

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union

Project no. 177316-LLP-1-2010-DE-ERASMUS-ENWA

## **LISBOAN**

### **Linking Interdisciplinary Integration Studies by Broadening the European Academic Network**

## **Report from the Workshop “EU Enlargement Policy After Lisbon”**

Atila Eralp, Özgehan Şenyuva, Başak Kale and Zerrin Torun

Centre for European Studies at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Ankara-Turkey (P54)

Deliverable No. 37

**29-30 May 2012, Project month 20**

Dissemination level: Public

Funding Disclaimer: This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## **Report from the Workshop “EU Enlargement Policy After Lisbon”, 29-30 May 2012, Ankara, Turkey**

### **Background:**

The European Union (EU) and the process of European integration have gone under a profound transformation with the entry into force of Lisbon Treaty. As a result, we witnessed an all-encompassing wave of changes in various realms of the EU polity such as foreign policy, security, policy-making and economics. Not surprisingly, this transformation has a direct impact on the EU enlargement policy. In particular, the Lisbon Treaty creates a novel legal and institutional setting in the area of the EU foreign policy with new actors and adapted functions of existing players. Besides the introduction of an elected semi-permanent President of the European Council, there is one key novelty which is particularly significant with respect to the EU enlargement: the establishment of a European External Action Service (EEAS) under the authority of the Higher Representative for Foreign and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton. This has a direct impact on the EU enlargement as the responsibility in terms of the EU conditionality for acceding countries such as Turkey is now shared between the EU Commissioner for Enlargement, the President of the European Council and the High Representative. Moreover, the EU Treaty for the first time entails a direct reference to the Union developing a 'special relationship' with neighbouring countries within the Article 8. On top of that, the past events in the region showed how volatile the EU neighbourhood can be. The developments following the elections in Belarus, the revolutions in Tunisia, and the changes now in Egypt, are clear examples that Europe needs to be more pro-active. All in all, the changes and challenges in terms of the EU enlargement policy present an interesting academic and political puzzle to think about.

### **Workshop:**

In order to further elaborate different dimensions of the EU enlargement policy, CES-METU at Ankara invited researchers, experts and practitioners from different countries to the LISBOAN workshop. In this workshop the issue of enlargement was discussed from different geo-political; institutional; theoretical and historical perspectives. The workshop was organized under three sessions, with invited speakers and presenters and each was followed by roundtable discussions with the participants.

Each session and main discussion points are presented below:

#### **Session I:**

- What are the likely implications of the economic crisis on enlargement policy in the EU?
- Can enlargement still be characterized as the most successful foreign policy tool for the EU? If not; what are the implications for the EU's foreign policy?
- How would relations between the EU and Turkey look like in the emerging multipolar system?

## Session II:

- What are the different forms of cooperation and integration as alternatives to enlargement?
- What are the possibilities within the existing Treaties (including the Lisbon Treaty)
- Could we think of possibilities outside of the Treaty framework?
- What are the implications of the EU's relationship with other regions for Turkey's relationship with the EU?

## Session III:

- To what extent is the integration capacity a determinant for the next wave of enlargement? (especially in case of Turkey)
- Are we heading towards different forms of membership?
- What are the implications of the EU's relationship with other regions for Turkey's relationship with the EU?
- What are the possibilities of collaboration in the area of foreign policy between the EU and Turkey? What could be its added-value? How could such collaboration affect the Turkey-EU relationship?
- Is Turkey and Western Balkans a meaningful group for next wave of enlargement?

**Workshop Programme:**

Date: 29-30 May 2012

Venue: Bilkent Convention Centre, Ankara, Turkey

**DAY 1: 29 MAY 2012**

14:00-14:10 Opening and Welcome

Prof. Dr. *Atila Eralp* (Middle East Technical University)

14:10-14:30 Keynote Speech

Prof. Dr. *Peter Balazs* (Central European University)

14:30- 16:15 SESSION I Enlargement Policy after Lisbon

Moderator: Prof. Dr. *Wolfgang Wessels* (University of Cologne)

Prof. Dr. *Gianni Bonvicini* (Istituto Affari Internazionali -IAI)

Prof. Dr. *Fuat Keyman* (Sabancı University)

Assist. Prof. Dr. *Özgehan Şenyuva* (Middle East Technical University)

Discussant: Assist. Prof. Dr. *İpek Eren Vural* (Middle East Technical University)

Roundtable Discussion

16:15-16:30 Coffee Break

16:30 – 18:00 SESSION II Alternatives to Enlargement

Moderator: Prof. Dr. *Fuat Keyman* (Sabancı University)

Prof. Dr. *Meliha Altunışık* (Middle East Technical University)

Dr. *Michele Comelli* (Istituto Affari Internazionali -IAI)

Dr. *Funda Tekin* (University of Cologne)

Discussant: Dr. *Zerrin Torun* (Middle East Technical University)

Roundtable discussion

18:15-19:00 Reception

**DAY 2: 30 MAY 2012**

09:30-12:00 SESSION III Next Wave(s) of Enlargement : Turkey and South East Europe

Moderator: Prof. Dr. *Atila Eralp*

Dr. *Domenico Fracchiola* (University Luiss -Guido Carli- of Rome)

Prof. Dr. *Ahmet Evin* (Sabancı University)

Prof. Dr. *Wolfgang Koeth* (EIPA Maastricht)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. *Valentin Petroussenko* (Univeristy of Plovdiv)

Prof. Dr. *Visnja Samardzija* (Institute for International Relations – IMO)

Discussant: Dr. *Başak Kale* (Middle East Technical University)

Roundtable discussion

12:00 – 13:00 Buffet Lunch 13:00 End of the workshop-departure of the participants

**Presentations and the discussion:**

The first panel aimed at presenting a meta analysis of the developments at political and institutional levels at the European Union following the Lisbon treaty. Prof. Bonvicini presented a general analysis of the past enlargement waves of the EU and what this experience signified for different members. He concluded his analysis by outlining potential challenges and opportunities that awaits the EU and potential accession countries in different geographies. Ozgehan Senyuva from the Centre for European Studies brought in a different perspective by laying the emphasis on the public opinion. By using the findings of the Eurobarometer and Transatlantic Trends Surveys and making trends analysis, Dr. Senyuva analyzed the public opinion and attitudes in EU member states and candidate countries. He presented his analysis on three different levels: EU-Turkey relations; opinions and attitudes towards EU enlargement and prospective members; Transatlantic relations and security. His main emphasis was on the issue of trust between EU and prospective members as well as the need for further policies in mobilizing EU public opinion in favor of future enlargements.

The second panel on alternatives to the EU enlargement policy opened with the moderator Fuat Keyman's remarks which drew attention to the global nature of current challenges, such as security concerns, economic crisis and environmental problems. Keyman argued that alternatives to enlargement and full EU membership already take place in answers to these problems. He pointed out that the impact of the directions that the Arab spring will take and other political upheavals, such as increasing nationalism, rise of the extreme right, the decline of the West and increasing multipolarity on the EU's enlargement policy and the transatlantic relationship have to be discussed.

The first speaker, Michele Comelli assessed the positions of the EU and Turkey in the current international system, particularly in light of the Arab Spring. For Comelli, the EU and Turkey could fare better if they coordinated their foreign policies during this process. They both have the same interests in stability and preventing spillover of external conflicts in their neighbourhood, but individually the result of their foreign policy actions are not satisfactory. Another example is the Caucasus, where Turkey and the EU have shortcomings even in representation in various forms and vis-à-vis Russia. Therefore, Turkey and the EU have to find ways of increasing their impact and power by engaging in closer cooperation in foreign policy, in light of the stagnation in the EU's enlargement policy.

Funda Tekin, the second speaker, pointed out that in light of the difficulties in enlargement, it is necessary to look at alternatives to this policy, and forms of differentiated integration. Tekin highlighted that flexible integration is part of the EU system already, for instance, implementation of the *acquis* by the member states is different. Furthermore, EU treaties facilitate enhanced cooperation or permanent structured cooperation. Primary law accepts opt-outs, as in the case of Schengen or Euro. These and the latest example of fiscal compact which is outside the treaty framework and does not have two of the member states within are good news for Turkey, increasing prospects of differentiated integration. Depending on the evolution of the EU polity, and its capacity to widen and deepen, different scenarios and models could be developed.

The third speaker, Meliha Altunışık took the discussion further by exploring changes in Turkish foreign policy after the Arab uprisings and analysed the implications of these for Turkey and the EU foreign policy cooperation. Altunışık argued that Turkish policy-makers hoped to reap the

benefits of relying on soft power during this period, but this has not been possible. Hard power had to be used, for instance in Libya, economic sanctions came to fore against Syria and Turkey housed the Syrian opposition, which is novel and in contradiction with the Turkish foreign policy during the war in Iraq in 2003. Turkish foreign policy came closer to the American foreign policy as Turkey participated in NATO action in Libya and supported transition to democracy in other countries. While this means convergence with the EU position, Turkey being dragged into regional fault lines may lead to deterioration of the Turkey-EU relationship. In addition, although the EU can be more attractive if it worked with Turkey, currently concrete examples of cooperation and mechanisms do not exist, so Turkey and the EU are engaged in separate but parallel activities.

The discussant of the panel, Zerrin Torun highlighted that given the current problems in the EU-Turkey relationship, the speakers were right in pointing out the need for differentiated integration as an alternative to the EU enlargement policy. However, as scholars we need to take the discussion further by addressing the problems that are common in the literature on differentiated integration. First, the role of ideational and material factors in facilitating or making differentiated integration more difficult has to be explored. How to make differentiated integration or closer cooperation possible should be analyzed. The negative position of Turkey on privileged partnership with the EU and what the EU can offer to Turkey in such frameworks - given that previous forms of flexible partnership or integration such as the EU neighbourhood policy failed in bringing about change in third countries – should be assessed in detail. The impact of the public opinion and domestic politics on differentiated integration is another factor that needs to be assessed further. Points of divergence in Turkish and the EU foreign policy, arising out of the different nature of their activeness and ideational loyalties of governments in power have to be analysed as well. As noted by Prof. Altunışık, while Turkey openly supported the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, the EU claims to be in the ‘listening mode’ and refrains from holding sides. This case shows that the convergence in Turkish and the EU foreign policies may not be taken as given and how to make closer cooperation or differentiated integration possible needs to be studied further.

After these, the moderator opened the floor for further discussion during which the speakers found the opportunity to answer the questions raised by the participants to the workshop. Overall, the need for alternative forms of cooperation between Turkey and the EU was confirmed and fruitful exchange of opinion on the implications of current developments in the international arena, particularly the Arab Spring for Turkey-EU relations has been possible during the panel.

In the third session, Next Wave(s) of Enlargement: Turkey and South East Europe, Prof. Ahmet Evin outlined in detail the issues relating to Turkish membership to the EU and Turkey’s relations with the Union. He argued that classic membership to the Union no longer seemed to be feasible. Thus, it is important to engage in a fresh discussion which puts forward the question how can it be possible to have an enlarged EU which is coherent but at the same time embracing asymmetry. In that regard, the focus of the integration debate between Turkey and EU will have to be based on shared values on democracy, rule of law, and stability.

Following Prof. Evin’s talk, Domenico Fracchiola argued that following the big bang expansion and Euro crisis, the EU enlargement lost its transformative power, attractiveness in a period when Europe needed more of the EU not less. He posed the question whether or not the EU can afford to make enlargement to come to an end. The EU aims to propose alternatives to enlargement or

differentiated integration models. However, differentiated integration models are not easy to propose as domestic dynamics are very important in influencing the success of a differentiated model. With respect to Turkey, alternatives to enlargement are taboos and they are not very well received at the public level as well as at the bureaucratic state level. In that respect, the EU has to work on its relationship with the candidate countries to build trust and confidence. This can be seen in the effort of the EU Commissioner for Enlargement Füle's proposal of a "positive agenda" with Turkey in order to complement and strengthen the accession process. Dr. Francchiola also argued that structural and systemic differences do not make "Turkey and Western Balkans" a meaningful group for enlargement.

Prof. Dr. Visnja Samardzija argued that the Croatian case presented the facts that EU conditionality actually worked. Especially the "membership carrot" is relatively attractive for the candidate countries. However, in the case of Western Balkans it is possible to see that there are delayed prospects for membership with delayed accession, stricter conditionality, limited guarantees, new methodologies for enlargement, suspension clauses, new issues and benchmarks which are in the end causing lack of confidence to the enlargement process. Prof. Dr. Visnja Samardzija was suggesting that in order to deal with the challenges of ethnic conflicts, organized crime, weak administrative capacities and delayed transition in Western Balkans a strong prospect for membership will be useful.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valentin Petroussenko supported the argument that in Western Balkans there is disparity and weakness in institutional capacity. This is evident in FYROM as well where different ethnic groups create problematic issues. With relation to Turkey's accession Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valentin Petroussenko argued that Turkey's good economic performance can provide benefits for the EU in an era of economic crisis.

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Koeth argued that for the enlargement policy public opinion is important, but it may not be the only obstacle. Bilateral issues are also important and occasionally bilateral disputes are swept under the carpet which later creates problems such as in the case of Cyprus.

Taking into consideration of the points raised during the presentation, the discussant proposed the possibility to argue that there has been a consensus on the difficulties of how to put Turkey and the Western Balkans under one meaningful group for enlargement. On the other hand, there has been a consensus on having shared values as the basis for enlargement. Extended conditionality after membership can provide the monitoring mechanisms for furthering reforms following accession. Conditionality for accession can only work when there is a clear prospect for membership as well as when the trust for the EU is high. In Croatia's case conditionality has worked as the prospects for membership were clear. In order to increase the impact of conditionality medium term carrots can provide a strong incentive for furthering reforms and gaining public support for integration. This is especially valid in the period of continuous crisis that the EU is experiencing starting from the constitutional crisis extending into the Euro crisis. With these crises on the agenda of the EU, the Union's soft power capability to induce reforms and change is getting limited. One possible solution to enhance the capability is to advance integration in the accession processes through sectoral based integration. For example, furthering integration with visa liberalization or visa facilitation for the accession countries can keep the momentum of integration going.