

**Paper for epsNet Plenary Conference**  
**Europe in Context: Debating the Project**  
**Central European University, Budapest**  
**16-17 June 2006**

**Workshop: The Europeanization of National Systems**

**Europeanization in Turkey: Searching for impacts on foreign policy**

Rabia Karakaya Polat, Isik University, Istanbul  
rabia@isikun.edu.tr

There has been a growing academic attention paid to the concept of Europeanization of various policy fields in EU members. Research have focused on definitions of Europeanization (Olsen, 2002), mechanisms of Europeanization (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002), and its application to particular policy fields ranging from environment (Knill, 2001) to telecommunications policies (Levi-Faur, 2002). Increasingly, researchers have been focusing on Europeanization of foreign policy which is a field that has been traditionally considered at the very heart of national sovereignty (Major, 2005; Smith, 2000). While discussions on Europeanization continue, the EU does not stay still and constantly changes. In 2004, the EU achieved its most ambitious enlargement by embracing 10 new members. This brings new curiosity about the extent to which these new members are integrated into the Union especially in terms of their foreign policies. Only a few years ago, there was heated debate about the European credentials of some of the CEE countries that took an Atlanticist stance over the issue of invasion of Iraq.

Within the context of the enlargement discussions, Turkey has a special status due to its demographic size, Muslim identity and proximity to such regions as the Middle East, the Balkans and the Caucasus that are characterised by instability and tension. There are various arguments against and in favour of Turkey's membership. Among the pros of prospective full membership, probably the strongest one is Turkey's

potential contribution to EU's foreign policy especially *vis-à-vis* the afore-mentioned regions. Turkish political leaders frequently speak of such potential contribution especially through serving as a geographical hub for regional cooperation, serving as a forward base for the EU's security and defence policy and extending the reach of the EU's neighbourhood policy. The challenge for researchers is to reveal the extent to which this rhetoric is likely to be converted into reality in case of Turkish membership. In other words, does Turkish foreign policy demonstrate signs of Europeanization? This paper investigates this question with the following questions in mind:

- Is there any Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy? If there is, how this could contribute to EU's foreign policy? Could the EU become a more effective international political actor with Turkey's membership?
- In Turkey, it is possible to observe the impact of EU especially in terms of democratization, human rights and economic liberalization. Do these reforms have any implications for Turkey's foreign policy?

These are challenging questions to be answered within the scope of this paper. Rather, the paper attempts to test the usefulness of the concept of 'Europeanization' in answering them. The paper sets out by defining and delimiting the concept of Europeanization. Then it goes on to apply this concept into foreign policy field. Later, the paper discusses the mechanisms of Europeanization; in other words, how does Europeanization work. Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy is discussed drawing upon concepts developed throughout the paper. Finally, methodological problems and implications of Europeanization are examined.

### **Defining and delimiting the concept of 'Europeanization'**

Research on Europeanization has concentrated on the impact that the European integration process has on national level policy and politics. What kind of change/impact caused by European integration process should be studied under the concept of Europeanization? Are we talking about change in policies, politics, institutions, ways of doing things, ideas or identities? This paper adapts the definition of Olsen (1996) who conceptualizes Europeanization as a process of change at the

domestic level in which the member states adapt their processes, policies, and institutions to new practices, norms, rules and procedures that emanate from the European system of governance.

However, Europeanization should not be seen as a one-way process. Member states themselves also take part in shaping the policies that they are affected by afterwards. Therefore, Europeanization should be understood as a mutually constitutive process of change linking national and European levels. This two-way nature of the process is rightly captured by the concepts of ‘downloading’ and ‘uploading’ (Major, 2005; Börzel, 2002). Here, downloading is used to describe the reception of EU-generated incentives and their integration into the national level. Members can also act proactively in exporting their national policies to the level of the EU which is referred as ‘uploading’. Uploading, therefore, is the projection of national preferences to the EU level within the emergence of new structures of government at this level (Major, 2005). Because Turkey is only a candidate country, there is limited scope for uploading. Therefore, this paper is more interested in Europeanization defined as ‘domestic change generated by the ongoing European integration process’ (Major, 2005). The direction of the impact is top-down rather than bottom-up. At this point, it may be useful to explain whether Europeanization is a concept peculiar to the impact of the EU on existing members or can it be applied to candidate countries as well.

Obviously, Turkey is not a member of the EU. Previous studies have almost exclusively dealt with Europeanization in countries that had already joined the EU (note exceptions Grabbe, 2001). Yet, studying Europeanization of candidate countries makes sense because EU exerts similar pressures on candidate countries. EU conditionality and the negotiation process provide the mechanisms through which Europeanization takes place. Therefore, having a candidate status does not constitute a barrier to the integration of foreign policies (or other policy areas). In fact, Grabbe (2001) argues that accession process actually pushes the candidate countries towards greater convergence with particular institutional models that has occurred within the existing EU (p. 1014). Accordingly, the formal accession process sets out to adapt candidate country institutions and policies to the EU much faster and more thoroughly than the adaptation of existing members, with very limited scope for negotiating transitional periods. Nevertheless, there may be

opportunities/cases of uploading for candidate countries especially in the field of foreign policy. Candidate countries, for example, may introduce new agendas, issues and priorities to the EU. Moreover, even before actual membership, aspiring states may start to identify themselves with European values, norms and identity.

In trying to understand Europeanization, one needs to distinguish it from other similar concepts such as European integration and convergence. According to Major (2005) Europeanization is not synonymous with *European integration*. European integration theories seeks to explain why national states agree to abandon parts of their sovereignty and what happens to the state and its sovereignty as a result of the integration process whereas Europeanization analyses what happens to domestic institutions and actors. Europeanization is thus just one mechanism within the broader construct of European integration.

Another concept that can be taken as synonymous with Europeanization is *convergence*. Radaelli (2003) notes that these two concepts should not be used interchangeably because there is a difference between a process and its consequences. Accordingly, there may be convergence in the monetary policies of the states that participated in EMU. However, they may be converging not as a result of initiatives emanating from Brussels, but as a response to domestic considerations.

### **Applying the concept of ‘Europeanization’ to foreign policy**

Despite the plethora of research on Europeanization of already communitarized policy areas such as environmental politics (Knill, 2001), telecommunications (Levi-Faur, 2002) or financial services (Howell, 2004), there has been few studies dealing with the Europeanization of foreign policies (note exceptions such as Major, 2005; Smith, 2000). In Turkey as well, although there has been considerable interest on analysing the impact of EU on democratisation process, civil society or minority and human rights (Diez et al, 2005; Tocci, 2005; Müftüler-Baç, 2005), there is not much work on analysing the impact of EU on Turkish foreign policy (note exceptions such as Tekin, 2005; Oğuzlu, 2004; Karaosmanoğlu and Taşhan, 2004).

Existence of few studies on Europeanization of foreign policy is probably due to the unique nature of foreign policy. More specifically;

- Foreign policy constitutes the second pillar of EU; therefore is different from first pillar which is already communitarized and subject to supranational institutions and policy making (such as environmental or transportation policy).
- Foreign policy is considered as 'high politics' and it lies at the heart of national sovereignty; it is still governed by the principle of intergovernmentalism.
- There is a lack of comprehensive institutional templates which would serve as 'models'. There are sometimes tensions within EU's foreign policy agenda.
- There is complexity of actor constellations within the EU (Grabbe, 2001).
- In the field of foreign policy, each candidate country has to take over the 'acquis politique' of the CFSP and adjust its foreign policy accordingly. However, there is no exact pressure on member states on foreign policy matters.

European co-operation in foreign and security policy-making was established outside the European treaties with the aim of avoiding the creation of common institutions. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was established as the second pillar of the European Union in the 1993 Treaty on European Union signed at Maastricht. A number of important changes were introduced in the Amsterdam Treaty which came into force in 1999. It has been agreed to embark on a common security and defence policy within the overall framework of the CFSP. As part of the CFSP, the Union later created a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) with the potential, if agreed later on, for creating a common defence structure. The European Council at Laeken of December 2001 adopted a declaration on the operational capability of the ESDP, officially recognising that the Union is now capable of conducting some crisis management operations.

With the CFSP and ESDP, the Union is creating a political dimension to add to its international role as a significant economic power. But there is still a long way to go before the scale of this political dimension becomes clear. Member governments sometimes find it difficult to change their own national policy in the name of EU solidarity. Member states continue to be the main actors within this field, as CFSP

follows an intergovernmental approach. Hence, treaties, not legislation, govern CFSP (Major, 2005). Although organised by intergovernmental decision-making and regularly criticised as being weak and even ‘uncommon’ (Gordon, 1997), cooperation in the area of foreign and security policy is expected, together with the general co-operation within the EU, to have affected the national level of foreign and security policy. At this point, it is important to continue studying the level of Europeanization of foreign policies especially for two reasons. First, EU is developing a new defence body and Europeanization as an analytical framework can help us in assessing the future development of this initiative. Second, recent failures of the EU in generating a common stance over crises in Yugoslavia and Iraq necessitate the study of possible barriers to Europeanization of foreign policy. In order to do that, we need to understand how Europeanization actually works. The next section focuses on mechanisms of Europeanization for this purpose.

### **Mechanisms of Europeanization**

This part of the paper aims to examine how Europeanization actually takes place; what kind of mechanisms are creating domestic change caused by EU; does change occur as a result of regulative attempts, mimetic processes or changing interests and identities at the domestic level? The challenge here is to identify the causal mechanisms through which Europeanization can affect the member states.

There have been several attempts for identifying such mechanisms of Europeanization (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002; Börzel and Risse, 2003). In order to understand the Europeanization of foreign policy particularly of a candidate country, three questions are of interest:

- What is the underlying logic of Europeanization? Why countries Europeanise?
- Are there any specific mechanisms of Europeanization that can be applied to foreign policy field? To put it another way, which mechanisms are most relevant for foreign policy field?
- Are there any differences between mechanisms of Europeanization for existing members and candidate countries? Do the same mechanisms work for candidate countries?

The most obvious mechanism is domestic change that is caused by obligatory regulations. Members have to comply with certain laws to avoid sanctions. Here, EU obligations prescribe an institutional model to which domestic arrangements have to be adjusted. There is not much national discretion. These policy fields are very prescriptive and member/candidate states know what to do exactly in order to comply. Example policy fields could be environmental protection or health and safety policies. Although these mechanisms are useful, there are a number of problems in applying them to the field of foreign policy. There is agreement among Europeanization scholars that mechanisms of Europeanization vary to a great degree depending on the specific policy field. As Major (2005) argues ‘the challenge is to apply these mechanisms initially formulated for policy areas in the first supranational pillar, to a policy area in the second intergovernmental pillar of the EU (in which CFSP is located). In policy fields in which supranationalism is the principle (first pillar), the most obvious mechanism is obligatory implementation of EU law. All members and aspiring members have to comply with EU regulations. In policy fields, in which intergovernmentalism is the principle, the European impact is less binding. Given, the intergovernmental nature of EU foreign policy, the mechanisms of vertical adaptational pressure from the EU might not be best suited to explain process of domestic change in the field of foreign policy. On the contrary, decisions are subject to unanimity and the EU is only an arena for the exchange of ideas, not a legislator as it is in the first pillar areas (Major, 2005, p. 186). This does not mean that the governments merely follow their own interests. In these cases, domestic change is likely to happen following different sets of mechanisms.

In order to reveal the underlying logic of Europeanization in the foreign policy field we can benefit from the framework developed by Börzel and Risse (2003). Börzel and Risse (2003) draw upon the work of March and Olsen’s (1989) concepts of ‘logic of consequentialism’ and ‘logic of appropriateness’ in order to underpin the specific mechanisms of Europeanization. They argue that in order for Europeanization to take place, there must first be a ‘misfit’ between European level processes, policies and institutions and domestic level processes, policies and institutions. This degree of misfit leads to adaptational pressures and induce domestic change. Following logic of consequentialism, the misfit between European and domestic processes, policies and institutions provides societal and/or political actors with new opportunities and

constraints to pursue their interests. Hence, Europeanization leads to domestic change through differential empowerment of actors resulting from a redistribution of resources at the domestic level (p. 58). Europeanization occurs when EU somehow alters the domestic rules of the game. This usually takes place through changes in the distribution of power and resources among actors (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002). For example, by empowering the regions *vis-à-vis* the central governments, the EU impacts upon domestic power configurations.

In contrast, 'logic of appropriateness' emphasises processes of persuasion. European policies, norms, and the collective understandings attached to them exert adaptational pressures on domestic level processes, because they do not resonate well with domestic norms and collective understandings. Hence, Europeanization leads to domestic change through a socialization and collective learning process, resulting in norm internalization and the development of new identities (p.59). This mechanisms works when EU impacts upon beliefs and expectations of domestic policy actors. Changes in domestic beliefs may in turn affect strategies and preferences of domestic actors, potentially leading to corresponding institutional adaptations. Hence, the domestic impact of European policies is primarily based on a cognitive logic (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002, p. 258). Actors seek to fulfil the obligations encapsulated in their role and identity in the EU.

What about the candidate countries? Could we say that same mechanisms apply to them as well? The process of Europeanization works somewhat differently for candidate countries which are part of an 'asymmetrical relation' with the EU. The EU accession involves different processes that effect some degree of institutional and policy transformation in candidate countries. Examining the case of CEE countries, Grabbe (2003) develops a set of mechanisms that the EU uses instrumentally such as provision of legislative and institutional templates, aid and technical assistance, benchmarking and monitoring, advice and twinning, and gate-keeping. With aid and technical assistance, for example, EU helps building up institutional capacity for change. Likewise, in creating monitoring mechanisms for the applicants, EU sets priorities and put pressure on candidate countries for showing progress. Arguably, the most important mechanism and conditionality tool is gate-keeping. Access to negotiations and further stages in the accession process depends on achievements

of the candidate countries. Although these mechanisms were formulated by Grabbe (2003) for CEE countries, there is no reason to apply them to other candidate countries including Turkey.

Although foreign policy field is not governed by legislation, constitutional changes as part of EU integration can have implications for foreign policy too. In the case of Turkey, recent domestic reforms towards more democracy as well as structural reforms in the economy illustrates this point. Although these are reforms at the domestic level, they have some implications for foreign policy particularly in the Middle East. A democratic Turkey that is also a member of the EU enhances the attraction of Turkey's democracy, secular system of government, free market economy, and tolerant form of Islam as a model for that troubled region (Kirişçi, 2004).

To summarize, Europeanization works through different mechanisms and in foreign policy field, some of these mechanisms are more relevant than others. Since Europeanization of foreign policies is an under-researched area, there is also not much work on analysing its specific mechanisms. Rather than focusing on the impact of regulative attempts, there is a need to understand how the above-mentioned two logics work in Europeanizing foreign policies. The next section benefits from these ideas and concepts in analysing the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy.

### **Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy**

Turkey is a candidate country, started negotiations in October 2005 after a long period of waiting since 1960. There are many arguments for and against Turkey's membership. One of the strongest arguments in favour is Turkey's potential contribution to the EU's strategic role in world politics especially within the post 9/11 context. However, we should expect that Europeanization of foreign policy would be more difficult than in other fields. This can be explained by several factors:

- As part of Europeanization, efforts at greater democracy and economic development are welcomed by national elites and the public at large. These efforts are also seen as the latest stage of Turkey's long process of

modernization and westernization. The same degree of openness on the side of the elite or the public in general does not exist for foreign policy matters.

- Euroscepticism among the public in Turkey manifests itself especially in foreign policy matters. Although Turkey's security culture<sup>1</sup> is currently undergoing a change as a result of post-cold war context and the impact of European integration, there are still groups of actors who are sceptical towards the West.
- Candidate countries have to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria; there is no discussion on that (negotiation is not about the content but about the timing). However, this is not the case for foreign policy. Foreign policy matters are still intergovernmental and negotiable. Foreign policy issues are, hence, more open to public debate. This can be a barrier especially in cases like Cyprus.
- There is substantial EU aid to support EU-related reforms and their implementation in various fields especially for strengthening civil society and democratic reform in general. There is not much aid for foreign policy matters<sup>2</sup>.
- There is a complex actor constellation in foreign policy making in the EU. Different institutions and actors within EU, as well as different country positions send different, sometimes even conflicting, signals about what Turkey should be doing in terms of her foreign policy.
- Foreign policy matters are further complicated by the existence and interference of non-EU actors. For example, with regard to the Middle East, actors such as U.S., Atomic Energy Board, and UN are also involved.

Despite these limitations, it is possible to observe some signs of Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy. The influence of the European integration process on Turkish foreign policy should be considered within the context of domestic reforms that Turkey has been going through. In understanding these changes, we can benefit from some concepts that are discussed up to this point of the paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on historical roots of Turkey's security culture see, Karaosmanoğlu, A. (2000) The Evolution of National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey, *Journal of International Affairs*, 54:1, 199-216

<sup>2</sup> Except some initiatives such as Civil Society Development Programme which aimed to promote Greek-Turkish civic dialogue at the grassroots and local level, and to enhance the capacities of NGOs in Turkey (Rumelili, 2005).

***Changes in the domestic opportunity structures:*** Turkish foreign policy is used to be controlled by a civil-military foreign policy establishment with marginal roles for elected politicians and the civil society. The role of the military in Turkish politics is well-documented<sup>3</sup> however this role started to decline with the EU agenda. Turkey's candidate status created a political climate in which a public debate on Turkey's definition of 'national security' began to emerge<sup>4</sup>. Turkey's national security is beginning to be debated by a broader segment of the society with an increasing input from civilians<sup>5</sup>.

Although EU demanded reforms that would increase the control of military by the civilians, membership was highly desired by the military because that would be the crowning achievement of Turkey's long and painful modernization efforts. EU membership prospect constituted a basis for a 'grand consensus' between the military and civilian elites (Aydınlı et al, 2006). The decline in the role of the military is also reflected in foreign policy making. The decision of the Turkish parliament, on March 1, 2003, not to allow U.S. troops to enter northern Iraq via Turkish territory could be viewed as a manifestation of greater democracy in Turkey and a weakening of the pro-U.S. military's power (Kirişçi, 2004).

Likewise, public opinion and civil society started to make their voice heard on foreign policy issues. In 2003, thousands of people demonstrated against the AKP government's proposal for sending troops to Iraq. At the end, these groups managed to exercise some degree of influence on the voting process in the Turkish National Assembly which resulted in a decision not to send troops to Iraq. Civil society organizations have also been influential in the *rapprochement* between Greece and Turkey. Some of them benefited from the Civil Society Development Programme (CSDP) of the European Union. CSDP aimed to promote Greek-Turkish civic

---

<sup>3</sup> Heper, M. (2005) 'The Justice and Development Party Government and the Military in Turkey', Turkish Studies, 6, 2, pp. 215-31; Cizre. U. (1997) "The Anatomy of the Turkish Military's Political Autonomy," Comparative Politics, 29:2, 151-166

<sup>4</sup> In August 2001, Mesut Yılmaz, the then chairman of Motherland Party argued that Turkey's national security understanding should be opened to debate. See 'Ulusal Güvenlik Tartışılmalı' Radikal newspaper, 5 August 2001. More recently, Bülent Arınç, the Speaker of the Parliament, in a special meeting of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, claimed that the Turkish Parliament is completely excluded from the processes of drafting Turkey's National Security Document and claimed that this is an evidence of the power of a secret and anti-democratic structure, see <http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/news/370345.asp>

<sup>5</sup> This also a result of the end of Cold War.

dialogue at the grassroots and local level, and to enhance the capacities of NGOs in Turkey (Rumelili, 2005). Using these funds, Turkish NGOs not only improved their organizational, financial and administrative capacities but also contributed to amelioration of the relations between the two countries. Other influential organisations such as TUSIAD (Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association) have been particularly insistent on making some compromises on the Cyprus issue. The European political opportunity structure offers resources for active domestic actors. TUSIAD, for example, opened its second representative office (after Washington) in Brussels to have access to the heart of the EU and to channel its interests as well as its positions on foreign policy matters directly into the European policy process.

***Level of misfit:*** The degree of Europeanization also depends on how well the EU's priorities fit with other domestic and foreign policy concerns (Grabbe, 2001, p. 1016). If there is a low degree of 'misfit' then there is not much need to change anyway. If the degree of misfit is high, then the adaptational pressure on member/candidate country is likely to be high. For Turkey, Europeanization of Cyprus policy may show how difficult and politically costly it could turn out to be when the national preferences diverge from EU foreign policy. Turkish policy changed radically in Cyprus shifting away from the traditional position on a two-state solution (which was actually not a solution). Turkey also accepted the involvement of the EU in this matter even before Cyprus became a member. This signifies a shift from bilateralism to multilateralism in Cyprus (thus giving more significant role to EU). However there are still unresolved issues around Cyprus and this poses a risk for the AKP government in the upcoming elections.

In the Middle East, there is a different situation arising from more or less converging interests and priorities of Turkey and the EU. Both for Turkey and the EU, stability, peace and promotion of democracy in the region are important. In the case of Iran, for example, Turkish position is relatively closer to the EU, which seeks engagement, rather than the USA, which prefers confrontation (Tekin, 2005). Likewise, Turkey's Iraq policy in and since 2003 has been in line with the mainstream European line although there have been significant divisions on this matter among EU countries. Level of misfit between EU and US foreign policies is also likely to have an impact on

Turkey and probably put Turkey into a difficult situation. The most comfortable situation for Turkey is the one in which there is transatlantic consensus (Tekin, 2005). The cooperation between US-EU-Turkey about energy transportation from the Caspian Sea through Turkey is such a situation. As mentioned before, many of Turkey's foreign policy issues involve several non-EU actors and Turkey tries to keep a balance between these actors while Europeanizing its foreign policy.

***Emergence of new norms, practices and structures of meaning:*** Europeanization process introduces new rules, norms, practices, and structures of meaning to which member states are exposed and which they have to incorporate into their domestic practices and structures (Börzel and Risse, 2003, p. 66). The question here is whether there have been changes in values, norms, rules and structures of meaning of Turkish foreign policy as a result of the European integration process. One good example is the increasing internalization of democracy which resulted in a growing emphasis on democracy and democratization in Turkey's foreign policy. In fact, the current government made the issue of democratization a foreign policy objective. The minister of foreign affairs, in an address to the Islamic Conference Organization summit in Tehran in May 2003 stressed the need for Muslim countries to democratize and pay greater attention to human and women's rights. This may well be the first occasion where Turkey has seriously and credibly attempted to live up to the frequent calls to become a model for other Muslim countries (Kirişçi, 2004).

The reform process as part of European integration also gave formerly inward-looking Turkish politicians a newfound self-assurance that they can influence regional politics around themselves (Aras and Bıçakcı, 2006). In this process, Turkey has managed to improve its relations with many of its neighbours including Greece and Syria<sup>6</sup>. Turkish leaders started to mention the need for reform in the Middle East and have advised Arab leaders many times not to use the Palestinian question to delay the reform process. By modernizing and democratizing at home, Turkey's politicians gained self-confidence in their ability to conduct a successful regional policy towards

---

<sup>6</sup> On April 2006 Finansbank, Turkey's eighth-biggest bank by assets and one of the country's best, was sold to the National Bank of Greece. The acquisition has special significance because of the two countries' history. Relations with Syria improved significantly following the capture of the leader of terror organization, PKK.

the Middle East (Aras and Bıçakcı, 2006) as well as taking a more constructive approach to Greece.

***Opportunities for ‘uploading’:*** Although Europeanization is a mutually constitutive process, for a candidate country, downloading of EU priorities, preferences and interests is often the case rather than uploading. Nevertheless, there are still opportunities for uploading. Turkish candidacy has already brought new items on the EU’s foreign policy agenda. Recently, matters of culture and identity have been a major topic of debate. This is both related to the process of drafting an EU Constitution and to Turkey’s candidacy. This is not only a debate within the EU; the way EU defines itself has significant implications for world politics as well. Is it going to be an inclusive, pluralistic, truly diverse community or an exclusive club? Within this context, Turkish candidacy combined with recent developments in international terrorism already brought the so-called ‘dialogue of civilisations’ high on the EU agenda. Turkish membership will also change the borders of EU and introduce new issues. EU will become neighbours with the world’s two most important energy basins: Middle East and the Caspian region. This would probably make EU an important player in the energy market. However, neighbouring those countries could also ‘upload’ new problems such as drug and human trafficking.

Opportunities for uploading exist even before actual membership. Turkey has begun to play a complimentary role to EU policies especially in the Middle East even before it becomes a full member of the union. Turkey’s new active policy in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq and Palestine, raises strong interest in EU foreign and security policy circles. In Iraq, for example, Turkey did not join the occupation forces but it has put enormous effort into mobilizing regional support for a stable Iraqi state (Aras et al, 2006). In the case of Palestine, Turkey takes a similar approach with the EU which emerged as a civil-economic power supporting civilian initiatives, political processes and economic development<sup>7</sup> (Aras and Bıçakcı, 2006).

---

<sup>7</sup> Turkey’s support is limited by its economic conditions and cannot catch the levels provided by the EU.

## **Conclusion**

The paper analyzed the Europeanization of Turkish foreign policy emanating from domestic reforms that are part of European integration process. Although Turkey is not yet a member, there are signs of Europeanization of her foreign policy mostly as a result of changing domestic opportunity structures and emergence of new values and norms. As a result of changing opportunity structures, actors which were excluded from foreign policy issues started to have more saying. In this new context, values and norms associated with democracy are not only internalized domestically but they also become foreign policy objectives. In pursuing reforms in democratization and liberalization, Turkey also started to feel more confident towards its neighbours with which it had antagonistic relations before.

Turkey's candidacy already started to upload new agendas, issues and problems to the EU. In this way, foreign policies of the EU and Turkey have mutually constituted each other. These signs of Europeanization have significant implications for the EU. By modernizing and democratizing at home, Turkey's politicians gained self-confidence in their ability to conduct an active and constructive regional policy towards regions surrounding her. As long as domestic reforms continue, Turkey can fulfil the expectations about being a geographical hub for regional cooperation and extending the reach of the EU's neighbourhood policy. In this way, Turkey contributes to EU's role as an international political actor.

## References

- Aras, B. and Bıçakcı, S. 'Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonisation Possible', Unpublished manuscript
- Aras, B., Bıçakcı, S. and Polat R. K. (2006) Turkey and the Middle East: Frontiers of the New Geographic Imagination, Unpublished manuscript
- Aydınlı, E., Özcan, N. A. and Akyaz, D. (2006) The Turkish Military's March toward Europe, *Foreign Affairs*, January-February 2006
- Börzel T. A. and Risse T. (2003) 'Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe' in Featherstone, K. and Radaelli, C. (eds.) *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Börzel, T. A. (2002) Pace-setting, Foot-dragging and Fence-sitting: Member State Responses to Europeanization, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40:2, 193-214
- Diez, T., Agnantopoulos, an and Kaliber, A. (2005) Turkey, Europeanization and Civil Society, *South European Society and Politics*, 10:1, 1-15
- Gordon, P. H. (1997) Europe's Uncommon Foreign Policy, *International Security*, 22:3, 74-100
- Grabbe, H. (2001) How does Europeanization Affect CEE Governance? Conditionality, Diffusion and Diversity, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8:6, 1013-1031
- Grabbe, H. (2003) 'Europeanization Goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process' in Featherstone, K. and Radaelli, C. (eds.) *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Howell, K. E. (2004) Developing Conceptualisations of Europeanisation: A Study of Financial Services, *Politics*, 24:1, 20-25
- Karaosmanoğlu, A. L. And Taşhan, S. (eds.) (2004) The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls, Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute
- Kirişçi, K. (2004) Between Europe and the Middle East: The Transformation of Turkish Policy, *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 8:1
- Knill, C. (2001) The Europeanisation of National Administrations: Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Knill, C. and Lehmkuhl, D. (2002) The National Impact of European Regulatory Policy: Three Europeanization Mechanisms, *European Journal of Political Research*, 41, 255-280
- Levi-Faur (2002) On the New Impact of Europeanisation: The EU's Telecoms and Electricity Regimes between the Global and the National, European Integration Online Papers, 6:7, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-007a.htm>

Please do not quote – First draft

Major, C. (2005) Europeanisation and Foreign and Security Policy: Undermining or Rescuing the Nation State?, *Politics*, 25:3, 175-190

March, J. G. and Olsen J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organisational Basis of Politics*, New York: Free Press

March, James and Olsen, J. (2004) The Logic of Appropriateness, ARENA Working Paper Series

Müftüler-Baç, M. (2005) Turkey's Political Reforms and the Impact of the European Union, *South European Society and Politics*, 10:1, 17-31

Oğuzlu, T. (2004) The Impact of 'Democratization in the Context of the EU Accession Process' on Turkish Foreign Policy, *Mediterranean Politics*, 9:1, 94-113

Olsen, J. (1996) 'Europeanization and Nation-State Dynamics', in Sverker G. And Leif L. (eds.) *The Future of the Nation-State*, London:Routledge, 245-285

Olsen, J. (2002) The Many Faces of Europeanization, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 5, 921-952

Radaelli, C. (2003) 'The Europeanization of Public Policy' in Featherstone, K. and Radaelli, C. (eds.) *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Rumelili, B. (2005) 'Civil Society and the Europeanization of Greek-Turkish Cooperation', *South European Society and Politics*, 10, 1, pp. 45-56

Smith, M. (2000) Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:4, 613-631

Tekin, A. (2005) The Evolution of Turkish Foreign Policy: The Impact of Europeanization, Paper prepared for Workshop on Turkey Relations Opportunities, Challenges and Unknowns, University of Pittsburg, November 17

Tocci, N. (2005) Europeanization in Turkey: Trigger or Anchor for Reform? *South European Society and Politics*, 10:1, 73-83

Vink, Maarten (2003) What is Europeanization? And Other Questions on a New Research Agenda, *European Political Science*, 3, 1, 63-74