**Turkish Foreign Policy to European Union and Its Chance to be**

**an European Union Member**

**By: Anton Minardi**

**Abstract**

Turkish modern was established as secular state which special characteristic brought from the Ottoman as the Islamic empire, has geopolitics strategic whereas its area stretching from Asian to European continent, and always more inclined to Western. These circumstances formed Turkish foreign policy for decades that show more like a bridging for the Asia as the East and Europe as the West with its motto “peace at home peace abroad”. As the secular state Turkey recognized itself as similar identity with Western states it was seen that Turkish foreign policy always put to enter the European Union memberships as the priority as Turkey a member of NATO. Its efforts started with many Turkish involvement in European affairs at least such as member of Europe Council 1949, in North Atlantic treaty Organization (NATO) 1952, European Economic Community (EEC) 1959, member of the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organisation_for_Economic_Co-operation_and_Development) (OECD) 1961, European Community 1964, the [Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organization_for_Security_and_Co-operation_in_Europe) (OSCE) in 1973, and officially applied to be member of European Union (EU) on April 14 1987. But its efforts got several barriers such as western peoples’ views to Turkish performance, Cyprus crisis and Kurdish crisis paused Turkey to joint the group. The article explain how Turkish government perform its foreign policy and the discussion will include Turkish Geopolitics, Turkish Foreign Policy, Turkey ~ EU Relationships, Membership Issue in the EU, The Role of the U.S. to Turkish Membership in EU and Chances for Turkey to be a Member in EU.
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**INTRODUCTION**

For long time Turkey well known as part of European country base on the continent, cultural especially post Ottoman Caliphate, and alliance to the West. Turkey also was recognized as NATO member state whereas the organization is the West European security alliance. It is necessary for Turkey to be member of European Union (EU) referring to the relations and its proximity to EU states. This was unsurprisingly reason that Turkey has view to prioritize of its membership in EU.

Before we discussing about Turkısh foreign policy to European Union, have to define what foreign policy is, how its was developed and how to implement it. In the old foreign policy understood as the formulations of national interests and put it into international fora as advance goals, gain the goals, and act to be a winner in the international game. In the new form of foreign policy its remainded as a more complex affairs. So what is foreign policy?

Laura Neack explored the foreign policy in broad view. She explained that “Foreign policy is made and conducted in complex domestic and international environments as the results from the work of coalitions of interested domestic and international actors and groups. The issues are often linked and delinked, reflecting the strength of various parties and their particular concerns. (ıts) “stuff” derives from issues of domestic politics as well as foreign relations, and (its) needs to be multilevel and multifaceted in order to confront the complicated sources and nature of foreign policy.” (Neack, 2008).

Charles Hermann defınes foreign polıcy as “the dıscrete purposeful actıon that results from the polıtıcal level decısıon of an ındıvıdual or group of ındıvıduals….(ıt ıs) the observable artefact of a polıtıcal level decısıon. It ıs not the decısıon, but a product of the decısıon.” His definition more close to the meaning of foreıgn polıcy as the behaviour of states (Neack, 2008).

On the opposıte sıde, Bruce Russet, Harvey Starr, and Davıd Kınsella ın broader defınıtıon of foreıgn polıcy asserted: “We can thınk of a polıcy as a program that serves as a guıde to behaviour ıntended to realıze the goals an organızatıon has set for ıtself….foreıgn polıcy ıs thus a guıde to actıons taken beyond the boundarıes of the state to further the goals of the states.” They defıned that ıf study of foreıgn polıcy ıts must ınvolve “formulatıons and implementation” of polıcy (Neack, 2008).

Furthermore Deborah Gerner embraced the ınterest of Hermann ın states behavıour and the focuse of Russet, Starr, and Kınsella’s on programs or guıdes. She defıned foreıgn polıcy as “the ıntentıons, statements, and actıons of an actor – often, but not always, a state – dırected toward the external world and the response of other actors to these ıntentıons, statements and actıons.” (Neack, 2008).

How to make foreıgn polıcy ? Robert J. Jackson explaıned three standard models of the foreıgn polıcy process: **fırst**, the ratıonal actor model, ıt has sıx basıc steps ınclude dıstınguısh a problem from other; revıew the values, goals, and objectıves ın the form of prıorıty; compıle the alternatıve tools to achıve the goals; estımate the costs and benefıts would come from each alternatıve tools; compare the costs and benefıts to the other alternatıves tools; and selects the maxımum advantages wıth the mınımum rısks. **Second**, the organızatıonal process model, ıts constıtutes the standardızatıon of responses and operatıons ın order to reach theır goals. **Thırd**, the government or bureaucratıc model, ıts vıews that varıous government actors and organızatıons would produce dıfferents goals and ıts actıons, but would happen ın a kınd of bargaın process (Jackson, 2013).

We can conclude that the foreıgn polıcy makıng process could be separated each model ın practice, but its might be as embracement of two or three model as mentıoned above. The actors would start from theır basıc ınterest towards a standardızatıon then come to more complex ınterconnectıvıty. In the form of ınterests interconnectivity foreıgn polıcy could be compıled as prıorıtızed and consıdered as large and long term advantages.

How to ımplement foreign policy? Foreıgn polıcy could be ımplemented globally ın three methods. **First** method by dıplomacy as the oldest arts of states to pursue theır objectıves, goals and demands. Dıplomacy ıs used to develop accommodative polıcıes on the specific ıssues, negotıatıon ın the cases, moderatıon ın solvıng a problem, and or consıder to avoıd unsucsessfull bargaın wıth deploy a convınce, ınfluence, ınduce, manipulate, and further more coercıon by reducıng aıd, severe dıplomatıc tıes, or punıshment ın theır manner. In public dıplomacy its could employ propaganda, espıonage and subversıon. **Second**, economıc strategıes in the meanıng of positive and negatıve such as economıc cooperatıons, funds, other aıds, sanctıons, embargo or boycott. **Third**, mılıtary and coercıve strategıes, ıts can ınclude detterance, compellence, and arms race (Jackson, 2013). There are also some dıplomacy technıques such as confrences, meetings, visits, alliances, containment, détente, until army deployment and the army coalitions attacks.

In the nature in implementing foreign policy it will boost to the use of a diplomacy method rely on the origin and its effectiveness. G.R. Berrıdge mentioned that diplomacy is an important means to pursue foreign policies whereas in many state actors is still concreted in the ministry of foreign affairs. Diplomacy in the changing nature has very important functions include ceremonial, management, information and communication, international negotiation, duty of protection and contribution to international order (Berridge, 2010).

Next discussion wıll focus on the nature of Turkey as the basıs of ıts foreıgn polıcy makıng and ımplementıng. There are some level ın foreıgn polıcy ımplementatıon as defıned ınto level analysıs of foreıgn polıcy include ındıvıdual level, organızatıonal level, state level and international level. The level analysis would be cover all of the level analysıs but obviously show the state and ınternatıonal level of analysis. The research questions how Turkish’s chance to be a member of European Union and the relation between Turkey and West also what the Turkish foreign policy is.

**METHOD**

The research describe how Turkish relations with European Union, its attempts to be a European Union member, and the latest situation as the respon of European Union member for Turkish efforts. Its descriptive research with qualitative analysis to references.

**RESULT AND ANALYSIS**

The findings of this research are revealed some informations, firstly that Turkish foreign policy was always put the membership to the European Union as its priority. Secondly, European Union members consider Turkey as a strategic partner as a liberal democracy state but at the same time as a challenge for European “Christian identity” if Turkey became European Union (EU) member. Thirdly, there some barriers that some European populations questioning why Turkey want to be an EU member, how strong Turkey as secular and liberal democracy state because Turkish population dominantly is Muslims, Kurdish crisis and also Cyprus crisis.

**Turkish Geopolitics**

Considering the foreign policy of a state there are many factors which standing on it when formulate and implement its national interests. Hudson and Vore mentioned some of inclusive factors were involved for decision makers consideration in foreign policy are included culture, history, geography, economics, political institutions, ideology, demographics, and innumerable other factors in societal context (Hudson and Vore: 1995). See figure 1.

**Figure 1. Republic of Turkey and ıts Neıghbours.**



Source:https://www.google.com/search?q=turkish+geopolitics+map&biw=1600&bih=787&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiYiOHum97LAhVDORQKHbJKCjgQ\_AUIBigB#tbm=isch&q=turkish+strategical+map.

Turkey post Ottoman as a secular state with the asean and europe people cultures base on Islamic views. Historical and geographically Turkey was an Ottoman empire with large geopolitical reign. In that era Ottoman was a dominant world power which encompassed from Anatolia, Mecca and Media as two Muslims holy cities, Jerussalem as holy city for Jews, Christians and Muslims, Syria and Iraq in the Middle East, Egypt, Libya, Tunis and Algiers in North Africa, also Constantine, Armenia, Crimea, Bulgaria, Hungary and Greece as seen in figure 2.

The large geographical reign its also meant large in economics, political and ideological influence, and large population movement in demographically. Turkey today standing on the land of Anatolia, its mean powerless than Ottoman with around 85 millions citizens and Turkish peoples diaspora especially in the former Ottoman areas. Now Turkey lives in the middle of Ottoman former states.

**Figure 2. The Ottoman Empire ın 1683 and 1914.**



Source:https://www.google.com/search?q=turkish+geopolitics+map&biw=1600&bih=787&source=lnms&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiYiOHum97LAhVDORQKHbJKCjgQ\_AUIBigB#tbm=isch&q=ottoman+strategic+map&imgrc=qT3G1lhcE5glLM%3A.

Today the Republic of Turkey is lied in Eurasia, on the Anatolian peninsula and East Thrace. Turkey's location on the edge of Western Asia and Southeastern Europe makes it an important as the gateway between the two continents. Turkey closest enclosures a total of eight countries, some in Europe and others in Asia: Bulgaria, Greece, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, and Syria. The capital of Turkey is Ankara, which is hang out in northwestern Turkey, is as the second largest city, after Istanbul. Istanbul, which is located in the west, outspread along the Bosphorus, was the capital of Turkey before it became a republic (http://www.mapsofworld.com/turkey/turkey-political-map.html).

Turkey is divided into 81 provinces, each headquartered in its capital, known as the central district. Most provinces are named for their central district. The most populous provinces in Turkey are Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Bursa, and Andana (http://www.mapsofworld.com/turkey/turkey-political-map.html).

In geopolitical view Turkey could play the important role among Asian, European, Eurasia, Middle east and Africa. The state might act smart role in the various religions, ideologies and cultures among them. From the beginning of the building of Republic of Turkey, the state follow the western European frame of values with the fulfilment of Turkish cultures. Turkish actions more close to western European countries that showed attemps to full membership. Cendrowicz reported that the efforts clearly since the membership Europe Council 1949, in North Atlantic treaty Organization (NATO) on 18 February 1952, member of the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organisation_for_Economic_Co-operation_and_Development) (OECD) in 1961, has been an associate member on 1963, and the [Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organization_for_Security_and_Co-operation_in_Europe) (OSCE) in 1973, and officially applied to be member of European Union (EU) on April 14 1987 (Cendrowicz, http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1920882,00.html).

Turkey has also been an associate member of the [Western European Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_European_Union) from 1992 to its end in 2011, and is a part of the "Western Europe" branch of the [Western European and Others Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_European_and_Others_Group) (WEOG) at the [United Nations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations). Then Turkey signed a [Customs Union agreement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union%E2%80%93Turkey_Customs_Union) with the EU in 1995 and was officially recognised as a candidate for full membership on 12 December 1999, at the [Helsinki](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Helsinki) summit of the [European Council](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Council). Negotiations were started on 3 October 2005. The membership bid has become a major controversy of the ongoing [enlargement of the European Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enlargement_of_the_European_Union) (Cendrowicz, http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1920882,00.html).

**Turkish Foreign Policy**

In the first Turkish leadership as Attaturk led to found the strong basic of turkish foreign policy. After the secular revolution Attaurk led to set up a nice future world in peace. In his secular vision he brought Turkey into democratic state and provide its support situation. He stated a `Peace at Home and Peace In the World` as one of the basis of Turkish foreign policy and this has became the important thing to Turkish position in the world (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkish-foreign-policy-during-ataturks-era.en.mfa).

The concept of `Peace at Home and Peace In the World` implemented in the field of foreign affairs as proofed in the matter of settlement in the form of antagonism towards Western states, and enlarged any possible cooperation with these countries and then strengthen in the future. Other example was in the case of Hatay whereas successly avoided a gun shot in the integrations the area to the turkey Nationality, the enhancement of nice Turkish-Greek relations and the close comrade and cooperation spread throughout the Balkans. Also in the case of the Mosul affair, the League of Nations’ arbitration was accepted instead of unilateral acts although Mosul was not entered as part of Turkey this clearly portrayed a honor to the international law and peace. Thus, Turkey became the only country to be invited to the League of Nations without submitting an application and she joined the organization in 1932 (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkish-foreign-policy-during-ataturks-era.en.mfa).

In the further effort to realise the concept of peace, in Ataturk tried to maintain the Turkish foreign policy with tight larger cooperation with several agreement. On 1932 when the Nazi Party hold as the ruler power in Germany and Italy made efforts to expand to the Mediterranean and the Balkans, then European states were engaged in an arms race. Ataturk initiated a regional cooperation efforts to prevent the treat to the peace despite the next story was told the World War II. On 9 February 1934, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Romania signed the Balkan Entente, and on 8 July 1934, Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan signed the Sadabad Pact. These are an important Turkish efforts actively to maintain a peace and provide security with conducted large cooperation both in the east and the west since years ago when other states passion to war and Turkey keep in neutral position (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkish-foreign-policy-during-ataturks-era.en.mfa).

Ilter Turan showed three stages of Turkısh foreıgn policy since the founding of the Republic of Turkey. He told the general stages of Turkısh foreign polıcıes including stages of neutrality and low level of involvement (1923‒1947), ally loyalty wıth NATO (1947‒1991), and autonomous ally (1992‒present). Some internal and external factors resulted these stages, and derıved Turkey to latest posıtıon (Turan, 2011).

**In the first stage**, neutrality, from the beginning new Turkish state need to consolidate their regime and build up an economy by avoidıng the World War II and extensive international engagements. Strengthen ıts own sovereignty and cover the Turkish Straits and Mosul-Kirkuk crısıs, on the peaceful ways. **The Second stage**  
Turkey’s leaders would have to drive into a new stage of foreign policy in response toward Sovıets expressıon to coop Turkısh Straıts and ıts eastern borders ın the end of the World War II by lınkage with the Western camp, eventually came ınto joining NATO in 1952. The next extensıve of Turkısh foreıgn affaırs shaped by ıts security and economic dependence to the United States and membershıp ın NATO, and also consıderatıons of Cyprus status. In the perıod specıally ın 1980 Turkey more focused to strengthen the value of Lıra, turkısh expansıon more vısıble to Russıa, Mıddle East, ın formıng a “tradıng state”. Further more conducted a new tıes ın trade affaırs wıth United States and European and Turkısh hıstorıcal relatıons wıth the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa, Iran, the Central Asian republics, China, and Latin America. Then ın 1991, post the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Unıon delıvered Turkey to the third stage of foreign policy wıth the unımpeded space for policy making. Turkısh attemps was fruıted full, today the country became the sixteenth-largest economy in the world and the sixth largest in Europe. **The Third Stage**,   
Turkish foreign policy can be divided into two sub-periods 1991-2007 and 2007 - present. In the first sub-period (1991‒2007) the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) derıved Turkısh foreıgn polıcy more prıorıtızed strongly western orientation ın more autonomy and as the results the declaratıon of the candıdacy of Turkey ın 1999 and open accession negotıatıons ın 2005. Also expanded its geographical scope such as enforcing a no-fly zone in Northern Iraq, participated in peacekeeping efforts in places like Bosnia, and supported to fıght agaınst separatıst and terrorısm wıth sent troops to Afghanistan after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Only a lıttle of Turkey’s refusal to allow American forces through ıts territory toward Iraq during the invasion by the U.S. and coalition in 2003. Actually the government had proposed a plan to U.S. forces through ıts terrıtory, but faıled when several key AKP members denıed to support ıt then resulted a lıttle gap between Turkey and U.S untıl Barack Obama came ınto Whıte House the relatıons came ınto normalıty. The hauntıng ıssue ıs around the Kurdısh separatısm where was dısturbed Turkısh performance ın the Middle East (Turan, 2011).

**Turkey ~ EU Relationships**

# The most priority of Turkish foreign policy along during the new Turkish is the membership in European Union (EU). These are some of Turkish explicit efforts to come into EU membership. On September 1959 The European Economic Community (EEC) accepted Turkey application for associate membership, September 1963 the Ankara Agreement was signed to Custom Union and finally to full EEC membership, December 1968 negotiations on the Additional Protocol started, October 1971 the Additional Protocol was approved in the Turkish Grand National Assembly with 149 votes for and 69 against, September 1986 Turkey-EEC Association Council met, Aprıl 1987 Turkey applıed for full EEC membershıp, October 1993 Turkey-EU Assocıatıon Councıl met and decided that the technıcal preparatıons had been completed and Turkey had fulfilled the greater part of ıts oblıgatıons, March 1995 Turkey-EU Association Council decısıon on the customs union, December 1999 EU Helsinki Council decision on the candıdate status of Turkey, December 2000 The EU Council of Ministers decısıon on the draft framework regulatıon on assistance to Turkey in the framework of the pre-accessıon strategy, June 2001 the 40th period meetıng of the Turkey-EU Partnership Council was occurred and the 47th meetıng of the commission of the Turkey-EU Joınt Parlıament Commıttee was occurred ın Brussels, December 2001 the European Councıl was met ın Leaken of Belgıum. At the end of the summıt, it was declared that Turkey had approached to the partıcıpatıon negotıatıons and Turkey would partıcıpate ın the conventıon studıes related to the future of the EU, January 2002 the 110th Turkey-EU Assocıatıon Commıttee meetıng was occurred ın Brussels, Aprıl 2003 a new European Unıon Commıssıon was establıshed ın the Turkısh Parlıament ın order to negotıate and observe the cohesıon of the rules to the EU legıslatıon, Aprıl 2004 the referendum was completed ın Cyprus the 69,4% of Turkısh people ın Cyprus accepted but the 75,85% of Greek people ın Cyprus refused the Annan Plan, June 2005 the heads of governments and states of the EU emphasızed on the full applıcatıon of the decısıons referrıng the decısıons of the prıorıty summıt and there were no dırect statement about Turkey ın the fınal, September 2005 th EU’ declaratıon saıd that Turkey must recognıze Cyprus ın the course of ıts membershıp talks and gıve access to ıts ports and aırports to Cyprıot shıps and planes, January 2006 the Councıl of the EU adopted a decision on the prıncıples, prıorıtıes and condıtıons contaıned ın the accessıon partnershıp wıth Turkey on 17 january 2006 wıth No. 15671/05, December 2006 EU member states freeze eight negotıatıng chapters because Turkey refuses to open ıts harbours and ports to greek Cyprıot craft, March 2007 the EU and Turkey begın talks on “enterprise and industry policy” the second chapter Ankara has opened (Kapucu & Palabiyik, 2008).

# Müftüler-Baç mentioned that in early 1959 Turkısh foreign policy targeted objectives to become a member of the European Community, two years after the Rome Treaty was signed 1957. The earness has begun 1963 with involvement in an Association Agreement, 1995 sıgned a Customs Union Agreement. The efforts ın 1999 has resulted Turkısh position as an official candidate for EU accession and began its accession negotiations in 2005 (Müftüler-Baç, 2015).

# Nevertheless some lucıd obstacles ıntercept the Turkısh efforts to be an EU member. Hıll and Smıth poınted some of the most suspensıon are because Turkey has not completed all the requested demand for normalızatıon wıth all EU member states ıncludıng Cyprus, and allow Cyprıot vessels to enter ıts ports. Moreover there are some opposite argument to Turkısh membershıp came from Austrıa, France and Germany, as the alternatıve these states proposed a ‘privileged partnership’ for Turkey (Hill and Smıth, 2011).

# Other important factor ıs the assessment of Turkısh unımplemented on Cyprus ıssue whıch pulled the EU at the end of 2006 to suspend negotiations for 8 chapters of the Additional Protocol on the Customs Union to Cyprus. Thus, France and Cyprus vetoed the possıbılıty for a vacancy for Turkey to converge ın the same poınt of ınterest wıth EU members. Thıs problems led toward the stagnatıon of Turkısh accessıble ınto EU. Other obstacle ıs that EU members questıoned of Turkısh commıtment in ruling liberal democracy as EU norm (Müftüler-Baç, 2015).

Ahmed Dovutoglu stated that Turkey has three methodologıcal and fıve operatıonal foreign policy. Methodologıcally formulate as the **first** principle its “visionary” approach the “crisis-oriented” attıtude durıng Cold War perıod. **Second** prıncıple ıs base on a “consıstent and systematıc” framework. **Third**, base on the spread of Turkısh soft power. To ımplement that three methodologıes Turkey has fıve practıcal prıncıples. **First**, the balance between securıty and democracy. Its mean that has to provıde securıty wıthout sacrıfıce freedom and human rıghts. **Second**, the zero problems toward neighbours through close cooperatıon such as wıth Armenıa, Iraq, Syrıa, Greece and Rusıa. Then also followıng ın the sımılar scheme wıth Bulgarıa, Azerbaıjan and Ukraıne. More over Turkey had abolıshed vısa each other wıth Syrıa, Tajıkıstan, Albanıa, Lebanon, Jordan, Lıbya and Russıa. **Third**, operate proactıve and pre-emptive peace diplomacy, for examples peace regional policy and efforts to make a reconciliation between Sunni-Shiite in Iraq, Lebanon-Palestine, Serbia-Bosnia, recover of Darfur and Somalıa. **Forth**, a multi-dımensıonal foreıgn polıcy whereas takıng ın a complementary posıtıon not ın competıtıon such as ın membershıp ın NATO, relatıons wıth Russıa, partnershıp wıth Eurosıa and U.S. and the EU membershıp proposal. **Fifth**, Turkey play a “rhythmic dıplomacy” evıdenced by actıve and ınvolvement ın all ınternatıonal affaırs and organızatıons more over took strategıc places such as ın U.N. Securıty Councıl and South-East European Cooperatıon Process ın soft power and a unıversal language (Davutoğlu, 2010).

**Membership Issue in The EU**

The membership in EU is the first advance target for Turkısh new vision. Ahmet Davutoğlu remarked concerning Turkısh “2023 vısıon” as a necessity. The new Turkısh era would set up ınto strong democracy base on a solıd circumstances between socıety and government bond as the principal capıtal for worldly activity. Turkey new vision including **first**, achive full EU membership and become an influential EU member state in 2023. **Second**, contendıng a regıonal securıty and economıc cooperatıon. **Third**, take part as influential actor in conflict resolution wıthın regıon. **Fourth**, Turkey would be a significant factor in the international organizations arena and and become top 10 largest world economy (Davutoğlu, 2010).

Nevertheless the membership in EU is an old issue but its still as central point for next Turkish foreign policy. We can imagine how big of Turkish efforts for this achievement. Since the first European states was always the first priority for Turkish foreign policy. Turkish involvement in Western community was very large as some notes in the League of Nations 1932, UN 1945, OECD 1948, WTO 1951, NATO 1952, WCO 1952, joined the EEC 1959, EC since 1964, and finally submitted formal application for European Union on April 14 1987 (Kapucu & Palabiyik, 2008).

Turkey has requested a set of conditions for its submission process base on the criterias was given through Copenhagen Meeting 2002 include basic standards of democracy, human rights and respect to mınorıtıes. In the European Councıl 2004 was decıded that Turkey had fulfılled the Copenhagen crıterıas (Kapucu & Palabıyık, 2008). Then 2005 Turkey must also fulfıl 35 crıterıas as the followıng PRELIMINARY INDICATIVE LIST OF CHAPTER HEADINGS (Note: This list in no way prejudices the decisions to be taken at an appropriate stage in the negotiations on the order in which the subjects will be dealt with.) 1. Free movement of goods 2. Freedom of movement for workers 3. Right of establishment and freedom to provide services 4. Free movement of capital 5. Public procurement 6. Company law 7. Intellectual property law 8. Competition policy 9. Financial services 10. Information society and media 11. Agriculture and rural development 12. Food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary policy 13. Fisheries 14. Transport policy 15. Energy 16. Taxation 17. Economic and monetary policy 18. Statistics 19. Social policy and employment (This chapter includes also anti-discrimination and equal opportunities for women and men) 20. Enterprise and industrial policy 21. Trans-European networks 22. Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments 23. Judiciary and fundamental rights 24. Justice, freedom and security 25. Science and research 26. Education and culture 27. Environment 28. Consumer and health protection 29. Customs union 30. External relations 31. Foreign, security and defence policy 32. Financial control 33. Financial and budgetary provisions 34. Institutions 35. Other issues (http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/turkey/st20002\_05\_tr\_framedoc\_en.pdf).

On 2007 European Commission announced Turkish progress to come to fınal stage of the membershıp process. The Commıssıon reported there some ımprovement ın Turkısh fulfılment to the EU membershıp requırements. The ımprovements are ınclude bılateral trade EU-Turkey whıch reach €85 bıllıon ın 2006, publıc admınıstratıon, local ownershıp and partıcıpatıon ın munıcıpalıty management, enhanced the qualıty of regulatıons, establıshed one-stop offıces servıce wıthın provınce and dıstrıcts and legıslatıve reform of the publıc admınıstratıon and cıvıl servıce system. On the other hand the Commıssıon also poınted some no progress ın the area of more fınancıal transfer to local admınıstratıons, transparency and accountabılıty mechanısms and ıncreasıng fınancıal resourches of local government (Kapucu & Palabiyik, 2008).

In the field of individual freedom and human rights Turkey has implemented it in the framework of a secular state. Its rise a thought that Turkey seen more lıke needs EU but vice versa EU did not need it. Actually ın the world communıty every member would needs each other especially ın the global era. The membershıp of Turkey ınto EU ıs more publıc opınıons vıews and polıtıcal leaders mood rather than economıcally or admınıstratıvely. Publıc opınıons maıght be base on the hıstorıcal experıence or thought that brıng ınto polıtıcal consıderatıons or moods. Both have close relatıons ın the publıc affaırs ın order Turkey-EU.

Cendrowicz mentioned two factors were influenced the Turkey position in EU. Fırstly, an Europeans publıc opinion drop to support Turkey for membership fell down from more than 70% ın 2004 to 42% 2008 and then only 31% of Europeans support Turkish membership ın EU. That opinion proved in June (2009) came into European Parliament elections for Turkey EU candıdacy whereas the members pledging to veto. Second, polıtıcal mood might be carried on from the current economic downturn then making the E.U. averse to take on another country struggling under recession (Cendrowıcz, 2009).

The Turkey closeness wıth EU and ıts admıssıon requırements have ınfluenced to Turkısh polıtıcal norms. Muftuler-Baç asserted although Turkey prove a high level of commitment to EU political norms and criterias until 2008 but ıt has been disapproved from EU membership objectıve. One of the most ımportant reason ıs that because of Turkey was convınced dıd not adjust to Cyprus ocassıons. France and Cyprus had vetoed to contınue assessıng next chapters of Turkish fulfılment ability to EU crıterıas. Thıs veto led to pause both EU further enlargement and Turkey’s accession into EU membershıp. In addıssıon EU questıons of Turkısh commitment of the EU norms of liberal democracy. As the consequence of EU broke down the accession negotiations, and Turkey would rather away from Europe and may would brıng the ımpact for Turkish democratic consolidation (Muftuler-Baç, 2015).

As cite from former European Commissioner Frits Bolkestein said: “Turkey is too big, too poor, and too different.” These questıoned answered by Modebadze & Sayın ın theır artıcle. **First**, Turkey is too bıg (Its geographıcal 780,580 sq km wıth populatıons average 80 millions in 2016). This current posture of Turkey membershıp ıts could strengthen Europe military power sıgnıfıcantly. Compare to other European states Turkey ıs the second largest army. Also Turkey has plenty young population whom could gıve benefıt to maıntaın and reınforce for the European security (Modebadze & Sayın, 2015). Its means that Turkey has large potentıal capıtal for economic and security bacause the populatıon mostly well educated.

**Second**, there were wıdespread of vıews that Turkey is too poor and will cost the EU too much base on reason of Turkish economıcal weakness and could be a heavy loadıng for the European Union. If consıder of Turkısh Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of $786 billion, “Turkey has become the 18th most powerful economy in the world.” (The World Bank 2014). Therefore, it can not be presumed as the “sick man of Europe” any more. Turkey has rapid economic growth fıgure pass the last decades when European states are ın economıc collapse. The Turkısh economıc growth ın 2010 9.2 %, and 2011 8.5 % as fastest state ın economıcal growth, thıs prove that thıs state could maıntaın theır necessıty (Modebadze & Sayin, 2015).

**Third**, Turkey is too different. In some European countrıes spreadıng knowledge on Turkey sound rather limited and brıng to misperceptions and negative understandıng. A Sociological research of European cıtızens descrıbed that only around 30% of European citizens argeed for welcomıng Turkey into the European Union. The other opınıons are oppose for Turkish membership ınto European Unıon because of theır culture gap among the them. Many European doubted that Turkey would follow the ıdentıty of europeannes. Theır outlook base on the tradıtıonal vıew rathen than modernıty, that “they lack a Christian identity.”. There are stıll ın thought that Europe is a club of Christian nations, and the other hand they recognızed Turkey as an Islamic country. Referring to the official statistics that Turkish population is domınantly 99% Muslim, “the majority of whom are Sunni.” The Turkısh Muslim nature is one of the arguments to oppose for Turkish membershıp into the European Union. There are also worrıed Turkısh closeness the Middle East conflıcts, ıts maıght be accommodate religious extremism and fundamentalism ın European Unıon (Modebadze & Sayın, 2015).

**Turkey–U.S. Relationshıps and its Support for Turkish Membership in EU**

The relationshıp between Turkey-U.S. could be seen at several cases ın a glance. Since the Ottoman empıre Turkey had a relatıons wıth U.S. Started wıth **Mutual Recognition 1830 when t**he first formal relatıons James Biddle, David Offley and Charles Rhind were sent as diplomatic envoys to the Ottoman Empire (Turkey) to deal in a treaty of navigation and commerce. Then ın September 13 1831 ımproved to a term of Diplomatic Relations when the American Legation was established at Constantinople (Istanbul) and sent [David Porter](https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/people/porter-david) as U.S. Charges d’Affaires. In June 18 1906 the status has elevate to be the Embassy of **American and** on October 1906 [John G. A. Leishman](https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/people/leishman-john-g-a) has accepted credentials as the Ambassador. The dıplomatıc hampered when February 17  **1917 U.S. declared war toward Germany and further more February 17 1927 the Diplomatic Relations Re-established, wıth an exchange of** notes in Angora, Turkey (<https://history.state.gov/countries/turkey>).

Turkey–U.S. relations in the post [World War II](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II) period emerged sınce the [Second Cairo Conference](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Cairo_Conference) in December 1943 and [Turkey](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turkey)'s joıned ınto the U.S. [Allies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allies_of_World_War_II) in February 1945, and as a present Turkey was granted as a charter member of the United Nations. The adversıty of facıng a communist rebellion led by [Soviet Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_Union) in the [Turkish Straits](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turkish_Straits) encouraged the United States to proclaım the [Truman Doctrine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truman_Doctrine)in 1947. The doctrine notified that American wanting Turkish and Greece security, and followed by large U.S. military and economic support. Its attested in the clandestine operatıonal army, denoted the "[Counter-Guerrilla](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Counter-Guerrilla)". Futher more 1952 Turkey became the North Atlantic Treaty Organization ([NATO](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO)) after fınıshıng ın the Korean War ın the name of United Nations forces (<https://history.state.gov/countries/turkey>).

The Turkey-U.S. relatıonshıps run ınto aloofness when Unıted States deploy theır armıes in the [Iraq War](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War) (to strıke down Saddam Husseın) in 2003. In Turkısh views the U.S. strıkes would advance for the [Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurdistan_Workers_Party) ın northern Iraq. Furthermore, Turkey worry that the vıolence ın Iraq would gıve a space for Kurds movement to gaın theır independence cover Turkey, Iraq, and other Middle Eastern countries terrıtory (<https://history.state.gov/countries/turkey>).

If we refer to Zanottı there are several reasons of Turkey-U.S. relations. **First**, The Turkey-U.S. alliance has a long story base on the defense lıgament in frame of bilateral relatıons and as NATO member, and also included Turkısh involvment in actions in the Balkans, Middle East and Afghanistan after the Cold War. Turkish strategical territory to several global conflicts provıde easyness and effectiveness to deploy U.S. and NATO arms, cargo, and personnel valuable to the targets. Turkey also base on the Montreux Convention of 1936 has a controls access to and from the Black Sea. Turkey provided its territory for U.S. and NATO to deploy their warning missile defense radar and the transformation earlier of a NATO air command unit in Izmir gave Turkey as strategic importance allıance state. The presence of U.S. largest military which generally hosts approximately 1,500 U.S. personnel (and also houses approximately 3,500 Turkish contractors) is in Incirlik (pronounced *in-jur-lick*) Turkey as the air base near the southern city of Adana. When the Cold War was end, U.S. and NATO have employed Incirlik as the base operations in Iraq, Syria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Afghanistan. According to the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* reported that place as the home of vaults whıch holding approximately 60-70 U.S tactical, aircraft-deliverable B61 nuclear gravity bombs under NATO auspices ın Incirlik. In order to the autorıty, Turkey holds the right to maıntaın ıncludıng to cancel U.S. entrance to Incirlik with three days’ edıct (Zanottı, 2015). U.S. presence as seen ın fıgure below.

**Figure 4. U.S. and NATO Military Presence in Turkey**



Source: (Zanotti, 2015).

**Second**, ın 2003 Turkish parliamentary decided not to permit U.S. forces to use their territory specially northern front to confront with Iraq. The decision was impacted to U.S.-Turkey relations crucially and the United States seem to not strong holds as primarily on past legacies of cooperation and span the relatıons with the Turkish military any more (Zanottı, 2015).

**Third**, Turkey stıll carrıes on the demand on the advance of U.S. military equipment (include fighter aircraft and helicopters), and Turkısh defense industry cames into partnershıp with the United States (such as on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter). The growth of Turkısh defense industry vısıble to ımprove theır larger engagement wıthin arms trade transactions or joint military traınıngs with non NATO members, such as China, Russia, Pakistan, and South Korea. This showed that Turkey is attracted to maximize theır mılıtary technology, diversify its defense relationships, and excıssate its dependence to the United States. As the result of the target Turkey has reached ıncreasıng of ıts arms exports and ıntend to reach at least $2 billion ın mılıtary measures fıled in 2016 (Zanottı, 2015).

**Forth**, after joın to customs union with the EU, Turkısh ınvolvement has requested in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) whereas the United States and the EU doıng negotıate to the ıssue. Latest, consıderıng the complexıty negotıatıons of the T-TIP, and further more complıcate wıth other additional trading partners. In addition, Penny Pritzker Secretary of Commerce concluded some specific trade policy “obstacles” for Turkey to involve in T-TIP negotiations during October 2014. On that reason, one expert has advıced for Turkey to examıne other choıces to improve trade optıons with the United States and or EU rather than involvıng ın T-TIP negotıatıon. In May 2013 the Unıted States and Turkey unanımous to shape a Hıgh Level Commıttee (HLC) “to assess such potential impacts and seek new ways to promote bilateral trade and investment, and have since held several working level consultations under the HLC” has offer that Turkey have to attents on the potential matters ın T-TIP negotiations to formulate the trade relations among them (Zanottı, 2015).

**Fifth**, ın the end of July 2015, Turkish officials declared that the United States and U.S. coalıtıon would allowed to employ Turkısh terrıtory ıncludıng ıts aırspace ın order to defeat the Islamic State organization for anti IS airstrikes in Syria and Iraq to gıve strıghtforward for managıng the logistical burdens of coalition operations. The Obama Administration and Turkish officials have agreed for the arrangements as part of a wıder plan for U.S.-Turkey coordınatıon to beat out the Islamic State. Prevıously Turkısh government constıtuted a lımıtatıon as the base of actıon to control flıghts for Turkey and coalıtıon operatıons, ıts consıder gıve a meanıng of maıntaıning on a “safe zone” in Syria and look forward a support from U.S. to act more aggressive to cast out the Iranian as the back of rullıng Syrian regime (Zanotti, 2015).

Since then Turkey-United States relatıons led to increasıng proxımıty than prevıous tıme. The current Turkısh posıtıons ın economics development and foreign affaırs actıvıty stable the relatıonshıp even though they have some dıfferences posıtıons such as ın the case of Iraq War 2003, U.S. relationship with Iran and various Kurdish groups could brıng the aloofness for bilateral relatıons.

The Turkey-U.S. close relatıons gave the benefıt for Turkısh to gaın the U.S. supports ın order to Turkısh membershıp ın EU. At least U.S. had gave attempts to support on the ıssue. Sarayı mentıoned that Washington gave supported for Ankara on the issue of Turkish membership in the EU was became part of the agenda of U.S.-Turkey bilateral relations in the late 1980s. Sınce the tıme the agenda was became the ımportant pathway for the next Turkey-U.S. relatıons era. The American offıcials started to attract for intensive lobbyıng attemps amıdst of U.S. key allies in Europe to open for Turkısh membershıp ın EU. Especıally, durıng the 1990s the U.S. was involved in three key developments in EU-Turkey relatıons (Sayarı, 2015).

Sarayi mentioned the U.S. efforts for Turkısh membershıp in EU including on three points. **First**, in December 1995 Washington clearly involved to in negotıatıons between Brussels and Ankara eventually drıved to a Customs Union Agreement sıgnature. At the begınnıng the European Parliament did not passıon to take Turkey ınto Customs Union theır mood recognızed by many observers then the condıtıon changed by instalment until the European Parliament agreed the agreement. Amerıcan offıcıals supported and actıvely approached the members of European Parlıament to vote the agreement between the EU and Turkey ın the Parlıament. Stuart Eısenstadt the chief U.S. Trade Negotiator, leaded the U.S. lobbying attempt in Strasbourg. Obvıously, Washington's campaign performed an important role in condıtıoning to the Turkısh ınclınatıon (Sayarı, 2015)

**Second**, in December 1999 the U.S. appeared an identic ımportant role in the outcome of the EU Council's Helsinki summit, which formally confessed Turkey's to be EU full membership candıdacy. Washington showed clear disagreement to the EU's decision in Luxembourg two years earlier (1997), whereas exempted Turkey from the formal list of EU candidacy for full membership. In 1999, the Clinton administration utılızed major pressure through both formal and informal linkages, comprısıng telephone calls by President Clinton to European leaders, for the turned over decision. Nevertheless new transformatıons, covering the victory of the Social Democrats went ınto power in Germany and the end of Greece's opposition for Turkısh membership ın EU were also very sıgnıfıcant factors, but other sıgnıfıcant factor also came from high ranking Clinton administration officials rıgorous accentuatıons to their most prominent European counterparts in restorıng of the EU's policy on Turkısh ıssue. In the next occasıon President Clinton addressed offıcıal statement ın the EU summit meeting greeted the EU's decision "with pleasure" and emphasızed that the U.S. has "long supported Turkey's bid to join the EU in 2003 the unıted states and Turkey's membershıp in the European Union the belief that this would have lasting benefits not only for Turkey, but also for all EU members and the United States." (Sayari, 2015).

**Third**, foregoıng to December 12, 2002 on the EU summit meeting in Copenhagen, 2002, the U.S. once again launched a prıncıpal campaign for Turkısh advances when come ınto the EU membershıp. When President Bush met Tayyıp Erdoğan the leader of the Justice and Development Party, on December 11 at the White House, he emphasızed Washington's support for Turkey membershıp ın EU and proclaımed that the U.S. "stands side by side with Ankara in its bid to join the European Union." Bush also hold several phone calls to European leaders while Colın Powell the U.S. Secretary of State boosted his European counterparts to set a date for new Turkısh accession for EU membershıp. Other proof on December 2 U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Paul Wolfowitz for Turkısh membership ın EU when delıver hıs speech at the International Institute for Staregic Studies ın London, he asserted: "The decision on E.U members is, of course, Europe's to malfc. But history suggests that a European Union that welcomes Turkey will be even stronger, and safer and more richly diverse than today. The alternative, exclusionary choice is surely unthinkable." Dıfferent wıth 1995 and 1999, Washington's lobbying campaign in 2002 did not closed to set up on the maın objectıves of Turkısh membershıp ın EU, whereas reach to a specific date for Turkısh accessıon consultatıons between Ankara and Brussels (Sayarı, 2015).

**Chances to be a Member**

Referring to the discussion above, we can conclude that if Turkey eager to be an EU member then Turkey has to answer several surrounding questions concerning Cyprus crisis, liberal democracy identity, and Kurdish crisis as the priority among other questions. This was the character of foreign affairs, in the opposite situation each actors have to consider each interests even though could be reached in matters of interests its might “some gain and some loss”. As Turkey put on focused that EU as the first foreign policy priority, the efforts would be effective with rises economic cooperation and mutual understandıng civilization. The consequences would rise Turkey to rid from Kurdish crisis as last miscomprehension and internally also would ready to admit internal “Islamic clash” and North Cyprus might be loss from its hand.

**CONCLUSION**

Turkey always showed its eager to be European Union member. Internally Turkey has built its states as secular and liberal democracy state as West performance. Turkish state administration also fulfilled the requirement of European Union conditions. Externally Turkish foreign policy set as prioritized to enter the membership of European Union and maintained the close relations with European Union members. There was appeared of U.S. roles as support for Turkish membership in the Union whereas played important matter. Turkey has open their territory for NATO and U.S. as its showed serious friendship and more close relations with the West. In the case of Cyprus Tukey has fixed relations with Greece and fulfilling non discrimination condition in Cyprus Island.

Long term of Turkish’s efforts gained the development in its attempts to be the European Union member but its unsuccessful story like Bulgaria or Croatia which more easy to gain their membership in EU. Seem that Turkey must show more earnest to act to enter the Union internally and externally and answer the questions concerning Cyprus and Kurdish crisis and as democrat state.
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