

ISSN: 2687-220X

NOVUS ORBIS

Journal of Politics and International Relations
Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi

Araştırma Makaleleri
Research Articles

Küresel Hegemonya, ABD ve COVID-19 Pandemisi: Salgının Küresel Güç Dönüşümü Etkisine İlişkin Bir Analiz

*Global Hegemony, the USA and the COVID-19 Pandemic:
An Analysis of the Effect of the Outbreak on the Global Power
Shifting*

Sertif Demir

Arktik Bilim Diplomasisi ve Türkiye

Arctic Science Diplomacy and Turkey

Ebru Caymaz

International Migration Dynamics in the Context of OECD Countries

OECD Ülkeleri Bağlamında Uluslararası Göç Dinamikleri

*Sinem Dedeoğlu Özkan
Seda Özlü
Dilek Beyazlı*

Europeanisation in the Non-European Union Countries and the Foreign and Security Policies of the Associated States

*Avrupa Birliği Üyesi ve Avrupa Birliği Üyesi Olmayan
Ülkelerin Dış ve Güvenlik Politikalarında Avrupahlaşma*

Erol Kalkan

Kitap İncelemesi
Book Review

Daniel Yergin

The New Map: Energy, Climate and the Clash of Nations

Aml Çağlar Erkan

Editörler Kurulu / Editorial Board

Baş Editör / Editor-in-Chief

- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Özgür Tüfekçi

Genel Koordinatör / General Coordinator

- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Alper Tolga Bulut

Yönetici Editörler / Managing Editors

- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Hülya Kınık
- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Göktuğ Kıprızlı

Kitap İnceleme Editörleri / Book Review Editors

- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Bülent Şener (*Türkçe Kitap / Books in Turkish*)
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Murat Ülgül (*İngilizce Kitap / Books in English*)

Alan Editörleri / Section Editors

- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Fatma Akkan Güngör
- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Yılmaz Bayram
- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Ayça Eminoğlu
- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Vahit Güntay
- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Erol Kalkan
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. İsmail Köse

Yardımcı Editörler / Assistant Editors

- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Sinem Çelik
- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Çağıl Durdu
- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Emel İlter
- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Çağlar Kaya
- Arş. Gör. / Research Assist. Ayçe Sepli

Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board

- Prof. Dr. Mohammad Arafat – Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Dr. Shane Brennan – American University in Dubai, UAE
- Dr. Alessia Chiriatti – University for Foreigners of Perugia, Italy
- Prof. Dr. Murat Çemrek – Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Rahman Dağ – Adıyaman Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Dr. Federico Donelli – University of Genoa, Italy
- Prof. Dr. Süleyman Erkan – Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Prof. Dr. Monique Sochaczewski Goldfeld – Escola de Comando e Estado-Maior do Exército, Brazil
- Dr. Ayla Göl – University of Nottingham, UK
- Prof. Dr. Emre İşeri – Yaşar Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Prof. Dr. Gökhan Koçer – Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Dr. SungYong Lee – University of Otago, New Zeland
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Ali Onur Özçelik – Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Prof. Dr. Alp Özerdem – George Mason University, USA
- Dr. Öğr. Ü. / Assist. Prof. Kaan Renda – Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Dr. Paul Richardson – University of Birmingham, UK
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Didem Ekinci Sarier – Çankaya Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Doç. Dr. / Assoc. Prof. Hüsrev Tabak – Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Türkiye
- Prof. Dr. Coşkun Topal – Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Türkiye

Novus Orbis

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi

Journal of Politics and International Relations

ISSN: 2687-220X

Cilt 3 | Sayı 1 | 2021
Volume 3 | Number 1 | 2021

İçindekiler / Table of Contents

Araştırma Makaleleri / Research Articles

4

Küresel Hegemonya, ABD ve COVID-19 Pandemisi: Salgının Küresel Güç Dönüşümü Etkisine İlişkin Bir Analiz

*Global Hegemony, the USA and the COVID-19 Pandemic:
An Analysis of the Effect of the Outbreak on the Global Power Shifting*

Sertif Demir

36

Arktik Bilim Diplomasisi ve Türkiye

Arctic Science Diplomacy and Turkey

Ebru Caymaz

54

International Migration Dynamics in the Context of OECD Countries

OECD Ülkeleri Bağlamında Uluslararası Göç Dinamikleri

Sinem Dedeoğlu Özkan & Seda Özlü & Dilek Beyazlı

79

Europeanisation in the Non-European Union Countries and the Foreign and Security Policies of the Associated States

*Avrupa Birliği Üyesi ve Avrupa Birliği Üyesi Olmayan Ülkelerin Dış ve Güvenlik
Politikalarında Avrupahlaşma*

Erol Kalkan

Kitap İncelemesi / Book Review

92

Daniel Yergin

The New Map: Energy, Climate and the Clash of Nations

Anıl Çağlar Erkan

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ / RESEARCH ARTICLE

**EUROPEANISATION IN THE NON-EUROPEAN
UNION COUNTRIES AND THE FOREIGN AND
SECURITY POLICIES OF THE ASSOCIATED
STATES**

Erol KALKAN*

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi // Received: 10.12.2020
Düzeltilme Tarihi // Revised: 03.05.2021
Yayına Kabul Tarihi // Accepted: 25.05.2021

Abstract

This study aims to explore the impact of the European Union (EU) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) on the non-EU countries and the foreign and security policies of the associated states. It argues that, first; the scope of EU's transformative impact is not limited to the EU members and their economy, the rule of law and democracy. The EU also has an increasing impact on the non-EU countries and the security, defence and foreign policies of the EU members. Second, the impact of the EU on the non-EU members and the security, defence and foreign policies of the EU members occurs in four ways: a) adaptation to the EU/CSDP norms and values throughout a socialisation and experimental learning, b) adaptation to the EU/CSDP requirements, norms and values as an outcome of the EU conditionality, c) adaptation to the EU/CSDP requirements, norms and values to achieve a diplomatic and national goal at the international level and d) adaptation to the EU/CSDP requirements, norms and values as an outcome of the effect of the EU on the domestic balance of power and the domestic sources of external policy.

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, ORCID: 0000-0003-2846-4088, erolkalkan@ktu.edu.tr

Keywords: Europeanisation, Common Defence and Security Policy, Acquis Communautaire, Socialisation, Conditionality

Avrupa Birliđi Üyesi ve Avrupa Birliđi Üyesi Olmayan Ülkelerin Dış ve Güvenlik Politikalarında Avrupalılařma

Öz

Bu alıřma, Avrupa Birliđi (AB) ve Ortak Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikasının (OGSP) AB Üyesi olmayan ve AB Üyesi Ülkelerin dış ve güvenlik politikalarına etkilerini incelemektedir. İlk olarak, AB'nin dönüřtürücü etkisinin kapsamının AB üyeleri ve onların ekonomi, hukukun üstünlüğü ve demokrasi alanlarıyla sınırlı olmadığı tartışılmaktadır. Nispeten sınırlı da olsa, AB'nin AB üyesi olmayan ülkeler ve AB üyelerinin güvenlik, savunma ve dış politikaları üzerinde de artan etkisinin varlığı not edilmektedir. İkinci olarak, AB'nin AB üyesi olmayan ülkeler ve AB üyelerinin güvenlik, savunma ve dış politikaları üzerindeki etkilerinin temel olarak dört şekilde: - a) sosyalleřme ve deneyimsel öğrenme yoluyla AB/OGSP normlarına ve deđerlerine uyum, b) AB çağrılarının ve kořulluluđunun bir sonucu olarak AB/OGSP gerekliliklerine, normlarına ve deđerlerine uyum, c) uluslararası düzeyde diplomatik ve ulusal hedefe ulařmak için AB / OGSP gerekliliklerine, normlarına ve deđerlerine uyum ve d) AB'nin iç güç dengesi ve dış politikanın yerel kaynakları üzerindeki etkisi neticesinde AB/OGSP gerekliliklerine, normlarına ve deđerlerine uyum – gerekleřtiđi tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupalılařma, Ortak Savunma ve Güvenlik Politikası, topluluk müktesebatı, sosyalleřme, AB Kořulluluđu

Introduction

The impact of the EU on the changes in the area of economy, the rule of law and democracy at the EU member and candidate countries has been a subject of many studies since the 1990s. However, the impact of the EU/CSDP on the non-EU members and the foreign and security policies of the associated states, including the member and candidate states, is a slightly less popular topic of discussion in academic literature. Although it is a relatively less popular subject of discussion, the impact of the EU/CSDP on the non-EU members and the foreign and security policies of the associated states has already been the subject of several studies. There is, therefore, a need for investigating whether and (if so) how the EU/CSDP has an impact on the non-EU members and the foreign and security policy of the associated states. This study aims, thus, to explore the impact of the EU/CDSP on the non-EU members and the

foreign and security policies of associated states. This study argues that, first, the EU/CSDP has a transformative impact on the non-EU countries and the foreign and security policies of the associated states, in addition to the EU/CDSP's impact on the economy, the rule of law, democracy and the governance of its member and candidate states. Second, the impact of the EU on the non-EU countries and on the foreign and security policies of the EU members occurs to a large extent both a horizontal pattern of experimental learning and socialisation and a vertical, 'top down' process of the EU conditionality and adaptation pressure. Third, associated states sometimes voluntarily adhere to the EU/CSDP requirements to increase their diplomatic power and to achieve their national goals at the international level. Fourth, changes in the economic and democratic realms and the rule of law at the associated states generated by the EU calls, adaptation pressure and conditionality lead to variations in the foreign and security policies of related states. Accordingly, this study focuses, first, on the impact of the EU/CSDP on non-EU countries and then the impact of the EU/CSDP on the foreign and security policies of member states.

1) The Impact of the EU on the Non-EU Countries

Although Europeanisation scholars focus largely on the impact of European integration on the EU members, its scope is not limited to the European continent and/or members of the EU (Vink and Graziano, 2007: 11-12; Schimmelfennig, 2010). Relatively few, but Europeanisation scholars are increasingly evaluating the changes caused by the EU pressure and conditionality in applicant and candidate states (Özdemir, 2012; Kalkan, 2020b; Wallace, 2000; Grabbe, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004; Sedelmeier, 2006; Wallace, 2000; Major, 2005). There are also several studies that have expanded the scope of Europeanisation beyond the member states (see, Nicolescu and Dragan, 2020; Shutes, 2016; Fischer et al., 2002; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Sverdrup and Kux, 2000; Özdemir, 2012; Kalkan, 2015). These studies mostly based their conceptual frameworks on the ongoing debate about the rationalist and sociological new institutionalism. They also argued that the impact of the EU on the candidates and/or non-EU members is also different between countries and policy fields, in line with the Europeanisation of member states

Candidate and applicant countries, as in member states, must adapt their policies and institutions to the EU regulations and directives. They are, therefore, exposed to the EU

adaptational pressures even more than the current member states. Hence, frameworks developed to analyse changes in governance, politics and policies of member states can also be applied in assessing the impact of the EU on candidate, applicant, and non-EU countries (Xavier, 2018; Shuter, 2016; Smith, 2011; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Goetz, 2000; Grabbe, 2003; Dimitrova, 2002; Pomorska, 2007; Aydin and Acikmese, 2007). As regards the asymmetric relationship with the EU and the principle of pre-accession conditionality, the method of Europeanisation in the candidate and applicant countries is different from that in the member states. There are several arguments as to why it is different, but here we can cite three main reasons: (1) the applicant and candidate countries cannot join the EU decision-making process, (2) With the accession partnership and regular progress reports, the EU directly affects the domestic policy-making, and (3) the applicant and candidate countries are obliged to implement the directives and regulations of the EU without the benefit of negotiation.

The applicant and candidate countries in the pre-accession process, therefore, transferred and adapted their policies and institutions to the EU as current member states do (for details see, Grabbe, 2003, 2006; Kalkan, 2015). However, existing member states, particularly the powerful member states, can to some extent 'upload' their preferences, interests, and policies to the EU level. Nevertheless. The applicant and candidate countries are simply expected to download the directives and regulations of the EU without the benefits of negotiation (Grabbe, 2003; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Smith, 2011; Shuter, 2016; Dimitrova, 2002). Since the EU has a coercive impact on the domestic decision-making processes of applicant and candidate countries through the pre-accession negotiations (Xavier, 2018; Kalkan, 2015, 2020b; Smith, 2011; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Pomorska, 2007; Grabbe, 2003). Candidate states cannot affect the EU decision-making process from within, which is a factor that constitutes the other dimension of Europeanization. Applicant and candidate countries, therefore, download the EU rules, regulations and directives to the domestic level even if these are unattractive to them (Grabbe, 2003, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2010). Because, as noted by Grabbe (2006: 2), they believed that "ultimately accession on any terms is better than no accession". Candidate and applicant countries adapt their policies to those of the EU without negotiating the concessions also to prove themselves worthy potential members of the club to which they are seeking admission: a factor which gives them

a far greater motivation to download and implement EU directives than existing members (Nicolescu and Dragan, 2020; Rasmussen, and Alexandrova, 2012; Shuter, 2016; Grabbe, 2001, 2003, 2006; Kalkan, 2020b). The creation of accession criteria known as the 'Copenhagen Criteria' has also given the EU much greater leverage to force candidate states to implement its demands and directives at the domestic level than was previously the case (Grabbe, 2001, 2006; Kalkan, 2015). Accordingly, the EU has a powerful impact on candidates' policy-making through the strategies embedded in the accession partnership and regular reports. The strategies embedded in the accession partnership and regular reports set out a list of priorities that must be implemented by candidate countries within a certain time frame to gain admittance. Candidate and applicant states, therefore, have to see the prospect of membership as a realistic target in order to be motivated to fulfil the Copenhagen Criteria and implement the necessary reforms (Grabbe, 2003, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2004, 2010; Kalkan, 2015; Hergüner, 2020). As noted by Schimmelfennig (2004), candidate states comply with the accession criteria if they calculate that doing so will produce a larger long-standing benefit than the status quo, regardless of the considerable domestic adaptation costs. The fear of rejection from full EU membership, as has been demonstrated in the Turkish case, produces a confidence problem. This creates negative impacts on the credibility of EU accession prospects and the domestic political will required to fulfil the accession criteria (Kalkan, 2015; 2020b).

The asymmetric relationship between the candidate states and the EU is also observed in the foreign policy field. This is partly related to the nature of the negotiation over the chapters. As is the case in other fields, in chapter 31 the EU requires candidates to internalise its foreign policy values and norms at the domestic level. Due to the asymmetric relationship, candidate states cannot upload their foreign and security policy concerns and interests to the EU level. They are expected to download the EU policies and norms in the foreign policy realm fully as well. The variations in Turkish foreign policy towards the Cyprus issue, Greece and Armenia during the first decade of 2000 constitute a good example of that. According to chapter 31 (CSDP) of the *acquis communautaire*, there is no requirement for specific legal adaptation to the national law, but 'candidate countries have to fully adapt their foreign policy' to the EU political declarations, statements, positions and agreements before accession. They even have to implement the sanctions and preventive measures when

enacted by the EU. The alignment of candidate states' foreign policy with the CSDP is monitored by the European Commission and announced every year in Progress Reports. For instance, according to the 2008 Commission reports on Turkey 'Turkey aligned itself with 109 out of 124 CSDP declarations' (2008 Progress Report on Turkey).

Socialisation and experimental learning have also been widely perceived in a candidate as an outcome of intensifying relations with the EU. As noted by Pomorska (2007), norm and value internalisation gains speed with the intensified relations in the accession negotiations. The increasing internalisation of the EU norms and values brings about a shift in the public and elite opinions in the candidate states as well (Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Pomorska, 2007; Kalkan, 2017). At the beginning of accession negotiations, candidate states are required to appoint a Political Director and create new posts to facilitate political dialogue with the EU. Delegating officials under the leadership of the Political Director perform the task of EU correspondents and join the Working Groups meeting in Brussels. Over time they socialise and redefine their self-interests in line with the EU policy norms and values (Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Joncos and Pomorska, 2006; Pomorska 2007; Kalkan, 2017). Increasing socialisation and experimental learning also change the external policy interests, preferences, readings and implementation of candidate states (Schimmelfennig, 2010; Pomorska 2007; Kalkan, 2017).

2) The Impact of the EU on the Foreign and Security Policies of the Associated States

Studies on the national impact of the EU largely focus on the impact of the EU's first pillar arrangements, regulations and directives on the socio-economic and democratic policies and practices of the EU members. How have the EU members adjusted their policies, institutions, and practices to the EU rules, norms and practices? As a result of the internalisation of the EU rules, norms and regulations how have the associated states' rules and implementations in connected fields changed over time? As noted above, the impact of the EU on the defence, security and foreign policies of related states has become less popular with researchers. Arguably, as noted by Smith (2000: 614), Major (2005: 180-183) and Radaelli (2004: 9), there are three main reasons for that. First, as noted by Smith (2000: 614) "there is usually great sensitivity among most governments about foreign policy as a special domain in which national

concerns dominate international or European interests”. Second, in contrast with the nature of the socio-economic and democratic rules, regulations and implementations, the CSDP does not include the obligatory downloading of the EU rules, regulations and implementations (Major, 2005: 180), and there is an intergovernmental policy-making instrument. So, as noted by Smith (2000) and Kalkan (2015: 56), ‘the capacity of the EU as a supranational authority is relatively limited in the foreign policy realm. To observe a wide range of changes in the foreign policy realm in a limited time is therefore relatively difficult’. Thirdly, as argued by Major (2005: 183) and Radaelli (2004: 9), organizationally, it is hard to differentiate the impact of the EU from other external and native factors in the changing approach of the associated states’ foreign policy. As noted by White (2001: 6) and mentioned above, most Europeanisation scholars, however, agree that “foreign policies of member states have been significantly changed, if not transformed, by participation over time in foreign policy-making at European-level” Therefore, a need occurs for the examination of the impact of the EU on the defence, security and external policies and implementations of the associated states.

In this regard, the question is how the EU impacts the member states’ foreign and security policy. There are diverse reasons and inspirations behind the alignment of national policy, politics and policy, including the foreign policy, with the EU’s. First, the EU has a considerable impact on the member states’ foreign and security policy through increasing socialisation and experimental learning. With the intensifying relations at the EU level, the foreign policy interests and identities of EU members change overtime which brings about variations in the member states’ foreign policy (Eriksson, 2006; Whiteman and Manner, 2000; Fredrick, 2008; Couloumbis, 1994; Goetz, 2001; Gross, 2007, 2009; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Pomorska, 2007). The increase in information-sharing and common practices in the EU structure and the advancing financial, monetary and political cooperation guide the perceptions of policymakers by enhancing socialisation and experimental learning. The outcomes of socialisation and experimental learning are the changing public and elite opinion and thus national and executive adaptation to the CFSP/CSDP norms and values (Xavier, 2018; Kalkan, 2015; 2017; Smith, 2011; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Pomorska, 2007; Manner and Whiteman, 2000; Tonra, 2001; Hill, 1983; Howorth, 2004). Throughout the adjustment and amendment procedure, domestic distinctiveness and external policy benefits are redesigned and redefined by a

raising 'we feeling' and a common 'role identity' as an outcome of growing socialisation, assignation and collaboration (Aggestam, 2004: 81-98). The point is that rising compromise and consultation in external and security strategy, plan and implementations at the EU level restrict the associated states' capacity to act and change individually worldwide (Smith, 2011; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Tonra, 2001; Nicolescu and Dragan, 2020; Rasmussen, and Alexandrova, 2012; Shuter, 2016). Through this progression, new rhetoric, routines, attitudes and policies come into practice which form, structure and reshape the policies, practices and behaviours of related states on both the national and global levels. In other words, the internalisation of the EU's rules, values, costumes and ideas have gradually altered the principles and beliefs of associated states' foreign policymakers. This results in alteration of national foreign policy rhetoric and thus politics and policies (Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012; Pomorska, 2007; Tonra, 2001). Consequently, foreign policies of the states associated with the EU are progressively limited and formed and/or shaped by the Union as a consequence of obtaining a 'we feeling', a common 'role identity' and a feeling of 'common destiny' as an outcome of growing synchronisation, socialisation and communication among the associated states.

Second, the promotion of national interests through EU membership and/or candidature is another chief inspiration behind the rule and norm convergence and transformation of associated states. Adaptation to the EU/CSDP norms and values and cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy create an opportunity for advocating and promoting the national interest of associated states in the international arena. Adaptation to the EU/CSDP norms and values and cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy also provide worldwide recognition, approval and acceptance to the associated states. Associated states, therefore, have also increasingly cooperated in high politics throughout putting aside their cultural, historical and traditional differences (Jacoby, 2004; Rasmussen and Alexandrova, 2012; Kaminska, 2007; Kalkan, 2020a; Coulombis, 1994; Jacoby, 2004; Rua, 2008; Nuttall, 1997; Manner and Whiteman, 2000; Pomorska, 2007). Therefore, the other argument related to how the EU has an impact on the increasing cooperation in the field of foreign policy among the associated states is based on the logic of consequences.

Third, administrative, financial and societal changes at the national levels produced by the EU brings about changes in associated states' foreign policy rhetoric and practices as well. It was argued by Torreblance (2001: 1) that "changes in Spanish

foreign policy are part of a wide process of political, economic and social modernisation". The significance of the democratic and financial reforms was particularly emphasised by Torreblanca as the key aspect behind the alterations in Spanish external policy. The concept of Europeanisation with rational and social new institutionalism was used as a theoretical framework, and thus both the 'logic of appropriateness' and 'logic of consequentiality' were emphasised as causes of the Europeanisation of Spanish foreign policy in Torreblanca's study. Therefore, the process of economic and democratic liberalisation generated by the EU adaptation pressure is also meaningful for understanding and explaining the changes in associated states. Forth, EU conditionality in the adaptation of associated states' foreign policy to the EU/CSDP requirements also brings about changes in associated states' foreign policy rhetoric and practices (Sedelmeier, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2010; Börzel and Risse, 2012). Changes in traditional Turkish foreign policy toward Greece and Cyprus during the first years of the 2000s constitutes a good example of that (for details, see Kalkan, 2020).

Conclusion

This study aims to examine the impact of the EU/CSDP on non-EU countries and the foreign and security policies of associated states. The study focused first on the impact of the EU/CSDP on non-EU countries and then the impact of the EU/CSDP on the foreign and security policies of associated states. Findings of the study reveal that, first; the EU/CSDP has had a gradually increasing impact on non-EU countries and associated states' foreign and security policies. Second, the impact of the EU on non-EU members and on the external and security policies of EU members occurs in different ways such as a) a horizontal pattern of experimental learning and socialisation (elite and bureaucratic socialisation), b) a vertical, 'top down' process of EU adaptation pressure and conditionality, c) voluntary adaptation to the EU/CSDP calls, norms and values to maximise national diplomatic power and interest at the global scale, d) changes in the domestic balance of power through the empowerment of new actors and institutions by the EU and e) changes in the realms of the rule of law, democracy and economy at the national level, directly and/or indirectly produced by the EU.

References

- Aggestam, L. (2004). Role identity and Europeanisation of foreign policy: A political-cultural approach. In *Rethinking European Union foreign policy*. Edited by Ben Tonra and Thomas Christiansen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 81–98.
- Aydin, M., and Acikmese, S. A. (2007). Europeanisation through EU conditionality: understanding new era in Turkish foreign policy. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 9(3), 263-274.
- Coulombis, T. (1994). Introduction: The impact of EC (EU) membership on Greece's foreign policy profile. In *Greece and EU membership evaluated*. Edited by Panos Kazakos and Panayotis Ioakimidis. London: Pinter, 189-198.
- Dimitrova, A. (2002). Enlargement, institution-building and the EU's administrative capacity requirement. *West European Politics*, 25(4), 171–90
- Eriksson, A. (2006). *Europeanisation and governance in defence policy: The example of Sweden*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Fischer, A., Nicolet, S., and Sciarini, P. (2002). Europeanisation of a non-European country: The case of Swiss immigration policy. *West European Politics*, 25(4), 143–170.
- Fredrick, L. O. (2008). Sweden and the development of the European security and defence policy: A bi-directional process of Europeanisation. *College of Europe EU Diplomacy Paper*, 5(1), 154-163.
- Goetz, K. H. (2001). European integration and national executives: A cause in search of an effect. In *Europeanized politics*. Edited by Klaus H. Goetz and Simon Hix. London: Frank Cass, 211–231.
- Grabbe, H. (2001). How does Europeanisation affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8(6), 1013–1031.
- Grabbe, H. (2003). Europeanisation goes east: Power and uncertainty in the EU accession process. In *The politics of Europeanisation*. Edited by Kevin Featherstone and Claudio M. Radaelli. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 303-327.
- Grabbe, H. (2006). The EU's transformative power: Europeanisation through conditionality in central and

- eastern Europe. Houndmills, Basingstoke, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gross, E. (2007). Germany and European security and defence cooperation: The Europeanisation of national crisis management policies?. *Security Dialogue*, 38(4), 501–20.
- Gross, E. (2009). *Europeanisation of national foreign policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gündođdu, A. (2001). Identities in question: Greek-Turkish relations in a period of transformation? *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 5(1), 106–17.
- Hergüner, B. (2020). An analysis of the EU's soft power and the EU – Turkey relations through metaphors. *Istanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, July 2020, 19th. Special issue of Prof. Dr. Sabri ORMAN, 501-514.
- Howorth, J. (2004). Discourse, ideas and epistemic communities in European security and defence policy. *West European Politics*, 27(1), 29–52.
- Hill, C. (1983). *National foreign policies and European political cooperation*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Jacoby, W. (2004). *The enlargement of the European Union and NATO: Ordering from the menu in central Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Juncos, A., and Pomorska, K. (2006). *Playing the Brussels Game: Strategic socialisation in the CFSP council working groups*. European Integration Online Paper 10.
- Kalkan, E. (2015). *Europeanisation of change in foreign policy: Transformation of Turkish foreign policy in the EU accession process*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Submitted to University of Kent.
- Kalkan, E. (2017). Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliđi sürecinde demokratikleşme çabaları. In *Farklı boyutlarıyla Avrupa Birliđi–Türkiye ilişkileri: Türkiye'nin dönüşümünde Avrupa Birliđi'nin rolü*. Edited by Burak Hergüner and Erol Kalkan. Ankara: Siyasal. 23-44.
- Kalkan, E. (2020a). Turkey in the future of European Union security. In *Contemporary issues in international relations: Problems of the international community*. Edited by Mehmet Emin Erendor and Mehmet Fatih Öztarsu. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Cambridge, 237-251.

- Kalkan, E. (2020b). The long-standing dispute between Turkey and Greece: The Aegean issue. *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi*, 28, 167-174.
- Kaminska, J. (2007). New members and the CFSP: Europeanisation of the Polish foreign policy. *Political Perspectives*, 2(2), 1-24.
- Major, C. (2005). Europeanisation and foreign and security policy: Undermining or rescuing the nation state. *Politics*, 175–90.
- Manners, I., and Whitman, R. (2000). Introduction. In *The foreign policy of the European Union member states*. Edited by Jan Manners and Richard G. Whitman. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1-16.
- Nicolescu, A. F., and Dragan, G. (2020). Integrating the non-EU immigrants into the EU labour market. An econometric analysis of some of the specific factors. *Management & Marketing*, 15(3), 364-380.
- Özdemir, F. (2012). Europeanisation: An answer to globalisation. *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 11(2), 123-140.
- Pomorska, K. (2007). The impact of enlargement: Europeanisation of Polish foreign policy? Tracking adaptation and change in the Polish ministry of foreign affairs. *The Huge Journal of Diplomacy*, 2, 25–51.
- Radaelli, C. M. (2004). Europeanisation: Solution or problem?. *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)*, 8(16).
- Rasmussen, A., and Alexandrova, P. (2012). Foreign interests lobbying Brussels: Participation of non-EU members in commission consultations. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(4), 614-631.
- Rua, S. (2008). The Europeanisation of the ministry for foreign affairs of Finland. ARANA Report, No. 8.
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2010). Europeanisation beyond the member states. *Journal for Comparative Government and European Policy*, 8(3), 319-339.
- 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), 661–79.

- Sedelmeier, U. (2006). Europeanisation in new member and candidate states. *Living Reviews in European Governance*, 1(3), 1-28.
- Shutes, I. (2016). Work-related conditionality and the access to social benefits of national citizens, EU and non-EU Citizens. *Journal of Social Policy*, 45(4), 691–707.
- Smith, M. E. (2000). Conforming to Europe: The domestic impact of EU foreign policy cooperation. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 614.
- Sverdrup, U., and Kux, S. (2000). Fuzzy borders and adaptive outsiders: Norway, Switzerland, and the EU. *Journal of European Integration*, 22(3), 237–70.
- Tonra, B. (2000). Denmark and Ireland. In *The foreign policy of European Union member states*. Edited by Richard G. Whitman and Ian Manners. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 245-267.
- Tonra, B. (2001). The Europeanisation of national foreign policy Dutch, Danish and Irish foreign policy in the EU. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Tonra, B., and Christiansen, T. (2004). *Rethinking European Union foreign policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Torreblanca, J. I. (2001). Ideas, preferences and institutions: Explanation the Europeanisation of Spanish foreign policy. ARENA Working Paper, 01/26.
- Vink, M. P., and Graziano, P. (2003). What is Europeanisation? and other questions on a new research agenda. *European Political Science*, 3(1), 63–74.
- Wallace, H. (2000). Europeanisation and globalisation: Complementary or contradictory trends?. *New Political Economy*, 5(3), 369–82.
- White, B. (2001). *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. London: Palgrave.
- Xavier, A. I. (2018). The Impact of Brexit on security and defence multilateralism: More cooperation or overlapping interests?, *Marmara Journal Of European Studies*, 26(1).