

## **TURKEY-EU RELATIONS: A GEOPOLITICAL EXAMINATION**

*The EU, which is defined by its own officials as 'a superpower under construction', will have to deal with a series of economic, political-institutional, cultural-social and geopolitical challenges due to enlargement. The author of this paper argues that given the inevitable problems that lie ahead of the EU and Turkey's many xx, Turkey stands no chance of joining the EU in the next 20 years no matter what it does. The paper further explores the ideological-psychological, ethnic, political-institutional, geopolitical, historical and economic dimensions of the policies that can be pursued by the EU towards Turkey within this time span. In light of these arguments the author suggests that for harmonious relations with the EU, Turkey should cease to aim for full membership and manage its relations through a framework other than that of the EU.*

**Ümit Özdağ\***

---

\* The author is the Head of the Eurasia Strategic Research Center, Ankara

The controversy over Turkey-EU relations is continuing at full speed along the wrong axis. The crux of the controversy is the question of whether Turkey should carry out the EU's demands to become eligible for membership and to what extent it should carry out these demands. On the face of it, there are no political parties or groups that object to Turkey's accession to the EU. The main disagreement is over the question of how far Ankara should go in changing the Turkish state's fundamental principles for the sake of joining and how fast it should do this.

Actually, the idea that Turkey should fulfil the criteria set by the EU in order to be able to join this organization is a wrong starting point for any discussion over the issue of membership. The main determinant of Turkey's prospects for membership is not what it is doing or will be doing to qualify for membership but the EU's political, economic, cultural, social and geopolitical needs and priorities. The EU has been honest enough to explain that even if a candidate for membership has carried out the Copenhagen Criteria, it might not become a full member if its accession to the EU gives rise to economic and/or social problems within the EU.

This study will examine the fundamental problems that will be facing the EU in the next 20-25 years and the implications of these problems for Turkey's EU policies.

### ***1. The EU as a Nascent Super Power and its Fundamental Problems***

It would seem to make sense to start by trying to explain what exactly the EU is. This organization is the political, military, economic and cultural product of Western Europe's bid to once more rise to global preeminence - a position it forfeited back in the 16th century - in what has been a bipolar world since World War II. The EU, which currently consists of 15 member-states, will implement two major expansion projects in the next ten years to increase the number of its members to 27, will spread over most of the Continent and will have a population of over 480 million.

This is one of the most ambitious and fast-progressing projects in the history of mankind. Obviously like all projects, this undertaking entails many risks and challenges as well as benefits.

However, regarding the EU simply as Europe's response to the bipolar world order that emerged in the wake of World War II and to ignore the EU's philosophical and historical foundations would be to take too simplistic a view of things. For ever since the collapse of the Roman Empire, Europe has been in search of a Pax Romana.

There have been many efforts to establish such a Union in Europe since the disintegration of the Roman Empire. After Charlemagne's Holy Roman Empire, it was Napoleon and Hitler who came close to achieving the ideal of a unified Europe, which was endorsed by gigantic intellectuals like Victor Hugo and Kant I. Yet no undertaking has been so successful as the EU project implemented in the second half of the twentieth century.

In this sense, what the EU signifies is the actualization of what has been Europe's utopia since the disintegration of the Roman Empire. The EU has felt a greater need to expedite the process of its transformation into a superpower since September 11.

The EU, which is described by its own officials as "a superpower under construction," will enter one of the most crucial stages in its struggle to become a superpower in the next 20 years. The EU's becoming a superpower depends on its achieving the project of its political unification, its building a fully-developed European, political, and social identity and its creating a Europe prepared to pay "blood tax."

The challenges facing the EU could be catalogued in the following fashion:

***a. Economic Challenges***

***b. Political-Institutional Challenges***

***c. Cultural-Social Challenges***

***d. Geopolitical Challenges***

These are difficulties that the EU has to surmount if it is to turn into a meaningful political body and a geopolitical force. The EU will spend the next 20 years addressing these challenges.

***a. Economic Challenges***

The EU will achieve a serious geopolitical and market expansion by making the entire Central and South-Eastern Europe a part of the EU market in the next six months. However, the economic cost of this expansion will be higher than its benefits in the short term. For the new markets integrating with the EU market are way behind the EU economy in every sense and Brussels' main goal will be to integrate these markets with the remaining sections of the EU market and to enable them to approximate to the economies of EU member states.

The EU needs quite an appreciable amount of funds to increase the per capita income of new members from \$5,600 to Greece and Portugal's level of \$10,000, which is well below the EU average of \$24,000. Overcoming problems such as the fact that the socio-economic infrastructures of former socialist states are anachronistic and that 25 percent of the population of countries like Poland consists of peasants is not easy even for the EU. For what is in question is the integration of as many as 115 million people with this organization. After having admitted an 8,000,000-strong Greece into the Union in 1981, the EU delayed taking any action until 1986 in connection with Spain and Portugal's applications for membership in 1983 on the grounds of the burden placed on the EU by the Greek economy. Notwithstanding the fact that the EU economy has grown to an extent beyond comparison with its state in the 1980s, historical facts suggest that the inclusion of some 115 million people within the EU will place great pressures on the Union's overall economy.

In order to impart a notion about the amount of economic burden that the expansion project will entail, it will suffice to say that as a result of new accessions between 2004 and 2008, the per capita income of EU citizens will decrease by 23 percent. It will be at least 10-12 years before the 115 million people who have joined the EU begin to play a role in the EU's economic development. Basically we are talking about the years 2018-2020. For Turkey to become an EU member within this time span is not rational at all from Brussel's standpoint in economic terms. For by allowing Turkey to join, the EU would end up placing an additional

burden of \$50 billion on its economy rather than drawing any benefits from Turkey's accession.

The Turkish market has in any way become a part of the EU market within the framework of the Customs Union Agreement thanks to a treaty that has virtually caused Turkey to be reduced to a colony. In other words, Turkey's accession to the EU as a full member within the next 20 years is not rational in economic terms from the EU's standpoint.

### ***b. Political-Institutional Challenges***

Today the EU is an economic giant but a political spastic. Yet it is trying hard to change this situation. For the EU's goal of becoming a superpower requires a joint political will beyond simple economic force. In other words, it requires the power resulting from economic unification to be translated into political terms. To achieve this goal, the EU stepped up the pace of its economic and commercial unification following the Maastricht Summit in 1991. It also achieved unification in political and military terms.

Today, the EU is struggling to find an answer to the question of how best to use this political-military will. While member states like Germany and Italy espouse federation, Britain maintains that the EU should have a confederate rather than a federal structure. In short, the EU is in a position where it has to decide what sort of superpower it needs to become in the future.

Obviously, the problem is not limited to the question of what sort of power the EU will become. The EU member-states make different definitions of their interests as nation states. There are differences between the interests of many EU member-states. These differences complicate the process whereby the EU is becoming a political and institutional body and present an obstacle to the EU's emerging as a superpower.

The "Future of Europe Convention" is a bid by the EU to establish a political framework that will allow it to use its unified political and military will more easily and effectively, as **needed by its goal** to emerge as a superpower. It is not yet known whether this framework will be a federation or a confederation. What we do know is that in either case there is an interesting political project that will entail new concepts and models.

The political-constitutional frame that will emerge at the end of the Convention will require another process for its implementation. This will not be an easy process. The government structures of some 28 states will be recreated in a new constitutional-political process. This stage will be followed by a process whereby the newly created institutions will evolve into mature organizations. Obviously this will require quite some time.

As this process is continuing, a country like Turkey, which would acquire great representative power in the EU's democratic mechanisms by dint of its population, might steer the democratic process within the EU toward unexpected directions. For Brussels, which is anxious to ensure that this process evolves into a stable framework, Ankara will not be a viable partner.

### ***c. Cultural-Social Challenges***

Demographic data suggests that the EU population, which currently stands at 377,792,670, will rise to 423,420,967 after the first wave of expansion and to 453,628,782 after the second. In terms of age average, this population is superior to those of the United States, Japan and the Russian Federation. It could be considered the most quality population in the world in terms of the percentage of qualified people. Yet these data do not mean that the EU demography is not problematic.

From a cultural standpoint, the EU is as heterogeneous as was the ancient Roman Empire and the former Soviet Union in more recent times. It is less lucky than either in that the number of different cultures that it embodies in a nation-state form will increase to 25 after the first wave of expansion and to 27 after the second. In this sense, compared with the efforts to create a Pax Romana or a Soviet citizen, it will be much more difficult to create a common European or EU identity. National identities that have developed within nation-state patterns will take a long time to evolve into a new and common identity. Such an evolution will have drastic implications for the ideologies of nation-states and for the religious and historical systems forming the basis of these ideologies.

However, there is a sense in which the EU is well positioned to overcome the identity crisis that is awaiting its members. All the EU member-states belong to the Christian culture. With the exception of Orthodox Greeks, people belonging to Catholic and Protestant denominations predominate the Union. Europeans have a sense of a common history resulting from the wars they fought against one another. All this will facilitate the emergence of a new political identity.

The Turks' accession to Europe will cause a "foreign body reaction" in a relatively homogeneous geo-culture. From a historical standpoint, Turks have been "the other" that contributed to the formation of a European identity. Europeans discovered who they were by defining themselves in terms of who they were not, i.e. Turks. The cultural and social cost of Turkey's accession to the EU, which faces the challenge of extensive heterogeneity despite possessing some sort of cultural homogeneity, would simply be unbearable.

Moreover, Turkey's large and fast-increasing population is a matter of serious concern to the EU. By 2025, the EU's population will have reached 481 million, on the condition that it does not grow after 2008, whereas Turkey's population will be 82 million. In other words, Turkey's population will constitute some 17 percent of the EU's population. By 2050, the population of the EU will have decreased to 419 million, while Turkey's population will have reached 103 million, corresponding to one quarter of the EU's population. In strategic terms, the EU perceives Turkey as a demographic threat in the medium and long term.

On the other hand, it is feared that by joining the EU or making headway toward EU membership in the next five years, Turkey will strengthen the hand of ultra-right parties in the EU whose rising popularity is considered a response to an identity crisis.

#### ***d. Geopolitical Challenges***

The EU is a civilization model and possesses its own geopolitical realities like all civilizations. The EU is generating its geopolitics only now. The two expansion waves in the offing will be the result of a geopolitical rather than an economic necessity. Eastern Europe faced instability in the wake of the Soviet Union's withdrawal from the region. The area was included within the EU geopolitics in a bid to prevent instability from threatening the EU.

The geopolitics of the EU, which currently consists of France, Spain, Sweden, Germany, Finland, Italy, Britain, Greece, Portugal, Austria, Ireland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg, will undergo a radical transformation in the next six years. The EU's geopolitics will assume a continental quality as a result of the accession of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta and the Southern Cyprus Greek Administration in the first wave of expansion and of Romania and Bulgaria in the second wave of expansion.

The EU is currently spread over an area of 3,238,062 square km. At the end of the first expansion, some 735,010 square km will be added to the current EU territory, increasing it to 3,973,072 square km. The second expansion will entail an additional 348,410 square km, increasing the overall EU territory to 4,321,482 square km.

After the second wave of expansion, European states outside the EU will be Ukraine, Moldavia, White Russia, Russia, Serbia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Macedonia, and Turkey. (Most probably, Serbia and Macedonia, which have not yet applied for membership in the EU, will have joined. As such, the EU will command a territory extending from the Baltic Sea in the north to Eastern Mediterranean in the south and will neighbor White Russia, the Russian Federation, Moldavia and Ukraine in the east and the Turkish Thrace in the southeast. Whether they join the EU or not, the said Balkan states will integrate with this organization in the sense that they will be islands in the EU sea.

This continental geography constitutes a very favorable geopolitical framework. This framework, wherein Russia does not pose a threat and occasional Balkan wars are under control, provides the EU with the sort of environment it needs to evolve into a superpower. Turkey's accession to the EU at this stage would cause the EU to expand beyond its safe continental geopolitical area and share borders with the most problematic subsystems of the globe. The EU would suddenly find itself in a situation where it had to generate a policy toward the Middle East, the Caucasus, and Turkistan. It would be drawn into a rivalry with the current hegemonic power of the world that it would like to avoid at this stage. What all this would amount to would be what might be termed a geopolitical miscarriage.

Owing to these circumstances, Turkey stands no chances of joining the EU in the next 20 years no matter what it does. The foregoing has certainly not been an exercise in subjective speculation but a consideration of the objective requirements of geopolitics, geoculture, and geo-economy. The EU is a political entity based on rationality rather than emotions and those ruling this entity have been more honest toward the Turkish people than Turkish politicians themselves in that they have occasionally said, albeit unofficially, that negotiations with Turkey will not start before 2010. Supposing negotiations start in 2010 - and that is an optimistic projection - they will last 10 years, bringing us to the year 2020.

The question we should ask ourselves in light of all this is what sort of policy toward Turkey the EU will pursue until 2020, why it has adopted such a policy and what sort of a Turkey it will want to see between 2020-2025. In the rest of this paper we will be examining the fundamental parameters of the EU's policy toward Turkey.

## ***II. The EU's Policy Toward Turkey***

The termination of the Cold War changed the international system in a way that precluded the possibility of the EU remaining unaffected by what was going on. The EU could not possibly

have pursued the same political and economic targets in the 1990s and after 2000 as it did in the 1950s.

Ankara has failed to understand the change in the EU's mindset that has taken place over the years and the international implications of this change. It fails to make a correct analysis of its relations with the EU under the changed circumstances of the post-Cold War era. Thus, with a political approach based on emotion rather than realistic analysis, it is maintaining its relations with the EU in accordance with a treaty signed in 1963. However, the perception that Turkey is a country belonging to the southeastern wing of NATO and offsetting the Soviet-Russian threat posed to the NATO's Central European front is a Cold War attitude that has long since lost its validity. Moreover, if Turkey took part in the Western alliance during the Cold War era, this was not because it was regarded as a European state but because the United States and Western Europe needed Turkey for strategic reasons.

The above mentioned geopolitical parameters are the determinants of the EU's attitude toward Turkey. There is a point in reiterating that a premature birth in a geopolitical sense will take place if Turkey joins the EU earlier than expected. The EU's becoming a superpower practically depends on Turkey's accession to the Union. This is because the Turkish geography possesses the ideal qualities for all global actors seeking to rise to preeminence in the Middle East, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea regions. Because Turkey is situated close to energy reserves and is an *energy passageway* itself, it is a country with a region that is very appealing to all powers that are poor in carbon energy.

On the other hand, the EU regards Asia Minor as a part of Europe from a historical-geopolitical perspective. It is not possible to examine Turkey-EU relations irrespective of the history of the Turks' relations with Europe. History is integral to everything. The history of Turkey-Europe relations actually constitutes a significant portion of world history. Following the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, the Turks not only entered Asia Minor but also the territory of the Byzantine Empire, which was a European state. For some 250 years, Europe refused to recognize the Turkish dominance of Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean. A series of Crusades were launched one after the other in order to drive the Turks out of Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean.

The Crusaders' efforts failed to stop the Turks' advance in Europe, which culminated in the siege of Vienna for a second time some 612 years after the Battle of Manzikert. Following the Turkish conquest of Istanbul, Europe's borders were pulled back as far west as Istanbul in the mind of Europeans. It was not before excavations of Greek settlements in Asia Minor were undertaken and missionary schools spread all over Asia Minor that the European origins of Asia Minor were rediscovered.

Europe regards an Anatolia without the Turks as part of Europe. The Turks' 703-year-long advance into Europe under Seljuk and Ottoman dynasties was followed by a 156-year-long era of retreat from Europe. The year 1918 marks the victory of the last Crusade against the Turks and that same year, the British Prime Minister saw no harm in disclosing their aim to drive the Turks out of Anatolia.

*Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the only political and military genius in the last 400 years of Turkish history, extended our borders from the River of Sakarya, the last point of withdrawal during the Turkish War of Independence, to their current status. Acting on the premise that power is*

the prerequisite of independence, he undertook to build a modern, powerful, independent and honorable Turkish nation state. He established a state that Europe respected and feared. For Ataturk knew that a nation needed to be powerful if it was to be independent and honorable. He was aware that Europe regarded the Lausanne Treaty not as a final peaceful settlement but as a provisional cease-fire. He expressed this most plainly in his address to the youth and issued a warning to future generations. There he says that the only way to establish relations with the world on an equal and honorable basis is to be powerful.

All social events take place against a historical background and can be subjected to a meaningful assessment only if the historical background is taken into consideration. There is no way of correctly understanding the Turkey-EU relations without taking into consideration the 853-year-long interval between 1071 and 1922.

Actually, many Turkish politicians who want Turkey to join the EU in good faith believe that Turkey's accession will transform the cease-fire that took place in Lausanne into an ultimate peaceful settlement and that the EU will not bear any more hostilities toward a Turkey that has become a part of Europe. Yet the fact is that Turkey is not likely to join the EU until the foundations of the republic and the Lausanne Treaty have been destroyed. And once the Lausanne Treaty has been nullified, there are no guarantees that Turkey will be able to join the EU on an equal footing.

The Turkish population will reach 82 million by 2025. A relatively young population compared with that of the EU, it will constitute some 17 percent of the overall EU population. Turkey possesses one of the strongest armies in Europe, one that has had war experience in the wake of World War II, and is capable of staging cross-border operations. As an industrially developed country close to energy sources and in a position to control part of these sources and with some 50 million Turks living in neighboring countries like Greece, Bulgaria, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq and Syria, Turkey is not a country that the EU could control if it became a member state.

Moreover, Brussels perceives Turkey as a threat because of its growing population regardless of whether it joins the EU or not. Just as history has made a deep impact on Turkish intellectuals and politicians' subconscious so it has shaped the mentality and subconscious of European politicians and intellectuals. From the standpoint of Europeans, the Turks represent a challenge. They will undoubtedly continue to be perceived in this way after they join the EU, too.

For this reason, a Turkey that has become part of Europe will cease to be home to a nation-state. To speak more plainly, Asia Minor will be partitioned into various sections after going through a civil war like Yugoslavia and the EU will want to admit some or all of the parts to membership within the framework of a federal structure.

It needs to be emphasized that the EU is not following a federalization policy only toward Turkey. It has been following this policy toward all EU member states right from the start. For, a supranational organization like the EU which covers a gigantic area and boasts a huge population wants its members to be small federal entities or small independent states rather than large nation-states and unitary entities. In this way, Brussels will gain in strength by establishing an identity independent of the nation-states that it represents even as it weakens those nation-states.

To achieve this goal, the EU will ask Turkey to fulfil totally new conditions in the future and will see no harm in failing to carry out its own commitments. Actually the national, secular, and the democratic Republic and our national identity have long faced an EU-supported systematic hostility, an ideological and psychological propaganda campaign and a special form of warfare that utilizes political pressures and separatist terror.

The EU's policy of federalizing Turkey is a multi-dimensional policy that has been implemented for some time. These dimensions could be grouped as a) ideological-psychological b) ethnic c) political-institutional d) geopolitical e) historical f) economic.

### ***a) Ideological-Psychological Dimension***

The basis of this dimension is the ambitious political argument that there is no such thing as a Turkish nation. The mastermind of this argument, which even certain Turkish politicians have been made to endorse, is the ideological war department of the KGB. The ideological-psychological war has entered a new phase thanks to the claim that Turkey consists of an ethnic mosaic.

This new thesis is a product of the German Intelligence Service. The creator of the thesis is Professor Udo Steinbach, the director of the Orient Institute and a member of the German Military Intelligence. Steinbach says: "The problem is the artificial Turkish state and nation that Ataturk created with an edict. The problem is Kemalism and the Kemalist principles of nationalism and secularism. The problem is the contrived, forced, and artificial Turkish nation. There is no such nation. The Turkish-Kurdish, Muslim-secular, Alevi-state conflicts bear witness to this fact. How did Ataturk establish this artificial nation? They first exterminated the Armenians and then the Greek subjects."

This so-called thesis, which is supported by many western-European orientalist other than Steinbach, was first carried onto an official platform when the Swedish Embassy distributed a pamphlet saying that there is no such thing as a Turkish nation but only the Turkish language at a meeting in Izmir. Turkey will be the target of a campaign trying to rally support for this thesis in the years to come. Once the idea that there is no such thing as a Turkish nation has been inculcated into the people's minds, all sorts of attacks against the Turkish Republic will become legitimate.

This process, consciously or unconsciously, is being supported by certain circles in Turkey. The Turkish Ministry of Education is drawing up a project that involves the reinterpretation of the Turkish history and teaching it on a more human basis. The Turkish History Foundation, on the other hand, maintains that Turkey should replace national historical education with regional historical education. However, what gives nations a separate sense of identity is their sense of a common history. Those nations that have lost this sense also lose their identity although they may retain their racial characteristics. Nations draw their life force from their sense of nationality. It is history which creates this feeling. In this connection it is useful to bear in mind Russian general Chernaiev's remark that in order to be able to defeat the Turks, it is first necessary to defeat their history.

One of the aims of the campaign we are talking about is to debase the concept of the Turkish nation. It has become fashionable among certain columnists and intellectuals to insult the Turkish nation. Certain enemy headquarters that are experienced in applying psychological war tactics are using part of the Turkish media to conduct a systematic campaign against the

fundamental principles of the Republic, the values that signify our national unity, and our consciousness of being an undivided nation with a common language, religion, origin, race, culture and fate.

In short, a small part of the media that is overtly hostile to the Turkish nation and to the secular, national, democratic Republic is conducting an all-out war on the fundamental values of our Republic and on our national unity and solidarity more audaciously than the traitorous Levantine press during the Turkish war of Independence.

### ***b)Ethnic-Political Dimension***

Our country and nation have had to fight against separatist terror since the late 1960s and particularly since the 1980s. This struggle has entailed an almost unbearable material and moral cost. While in a military sense the Turkish nation has defeated the PKK, imperialists' chief hireling, and certain regional elements supporting the PKK, the terrorist organization has done great harm to our national structure and national identity.

Where Turkey should be trying to repair the damage that the separatist organization has done to our national fabric and to crown the military victory against the PKK with a political campaign aiming to bring about ideological decontamination and moral rehabilitation, certain quarters within the state are helping the terrorist organization achieve its political aims by trying to create new peoples out of our nation. The Copenhagen Criteria, which Turkey is expected to fulfil to become eligible for EU membership, is laying the legal and social groundwork for the emergence of new nationalities.

The adoption of the Copenhagen Criteria in Turkey will pave the way for the rise of ethnic consciousness. Actually, the psychological war conducted against Turkish politicians, intellectuals and citizens over the past 30 years by the Soviet Union and certain Western states has gone a long way toward destroying our sense of what the Turkish nation consists of. The Copenhagen Criteria will destroy the Turkish national consciousness on which our Republic is based on and will provide certain sub-ethnic identities with national characteristics. Thus, these criteria will bring all the acquisitions of the Republic to naught. The Copenhagen Criteria will not be limited simply to the issue of broadcasts and to the freedom of education but will pave the way for ethnic and socioeconomic demands. When the Turkish economy, which is going down the tubes, fails to meet these demands, these demands will soon turn into political claims.

Once ethnic consciousness takes on a political quality, there will be increasing demands for a constitutional amendment that will change the Turks' current status from the sole founder of the Turkish Republic to one of the founders of the Republic. It is very probable that such demands will collide with a campaign to have PKK leader Ocalan released. This will be followed by demands for Turkey to evolve into a federal structure.

Actually the European Parliament demanded as early as 1993 that Turkey's administrative structure be changed in accordance with ethnic principles when it said, "The Turkish state's unity should be in harmony not only with the Kurds' right to use their tongue, receive an education in their own language and maintain their traditions and customs but also with an appropriate degree of administrative autonomy." In 2000, the European Parliament phrased this demand in the following fashion: "The central authority continues to enjoy a powerful control over local administrations. It is expected that the local administrations bill, which

aims at a greater degree of decentralization and which is still being debated by various ministries, will be passed." Quite obviously, the EU will much more blatantly demand in the near future that Turkey change its political and administrative structure.

In its 2001 Progress Report, the EU has expressed another important issue that will radically harm Turkey's national fabric: "New rights for your Alevi citizens." These rights are similar to the rights ceded to Armenian, Greek and Jewish citizens in the Lausanne Treaty. Brussels has started a very dangerous process by making this move. These rights demanded by the EU cannot be described as individual cultural rights. For what is being demanded is collective rights.

All these developments are seen to have started a very dangerous process in Turkey between 2001-2002. This process is called "the Turkish issue." Turkish nationalism, which has been based ever since the foundation of the Republic on certain political and cultural principles and which has found its pithiest expression in Ataturk's saying "How fortunate it is to be able to say you are a Turk" has entered a process of change and has assumed an **exclusive** characteristic. Many people who used to counter certain PKK sympathizers' remark that they are not Turks but Kurds with the *sympathetic* comment that there is no difference between Turks and Kurds are fast tending toward an exclusive Turkish nationalism and are beginning to say that Kurds are not Turks. It is clear how demands for television and radio broadcasts and a mother tongue education in Arabic, Circassian, Laz, Georgian etc in the wake of the adoption of Copenhagen Criteria will provoke exclusive Turkish nationalism.

### ***c)Political-Institutional Dimension***

It is one of the aims of the EU's policy toward Turkey to change Turkey's political structure. Once the ideological attacks toward Turkey have destroyed the concept of nationhood that the republic is based on, the way will have been cleared for the destruction of the state structure, which is also based on this concept. Actually the EU could be said to be acting honestly as regards this subject. The changes that Turkey is expected to implement in the short and medium term in the Accession Partnership Document are intended to prepare the infrastructure of such a formation. What is even more frightening is that as the process of Turkey's accession to the EU is prolonged and as Brussels keeps creating problems for Ankara, new additions are being made to the Accession Partnership Document, requiring Turkey to make even more radical changes to its state structure. The EU has done this to other membership candidates, too.

The disclosures made by EU officials suggest that the changes they want Turkey to implement to the fundamental principles of the Turkish Republic are much more than those expressed in the Accession Partnership Document. Daniel Cohn-Bandit, Co-Chairman of the Turkish-EU Joint Parliamentary Commission, has said that Turkey faces a choice between taking the road to Barcelona or the road to Baghdad, adding, "Either way is possible. Both roads have their own advantages and possibilities. The road to Barcelona will mean the disintegration for Turkey of traditional Kemalist fundamentalism. By taking this road, Turkey will have to undertake regional decentralization, which includes strengthening regional autonomy. Taking the road to Baghdad will mean strengthening Kemalist centralization and authoritarianism and giving up the bid for EU membership.

### ***d)Geopolitical Dimension***

The third dimension of the process of federalizing Turkey consists of demands that will pave the way for geopolitical changes. What is in question here is an attempt to make moves that will make it impossible for Turkey to claim to be a geopolitical power center and that will create a psychology of defeat among the Turkish people. The EU is trying to drive Turkey out of Cyprus and to turn Cyprus into a second Crete and the Aegean into a Greek-European sea. Turkey's forfeiture of Cyprus and the Aegean through arrangements in favor of Greece and Europe will make a deep political and psychological impact on the Turkish people. Cyprus and the Aegean are the symbols of Turkey's resistance against the West's demands. The loss of these fronts will destroy the psychological resistance against Western demands.

It is also an important aim of the EU's geopolitical demands to turn Asia Minor into a geopolitical graveyard. The extreme poverty caused by globalization in many parts of the world is causing people in these regions to emigrate to rich countries and particularly to EU member-states. Turkey is like a transit route in this communal emigration not only in terms of its economic status but also in terms of the legal arrangements it has made for refugees. However, the EU is following a policy that seeks to turn Turkey into "a moat around the EU castle," so to speak, and to cause the refugees to amass in this moat. For this reason, Brussels is trying to pressure Turkey into changing its policy on refugees.

#### ***e)Historical-Psychological Dimension***

Another aim of the EU's policy toward Turkey is to harm Turkey's current and future interests by alienating the Turkish people from their own history and misleading them into believing that theirs is a history full of injustices to, and massacres committed against, other peoples. Once the Turkish people have been made to take this view of their own history, the next step will be to start the process of redressing presumed wrongs. In this connection, Turkey is under pressure from the EU to solve three issues: 1. The Armenian issue 2) The Pontus issue 3) The Greek Patriarchate issue. The first two involve accusations of ethnic genocide against the Turkish people whereas the third is an allegation of cultural genocide.

Turkey will increasingly become the target of a psychological war aiming to force Ankara into recognizing the so-called Armenian claims of genocide and the cultural existence of the Pontus Greeks.

In the same way, Europe will be campaigning in the next ten years to transform the Greek Patriarchate in Istanbul into a Vatican in its own right. Documents drawn up by the European Parliament have already begun to refer to Istanbul as Constantinopolis. The European Parliament has begun to voice certain demands concerning churches found in various parts of Asia Minor, some of which have demolished and some of which have been turned into museums. It is being said by the European Parliament within this framework that "Christian churches face certain hardships with regard to ownership. The fact that the legal status of certain churches has not been recognized is creating problems such as by preventing religious personnel from coming to Turkey." This amounts openly to a threat. The legal status of which churches is the European Parliament talking about? And what religious personnel could it possibly be referring to?

After the European Parliament adopted the Armenian Genocide Bill, a monument was erected on March 8, 2001 in front of the building where the Sevres Treaty was signed to commemorate the so-called Armenian genocide. The fact that this monument was erected in front of this building is not a coincidence at all. The aim is to create the psychological

atmosphere needed to pave the way for the scrapping of the Lausanne Treaty. All this is a part of the historical psychological attack against Turkey.

### ***f)Economic Dimension***

The economic dimension of the EU's project to federalize Turkey requires a consideration of Turkey's accession to the Customs Union has entailed. After the Customs Union Agreement was signed, the EU-Turkey relations entered a process where Turkey's sovereignty became unilaterally restricted. Also by joining the Customs Union, Turkey has incurred major economic losses.

The Turkish economy has become one of the economies with the largest domestic and foreign debts. The latest economic crises have allowed foreign capital to capture control of the Turkish economy. The economy has come under foreign control so extensively that the Turkish State cannot any more generate independent policies.

Yet, what is more important than anything else is the fact that by agreeing to transfer its sovereignty rights partly to the EU in entering the Customs Union, Turkey made concessions on the idea of independence. As a result of the dependence and the economic losses caused by Turkey's membership in the Customs Union, Ankara will come to the point where it will not be able to object to the EU's demands. As has been pointed out above, a country that is ceding ethnic rights and yet is failing to economically satisfy the emerging ethnic consciousness will face a very serious socio-economic chaos and ethnic demands will take on a political quality.

### ***Conclusion***

All this might possibly have three possible implications for Turkey. First, Turkey might recognize cultural and then political economy to ethnic groups or agree to a federal government structure in a bid to join the EU even 25 years from now. Second, the country might be dragged into a civil war and disintegrate as a result of an attempt by the state or by part of the Turkish people to stop the process of Turkey's accession to the EU in the belief that Turkey is being given away to foreigners. Third, the state might be restructured following a civil war and a federal Turkey might be founded.

Only in the case of Belgium has a national state turned into a federal one in a peaceful manner in the history of mankind. It is very difficult for this to happen in Asia Minor. The only way for the Turkish Republic to continue as a national state or just as a state is to discard the irrational policy that seeks to make Turkey a full member in the EU and to redefine the Turkey-EU relations realistically. Although part of the public has been brainwashed by the Turkish political elite and media into believing that Turkey has no choice but EU membership, it will soon become clear that full membership in the EU or membership in the Customs Union is not the only way of establishing relations with EU and that the only way of maintaining a harmonious relationship with the EU is a platform that does not include the EU-CU framework.

By making this choice, Ankara can put an end to the hegemony the EU has established in recent years over Turkish politics and economy. By obtaining its independence both mentally and actually in this way, Turkey will be able to assess its options more independently.

Seemingly eternal historical eras always come to an end. The Cold War era, which we only recently left behind, is a historical period that only lasted 40 years. Today the world is going a phase when impermanent projects like globalization and the EU are front and center in world politics. These projects will eventually evolve into new schemes. What is vitally important from Turkey's viewpoint is to generate a political concept that will allow Turkey to remain loyal to its fundamental principles, maintain social peace and territorial integrity and achieve democracy and social prosperity. Otherwise the existence of the Turkish Republic and the Turkish nation will be jeopardized.