
THE AGENDA:
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTS,
REPORTS AND EVENTS
JUNE 2010 - NOVEMBER 2010

By Richard Giragosian

1. “CHRONOLOGICAL REVIEW”

25-26 November 2010: The looming release of a sizable amount of confidential documents on the Internet by the WikiLeaks organization has triggered serious concern in Washington over the possible “diplomatic damage” in exposing some classified State Department cables and other U.S. military-related documents.

19-20 November 2010: During the annual NATO summit in Lisbon, alliance member states focused on persuading Turkey to sign on to America’s new missile defense plan, which in its early stages is designed to protect Europe from ballistic missile threats from “rogue countries.” Turkey agreed to the missile defense proposal after NATO agreed not to specifically name Iran or any other country as a threat. Under the terms of the new agreement, the U.S. will place X-Band radars in Turkey, which will substantially boost the effectiveness of the defense shield against missiles emanating from the Middle East. Turkey now seeks to secure a related agreement granting Ankara central command and control authority over the missile shield. For his part, Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan noted that since the missile defense system will “be on our territory,” then control “should definitely be handed to us.”

22 October 2010: A delegation led by Stuart Levey, the U.S. Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, met with Turkish officials and banking executives to coordinate the enforcement of new financial restrictions against Iran. Turkish banks are under added pressure to enforce the financial sanctions, especially as under current U.S. law, Turkish banks doing business in the United States could face stiff penalties for dealing with Iranian firms that are blacklisted by Washington.

18 October 2010: A trial of some 151 people, including 12 local mayors, accused of ties to the outlawed PKK opened in Diyarbakır. The defendants face charges ranging from membership in an illegal armed group to undermining Turkey’s territorial integrity. The trial, seen as a test of Turkey’s judicial system and rule of law, follows an earlier effort by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in July 2009 to seek a peaceful resolution to the Kurdish issue.

13 October 2010: Azerbaijan increases its defense budget for 2011 to 3.1 billion dollars, representing an increase of nearly 90 percent over last year’s level. Azerbaijani Finance Minister Samir Sharifov stated that roughly half of defense spending would be allocated for procurement of modern weapons systems.

12 September 2010: A national referendum on constitutional reforms in Turkey adopts a set of amendments to increase parliamentary control over the army and judiciary, with 58 percent of the roughly 50 million eligible voters supporting the changes. The EU welcomed the constitutional changes, which although centered on judicial reforms, was also viewed as a test for the ruling AKP prior to the country's parliamentary elections set for June 2011. The overall turnout for the referendum, which was on the 30th anniversary of the 1980 military coup d'état, was estimated at about 77 percent.

11-17 September 2010: A Turkish military delegation participated in a NATO exercise hosted by Armenia. The exercise, involving the participation of some twenty countries, although Azerbaijan declined to send any representatives to Armenia, was run by NATO's Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EAD-RCC). Turkish officials initially considered a temporary opening of the closed border with Armenia to "ensure the passage of military units for humanitarian purposes," but explaining that such a move would "not mean that the state border between Turkey and Armenia will be declared open." At the last minute, Turkey decided against the move, sending its delegation to Armenia through Georgia instead.

1 September 2010: After a successful diplomatic effort, Turkey formally assumed the rotating presidency of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), a position that is traditionally held for one month by each of the rotating chairing nations. Turkey's bid to secure the position marks an effective campaign by Ankara to broaden and expand its diplomatic influence.

20 August 2010: Armenian President Serzh Sarkisian noted that while Yerevan has sought to normalize relations with Turkey, the lack of political will in Ankara has obstructed this process, adding that "by initiating the process of normalization of relations with Turkey, Armenia invested it with logic of full-scale cooperation and mutually advantageous trade."

9 June 2010: Meeting in New York, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution to strengthen sanctions regime against Iran over its pursuit of a nuclear program. Turkey formally voted against the resolution, which Prime Minister Erdogan defined as a matter of Turkish "honor". Turkey has repeatedly supported the Iranian attempt for a civilian nuclear program and has called for the Iranian nuclear issue to be resolved by dialogue and diplomacy only. The Turkish government has been especially active on the Iran issue and, on 17 May 2010, partnered with Brazil in a diplomatic initiative to resolve the Iran crises by forging a new agreement with Iran that calls on Tehran to ship 1,200 kilograms of low enriched uranium, or roughly half of its stockpile, to Turkey for supervised enrichment, in return for 120 kilos of 20 percent enriched uranium in the form of fuel rods in exchange.

7 June 2010: Turkish Energy Minister Taner Yıldız signed a new agreement in Istanbul with his Azerbaijani counterpart Natiq Aliyev calling for the import of 388 billion cubic feet of natural gas from Azerbaijan. The new agreement, which will provide Turkey with gas from Azerbaijan's Shah Deniz field by 2017, is seen as a major step forward in the planned development of the Nabucco pipeline. The Nabucco consortium hailed the agreement, saying it would go a long way toward bringing energy security to Europe. The proposed Nabucco pipeline would run from Azerbaijan to Austria via Turkey and would carry 1.1 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year to Europe.

7 June 2010: Turkey formally calls for "international punishment" of Israel in the wake of its 30 May raid on a Turkish Gaza-bound aid ship. The Turkish government further urges an "immediate end to Israel's blockade" of Gaza. In what become known as the "flotilla" incident, Israeli military commandos boarded the "Mavi Marmara", one of six ships, roughly 120 kilometers west of Haifa en route to Gaza, and clash with protesters on board. The Israeli force regains control but nine Turkish activists are killed. In response, Turkey accused Israel of "state terrorism" and recalls its ambassador from Tel Aviv. On 3 June, several hundred activists from the flotilla landed at Istanbul, welcomed by thousands of cheering supporters waiting at the airport. The three planes also transported the coffins of the nine dead.

2. REPORTS OF INTEREST & NEWS FROM ACADEMIA AND THE "THINK THANK" WORLD

New Report: "Obama's Leverage: How to Improve U.S.-Turkish Relations." In its "Policy Watch No. 1725" released on 23 November 2010, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy's J. Scott Carpenter and Soner Çağaptay wrote about Turkish-U.S. relations.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

A foreign policy rift is emerging between the United States and Turkey's AKP government on a range of Middle East issues, including Iran's nuclear program, support for Hamas, and the deteriorating relations between Ankara and Israel. Some U.S. officials are concerned that Washington has little or no leverage to prevent further erosion, and the AKP's leadership seems to agree, apparently believing the United States needs Turkey more than Turkey needs the United States.

The full paper is available at: www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=3275

New Report: “A very special relationship. Why Turkey’s EU accession process will continue” On 11 November 2010, the European Stability Initiative (ESI) released a new report assessing Turkey’s EU accession process. The report noted that it was “thanks to its doggedness and its commitment to the EU process that Turkey is a much more democratic and economically resilient place than a decade ago” and went on to stress that “while nobody can look into the future, for now it is reasonable to expect there to be a lot more life in the Turkish accession story.”

The following is a brief summary of the report:

The widespread sense among observers that the Turkish EU accession process might be headed for imminent failure has been present from its very outset. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, however, the risk of a “train crash” in the accession talks is minimal. The reason for this is reassuringly self-evident: it is neither in Turkey’s interest, nor the EU’s, to derail the accession train.

We predict that even ten years from now, unless Turkey will have joined the EU as a full member, the accession process will be ongoing. Today’s relationship between Turkey and the EU is like a Catholic marriage: divorce is not an option for either side. The only question then is whether the couple will be happy or not and the only special partnership that is acceptable to Turkey and to the vast majority of EU members is one they have today – an open-ended accession process.

There are only two ways for the current accession talks to end or be suspended: one is for Turkey to give up and walk away from the negotiating table; the other is for the EU member states to decide on a suspension. The first of these scenarios would require a major policy shift inside Turkey, which is very unlikely. Imagining a scenario whereby the opponents of Turkish accession inside the EU succeed in suspending the negotiations is just as difficult – not only because it is not in their interests, but also because it is not in their power. The combined votes of Germany, France, Greece, Cyprus, the Netherlands and Austria (to name some of the countries where scepticism about Turkey’s EU membership has been an important part of the domestic debate) would fall far short of the 255 needed to suspend the negotiating process. Barring a return to the pattern of human rights abuses of the 1990s, a reintroduction of the death penalty or a military

takeover in Turkey, the EU cannot unilaterally stop a process to which it has committed itself under the Negotiating Framework. Here, all the cards are in the hands of Turkey's politicians.

The full paper is available at: www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_document_id_118.pdf

New Report: “Turkey and the EU: A ‘New’ European Identity in the Making?”

On 1 October 2010, Ingrid Kylstad released a report assessing the debate within the European Union (EU) generated by Turkey's application for EU membership. The report, LEQS Paper No. 27, is part of the Discussion Paper Series from the European Institute at the London School of Economics.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

This paper conducts an ontological inquiry into the identity of the European Union, and seeks to establish whether its core identity is of a cultural or political nature through looking at the debate generated by Turkey's application for EU membership. The concepts of ‘the other,’ the nation-state and a secularism rooted in Christianity contributes towards a peculiar culturalist understanding of the EU project both on the left and on the right side of the political spectrum. The debate also demonstrates that there is a gap between what the EU ought to be judging from its fundamental documents, and what kind form of the EU ‘Europe’ is ready for. The liberal idea of the EU being a purely political union based on Kantian ideals will require a whole new language for talking about Europe.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1708025>

New Report: “Turkey: Politics of Identity and Power,” was released on 21 September 2010 by the U.S. Congressional Research Service (CRS), the internal research and analysis arm of the U.S. Congress. Written by CRS analyst Carol Migdalovitz, the 33-page report presents an “overview of the current Turkish domestic political scene.” Although this internal report was not publicly released, it is available for TPQ readers by contacting our staff.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

Turkey has long been a valued U.S. NATO ally and strategic partner. Successive administrations have viewed it as a secular democracy that could serve as an inspiration or model for other Muslim majority

countries. However, the ruling AKP foreign policy decisions have led some U.S. observers, including Members of Congress, to question its future course. Domestic political developments may be enabling the AKP's greater assertiveness in international affairs and are, therefore, worthy of closer scrutiny. This report provides that examination via an overview of the current Turkish domestic political scene.

The main theme of the report is that the ongoing struggle for power in Turkey will determine the country's identity, and that will have consequences for U.S. policymakers. Turkey's secular identity has long been considered unique among majority Muslim states, as secularism was a founding principle of the modern Turkish Republic as well as the principle that has produced the most domestic political tension. The AKP, formed in 2001, has Islamist roots but claims to be conservative and democratic. Its emergence and acquisition of power have exacerbated concerns, especially in secularist circles, about whether AKP is intent on altering Turkey's identity. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and his AKP have governed in an increasingly confident manner since a court refused to ban the party for being "a focal point of anti-secular activities" in 2008.

Already in control of the executive and legislature, they have gained influence over bastions of secularism in the judiciary and military. These developments may enable the AKP to implement a domestic agenda that is more consistent with its core identity. However, the AKP has failed to deal comprehensively with a significant domestic group's struggle for recognition of its own identity – the Kurds in a majority Turkish state. The government initiated a "Kurdish opening," but managed it poorly, produced unfulfilled expectations, and may have contributed to an escalation in terrorism.

The unraveling of a series of alleged coup plots is another arena in which the struggle for power and identity between the AKP and its opponents is being played out. In the first, major alleged conspiracy, called Ergenekon, ultranationalists and secularists are said to have planned to create instability in the country in order to provide a pretext for the military to intervene and overthrow the government. Believers in the conspiracies, who include the AKP and its supporters, cite the revelations as evidence of Turkey's progress as a democracy because what is called the "deep state," or elite who have controlled the political system for 50 years, is finally being confronted. Skeptics charge that the AKP is using a fictitious affair to intimidate and weaken op-

ponents in the military, judiciary, media, and elsewhere who are ardent secularists, and that the authorities' handling of suspects fails to meet international legal standards, thereby marring Turkey's democratic advance. They also suggest that the enigmatic and powerful Fethullah Gülen Movement, a religious group, may be driving the investigations and is a new "deep state."

The AKP has appeared increasingly confident. Although its diminished plurality of votes in the 2009 municipal elections provided signs that it can be challenged, its victory in the September 2010 referendum on constitutional reforms produced doubts about whether AKP's ambitions to alter Turkey's identity and policies can be constrained. Nonetheless, the vote indicates that the AKP continues to function within the parameters of a democratic political system, albeit flawed, that allows these developments.

The full report is available from the TPQ Editorial Staff upon request.

New Book Chapter: "Battles, Barrels and Belonging: Turkey and its Black Sea Neighbors" Professor Ronald H. Linden, from the Department of Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh, presented a paper at the 2010 Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (APSA) in Washington DC, which met from 2-5 September 2010. The Linden paper will be published as a chapter in a forthcoming book entitled, *Getting to Zero: Turkey and its Neighbors in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Linden, Ahmet Evin, Kemal Kirişçi, Thomas Straubhaar, Nathalie Tocci, Juliette Tolay, and Joshua Walker.

The following is a brief summary of the forthcoming chapter:

Turkey's relations with its Black Sea neighbors are a product of both historical antecedents and future perspectives, of state-to-state ties and of Turkey's perception of itself as an "energy hub." While domestic factors drive important parts of Turkey's policy toward this region, powerful external actors, including the United States, the EU and especially Russia are key factors in understanding the dynamics of Turkey's relations with this part of its neighborhood.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1643577>

New Report: "Experts' Report on the Legal Education and Training System

in Turkey” In a report released in September 2010, Professor Julian Lonbay of the University of Birmingham’s School of Law (UK), outlines the findings of a group of European legal experts on the Turkish legal education and training system following visits to seven different regions of Turkey.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

This report outlines the findings of a group of European legal experts on the Turkish legal education and training system following scoping visits to seven different regions of Turkey: Adana, Ankara, Denizli, Elazığ, Istanbul, Samsun and Şanlıurfa.

The scoping visits took place in November 2008 and constituted the first practical activity of a joint project between the Union of Turkish Bars (Türkiye Barolar Birliği - TBB), three other project partners –The Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe (CCBE), the French Conseil National des Barreaux (CNB) and the Law Society of England and Wales (LSEW)– and four project associates –the Spanish Consejo General de la Abogacía Española (CGAE), the Italian Consiglio Nazionale Forense (CNF) the Polish Krajowa Rada Radców Prawnych (KRRP) and the Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag (ÖRAK) of Austria–. This 18-month project is funded by the European Union under the Civil Society Dialogue programme.

The general objectives of the “Promoting Civil Society Dialogue between Bars Through Legal Education” project are to review the legal education and training system in Turkey in the light of other European experiences and best practice and to foster an evidence-based debate within the Turkish legal profession, prior to reforming the initial education and training system as well as introducing a continuous professional education system.

This report contributes to the above-mentioned objectives in several ways. It includes in its annexes individual reports on the seven scoping visits, relying on a methodology of direct observations, interviews and discussions with the various stakeholders identified (bar association officials, practicing lawyers, trainers and trainees, court and police officials). The body of the report, resulting from subsequent discussions between experts and Union of Turkish Bars officials, offers a description of the current legal education and training system in Turkey and provide a “gaps and needs” analysis in light of other European experiences and best practice. Finally, the report will be

translated into Turkish and used in subsequent project activities, notably regional workshops as well as the project closing conference, so as to foster an evidence-based debate on the issue within the Turkish legal profession.

Co-authored Dr Julian Lonbay, (chair of the expert group), Birmingham Law School, University of Birmingham (UK), Chair of the CCBE Training Committee; Me Marc Jobert, Paris, (France) Dr Florence Lec, Amiens University (France) Mr Mickaël Laurans, International Policy Manager, Law Society of England and Wales, London (UK) Abogada Marta Isern, Barcelona (Spain) Avvocato Roberto Sorcinelli, Cagliari (Italy) Radca Prawny Agata Adamczyk, Kraków (Poland) Rechtsanwalt Frank Markus Nestl, Vienna (Austria), Me Florence Legrand, CNB, (France)

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1677818>

New Article: “Open-Ended Membership Prospect and Commitment Credibility: Explaining the Deadlock in EU–Turkey Accession Negotiations” Professor Mehmet Uğur, from the University of Greenwich (UK), published an article examining the “dynamics of deteriorating reform” in Turkey and the “weakening EU commitment to Turkish membership since the start of the open-ended accession negotiations process in 2005.” The article appeared in the September 2010 issue of the *Journal of Common Market Studies* (Vol. 48, No. 4, pp. 967-991).

The following is a brief summary of the article:

After the enlargement of 2004, the EU has introduced an open-ended framework for accession negotiations. Although the ultimate aim is still to ensure the integration of candidate countries, the timing and modality of membership is not guaranteed in advance. This article utilizes a political economy model to demonstrate that open-ended accession negotiations would lead to suboptimal outcomes in the form of inadequate convergence reforms undertaken in the candidate country and poor membership prospect offered by the EU. This analytical finding is compatible with and can be useful in understanding the dynamics of deteriorating reform output in Turkey and weakening EU commitment to Turkish membership since the start of the open-ended accession negotiations process in 2005. Two necessary conditions must be satisfied to overcome such adverse outcomes in the enlargement process: (i) the EU and the accession country must renew their commitments to reform and integration through a new political bargain;

and (ii) they should follow this bargain with periodic summits for co-ordinating their commitments in the face of shocks to, or emerging deadlocks in, the process of open-ended accession negotiations.

The article is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1660079>

New Report: “Human Rights in Political Party and Government Programs: Inferences from the Case of Turkey” Professor Zehra Arat, from Purchase College at SUNY, presented a paper at the Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (APSA), which met in Washington from 2-5 September 2010.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

Political parties are essential to representative democracies and important in agenda setting and shaping the political discourse, even if they fall short of forming the government or acquiring seats in the parliament. Focusing on the case of Turkey, this paper assesses the extent to which human rights have been incorporated into the programs of political parties and governments, identifies the pattern of change in their discourse, and examines the relationship between the human rights approaches displayed in political party and government programs. The manifest and latent content analyses of 95 party programs and 60 government program, as well as the human rights content of constitutions, are conducted for the period of 1923-2000. The longitudinal analysis of Turkey as a case study, which employs government as the unit of analysis and combines quantitative and qualitative methodologies, is used to develop an alternative to the theories (e.g., modernization theory; boomerang theory/spiral model) that are commonly employed to explain changes in a country's human rights discourse and practices. Abstract will be provided by author.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1642179>

New Paper: “Hegemonic Preservation or Horizontal Accountability: Constitutional Review in Turkey” Yasushi Hazama, from JETRO, the Institute of Developing Economies (Japan), presented a paper at the Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (APSA), which met in Washington from 2-5 September 2010. Hazama analyzed the “question of hegemonic preservation versus horizontal accountability” by utilizing coded data of the Turkish Constitutional Court's decisions from 1984-2007.

The following is a brief summary of the paper:

The major obstacle to the consolidation of democracy has been the lack of horizontal accountability and transgressions of the executive branch of government. Constitutional review, as it is designed to prevent majoritarian tyranny, should be able to reinforce horizontal accountability. Most recently, however, it has been argued that constitutional review favors the hegemony of the elite representative of the center of a society that is divided by the center-periphery cleavage. If this hegemonic preservation thesis applies to emerging democracies, then constitutional review would hamper rather than promote democratic consolidation.

This paper addresses the question of hegemonic preservation versus horizontal accountability with a Turkish case, in which the center-periphery cleavage has been persistent and constitutional review has been institutionalized for the last half-century. Is the Turkish Constitutional Court keener to preserve the hegemony of the state-elite who represent the center or to rectify incumbent transgressions? The coded data of the Turkish Constitutional Court's decisions during the 1984-2007 period are analyzed using quantitative (two-level mixed-effects logistic regression model) and qualitative methods. The dependent variable is the binary decision of the Court to either accept or reject each of the unconstitutionality claims included in a referral. The independent variables are referring authorities (of a state-elite or non-state-elite background) and referral reasons (based on state principles or horizontal accountability).

The results show (1) that for referrals from main opposition parties, the Court did not favor state-elite parties over non-state-elite parties and (2) that the Court was more likely to accept referral reasons that alleged executive transgressions than those that alleged the violation of state principles. Among referrals from presidents, those from state-elite presidents did result in unconstitutionality decisions with a very high probability. Yet, those referrals were much fewer than referrals from main opposition parties. Moreover, state-elite presidents' unconstitutionality claims were accepted by the Court not so much for reasons of state principles as horizontal accountability. In sum, the evidence points to Court preference for horizontal accountability over hegemonic preservation.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1642116>

New Paper: "New Media and Public Opinion during Hard Times: A Case

Study of Turkey” M. Selcan Kaynak, from Boğaziçi University’s Department of Political Science, and Didem Türkoğlu presented a joint paper at the Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (APSA), which met in Washington from 2-5 September 2010. Kaynak and Türkoğlu assessed the preliminary results of a project which explores the socio-political consequences of social network sites among Turkish youth.

The following is a brief summary of the paper:

The paper presents preliminary results of a project which explores the socio-political consequences of social network sites (SNS). More specifically, the study looks into how a significant segment of Turkish youth utilizes Facebook to form, maintain and manage networks; the nature of the conversation they carry on in the networked space and the implications of such activity for their political socialization process – given the highly polarized, crisis-ridden everyday political culture of the country.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1642649>

New Paper: “Diffusing Liberal Market and Democratic Values: Assessing Turkey’s ‘Soft Power’ in Transforming its Neighborhood” Kemal Kirişçi presented a paper at the Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association (APSA), which met in Washington from 2-5 September 2010, analyzing whether Turkey can have “a role to play in assisting or diffusing democracy in its neighborhood.”

The following is a brief summary of the paper:

The aim of this paper is to address a question that at first may seem unusual: does or can Turkey have a role to play in assisting or diffusing democracy in its neighborhood? The idea of Turkey as a partner that could contribute to democracy diffusion and promotion may at first be puzzling. Actually, a leading scholar of democracy promotion, Richard Youngs, immediate reaction to the idea was more like along the lines of Turkey being associated with “non-diffusion” of democracy. Turkey is not exactly a bastion of pluralist democracy let alone a declared agent for diffusing democracy into its neighborhood. Yet, in policy circles there is also a long tradition of citing Turkey as a “model”. Diamond takes the idea of Turkey as a “model” of democracy going back to the early 1970s but notes how Turkish democracy drifted into trouble especially with the violence and instability of the late 1970s followed by

a military coup in 1980. He underlines how in spite of an initial round of economic and political reforms in 1987 when Turkey applied for EU membership, Turkey was at best an “illiberal democracy”. While the history of Turkish democracy is more than half a century long, it is clearly characterized by ups and downs. Turkey’s engagement with the EU did improve and liberalize its democracy. Currently, Freedom House lists Turkey only as an “electoral” but not “liberal democracy. But, as Youngs, points out “Democracy has been increasingly acknowledged to be less a simple absolute – either entirely present or fully absent – ... and more a matter of degree, with states possessing different strong and weak attributes along a spectrum of democratic quality”. Does that mean Turkey could be a promoter of democracy in its neighborhood?

The thesis of this paper is that in spite of an absence of experience in democracy assistance and deficiencies in its own democracy Turkey by “default” is actually involved in a modest exercise of democracy diffusion. The “default” diffusion of democracy from Turkey is mediated through at least three channels: demonstrative effect, various government initiatives that indirectly address democracy promotion issues and the transnational activities of Turkish civil society. The paper will also argue that the very fact that Turkish democracy is a “work in progress” project is in itself an asset from the perspective of cooperation with recipients or targets of democracy promotion. It diffuses the tension resulting from the real or perceived hierarchical relations between donor and recipient and engenders a sense of solidarity. At a time when a debate in the U.S. and the EU on reforming democracy promotion and assistance policies is expanding Turkey could well be considered as a partner and an asset. Engaging Turkey can contribute to the reform process of democracy promotion, bring to democracy promotion in Turkey’s neighborhood a value added and also assist Turkey in broadening and deepening its own democracy.

The paper is composed of three sections. The first maps out domestic political changes that have helped create a capacity for the diffusion of democratic values and entrepreneurship. Particular attention is given to examining the emergence of Turkish channels of diffusion such as trade, movement of people, government policies and civil society. The second section surveys the reasons that have brought about these sea changes in Turkey. These reasons will be grouped into those emanating from the international, regional and domestic levels. The third section addresses the issue of “impact” of Turkey in terms of

democracy support in its neighborhood through the aforementioned three “channels” of diffusion. The empirical part of the analysis is primarily based on a set of interviews held with government officials, civil society representatives and experts in Turkey as well as in a number of neighboring countries.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1644657>

New Report: “Disciples of the State? Historical Legacies and State Control of Social Discipline in Turkey and Greece” In a Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Working Paper released on 19 August 2010, Kristen Fabbe analyzes the historical course of Turkey’s process of modernization and secularization.

The following is a brief summary of the working paper:

Through a detailed case study of late Ottoman and early Republican Turkey, this paper presents an argument for why Mustafa Kemal’s founding regime was able to assert control over institutions of social discipline so decisively in the 1920s. The argument is built around an understanding of two historical legacies that had a substantial impact on founding regimes’ ability to consolidate state control throughout the former Ottoman World: 1) the “deep” cultural legacy of Ottoman administration via the millet system; and 2) the more immediate institutional legacy of early modernizing reforms. I question the prevailing assumption that Turkey’s process of modernization and secularization was unique to the region. Instead of juxtaposing the Turkish case against failed attempts at secularization and state centralization in the Muslim majority countries to its east, I argue that a relevant comparative case exhibiting similar dynamics can be found by looking west. Through a brief and stylized comparative case study of modernizing reforms in 19th century Greece, I highlight a number of generalizable conclusions about the conditions necessary for the successful state consolidation of institutions of social discipline in the former Ottoman world.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1662128>

New SETA Policy Brief: “Why Welcome Al Basheer? Contextualizing Turkey’s Darfur Policy” In a new policy paper released by the SETA Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research, Birol Akgün and Mehmet Özkan, from Sevilla University (Spain), analyzes the underlying elements of the Muslim world’s reaction toward the Darfur crisis by critically evaluating Turkey’s involvement. The paper, released in July 2010, was Policy Brief No. 45 of the SETA Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research.

The following is a brief summary of the paper:

This study analyses the underlying elements of the Muslim world’s reaction toward the Darfur crisis by critically evaluating Turkey’s involvement. Turkey is important because it has been cited as a rising star of 21st century in the Muslim world not only for its growing economic potential and deepening democratic credentials, but also with its recent pro-active diplomatic initiatives in conflict areas such as in the Middle East, the Balkans and the Caucasus.

Turkey’s Darfur policy has been one of its most criticized in recent times. Although the criticisms leveled against this policy have some merit, they do not provide much insight into the motivations behind Turkey’s approach to Darfur. Thus, Ankara’s distinctive approach to Darfur and Khartoum requires a thorough, in-depth analysis within the context of Turkey’s changing role in regional and global affairs. It is argued that on the Darfur issue, Turkish policy has been characterized by convergence and distinction from the official position of the Muslim-Arab world.

We argue that the Turkish approach to Darfur has been mainly shaped by three elements: the international environment/discourse on “the war on terror” since 2002; Turkey’s recently deepening political and economic engagement with the Arab world and Africa; and Ankara’s search for a new political “language” on Darfur, a middle ground between the West’s claims of “genocide” and defending Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir. In sum, Turkey’s Darfur policy can be described as an example of “passive quiet diplomacy” in a highly complex international environment.

The full paper is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1641357>

New Report: “Cyprus: Reunification Proving Elusive,” was released on 16 June 2010 by the U.S. Congressional Research Service (CRS), the internal research and analysis arm of the U.S. Congress. The 16-page report was written by CRS analyst Vincent Morelli. Although this internal report was not publicly released, it is available for TPQ readers by contacting our staff.

The following is a brief summary of the report:

Attempts to resolve the Cyprus problem and reunify the island have undergone various levels of negotiation for almost 40 years. Beginning in 2008, Cyprus President Dimitris Christofias, a Greek Cypriot, and the former Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat engaged in what appeared to be a positive and concerted effort to reach some type of acceptable solution. However, by the end of March 2010 time and politics ran out on both. On 18 April 2010, Turkish Cypriot voters selected a new leader, Derviş Eroğlu of the National Unity Party (UBP). Eroğlu, a 72-year-old physician, and long-time politician, led a political party that included some who have advocated a permanently divided island and international recognition for the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). During the political campaign in the north, Eroğlu criticized Talat for what he thought were too many concessions to the Greek Cypriot side. However, since then Eroğlu has reassured everyone that he will continue with the negotiations.

For his part, Republic of Cyprus President Dimitris Christofias had experienced his own internal political difficulties as one of his governing coalition partners, the Socialist Party (EDEK), quit the governing coalition over disagreements with the President’s negotiating strategy. Almost immediately following the EDEK decision, hard-liners in the other coalition partner, the Democratic Party (DIKO), also criticized Christofias for what they considered to be too many concessions to the Turkish Cypriot side. These disagreements continued into May when the Greek Cypriot National Council, the political body that advises the President on Cyprus settlement issues, apparently failed to agree on a joint communiqué outlining the negotiating strategy for the new round of talks with Eroğlu. This lack of consensus raises the question of whether Christofias can be guaranteed support for whatever negotiated solution he could achieve with Eroğlu.

The change in leadership in the north from Talat to Eroğlu initially raised the question of whether prospects for a settlement that would end the political division of Cyprus would enter a period of retrench-

ment with possibly more difficult negotiations ahead dominated by harder-line views on both sides. It also called into question whether the “understandings” reached between Christofias and Talat would form the basis for the new round of talks. Both sides had repeated that the talks would resume from where they left off, although it is somewhat unclear exactly where Christofias and Talat left off as neither side officially revealed any of the so-called “convergences” that they had apparently arrived at before Talat left office. Nevertheless, the first round of the new talks was held on 26 May 2010, and continued briefly on June 3 and again on June 15. Four additional sessions have been scheduled through the end of July. Both Cristofias and Eroğlu have stated their desire to reach a solution, but most predict a difficult period ahead.

The United States has long maintained a position of strong support for a negotiated settlement. This has been reaffirmed by the Obama Administration. Many Members of Congress have continued to maintain their interest in Cyprus during the 111th Congress, partly due to keen constituent concern. Congressional hearings could be anticipated on the future of the negotiations as the new round of talks begin.

The full report is available from the TPQ Editorial Staff upon request.

New Article: “Public Attitudes towards the Tüurban Ban in Turkey” Professor Ali Çarkoğlu published an article assessing the “tüurban ban” (headscarf ban) controversy in Turkish politics from “an empirical and behavioural perspective.” The article appeared in the June 2010 issue of the *Utrecht Law Review* (Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 145-157).

The following is a brief summary of the article:

This paper looks at the tüurban ban controversy in Turkish politics from an empirical and behavioural perspective. With the aid of a number of nationwide surveys I aim to clarify how the ban on the tüurban in public spaces is being evaluated by different segments of Turkish society. Who supports which policy options and who opposes these options for what reasons? The policy implications of these findings will be evaluated in the concluding section.

The article is available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1625661>

3.EVENTS OF NOTE

Event of Note: Turkey, Europe and the International System to 2025 On 8 November 2010, Chatham House hosted Turkish President Abdullah Gül for a discussion on Turkey and its place in the evolving international system. Chaired by Dr Robin Niblett, the session featured a formal presentation by President Gül, who was recently awarded with this year's Chatham House Prize, which was followed by a lively discussion.

For more information and for the complete transcript, go to: http://www.chatham-house.org.uk/files/17759_081110gul.pdf

Event of Note: Atlantic Council of the U.S. Black Sea Energy and Economic Forum

The 2010 Black Sea Energy and Economic Forum (BSEEF) was held in Istanbul, Turkey from 29 September - 1 October 2010, following the inaugural Forum last year in Bucharest, Romania. The forum is a unique annual initiative that brings business and policy leaders together to discuss Eurasia's leading economic and energy challenges, and aims to develop best policy solutions to help the region be a center for economic cooperation, investment and trade.

For more information and for session transcripts, go to: www.acus.org/event/black-sea-energy-and-economic-forum-2010