

F | E U | T U | R E

THE FUTURE OF EU-TURKEY RELATIONS:
MAPPING DYNAMICS AND TESTING SCENARIOS

Kick-Off Conference, 26 & 27 May

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Conference Report

Content

Summary	2
Detailed Report.....	4
Welcome and Introduction	4
Panel 1: FEUTURE Scenarios.....	5
Panel 2: History of EU-Turkey relations / Narratives	8



Summary

Taking Stock of EU-Turkey Relations: A Successful Kick-off for FEUTURE

On 26 and 27 May 2016 the research project “The Future of EU-Turkey Relations: Mapping Dynamics and Testing Scenarios” (FEUTURE) funded from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 programme was officially launched. About 100 participants including researchers from the consortium, distinguished Turkey experts, stakeholders and practitioners from Turkey, the European Union (EU) and the neighbourhood, as well as students and the wider interested public got together at the FEUTURE Kick-Off Conference in Istanbul. This event was hosted by Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.



During the debate of the first day, which was open to the public, different views as to which path relations will most likely take in the future were exchanged and discussed in light of FEUTURE’s research aims and design. FEUTURE’s broad assessment of this relationship acknowledges the depth and intensity of relations between Turkey and the EU. It will combine both a look ‘backwards’ through its analysis of narratives which have shaped the debate in Turkey and the EU in

different phases with a forward-looking approach which aims at delineating a most likely scenario(s) for the future and related policy recommendations. All participants welcomed this project and its research approach, because they felt that at this point in time substantial and ambitious research on EU-Turkey relations is highly relevant.

Debating FEUTURE’s Research Design: Future Scenarios and Historical Narratives

The first day of the conference focused on discussing FEUTURE’s scenarios and narratives at two high-level panels with the project’s researchers and renowned Turkey experts from the project’s Scientific and Policy Advisory Board. The aim was to update the project’s research agenda and make it fit to meet the challenges of analyzing EU-Turkey relations which constitute a ‘moving target’ par excellence.

At the first panel, chaired by Funda Tekin (FEUTURE Project Director), Nathalie Tocci (FEUTURE Scientific Coordinator) presented three ideal-type scenarios (Convergence, Cooperation, Conflict) that will be tested through FEUTURE’s research in the upcoming three years. Overall, Tocci identified coexisting trends and concluded that for the project this will also mean that research will most probably not identify only one most likely scenario but rather delineate a mix of their features. Andrew Duff (former MeP), Nilgün Arisan Eralp (TEPAV) and Ronald Linden (University of Pittsburgh) agreed and particularly stressed the need for flexibility in these three scenarios. Furthermore they encouraged “out of the box”-thinking by scrutinizing the EU’s relationship with other (new) external countries.



The second panel, chaired by Senem Aydın-Düzgit (Bilgi University), elaborated on the project's 'backward perspective' of EU-Turkey relations in form of the historical analysis of narratives. Wolfgang Wessels (FEUTURE Project Director) and Atila Eralp (METU) presented this part of FEUTURE research that starts from the assumption that a critical assessment of the history of EU-Turkey relations is a key element for delineating scenarios for the future.



Therefore, the research aims to 1. map the milestones and periods of EU-Turkey relations and 2. identify the most salient narratives, which have shaped the political debate both in the EU and in Turkey during different historical phases. The representatives from the FEUTURE Scientific and Policy Advisory Board, Albert Rohan (Independent Commission on Turkey), Ofra Bengio (Tel Aviv University) and Meltem Müftüler-Baç (Sabancı University) further contextualized the narrative analysis of EU-Turkey relations by elaborating on four key-terms that have been used in the past and present in order to structure the interrelatedness of the EU and Turkey: 1. Bridge, 2. Model, 3. Orientation and 4. Asset. Additionally, the debate critically assessed the question of how relevant history really was for the present and what the added value of a historical analysis was in light of EU-Turkey relations. Finally, the importance of understanding the EU integration process itself for analysing EU-Turkey relations was underlined.

Getting Started with the Research: Workshops on the Second Day

The second day provided the researchers from the consortium the possibility to familiarize themselves with the details of FEUTURE research. The Work Package (WP) Leaders organized parallel workshops on the six thematic dimensions that FEUTURE will analyse: politics, economics, security, energy/climate, migration and identity/culture. It will be the aim of their research to identify the drivers that determine the relations from these different perspectives. At these workshops in the morning of 27 May 2016, the WP leaders together with their research teams prepared the first steps and updated their research designs with regard to the latest developments.

In a 'synthesis and outreach' session led by Nathalie Tocci and Sinan Ülgen the consortium discussed the third phase of the project, which will synthesis and test these results within one or more scenario(s) with the aim of producing policy recommendations. The Kick-Off Conference concluded within the first meeting of the FEUTURE General Assembly, in which the partners' representatives discussed matters concerning the consortium as a whole.



Detailed Report

Welcome and Introduction

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Durman, Rector of Istanbul Bilgi University welcomed the participants of the FEUTURE Kick-Off Conference which he was delighted to host at İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi. He also underlined the importance and timeliness of FEUTURE's research. Following his welcoming remarks, FEUTURE's Coordinators Dr. Nathalie Tocci and Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels as well as Project Director Dr. Funda Tekin outlined the project framework in their introductions.



Prof. Dr. Mehmet Durman
Rector of Bilgi University



Dr. Nathalie Tocci
Scientific Coordinator



Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels
Project Coordinator



Dr. Funda Tekin
Project Director

Dr. Nathalie Tocci, Scientific Coordinator and Deputy Director of the Istituto Affari Internazionali, highlighted that in light of the current fast developments as well as the depth and intensity of EU-Turkey relations FEUTURE's research benefited from its broad look at this relationship. She explained that the project will combine a look 'backwards' through its analysis of narratives, which have shaped the debate in Turkey and the EU in different phases, with a forward-looking approach, which aims at delineating a most likely scenario for the future and related policy recommendations.

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels, Project Coordinator and Director of the Centre for Turkey and EU Studies at the University of Cologne, drew attention to the historical ups and downs of past relations between Turkey and the EU. He suggested that the migration crises in 2015 can be perceived to have triggered a new phase of relations marked by re-intensification of cooperation – a question which will also feature in the project's research. He also thanked the organization team, a joint effort of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Senem Aydın-Düzgüt and Asli Aydın at Istanbul Bilgi University as well as his colleagues of the Coordination Office in Cologne. The Coordinators excused Undersecretary of the Ministry for EU Affairs, Ambassador Engin Soysal, who had agreed to deliver the keynote speech. Unfortunately, he had to cancel his participation on very short notice due to unexpected obligations requiring him to represent the Minister of EU Affairs at another event.



Panel 1: FEUTURE Scenarios

Rapporteur: Hanna-Lisa Hauge

The Debate of the first panel, chaired by FEUTURE's Project Director, Dr. Funda Tekin, aimed at presenting and discussing FEUTURE's research design. Dr. Nathalie Tocci, Scientific Coordinator, presented the three ideal-type scenarios 'Conflict', 'Cooperation', and 'Convergence' that frame the project's research. The members of the Scientific and Policy Advisory Board Andrew Duff, Visiting Fellow at European Policy Centre, Nilgün Arisan Eralp EU Director at TEPAV and Prof. Dr. Ronald Linden from the University of Pittsburgh presented their assessment and advice on FEUTURE's research design.

The chair **Funda Tekin** drew attention to some of the questions most interesting for research at the moment: In light of the mid-term perspective of the FEUTURE scenarios, what will the EU itself look like in 2023? How likely is Turkish membership and what are other possible frameworks and forms of integration that could be realistic for Turkey? Tekin also underlined the importance to adapt the original project proposal – which was submitted to the European Commission exactly one year ago – in light of the most recent developments.

Nathalie Tocci focused her elaborations on the ideal-type scenarios, which will be tested through FEUTURE's research in the next three years and gave examples of how these could materialize in concrete terms.

Building on a historical assessment, Tocci stressed that Turkey's importance for Europe is not a new phenomenon and that Turkey stood on the frontiers of the early ideas of European unification, thus already in the inter-war years. For example Turkey was included in Aristide Briand's Commission of Enquiry for European Union within the framework of the League of Nations. She also underlined that currently relations between EU and Turkey certainly lie at a crossroads, rendering the FEUTURE scenarios even more relevant. She pointed out that although she had always been convinced that Turkey was strategically important for the EU, we might witness a European re-awakening regarding Turkey's strategic value these days, which we might not have anticipated.

"Turkey stood on the frontiers of the early ideas of European unification." (N. Tocci)

Currently, several trends point towards the *conflict* scenario, such as the growing authoritarian trends within Turkey, the failure of its 'zero problems with the neighbours'-policy, as well as the ending of the peace process with the Kurds. On the EU side, we see the growing disintegration trends and multiple crises ranging from the Eurozone crises to the Brexit question. Additionally, she referred to the rather blunt but not surprising message communicated by Commission President Juncker that there would be no further enlargement of the EU in the five years of his tenure.

Tocci also identified indicators that suggest a tendency towards the *cooperation* scenario (in terms of some sort of 'privileged partnership' or 'associate membership') or *convergence* scenario (i.e. full



Dr. Nathalie Tocci, FEUTURE Scientific Director



membership with possible forms of differentiated integration). While foreign and security policy, energy and the economy all invariably point to Turkey's strategic relevance for the Union, it had been migration, and in particular the refugee crisis over the course of the last year, that have triggered changes in policies and strategies towards Turkey both in Brussels as well as Berlin. In spite of all justified skepticism regarding the solution of the Cyprus conflict that impacts EU-Turkey relations, Tocci acknowledged that the current situation might point towards a political alignment – although not in the short term.

Overall, Tocci identified coexisting trends and concluded that for the project this will also mean that research will most probably not identify only one most likely scenario but rather delineate a mix of their distinctive features. While the scenarios are conceptualized as ideal-types, FEUTURE researchers will take great care to formulate their policy recommendations as concretely and close to reality as possible.

Nilgün Arisan Eralp



Andrew Duff

The first commentator, **Andrew Duff**, who witnessed the 1999 Helsinki decision on Turkey's candidate status as Member of the European Parliament, drew a less positive picture of the present and future. With regard to the scenarios, he stated that if one considered the original aim of European integration one would certainly opt for the convergence scenario, which implied Turkish EU membership. Today, however there were several indicators for conflict, such as the crescendo of nationalist populism both in Turkey and in the EU, which was challenging – if not poisoning – the democratic institutions. Along these lines he pointed out the diverging developments in the EU and in Turkey. While the EU was elaborating on the potentials and reforms for developing into a multi-cultural federal union, Turkey was moving in the opposite direction. Duff

also contradicted the general assessment that NATO represented a tool of convergence between the EU and Turkey. He perceives this to represent a conflict prevention exercise instead. In light of these potential triggers for conflict in the EU-Turkey relationship Duff highlighted that “sometimes conflict is important”. The current efforts to revitalize the negotiations with Turkey however seem more like “wishful thinking” to him and the EU should not jeopardize the value of the formal accession process including the Copenhagen Criteria.

“We should drop the accession negotiations with Turkey and try for a fresh start” (A. Duff)

Rather, one should aim for a fresh start of relations, and this should be based on an unsentimental assessment beyond the idea of full membership. The looming “soft or hard Brexit” could offer ideas for such a new framework of relations. As for the time frame set out for FEUTURE's scenarios, Duff suggested to extend the time frame to 2053 instead of 2023, since it would be highly unlikely that domestic change could in Turkey could take place in the near future.

Nilgün Arisan Eralp, as second commentator, also underlined the ideal-type character of the scenarios outlined in FEUTURE's proposal. She identified a mix of conflict and cooperation for the present, however with an emphasis on cooperation. Further, she emphasized that the conflict scenario alone would not represent a likely option for the future, due to inter-dependencies in the EU-Turkey



relationship. Along these lines, she emphasized that Turkey's economy as well as its credibility for foreign investors were strongly related to its status as EU accession candidate. She also suggested to keep in mind that parts of Turkey's attractiveness in the region was based on its close bonds with the EU. On the other hand Turkey was – among other aspects – of geostrategic importance for Europe, being a buffer to an unstable region.

“A scenario of pure conflict is unlikely, since the EU and Turkey are highly dependent on each other” (N. Arisan Eralp)



Arisan Eralp identified the convergence – i.e. membership – scenario as the least likely scenario. According to her, Turkey's EU accession depended on too many crucial factors such as domestic developments in Turkey, the politics of enlargement in the EU but also a solution of the Cyprus issue. She underlined that identity issues constituted a further crucial dividing line, with a growing anti-Turkey constituency in the EU and a similar discourse in Turkey on the EU and Turkey's membership in the EU. Overall, she stated that the trust between the two parties seemed to be rather low in the current situation.



Prof. Dr. Ronald Linden

Thirdly, **Ronald Linden** presented his comments on the research design and underlined the importance of the flexibility of the scenarios. Research should be sure to reflect the dynamics that characterized EU-Turkey relations – and suggested a “mixed scenario,” one that included both conflict and cooperation. He alluded to a famous analogy presented by Gabriel Almond and suggested that the FEUTURE project had the task of trying to make a precise ‘clock’ out of the fuzzy ‘cloud’ of the EU-Turkey relationship.

Further, he stressed that the project should not privilege the importance of narratives and discourse over actions, but rather map the dynamics of the relationship over time. As an example he offered a charting of US-Soviet relations during the Cold War.

“The project will be challenged by trying to make a ‘clock’ out of the fuzzy ‘cloud’ that this relationship is.” (R. Linden)

Linden also suggested that one does not necessarily need to invent new models as points of reference for the assessment of the EU-Turkey relationship. Useful cases could include countries that are external to the EU, such as Russia or Ukraine, who have no membership perspectives, as well as individual EU member states whose relations are characterized in part by conflict, such as Hungary. Of course, future relations to a possible non-EU member Great Britain could serve as a model as well. In terms of drivers of EU-Turkey relations Linden elaborated on the need to also consider the normative question of the declining power of the EU's ‘value hegemony’. Finally, he urged the project's investigators to consider the value of using “counterfactuals” to highlight key factors in the EU-Turkey relationship.



Panel 2: History of EU-Turkey relations / Narratives

Rapporteurs: Ebru Ece Özbey, Hanna-Lisa Hauge



Prof. O. Bengio, H.E. Dr. A. Rohan, Prof. W. Wessels, Assoc. Prof. S. Aydın-Düzgit, Prof. A. Eralp, Prof. M. Müftüler-Bac

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Senem Aydın-Düzgit from Bilgi University chaired the second panel, which focused on the ‘backward perspective’ of EU-Turkey relations, namely the historical analysis of narratives. Aydın-Düzgit also forms part of the FEUTURE consortium and will contribute in particular to the work package on identity and culture drivers. Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels, Project Director and Jean Monnet Chair ad personam at the University of Cologne and Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp, Director of the CES at METU, introduced their research within FEUTURE, which aims at mapping milestones and periods of relations as well as identifying the most salient narratives which have shaped the relations over time. In this panel, too, three members of the Scientific and Policy Advisory Board provided valuable comments on the envisaged research design: H.E. Dr. Albert Rohan, Member of the Independent Commission on Turkey, Prof. Ofra Bengio, Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies at Tel Aviv University as well as Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç, Jean Monnet Chair at Sabancı University.

Atila Eralp started by underlining the innovative character of FEUTURE’s historical analysis, since there were no other studies that linked the time factor with narratives, i.e. analysing narratives of EU-Turkey relations over such a long time frame. He defined narratives as predominant interpretations of major actors and milestones, which may change over time. In his view, analysing them was useful in terms of understanding important changes in the EU-Turkish relationship. Acknowledging Ron Linden’s statement on the importance of actions, Eralp emphasized that the research design included events and critical junctures, and that it was



Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp



important to know how these were interpreted by the political elites at the respective point in time: “We will examine if and how events and their interpretations in the form of narratives diverge”.

Eralp continued by outlining major phases of EU-Turkey relations, linking them to possible narratives. The first period after WWII e.g. was framed by the ‘Westernization’ narrative that shaped the relations to Europe and the Turkish stance towards the developing integration process. Milestones of that period were also the Turkish membership to NATO, and more generally its status as a partner against the Soviet Union.

Eralp stated that in the 1970s and 1980s new narratives emerged and challenged the predominant views. This was reflected by the slogan ‘They are the partners, we are the market’. The post 1999 period was again characterized by cooperation followed by Turkey becoming an EU accession candidate state in 2005. He identifies the beginning of accession negotiations as a turning point, after which another downturn in EU-Turkey relations took place and alternative narratives questioning the European path of Turkey came up – one of these had been known as Neo-Ottomanism.

“Time and context matter, but the narratives of political actors also matter.” (A. Eralp)

As for the present context, Eralp posed the question whether we had entered a new phase. Did 2015 mark a new path for EU-Turkey relations? It seemed that there is a more interest driven approach on both sides, Eralp stated. However, he highlighted the current difficulties to identify whether this would rather lead towards a scenario of conflict or cooperation. “What will happen next is the critical question and we aim to answer it”, Eralp concluded.

Wolfgang Wessels, who will work together with Atila Eralp on this historical analysis, continued with contextualising this part of FEUTURE’s research regarding the time period in which EU-Turkey relations develop. In line with this, he asked “Are we caught by the *Zeitgeist*?”. As an example he assumed that had FEUTURE kicked-off in summer 2004, Andrew Duff might have said that we were on the way to Turkish full EU membership. “I think we would have different narratives and understandings and we would deal with these issues totally differently.” He stressed that in research on future scenarios we needed to be open, since ‘fairytales’ may happen. One example is the case of the German unification.



Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Wessels

“Are we caught by the ‘Zeitgeist’ in our analysis of EU-Turkey relations?” (W. Wessels)

Further, Wessels outlined the central questions that structure FEUTURE’s narrative analysis. First, the analysis would tackle the question which critical dates/milestones and which periods could be identified and how could they be differentiated. Wessels emphasized that the narratives should be analysed in a broader context and that we could not just look at the EU and Turkey, but need to include the EU enlargement policy in general.

Second, it would be critical to understand the constructions of European and EU identity, since these determined the perspective on enlargement and Turkish membership. Wessels emphasized that it was highly important to understand that enlargement was not just a question of access to the market etc., but also resulted from the definition of the EU's own character. He further stressed that it would be crucial to compare the narratives on Turkey with those on other candidate countries in history and present.

Finally, he discussed whether one could identify a so called 'Copenhagen Enlargement Narrative' in the documents by EU institutions since these constantly conveyed a clear message to the potential applicant: namely that it was only up to the EU institutions and the Member States to define the conditions of accession and to decide who was eligible to become a member, with Art. 49 TEU of the Lisbon Treaty being the latest legal documentation of this perspective.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva was invited by the panel to elaborate on the methods that will be applied for the historical analysis. He underlined that the main problem while studying EU-Turkey relations was the availability of data. For example, until 2001, there had only been the data set by the Eurobarometer. While nowadays there were numerous surveys, it was still difficult for researchers to get access to the data. The FEUTURE project would address this gap, e.g. in its Work Packages on Migration and Economics, but also in its historical analysis and make these accessible. The team analyzing the history of EU-Turkey relations would analyse speeches and strategic documents from Turkey and the EU, starting with the post WWII-period. A codebook would ensure the comparability of results between the respective teams at METU and University of Cologne.



Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva

"We want to generate data that will be accessible for young researchers." (Ö. Senyuva)



H.E. Ambassador Albert Rohan

H.E. Ambassador Albert Rohan, as first commentator, explained that he would focus on attitudes of Europeans towards Turkey and demonstrate how and why they changed. He underlined that Turkey was the cornerstone of the Transatlantic defense system after WWII and in the following years. The country's "European credentials" were not questioned at that time because it was the strategic interest to anchor Turkey in the Western camp – hence, this was the predominant factor.

While in 1989, Turkey's application for full membership was rejected for several reasons, the European Commission explicitly underlined Turkey's eligibility for membership.

"For a long time, Turkey's European credentials were not questioned, because it was the strategic interest to anchor Turkey in the Western Camp." (A. Rohan)



Only later, first doubts materialized regarding Turkey's eligibility. There was however a gap between official policies and the public opinion. Governments were mainly motivated by Turkey's geo-strategic importance. The wider public, on the other hand, considered Turkey as a country that was too big, too poor and not sufficiently 'European'. Rohan underlined that there were, of course, valid counterarguments on all of these points, which however did not reach the minds of the wider public. Today, the populist segment of the media and political parties on the far right are aggressively opposing Turkish EU membership. Moreover, some of the positive factors driving EU-Turkey relations and its perception a decade ago have disappeared and the present Turkey was increasingly viewed as authoritarian. Rohan argued that unlike in 2005, the European Commission today would not be in the position to confirm that Turkey sufficiently fulfils the political criteria for EU accession talks to go forward.

Rohan concluded that the FEUTURE project should indeed provide answers for the future relationship with Turkey and that he perceived the resulting policy recommendations as a highly interesting and valuable output of the project that one could look forward to.

Prof. Ofra Bengio argued that at the turn of this century we could identify a paradigmatic change in EU-Turkey relations. Starting from a historical perspective, she differentiated four pillars or catchwords which defined these relations: 1. *bridge*, 2. *modern* 3. *orientation* 4. *asset*. Bengio argued that for a long time these catchwords connected the two parties.

From a European perspective, the asset of Turkey was its role as a bridge to the Arab and a model for the Muslim world, oriented to the West, and as buffer against the Soviet Union. From a Turkish perspective, the EU was considered a bridge to the 'West', a model for Turkey to follow (especially under the Kemalist Turkey) and as an asset, since it was defending Turkey against the Soviet Union. However, later one could identify a shift in the narratives, and a mutual frustration, as Bengio outlined. For the EU side this was due mainly to the Islamic tendencies in Turkey, especially under the Erdogan regime. At the same time, the Kurdish issues remained unsolved and Turkey became a bridge rather for the refugees to come to the EU. Hence, the term "bridge" obtained a negative meaning. She stressed that the interdependence between the parties nevertheless grew stronger and that the EU needed Turkey for combating the Islamic State and solve the migration issue. The EU's biggest leverage in the relationship used to be the EU membership, but it seemed that Ankara's interest in joining the EU was declining, which rendered this an imbalanced interdependence.

As for the research design, she proposed to include the aspect of the Turkish and Kurdish diaspora in Europe. One should also analyse their influence on the European public. Also, the analysis should include the Turkey-Israel relationship, since this had a special meaning for the EU. Methodologically, she proposed that new media should also be taken into consideration.

"The ideological gap between EU and Turkey seems to be growing." (O. Bengio)



Prof. Ofra Bengio



In conclusion, Bengio argued that the ideological gap between the EU and Turkey seemed to be growing. Against this background, the EU should focus on fighting growing Islamophobia. In terms of a possible scenario of EU-Turkey relations in the long run, she expected modest cooperation instead of integration/convergence.



Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç

Prof. Dr. Meltem Müftüler-Baç, as third commentator, started by suspecting that a young person's initial reaction to FEUTURE's historical narrative analysis would be the question "Why would history matter?" Nothing really had changed after 1963, 1999, or 2005. Hence, from such a perspective the history might not tell us much about what was going on right now. However, she suggested taking a deep look into the EU integration process itself in order to understand the many layers of the current situation. The project's EU 28 country reports will be crucial for identifying the multiple preferences among member states.

Müftüler-Baç also advised the project to specify the research questions further since the three years of project time were very limited. Also she underlined that there were so many issues that would unfold in the coming years that one needed to prioritize.

She proposed to focus on the external and domestic conditions. The analysis of narratives should focus on the conditions that shaped the EU-Turkey relations, i.e. analyzing whether these were utility-driven, norms-driven or rights-based.

Since the EU as "political animal" was changing - such as through the possible Brexit or Grexit – there was very little room for further enlargement. While Müftüler-Baç realised that Commission President Juncker had been very clear regarding the enlargement stop until 2019, she suggested to closely scrutinize what happened with the other accession candidates such as Montenegro and Serbia in the meantime.

"We should put the accession process in the drawer and focus on figuring out the alternative ways of integration." (M. Müftüler-Baç)

Meltem Müftüler-Baç advised to go beyond the narrative of accession and to look into what kind of other possible patterns of integration were unfolding or would unfold. If this was taken into consideration a very feasible analysis result could come out of this project. As one example she mentioned Ukraine. While Turkey did not like being compared to Ukraine, one could see that the country was now negotiating several integration possibilities with the EU, such as a Customs Union, like Turkey once did. Therefore, a comparison would benefit FEUTURE's research.

