



Universiteit Leiden

MINORITY RIGHTS IN TURKEY:
EU Smart Power and the Aramean Property Issue

by

Sarah W. Bakir

Student no. s1807420
Thesis appl: Ma International Relations (International Studies)
Words: 10,371
Supervisor: dr. Noa Schonmann
Date: 5 January 2018

Acknowledgements

First off, I wish to thank my supervisor dr. Noa Schonmann for her guidance throughout my writing process. I also would like to thank dr. Maxine David and dr. Jan Oster for their valuable insights on the EU.

A special thank you to my family and friends. Not only for their undying love and support, but for their patience through my pre-master and master degrees. Last, but definitely not least: *to the World Council of my Aramean people. The Aramean garden that is greatly loved and respected!*¹ Its leadership and volunteers have dedicated their life to advocate the plight of the Aramean people worldwide, and especially in the homeland. Along the way, they have greatly inspired Arameans, including myself, to develop their personal, academic and professional skills in order to serve our people. It is to you and to my family, who originate from Tur Abdin, that I dedicate this thesis.

– Sarah W. Bakir

Amsterdam, 5 January 2018

¹ Translated from the 1983 poem *Shlomo kulkhun Suryoye* by the legendary Aramean singer Fuad Ispir († 2012) in dedication of the establishment of the Syriac Universal Alliance (now: World Council of Arameans).

Note to reader

Aramean or Syrian/Syriac? | In his book, the late Syrian Orthodox patriarch stated that “the Syriac language is the Aramaic language itself, and the Arameans are the Syrians themselves. Whoever has made a distinction between them has erred.”² To avoid unnecessary confusion as to which people this thesis refers to, the term *Aramean(s)* (Turkish: *Süryani(ler)*) will be used for the Aramean/Syriac people, unless directly quoted from the primary source.

List of abbreviations

CoE	Council of Europe
EU	European Union
EC	European Commission
ECtHR	European Court for Human Rights
MEP	Member of the European Parliament

² H.H. Moran Mor Ignatius Zakka I beth Iwas (1983). *The Syrian Orthodox Church at a Glance*. Damascus: Bab Touma Press, p. 25.

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Note to reader	3
List of abbreviations	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Conceptual Framework: The (Normative) Power of Regional Organisations.....	7
Smart Power and the EU	8
Research Question.....	9
Design and Methodology	10
III. Institutional and Historical Background	13
Minority Issues in Turkey	13
The Aramean Property Issue	13
Turkey and EU Accession Process	15
IV. EU Power Application and its Effectiveness.....	16
2005 – 2008.....	16
2008 – 2011	19
V. Conclusion.....	25
Lack of Public Diplomacy	25
A Unified EU Message	26
Bibliography	28

I. *Introduction*

In the last several years, Turkey's relationship with the EU has strongly deteriorated over the country's equally deteriorating human rights conditions. Especially in the case of Turkey's handling of issues regarding freedom of speech and freedom of assembly/protest. From the Gezi park protests to shutting down social media and its handling of the failed coup attempt. It was further exacerbated by Turkey's diplomatic rows with EU member states Germany and the Netherlands. The trust and relationship between the EU and Turkey has been so severely damaged, that the EU has recently decided to cut funds for Turkey's accession, with the exception of the funds dedicated to human rights reforms in the country – leaving some room for Turkey to redeem itself (Emmott, 2017).

However, there was a time when Turkey was dedicated to its reform process for the purpose of EU accession. The country already had a history of human rights violations, particularly when it came to minority rights issues. Nonetheless, Turkey convinced the EU that it made sincere efforts to norm change by adopting laws in line with EU standards. These reforms turned out to be merely superficial, as the human rights situation in the country deteriorated. As the EU views itself as a normative power, and it had been relatively successful in advancing minority rights in the CEECs, why had it not been able to do the same in Turkey? Especially considering that Turkey's (non-Muslim) minorities compose only 0,20% of the total populace, in comparison to e.g. Latvia where its Russophone minority composes a third of the population during its accession process (Hurst, 2012; Hughes, 2005).

What is interesting in this regard is to see to what degree the EU has exhausted the use of its smart power to ensure norm change to ensue in Turkey. This is particularly relevant at a time where regional organisations, such as the EU, are deemed incompetent by their critics. To select a specific case, this thesis focuses on the Aramean property issue in *Tur Abdin*³. Research on Turkey and its minority issues, within the context of EU accession talks, are mostly limited to the Kurdish and Greek communities. In case of non-Muslim minorities, and/or property issues, the Greek question within Turkey is used as a prime example. Both these minorities pose a bigger challenge for Turkey. Whereas the Kurds are a threat to Turkish security and territory, the issue with the Greeks is linked to Cyprus and the implementation of the Lausanne Treaty (1923). The Arameans, however, are a small indigenous minority with no independent government, are not recognised under Lausanne, and pose no threat to Turkish sovereignty.

³ The native region where the Arameans reside in southeast Turkey is called *Tur Abdin* (English: "Mountain of the Servants" of God), and covers the cities and villages in the Mardin, Batman and Sirnak provinces.

Their case is not mentioned in academic works within the framework of minority rights in Turkey, apart from an occasional implicit reference under *other non-Muslim* or *Christian minorities*. They are, however, mentioned in policy papers and statements pertaining to freedom of religion and right to property (e.g. Güsten, 2015; Omtzigt, Tozman & Tyndall, 2012). None of these studies, however, discuss the – relatively minor – Aramean property issue as a possible first victory for the EU in bringing about norm change in Turkey. Advancing their property issues, could lay down the groundwork for any further positive steps within the larger Aramean question, but also for other ethno-religious minorities.

Hence, the current thesis researches: *why was the EU unable to advance the Aramean property cases during the height of Turkey's accession negotiations (2005-2011)?* The thesis suggests that, in order to effectively convey EU normative power, the EU should use smart power as a means to bring about norm change in both the target government (through foreign policy), and its society (through public diplomacy; Nye, 2008). It subsequently argues that, in terms of foreign policy, the EU's credibility plays a strong role in governmental norm change (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2004). Based on the reports and resolutions issued by the EU,⁴ its policy toward the Turkish government and public, and the subsequent reactions by the Turkish government, this thesis concludes that the EU had a limited approach to smart power, and did not prove to be credible in Turkey's view.

In order to answer the abovementioned research question, this study examines the effects of EU normative power in the Aramean property issue in Turkey. First, the thesis presents the conceptual framework of the research. It debates the use of 'power' in regional organisations when it comes to minority issues. Second, the thesis provides historical backgrounds of the Aramean property issue in Turkey, as well as the Turkey-EU process. Third, the current thesis analyses EU smart power with regard to the Aramean property cases during 2005-2011. Finally, the thesis offers a number of conclusions to answer the aforementioned research question.

⁴ This includes all its institutions and the CoE.

II. *Conceptual Framework: The (Normative) Power of Regional Organisations*

Normative power is generally perceived as the *power over opinion* (Manners, 2006). It aims to reshape a perceived notion to comply with an actor's own paradigm. As a regional organisation, the EU has been one such actor to exert its normative power. The EU's norm driven policy is well codified in its legislation and policies, and particularly article 21 Treaty of the EU. In it, it defines its core norms: peace, liberty, democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

It is by virtue of its principles that the EU aims to exert its normative power (*idem*). However, some argue that the EU member states, additionally, seek to strengthen their position among great powers such as the US, Russia and China. The EU, in this sense, serves as an instrument to promote the collective security of these states (Hyde-Price, 2006). Though these different conceptions of what drives EU normative power might not greatly influence the decision to exert power, it does affect the credibility of its application of EU political values. It subsequently affects the target government's willingness to comply. The goal of norm change can be achieved by exerting power. Within the study of International Relations, soft and hard power are prevalent, while smart power promotes the combination of both.

Soft power is the method of attraction to gain a desired outcome (Nye, 2008). Three resources determine its effectiveness: influencing (popular) culture, political values and foreign policies. The latter two are mostly dependent on the norm imposing actor's perceived *credibility* and *legitimacy*. If these are considered positive, the norm changing actor would be perceived as having *moral authority* (*idem*). However, soft power is just that: soft. Its (realist) critics refer to the concept's inability to meet its goal through attraction alone. Ferguson (2003) states that having success in soft power resource areas does not necessarily result in a favourable outcome. Matsuda (2007) adds to this and notes that the US's attempt to transfer its norms onto Japan was unsuccessful. Though Japan did adopt some of the US cultural values, it never distanced itself from its own traditional cultural norms. This is the issue of having some success through (some) power resources versus actually bringing about the envisioned behavioural change. Nye (2008) further defines power, and states that the approach is divided between inducements ("carrots") and threats ("sticks"). Inducements can be viewed as rewards for compliance, whereas threats are punishments such as military measures and economic sanctions (*idem*). This description exceeds the definition of soft power (attraction) and comes closer to hard power application.

Realists would assert that the latter is a more successful approach to power. Hard power relies on coercion and payment to achieve the desired outcome. Its resources are

military and economic coercion to influence the target political entity (idem). Ferguson (2003) argues that power depends on economic growth and political institutions. However, as history shows, relying solely on coercive – and oppressive – measures, could result in public backlash and even revolt. To bring about norm change, as a (public) policy, it needs to be assimilated within both government and society to be sustainable. Hence, for both soft and hard power to be effective, diplomacy is necessary to ensure their strength (idem). Most scholars agree that neither approach alone is sufficient to bring about lasting behavioural change. Hence, this thesis will focus on the smart power of the EU. Smart power makes use of both soft and hard power elements and uses public diplomacy as its main resource (Nye, 2008).

Smart Power and the EU

With smart power, public diplomacy is an important means to come to norm compliance (Nye, 2009). Public diplomacy makes use of external communications towards target societies to achieve its aims. These are 1) daily communications, which seek to inform the target society on EU policies and measures towards their government, 2) strategic communications, which pertain to an EU narrative that bonds both the EU and the candidate country, and 3) long-term relationships with key actors (including the government) by way of bilateral development projects (idem). All three communications steer away from classical hard power measures towards norm change. By putting emphasis on norm change with the target society, target governments will – in theory – be relieved of effectively implementing the new norm within their society. One might view this as a way to use a society to enforce norm change with its own government.

Norm change towards governments focuses on institutional and legislative change, and their effective implementation. As part of a long-term relationship with key actors, and to ensure norm change ensues with the candidate country, the application of sticks and carrots is applied. In general, the premise for this approach is that norm change will only occur if they are set as prerequisites for rewards. These rewards, however, need to exceed the adoption costs of the candidate state. This consideration depends on the determinacy of conditions, the size and speed of rewards, the credibility of threats and promises, and the size of adoption costs (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2004).

The determinacy of conditions refers to the clarity and formality of the condition in question. This allows for no ambiguous interpretations of the rewards condition and adds to the EU's credibility (idem). This needs to show the EU's uncompromised dedication to multiply its principles. The size and speed of rewards refers to how "big" the reward is that

will take the candidate country closer to EU membership, and how long it has to wait to receive the reward. If the reward is perceived as significantly valuable to the candidate state, and given within an acceptable time after the condition is met, the more likely the candidate state is to comply with EU conditionality (idem). The credibility of threats and promises are connected to the credibility of the threat to not allocate rewards in case of non-compliance. Regarding threats, this increases when the EU has the superior bargaining power over the candidate state. As per promises, it pertains to the credibility of following up on promises made. In both cases, credibility would increase with consistency in reward application: with non-compliance, no reward will follow. With compliance, reward will follow (idem). This also pertains to the EU's political value, and ultimately the strength of its foreign policy, as resources of soft power (Nye, 2008). Once the former three are viewed positively by the candidate country, it will weigh the size of adoption costs against the rewards. The adoption costs can be ascribed to the internal situation in the candidate country. Beside the desire of the candidate government to receive rewards, its domestic actors need to be on board with the decision to meet conditionality. One might think of a society where the elite favour EU accession, but the people have no interest in it. This would make the practical implementation of EU conditions very difficult (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2004). The latter reaffirms the need for public diplomacy to shape the minds of the public into norm compliance as well (Nye, 2008).

Research Question

Looking at Turkey's accession progress and its minority issues, one might argue that the EU was in a position to exert its normative power through smart power. Especially during the first years of accession talks when Turkey repeatedly expressed full commitment to implementing the necessary conditions for EU accession (e.g. BBC News, 2009). Considering this momentum, and the assistance and cooperation it had received from the EU, one might wonder why the EU was unable to bring about norm change in Turkey. In particular with regard to the Arameans, its unrecognised non-Muslim minority (approx. 0.04% of the population), and their property issues. Hence, this thesis formulates the following central question: *why was the EU unable to advance the Aramean property cases during the height of Turkey's accession negotiations (2005-2011)?*

Taking into consideration Nye's (2008) and Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeiers's (2004) factors to increase the effectiveness of applying *carrots*, the current thesis hypothesises the following:

1. *There was a lack of consistency in EU conditionality application*, as member states had different opinions on Turkey's accession. The mandatory compliance with the political criteria was an issue. The minority situation has generally known to be dire in Turkey for decades. The EU's decision to proceed in opening of the chapters anyway, might have given Turkey the notion that it had the superior bargaining position and could brush over the minority issues in the country.
2. *The EU was not in a superior bargaining position*, as Turkey was already an active player within the international community. It is an important NATO member that also hosts one of its military bases. In 2008, the EU accounted for the majority of Turkey's exports. The EU also took note of Turkey's 'zero problems with neighbours'-policy, which turned the country into the mediator between the West and the Middle East. These are but some of the areas in which Turkey played an active and significant role during the height of the accession talks.
3. *The EU neglected to address Turkish society in its pursuit to multiply its norms*. Though bilateral programmes were set into place, it did not engage in other forms of public diplomacy on the matter with Turkish society. Most news brought forward consisted of prepared articles and press releases, but rarely contained addresses to the Turkish public. Thus the information flow towards the Turkish public was mostly one-sided.

Design and Methodology

The current thesis will take on a qualitative approach to the proposed research question. In particular the method of explaining outcome process tracing will be applied to the thesis. It takes on the Aramean property issues case, i.e. minority issues, within the context of Turkey's accession to the EU. Within this framework, the present study seeks to explain the causal chain that led to EU power being insufficient to push Turkey into norm compliance in the Aramean case (Collier, 2011). However, there are some limitations to this method.

The **first** refers to the availability of information (Black, 2016). The accounts of EU decision making, Turkish responses and the situational analysis will be based on available research on Turkey's accession talks and minority issues. These can be found in governmental documents of Turkey, EU Progress Reports on Turkey, EP Resolutions pertaining to Turkey's *acquis* negotiations, CoE Resolutions, advocacy reports and interviews, among others.

However, politics and diplomacy are as much activities that are played out behind closed doors as they are in public. Hence, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to get this information. The **second** refers to the time intensity of the method (*idem*). During the observed period 2005-2011, the EU institutions produced several reports and resolutions (including debates) on Turkey each year. Adding to this the media coverage of these reports, and EU-Turkey developments, this can be quite time consuming.

In order to better understand the evolution of the EU's influence in resolving Turkey's minority property issues, the process tracing method will be complemented with (political) discourse analysis of the actors involved in the issue: the EU, its separate member states, Turkey, and Aramean advocacy groups. The use of words – in both speech and writing – is imperative, as it is telling in what way the EU was publically pressuring the Turkish government into compliance.⁵ Subsequently, how Turkey responded to the EU narrative (Neumann, 2008). What is particularly of interest here, is to see to what degree Aramean advocacy groups were responsible for pressuring both the EU and Turkey to resolve the issues in the Tur Abdin region.

Finally, to triangulate the research process, the thesis will include interviews with stakeholders and other interested groups who are either directly involved or specialised in the question of minority property issues in Turkey. Their insights would provide additional context in which the aforementioned discourses and responses manifested. These stakeholders are, among which, MEPs, Aramean diaspora leadership, policy advisors, and others who are involved in the issue.⁶

As for the considered timeframe of this thesis, it will observe the period 2005 – 2011. Though the Aramean property issue existed prior to the formal start of the Turkish *acquis* negotiations in 2005, it does show a larger involvement in the issue by both the EU and Aramean diaspora groups. The latter mainly focussed on the Armenian genocide and more general minority issues that the national minorities faced in the wake of Turkey-EU accession talks. The end of the proposed period (2011) marks the year when the property issues slowly simmered down and was replaced with the Syrian crisis, an issue in which all the actors were involved. As the EU and Turkey worked together to support the opposition in Syria, the Aramean advocacy groups shifted their focus towards aiding Aramean refugees from and within Turkey's neighbouring country.

⁵ As there was no public discourse (i.e. through media outlets) to be found on the subject matter in the observed period, no discourse could be analysed.

⁶ Despite the author's timely efforts to organise the interviews, these had not taken place due to non-availability of the interviewees.

The envisioned methodology and research strategy would provide for a rigorous analysis of the EU's reward conditionality as a problem-solving instrument to advance the Aramean property issues case.

III. *Institutional and Historical Background*

Minority Issues in Turkey

Turkey was home to over 67 million people in 2005 of which a mere 0,20% (1,34 million) consists of ethno-religious minorities – i.e. non-Turkish and non-Muslim (Hurst, 2012). Among these minorities are the Arameans who are native to the Kurdish dominated southeast region, otherwise known as Tur Abdin. In 2005, they numbered up to 30,000 individuals in Turkey, of which 2,500 lived in Tur Abdin. As there is much written about the general situation of minorities in Turkey, this thesis will focus solely on the property issue of the Arameans.

Aramean property issue

The Aramean property issues case in Turkey is fairly unknown, both within and outside of Turkey. The EC reported on the Aramean (and other non-Muslims) property issues as early as 2003 (EC, 2003 [report]). This occurred after Arameans started to rebuild their homes *en masse* following a 2001 decree issued by then Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit, reluctantly calling on the Aramean diaspora to return to their lands (Ecevit, 2001). Nonetheless, the Arameans saw it as a positive step in the right direction and returned to Tur Abdin (Güsten, 2015). The euphoria was short lived when their sense of security – in the broadest sense – seemed to be non-existent (idem; Syriac Universal Alliance, 2011 [report]). Issues started in 2008 when the Turkish government started a project to modernise its land registration and cadastre. The following section briefly discusses the general property issues pertaining to claims on boundaries (cadastre), forestry and state treasury, and specifically the Mor Gabriel case.

The boundary cases relate to the borders of the property in question. The cadastre was put in charge to modernise the land registration in Tur Abdin. In this process, the cadastre altered existing boundaries, of which a part hereof was implemented after Kurdish claims to Aramean property, in spite of various testimonies of ownership (Tozman, 2012).

Forestry cases relate to claims of woods and river lands. Turkish Forest Law [1987] stipulates that no parcel of land containing ‘woods’ or rivers can be privately owned. The Turkish authorities had defined several parcels of land belonging to Mor Gabriel and individual Arameans as state forestry. Regardless of the fact that Mor Gabriel produced substantial proof that it has title deeds to the disputed 276,000m² of land, planted the trees on

the lands itself, and has payed taxes over them since the creation of the Turkish Republic (Omtzigt, 2012).

Treasury cases pertain to property (e.g. monuments) and lands that fall under the care of the government and/or its bodies. Similar to the forestry cases, the government laid claims on lands belonging to the Aramean individuals and religious entities. In these cases, pertaining to forestry and treasury, the local courts ruled in favour of the monastery only to be overturned by the Supreme Court in Ankara (idem; Syriac Universal Alliance, 2011 [report]).

The Aramean property issues case only received partial notoriety, when the Kurds and the Turkish government made claims to the lands of Mor Gabriel Monastery in 2008 (Yayvantepe, Eğlence ve Çandarlı köy muhtarları k. Deyrulumur Manastırı Yönetimi, [2008]). This triggered a mass demonstration in Berlin, where over 20,000 Arameans (and supporters) from across Europe gathered (Die Welt, 2009). The demonstration, and consequent media attention, prompted a number of MEPs to intervene in the matter. Mor Gabriel's neighbouring villages of Yayvantepe, Eğlence and Çandarlı made claims with regard to the boundaries of the villages and the monastery. They claimed that the monastery was making illegal use of their lands. The court granted these villages over 100,000m², and attempted to allow for the claim to an additional 300,000m² (Syriac Universal Alliance, 2011 [report]). Moreover, without evidence, these villages accused the monastery of performing illegal practices. In addition, despite its foundation in the year 397 AD, they even claimed that this sacred site and place of worship was built on Islamic foundations (Yayvantepe, Eğlence ve Çandarlı köy muhtarları k. Deyrulumur Manastırı Yönetimi, [2008]). The court cases against the government, which pertain to forestry and treasury issues, had been taken up by the Turkish Supreme Court. It subsequently ruled in favour of the government, which prompted the monastery to take the case to the ECtHR (Midyat Syriac Deyrulumur Mor Gabriel Foundation v. Turkey, [2011]).

The Mor Gabriel case can be viewed as the poster child for the illegal expropriation of property in Tur Abdin. An extensive investigation into the issues in 2009 concluded that over 30 Aramean villages faced similar issues (Syriac Universal Alliance, 2011 [report]). They were subject to numerous court cases with their Kurdish neighbours, the cadastre and the government. The complexity of the cases – both in establishing ownership where no title deeds were available and the great influence of the Muslim-Kurdish *aghas* on the local authorities – allowed for the issues to be unreasonably prolonged. Notwithstanding Turkey's reputation in intentionally delaying court procedures to exhaust the civilian plaintiffs.

Policy advisors and interest groups have indicated that the Aramean property issue could be fairly easily resolved (e.g. Güsten, 2015). However, considering the position of the Arameans and the status of all the court cases, it is evident that it is not an issue that can be resolved internally. Hence, the EU's intervention, as an impartial arbiter, could help to advance the case in a controlled manner. The next chapter examines the effectiveness of EU normative power in the Aramean property issues case.

Turkey and EU Accession Process

At the outset of the negotiations the EU and Turkey had set up the Framework for Negotiations (2005) in which the EU stated its intentions and expectations towards Turkey. In general, the EU made clear that both it and Turkey's mutual objective would be Turkish accession to the EU. To emphasize the EU's bid towards Turkish norm change, the framework included a *plan B* should Turkey be unable to meet the criteria for accession. This alternative route would see a Turkey that would be "anchored within European structures through the strongest possible bond" (EC, 2005 [framework]). This type of cooperation with Turkey was the preferred option over accession by France, Germany, and Austria. The latter, whose constituency voted 80% against Turkish accession, insisted on associate membership (Watt, 2005). However, after including a right to suspend Turkey's candidacy in case of significant and ongoing violation of the EU's principles set forth in the framework, Austria stepped down on its position (EC, 2005 [framework]; The Guardian, 2005). Turkey met the reluctance of these EU members with diplomatic discourse. In it, it emphasized the ambition of Turkey to bridge the gap between *Christian* Europe and the *Muslim* Middle East. By allowing Turkey to play this role, it argued, would result in the EU becoming a global power. Not doing so, would lack "political maturity" on the EU's part, and would diminish the organisation as nothing more than a "Christian club" (idem). Turkey used this narrative in the wake of the negotiation opening. It sufficiently convinced the EU and the European public of Turkey's genuine intentions towards EU norm implementation.

IV. *EU Power Application and its Effectiveness*

The current section analyses 2005–2008, representing the earlier period of Turkey’s accession talks, and 2008–2011, when the Aramean property issues case had caught the attention of the international community. In both periods, the analyses focus on the strength of EU power with regard to Turkey. It subsequently considers the influence of Aramean interest groups in the development of the Aramean property issue.

2005 – 2008

During the **first year** the EC reported on Turkey’s progress compared to the 2004 Regular Report. As per the situation of minorities, it concluded that the situation of minorities in the country remained unchanged. Turkey’s reluctance to sign the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was viewed by the EC as an element that “could be used to prevent further progress on the protection of minority rights” (EC, 2005: 36 [report]). Additionally, the EC raised concern over Turkey not signing the European framework convention (protection of minorities) and charter (minority languages) pertaining to the right of minorities. The EC deemed it imperative as minorities in Turkey are subject to “de facto discrimination” (ibid). This holds particularly true for those that belong to non-Muslim minorities with respect to their legal status and property rights. With regard to the Arameans’ property issues, the report mentioned the seizure of Aramean property by inhabitants of the region and the cadastre office (idem). The EU’s public engagement – i.e. outside the EU bodies – regarding the property issues of Arameans, or other Christian minorities for that matter, were virtually non-existent. Nor did the individual member states or Turkey address this issue publicly. The resolution that the EP subsequently adopted did not deal with the actual issues the EC reported on. Rather, it reemphasized the Framework for Negotiations, and the EP’s insistence that Turkey abides by it (EP, 2005 [resolution]).

In this first year the EU made no efforts to influence Turkish society through domestic (Turkish) or international media in order to shed light on the Aramean issue. Considering that the EU was aware of the minority issues, and specifically that of the Arameans, it is possible that the EU did not perceive it beneficial to further publically point out Turkey’s problems in the media. Turkey, which, at that time, seemed motivated to follow EU conditions for accession, might well have perceived such an action as a public punishment.

In **2006**, when the first chapters of the *acquis* were opened, the EC reported on increased complaints of both Aramean private as religious property. Notably, the report also

observed an increased number of applications to the ECtHR, regarding right to a fair trial and protection of property rights (EC, 2006 [report]). Based on this report and other relevant Turkey reviews, the EU Rapporteur for Turkey (Camiel Eurlings), forwarded a motion for a resolution on the 2005 and 2006 Turkey reports. In the resolution, he lumped all minorities' issues into two paragraphs. The first was directed at religious communities, in which the Rapporteur reiterated his call to Turkey to eliminate all obstacles faced by religious minorities, including the end of seizing their properties. He furthermore called on the protection of fundamental rights of Christian minorities (Eurlings, 2006). The second was a call to settle issues with Turkey's national minorities in the same matter Turkey sought to overcome historical issues with Armenia. With this regard, the Rapporteur explicitly mentioned the Arameans (idem). The debates following the motion did point to issues affecting the Arameans, but it ignored the property issues. It was the issue of Cyprus that pushed the EP to use harsher language towards Turkey (EP, 2006 [press release]). Turkey's EU Chief negotiator, Ali Babacan, reaffirmed Turkey's willingness to resolve the Cyprus issue and other high profile issues during the 11th Conference of the Baltic Forum (Babacan, 2006). This, in spite of growing Turkish public opinion to quit the EU talks (Castle, 2006). In his speech, Babacan made no mention of minority issues. After diplomatic efforts failed to push Turkey to meet its obligations under the Ankara protocol, the EU decided to freeze the open chapters until Turkey did (EC, 2006 [press statement]).

Though the Cyprus issue was covered by the international media, the EU still reluctantly engaged in public diplomacy around the issue, and neither did it take any steps to seek Turkish norm compliance in the Aramean property cases. The media attention did prompt the Turkish representation to publicly respond to the Cyprus issue.

In **2007** Turkey's minority issues remained unchanged. The EC particularly noted that no progress had been made toward the Aramean property issue, and that complaints again had risen (EC, 2007 [report]). Even though Turkey had the legal system in place to ensure the proper regulation of property rights, it lacked the implementation of it. The EC also noted Turkey's "reservation regarding minority rights," and the signing of relevant conventions such as the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. These aspects combined, led minority property issues to remain a growing issue (idem: 21). Over two-thirds of cases brought against Turkey at the ECtHR pertained to right to a fair trial and protection of property. The report also noted the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities requesting access to South-East Turkey (i.e. Tur Abdin). However, this was refused. The report further only noted the Kurdish issue, including the PKK, the Arameans were not

mentioned in this regard. It is worth recalling that the Aramean (property) issue is as much an issue with the Turkish government, as it is with the Kurds in Tur Abdin.

The new EU Turkey Rapporteur, Ria Oomen-Ruijten, proposed a resolution in which she sought the diplomatic route to push for Turkish norm change. Welcoming the positive steps Turkey made with regard to the Law on Foundations, she called on Turkey to ensure that the law meets ECHR requirements and that it resolves the issues non-Muslim religious foundations have (e.g. legal entity and property rights). She further called on the protection of religious and cultural heritage, referring to – among others – the Greek Halki Seminary. No specific reference was made toward the issue of Aramean private and religious property (Oomen-Ruijten, 2008).

During the debate on the Rapporteur's resolution proposal, several MEPs had stronger concerns about Turkey's failure to respect EU principles, including minority rights. Especially with regard to the general situation of non-Muslim minorities, ranging from discrimination to seizure of property. MEP Bastiaan Belder even pointed towards the Turkish government for publicly "indicting" Arameans and other Christians, leading to their long persecution in the country (EP, 2008 [debate]). All MEPs concluded that much more needed to be done on Turkey's part to ensure the rights of minorities. MEP István Szent-Iványi took a more nuanced approach and noted that Turkey's failure to implement EU principles lies with

(...) uncertainties in Turkish domestic politics and by hesitation on the part of the European Union with regard to Turkey. (...) It is in our strategic interests that Turkey should become part of the political body of Europe in the long term. (...) We have a joint responsibility to ensure that this process is a success, because it is our failure too, and not just Turkey's, if the negotiations run aground (idem).

The final resolution on Turkey's 2007 report put stronger emphasis on the situation of ethno-religious minorities than the draft proposal (EP, 2008 [resolution]). Though the Armenians (regarding the murder of Hrant Dink), the Greeks (regarding the re-opening of the Halki Seminary) and the Kurdish issue were mentioned, the Aramean issue was omitted from the final resolution. Again, the strong message of the EU hardly left the floor of its institutions. The press statement from the EC that was released earlier was limited to general remarks. It did not mention the (Aramean) property issue in Turkey, though the EC did "urge" Turkey to make rapid reforms with regard to the situation of minorities (EC, 2007 [report]). Again, the EU did not make any efforts to engage in public diplomacy to address Turkey's minority issues and specifically that of the Aramean property issue.

It is worth noting that during the period 2005-2008, Turkey strongly narrated a position as being the only secular Muslim country that was ready and willing to comply with EU norms. Nonetheless, the EU did not effectively reach mass media and incorporate programmes, which would benefit the situation of minorities in Turkey. However, even the Arameans themselves did not attempt to escalate their issues to the (inter)national press. Aramean interest organisations state that, at the time, their focus was geared toward the preservation of their identity in Turkey as well as in the diaspora (Güsten, 2015). The Aramean village associations, that were set up after considerable numbers of Arameans returned to Turkey following President Ecevit's decree (2001), were aware of the situation. They chose to remain discrete as to not give their Kurdish neighbours reasons to assault them, and the Turkish government and authorities to not further discriminate against them (*idem*). In the first three years, no change in approach was seen pertaining to the EU's application of power – whether in public diplomacy or reprimanding Turkey for increased minority rights violations – in the Aramean property case. Turkey's approach to its minorities resulted in a growth of the Aramean issues.

2008 – 2011

In **2008** the EC put a larger emphasis on the minority property issues in Turkey. It specifically put focus on post-war property issues of non-Muslim minorities, and the Greek private and religious properties. Regarding the Arameans, the EC again reported an increase in private and religious property expropriations. Now noting the implications of the cadastre establishment on the expropriations. In general, the issues concerning minorities, their property issues, and in particular that of the Aramean people remained unchanged (EC, 2008 [report]). Between the publication of the EC Report and the resolution tabled by the Turkey Rapporteur, the Kurds had made claims on Mor Gabriel monastery. This led to the Aramean interest organisations to lobby their national governments, international organisations and the media. The Aramean organisations, Swedish MPs and international media attended the first court hearings (WCA-NGO, 2008). However, when the courts ruled in favour of the Kurdish villages, mass protests ensued in the diaspora.

In her tabled draft resolution, the Rapporteur acknowledged the international outrage. In one paragraph she listed the most notable issue of each non-Muslim religious institute. On the Arameans she included the following:

(...) regrets the planned expropriation of the Syriac Orthodox Monastery of St Gabriel in Tur Abdin and the court procedures against representatives of the monastery (Oomen-Ruijten, 2009).

The debate on the draft resolution had no special focus on the Aramean property issue, but rather on all forms of persecution and discrimination of non-Muslim minorities. This led to debates on these minorities being centred around freedom of religion, meaning that the EU viewed the issues were largely rooted in Turkish intolerance for non-Muslim (i.e. non-Sunni) Turks. MEPs reaffirmed their views of Turkey, with some acknowledging the strategic benefits of having Turkey as a member, yet expressing their strong concerns on the growing infringement on freedom of religion. One MEP noted the demonization of indigenous Christian minorities in, among others, media and education, which contributed to their situation in the country (EP, 2009 [debate]). While one MEP pointed towards Turkey's "continuous and increasingly irritating delays (...) in relation to these [non-Muslim] issues," another claimed that the lack of progress resulted in

(...) the EU [being] less willing to give Turkey a fair chance and that in Turkey, enthusiasm for membership has waned (idem).

The paragraph in the final resolution remained unchanged after the debate (EP, 2009 [resolution]). Though MPs and MEPs with a large Aramean constituency did pay heed to the property issues in Tur Abdin, and engaged with their domestic media, the EU once again refrained from using public diplomacy as a resource towards Turkish norm change. With MEPs voicing their discontent with the lack of progress, the EU simultaneously avoided using *sticks* to motivate Turkey to respect minority rights. This shows both a lack of unity within the EU (and its institutions) and a lack of credibility, as the EU does not follow up on its own threats.

In **2009**, the EU published three reports on Turkey. One was the EC 2009 Progress report, the second was of the CoE on Religious Freedom in Turkey and Eastern Thrace (Greece) and the third was the resolution (or report) of the EP Turkey Rapporteur.

The EC reported the same property issues the Arameans (and other non-Muslim) are facing. It took note of the court cases against private Arameans and, in particular, the cases against the Mor Gabriel monastery. Whereas it did describe to what the property issues pertained to, it made no mention of the government's and Kurds' responses to the cases –

similar to the previous years. Additionally, the problems non-Muslim religious institutes faced were mentioned in general terms (EC, 2009 [report]).

The CoE addressed the Aramean property issue as a part of Turkey's and Greece's approach pertaining to religious freedom, which is guided by the Lausanne Treaty (1923) (Hunault, 2009 [report]). With respect to the Aramean (property) issue, the CoE Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion makes no mention of the Arameans in his report – apart from describing the Christian demography in Turkey. However, when it comes to his draft resolution he explicitly calls on Turkey to ensure that Mor Gabriel “is not deprived of its lands, and that it is protected in its entirety” (idem: 5). Any other (property) issues the Arameans were facing, were mentioned in general terms under the term *non-Muslim minorities* (ibid). A final decision on this resolution was made in early 2010 (see below).

The EP Turkey Rapporteur, taking note of both the EC and CoE reports, expressed her concerns about the Aramean property issue, highlighting the Mor Gabriel case (Oomen-Ruijten, 2010). The debate continued on in a growing concern for Turkey's ability to respect minority rights. As non-Muslim minorities in Turkey experience largely the same issues, most MEPs spoke in general terms on the issues of property rights, religious freedom and other areas in which Arameans and other Christians were negatively impacted (EP, 2010 [debate]). The Rapporteur's mention of the Arameans in the final resolution did not change. However, she did add a paragraph in which she again called on Turkey to respect minority rights as part of the country's fulfilment of the Copenhagen criteria (EP, 2010 [resolution]).

At this time, international media outlets and national media reported on the Aramean Mor Gabriel monastery. Wall Street Journal named the case a test of Turkey's tolerance towards minorities and Reuters dedicated an article on the monastery and the Arameans in Tur Abdin (Higgins, 2009; Villelabeitia, 2009). Yet again, no commentary is to be found in these articles, or others, by the EU. Neither was Turkey reprimanded by the EU for its ever-growing minority rights violations, thus countering the credibility of its own Framework for Negotiations with Turkey (2005).

In **2010**, the EC reported on the status of the Mor Gabriel cases and noted that Turkey needed “to ensure full respect of the property rights of all non-Muslim religious communities”, in its final remarks (EC, 2010: 31). Though it did mention that Aramean private individuals were experiencing the same property issues, it did not elaborate on the situation of other Aramean properties (idem). While Mor Gabriel had become the high profile case, the property issues of other Aramean monasteries and private property were in a far worse state (Tozman, 2012). Nor did the EC address the underlying causes that led to the

property issues cases. A month later the EP organised a *Public Hearing on Human Rights in Turkey in view of the Commission's Progress Report on 9 November 2010*. The director of EC Enlargement stated that the individual (Aramean) property cases, brought forward to the EC, represented “systematic failures to comply with the criteria” (EP, 2010 [video]).

The Turkey Rapporteur’s resolution was largely in line with the messages in the EC report and the EP public hearing. She welcomed the efforts made by the Turkish government to improve its relationship with its minorities, but expressed her worries at the size and effectiveness of these efforts. The issues with key religious property issues were mentioned, including Mor Gabriel pertaining to the Arameans as a Christian minority. The private property cases, nor the lesser known confiscations and destruction of other Aramean churches and monasteries, were mentioned (Oomen-Ruijten, 2011). During the debate the Rapporteur stated that

(...) the statement on Mor Gabriel, in particular, proves that plenty of work still needs to be done and I suspect that it would be damaging for the Turkish Government if this case had to be settled by the Court of Justice once again. That is why something must be done about providing a democratic opening (EP, 2011 [debate]).

The Rapporteur did not disclose what actually needed to be done, however most MEPs agreed, and emphasized that it was Turkey’s responsibility to implement the EU principles. They added that the Turkey was important to the EU, but that there was a limit to the lengths it would go to, to ensure Turkey’s accession. Staunch supporters of Turkish accession, who played down the situation in Turkey (including minority rights), found little support within the EP chambers. While some called to end the negotiations with Turkey, branding it a lost cause, others emphasized the importance of multiplying EU norms onto Turkey.

Developments within the CoE, however, were different. Resolution 1704 (2010), building on Hunault’s 2009 religious freedom report, was adopted. One Aramean interest group in particular, successfully lobbied CoE members who proposed and accepted amendments to the draft. These were nearly verbatim adopted in the final resolution (WCA-NGO, 2010). What made this resolution different from the ones passed in the EP, is that it looks beyond Mor Gabriel. It included: all Aramean property cases; other forms of minority rights violations; the underlying causes of the Aramean (and Greek) issue, and; finally, forced Turkey to report back to the CoE within a year on the progress it had made with respect to the minority issues set out in the resolution. It was regarded by the Aramean interest organisations as the first clear message given by an EU institution towards Turkey (idem). The effect of this

resolution became noticeable as Turkish officials started to engage more with the Aramean diaspora through their organisations. It was at this time that the Turkish government held closed consultations with the Aramean interest groups in Brussels. Later that year Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, attended a conference organised by the Greek diaspora, to which the Aramean representation, and EU politicians – who were active on the issues of Christian minorities in Turkey – were invited to facilitate dialogue between Turkey and its Christian minorities.

As a guest keynote speaker, he stated that the Turkish government primary goals was that its citizens lived in harmony and were free to exercise their religion (Order St Andrew, 2011 [video 1]). Above all, Turkey was a secular state that safeguarded this right by law. Refraining from mentioning any specific minority (property) issue, he stated that Turkey was in dialogue with various community representatives to address any issue pertaining to freedom of religion, hinting towards the Mor Gabriel case. He proceeded to give a short account of steps Turkey had undertaken in light of Resolution 1704. However, he continued on with general remarks on how the EU would profit from Turkey's accession. When asked about concrete issues, such as the demonization of minorities in textbooks, Bağış stated that the Turkish Ministry for Education would ensure that no textbook in 2011 would contain such texts (idem). In 2011, the Ministry for Education released a history book designated for Turkish middle school students. In the paragraph entitled *The Situation of Arameans within the Ottoman State* the book propagates, among others, that the Arameans are the political and religious tools of the West⁷ (Cazgir et al., 2011). The author of this thesis attended the conference mentioned in this paragraph, and observed how the EU Minister came to give his speech and left after answering a few questions. The entire Turkish delegation, including Turkish media, left the room, with no delegate remaining to, at the very least, hear the concerns and proposed solutions forwarded by the participant minorities. The Aramean representation took note of this and deplored this in his speech (Order St Andrew, 2011 [video 2]).

The latter indicates the lack of sincerity to advance any minority issues on the Turkish representation part – as further noted by the EU members. One might draw the conclusion that Turkey, when it comes to minority rights, holds no regard for EU principles. Yet, no action was taken by the EU to show Turkey and its society, that respecting EU principles are

⁷ Original text (Turkish): Özellikle yurt dışına göç eden Süryaniler Batı'nın ekonomik refahı içinde yaşamak için o devletlerin siyasi ve dinî çıkarlarına alet olmaktadır (Cazgir, et al., 2011: 66).

prerequisites for EU accession. Not through public diplomacy, nor through pro-active displays of its power.

In **2011**, the EC again raised the same concerns as in the previous years and additionally reported on increased violence against non-Muslim minorities (EC, 2011 [report]). The Turkish minister for EU Affairs responded to the report stating that he was disturbed by the EC *allegation* that the country's approach to minority rights had resulted in further deterioration of the situation, and went as far as claiming non-Muslim minorities were satisfied with the government's efforts towards them (Bağış, 2011). At the end of the year, Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu made a diplomatic visit to Germany to meet with the Aramean interest organisations and their following. There was mostly an exchange of compliments back and forth, in the hopes of generating the desired cooperation on each side (Haberler, 2011).

The Turkey Rapporteur had significantly reduced her mentions of property issues with regard to non-Muslims, and dedicated a short sentence to mention only the issue of Mor Gabriel (Oomen-Ruijten, 2012). The debate however, did explicitly concern itself with the situation of Arameans and their property issues (EP, 2012 [debate]). Yet, these concerns were not reflected in the final resolution (EP, 2012 [resolution]).

During the observed years of accession talks, it is clear that the EU did not sufficiently emphasize the gravity of minority issues in Turkey. Though various MEPs were aware of the reality of events, their concerns were not reflected in subsequent resolutions. In 2010, when the Aramean property issue received the most notoriety – through the Mor Gabriel trials – CoE efforts to force Turkey into norm change remained within the confinements of the EU institutions. During the observed years, no news articles were found that included EU narratives on enforcing minority rights (as part of the EU principles), and thus no commentary on the Arameans and their property issues.

V. *Conclusion*

This thesis sought to research the strength and effect of EU normative power on candidate member states, when it comes to minority rights. It took Turkey and the Aramean property issue as a case study to test the EU's impact, and concluded that – based on the theory discussed – the EU was unable to advance the situation. This is because the EU 1) was unable to fully apply smart power, as it failed to fully engage in public diplomacy, and 2) lacked credibility and was unable to effectively apply *carrots* and *sticks* as a general power resource.

The Aramean property issue in Turkey is relatively small, as it affects around 2,500 people. Further considering Nye's theory on public diplomacy and Sedelmeier's on the use of sticks and carrots, the Aramean issue could have been advanced through cease and desist of (il)legal expropriation of Aramean properties, returning property, and/or compensate property destroyed by the Turkish government. This would have been equally beneficial to Turkey as it would not only have appeased the EU, but it would have served as a proof point for the country to show that it could have a good relationship with its national minorities. However, herein lies the issue. Turkey has a well-documented history in which it promoted discriminatory policies towards ethno-religious minorities (e.g. Akçam, 2004). These policies were still visible during the period researched. Moreover, while Turkey failed to implement EU principles, minority issues grew as well as xenophobic sentiments towards non-Muslims. This made it all the more important to not only encourage the Turkish government to adopt EU principles, but also Turkish society.

Lack of Public Diplomacy

At the outset, it was argued that, in order to bring about norm change, smart power was best to be applied. Herein, public diplomacy is used as a means to not only change government behaviour, but also to bring about norm change in Turkish society (Nye, 2008). This thesis found that the EU, and its institutions, made no effort to promote minority rights (as a norm) to the Turkish public. When the organisation did mention minority issues, and specifically the Aramean property issue, it was limited to its own reports, resolutions and press releases (report summary). Even in this respect, – and outside the EP and CoE debates – information shared and resolutions adopted were generalised and hardly transferred the EU's insistence of norm compliance. As a result, the public hardly received any information on the Aramean property cases. When they did, no EU narrative was to be found whatsoever. Hence, there was no EU discourse to publicly respond to for Turkey. It did not need to defend itself, and could

present a one-sided story of the issue within the country itself. The EU's choice to not target Turkish public opinion could be attributed to two explanations. The first is that politics often is as much an activity that is performed behind closed doors, than it is in public. In some cases, it can be argued that it is more effective when done behind closed doors. However, after more than a decade of (pre-)accession talks, no improvement in minority rights were made. Mind you that, since Turkey had made no significant change throughout the observed period, it would make no sense for the EU to maintain the same strategy in the hopes that Turkey would respect minority rights and return the Arameans their property. Especially considering Turkey's history with its minorities. The second is the consideration of Turkey's sovereignty, and to refrain from interfering in Turkey's domestic affairs. Nevertheless, it is to be argued that Turkey had ample time to implement the needed reforms itself. Notwithstanding, that with EU (candidate) accession one relinquishes part of its sovereignty to Brussels. If promoting EU principles is and was the only agenda for the EU, then surely shaping public opinion into respecting minority rights would have aided Turkey in implementing the reforms it had undergone.

A Unified EU Message

This thesis also argued that norm compliance, pertaining to the candidate EU member, relies on the credibility and effective use of *sticks* and *carrots*, a clear message from the EU, and the timeliness of rewards (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2004). Carrots were, among others, the opening of the *acquis* chapters and the (financial) aid package to implement the needed reforms. The sticks that were used were limited to the freezing of negotiation chapters. But never did the EU go as far as to (temporarily) suspend the accession talks with Turkey over its deteriorating human rights situation, despite the Framework for Negotiations (2005) specifically mentioning this. This brings into question the credibility of the EU's ability to apply this *stick* in case of non-compliance. It also sent out the message that Turkey had the superior bargaining position over the EU. Turkey's general narrative regarding EU accession has mostly revolved around the country's political strength (especially in the Muslim world), growing economy, and military power. It would be worth exploring to what extent Turkey perceived EU accession as invaluable to its development – giving EU the superior bargaining power – or if it was a strategic move to expand the country's political power within the regional organisation.

Moreover, the issue lies with the various signals EU members were sending Turkey. Whereas Turkey's supporters (e.g. the UK) brushed over the minority rights issues as something that could be dealt with along the way, opponents pointed out that with non-compliance no reward should follow. This lack of unification, in addition to not suspending the talks, would in theory damage the EU's credibility. After all, if the member states do not respect their own political values, why should Turkey? Realists would point out that the member states naturally sought their own interests above that of the EU collective. However, this approach would diminish the EU's normative power.

Finally, one should consider the timeliness of rewards. As Turkey's accession talks did not result into full EU accession by the end of the observed period, it would be unlikely that Turkey would be motivated to fully comply with EU principles. Nonetheless, it was Turkey's failure to implement EU principles pertaining to minority rights, and that of the EU – as a normative power – to apply smart power which led to Turkey not improving its minority and human rights situation, and perhaps, becoming a member.

Bibliography

- Akçam, T. (2004). *From Empire to Republic*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Babacan, A. (2006). Press lunch with the Turkish State Minister H.E. Ali Babacan. In: *The Baltic Forum's 11th International Conference*. [online] Riga: The Baltic Forum. Available at: <http://www.balticforum.org/events/year-2006/> [Accessed 15 Dec. 2017].
- Bağış, E. (2011). *Press Statement of H.E. Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs, on Turkey's 2011 Progress Report*. [online] Ankara: Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Available at: https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/IlerlemeRaporlari/sn__bakan_in__2011_ir_degerlendirmesi__eng_.pdf [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- BBC News. (2009). *Turkey tries to revive EU drive*. [online] Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7837145.stm> [Accessed 17 Nov. 2017].
- Black, L. (2016). *MAIR Methods Process Tracing*.
- Cazgir, V., Genç, I., Çelik, M., Genç, C. and Turedi, S. (2011). *Ortaöğretim Tarih 10*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of Education], pp.65-66.
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding Process Tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(04), pp.823-830.
- CoE Parliamentary Assembly (2010). *Resolution 1704: Freedom of religion and other human rights for non-Muslim minorities in Turkey and for the Muslim minority in Thrace (eastern Greece)*. [online] Strasbourg: CoE. Available at: <http://semantic-pace.net/tools/pdf.aspx?doc=aHR0cDovL2Fzc2VtYmx5LmNvZS5pbnQvbncveG1sL1hSZWYvWDJILURXLWV4dHIuYXNwP2ZpbGVpZD0xNzgwNyZsYW5nPUVO&xsl=aHR0cDovL3NlbWFudGljcGFjZS5uZXQvWHNsdC9QZGYvWFJiZi1XRRC1BVC1YTUwyUERGLnhzbA==&xslparams=ZmlsZWlkPTE3ODA3> [Accessed 4 Dec. 2017].
- Die Welt. (2009). *Religionsfreiheit: Tausende demonstrieren für Kloster in der Türkei - WELT*. [online] Available at: <https://www.welt.de/regionales/berlin/article3088616/Tausende-demonstrieren-fuer-Kloster-in-der-Tuerkei.html> [Accessed 17 Nov. 2017].
- EC (2003). *2003 Regular Report on Turkey*. Brussels: EC.
- EC (2005). *Turkey 2005 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/Turkey_Progress_Report_2005.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2005). *Turkey Negotiating Framework*. [online] Luxembourg: EC. Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood->

- enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/turkey/st20002_05_tr_framedoc_en.pdf [Accessed 8 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2006). *Turkey 2006 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://www.avrupa.info.tr/sites/default/files/2016-11/Turkey_progress_report%202006.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2007). *Turkey 2007 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/turkey_progress_report_2007.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2007). *Key findings of the progress reports on the candidate countries: Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey*. [online] Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-07-447_en.htm?locale=en [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2008). *Turkey 2008 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/press_corner/key_documents/reports_nov_2008/turkey_progress_report_en.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2009). *Turkey 2009 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/key_documents/2009/tr_rapport_2009_en.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2010). *Turkey 2010 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/key_documents/2010/package/tr_rapport_2010_en.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- EC (2011). *Turkey 2011 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EC. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/key_documents/2011/package/tr_rapport_2011_en.pdf [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- Ecevit, B. (2001). *Genelge 2001/33*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık: Personel ve Prensipler Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Emmott, R. (2018). In warning to Ankara, EU cuts funds for Turkey's membership bid. *Reuters*. [online] Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-eu-turkey/in-warning-to-ankara-eu-cuts-funds-for-turkeys-membership-bid-idUSKBN1DU2D4> [Accessed 28 Dec. 2017].

- European Council (2006). *Press Release General Affairs and External Relations*. [online] Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-06-352_en.htm?locale=en [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2005). *Opening of negotiations with Turkey*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P6-TA-2005-0350&language=EN&ring=B6-2005-0505> [Accessed 14 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2006). *Turkey's Progress Towards Accession (debate and final resolution)*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20060926&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN&ring=A6-2006-0269> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2006). *Parliament's position on Turkey's candidacy for EU membership*. [online] Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=EN&type=IMPRESS&reference=20060919BKG10804> [Accessed 4 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2008). *Turkey 2007 Progress Report (debate and final resolution)*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A6-2008-0168&language=EN> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2009). *2008 Turkey Progress Report (debate and final resolution)*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20090311&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN&ring=B6-2009-0105> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2010). *2009 Turkey Progress Report (debate and final resolution)*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20100210&secondRef=ITEM-008&language=EN&ring=B7-2010-0068> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2010). *Sub-Committee on Human Rights: \Public Hearing on Human Rights in Turkey*. [video] Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ep-live/en/committees/video?event=20101025-1500-COMMITTEE-DROI> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- EP (2011). *2010 Progress Report on Turkey (debate and final resolution)*. [online] Strasbourg: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20110308&secondRef=ITEM-014&language=EN&ring=B7-2011-0156> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].

- EP (2012). *Enlargement Report on Turkey (debate and final resolution)*. (2012). [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2012-0116&language=EN&ring=B7-2012-0189> [Accessed 18 Dec. 2017].
- Eurlings, C. (2006). *Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A6-2006-0269+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN> [Accessed 4 Dec. 2017].
- Ferguson, N. (2003). Think Again: Power. *Foreign Policy*.
- Güsten, S. (2015). The Syriac Property Issue in Tur Abdin. *IPC-Mercator Policy Brief*.
- Haberler (2011). Davutoğlu'ndan Anlamlı Ziyaret. [online] Available at: <https://www.haberler.com/davutoglu-ndan-anlamli-ziyaret-3168620-haberi/> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- Higgins, A. (2009). Defending the Faith. *Wall Street Journal*. [online] Available at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123638477632658147> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- Hughes, J. (2005). 'Exit' in Deeply Divided Societies: Regimes of Discrimination in Estonia and Latvia and the Potential for Russophone Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(4), pp.739-762.
- Hunault, M. (2009). *Freedom of religion and other human rights for non-Muslim minorities in Turkey and for the Muslim minority in Thrace (Eastern Greece)*. [online] Strasbourg: CoE Parliamentary Assembly. Available at: <http://semanticpace.net/tools/pdf.aspx?doc=aHR0cDovL2Fzc2VtYmx5LmNvZS5pbmQvbnNveG1sL1hSZWYvWDJILURXLWV4dHIuYXNwP2ZpbGVpZD0xMjY4MSZsYW5nPUVO&xsl=aHR0cDovL3NlbWFudGljcGFjZS5uZXQvWHNsdC9QZGYvWFJIZi1XRC1BVC1YTUwyUERGLnhzbA==&xsltparams=ZmlsZWlkPTEyNjgx> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- Hurst, A. (2012). The Lausanne Treaty: High Aspirations, Highly Neglected. In: P. Omtzigt, M. Tozman and A. Tyndall, ed., *The Slow Disappearance of the Syrians from Turkey And of the Grounds of the Mor Gabriel Monastery*. Berlin: Lit.
- Hyde-Price, A. (2006). 'Normative' power Europe: a realist critique. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(2), pp.217-234.
- Independent (2006). EU freezes talks on Turkey membership. [online] Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/eu-freezes-talks-on-turkey-membership-428085.html> [Accessed 13 Dec. 2017].

- Manners, I. (2006). The European Union as a Normative Power: A Response to Thomas Diez. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35(1), pp.167-180.
- Matsuda, T. (2007). *Soft power and its Perils*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Midyat Syriac Deyrulumur Mor Gabriel Foundation v. Turkey* [2011] Application no. 61412/11 (European Court for Human Rights).
- Neumann, I. (2008). Discourse Analysis. In: A. Klotz and D. Prakash, ed., *Qualitative Research Methods in International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillen.
- Nye, J. (2008). Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *AAPS*, 616(1), pp.94-109.
- Nye, J. (2009). Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 4(88), pp.160-163.
- Omtzigt, P., Tozman, M. and Tyndall, A. (2012). *The Slow Disappearance of the Syrians from Turkey And of the Grounds of the Mor Gabriel Monastery*. Berlin: Lit.
- Omtzigt, P. (2012). Appendix 1: Initiative Policy Document. In: P. Omtzigt, M. Tozman and A. Tyndall, ed., *The Slow Disappearance of the Syrians from Turkey And of the Grounds of the Mor Gabriel Monastery*. Berlin: Lit.
- Oomen-Ruijten, R. (2008). *Report on Turkey's 2007 progress report*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A6-2008-0168&language=EN> [Accessed 4 Dec. 2017].
- Oomen-Ruijten, R. (2009). *Motion for a Resolution on Turkey's progress report 2008*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=MOTION&reference=B6-2009-0105&language=EN> [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- Oomen-Ruijten, R. (2010). *Motion for a Resolution on Turkey's progress report 2009*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=MOTION&reference=B7-2010-0068&language=EN> [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- Oomen-Ruijten, R. (2011). *Motion for a Resolution on Turkey's 2010 Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=MOTION&reference=B7-2011-0156&language=EN> [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- Oomen-Ruijten, R. (2012). *Motion for a Resolution on the 2011 Turkey Progress Report*. [online] Brussels: EP. Available at:

- <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+MOTION+B7-2012-0189+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN> [Accessed 6 Dec. 2017].
- Order St Andrew (2011). *Archon Religious Freedom Conference: Egemen Bagis*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KdGIowbj2lA> [Accessed 18 Dec. 2017].
- Order St Andrew (2011). *Archon Religious Freedom Conference: Specific Religious Freedom Issues and Concerns of Minorities*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qjrzqdYJkjQ> [Accessed 18 Dec. 2017].
- Schimmelfennig, F. and Sedelmeier, U. (2004). Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(4), pp.661-679.
- Syriac Universal Alliance (2011). *Recommendations for Promoting and Protecting the Human Rights of Syriac (Aramean) Christians*. 2011 Turkey Report. [online] Geneva: UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Available at: http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CESCR/Shared%20Documents/TUR/INT_CESCR_NGO_TUR_46_10199_E.pdf [Accessed 16 Nov. 2017].
- The Guardian (2005). EU and Turkey agree terms. [online] Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/oct/03/eu.politics> [Accessed 9 Dec. 2017].
- Tozman, M. (2012). Cadastral Registration of Lands and Preservation Orders in Turkey's South-East. In: P. Omtzigt, M. Tozman and A. Tyndall, ed., *The Slow Disappearance of the Syriacs from Turkey And of the Grounds of the Mor Gabriel Monastery*. Berlin: Lit.
- Villelabeitia, I. (2009). Christian monastery in Turkey fights to keep land. *Reuters*. [online] Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-religion-turkey-christians/christian-monastery-in-turkey-fights-to-keep-land-idUSTRE50L08720090122> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- Watt, N. (2005). Turkey EU talks deadlocked as Austria digs in. *The Guardian*. [online] Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/oct/03/turkey.eu1> [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].
- WCA-NGO. (2008). *Syriac Monastery in Turkey Appeals Proceeding Status (December 2008)*. [online] Available at: <http://wca-ngo.org/humanrightsfiles/the-saint-gabriel-trials/390-pr-syriac-monastery-in-turkey-appeals-proceeding-status> [Accessed 10 Dec. 2017].

WCA-NGO (2010). *Syriac Universal Alliance's Recommendations adopted by CoE (Resolution 1704)*. [video] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uS9sqVnSd1g> [Accessed 18 Dec. 2017].

Yayvantepe, Eğlence ve Çandarlı köy muhtarları k. Deyrulumur Manastırı Yönetimi [2008] Application no. 2008/1121 (Cumhuriyet Başsavcılığına Midyat).