The Historical Roots of European Union: Integration, Characteristics, and Responsibilities for the 21st Century

Süha Atatüre

Assistant Professor, Political Science and International Relations Department
Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey
E-mail: suhaatature@yeditepe.edu.tr
Tel: +90-216-5780746; Fax: +90-216-5780797

Abstract
Although European Union already plays a significant role in shaping international society, it may still influence international society more effectively. In this study, this claim will be demonstrated with reference to the success of European countries in transforming the concept of sovereignty and to three other characteristics of the union which have emerged in the process of integration: (1) implicit formation, (2) passive defense, and (3) will-power and concert. Moreover, it will be argued that arrangements, which remove structural inconsistencies of the union, and policies, which facilitate inclusion of Turkey to the union, will play a significant role in enhancing the European Union's capacity to mould the international society. As a result, in spite of its inability to affect international order, this paper will describe the Union's potential to influence international society and discuss the strategies to increase this potential.

Keywords: Sovereignty, International Society, Passive Defense, Implicit formation, Will Power.

1. Introduction

A better comprehension of global politics in the twenty-first century necessitates the clarification of the difference between two concepts: international order and international society. These two concepts might seem to be synonymous at first sight but they obtained distinct meanings in the process of European Union integration. In fact, international order as a term stands for the balance of power, which emerges as an outcome of power relations among states whereas international society includes universal values such as human rights, the environment, international law and organizations. Since the European Union does not possess the military power required for the formulation and implementation of common foreign and security policies, the impact of the EU on the international order remains limited. However, the European Union holds considerable potential for shaping international society.

In this study, we shall claim that the European Union plays a significant role in shaping international society. We shall also argue that the European Union has the potential to influence international society more effectively. This claim will be demonstrated with reference to the success of European countries in transforming the concept of sovereignty and to three principal characteristics of the Union, which emerged in the process of integration. Moreover, we shall argue that arrangements, which remove structural inconsistencies of the Union, and policies, which facilitate the inclusion of Turkey to the union, will play a significant role in enhancing the European Union's capacity to mould the international society. As a result, this paper will describe the European Union's potential to influence international society and discuss the strategies to increase this potential.

2. Material Bases Effecting to International Society
2.1. The Sovereignty before and after Westphalia

The European Union is a project of integration and peace pursued by the European countries after the Second World War, the latest link in the long chain of wars in the history of Europe. This project has a unique character, which explains how the new state of sovereignty emerged at the end of an antagonistic process. This new state of sovereignty formed by the European Union indicates the transformation of sovereignty as a concept from its formation till today.

Until the Thirty Years War (1618-48), a rivalry over the sovereignty of the temporal world had existed between the papacy and the emperors. In other words, the papacy struggled to keep its sovereignty not only over the eternal world but also over the material world; and resisted the demand of power coming from the emperors. The following stages can be enumerated among the outstanding stages of this struggle: In the first period St. Augustine's (A.D. 354-430) platonic division between 'the city of god" and "the city of men' prevailed. After that, the ideas of Pope Gelasius I gained credence offering a distinction between the two powers: the "holy authority of bishops" (*auctoritas sacrata pontificum*) and 'royal power" (*regalis potestas*). Defining the church as the ultimate authority, he presented this doctrine to legitimize papal supremacy. After St. Augustinus, Pope Gregorius VII reformulated the two swords theory by uniting the religious and political powers under the supreme authority of the Church (Sabine, 1969: 221-49).

Declaring that the King of France was not dependent on the emperor in secular affairs, Pope Innocentus III allowed the kingdoms within empires to join the struggle over sovereignty by his edict "*Per vernerabilem*" issued in 1202. This edict brought about the doctrine of "*rex imperator in regno suo*," which implied that the king had the autonomy to make laws or to declare wars independently from the emperor. Thereby, a new system comprising the idea of independent kings began to be accepted by the 13th century as opposed to the old system in which the kings were vassals of the emperor (Post, 1953: 320)[1]. The Pope's attempt to weaken the power of the emperor then turned into a struggle of principalities against kingdoms during the religious wars. In fact, in the transitory period from feudalism to absolutism, the concept of sovereignty was first used by Bodin in a broader sense, that is "the highest, absolute and constant power over the citizens," rather than simply referring to the relation between the ruler and the ruled (Hakyemez, 2004: 29).

In his work titled "the Law of War and Peace" (De Jure Belli ac Pacis), Hugo Grotius argues that the independence of a state means that the state is not exposed to any intervention. On the other hand, the sovereignty of a state means the actions of a state is neither controlled nor hindered by external forces (Keene, 2002: 49). According to Grotius the state, which he defined as a perfect or complete community, is the collective bearer of sovereignty (Grotius, 1967: 30).

In the *Leviathan*, Thomas Hobbes formulated the legal grounds of the Westphalia Treaty by conceptualizing sovereignty as the absolute, constant, indivisible, nonnegotiable and the most supreme authorization in the period when the Thirty Years War had just ended (Hobbes, 1988: 96-100). As a result, modern states began to emerge, and the "Westphalian state order", which would last for three hundred years, was constructed. This new order necessitated every state to respect each other's independence, sovereignty, equality and territory. In fact, with the new order the idea of nation, which was not widely accepted before, achieved a great deal of legitimacy, and thereby led to the emergence of international law (Krasner, 2006: 81).

With Rousseau, the possession of sovereignty was transferred from a single authority to the community through the concepts of popular sovereignty and unity of powers (Rousseau, [1762] 1990: 49-58). Subsequently, the concept of unity of powers was replaced by the principle of division of powers between the judicial, legislative and executive institutions and thereby gained democratic characteristics (Montesquieu, 1989: 156-66). Towards the end of the 20th century, absolute sovereignty as a characteristic of the nation state was transformed into flexible and limited sovereignty due to

---

[1] Gaines Post; "Two Notes on Nationalism in the Middle Ages", in traditio, c. 9, 1953, p 320, Ozan Erozden; Ulus-Devlet, Dost, Ankara, 1997.

globalization, and the crystallization of the human rights regime and the rule of law (Atatüre, 2000: 242). The consolidation of this process is still in progress and problems related to the latest understanding of sovereignty are not yet clear. For instance, Krasner claims that there is a conflict between national and international sovereignty. For him, states exploit national sovereignty for their own interest and fail to contribute to construction of international sovereignty as much as they can. Despite the organized hypocrisy of nation states, it is safe to claim that since the 1990s the concept of sovereignty has reached a status completely different from the Westphalian understating of sovereignty (Krasner, 2006: 90).

To sum up, a periodization of European history through the concept of sovereignty yields three different stages. The pre-Westphelia period included the political and religious struggle for the monopoly of sovereignty between the papacy and the emperors. In the post-Westphalia period (1648-1990), the struggle turned into a combat of sharing sovereignty among equal and independent states. Finally in the period starting after 1990, indivisible/integral sovereignty of the pre-Westphalian order and divisible sovereignty of the post-Westphalian order were substituted by the European integration process. This process brought about an authentic idea of sovereignty, which combines the two understandings of sovereignty before and after Westphalia. This new idea of sovereignty even went beyond the older ones by putting forth a new synthesis representing the latest stage of sovereignty, that is, "sovereignty beyond Westphalia".

2.2. Integration

2.2.1. Historical and Conceptual Frame

While this process of transformation of the sovereignty, serves as a determining function in the historical sense, it can also be seen as the determinant of the new formations in the political sense. In fact, after World War II, the question that the international society should have answered was "How to prevent the European continent from becoming the scene of wars, again?" In fact, Dante Aligheri was the first to voice the dream of the Europe in unity and integration as a family of nations (Amittay, 1983: 110). The Project of Perpetual Peace of Abbe de St. Pierre, Perpetual Peace of Immanuel Kant, Paneuropa of Count Richard Coudleuhade- Kalergi and the endeavors of Aristide Briand to keep the peace in Europe were all similar plans of bringing peace to Europe. However, none of these projects was implemented because the motive of bringing peace on its own was not enough for achieving unity (Mattli, 1999: 69). More extensive and permanent integration required not only theoretical and practical support but also a synchronized triggering and suitable environment both from the inner and outer world.

When we look at the process of unification in Europe practically and historically, it can be seen that the first constitution having similar characteristics with the EU is the Hanseatic League. The League formed in 1356. It is a prototype of the EU with cities in Northern Europe having common commercial practices, a Europewide common currency, with its institutions to be located in city centers like Lübeck (Hirst, 2007: 49-52). This league collapsed in 1669 due to its clumsy structure, the rise of new rivals and the impact of the Reformation, and the emergence of the Westphalian state order.

Following that, a number of unions, which were mainly based on unification of customs and trade area, were established. Among them, the Bavaria-Württemberg Customs Union (1823-33), the Middle German Commercial League (1821-31), the German Customs Union (Zollverein, 1834), the Tax Union (1834-54), the German Monetary Union (Deutscher Münzverein, 1838), the Moldovian Wallachian Customs Union (1847), the Swiss Confederation (1848, completed in 1874), the German Monetary Convention (1857), the Scandinavian Monetary Union (1875) and the Benelux (1944) were the most outstanding ones (Mattli, 1999: 4-9)

With the influence of both the accumulation of these formations and the Second World War, in his book *A Working Peace System* David Mitrany, put forth the idea that states can unite to achieve peace. Holding a functionalist view, Mitrany proposed a new thesis in his book, which was published before the end of the war. He argued that "the problem of our time is not how to keep nations

peacefully apart but how to bring them actively together" (*ibid*.: 21). He further claimed that peace could be developed by uniting common peace elements rather than pacts among diplomats. He concluded that, the real peace was a working peace. The essence of the functionalist view depended on the fact that sovereignty cannot be transferred with a directive, but as a part of function and as the trust flourishes, it separates itself from the former authority in fragments. Mitrany calls this "peace by pieces".

The functionalist view believes that political divisions are the reasons of conflicts among states, international organizations are not an aim on their own, but they are instruments to deal with human needs, and thereby these organizations should be flexible and change their functions in line with the needs of the time (*ibid*.: 22). Working together in a specific technical or functional area will enable to spillover to other areas by ramification (Viotti and Kauppi, 1999: 212). Industrialized democracies, facing the problems caused by technology or by the products of technology in the 20th century, will feel the need for international cooperation in the functional domain (Carlsnaes, 2002: 257) and the unions to be formed in the economic area will also bring about unions in the political area (Viotti and Kauppi, 1999: 212).

Similar to Mitrany, functionalist Ernst Haas advocates that cooperation in technical and functional fields cannot be separated from political factors. For him, regional organization is an ongoing process of cooperation. In his work "The Uniting of Europe", Haas directs all his efforts to understand the issue of how states can achieve cooperation rather than the issue of understanding the conflicts among states facing the dilemma of security (Viotti and Kauppi, 1999: 212-13). With his new functionalist theory, he draws Mitrany's functionalism from international level down to the level of neighbor countries that is, to a concrete regional level (Moussis, 2004: 6). Finally, these ideas were put into practice when Robert Schuman under the influence of Monnet, announced the establishment of European Coal and Steel Company on 9 May 1950. This was the first instance that the European countries yielded part of their sovereignty to a higher independent/international authority.

The primary aim of the multi-national unification is to bring about peace and security between and among the member states, and the rest of the world. This situation is different from a direct political and military alliance and it is constructed gradually through a number of policies that create interdependence among member countries by making common interests more visible. In a multi-national unification, the common denominator consists of shared interests, institutions, objectives, needs, rules, measures, and codes of behavior.

Naturally, national action in compliance with common interest is hardly possible in an anarchic international context. In fact, despite its success in achieving a high level of integrity, European Union still faces very significant problems, especially with regards to the processes of decision-making and identity-formation. Though, the Lisbon Treaty contributed a lot to the solution of these two issues with its arrangements aiming at *a more democratic and transparent Europe; a more efficient Europe; a Europe of rights, values, liberty, solidarity and safety; a Europe as an actor on the global scene.*[2] At this point, the EU constitution becomes the main indicator of social and political unification, which will be studied, in the ensuing part.

2.2.2. Constitution of European Union

The widespread debate over the EU Constitution has not been solved yet. The debate even includes the query whether there is really a need for a EU constitution. Dieter Grimm, for instance, argues that a EU Constitution can turn the EU into a super-state consisting of several nations united within the EU. This option, though, seems to be unlikely because there is no single nation or state of Europe. On the other hand, Weiler argues that since construction of a European nation would require imagination of a political community with an exclusively defined identity, construction of a European nation would be against the basic principles of EU integration (Priban, 2005: 135-53). In harmony with Grimm, Habermas further argues that since EU laws are preferred over national laws in the member countries,

---

[2] Lisbon Agreement dated 13 December, Official Document of EU.

legislation of Brussels and Luxemburg presents a *de facto* constitution, which negates the necessity of a EU constitution (Habermas, 2007: 79). Fundamentally, the execution of the existing acquis for thinkers like Grimm and Weiler has "primary law" codes that materially have earned the quality of a constitution, and creates a situation that EU member countries cannot destroy through internal law arrangements. This situation causes the existence of a constitution to be perceived; furthermore, it makes the EU more dynamic. At this point, Habermas goes one step further and puts forth the idea that it is a case of *noblesse oblige* for the EU to spread European ideas and values even beyond the borders of Europe. This, however, necessitates a model of union exceeding the limits of an economic union (Habermas: 106-11).

This debate is also taking place within the union. The federalists demand more power for the union, the confederalists claim that power should be retained at the national level and common interests should be achieved through inter-governmental cooperation (Rifkin, 2004: 214-15). Nevertheless, the EU cannot be seen either as a theoretically explained state or – similar to the United States - as a super-nation state or a state of nation states. The EU is neither a "confederation" set up by international treaties nor a "federation" in which different states are collected around a constitution. The EU can be perceived as a confederation on the grounds that its constitution has the feature of "international treaty". It may also seen as a federation on the grounds that member states are united around a constitution in which they hand over their sovereignty to an EU body in different areas, at different levels and according to a specified mechanism. In the case of sovereignty, we have previously noted, that EU exemplifies neither divisible nor indivisible types of sovereignty but a synthesis of the two. Similarly, the EU is neither a case of federation nor a confederation but a synthesis of these two. Thus, federation, confederation and nation state are not valid labels for the EU. If this new structure has to be named, it can be called a "Regional – Democratic – State" of the global world.

2.3. Features of European Union

The economic and political developments in Europe in the years between 1945 and 2000, explain the process in which nation states turned into a regional democratic state within the European Union. In this period, nation states were transferring part of their sovereignty while they were becoming members of international organizations, primarily the United Nations. The transformation of Europe in this matter revealed a very different structure. Indeed, the EU showed a much greater development than the expectations at the time of its establishment. It emerged as a unique international actor thanks to its current size, its members and the representation of its peoples with their horizontal and vertical mechanisms in the union, seeing the union's consciousness and applications in the brackets of "company" and its feature of being a model. With its unsolved problems, this unification, although not foreseen beforehand, has produced organizational qualities that come into being on their own, having an enriching content and increasing influence based on its healthy and consistent development throughout the process. In this sense, it can be stated that there are three characteristics of the EU.

1) Implicit (soft) Formation
2) Passive (indirect) Defense
3) Will-power and Concert

These characteristics transform the EU into a new environmental power along with its own structural power. This situation concerns both the governments of member states with their people and other governments, regional unions, non-governmental organizations and individuals, and become a center of attraction. For the European community which went through the pains of the transformation of sovereignty before and after Westphalia, their success of turning this experience into a community of working peace should not be surprising.

2.3.1. Characteristic of Implicit (or soft) Formation
EU realized its integration process during the fiercest years of the Cold War. Along with the constant tension between the US and the Soviet Union, the Berlin Blockade (1948-9), the Korean War (1950-

53), the Soviet occupation of Hungary (1956), the Arab-Israeli Wars (1948-49, 1956, 1967, 1973-74, and 1982), the Vietnam War (1963-75), the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) and many other conflicts were waged in this period. The Kosovo Crisis (1992) after the fall of Soviet Union, the occupation of Afghanistan (1979 and 2002) and the War in Iraq (1991 and 2003), and many international problems concerning Europe took place in the years when the EU was striving to be integrated.

The point that makes the situation interesting is that the EU integration process continued more actively, when the Cold War was ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union, and even when a new transitory-incubation period started. While succeeding to overcome the problems within the union through its own ways, the EU integration process is also developing almost independently of the international system. It is influenced by the outer world minimally or disadvantages are turned into advantages for integration. In other words, the EU integration movement, starting during the period when the international system was experiencing the Cold War years, did not change its characteristics. It continued the process on the grounds of formerly set principles and the motions brought by the continually formed new values and norms, even when the system with these two poles was shattered and the transition to a new system occurred.

Although it is possible to attribute this success to the implementation of the functionalist and new functionalist views pioneered by thinkers like Monnet, Mitrany, and Haas, or to the other factors like the devastation of Europe after WWII, the Cold War, the end of the Cold War, the support of USA *et cetera*, these factors are neither sufficient nor explanatory. Indeed, integration was accomplished through the correct evaluation of the previous experiences, the display of a rare and patient political leadership of each member state, and overcoming challenging problems within the union. In this respect, the EU serves as an applied example of a regional integration plan to the world with the model of a multi-national integration that has gone on for a long time.

Regional unions like ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), ASEAN+3, APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation), the African International Community, South America Nations Community are structures established in the years after the EU's establishment. Indeed they were formed to minimize the external negative economic influences caused by the EU, and they opposed EU, but used the EU as a model at the same time. They also started the process of integration in the economic area; formed a similar structure, copied the principles and codes of Europe, and now they are trying to widen their common action domains. It is clear that they have not been as successful as the so far, but they are making a great effort to do so. Indeed these unions, just like the EU, have had an integration of power and principle to carry on development without any disruption in these two different international systems following each other. This system of principle and integration gains a continuum with the formation of a mutual energy because inter-union economic, political and social relations are carried on basically by all organizations, but under the EU's initiative and leadership[3].

If the foundations of these regional unions were based on the main axis of security instead of economy, it could be thought that the political tensions they cause would pose a risk for the world peace. However, economic interdependence, common interests and the fact that these interests go beyond the inter-governmental level, and spread to social and political life make it easy to solve conflicts among unions, and automatically develop a peaceful environment. In this sense, it can be stated that the EU gives secondary importance to the realistic conception based on the "balance of powers", adopted by USA, as a basic political preference, and adopt a conception that puts primary importance on the economy, politics, democracy, codes of law and human rights.

On the other hand, the world order under tension with two poles was destroyed by the pressure of USA, and now the tendency to become unipolar world is spreading more deeply due to globalization. This situation, while clearly exposing the hegemonic attitude carried on through the policy of "balance of powers" based on USA's hard power and national interests; it also indicates a situation conflicting with the EU's approaches and values. The EU creates security and dignity in the

---

[3] European Union Neighborhood Policy.

world, while posing as a model for regional unions with its own initiative, structure, mental setup, approaches and peaceful attitude. This is why non-member states apply to become members.

The EU plays an important role by spreading European values and norms while providing economic support for these unions with all regional cooperation programs, regional formations and regular meetings. Naturally, these higher attributes will not prevent us from ignoring the problems of the union such as ethnic and religious discrimination, migration policy *et cetera*. However, potentially the EU is influential in affecting international order and international society. This phenomenon reveals the EU's "implicit formation" characteristic indicating its moderate and peaceful attitude adopted and applied internationally with various economic gains.

2.3.2. Characteristic of Passive (Indirect) Defense

The passive defense characteristic of the EU is progressing phenomenon in the course of time, and the factors that reveal this are the values EU has created. Taking the decision not to make war, the European integration movement has created new values in the course of time, appropriating these things for itself. It has passed on these values to other nations and regional unions, primarily in economic and technological areas.[4]

Previously in the bi-polar world order (1950-80), the international society was shaped by American values, whereas especially after the 1980's the emergence of an increasingly peaceful consciousness in international society is very much in harmony with the values peculiar to the EU. Among these values democracy, rule of law, human rights, and environment can be mentioned. The impact of these values is quite clear that observing violation of human rights and principles of rule of law in some countries would not make any change. Furthermore, it can be argued that the main reason behind the increasing influence of EU values on the consciousness of international society is the difference of EU values from those values of the USA. The main difference is the common belief that USA is not sincere in its struggle for democratic values. Thus, the USA prepares the grounds of legitimacy for the admission of EU values by the international society.

These new international values, participatory democracy being the most primary one, include human rights, women's rights, children's rights, minority rights, animal rights, rule of law, non-governmental organizations, liberty, equality of women and men, education, and struggle against poverty. These values explaining the determining attributes at every level of globalization are the building blocks of the union. These values enabled countries or unions in close economic, political and social relationships with the EU to adopt these values in the course of time, and to insert these values in their own legal system. Thus, the EU has created a mode of behavior comprising similar views of world, similar ways of life and values in the countries of close or remote geographies.

The impact of European state system (Westphalian State Order) is not clear outside Europe between the years 1648 and 1945. However, its influence has been felt clearly since 1991. This indicates that the international community was accepting the peaceful EU values. Although perceived to be insufficient at the moment, the EU is organizing meetings with all regional unions periodically, sharing problems, and following policies. Far from being colonialist or imperialistic it is creating a pacific environment at the same time. So, the influence of these EU policies in close or remote geographies bring in the feature of passive defense or forms an indirect defense circle for the EU and regions of the unions, which prevents the threats to both their own areas and the EU from close or remote environments, at least by turning the problems and threats that will appear into a soluble consensus through treaties and meetings. This becomes a defense that is obtained not by weapons, not by interferences into the internal structures of countries and creating alternative governments, but by forming and sharing common contemporary, peaceful and humane values. Furthermore, this defense becomes also valid for other unions and states having relations with the EU. Excluding the unilateral wars and ethnic fights within countries created by the US, the decrease in the tendency to wage wars should be an indication of this process.

---

[4] The preamble of the ASEAN Charter envisions the creation of a peaceful and safe region, -ie. nuclear-free zone.

The discussions on political theory, especially the fact that positivist theory has been criticized harshly since the 1980s, and the resulting translocation of the applications of positivist view and the post-positivist applications questioning this have consequences on the nations apart from the EU and cause important changes on the communities of these nations. Since post-positivist theory offers emancipation to communities, and these values, though it is a harsh process, are accepted by these communities. This situation creates a defense with passive or indirect effect by decreasing the differences of views between the EU and these communities.

Consequently, this defense connotes a secondary mechanism based on minimizing the differences of perception between "other" nations by the embellishment of "other" nations with these values. Mental resemblance will both approximate perspectives and ease the hostilities. Passive Defense is a peaceful, rationalist and humane approach that is opposite of the European approach of destroying, smashing or digesting the other in the previous century.

2.3.3. Characteristic of Will-power and Concert

The motive that started the process of integration in Europe was to prevent another war by controlling each other. Drawing conclusions from the bloody wars in their history, the European powers decided to act collectively. This willingness for collective action has been the critical point in the process of integration. Here, the determination and ability of nation states of the EU to come together will be described as the EU's will-power. Transforming this will-power into a process, and making it permanent/constant will be labeled as the EU's power of concert. Indeed, the EU is an outcome of a demand and supply relationship. In this context, the demand is formation of economic environment, whereas the supply is willingness of leading countries to proceed with this process. Thus, concert and will power are some of the most significant characteristics of the European Union.

This feature of will-power and concert explains the action of developing a long-lasting mental conception and structure step by step for the common objectives to be followed by countries having very different interests, powers and values. Will-power and concert are so powerful that they could lead to the transfer or weakening of total sovereignty, the most important feature of the Westphalian system, and the restriction of independence of nation states by a superior administration through various mechanisms. The member states' willingness to accept integration as a peace term, a term of harmony will last for a long time and will gradually be realized step by step. It has become the assurance of the action. Naturally, this is also the premise of leading countries both the power and the success of applying these values and rules before anything else. It seems that this assurance will last in spite of many complications such as financial problems, immigration, identity problems and the effects of increasing ethnic nationalist movements. Besides the legal attitudes and implications that the union has formed for its inner congruity is also influencing the international society. They have experienced new adjustments which even the UN cannot realize both in domestic laws of states and in the field of international law.

At this point, the questions to be focused on are: "How did these nations, battling with each other for many years and having historical hostility and rivalry towards each other, come together?" Moreover, even when they came together, "what was the distinct motive for this?" In other words, "how did this integration process bear the negative effects of these tensions in the period of excessive tensions like the Cold War?" Or "how did it resist this with no interruption in the integration process?" Even more, "although it was formed in this bipolar world order, why did this integration movement expand instead of reducing its speed even when this order changed?" "What kind of will-power, and in order to maintain it what kind of congruity did Germany, England, France, Holland, Spain, Belgium and Italy have? They have experienced the worst possible hostility having fought two world wars. The answers for all the questions above can be explained by giving examples in long and historical dimension. However, if we were to answer these questions in one word, our answer would be "necessity". Necessity implies reiterating excessive will-power to overcome a deficiency (Atatüre, 2004: 64); this was established as an outcome of the perception that peace was a necessity. This

rational way that was preferred thanks to the desire of certain leaders in the post war international conjuncture. This will-power incrementally began to emerge in all European countries. It was facilitated by all governments regardless of their political ideology, with their will-power to maintain this process uninterruptedly.

While this will-power (leadership) held together the countries coming together in harmony, this structure influenced other countries and started to attract them to the union. On this matter, the ability of the pioneer countries' producing common values in addition to having solidified their economy since 1970 had an active role in this. It affected the countries that try to make their inner structure in accordance with *Acquis Communitaire* in order to join this formation. Thereby, the adaptation process began with the countries who were willing to join the union and who will adapt their inner structure in harmony with the union. Once they entered the union, keeping the harmony with the union has become a natural aspect of the membership.

In this process, although many problems were experienced with England, the feature of will-power and concert has managed to overcome them. Now, the most significant problem of union in terms of membership is whether it will be possible to accept Turkey to the union. This situation should be seen as the harshest test for the will-power and concert characteristic of the union. Here, Turkey is the main actor who has the responsibility to comply with the EU conditions. However, the union is not being clear about what its attitude will be in a situation where Turkey accomplishes each and every condition. Supposing that the result of the EU-Turkey relationship has a potential that can create a negative result for the international society and international order, we would expect that both sides would stick to the process with "will-power and concert". The EU is very important for global politics. In that case, the result of the relations between the EU and Turkey will be an attribute to determine the place of the EU in global politics.

3. European Union and International Society

An implied disagreement between the EU and the US has recently turned into an explicit conflict. This disagreement is USA's accusing EU on the grounds that EU left USA alone in the struggle of international terror. Furthermore, this accusation has turned into an implied threat that NATO will burst into parts, as a result of the allegations that this conflict is at a level that can separate NATO in two parts as "opponents and supporters of the war".[5] According to us, the main problem is on which basements that international order and society of the near future will be established. European Union is aware of the fact that it cannot form an international order with its present armed strength, structure and size. However, in spite of all impediments EU should naturally feel the responsibility for the international society to be a peaceful social structure standing out with the values of EU. It is evident that European values' being shared only among the member states cannot be of critical importance in terms of the international order and society.

As a matter of fact, various arguments have been going on over whether the European state order and society that formed after Westphalia Treaty in 1648 have created an international order and an international society outside Europe. Writers such as Hedley Bull and Adam Watson maintain that there is a European-states order outside Europe; whereas, writers and intellectuals such as Paul Hirst, Jurgen Habermas and Edward Keene argue that European-states order is only limited to Europe. In his book "The Anarchical Society", denoting that the starting point of international relationships is state; that is, "independent political society having a certain land, a certain population and a government asserting the right of hegemony on this land", one of the founders of International Society Approach, Hedley Bull states that "If a group of states, which are aware of the certain common interests and values form a society type by committing themselves to these common rules and participating the endeavors of common foundations, it is called international society." According to Bull, international

---

[5] The speech of the US Secretary of Defense, on 10 February 2008 after the Munich Conference.

society is pluralistic or liberal, and independent state is the nucleus of this society structure (Bull, 1995: 21-31).

Regarding international society, Adam Watson mentions an international society growing out of Europe and, after examining all societies in historical process, explains that European order was brought from Iberia, and was taken to both Latin America and India by ocean, and to Levant and Asia through Ottoman Empire (Watson, 1992: 216-28).

While Paul Hirst, having an opposing idea, denotes that international law works differently in colonies and non-European places, and *jus belli* is only valid among civilized countries, he also maintains that Clausewitz made an association between the point of political border and the nature of military operations by looking at the Rechsstaat of Europe (Hirst, 2007: 67). Habermas, sharing the same view, states that only the states in Westphalia state order accept each other as equal, and they separate the rest of the world into regions according to their zones of influence with the aim of colonization and missionary work (Habermas, 2007: 146).

Edward Keene, holding the same view with Hirst and Habermas, objects to Watson and Bull, and stating that Bull's work is very comprehensive and bright, he also makes an important criticism of it (Keene, 2002: xi). Keene states that Bull's work is deficient in explaining that international community and international order cannot be described on the grounds of the equality, the liberty of states originating from Westphalia, accepting each other, and respecting each other's territories and sovereignty. An international order in which a peaceful life prevail in an anarchic world cannot be put forth on this basis. Even if it is valid in Europe, it will not be so outside of Europe, and Bull and orthodox writers are under the illusion of this error (Keene, 2002: 147).

Keene states that this alleged order is the main principle of toleration, which will not be valid outside Europe. Outside Europe there were empires in earlier times and there were no sovereign states. Rather than a system of toleration, a civilization order existed (*ibid*.: 143-49). In this sense, he argues that he is opposed to the claim of this new international order is a post-Westphalian order.

It appears that both Bull and Watson accepted or at least knew there was not a one-to-one European international community out of Europe called non-European or extra-European; however, they thought this was not totally restricted in Europe. As a matter of fact in an analysis Watson carried on together with Hedley Bull by pointing out that the overall pictures of the West Europeans and non-European world are different. While, on one hand, the Latin and parts of Asia had an even more developed civilization than Europe, on the other hand primitive civilizations still existed. They write there are empires, there are states subordinate to the empires but these states do not make an effort to overthrow the centre though they sometimes rebel against its sovereignty (Watson, 1992: 216-28).

As for the Turks, it is not wrong to argue that the Ottoman Empire occupied an important area in the Balkans, in the Middle East and North Africa, having close relationships with Europe because of the nineteenth century Concert of Europe (Bull, 1995: 32). Although not totally resembling Russia and North America, it had some of the features of European community and order, and this was accepted by a large geography of earth. Besides, though most participants in the Hague Conference in the years 1899 and 1907 were mainly European countries, countries like China, the US, Mexico, Japan, Iran and Siam also participated (Clark, 1993: 95). The aim of these conferences was to come to a consensus on international law, common interests and values. It can therefore be seen more clearly that the European state system is not limited to the Europe.

To sum up, while Keene, Hirst and Habermas accept the existence of a Westphalian state order in Europe between 1648 and 1945, Bull and Watson argue that it forms an international community despite its restrictions. Although Keene, Hirst and Habermas hold a more coherent view because of their idea that they depend on geography and empire, it is impossible to ignore the views of Bull and Watson who speak of an international community by highlighting both geography and empires, and values. The Hague Conferences, in particular, should be interpreted as an indication of the commonness in this head, and it should be thought that European values will become widespread and will be embraced. Even more interestingly, the appearance of the influences of revolution any ideas

after the French Revolution in South American countries and Haiti, a French colony, can be accepted as proof that shows the justness of Bull and Watson (Berdal and Economides, 2007: 168-92).

On the other hand, related to sovereignty, the struggle of indivisibility of sovereignty between Pope and Emperor interestingly turned into the Westphalian state order that explains the divisibility of sovereignty among states between the years 1648-1945. This, in turn, left its place to the struggle between US and Soviet Union, similar to this struggle between Pope and Emperor for indivisibility of sovereignty, in the years 1945-91. While the ruling powers before Westphalia almost ignored various political units and did not give any role to sovereignty, the powers of the Cold War period did not ignore other states, but made them dependent and digested their existing sovereignty.

These structures following each other, beginning from the end of 1980s, make it possible to talk about tending towards an international community that centers on EU values. Moreover, while an international order based on US centered balance of power and predominated by the global economy is beginning to emerge. But an uncertainty that is causing suspicion and unease. While this order should create its original international community, this may bring for the first time an international community different from this international order into being. This community is probably very close to an international community that is focused on the EU, is centered around EU values, bears pacific values and opposed to the thesis maintained by Keene: "There has never become a European community out of Europe" after Westphalia. This situation is important enough for the EU to make a greater effort to realize it by freeing itself from deficiencies and wrong attitudes, and increasing credibility in all societies.

For as much as, the EU has not got an ability to form an international or global order, apart from shaping the international community and adding it superior values. Michael Smith, in his article where he examines the role of the EU in international relations, states that the EU has been engaged in international order at three levels, and these are the EU order, the EU in European order and the EU in global order. According to Smith, along with the sight that the EU has expanding, deepening and sending out strong tendencies in the international order with EU ideas, its institutions and economic power. These things both bear restrictions and may create situations open to conflicts (Smith, 2007: 437-55, 56). As a matter of fact, although the attributes, effective for the formation of the EU order, create various opportunities for global order, it does not seem possible that they are effective at the global level; they suspend the effective or realistic external politics and form a power according to this. As a result, they are not bearing a political approach. *Therefore, the role of the EU at global level should not be sought in the international order but in the international community.*

This optimistic view displays basically a responsibility like generalizing the conception, institutions and values of the EU in a way to make contributions directly to the international community coming into being, and indirectly to the international order. This view, without doubt, does not put the burden of a Europe not being able to expand the Westphalian state order to the non-European geographies in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. However, this does not also not free it from the responsibility of being efficient in the formation of the international order, while shaping the international community with actions that do not oppose a superior mechanism (the UN) which construct good relations in concert with each other for now and which is based on the grounds of regional unions. In any event, especially after 1991 and with the negative influence of balance of powers based on violence, EU values have become interesting and widespread, and international community seems to appreciate these values. The 21st century is tending to be the century of progress in peace rather than new wars. These things, despite the all the difficulties, preventions and paradoxes show that 21st century is a candidate to be a century in which the view that "point where politics ends, politics starts" goes on insistently and where peaceful perspective will prevail.

4. The Structural Consistency of EU and Turkey's Candidacy Process

The EU has got enough support and reason to be the carrier of a peaceful century. The world has been in a process of a new international order beginning in the 1990s. Although the formation of this new order became possible right after the collapse of The Soviet Union, its structure would depend on global economic competition, highlighting peaceful approaches, eliminating common threats and carrying on the conflict resolutions by means of UN[6]. It has not been realized so far and has been clouded by the US's preference to bring democracy to regions without democracy or with a very low level of democracy, by means of military force.

The EU bears an important responsibility in the establishment of such an order, through delayed but still living a period of waiting of suspicion and worry. This responsibility means: 1) Trying to make the US abstain from policies based on violence. 2) Enabling regional unions to develop and increase relations among them. 3) Clarifying and stating precisely relations with Turkey. The results of the efforts in the process of realizing these responsibilities will be seen by the EU both as the expansion of EU values to the international (even global) community and as an indirect role in the establishment of an international order centered on USA.

Indeed, the four main attributes put forth by the Lisbon Treaty aim the union to be carried to an effective level in both within itself and the international community in terms of structure and values. Although these two steps are very positive, the determining third factor is the relations with Turkey. Therefore, it is hard to talk about an international importance and effect unless these three important problems are surmounted. For this reason, both the EU and Turkey should put each others' positions on a new platform, different from today. They should start their new relationship according to the outlook of the new platform because the possibility of success has been greatly decreased with the current outlooks, attitudes and expressions.

4.1. The Outlook of EU from Turkey

Turkey's relations with Europe go back to the 14th century. Six hundred years after the Ottoman period, Atatürk explained that the place of Turkey is the western world before the Treaty of Lausanne[7], and he formed all political, administrative and social structure of the country in accordance with Western codes. Turkey is the charter member of many international organizations like the UN and the European Council. It has been effectively in the EU since the 1963 Treaty of Ankara, and in the Customs Union since 1995. Despite that, the EU is not clear about the future of Turkey for the union. Furthermore, countries like South Cyprus and the East European countries that have a lower performance than Turkey and have major problems, are being accepted to the union as full members. The EU does not behave transparently. In fact, several members of the EU have supported the PKK a separatist, terrorist organization. This European attitude keeps Turkey in suspense. While the membership is not mentioned in the progress report, issues like minorities, ethnic and religious rights, and arrangements for the international use of Turkey's territorial waters have led the EU to be looked upon with suspicion. At least, that is how the Turkish bureaucracy and the people perceive the EU.

4.2. The Outlook of Turkey from EU

Turkey has been making an effort to be a member of the EU. However, in this process, the political groups forming the government have not been able to show a decided attitude towards membership, neither single-party governments nor coalition governments. The negotiations for the EU membership have been used as political material in domestic politics. The inconsistency of the political groups forming the government arouses EU's suspicions about Turkey's sincerity in its will to join the union. Although the criteria are clear, many resolutions like human rights, minority rights, rule of law and

---

[6] Common threats include pressure on women, poverty, hunger, abuse of human rights, lack of drinkable water, drought, environmental problems, torture, and WMD. Cf. Süha Atatüre; Küreselleşme Sürecinin Ulus Devlet Üzerine Etkileri, p, 263.

[7] Izmir Economy Conference in 1923.

democratic rights that should have been adopted naturally not have been adopted. Legal and administrative amendments have been legislated or laws adopted have not been implemented. Turkish governments have not established a relationship for integration with Turkish people living in various European countries causing them to be isolated from European society by encouraging the identities based on religion and ethnicity. The EU process has become a political instrument that is accelerated or slowed down according to the interests of political governments in Turkey. At least, that is how Europe perceives it.

As can be seen, the main problem lies in the accumulation of problems. Actually, there have been misconceptions on both sides in this uncertain membership process, and this in turn has created distrust, and even hypocrisy. For a long time the relations have not been clear and honest at a level that is allowed by this environment of hypocrisy. The time lost will create problems for both sides. The problem is clear, and the first action to be taken is to fix the misconceptions between the two sides, and overcome this uncertainty. To do so, the two sides should come together according to a schedule and come to agreement by the help of a committee formed to analyze the relations for the needed steps. This volition should be exhibited and applied.

We should think that Turkey and the EU have no other choice but to behave differently because of both structural reasons and shared values; both common responsibilities to create a peaceful international order, or at least an international community that is close to European values. Turkey, with Ataturk's reforms, still keeps its feature of being an example of the only Muslim and secular country. This situation will make a contribution to the international generalization of common values if the EU membership of Turkey becomes definite. The EU's reliability will be the main assurance of this; moreover, the region will succeed in having a peaceful environment.

Although we think that it is not true to burden historical responsibility on both sides, it will not be an exaggeration to emphasis that this issue is more important than it appears. Without doubting the important and long-lasting contributions of this big formation to the international order and community, we think that it is possible and logical to solve the problem with collaboration and by getting rid of the stated mistakes. For the world, for the EU, and for Turkey, this is the way that best fits and most closely to Kant, Monnet and Ataturk. The point, the President of the French Republic Sarkozy and thinkers like him will take us to, is the Europe offered by Duc de Sully in 1638, Coudenhove-Kalergi and Aristide Briand in the 1920s, leaving behind the traces of Huntingon's "conflicts of civilizations" thesis in the dustbin of history.

5. Conclusion

The largest segment of world history consists of the history of Europe, which has mostly been determined by the concepts of sovereignty, religion (Christianity) and war. The interplay between these three factors has always yielded outcomes in the forms of compromises, agreements and treaties. The latest struggle related to them was the Second World War, which manufactured the European Union as an outcome. The European Union, even at its early stage, transformed these three deterministic concepts and provided them with a new dimension, which resolves the issue of sovereignty, Christianity, and war.

This new dimension liberated the European Union from a power-based center and allowed her to move towards a system based on universal norms and values. This turned out to be the main distinction between the Europe before and after the Second World War. Naturally, this indicates that European Union plays a significant role in shaping international society rather than international order. The European Union has been enhancing this role through various characteristics that the Union acquired in the process of integration such as (1) Implicit formation, (2) Passive defense, and (3) Will-power and concert. However, the success of the Union in this process depends on achieving good results in the relations with Turkey. Since the European Union does not have any comparative advantage in the struggle for international power except in trade and business, the greatest outcome of

the integration process will be that of a union molding the international society with universal, modern, European values. With this purpose, the European Union should minimize the inconsistencies within the Union and accept Turkey, who conforms to the norms and values of the union, as a full member without further conditions.

References

[1] Amittay, J. B., 1983. "Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi (History of Political Thought)," *Savaş Publishing*, Ankara.

[2] Atatüre, S., 2000. "Küreselleşme Sürecinin Ulus Devlet Üzerine Etkileri (The Impact of Globalization Process on Nation-States)," Unpublished Dissertation, *Gazi University*, Ankara.

[3] Atatüre, S., 2004. "2015 Yılında Dünya ve Türkiye (Turkey and the World in the year 2015)," *Başkent University Publication*, Ankara.

[4] Baylis, J., and S. Smith, 2005. "The Globalization of World Politics," 3rd ed., *Oxford University Press*, New York.

[5] Berdal, M., and S. Economides, 2007. "United Nations Interventionism: 1991-2004," *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge.

[6] Bull, H., 1995. "The Anarchical Society," *Macmillan Press*, London.

[7] Carlsnaes, W., T. Risse, and B.A. Simmons, 2002. "International Relations," *Sage*, London.

[8] Clark, I., 1993. "The Hierarchy of States, Reform and Resistance in the International Order," *Cambridge University Publication*, Cambridge.

[9] Erözden, O., 1997. "Ulus-Devlet (Nation-States)," *Dost Publications*, Ankara.

[10] Grotius, H., 1967. "Şavaş ve Barış Hukuku (War and Peace Law), translated by S. Meray, SBFY.

[11] Habermas, J., 2007. "The Divided West, Polity Press," translated by Ciaran Cronin, *Cambridge Publications*, Cambridge.

[12] Hakyemez, Y.Ş., 2004. "Egemenlik Kavramı (The Concept of Sovereignty), *Seçkin*, Ankara.

[13] Hirst, P., 2007. "War and Power in the 21st Century," Maryland.

[14] Hobbes, T., 1988. "The Leviathan," *Prometus Books*, New York.

[15] Keene, E., 2002. "Beyond The Anarchical Society," *Cambridge University Publication*, Cambridge.

[16] Krasner, S. D., 2006. "Sovereignty and Its Discontent," Joel Kruger, (ed); Globalization and State Power, *Pearson*, New York.

[17] Lisbon Agreement dated 13 December, Official Document of EU.

[18] Mattli, W., 1999. "The Logic of Regional Integration, Europe and Beyond," *Cambridge University Publication*, Cambridge.

[19] Montesquieu, 1989. "The Spirit of the Laws," *Cambridge University Publication*, Cambridge.

[20] Moussis, N. 2004. "Avrupa Birliği Politikalarına Giriş Rehberi (An Introductory Guide to European Union Policies)", *Mega Press*, Istanbul.

[21] Post, G., 1953. "Two Notes on Nationalism in the Middle Ages," in *traditio*, 9.

[22] Priban, J., 2005. "EU Constitution-Making Political Identity and Central Reflections," *European Law Journal*, 11 (2): 135-53.

[23] Rifkin, J. 2004. "European Dream," *Penguin*, New York.

[24] Rousseau, J.J., 1968. "The Social Contract, " translated by Maurice Cranston, *Penguin Books*, London.

[25] Sabine, G., 1969. "Siyasal Düsünceler Tarihi, Eski Çağ-Yeni Çağ (History of Political Thought)," 3rd ed., *Sevinç Publications*, Ankara.

[26] Smith, M., 2007. "The European Union and International Order: European and Global Dimensions," *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 12: 437-56.

[27]   Viotti, P.R., and M. V. Kauppi, 1999. "International Relations Theory," *Allyn & Bacon*, Boston.

[28]   Watson, A., 1992. "The Evolution of International Society," *Routledge*, London.