trans-border military incursions, mostly in Northern Iraq in order to prevent terrorist infiltrations through frontiers. The analogy between Afghanistan occupation and Turkey’s military campaigns against PKK created a common understanding and political justification in international area.

To sum up, although faltered in the early years of post-Cold War era, Turkey adjusted its position according to changing understanding of security within NATO and its ramifications

⁶³ Miran Varouhakis, “Greek Intelligence and the Capture of PKK Leader Abdullah Ocalan in 1999”, *CIA Studies in Intellegence*, (Volume 53, Number 1)

in different domains. When terrorism came into the world's agenda with 9/11, a new era opened up and Turkey benefited from this context in line with its fight against PKK.

II. Turkey and Different NATO Policies

Turkey's position on different NATO issues diverges according to its geographic constraints and the nature of the case to be handled. It is true that being a part of a security alliance which conducts operations in different parts of the world requires a strong position in a multilateral environment. Therefore, a long term strategy declared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs⁶⁴ is of utmost importance to understand general lines of Turkish policy *vis-à-vis* current NATO issues of which most important ones are, participation in NATO operations and its contribution to Afghanistan, enlargement process, partnership relations and NATO – Russia Relations. Turkey's approach to these subjects are determined by its concerns stemming from asymmetric challenges such as terrorism, regional instability, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, drug, arm and human trafficking. Other issues relevant to the EU – NATO relations will be examined in subsequent chapters.

Today, Afghanistan constitutes the biggest ordeal for NATO. Success or failure in Afghanistan will determine the future of the Alliance and its legitimacy in international area. Since 2001, considerable effort has been made to stabilize the country which was used to be in the hands of extremist religious groups and the backdrop for terrorist activities. When coalition forces invaded the country, few doubted that this military campaign would fail. However, it is implausible to argue that military operations and political initiatives aiming at rooting out terrorism in Afghanistan and especially along its border with Pakistan completely achieved tangible results. Member states are straddling between sustaining their contributions in military campaign to foster the Alliance and being accountable to their public opinions for civilian and military casualties. As the last NATO Summit in Strasbourg has shown, this issue creates a salient rift between USA and its European allies. In this context, Turkey's contribution to the NATO presence in Afghanistan presents an outright political support.⁶⁵ In concrete terms, Turkey assumed twice the command of International Assistance Force (ISAF), first between June 2002 and February 2003, second 13 February – 4 August 2005 with more than 1400 troops. For the same token, *Hikmet Cetin*, a former minister of foreign

⁶⁴ As a clear sign of the importance of NATO in Turkish security policy, the title of the section concerning security issues is 'Turkey's Security (NATO)'. [See MFA Website]

⁶⁵ NATO troop contributions and their deployment in Afghanistan [see NATO Website]

affairs undertook the post of NATO Secretary General's Senior Civilian Representative in Afghanistan during two years.

Regarding the enlargement process, Turkey has been a strong supporter of NATO's open door policy. At the Bucharest Summit in 2008, where Albania and Croatia have been invited to NATO and became members at the Strasbourg Summit in 2009. However, the failure to do the same for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, that Turkey has been endorsing since long time⁶⁶ created disappointment. Things become thornier when it comes to the membership of Ukraine and Georgia. As the recent Russia – Georgia has shown, frozen conflicts can abruptly flare up and turn out to be outrage in Caucasian which is a direct concern to Ankara. Since Russia has made public several times that adhesion of those countries would be regarded threat to its national security, it is wise to argue that Turkey would feel uncomfortable in the course of these countries' engagements. Nevertheless, it is position on the fact that 'no State outside of NATO have the right to veto NATO decisions and sovereign States make their own decisions according to their national interests' is clear.

NATO's Member States have national security interests which go far beyond their borders. Therefore, a strong coordination with neighboring countries of Transatlantic area is helpful to stabilize other regions of the world and address risks and threats before they reach to their territories. Partnership for Peace (PfP) Program, established in 1994 and Mediterranean Dialogue in 1995 (also known as Barcelona Process) cover scores of countries in the Middle East, Mediterranean Region and in the Balkans. Not surprisingly, Turkey pays big attention to these initiatives which surround its soil. In Prague 2002, 'The Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism' has been launched as a specific cooperation area. Corollary, at the Istanbul Summit in 2004, enhancement of this cooperation and further improvement of defense planning and reform have been reaffirmed. In line with its support to PfP, Turkey opened the PfP training center to provide strategic understanding for participating states' military personnel.⁶⁷

The geopolitical importance of Russia is obvious. NATO – Russia Council has been established in 2002 for joint consultation and to enhance mutual understanding in various

⁶⁶ In every publication and official document of NATO, it is indicated with a footnote that 'Turkey recognizes the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name'.

⁶⁷ For detailed information see PfP Training Website

issues. Turkey has also supported this initiative as an important importer of Russian gas and a significant trade partner. Moreover, energy transportation from Caspian Basin to Europe constitutes the balance of power in the region. Although Georgian conflict and recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states frozen relations between Russia – NATO, Members States did not adopt an aggressive policy towards Russia. At the end of 2008, NATO declared ‘gradual re-engagement’ with Moscow.

B. NATO – EU Relations

The disappearance of common enemy of the Cold War, the Soviet Union, made compulsory adjustments in both sides of Transatlantic sphere. Whilst the US has remained as the only biggest power and opened up an exceptional era in the world history, Europe has been trying to garner autonomy to a certain extent and step up as a global player. The aim of this chapter is to understand this extent of autonomy of the EU from NATO as regards the international security challenges, the nature of this relationship, various stances of different actors, issues at the stake and possible cooperation areas. Common Foreign and Security Policy and European Security and Defense Policy are examined under this chapter only in their relations with NATO.

I. EU in NATO: ESDI and ESDP

European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) created the legal means by which Europe has been involved within the NATO structure. This term has been officially inserted into the first Strategic Concept of NATO in 1991. Separately, European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) implies another structure, which is outside of NATO and constitutes the military dimension of CFSP. ESDP can be seen as a political will of the EU to exist as an autonomous security actor.

a. Establishment of ESDP: What Autonomy vis-à-vis NATO?

The main ordeal of ESDP is to create an autonomous military structure within the EU without degrading the importance of the Atlantic Alliance. The Treaty on European Union (TEU), adopted in Maastricht in 1992 created a common foreign and security policy, which also foresees ‘the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might lead to common

defence' (Art. J4). Concerning its relations with NATO, article makes clear the compliance of CFSP and NATO:

The policy of the Union in accordance with this article shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of certain Member States under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with common security and defence policy established within that framework.

At the same time, the Western European Union declared that 'WEU will be developed as the defence component of the European Union and as a means to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance'.⁶⁸ Amsterdam Treaty made no significant modification to the existing relationship between NATO and the EU. (Art. 17 of the consolidated version of the TEU) Nevertheless, reference to NATO's role has been reinforced by pointing out the concerned Member States, 'which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), under the North Atlantic Treaty'.

After Franco – British Summit in Saint Malo in 1998, where two leaders proposed to equip the EU 'with autonomous capacity, backed up by credible military forces', European Council of 1999 adopted ESDP and decided to fulfill missions hitherto undertaken by the WEU. As far as NATO's position was concerned, international crisis shall be responded without prejudice to actions of NATO.⁶⁹ The Constitutional Treaty would have brought equivalent provisions to NATO – EU relations, if it had entered into force. However, Art. I-40, para 7, which drew up provisions concerning territorial defence of Europe could have had some impact on the subject matter:

If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all means in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

⁶⁸ Fabien Tarpan, "EU – NATO Relations: Consistency as a Strategic Consideration and a Legal Requirement", in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 276.

⁶⁹ Annex III – European Council Declaration on Strengthening the European Common Policy on Security and Defence, European Council, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999

This provision did not specifically point out the use of force but naturally it could be included according to the political context. Corollary to this, the solidarity clause foresees the mobilization of military sources in case of terrorist attack or natural or man-made disaster.

b. European Pillar within NATO: the Building of ESDI

Whether the creation of the ESDP could have been accomplished without any precedent initiative deserves to be questioned. Therefore, engagement of the EU's institutional structure and NATO can be understood firstly by examining European Security and Defence Identity.

The idea of creating an ESDI within NATO has been supported by the US to foster European contribution to NATO and a more equal burden sharing. Also the UK defended this initiative on the condition that it would remain within the NATO structure.⁷⁰ In the early 1990s, allied States agreed upon the building of ESDI, hence there was no legal impediment in the North Atlantic Charter. In the Brussels Declaration of North Atlantic Council in 1990⁷¹, Ministers stated that 'a European security identity and defence role, reflected of a European pillar within the Alliance, will not only serve the interests of the European states but also help to strengthen Atlantic solidarity.' ESDI has been officially recognized at the Rome Summit in 1991.

II. Legal Basis of Current Relationship and its Outcomes

a. From WEU Agreements to Berlin Plus

The legal engagement between the EU and NATO in security and defence area has been launched within the framework of NATO – WEU arrangements. Fundamental principles of NATO's rapprochement, transparency and complementarity, stigmatized the negotiations.

In 1996, Berlin – Brussels agreements have drawn up to grant the legal basis for WEU's access to NATO assets. More concretely, WEU could enjoy the staff officers, military equipment of, Deputy SACEUR (Supreme Allied Commander Europe) in circumstances when NATO is not involved as a whole. This can be argued as a reference to the supremacy of NATO.

⁷⁰ Tarpan, *Opcit.*, p. 281

⁷¹ Final Communiqué, North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 17 – 18 December 1990

1999 Cologne European Council decided to implement European defence issues by the EU and integrate WEU's structures to accomplish Petersburg Tasks. However, this transformation from WEU to EU had to be implemented in a new dimension within NATO structure. To this end, Berlin Plus arrangements have been finalized in 2003, which outlined NATO – ESDP cooperation. Decisions taken for WEU 'separable but not separate' concerning NATO assets and capabilities for EU-led operations remained in place. Berlin Plus creates the ground for NATO – EU cooperation and EU-led operations.

Framework arrangements built upon NATO's Washington Summit in 1999 and the conclusions of the European Council in Nice in December 2000 as well as the EU-NATO joint declaration of 16 December 2002 on ESDP.⁷² The latter created a strategic partnership⁷³ in crisis management and based on following principles: effective mutual consultation, autonomy of the EU and NATO in decision-making; respect for the UN Charter; and mutually reinforcing the development of the military capabilities within the two organizations. These arrangements allow the EU to have an assured access to NATO assets and capabilities, assistance in operational planning. In effect, they allow the Alliance to support EU-led operations in which NATO as a whole is not engaged.⁷⁴

In fact, Berlin Plus agreements cover four main elements: 'assured access' means that the EU military staff works in close cooperation with SHAPE to assess military options. Second, the Operation Commander should be a D-SACEUR, that is to say, a European Commander. Third, assets and capabilities are enlisted in a specific arrangement and procedures are specified with agreement (known as the 'Model Contract'). The last element is about arrangements for coherent and mutually reinforcing capability requirements. 'Berlin Plus' is a series of useful arrangements tied together with the so-called 'Framework Agreement' which consists of an exchange of letters between the EU's High Representative for CFSP and NATO Secretary General dated 17 March 2003.

b. Berlin Plus in Practice

Operational capability and efficiency on the field are as important as legal arrangements. The success of a political framework must be assessed by taking into account its concrete outcomes. To this aim, two operations conducted under the auspices of 'Berlin Plus

⁷² The Council of the European Union, *EU - NATO: The Framework for Permanent Relations and Berlin Plus*

⁷³ EU – NATO Declaration on ESDP, 16 December 2002

⁷⁴ NATO Topics: *NATO's Relations with the European Union*

agreement’, Operation Concordia and EUFOR – ALTHEA, provide tangible data for further analysis.

Concordia is the first operation launched few days after the final adoption of ‘Berlin Plus’ and EU-led Concordia succeeded NATO-led Mission ‘Allied Harmony’ in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia starting from 31 March 2003. Operation ALTHEA is another good example of ‘Berlin Plus’ agreement. For both operations, in line with the legal arrangements, NATO’s D-SACEUR was the EU Operation Commander and the EU had access to NATO’s assets and capabilities.

EUFOR mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Concordia

Dates	March 31 - December 15, 2003
Goals	Contribute to the establishment of a stable and secure environment in Macedonia, leading to a situation in which an international security presence is no longer needed
Composition	400 persons from 26 countries
Cost of Operation	The common costs of the operation are €6.2 million; personnel and other items are on a “costs lie where they fall” basis, i.e. member states pay from their own budgets for their own forces and for their support in the field
Chain of Command	Operation commander: DSCEUR; chief of staff of the EU command element: EUFOR; force commander: EUFOR. EU operation headquarters will be located at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe.

EU Military Operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina: EUFOR Althea

Dates	December 2, 2004 - present
Goals	Provide deterrence, continued compliance with the responsibility to fulfill the role specified in Annexes 1A and 2 of the Dayton/Paris Agreement (General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina); contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH, in line with its mandate, required to achieve core tasks in the OHR’s Mission Implementation Plan and the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP)
Composition	The EU deployed a robust force (EUFOR) - at the same force levels as SFOR (7,000 troops); in addition to 22 EU member states, the following countries are participating in the Althea Operation: Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Switzerland, and Turkey
Cost of Operation	Common costs of the operation are €71.7 million; personnel and other items are on a “costs lie where they fall” basis
Chain of Command	EU operation commander (OpCdr): DSACEUR, with the EU operation headquarters located at Supreme Headquarters for the

	Allied forces in Europe; EU force commander: EUFOR. The basic decisions on the operation are taken by the Council of the European Union. The EU's Political and Security Committee will exercise the political control and strategic decision of the operation. EU operations commander will direct Althea through the EU Command Element in Naples and EUFOR HQ in Sarajevo.
--	---

(Source: Transatlantic Transformation: Building NATO – EU Security Architecture, the Atlantic Council of the United States, Policy Paper, March 2006)

III. Competition or Co-operation: Challenges and Opportunities for NATO-EU

Partnership

Different perspectives and various ideas take place in the debate regarding the extent to which both sides of the Atlantic Alliance diverge and/or converge in terms of security issues. While Europe is trying to garner confidence as autonomous security player – indeed, still awkward – the US is keen on keeping its security umbrella in Europe and in Eurasia through NATO. Moreover, rifts within the EU as regards the NATO's position further complicate a common European stance. The aim of this chapter is to pose appropriate questions to clarify this problematic in practical as well as in theoretical context.

a. Is There Still a Common Understanding?

As it has been pointed out in the precedent chapters, the end of the Cold War and emergence of new threats and risks profoundly shook up traditional security understandings in today's political agenda. The fundamental question is, whether NATO is suitable to cope with these new challenges.

The disintegration of the Yugoslav Republic followed by bloody atrocities in Bosnia and in Kosovo demonstrated that Europe's inaction still requires NATO's involvement in international crises. Strategic Concepts of 1991 and 1999 have been drawn up to respond to this necessity. Europe's awkwardness as a security actor, even on its continent, became clear on the eve of 21st Century. The absence of international community during these crises had repercussions both in Europe and in the US and inevitably paved the way of changing the Transatlantic partnership's nature.

From the US perspective, the debate about the role of the US in the forthcoming years is intensified both theoretically and politically. Two academicians put forward the dominant role

of the US and its security implications concerning US – Europe alliance.⁷⁵ Joseph Nye argues in his book *Bound to Lead* (1990) that the US will maintain its superpower status in the future. He proposes a distinction between hard power and soft power which, according to him, can explain the concept of power in the post-Cold War era since total power of a country cannot be confined to nuclear or conventional capacity anymore. The international system will be shaped as polyarchy and within this system; the US will remain superior in both hard and soft power. The conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is the fact that no other State on the world can challenge the US and naturally, Europe will remain in the security circle provided by NATO. Robert Kagan, on the other hand, argues that the US and Europe does not share the same strategic culture any more. He gives the example of Balkan wars and reluctance of Europe to improve its strategic capabilities to confront possible crisis. According to Kagan, USA will be dominant power in the 21st Century. European integration has not been and will not be possible without American power.

These debates in academia seem to be applied in US foreign policy by two major events: Afghanistan and Iraq Wars. Arguably, after September 11, the US stance towards NATO has been profoundly changed. On the eve of the Afghanistan military campaign, the US did not rely on NATO's support although the latter revoked Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty for the very first time. Likewise, the US did not refrain from waging war on Iraq despite heavy opposition from international community, as a part of its 'go it alone' policy.

Does the US still need NATO for its national security? Two arguments can be put forward for this question. For the first, the new American thinking towards NATO was summed up Wolfowitz's (2002) phrase⁷⁶: "not the coalition make the mission, the mission makes the coalition". Therefore, NATO is seen by Washington as a means of controlling Europe and its security affairs. An autonomous Europe is not desired by the US, especially if the burden sharing is neglectable. The EU25 is spending less than 40% of the US military expenditures although its GDP is at the same level.⁷⁷ As to the second argument, it is highly unlikely that any country – including the US - on the world can launch and maintain its military campaign

⁷⁵ Magnus Christiansson, "US and Europe in the International System – Four American Perspectives", in *NATO versus EU? Security Strategies for Europe*, eds. Bernhard May and May-Britt Stumbaum, (Berlin: Dt. Ges. für Auswärtige Politik, 2005), 152 - 154

⁷⁶ Maxime Lefebvire, "Europe's New Role in Global Affairs: Implications for NATO and Transatlantic Relations", in *NATO versus EU? Security Strategies for Europe*, eds. Bernhard May and May-Britt Stumbaum, (Berlin: Dt. Ges. für Auswärtige Politik, 2005), 173.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 178

without international recognition, at least to a certain extent. ISAF in Afghanistan and Iraqi Military Training Force endorses this argument and underscores allies support in such operations. Furthermore, a pro-European perspective would approve the importance of military endeavors of the EU and its positive impacts in Europe and within NATO, particularly as far as peacekeeping and peace building operations are concerned.

b. Hard Power or Soft Power: A Question of Subsidiarity

A thorough assessment of legal arrangements which are explained above, points out that Europe is not eager to take the responsibility in crisis management where NATO would take the lead. The argument that this is due to the incapacity of the EU as a military power on the one hand, the nature of the EU as an economic and ideological actor on the other hand can be interpreted as its ambition to exist as a soft power on the global scale rather than a hard one.

Joseph Nye, who proposes a new approach to the concept of power, gives the definition of hard power and soft power. Hard power implies coercive methods possessed by a State or an international organization to urge its decisions to an actor even though it is not willing to comply with that. Military and – in some cases – economic means are wielded to reach this aim. Soft power, however, relies on the conviction and seduction capacity of the concerned State. Cultural and ideological instruments can be used to influence indirectly other entities within the system.

Is it plausible to distinguish the EU and NATO as soft power and hard power respectively? The reality is more complicated than this definition. As regards their activities, ‘complementarity’ principle is an overriding approach. That is to say, military sanction can be implemented by NATO whereas the EU would prefer wielding economic instruments. For example, could ‘civilian tasks for the EU, military tasks for NATO’ or ‘peacekeeping for the EU, peace enforcement for NATO’ divisions be applicable?⁷⁸ The fact is, in order to duly accomplish security operations in troubled regions, only an outright synchronization of military implementation and economic-humanitarian support can succeed. However, these activities are highly intertwined and shall not be assigned, *a priori*, to a specific structure. Legal framework provides the backdrop for both organizations to take the lead, although it implicitly puts NATO to a high-ranking position. Moreover, the fact that most of the

⁷⁸ Heike Krieger, “Common European Defence: Competition or Compatibility with NATO?”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 276.

humanitarian/peacekeeping operations are protected by military means in unstable regions demonstrates the entanglement of those two concepts. Therefore, it does not make sense to assert hard power – soft power distinction to NATO – EU relationship.⁷⁹

Subsidiarity principle, which implies the application of a policy in the lowest possible level to improve its efficiency, is proposed by some academicians to manage the burden sharing between NATO and the EU.⁸⁰ The official formulation that EU will act only ‘where NATO as a whole is not engaged’ is to be interpreted in line with this thinking.

However, international security necessitates a multi-level analysis of actors’ involvement. Security is provided by different networks with a multiplicity of actors and organizations. This multilevel system is characterized by some international organizations which are dealing with defence and security issues. Neither in NATO nor in the EU Member States have relinquished their national sovereignties in favor of a supranational structure. Therefore, the political will of these actors is the key element for a fair co-operation.

Whether the fact that the autonomous decision of the EU to take a military initiative is contingent upon NATO’s engagement as a whole is an application of the subsidiarity principle poses three crucial problematics.⁸¹ Firstly, ‘NATO comes first’ understanding is a daunting approach. Since most of the EU Member States are also NATO Members, this clause can be interpreted by some countries as the EU still possesses the competence to launch its own operation, even in those situations where NATO is prepared to take the lead. The second question is related to the EU’s own capabilities. It is highly contestable that the EU could assert itself as a genuine military power. In order to launch a large-scale military campaign to prevent or stop an international crisis, the EU would require NATO’s assets. Lastly, ‘what criteria must be applied for a fair burden’ sharing remains unclear.

Another perspective which shapes NATO – EU relations is to avoid unnecessary duplication of competences and capabilities. According to Madeleine Albright⁸² 3D principles must be applied for every initiative taken by the European structures: avoiding the duplication of

⁷⁹ Anne-Marie Bouché; Denis Guignot; Fritz Urbach, *Soft Power, Hard Power : une possibilité de répartir les responsabilités politiques et militaires entre l'UE et l'OTAN*, (Paris: Les Éd. de Riaux, 2006)

⁸⁰ Tarpan, *Opcit.*, p. 284 - 287

⁸¹ **Idem.**

⁸² M Albright, “The Right Balance will Secure NATO’s Future”, *Financial Times*, 7 December 1998

existing efforts, decoupling of NATO – EU and guaranteeing non-discrimination against non-EU NATO Member States, such as Turkey. This approach aims an efficient interoperability on the field and unnecessary expenses from the EU's side.

c. The US and an Autonomous ESDP

From the US point of view, the emergence of Europe as a security player is a new phenomenon that has pros and cons. A robust Europe committed to taking part in international security affairs is a major contribution to military operations and thus, would lessen America's burden. On the other hand, this development is prone to diverging Europe's security concerns from the US and creating rifts in the Transatlantic Alliance.

As it has been explained, the US welcomed ESDI efforts in order to create an integral European pillar within NATO. ESDI was officially recognized as a part of the Alliance in 1991 Rome Summit, the EU started to use the term ESDP in 1999. This initiative was supposed to be integrated to CFSP and function outside of NATO. The EU had the ambition to develop a more autonomous structure and this would destabilize NATO.⁸³ An unfruitful competition between NATO and the EU both in terms of capacity and missions was likely to appear.

The US has been long dithering between accepting Europe's autonomy as a means of strengthening the Transatlantic alliance and being suspicious about the EU's endeavors which might be to the detriment of US dominant position. In order to alleviate these concerns, the UK and other Member States close to the US have to assure that 'more Europe does not mean less America on the continent' and this will foster NATO's initiatives. On the other hand, France shall point out that the main goal of an autonomous Europe is not in opposition with the security concerns of the US. Arguably, despite slight differences in terms of means and aims, those countries share a common understanding of security.

Arrangements between NATO and the EU seem to keep this balance in favor of the US and NATO. If Europeans want to increase their capabilities, they have to do this in a way that will not be interpreted as an absolute break of the link by Americans. The most desirable outcome of NATO – EU relationship of in the eyes of American decision makers is to enjoy a resolute

⁸³ Krieger, *Opcit.*, p. 281

contribution of Europe in crisis areas while it will not lead to a sharp divergence in aims and means.

d. Different Approaches within the EU

It is not a secret that the EU Member States have troubles to speak as a united voice when it comes to security affairs and thus, to the nature of the Transatlantic Partnership. The degree to which Europe should be a security actor constitutes the centerpiece of this debate. Some countries are more Atlanticists, which means inclined to rely upon the US support, whereas some others are advocating for a policy which would enhance the security dimension of the European integration.

It is fruitful to assess European countries' stances by taking into account their policies during the period before the Iraq War. The UK, for instance, as the strategic partner of the US has supported the invasion of Iraq. London is also eager to keep the Transatlantic balance in NATO's favor. Nevertheless, it supported ESDP initiative first with Saint Malo declaration together with the French. This is to be interpreted as an intention to have leverage to get an influence on the US. Netherlands, Italy and most of the Central and Eastern European Countries have also a NATO-prone approach.

On the other hand, Franco-German couple seem to preserve an autonomous Europe *vis-à-vis* the US and NATO. An ESDP operation, which can be successful even without wielding NATO's assets, is desirable for this. In this context, how can we interpret France's re-integration to the military structure of NATO and Franco-German position in the last Strasbourg Summit?⁸⁴ Both leaders claim that, as a reiteration of the ESS, no power on the world can solve security concerns alone. They put forward the importance of CFSP to reinforce the security of the Transatlantic Alliance and warned the US to refrain from taking unilateral decision, which would be in contradiction with the sense of solidarity. While two leaders asserted that the Alliance must be adjusted according to the changing needs, they also pledged for an armament process of Europe, which would be modern, efficient and interoperable.

⁸⁴ Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy, "La Sécurité, Notre Mission Commune", *Le Monde*, 12.03.2009

It is not true to argue that the EU would be a united body concerning its relations with NATO in the foreseeable future. Corollary to this, no significant change in this relationship is foreseen in the forthcoming years.

e. The EU as a Defence Alliance?

Whether the EU possesses the capacity to defend its own territorial integrity is the essence of the debate about the Transatlantic alliance. Today, it is generally accepted that most of the EU Member States are not able to respond to a heavy armed attack on their territory. In this context, should the EU become a traditional security alliance?

The motivation behind the European integration is to secure Europe both against an armed attack from the Soviet Union and to render the war inconceivable among Member States due to the profound economic engagement. It is plausible to say that this reason still subsists today. However, the Soviet Union does not exist anymore and a conventional conflict between these regions is unlikely to occur.

The argument that the EU should not become a traditional security alliance seems plausible for two reasons: First, there is no consensus between the EU Member States about the issue. Some of them are highly reluctant to increase their military expenditures instead of spending it for the welfare in their countries. The ambition to become a security alliance would saddle an enormous burden on the EU. Moreover, the discord about security matters might overshadow and hammer the European integration in other different domains. Due to the high integration of the European countries and profound interdependence of their interests, it is not wise to say that an EU Member State, even if it is not a part of NATO, would be left totally alone in case of an armed attack.

Secondly, the concept of territorial integrity and its pertinence in today's security affairs is contestable. Even though traditional threats, such as nuclear and conventional arms, subsist in 21st Century; challenges that the EU has to cope with are much more diverse. The risks that Europe is confronted with do not aim borders but people through borderless means. As the ESS and its revision puts forward (See *Supra*), Europe has security concerns which go far beyond than territorial integrity. Therefore, while a strong co-operation with NATO is assuring traditional security of the most of the EU Member States, they will have the possibility to deal with other challenges.

IV. Turkey's Perspective on NATO – EU Cooperation⁸⁵

Turkey, as a candidate country of the EU and member of NATO since 1952, has played a crucial role in the NATO – EU partnership. However, since 1990s, when the EU started to claim the role of a security actor on the global scale, Turkey has been considered as blocking the advancement of NATO – EU co-operation. This argument deserves to be assessed in legal as well as in political terms. On the one side, the EU has to behave in a coherent manner with all its 27 Member States, whose biggest ordeal became clear with the admission of Greek Cypriots and Maltese. On the other side, from a Turkish point of view, lack of transparency and openness of the EU, as well as its reluctance to implement the legal arrangements are the biggest hurdles in the way. Hence, the legal framework of NATO – EU strategic partnership, Cyprus issue, Turkey's position in ESDP operations related to NATO structure are examined in this chapter.

The misinterpretation that Turkey is blocking NATO – EU co-operation derives from two presumptions: Accession talks with the EU and Greek Cypriot problem. For the first, some Europeans think that Turkey is trying to gain leverage for its full membership ambition by playing the NATO card. In fact, Turkey has declared several times that two organisations must be considered separately when it comes to membership talks.⁸⁶ Regarding the thorny Cyprus issue, stakes are higher in both sides. The comprehensive UN Plan to settle disputes over military presence of Turkey on the island and property problems of both communities would have brought the final solution, if the Plan had been accepted by Greek side as it was the case for Turkish side. Nevertheless, despite the 'no' from Greeks Cypriots, the divided island has been admitted to the EU in following days. The anticipated membership of the Greek Cypriots created frustration by Turkish side. If the Plan had been accepted, the Island would have a demilitarized status, which means it would not have a significant position regarding ESDP operations. Turkey is consistently opposing the inclusion of Greek Cypriot Administration in NATO – EU affairs, due to its non-recognition as a subject of international law.

⁸⁵ The arguments discussed under this chapter are based on the articles of Tomur Bayer (Ambassador, Director General of International Security Affairs, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs), "Turkey's Role in European Security and Defence", *Defence Turkey*, (Volume: 3 Issue: 13 Year: 2008, and of Ihsan Kiziltan (Counselor at the Embassy of Turkey in Washington DC), "Improving the NATO – EU Partnership: A Turkish Perspective", *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, (2008-No:3), unless otherwise indicated. Views expressed do not necessarily represent those of Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁸⁶ "Gul Lashes out at European Critics", *Financial Times*, 8.4.2009

The main argument of Turkey regarding NATO – EU co-operation and thus, the involvement of Greek Cypriots is the reluctance of full-respect for the ‘agreed framework’, which the legal ground of the concerned subject. ‘Agreed Framework’ covers; : (a) Berlin plus arrangements, (b) Strategic cooperation as underlined by the North Atlantic Council on 13 December 2002 and (c) Nice implementation document and its full implementation.

As it is explained above, EU’s access to NATO assets started with the legal arrangements between NATO and WEU in 1996. In 1999 Washington Summit’s Communiqué, whose para 10.d is of utmost importance for Turkey.

“We attach utmost importance to ensuring the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European Allies in the EU-led crisis response operations, *building on existing consultation arrangements within the WEU.*”

The Nice Implementation Document started to be outlined in 2000, in Nice European Council Meeting to detail the involvement of non-EU Member States in ESDP operations (Norway, Iceland and Turkey) as well as the consultation manners. However, this document could be finalized in 2002 at the Brussels European Council, after intensive discussions between Greece, Turkey, the USA and the UK. This document describes the modalities of consultation and operation exercise of ESDP. However, from Turkey’s point of view, Nice Implementation Document is not fully respected by the EU side. The holistic approach of the ‘agreed framework’, which covers NATO – EU co-operation related to security, defence and crisis management issues is interpreted in a different manner by the EU. The EU argued that these arrangements cover only cases where the EU would request military support from NATO (“Berlin plus” type operations).

The narrow interpretation of the EU regarding the ‘agreed framework’ covers the EU Member States participation in NATO – EU consultations. The EU believes that except ‘Berlin Plus’ arrangements, all EU Members, including Greek Cypriot Administration should take part in the interactions between two organizations. Consultations between the North Atlantic Council and the EU’s Political and Security Committee (without Greek Cypriot and Malta representatives) is confined only to Operation ALTHEA, which is a ‘Berlin Plus’ operation. The EU insists that, other topics which are on the agenda of NAC – PSC gatherings must be

handled with the presence of these two delegations. In other words, the EU believes that all EU Member States must participate in the talks between NATO and EU, where 'Berlin Plus' arrangements are not employed. On the contrary, Turkey holds the view that 'agreed framework' – which includes Nice Implementation Document as well – must cover all aspects of the relationship. Agreed framework creates a delicate balance between on the one hand, the involvement of non-EU States, on the other hand assures the NATO support to EU-led operations, namely ESDP.

Ankara believes that provisions of the 'agreed framework' are not duly respected for non-EU allies, such as Turkey, which demands from the EU to be more 'open'. Operations in Afghanistan and in Kosovo remain outside of the scope of the 'agreed framework', because the EU holds the position that these operations are not employing 'Berlin Plus' agreements. This interpretation of the EU has two major consequences: first, Turkey cannot enjoy its rights as provided by Nice Implementation Document. Secondly, the presence of two organizations on the same terrain with different roles impedes the interoperability capacity and thus, effectiveness of the operation.

C. Turkey and ESDP

The willingness to set up an autonomous Europe after the Cold War proceeded in 1990s with the common positions and joint actions of CFSP. However, heinous bloodshed in Bosnia and Croatia could not be prevented by the emerging political Europe and demonstrated clearly the shortcomings of its structural capabilities. The idea of building up a military arm of the EU, which would be outside of NATO unlike ESDI, has become salient in this context for a more assertive Europe.

The Amsterdam Treaty incorporated the Petersburg Tasks of the WEU – humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. The British – French Summit in 1998 laid out the decision to be taken in 1999 Helsinki Summit, which was followed by informal decisions and final adoption of Helsinki Headline Goal (60.000 troops, deployable within 60 days for at least one year). The intergovernmental structure has been built up and the Political and Military Committee, the EU Military Committee and the EU Military Staff began their work. The framework for the

cooperation between the EU and NATO has been drawn up (See *Supra*) and the first ESDP operation, Concordia, was launched on 1 January 2003 in Macedonia.

I. An Appraisal of ESDP and Operations

As a highly complex structure with operational dimension, ESDP implies the translation of the EU's foreign and security policy ambitions into the practice. Apart from the question whether the EU aims at establishing a structure which would eventually guarantee European territorial integrity, it is pertinent to question a fundamental point: What is the use of ESDP?

The first answer is to be found in the grand strategy of the EU, which is the stabilization of the wider Europe. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and emergence of new nation states imposed the mission of preserving the peace and stability in the region on the EU. This had to be done within second and third pillar of the EU and ESDP aimed at adding value to these goals.⁸⁷ The ESDP operations launched, for instance the rule of law mission in Georgia and the police mission in Macedonia makes clear the fact that ESDP and enlargement (or neighborhood) policies are complementary insofar as they constitutes different levels of the same strategy. In addition, ESDP operations also serve to the goals of the third pillar, namely to fight against trafficking, drugs, organized crime and terrorism through transnational cooperation.

The second point demonstrates the political will of the EU to play a global role, as Mr. Solana expressed 'when there is political will, things get done'⁸⁸ The very first autonomous operation, namely Artemis, in the Democratic Republic of Congo aimed at assuring the humanitarian aid and preventing a civilian crisis was not dependent on NATO's assets. As the first operation outside Europe, this was also a concrete step to implement the ESS. The EU demonstrated its willingness to pursue the goals that are set out in its strategy, which is a significant step towards the consolidation of the 'actorness'.

Another value in ESDP operations is their mixed and separable characteristic, which is constituted of military and civilian missions. While military operations are carried out to

⁸⁷ Maria Raquel Freire, "The European Security and Defence Policy: History, structures and capabilities", in *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implemenatation Perspective*, eds. Michael Merlinger and Rasa Oustrauskaite, (Newyork: Routledge, 2007), 19.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 21

prevent eruption of armed conflicts in unstable regions, civilian missions focus on reforms of the rule of law and policing fields. Civilian missions are politically easier to be launched because they do not include NATO's capabilities and hence, do not entail an intra-European spat between Europeanists and Atlanticists. Also from a financial perspective, civilian operations have advantages compared to the military ones thus they are funded by the CFSP budget, which grew progressively and will reach to 250 million euro in the forthcoming years.⁸⁹ This reflects the increase of operational initiatives. The civilian capability of the EU is important and deriving from two reasons: first, implication of the EU in an operation, which can be an intervention of the US or NATO, is contributing to the presence in the given country and its international recognition. Second, humanitarian activities have a positive impact on the international community and public opinion.

As to the scope of the ESDP operations, the broad variety of missions renders possible to wield different instruments according to the needs of the objective.⁹⁰ The mission of EUJUST THEMIS is defined as the rule of law establishment⁹¹ whereas the operation EU Bam Rafah is in charge of border controlling.⁹² Despite this variety of operations raises the question that to which extent these operations must be considered within ESDP, the flexibility that the EU enjoys is important in terms of broadening to perspective of stability in all its tracks. The second aspect of ESDP's scope is related to geographical assessment. Started with the Balkans, the EU now conducts operations in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. This implies its global role and the fact that the EU's goals are not confined to the European territory. The geographical distance increases the military and financial burden, which is a challenging fact as it is in the case of ARTEMIS. Moreover, the aforementioned operation points out that the ESDP operations are not limited to peacekeeping missions but can also include peace enforcement objective.

An important asset of the EU, which is declared by several times (see *ESS*) politically as well as legally is its strong commitment to the international law and multilateralism. This perspective is kept in the domain of ESDP operations. All ESDP operations have a clear basis

⁸⁹ Michael Merlingen and Rasa Ostrauskaite, "The Implementation of the ESDP", in *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implemenatation Perspective*, eds. Michael Merlinger and Rasa Oustrauskaite, (Newyork: Routledge, 2007), 193.

⁹⁰ Frederic Naert, "ESDP in Practice: Increasingly Varied and Ambitious EU Security and Defence Operations", in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 64.

⁹¹ EU Rule of Law Mission to Georgia

⁹² Council Joint Action 2005/889/CFSP

of international law.⁹³ In all cases, the operations are launched either by the invitation of the host country, through agreements (called as SOMA/SOFA) with them, or by Security Council authorization, as in the case of ARTEMIS and ALTHEA.

Practice shows that not all member states are participating in all operations and even when this is the case, the extent of contributions varies greatly. ‘Constructive abstention’ is the justification mechanism of those cases. On the other hand, the former candidate countries (which now became members of the Union) and non-EU NATO countries have also been active participants. Countries outside of Europe, such as Brazil, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand and some others have also contributed to specific missions through bilateral agreements. As an example, ALTHEA (BiH) is the biggest operation that the EU undertook in 2004. According to the ALTHEA Joint Action, its mission is two-pronged: to provide deterrence and continued compliance with Annexes 1A and 2 of the Dayton Agreement, and to contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH. The operation is constituted of 2200 troops from 28 countries, including 23 EU Member States and 5 non-EU countries (including Turkey).⁹⁴

II. Turkey’s Contribution to ESDP and Challenges

As it is mentioned above, Turkey’s participation in ESDP operations are highly entangled with the NATO – EU cooperation mechanism. However, apart from this framework, Turkey is the biggest non-EU contributor to ESDP operations and sometimes even a bigger contributor than some EU Member States. This is mostly due to the fact that a significant number of ESDP operations are launched in the proximity of Turkey and Turkish foreign policy considers this fact as a compulsory factor for being involved in those initiatives.

It should be noted that third country participation in ESDP operations are accepted, without prejudice to the EU’s decision making autonomy. This is eligible for Turkey as well and is not an issue on which Turkish decision makers are totally comfortable. Turkey has no say in as to how a particular mission or operation will be conducted in the future.⁹⁵ From a Turkish

⁹³ Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, “Some General Conclusions”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 359.

⁹⁴ EUFOR BiH Organisation, available at [http://www.euforbih.org/eufor/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=30]

⁹⁵ Bayer, **Loc. cit.**

perspective, it is also noteworthy to make clear that even for some operations which are carried out in the immediate vicinity of Turkey, such as EUJUST LEX in Iraq, the EU refused Turkey's demand to take part in. Ongoing 12 ESDP missions and operations, seven are in Turkey's neighbourhood.

Turkey's exclusion from the decision making procedures of ESDP is an important challenge for further development of Turkey – EU cooperation in security matters. Turkey has been an associate member of the WEU, which is regarded as the precursor of ESDP, and thus, had the possibility, at least, make its voice heard.⁹⁶ Turkey has lost this position within the ESDP structure and moreover, had been excluded from European Defence Agency unlike Norway, which is also a non-EU ally. EDA is an institution for European defence industry cooperation and Turkey's involvement would be valuable for both sides.

From the EU's point of view, Turkey's position in ESDP is summarized as following⁹⁷:

“Within the framework of the **European security and defence policy** (ESDP), Turkey continues to contribute to the EU-led military mission EUFOR/ALTHEA in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Turkey is also supporting the EU-led police missions EUPM in Bosnia Herzegovina. Turkey is one of five non-EU countries contributing to the EULEX mission in Kosovo. Turkey wishes to enhance cooperation on ESDP, while stressing its discontent with its status within ESDP, with the stalemate over the conclusion of a bilateral security agreement with the EU, as well as over the administrative arrangements with the European Defence Agency.”

This statement is offset in the following paragraph of the Report by mentioning Turkey's reservations concerning NATO – EU cooperation, which gives the impression that this issue and the aforementioned 'stalemate' are interrelated.

D. Clearing Up the Opportunities

It is clear that Turkey's engagement to the military aspect of European security will have impact mainly in two areas: Its contribution to ESDP will be increased and Transatlantic relations will be shaped in a more effective manner. These outcomes are desirable for both

⁹⁶ Kızıltan, **Loc. cit.**

⁹⁷ Turkey Progress Report 2008

Turkey and the EU. Therefore, possible ways to advance the relationship must be clarified to reach this aim.

With regard to the military arm of the EU, Turkey's significant input is important due to its military capabilities and military bases.⁹⁸ Turkey has the second largest army of NATO (after the US) and ranks fifth in terms of naval forces. The stability in the region where Turkey is located is of vital importance to European security considerations. Moreover, its former and ongoing contributions to ESDP operations as well as those of NATO and the UN demonstrate the political will to take part in international peace and security endeavors. Despite knowing the fact that Turkey would never enjoy a full-say in the EU concerning ESDP operations, it endorses those activities to the extent possible. Turkey is the biggest contributor as a non-EU country – and even bigger than some EU Members - to ESDP operations and supports further security co-operation in order to assure the stability in the region. Employment of logistic and material capabilities of Turkey will be in the interest of Europe. Bigger Turkish contribution could be approved by full implementation of already existing mechanisms.⁹⁹

This brings us to the second point, which is the NATO – EU gridlock. To handle with this conundrum is highly dependant on political choices due to the complexity of Cyprus dispute. It is not possible to forecast a strategic shift in both sides as long as the deadlock continues. To overcome the challenge does not represent a chimera but it is related to the peace talks on the Island between two communities. If the last round of the negotiations that started in 2008 bear fruit, the removal of this impediment will pave the way of farther advancement. All these issues point out the necessity of a comprehensive approach which will cover problematic factors of NATO – EU – Turkey relations as well as Turkey's contribution to ESDP.

⁹⁸ Meltem Müftüleri Baç, "Turkey's Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common Security and Defence Policy", *Turkey and European Security*, IAA-TESEV Report, 2006

⁹⁹ Bayer, **Loc. Cit.**

CONCLUSION

Turkey and the EU have long-lasting relations covering several different areas. Security is one among others. In this work, the importance of this aspect has been highlighted and various viewpoints are discussed with the aim of clarifying the broader picture.

The outcome of this research clearly puts forward the strong interdependence between Turkey and Europe in security matters. The arguments that are carried during this research demonstrate, however, the fact that the EU needs this engagement more than Turkey does. This is proven on two points: Historical development of relations, theoretical considerations, key points in broader security policy and more specifically in military area (including the cooperation with NATO) make clear that the benefit that Turkey's membership will bring to European security is not negligible. Security concerns within Europe can be better alleviated with Turkey's robust role in geopolitical terms. The stabilizing function of Turkish security policy in a broader geography will support the EU to pursue its foreign and security policy goals and to reach out the regions and get involved in the issues which are direct concern to Europe. Second contribution of Turkey will be to the EU's 'actorness' in international system. This perspective is highly advantageous as far as military domain is concerned. The EU as a resolute security player will accurately find value in Turkey's membership in benefiting from its military capabilities and farther strengthening the Transatlantic link.

Conversely, the price of leaving Turkey outside of the EU would be disquieting. Apart from the fact that Turkey will be increasing its influence as a regional stake holder in the

forthcoming years, the Turkish society would be radicalized from European values if it feels excluded despite 50 years of political endeavor. Turkish foreign and security policy will not be insulated from this tendency and this will bode an American outweigh, which care more about a strong and stable Turkey rather than its democratic strength. Nationalism and conservatism in Turkey would be prominent tenets which would highly undermine the relationship due to the inconsistency of political understandings with Europe. This rift will have negative impacts on other countries, which are carefully observing Turkey's EU bid as a sign of the reconciliation with the West. If this forecast will be the reality, this would, no doubt, overshadow the potential that both sides hold at this moment and dominate the overall significance of the prospect.

The reluctance of some EU Member States *vis-à-vis* Turkey's membership is very well known. The 'privileged partnership' option which has been consistently advocated by the French and German decision makers¹⁰⁰ is a chimera not only because no one knows the exact meaning (what kind of relationship is envisaged and to which degree) of this partnership, but also such a proposal would make no sense for Turkey.¹⁰¹ The EU Membership will signify Turkey's eventual anchor in Europe and therefore, has primarily an ideological implication. Moreover, Turkey will entrench a stable democracy that fully respects fundamental rights of its citizens (including minorities) with duly functioning institutions which embrace European values. Consequently, a 'privileged partnership' would put these ambitions in the second plan and emphasize other aspects which are either not primordial for Turkey's EU bid or included in already existing mechanisms.

All these sequences and the main argument that the EU has to acquire Turkey's support in security domain for both securing Europe and bolstering its 'actorness' in the world does not mean that the membership decision has to be taken at any cost. This process includes various parts of a political and economic engagement and cannot be reduced to security aspect. However, a process which lasts a half-century boils down to the mutual benefits that neither part can easily give up. Turkey's membership represents such an important political project and the author of this work believes that the both sides have no other alternative than to engage each other.

¹⁰⁰ "Berlin and Paris Unite Over Turkey", *Financial Times*, 11.5.2009

¹⁰¹ "Européennes: la Turquie lassée d'être un enjeu électoral", *Le Figaro*, 19.5.2009

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arikan, Harun, "Security Aspect of the EU's Relations with Turkey", in *Turkey and the EU: an Awkward Membership?*, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2003
- Biscop, Sven and Andersson, Jean Joel, "Introduction", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008
- Biscop, Sven, "The European Security Strategy in Context", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008
- Bouché, Anne-Marie; Guignot, Denis; Urbach, Fritz, *Soft Power, Hard Power : une possibilité de répartir les responsabilités politiques et militaires entre l'UE et l'OTAN*, Paris: Les Éd. de Riaux, 2006
- Cristiansson, Magnus, "US and Europe in the International System – Four American Perspectives", in *NATO versus EU? Security Strategies for Europe*, eds. Bernhard May and May-Britt Stumbaum, Berlin: Dt. Ges. für Auswärtige Politik, 2005
- Deutsch, Karl W., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton - New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957
- Freire, Maria Raquel, "The European Security and Defence Policy: History, structures and capabilities", in *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implementation Perspective*, eds. Michael Merlinger and Rasa Oustrauskaite, Newyork: Routledge, 2007
- Gowan, Richard, "The European Security Strategy's Global Objective: Effective Multilateralism", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008
- Haine, Jean-Jves, "The European Security Strategy Coping with Threats: Is Europe Secure?", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008
- Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Extremes*, Newyork: Vintage Books, 1996
- Jørgensen, Knud Erik, "Overview: The European Union and the World", in *Handbook of European Union Politics*, ed. Knud Erik Jørgensen, London: Sage Publ., 2006
- Kelleher, Catherine, "The European Security Strategy and the United States", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008

Krieger, Heike, “Common European Defence: Competition or Compatibility with NATO?”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007

Lefebvire, Maxime, “Europe’s New Role in Global Affairs: Implications for NATO and Transatlantic Relations”, in *NATO versus EU? Security Strategies for Europe*, eds. Bernhard May and May-Britt Stumbaum, Berlin: Dt. Ges. für Auswärtige Politik, 2005

Menotti, Roberto and Vencanto, Francesca, “The European Security Strategy and the Partners”, in *The EU and the European Security Strategy*, ed. Sven Biscop and Jean Joel Andersson, London: Routledge, 2008

Merlingen, Michael and Oustrauskaite, Rasa, “The Implementation of the ESDP”, in *European Security and Defence Policy: An Implemenatation Perspective*, eds. Michael Merlinger and Rasa Oustrauskaite, Newyork: Routledge, 2007

Mowle, Thomas S., “Transatlantic Relations and Turkey”, in *Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey*, ed. Nursin Atesoglu Guney, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007

Naert, Frederic, “ESDP in Practice: Increasingly Varied and Ambitious EU Security and Defence Operations”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007

Sadège, Mireille, *La France et la Turquie dans l’Alliance atlantique*, Paris: Les Éd. CVMAG, 2005

Tarpan, Fabien, “EU – NATO Relations: Consistency as a Strategic Consideration and a Legal Requirement”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007

Terpan, Fabien, *La politique étrangère et de sécurité commune de l’Union Européenne*, Bruxelles: Bruylant, 2003

Trybus, Martin and White, Nigel D., “Some General Conclusions”, in *European Security Law*, eds. Martin Trybus and Nigel D. White, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007

Ulusoy, Hasan, *One Policy, Many Identities – The Consistency of Turkey’s Foreign Policy with Special Emphasis on its Security Dimension in the Post-Cold War Era*, Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2007

Waever, Ole, “Securitization and Desecuritization’ in *On Security*, ed. Ronnie D. Lipschutz, Newyork: Columbia Univ. Press, 1995

Articles

A Human Security Doctrine for Europe, *The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe’s Security Capabilities*, Barcelona, 15.9.2004

Baç, Meltem Müftüleri, “Turkey’s Accession to the EU: Its Potential Impact on Common Security and Defence Policy”, *Turkey and European Security*, IAA-TESEV Report, 2006

Bayer, Tomur, "Turkey's Role in European Security and Defence", *Defence Turkey*, Volume: 3 Issue: 13 Year: 2008

Cagaptay, Soner, "Secularism and Foreign Policy in Turkey", *Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, April 2007

Churruca, Cristina, "Criticizing the EU Security Strategy: The EU as a Regional Cooperative Security Provider", *Revista Electronica de Estudios Internacionales*, 2005

Human Security Now, *Final Report of the Commission on Human Security*

Kiziltan, Ihsan, "Improving the NATO – EU Partnership: A Turkish Perspective", *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 2008-No:3

Onis, Ziya, "The New Wave of Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey", *DIIS Report*, January 2009

Rynning, Sten, "The European Union: Towards a Strategic Culture?", *Security Dialogue* 34, no. 4, (December 2003)

Turkey's Energy Strategy, *Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Deputy Directorate General for Energy, Water and Environment*, January 2009

Varouhakis, Miran, "Greek Intelligence and the Capture of PKK Leader Abdullah Ocalan in 1999", *CIA Studies in Intelligence*, (Volume 53, Number 1)

Reports / Declarations

Annex III – European Council Declaration on Strengthening the European Common Policy on Security and Defence, European Council, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999

Annual Report from the Council to the Parliament on the main aspects and the basic choices of the CFSP 2007

Council Joint Action 2005/889/CFSP

EU – NATO Declaration on ESDP, 16 December 2002

EU Energy Policy and Turkey, MEMO/07/219, 1.6.2007

Final Communiqué, North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 17 – 18 December 1990

Human Development Report, *United Nations Development Programme* (1994)

Javier Solana's congratulation message to Ahmet Davutoglu on his appointment as Minister of Foreign Affairs, 5.5.2009

Javier Solana's message on the announcement by Turkey and Armenia of a framework to normalise relations, 23.4.2009

Kofi Annan, “Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia.” Two-Day Session in Ulaanbaatar, May 8-10, 2000. Press Release SG/SM/7382.

Providing Security in a Changing World, *Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy*, Brussels, 2008

Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy, *Providing Security in a Changing World*, Brussels, 11.12.2008

Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Speech of H.E. Mr. Ali Babacan the 45. Munich Security Conference, 7 February 2009

Revisiting the European Security Strategy – beyond 2008”, *European Policy Centre*, Brussels, 2008

Turkey 2008 Progress Report

Newspapers

“Berlin and Paris Unite Over Turkey”, *Financial Times*, 11.5.2009

“Boost for Nabucco from Iraqi Gas Deal”, *Financial Times*, 17.5.2009

“Européennes: la Turquie lassée d’être un enjeu électoral”, *Le Figaro*, 19.5.2009

“Gul Lashes out at European Critics”, *Financial Times*, 8.4.2009

“La Sécurité, Notre Mission Commune”, Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy, *Le Monde*, 12.03.2009

“The Right Balance will Secure NATO’s Future”, M Albright, *Financial Times*, 7 December 1998

“Turkey and Armenia Pave Way for Historical Accords”, *The Wall Street Journal*, 03.04.2009

Websites (all websites were available on 25.5.2009)

Council of the European Union, Foreign Policy - *Third Countries and Regions*
[<http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=260&lang=EN>]

EU - NATO: The Framework for Permanent Relations and Berlin Plus
[<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/03-11-11BerlinPluspressnoteBL.pdf>]

EU Rule of Law Mission to Georgia
[<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=701&lang=en>]

EUFOR BiH Organisation
[http://www.euforbih.org/eufor/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=30]

European Commission, *European Neighbourhood Policy*,
[http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/policy_en.htm]

European Commission, *External Relation Divisions, Russia*,
[http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/russia/index_en.htm]

NATO Handbook
[<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb010303.htm>]

NATO PfP Training Website
[www.bioem.tsk.tr]

NATO Topics: NATO's Relations with the European Union
[<http://www.nato.int/issues/nato-eu/index.html>]

NATO Troop Contributions to Afghanistan
[http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/isaf_placemat.pdf]

Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Turkey's Security Perspective, Historical and Conceptual Background*
[http://www.mfa.gov.tr/i_-turkey_s-security-perspective_-historical-and-conceptual-background_-turkey_s-contributions.en.mfa]