pean context, largely forget about intra-Eu-
ropean material inequality and polarisa-
tion as a potential key variable? To me it
seems quite possible that much gender re-
search going on in the European context
has difficulties tackling the most obvious
and pressing political question of intra-Eu-
ropean inequality, in which, as European
citizens, we are all directly involved on
many levels. It is perhaps indeed ‘easier’ to
prioritise the category of gender over this
one particular intersecting category, even
as the intersectionality perspective, with its
conceptual openness to include all dimen-
sions of inequality, is ‘mainstreamed’ into
gender research with a focus on present-
day Europe. Yet Citizenship in an Enlarging
Europe convincingly demonstrates, not-
withstanding its scholarly achievements,
that the inevitable weaknesses of such gen-
der analysis considerably outweigh the
questionable pleasures of such avoidance.

Susan Zimmermann
Central European University
zimmerma@ceu.hu

Notes:
1 In the following I use the terms Western and
Eastern Europe as a simplifying shorthand for
two internally highly differentiated yet, in com-
parison to each other, in many aspects distinctly
different European regions.

Lucia Tunkrova and Pavel Saradin (eds.): The Politics of EU Accession: Turkish Challenges and Central European Experiences

Turkey’s relationship with the European Union has been on a roll for more than for-
ty years, and while Turkey was unanimous-
ly accepted as a candidate country in 1999,
the membership negotiations only took off
in 2005. Since then not much progress has
been achieved, and compared to other can-
didate countries the Turkish experience can
be described as sluggish. This highly prob-
lematic relationship between Turkey and
the EU has raised heated public debates
and has become one of the most conten-
tious issues in European politics. The schol-
larly literature on the subject has boomed in
recent years, but most of these studies ei-
ther weigh the pros and cons of Turkey’s
membership from both perspectives or
look at the impact of the EU on particular
policy areas. Relatively less work has con-
centrated on the issue of enlargement-led
change in Turkey, and under what condi-
tions it can endure.

Lucia Tunkrova and Pavel Saradin ex-
amine this question through the lens of so-
cial constructivism, which supposes that
the candidate countries’ willingness to em-
brace EU norms and values mainly ema-
nates from the belief in their legitimacy
and from viewing them as viable solutions
to domestic problems that are nearly im-
possible to solve without the adoption of
these norms and values. The second aim of
the volume is to draw parallels between
the four new EU member states of East
Central European Countries (ECECs)—the
Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slo-
vakia—and Turkey by highlighting the po-
litical and social circumstances that were
present before the countries joined the EU.
Among the many similarities, the domina-
tion of the state over society, corrupt poli-
tics, imperfect judicial systems, and a lack
of independent media are listed. Neverthe-
less, the volume comes short of meeting
both of its central foci, as the choice of the-
toretical framework, social constructivism,
is not fully substantiated, and the attempt
to compare the Europeanisation of the
ECECs with the Turkish experience is not
done thoroughly and systematically.

Kemalist reforms construct the ideo-
logical basis of modern Turkey and con-
temporary politics cannot be evaluated
without a reference to Kemalism’s ambi-
tion to Westernise Turkish identity. Even
before the onset of the new republic, Eastern cultural elements and ties to Ottoman legacy were abandoned, and a strong effort was put into recreating pre-Islamist Turkish history. In Chapter 2 Kucera illustrates these points by analysing the writings of the prominent literary figures of the early republic. Even though the author provides a historical account of Turkey’s position towards the West and captures it with the term ‘Turkish Occidentalism’, it is not yet clear how the Turkish experience of cultural reinterpretation is any different than what occurred in other countries. Occidentalism and Orientalism need to be defined in unity since one cannot exist without the other, and thus any allegedly non-Western nation has to refer to Europe in its identity formation, albeit to different degrees. Additionally, the chapter overlooks the importance of the strong reactions in the contemporary period, which directly address the Kemalist reforms and detachment from the Ottoman past. Indeed the struggle between the new elite (the liberal-Muslim coalition and green capital) and the civilian-military bureaucracy which is secular and Kemalist reappears in Chapter 4. The author suggests that the securitisation of Turkish politics is maintained by generating fears towards perceived external and internal threats, and until very recently the bureaucratic bloc successfully utilised this strategy to legitimise their decisions with the help of educational institutions and the media. The EU, in Tunkrova’s view, has a strong role in the process of de-securitising domestic issues and political culture in Turkey. This is mainly achieved by altering the domestic opportunity structures and adopting EU norms and values. However, the author does not question the limited power of the EU, especially over the norms and values held by the ‘de-securitisers’, and does not question whether Western ideals are indeed adopted or whether these have been employed for purely instrumental purposes such as re-securitisation. For many, the politics of fear has not diminished with the EU accession process, but has rather shifted its axis from Islam to secularism.

Democratisation and EU integration are among the most widely discussed topics in the Europeanisation literature. Tunkrova, after reviewing the impact of conditionality and the acquis communautaire on democratisation in candidate countries, concludes that consolidation is only possible when political will is accompanied by a belief in liberal democratic values and by strong domestic support. In this sense the EU can act as a catalyst to the process but would be unable to prevent backsliding. Then Tunkrova uses gender equality and corruption as case studies to compare the impact of Europeanisation in the ECECs and Turkey. There are several major problems with this chapter. First, the case studies are not justified and are not linked to the previous discussion about democratisation. No explicit argument is presented as to whether gender equality and corruption have a crucial role to play in democratic consolidation in the mentioned countries, and no discussion of the reasons for excluding other policies is provided. Second, gender regimes and degrees of familialism in the ECECs and Turkey are extremely different, and the underlying domestic factors are hard to compare. Even after EU accession talks and conditionalities peaked, the female labour force participation in Turkey continued to decline, signifying that reconciliation policies have been neglected. By contrast, all the ECECs are improving gender equality, albeit to differing extents and through different policies. Finally, corruption is not defined by the authors, and it is almost exclusively attributed to government actions.

The Cyprus dispute has always been high on the agenda both for the EU and Turkey. Up until 2003, Northern Cyprus with the backing of Turkish National Security Council opted for the two-state solution. However, after the shift in the govern-
ing party in 2003 the single federal state solution was preferred by the Turkish Cypriots. According to Sozen, the EU’s mistake was to grant membership to the Greek Cypriot part, even though they had been uncooperative, and to leave out the Turkish Cypriot side that was ready to accept UN General Secretary Kofi Annan’s plan. This immensely reduced Europe’s leverage, and Cyprus turned into an influential veto player against Turkish accession. The issue is used by the anti-Turkey elites in the EU to stall membership and at the same time it elevates anti-EU sentiments at the domestic level. Sozen then very briefly mentions the ECECs’ stance towards the island and admits that it does not get much attention. Although the chapter is descriptively rich, it does not address how norms and values have evolved with EU accession talks, which is the central premise of the book. Also, Sozen’s detailed account of the negotiations among multiple actors over Cyprus seems to confirm an interest-based explanation. Europe’s intervention into the dispute changed the opportunity structures by strengthening the hands of the Greek Cypriots, but had no profound influence on the way the actors involved view the matter.

The main asset of this book emerges in the final three chapters, which provide a more systematic and complete evaluation of ECECs’s and Turkey’s accession process. Chapter 6 emphasises the importance of public opinion on Europeanisation. Then it describes the variations in Euroscepticism and the possible reasons behind them. Tunkrova mentions economic costs and benefits, domestic political views, and identity politics as the main determinants of attitudes towards membership. Turkish public opinion on EU integration fluctuates, with high support at the beginning, then increasing scepticism, followed by a recovery of support. The ECECs show less oscillation, yet there is a discernible decline in support levels in Hungary and to a certain extent the Czech Republic. Political parties in the two sets of countries also display some similarities, with the more nationalist and religious parties being more Eurosceptic. Chapters 7 and 8 examine the views on Turkey’s accession to the EU in the ECECs. While Cakir and Gergelova evaluate the elite’s position on Turkish accession and look at the official documents, Saradin focuses also on the more organised and vocal groups. These two chapters are methodologically clear and they meticulously assess the support for Turkish membership or lack thereof. Cakir and Gergelova find out that among all four states, the Czech Republic has the most positive opinion due to the anti-federalist tendencies in the country. Poland, Slovakia, and Hungary have more ambiguous attitudes, but in all cases Christian Democrats are against Turkish membership. Additionally, there are economic arguments challenging further enlargement, as Turkey is expected to receive a big chunk of the structural funds after joining the club. The institutional implications of Turkish accession do not appear to be a substantial concern, though accession could give the country considerable voting power if the EU’s structure were to remain as it is. Nevertheless, Turkish membership is not a salient issue for the ECECs. Chapter 8 enriches the analysis by including the public’s opinion in addition to the views of the governing parties and political elites. It should be noted that Saradin’s findings contradict the preceding chapter, as Hungary and Poland appear to be more accommodating than the Czech Republic and Slovakia. However, the root causes of lack of support are similar; perceived religious, cultural, and democratic differences between Europe and Turkey.

Undeniably, individual contributions carry their own merit and further stimulate the debate on Turkey’s EU membership. However, the book as a whole does not answer some of the vital questions it helps to raise. The existence and the degree
of the adoption of European values and norms are presented, at best, incompletely both in the Turkish and Eastern European cases. I wonder whether the comparison between the ECECs and Turkey is all that revealing, as integration of the former was seen as a return to Europe and despite the socialist legacy these countries were never entirely deprived of their Europeanness. Hopefully, the similarities between these cases and lessons that can be derived from the ECECs’ accession process will be studied more systematically in future work.

Anil Duman
Central European University, Budapest
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Bent Greve (ed.): Choice: Challenges and Perspectives for the European Welfare States

As Bent Greve writes in his editorial introduction to this book, ‘choice’ has been a buzzword in many welfare states around Europe in recent years. As New Public Management ideals became embedded in the discourse over the ‘modernisation’ of European welfare states, these have become more market-oriented. In many contexts increased user choice has been part of a neoliberal agenda that pushed for the retrenchment of welfare states. However, the call for increased user choice in welfare states did not originate only from the neoliberal side. It also stemmed from groups of citizens who were far from seeking a retrenchment of the welfare state or the transformation of users into consumers. ‘User movements’ of disabled and old-age people, for whom user choice became a synonym for empowerment and increased social rights, also played an important role in the introduction of choice, as mentioned by Rummery’s chapter in this book. Arguments advocating or dismissing choice in welfare states have thus been accompanied by a fierce ideological debate, which may have precluded a serious analysis over the consequences of introducing choice. This book proposes to contribute to the understanding of recent changes with regard to choice in European welfare states, both from a theoretical and empirical perspective. In particular, it looks at the impact that welfare states that incorporate choice elements (dubbed ‘choice welfare states’) have had on equity. It does so by bringing together contributions from several authors that analyse the issue of choice in a number of countries, covering various areas (education, employment, pensions, health and long-term care) and offering different perspectives on the subject (for example, looking at the gender implications of choice).

The first two chapters elaborate on more theoretical considerations regarding choice, while the remaining chapters present more of a case-study approach to the issue of choice, either basing their analysis on a specific country, or on a specific sector. The first theoretical chapter, authored by Bent Greve, discusses the necessary conditions for informed choice to take place without negative effects on equity, which is defined as ‘equality in the ability to exercise choice and gain access to welfare state services’ (p. 6). According to Greve, these conditions amount to: competitive market forces, sufficient and precise information, low transaction costs, precise incentive structure, avoidance of incentives to cream-skimming and trust in providers. By discussing each of these conditions the author depicts in a clear and precise manner the potential (if not necessarily insurmountable) obstacles that stand in the way of achieving equity through user choice. For example, precise information may be costly to produce, but even when available, some users may be better equipped to understand it than others. This can increase inequality in a choice welfare system as rela-