

Alternative Futures for the European Union-Turkey Accession Negotiations

SERDAR Ş. GÜNER

This work proposes a simple two-period interaction model to study EU-Turkey accession negotiations. Turkey perceives the EU as composed of two distinct groups with respect to its accession: traditional supporters and objectors. Supporters opt for either cooperation or defection in period one while objectors consistently oppose Turkish accession. Turkey reacts to cooperation and defection in the second period under its perceptions of EU support. Future uncertainties concerning Turkey's accession do not prevent supporters' cooperation provided that Turkey becomes successful in economics, political reforms, and foreign policy. Turkey continues to negotiate not because it appreciates supporters' cooperation but because no supporter defects. Supporters become concerned about the future interacting with a failing Turkey. Unlike impatient supporters that are less concerned about the future, patient supporters oppose a failing Turkey's accession. Turkey then extremely appreciates supporters' cooperation but quits accession process that becomes highly costly.

Keywords: Supporters, objectors, cooperation, defection, threshold, future discount factor

Introduction

Turkey is the largest Muslim state to have applied for European Union (EU) membership. Geographically located at an intersection between the Middle East and Europe, it constitutes a unique case in the possible

enlargement of the EU. However, after almost five decades of bargaining and negotiations, Turkey suspects that the EU members do not genuinely seek its accession.¹ It perceives the EU as divided over its membership by receiving support from some EU members and observing Franco-German proposals of privileged partnership (PP) instead of membership.²

*Serdar Ş.
Güner*

A better understanding of Turkish accession to the EU helps us think about how intermingling cultural-religious differences affect international interactions. A rejected Turkey could cease taking steps toward adjustment with European norms and democratisation; a move that could socially and politically destabilise the periphery of the EU. Rejection could even support the “clash of civilizations” thesis and demonstrate that political-economic blocs can emerge in terms of religious and cultural fault lines.³ In that respect, the fate of Turkish accession constitutes an outstanding example for world politics.

That said, two recent developments must be taken into account. First, Turkish foreign policy recently shifted and has become more independent in terms of diverting priorities away from Turkey’s traditional Western orientation and connections. Second, Turkey has economically propelled and is now situated among the largest economies in the world; a point made more prominent as financial difficulties continue to threaten Europe’s common currency and pose formidable problems for some members such as Greece. These developments certainly affect EU members’ incentives in supporting Turkey.

This work argues that, in an interactive context, Turkish success in three domains, namely: economics, democratic reforms, and foreign policy, play a major role in the level of support Turkey receives from the EU. I argue that Turkish successes prevent the impact of future concerns on cooperative policies of traditional supporters of Turkey. However, a successful Turkey becomes bolder in negotiations unlike a failed one. Turkish failures trigger EU concerns about the future of Turkey’s accession process and defections in turn. Turkish tendency to quit negotiations then increases. Thus, the blend of European and Turkish incentives to cooperate and defect paints complex interactions under Turkish successes and failures.

The next section describes European and Turkish perceptions. The second outlines assumptions on preferences and interactions. The third briefly discusses how Turkish successes and failures in economics, domestic reforms, and foreign policy affect EU members’ prefer-

ences for cooperation and defection. The fourth offers three alternative interaction paths for the future. The last section concludes this work while the appendix contains two basic deductions with respect to EU and Turkish actions.

CEJISS
2/2013

Mutual Perceptions

Turkey's culture, large, predominantly Muslim population, its history of interactions with European countries – going back centuries – and its geographic location generate EU perceptions of Turkey as a non-European country and produces hostile European beliefs and discourses with respect to Turkey's candidacy. The overwhelming majority of Europeans believe that Christian Europe must be protected from Muslim Turks and that Turkey represents an identity that largely differs from theirs.⁴ Therefore, there exist multiple cognitive and discursive factors working against Turkish accession.

The evidence of adverse European perceptions is abundant. The French rejected the draft EU constitution in a 2005 referendum because they feared the new constitution would make Turkish accession a likely prospect. French leaders like Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Nicolas Sarkozy, German Prime Minister Angela Merkel, and Dutch Leader Geert Wilders argue that Turkey should never have a chance to become an EU member. In addition, EU governments cannot discard citizens' opinions easily.⁵ As a result, Turkish accession faces formidable public and political opposition.

Turkish leaders, in turn, believe that their country is segregated in terms of religious and cultural differences. Recent polls conducted in Turkey exposed Turks' beliefs of the European use of double standards with respect to their country's membership. Turkish citizens do not believe their country will become an EU member.⁶ The length of the accession process, the EU enlargement spanning the accessions of the Republic of Cyprus, Central and Eastern European applicants, and proposals of PP produce Turkish distrust and suspicion.⁷ Moreover, Turkish leaders and citizens suspect that the EU negotiates to create a neighbour sharing European norms but not to integrate it. The rationale is that Turkey, having improved conditions in human rights, civil-military relations and minority rights, is preferable to Turkey having not accomplished reforms in these areas.⁸

Turkey began its interaction with the EU – the European Economic Community at that time – in 1959 with the aim to join the organi-

sation. It became an associate member by the Ankara Treaty of 1963. Turkey, the only candidate country that signed a customs union agreement with the EU, still strives to become an EU member. The length of the process is staggering; it covers both Cold War and post-Cold War periods, and Turks' patience is wearing thin. The more the accession drags, the more Turks believe that the EU is politically hypocritical. Turkish enthusiasm for EU membership accordingly wanes.⁹

The recent EU enlargement strengthens Turkish perceptions of European double standards and non-existence of scales in measuring a candidate's performance to become a member. The acceptance of a new member is rooted not in the fulfilment of Copenhagen criteria but in EU members' power, that is, EU members' interests and ability to influence the accession process. Indeed, there exists no precise measure to quantify the ripeness of economic and political conditions prevailing in the candidate country. To illustrate, Greece became a member in 1981 while it was negatively evaluated in 1976. In contrast with Turkey, some former Communist Bloc countries became members less than two decades after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Hungary and Poland became EU members in 2004; Bulgaria and Romania waited just three more years for full accession. In short, the fulfilment of the Copenhagen criteria is not a sufficient, but a necessary, condition for accession.¹⁰

Turkish misperceptions about the EU became deeper with the accession of the Republic of Cyprus in 2004.¹¹ The island has been divided since 1974 and constitutes one of the oldest unresolved international conflicts. When the UN formulated the Annan Plan to unify the island, unlike Turkish Cypriots, Greek Cypriots voted against it. Yet Greek Cypriots became EU citizens just a week later. There is a claim that the customs union agreement between Turkey and the EU was made possible by a promise from the EU to Greece about starting accession negotiations with Cyprus; otherwise Greece would have vetoed the agreement.¹² Hence, the admission of the Republic of Cyprus as an EU member exemplifies the Greek veto as an extortionate threat first formulated by Thomas C. Schelling.¹³

Presently, one of the most substantial obstacles to Turkish accession remains Turkey's non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, and, as a consequence, Turkey's denial of its ports to Cypriot trade.¹⁴ Cyprus is responsible for many frozen chapters in accession negotiations; only one out of 35 chapters is negotiated and closed.¹⁵ Greece and Cyprus

both declared their support for Turkey in its EU membership quest. Yet they also stepped-up their own conditions for a successful process: Turkey's diplomatic recognition of the Cyprus Republic, Turkish acceptance of Greek Cypriot trade at its ports and the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus. Unfortunately, no Turkish government can fulfil these conditions unless significant Greek and Cypriot concessions and incentives are provided.

Franco-German proposals of PP exacerbate Turkish beliefs further. No other candidate – besides Turkey – faced the PP proposal formulated by German Christian democrats in 2002. The proposal was then supported not only by Austria, Germany, and France but also by the Czech Republic and Denmark.¹⁶ Interestingly, even the proponents of the proposal do not agree about its content.¹⁷ Turkey, as a “privileged partner” would have no rights to be part of EU decision-making processes; it would only have an observer status Turkey already occupies. Hence, the implications of the PP proposal are not clear enough.

Moreover, there is uncertainty about whether Turkey can join the EU in the foreseeable future. The Turkish accession process is open ended. Turkey might still not achieve its full membership goal even if it successfully conducts all reforms needed to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria.

Turkey did not abandon its desire to become an EU member. The Justice and Development Party (known under AKP, its Turkish acronym), in power since 2002, is of a moderately Islamic political tendency. One might expect that such a party would oppose Turkey's EU membership. However, the AKP continued to spend efforts for the accession, perhaps because an EU membership can strengthen religious actors through higher democratic norms and wider freedom.¹⁸ In fact, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan rejects PP status and affirms that Turkey continues to negotiate with the final goal of becoming an EU member. Turkey will not be encrusted in the Western world without an EU membership indeed.¹⁹ Thus, Turkish preference to finalise its European status has strong bases.

Interactions

Turkey perceives the EU as roughly composed of two groups with respect to its membership bid. Some EU members such as the UK, Sweden, Italy, and Spain encourage and cooperate with Turkey by issuing declarations of strong support while they recognise the existence of

multiple obstacles. They indicate that Turkish membership is not a sure prospect; negotiations are open-ended and will take a long time. These countries are qualified as supporters and their behaviour as cooperation. Some EU members such as France and Germany firmly oppose Turkey's accession by openly declaring that Turkey has no place in Europe and that Turkey should instead accept a position of privileged partner. These countries are qualified as objectors and their behaviour as defection in turn.

*Serdar Ş.
Güner*

This work simplifies EU-Turkey accession negotiations as if it consists of two periods. In the first period, supporters and objectors move by choosing between defection and cooperation. Turkey moves in the second period under its perceptions of a divided EU. Turkey reacts to cooperation by continuing negotiations but withdraws given defection. How would supporters, objectors, and Turkey interact under these rules? An answer comes through the distinction between present and future payoffs.

Future payoffs represent lesser values compared to present ones, as an uncertain future weighs less than the present.²⁰ A discount factor represents future evaluations of payoffs. The factor ranges between zero and one and scales second-period payoffs down. If the factor is close to one, its multiplication produces a second-period payoff which is almost equal to the present one. As a consequence, the future becomes nearly as valuable as the present. If it is close to zero, second-period payoffs become smaller; future does not matter to a high extent. To summarise, lower discount factors that are close to zero mean that the future is relatively unimportant while higher factors that are close to one imply that the future is important and cast a shadow upon present interactions.

Germany and France do not act like supporters.²¹ They always defect in the first period. Turkey quits in the second period as a reaction to defection. Thus, objectors gain the present value of defection and the future value of Turkish exit from the process. If supporters cooperate in the first period, Turkey does not quit in the second period and continues to negotiate. Consequently, supporters obtain present and future values of having Turkey in track for EU accession. If they defect, they gain the present value of defection and the future value of Turkish exit similar to objectors. Would supporters defect or cooperate? The answer depends on supporters' preferences and evaluations of the future.

Objectors' preferences are fixed: future evaluations do not transform them. As to supporters, they can be assessed as preferring cooperation the most. The assumption leads to the strategically trivial result of supporters' constant cooperation. Consequently, the EU consists of two groups such that one cooperates and the other defects. No strategic uncertainty can affect EU policy towards Turkey's accession: interactions remain the same all the time, as future evaluations do not transform cooperators' preferences similar to objectors. No room for change exists in EU-Turkey interactions.

As an alternative, supporters can be assessed as preferring cooperation over defection unlike objectors and, like objectors, seek Turkish exit. In fact, the previous section established that such Turkish perceptions are well grounded. Turkey perceives that the EU negotiates not to ease its accession but rather to prevent it and that no EU member genuinely prefers its accession as a full member. Accordingly, we assume that supporters and objectors all prefer a Turkish decision to quit from the negotiation process yet, unlike objectors, supporters prefer cooperation over defection.

Supporters cooperate provided that the sum of present and future values of having Turkey on track for EU membership exceeds the sum of present value of their defection and the future value of Turkish exit; they defect otherwise. The comparison of cooperation and defection payoffs reveals a critical threshold that explains supporters' choice. The threshold is a ratio of the difference between cooperation and defection values to the difference between the values of cooperation and the Turkish decision to quit the process. If the future discount value exceeds the threshold, supporters prefer to defect. They cooperate when the future discount parameter remains below it.²² Hence, supporters' preferences over actions toward Turkey are not immune from future evaluations like those of objectors. Supporters can cooperate or defect depending on how they evaluate future interactions. Additionally, they can evaluate the future differently, but all discount factors must remain below the threshold for them to encourage Turkey in its EU bid.

Supporters can also act like objectors. By assumption, the value of cooperation is higher than the value of defection for supporters. Thus, supporters suffer a net loss from defection in the first period when they defect. They recover from the costs and gain some benefit by obtaining the value of their most desired outcome provided that Turkey quits accession negotiations in the second period. If Turkey does not quit,

defection in the first period becomes costly for supporters who would then have no incentive to behave like objectors. Therefore, supporters prefer to defect, if Turkey, as a reaction, certainly quits the process of accession.

Turkish decisions derive from a simple comparison similar to supporters' decision. If the sum of Turkish payoffs to EU cooperation and defection weighed by Turkish beliefs of receiving support or rejection constitutes a loss, Turkey stops negotiations. The comparison generates a threshold in the form of a ratio of Turkish payoff to EU rejection to the difference between Turkish payoff to EU rejection and EU support.²³ If the Turkish belief of receiving support remains below the threshold, Turkey quits from the accession process.

Alternative Futures for the European Union-Turkey Accession Negotiations

Empirical Assessments

The Copenhagen criteria emphasises economic and political successes – such as achieving a functioning market economy, the capacity to compete within the EU, increases in the standards of democracy, and human rights – for would-be members. Therefore, Turkey's successes and failures in meeting the criteria affect how supporters evaluate cooperation, defection, and the Turkish decision to abandon the process.²⁴ It can be safely assumed that objectors are indifferent to Turkish successes; Turkish failures can only strengthen their position towards Turkey. An analysis indeed claims that the accession of Muslim Turkey still remains controversial even if economic barriers are worked out.²⁵ Cultural differences, which are not included in the Copenhagen criteria, offset repercussions of Turkey's economic successes.

Turkey remains almost unaffected by the 2007 global crisis and its economic performance is impressive given the financial crises some EU members face. In fact, Turkey's economy is ranked 6th in the world in terms of the 2010 single-digit inflation rates compared to those EU countries.²⁶ Turkey is the 'rising power on the Bosphorus' and constitutes an economic power and a "trading state."²⁷ According to Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan, these facts rule out the possibility of a poor country aiming at an expected economic growth through EU membership.²⁸

A wealthier Turkey is certainly a more valuable candidate than an economically weak one. Supporters would then attribute higher values to cooperation. The Turkish elite also expects that the long-term Turkish assets form 'a hedge against EU rejection,' and make Turkey

'more attractive to Europe.'²⁹ Nevertheless, Turkey's economy is not immune from adverse developments. The Wall Street Journal indicates that Turkey's economic boom is not without structural weaknesses, as the value of Turkish lira continues to drop against the US dollar.³⁰ Therefore, Turkey's economic performance can vary affecting supporters' evaluations and their critical thresholds to cooperate.

Turkish successes and failures in domestic reforms that aim at improving minority group rights and eliminating military interference into domestic politics also affects supporters' preference for cooperation. Van Rompuy and Barroso, respectively presidents of the European Council and the European Commission, congratulated Erdoğan on the success of the AKP in the parliamentary elections of 12 June 2011. They declared that progress in political reforms 'should also give a new impetus to the accession negotiations with the EU.'³¹ The rationale is that there is a lesser value in raising objections against a country sharing EU political norms. Thus, more valuable become efforts for uninterrupted accession negotiations with a more democratic Turkey having improved human rights.

Constitutional amendments have been under way since 2001 and those following the 2010 Turkish referendum hint at Turkey's commitment for success along with the political criteria. Yet, there is no new Constitution. Moreover, Turkey's democratisation is difficult to achieve as long as the Kurdish question is not peacefully managed and civilian control over the military is not fully established.³² There are actually several court cases against alleged military-coup leaders including civilians, bureaucrats, and journalists. The cases are still open while the intensity of armed clashes between the Turkish Army and the PKK (acronym for Partiya Kerkarani Kurdistan) is currently on the rise. Elected parliament members of the pro-Kurdish Peace and Democracy Party boycotted the Turkish Grand Assembly for a long time by refusing to take their parliamentary oaths. Some of them are charged with having ties to the PKK and are detained for this reason. A new constitution, prepared by the newly elected parliament, might be a solution to the Kurdish problem. It is unclear, however, how such a collective deal might be found. Political reforms to reach more refined norms constitute the greatest impediment to higher cooperation values and thresholds.

A factor omitted in the Copenhagen criteria – which also impacts supporters' cooperation value – is Turkey's conduct of it new, more

active, foreign policy that aims at 'zero-conflict' with its neighbours and the establishment of lucrative trade relations. According to Ahmet Davutoğlu, Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs and the architect of the new TFP, Turkey constitutes a source of stability for many countries and enjoys 'strategic depth.'³³ He believes that Turkey is differentiated from other Islamic states with its unique history and Turkish speaking minorities around the world. Turkey's imperial history, geopolitical position, cultural affinities and ties can help foreign-policy makers in the Middle East and the Balkans to understand how interconnected are their countries with each other and with Turkey. Any Turkish foreign policy not tapping into the strategic depth constrains Turkey's diplomatic power and leverage.

*Serdar Ş.
Güner*

Some analysts qualify the new TFP as "soft Euro-Asianism" as accession to the EU no more occupies an utmost priority for Turkish decision makers who are busy in building commercial and political connections with China and Russia.³⁴ On the contrary, some analysts indicate that Turkish commitment to joining the EU is still strong. According to a political analyst, Turkey simply has alternative foreign options to increase its wealth and political influence at regional and global levels; the EU bid is just one of them. The new TFP remains in line with AKP political elite's cultural background and exhibits a "trading state" behaviour evolving through commercial links.³⁵ We also claim that a powerful and prosperous Turkey would become an attractive EU candidate through management of energy routes from Central Asia to Europe, Russo-Turkish energy cooperation prospects, lucrative trade interactions at different scales, and resolution of old animosities and conflicts in the neighbourhood.

Nevertheless, there are some question marks about the new TFP that became more volatile and independent in terms of the country's traditional-Western orientation. Some analysts believe that the drift in TFP constitutes a reaction to EU and American policies.³⁶ Consequently, there exists a tension between Turkish efforts for accession and the new TFP orientation.³⁷ The accession of Turkey would lead to the EU entanglement in centuries-old rivalries ravaging the Middle East and the Caucasus.³⁸ The current deterioration of Turkey-Israel and Turkey-Syria relations can indeed revive such worries and demonstrate that the new TFP can spectacularly fail. However, provided that the new TFP succeeds, Turkey's accession would not necessarily entail the EU entrapment in such conflict epicentres. As a consequence, the new

TFP can strengthen or undermine anti-Turkish geo-strategic assessments within the EU and affect supporters' incentives to cooperate.

Paths of Interactions

CEJISS
2/2013

A complex system of incentives underlies EU-Turkey interactions. The value of cooperation increases for supporters as Turkey registers successes in economics, foreign policy, and domestic reforms. The consequence becomes higher cooperation thresholds for supporters. It then becomes more likely that supporters' future discounts remain below thresholds which are getting closer to the value of one. Therefore, supporters cooperate with a successful Turkey by becoming less concerned about the future.

Yet, Turkish successes have produced an inversed impact on the Turkish threshold to quit. A successful Turkey can be assumed to evaluate objectors' defections as representing lesser costs. The consequence becomes lower Turkish thresholds to quit negotiations. It then becomes more likely that the now reduced Turkish beliefs of receiving support remains below thresholds which are contracting even more. Therefore, the slightest Turkish belief of receiving considerably low support, and, therefore, Turkish suspicion that supporters' now act like objectors, can prompt Turkey to end its EU membership quest.

In contrast, Turkish failures generate lower values of cooperation for supporters. The threshold of supporters' cooperation then becomes smaller. If supporters' future discounts are high and close to the value of one, it is likely that they exceed smaller thresholds. As a consequence, supporters who are patient, so that the future matters for them, prefer defect and act like objectors. Otherwise, if supporters do not care much about the future and, therefore, their discount factors are small and close to zero, then they cooperate. Therefore, those supporters that are less concerned about the future cooperate with those who care about the future and defect against a failing Turkey in accession negotiations.

For Turkey, the higher the rate of its failures, the higher are the costs of an EU rejection. A failing Turkey suffers more in the process and Turkey's threshold for ending negotiations rises. As a result, it becomes more likely that high Turkish belief of receiving support remains short of higher thresholds. Therefore, a failing Turkey can give up its EU membership bid even if its belief of receiving support is relatively strong. Three alternative paths below organise these dynamics and

display the complexity of EU-Turkey interactions.

Full Success

As established, supporters continue to cooperate if their future discount rate remains below the critical threshold. In general, Turkish successes along the three dimensions lead to higher values of cooperation and lower values of Turkish unilateral exit and defection. The threshold then swiftly increases so that no discount rate can exceed it. Time preferences become obsolete for supporters.

Naturally, it is impossible to assess that each supporter has the same future preference as the others; some might be more patient, others less. If the threshold is high enough, it is more likely that each individual future discount rate remains below it, triggering cooperation. Consequently, supporters' time preferences would not matter for their cooperative conduct as long as the new TFP continues to augment Turkish power and reputation, domestic reforms are conducted at a steady rate, and Turkish economy continues to thrive. Supporters would always cooperate with a successful Turkey regardless its evaluations of future.

A fully successful Turkey remains in track not because it highly values supporters' cooperation but because it faces no objection. Turkey, registering successes in all three domains, does not have to perceive that the EU is the only way to harness wealth and power. It would end accession negotiations at the slightest perception of defection emanating from supporters. Yet no defection occurs in this case. Therefore, a fully successful Turkey does not need a high level of cooperation to continue accession negotiations. It can spend efforts to become an EU member under even smaller beliefs of receiving support.

Mixed Success

If Turkey fails in some domain, supporters' payoff to cooperation decreases while Turkish unilateral exit and defection become more attractive for supporters. The weight of failures on the threshold can vary and affect each other. For example, failures in domestic reform can be evaluated as inconsiderable next to Turkish economic successes. An economic setback would hurt domestic reform efforts. Reversals in new TFP would drain economic performance and vice versa. As a result, the critical threshold would become lower at different rates affecting supporters' preference for cooperation. Supporters' time pref-

*Alternative
Futures for
the European
Union-Tur-
key Acces-
sion Negotia-
tions*

erences start to matter given Turkish failures, because the discount rate must be lower than smaller thresholds for supporters to cooperate. Supporters' future payoffs then are weighted by discount factors close to zero. Thus, if supporters cooperate under some Turkish failures, say, in the domain of human rights reforms, this implies that the future concerns play a relatively lesser role in their preferences toward Turkey.

Supporters do not necessarily have the same evaluations of the future. Some can cooperate with a failing Turkey only if the present is more important than the future, that is, if they are impatient. Some patient supporters can in turn value the future and defect while Turkey registers mixed successes. One would intuitively expect that if the future matters, some EU countries would have a higher tendency to cooperate with Turkey. Unfortunately, this might not be the case. Turkish failures induce supporters to encourage Turkey only if supporters evaluate future gains of the accession process are not as valuable as the present ones. The future then casts a shadow over present EU-Turkey interactions.

An economic or a foreign policy success can induce Turkish leaders to become bolder during the accession process even if they fail in achieving higher standards of democracy and human rights. The reason is simple; leaders can assess EU defective moves as less costly compared to periods with no Turkish accomplishments in economics or foreign policy. A successful Turkey would evaluate EU cooperation as representing lesser values and become highly sensitive to a supporter's defection. Therefore, as EU cooperation loses value in the eyes of Turkish leaders, stopping negotiations can become a compelling option.

According to Turkish leaders, Turkey having a stronger economy or an increased influence and power through its new foreign policy might not need an EU membership. Political reforms, for example, are not necessarily conducted to meet EU criteria; they are tools to improve Turkish standards of living. It is also possible that Turks simply will not desire their country to become an EU member in the future. National priorities can change. Perhaps EU membership is no more the principal Turkish national interest.³⁹ Recent speeches emanating from the highest-rank Turkish leaders indicate that a reversal in Turkish preference might actually occur in the long run. Hence, a defection by a traditional supporter could prompt a partially successful Turkey

to stop negotiations as Turkish perceptions of receiving support falls below the threshold.

To sum up, if Turkey is economically successful facing setbacks in foreign-policy or internal reforms, the accession process can become more conflictive than before. It is possible that some supporters defect and Turkey evaluates EU support as representing a lesser weight. The path of interactions can then reflect mixed actions and reactions both from the EU and Turkey demonstrating how cultural and religious differences divide states.

*Serdar Ş.
Güner*

Full Failure

If Turkey fails in all three domains, the threshold for supporters' cooperation decreases further. All discount rates can exceed it triggering full EU opposition against Turkey. Turkish beliefs then determine Turkish decision to quit accession negotiations. To illustrate this, imagine that the EU decides to suspend accession negotiations as Turkey does not open its ports to Greek Cypriot vessels. Turkey must quit as a reaction because supporters suffer a net loss from defection in the first period when they defect. Supporters recover from the cost and make some benefit if Turkey quits accession negotiations in the second period obtaining the value of their most desired outcome.

Turkey quits if the expectation of continuing negotiations constitutes a loss given an overall EU defection. Turkey indeed suffers from an EU defection to a high extent because the EU becomes the sole anchor given no success in any domain. The higher the costs Turkey suffers from the EU defection, the higher the threshold for Turkish perceptions of interacting with supporters. Thus, while cooperation becomes highly valuable for a failed Turkey, it quits believing that even its traditional supporters tend to oppose its accession. In other words, a totally failed Turkey quits the accession process because negotiations becomes highly costly while it extremely appreciates supporters' cooperation. Hence, the third scenario demonstrates how a Muslim country can be a member of NATO but not of the EU.

Conclusion

This work obtained insights about EU-Turkey membership negotiations through a fairly simple analysis. The analysis developed does not aim at an empirical application, an overly complicated objective. The deductions made here do not explain what exactly happens or how

the future will look like. They generate conceptual clarifications and insights by letting us think about different scenarios. Despite its simplicity, the analysis reveals how Turkish beliefs and EU time preferences change in function of Turkish successes and failures. In gist, Turkey would reciprocate cooperative moves as long as there is a division within the EU regarding Turkey's accession. As to future concerns of Turkey's traditional supporters, they outline possible paths depending on how Turkey fares.

The present analysis can be extended to cover additional periods, actions, and EU groups towards Turkish membership to allow for more complexity. Nevertheless, it sheds some light on the present and the future EU-Turkey negotiations. Any analysis of EU-Turkey interactions must be dynamic, as actors must look forward about successive periods and they can hurt each other in the future affecting their choices today. If Turkey is successful, the accession process will linger on for more years to come. This might be interpreted as a failure by some and as a success by others who oppose the adhesion of a Muslim country in the EU.

Appendix

Supporters' threshold for cooperation and defection

Let A_1 denote the value of Turkish unilateral end of negotiations, A_2 the value of cooperation with Turkey, and A_3 the value of defection, that is, the opposition against full Turkish membership, for supporters. Supporters' preference ordering is assumed to be $A_1 > A_2 > A_3 > 0$. Supporters' cooperation payoff becomes $A_2 + \delta A_2$ as it obtains A_2 in both periods, but the second-period payoff is discounted. If supporters defect, they obtain A_3 in the first period. Turkey then suffers B_2 in the first period, updates its beliefs, and presumes it is dealing with objectors. As a result, Turkey stops negotiations in the second period. Turkish exit move generates a payoff of A_1 for supporters. Thus, the supporters receive a payoff of $A_3 + \delta A_1$ from defection. They cooperate only if cooperation yields a higher payoff than defection, that is, if $A_3 + \delta A_1 < A_2 + \delta A_2$. Rearranging, we obtain $\delta A_1 - \delta A_2 < A_2 - A_3$. Hence, we have $\delta (A_1 - A_2) < A_2 - A_3$. Dividing both sides of the inequality by $A_1 - A_2$, the future discount factor condition for supporters to cooperate with Turkey becomes:

$$\delta < \frac{A_2 - A_3}{A_1 - A_2}$$

Turkish threshold for continuing negotiations

Turkey walks away only if ending negotiations generates a payoff greater than or equal to the uncertain prospect negotiating with supporters or objectors. Turkey must decide to stay in or to exit the negotiation process without knowing whether it interacts with supporters or objectors. Turkish expectation of continuing negotiations is $pB_1 + (1 - p)B_2$ where p and $1 - p$ are Turkish beliefs of interacting with supporters and objectors; B_1 and B_2 are Turkish payoffs to EU cooperation and defection, respectively. We assume that $B_1 > 0 > B_2$. If the expectation constitutes a loss, that is, $0 > pB_1 + (1 - p)B_2$, Turkey stops to avoid any more losses. The inequality implies that:

$$p < \frac{B_2}{B_2 - B_1}$$

The threshold $\frac{B_2}{B_2 - B_1}$ is positive, as both the nominator and the denominator of threshold are negative and smaller than one under the assumption of $B_1 > 0 > B_2$.

Serdar Ş. Güner is affiliated to the Department of International Relations at Bilkent University, and may be reached at: sguner@bilkent.edu.tr

Notes

- 1 'USAK,' Dış Politika Algılama Anketi, Ankara, August 2009, available at: <http://www.usak.org.tr/dosyalar/TDPAnket4_TFP.pdf> (accessed 13 May 2013) and German Marshall Fund, Transatlantic Trends, September 2010, available at: <www.gmfus.org/trends/2010/> (accessed 13 May 2013). See also Ç. Kentmen (2008),

Alternative Futures for the European Union-Turkey Accession Negotiations

- 'Determinants of Support for EU Membership in Turkey: Islamic Attachments, Utilitarian Considerations and National Identity', *European Union Politics*, 9:4, pp.487-510.
- 2 See www.euractiv.com/en/eu-elections/sarkozy-kicks-french-eu-elections-campaign/article-182104 for Sarkozy's view and www.euractiv.com/en/eu-elections/turkey-shocked-franco-german-election-rhetoric/article-182187 (accessed 25 May 2013) for Merkel's.
- 3 Huntington (1993), 'The Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Affairs*, 72:3, pp. 22-49.
- 4 Bürgin (2010), 'Cosmopolitan Entrapment: The Failed Strategies to Reverse Turkey's EU Membership Eligibility,' *Perspectives: Central European Review of International Affairs*, 18:2, pp. 33-56; De Vreese, Boomgaarden, and Semetko (2008), 'Hard and Soft: Public Support for Turkish Membership in the EU,' *European Union Politics*, 9:4, pp. 511-530; Jovanovich (2004), 'Eastern Enlargement of the EU: A Top-sy-Turvy Endgame or Permanent Disillusionment,' *Journal of Economic Integration*, 19:4, pp. 830-868; Grigoriadis (2006), 'Turkey's Accession to the European Union: Debating the Most Difficult Enlargement Ever,' *SAIS Review*, 26:1, pp. 147-160; Rumelili (2011), 'Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy, and Socialization in a Post-enlargement Europe,' *Journal of European Integration*, 33:2, pp. 235-249; Rumelili (2004), 'Constructing Identity and Relating to Difference: Understanding the EU's Mode of Differentiation,' *Review of International Studies*, 30:1, pp. 27-47; Schmidt (2012), 'European Member State Elites' Diverging Visions of the European Union: Diverging Differently Since the Economic Crisis and the Libyan Intervention?' *Journal of European Integration*, 34:2, pp. 169-190. Yeğenoğlu (2006), 'The Return of the Religious: Revisiting Europe and its Islamic Others,' *Culture and Religion*, 7:3, pp. 245-261; Wodak (2007), 'Discourses in EU Organizations: Aspects of Access, Participation, and Exclusion,' *Text and Talk*, 25:5/6, pp. 655-680.
- 5 Köprülü (2009), 'Paradigm Shift in Turkey's Foreign Policy,' *Brown Journal of International Affairs*, 16:1, p. 185-201; Müftüler-Baç (2000), 'Through the Looking Glass: Turkey in Europe,' *Turkish Studies*, 1:1, pp. 21-35; Robins (2006), 'A Double-Gravity State: Turkish Foreign Policy Reconsidered,' *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 33:2, pp. 199-211; Robins (2007), 'Turkish Foreign Policy Since 2002: Between a Post-Islamist Government and a Kemalist State,' *International Affairs*, 83:2, pp. 289-304.
- 6 Kardaş (2010), 'Turkey: Redrawing the Middle East Map or Building Sandcastles?' *Middle East Policy*, 17:1, p. 115-136. Larrabee (2010),

- 'Turkey's New Geopolitics,' *Survival*, 52:2, pp. 157-180.
- 7 Kirişçi (2004), 'The December 2004 European Council Decision on Turkey: Is It an Historic Turning Point?' *The Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 8:4, pp. 87-94; Öniş (2007), 'Conservative Globalists Versus Defensive Nationalists: Political Parties and Paradoxes of Europeanisation in Turkey,' *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 9:3, pp. 247-261; Öniş (2009), 'The New Wave of Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey: Drifting Away from Europeanisation?' Danish Institute for International Studies Report, no. 5.
 - 8 Müftüler-Baç (2008), 'The European Union: Accession Negotiations with Turkey from a Foreign Policy Perspective,' *Journal of European Integration*, 30:1, p. 67.
 - 9 Gordon and Taşpınar (2006), 'Turkey on the Brink,' *Washington Quarterly*, 29:3, pp. 57-70; D. Jung (2001), 'Turkey and Europe: Ongoing Hypocrisy?' Working paper, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute; Yılmaz (2011), 'Turkey's Membership in the EU: Realistic or Merely Wishful?' Available at: <http://hir.harvard.edu/print/turkey-s-membership-in-the-eu-realistic-or-merely-wishful> (accessed 28 May 2013); Yılmaz (2008), 'Euro-skepticism in Turkey: Parties, Elites and Public Opinion, 1995-2006,' *South European Society and Politics*, 16:1, pp. 185-208.
 - 10 Müftüler-Baç (2008), pp. 201-219; Müftüler-Baç and McLaren (2003), 'Enlargement Preferences and Policy-Making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey,' *European Integration*, 25:1, pp. 17-30.
 - 11 Öniş (2011), 'Multiple Faces of the "New" Turkish Foreign Policy: Underlying Dynamics and a Critique,' *Insight Turkey*, 13:1, pp. 47-65; Kardaş (2010), p.116.
 - 12 Erdoğan (2002), 'Turkey and Europe: Undivided but Not United,' *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 6:2, p. 43.
 - 13 Schelling (1980), *The Strategy of Conflict*, Harvard UP, pp. 50-52.
 - 14 Merkel re-iterated her position with respect to Turkish candidacy during her recent visit of Cyprus, available at: www.neurope.eu/articles/104242.php (accessed 20 May 2013).
 - 15 Christensen (2009), 'Mobilising Local Networks for a Better Informed Dialogue on Turkey's Accession to the EU,' Policy Brief, Danish Institute of International Studies; Kettle (2010), 'Disgracefully, Turkey's EU Accession Bid is Going Nowhere Soon,' *Guardian*, 29 October, p. 43; Morelli (2010), 'European Union Enlargement: a Status Report on Turkey's Accession Negotiations,' CRS Report for the Congress available at: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22517.pdf (accessed 12 June 2013); Tocci (2010), 'The Baffling Short-Sightedness in the EU-Turkey-Cyprus Triangle,' available at: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22517.pdf

Serdar Ş.
Güner

- ciaonet.org/wps/iaii/0020222/f_0020222_17096.pdf> (accessed 10 June 2013).
- 16 Karakaş (2006), 'Gradual Integration – A Sustainable Alternative for Both Sides, Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) ZEI Turkey Monitor, 2:4: pp. 5-7, available at: <www.zei.de/download/zei_tur/ZEI_EU-Turkey-Monitor_vol2noi.pdf> (accessed 22 May 2013).
 - 17 Pope (2009), 'Privileged Partnership Offers Turkey Neither Privilege Nor Partnership.' Available at: <www.crisisgroup.org/en/publication-type/blogs/eu-turkey-cyprus-triangle/privileged-partnership-offers-turkey-neither-privilege-nor-partnership.aspx> (accessed 12 June 2013).
 - 18 Bech and Snyder (2011), 'Religion's Contribution to International Relations Theory,' in Snyder (ed.) (2011), *Religion and International Relations Theory*, Columbia UP, p. 201.
 - 19 Gordon and Taşpınar (2004), 'Turkey's European Quest: The EU's Decision on Turkish Accession,' Centre on the United States and Europe, The Brookings Institution; Hadjit and Moxon-Browne (2005), 'Foreign Direct Investment in Turkey: The Implications of EU Accession,' *Turkish Studies*, 6:3, pp. 321–40.
 - 20 Gardner (2003), *Games for Business and Economics*. New Jersey: Wiley; E. Rasmusen (1989), *Games and Information: An Introduction to Game Theory*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
 - 21 French President François Hollande has the same attitude towards Turkish accession as his predecessor Nicolas Sarkozy. The likelihood of Laurent Fabius who opposes Turkish accession to become the new French MFA can only strengthen such prospects.
 - 22 See appendix.
 - 23 See appendix.
 - 24 European Council 2010 Progress Report on Turkey, pp. 9-12.
 - 25 Nelsen, Guth, and Cleveland (2001), 'Does Religion Matter? Christianity and Public Support for the European Union,' *European Union Politics*, 2:2, p. 22.
 - 26 For details see: <www.globserver.com/en/turkey-economy> (accessed 22 May 2013).
 - 27 Kirişçi (2009), 'Transformation of Turkish Foreign Policy,' *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 40:1, pp. 29-57; Steinworth and Zand. (2011), 'Is Erdogan's Success Pulling Turks Away from Europe?' *Der Spiegel*, 9 June 2009; see also Kirişçi, (2009), pp. 33.
 - 28 Erdoğan (2011), 'The Robust Man of Europe: Turkey Has the Vigor that the EU Needs Badly,' *Newsweek*.
 - 29 Danforth (2011), 'Turkey: Between Paranoia and Prosperity,' *Dis-*

- sent, 58:1, p. 21.
- 30 See: <online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304584004576419470604208418.html> (accessed 10 May 2013).
- 31 See: <europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/402&format=HT.>.
- 32 Güney and Karatekelioğlu (2005), 'Turkey's EU Candidacy and Civil-Military Relations: Challenges and Prospects,' *Armed Forces and Society*, 31:3, pp. 439-462; Ulusoy (2008), 'Turkey and the EU: Democratisation, Civil-Military Relations, and the Cyprus Issue,' *Insight Turkey*, 10:4, pp. 51-76.
- 33 Davutoğlu (2001), *Stratejik Derinlik*, İstanbul: Küre; Davutoğlu (2008), 'Turkey's New Foreign Policy Vision,' *Insight Turkey*, 10:1, pp. 77-96.
- 34 Öniş and Yılmaz (2009), 'Between Europeanisation and Euro-Asianism: Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey During the AKP Era,' *Turkish Studies*, 10:1, pp. 7-24.
- 35 Zalewski (2010), 'The Self-Appointed Superpower,' *World Policy Journal*, 27:4, pp. 97-102.
- 36 Cook (2009), 'Turkey's War at Home,' *Survival*, 51:5, p. 116.
- 37 Çağaptay (2009), 'Is Turkey Leaving the West?' *Foreign Affairs*, 26 October 2009; Öniş (2010), 'Contesting for Turkey's Political 'Centre': Domestic Politics, Identity Conflicts and the Controversy over EU Membership,' *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 18:3, pp. 361-376; Pope (2010), 'Pax Ottomana? The Mixed Success of Turkey's New Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Affairs* November/December 2010.
- 38 Buzan and Diez (1999), 'The European Union and Turkey,' *Survival*, 41:1, p. 47.
- 39 Zalewski (2010), p. 97.