"Saving the State" Again: Turks Face the Challenge of European Governance[1]

Dr. Kivanç Ulusoy
Center for European Studies
Middle East Technical University
Ankara, Turkey

"The states will make further surrenders of sovereignty if, but only if, they have to in the attempt to survive."[2]

Introduction

During the last two centuries, Turks had one central problem: "saving the state".[3] "Saving the state" was the spontaneous, sentimental reaction that Turks displayed when faced with the European challenge of political-institutional superiority. Initially emerging in the 19th century from the necessity to resist the impact of the French Revolution by reforming the state, this motive is still relevant in the early 21st century, again in the face of the structural impact of European governance. Finally, "saving the state", which will be the guiding theme of this paper, conveys a search to transform the basic governing structures in Turkey and to adopt the European mode of governance, precisely by using European techniques of government. The process of regional integration in Europe is taking a clear course towards the creation of a Europe that is fundamentally different from a common market. The creation of an administrative structure composed of local, regional, national and supranational tiers shows that the mobilization of subnational actors is an integral part of European integration. This study reviews the transformation of governing structures in Europe over two centuries: from the rise of the nation-state to the present stage of creating a supranational entity that operates according to governance principles, significantly empowers subnational authorities and civil society in policy-making and implementation, and places special emphasis on fundamental rights and freedom of expression.

The reform laws related to EU membership that were accepted in August 2002 by the Turkish Parliament initiated a democratic regime that was structurally different from the previous one. This radical democratic initiative resulted from the mobilization of subnational groups in Turkey at European level. Although relations between the EU and Turkey are set out in terms of democratic conditionality, European governance actually places a structural imperative on Turkish politics. It poses a

---

[2] Milward, A.S. (1992), *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*, University of California Press, Berkeley, p. 446.

[3] Some might argue that, as a sign of theoretical sophistication, the author should make a distinction between the Ottoman governing elite and the Turks, particularly with regard to the 19th century. It is true that during the 19th century the Ottoman Empire was governed by a much more cosmopolitan governing elite, which cannot be reduced to one of its ethnic components. However, leaving aside the reality that the Ottoman Empire was regarded as a Turkish empire and that Ottoman lands were referred to as Turkey for so long by the European powers, the emphasis in this study is more on the structural impact of governmental changes in Europe on Ottoman-Turkish polity and on the continuity between the motives and phases of the Ottoman-Turkish process of political and institutional reform.

tremendous challenge that could again only be faced by "saving the state" in Turkey. This time the state will be saved again in European form by transforming basic governing structures and mentalities and by creating mechanisms for multi-level governance. Turkey has consistently adapted to changes in the state systems of Europe over the last two centuries. The requirements placed on Turkey for EU membership are viewed in this context. Europeanization – the process of governmental adaptation in Turkey – is actually a process that challenges the structure of the nation-state in Turkey. The conditions for Turkish membership in the EU are virtually of a revolutionary character in that they require fundamental change in the structure of government of the republican regime. Given this assessment of the radical character of the proposed reforms for EU membership, the challenge of EU membership is actually an effort of "saving the state".

The EU is a structural event, an entity in the process of constant governmental transformation. It also mobilizes a transformation process beyond its boundaries. For that reason, instead of considering EU-Turkey relations in terms of external imposition of the criteria for membership, this study concentrates on the structural impact of European governance on Turkish politics. In fact, an adaptation of governing structures follows the logic of EU-Turkey relations. Turks were able to reform governing structures during the 19th century and to "save the state" once in the early 20th century, after an almost mortal crisis. They were able to transform a multi-national and multi-religious empire into a nation-state with a modern administrative structure and national economy. As they have saved the state once, Turks are able to "save the state" again to face the challenge of European governance. The present study aims to provide clues that demonstrate the rationality of this challenge and indicate ways of facing it.

The organisation of this paper will be the following: first of all, after briefly dealing with the recent changes in EU-Turkey relations, the transformation of European governance is placed as a structural imperative. As the relations between Turkey and Europe are considered as a process over two centuries, the paper provides a comprehensive summary of the political reforms instituted by Ottoman officials in the 19th century. This summary aims to help the reader conceptualize the depth of the European impact on Turkish politics. The second part of the study extensively reviews the emergence of multi-level governance across Europe in the last three decades. The rise of multi-level governance in Europe will be placed as the key to eventual governmental transformation in Turkey. The necessity for change will be explained in terms of the creation of a new form of governance in Turkey that would respond to political, institutional and economic changes at European level. Finally, the study briefly touches on the impact of this new mode of governance on contemporary Turkey.

The European Effect on Turkish Politics and Political Structure

Recent Changes

The relations between Turkey and the EU gained significant momentum after the Helsinki Summit of the European Council in December 1999, confirming the candidate status of Turkey. With the Helsinki decision, the case of Turkey has been placed within the framework of enlargement in terms of conditionality and compliance, drawing the strategy of the EU closer to the candidate countries in order to complete the necessary changes for EU membership.[4] The Helsinki decision also showed the willingness of the EU to share the burden of convergence by setting up an accession partnership and

---

[4] Smith, K.E. (1997), "The Use of Political Conditionality in the EU's Relations with Third Countries: How Effective?", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 253-274; Grabbe, H. (2002), "European Union Conditionality and the *Acquis communautaire*", *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 249-268; Engert, S., H. Knobel and F. Schimmelfenning (2003), "Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3., pp. 506-509; Ugur, M. (2003), "Testing Times in EU-Turkey Relations: the Road to Copenhagen and Beyond", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 165-183.

enabling Turkey to participate in several EU programmes. It obliged Turkey to undertake two major commitments: fulfilment of the Copenhagen criteria, which were designed in 1993 to ensure a candidate's adoption of EU norms, and resolution of border problems, in accordance with the UN Charter or through the International Court of Justice.[5]

Apart from searching for ways to resolve the border problems with Greece and the Cyprus issue, Turkey made significant constitutional changes after the Helsinki Summit in August 2002, including abolition of the death penalty, granting of property rights to minority foundations, and freedom of expression in languages other than Turkish. Under the pressure of the reforms, the coalition government led by Bulent Ecevit collapsed, and elections were called three days before the last reform packages were passed in parliament. The elections on 3 November 2002 involved two competing camps – one defining Turkey as a European country and demanding completion of the reforms for EU membership, and the other equating European pressure for democratization with interference in domestic politics that endangered the unity of the country.

The November 2002 elections resulted in the victory in parliament of the Justice and Development Party with a rather weak opposition, the Republican People's Party. In the meantime, the European Commission had issued its 2002 Regular Report on Turkey. Stating that Turkey had made noticeable progress in 2002 towards meeting the Copenhagen criteria, the report concluded that the candidate had not fully met the political criteria.[6] Immediately after the elections, together with a platform organised by economic interest groups, the government toured European capitals on the eve of the Copenhagen Summit of the European Council in December 2003, in an attempt to drum up support for Turkish accession to the EU. Instead, it obtained only a conditional date of the end of 2004 for the opening of accession negotiations.[7] The government's immediate reaction to the summit decision was negative, but it was subsequently able to pass four major reform packages in the short period from January to July 2003. The sixth and seventh reform packages in particular included crucial reforms in the areas of freedom of expression, cultural rights, human rights, freedom of association and civilian control of the military. While acknowledging the government's determination in accelerating the reform process, the European Commission concluded in its 2003 Regular Report that the implementation of reforms had been uneven.[8]

In line with the priorities set out in the accession partnership, Turkey significantly progressed in the political reform process through constitutional and legislative changes, particularly between 2002 and 2004. In the 12 months following the Commission's 2003 Regular Report, Turkey undertook serious measures to ensure the proper implementation of these reforms, with a zero-tolerance policy in the fight against torture and ill treatment, strengthening the implementation of provisions relating to freedom of expression, freedom of religion, women's rights, trade union rights and minority rights.[9] Finally, in its Communication to the Council and the European Parliament in October 2004, the Commission considered that Turkey had sufficiently fulfilled the political criteria and recommended the opening of accession negotiations, while underlining that "the irreversibility of the reform process, its implementation in particular with regard to fundamental freedoms, will need to be confirmed over a

---

[5] European Council (1999), *Presidency Conclusions, Helsinki European Council, 11 December 1999*, Brussels [SN 00300/ 99].

[6] EC (European Commission) (2002), *Regular Report on Turkey's Progress towards Accession*, Brussels, pp. 138-139 [SEC (2002) 1412].

[7] European Council (2002), *Presidency Conclusions, Copenhagen European Council, 12-13 December 2002* [SN 400/02].

[8] EC (European Commission) (2003), *Regular Report on Turkey's Progress towards Accession*, Brussels, p. 130.

[9] For a detailed analysis of Turkey's progress in the reform process during the past year, see: EC (2004), *Regular Report on Turkey's Progress towards Accession*', Brussels, in particular pp. 16-18 and 29-44 [SEC (2004) 1201].

long period of time."[10] In its Communication, the Commission's diagnosis was that, in order to reinforce and guide further reforms in Turkey, particularly in relation to the continued fulfilment of the Copenhagen political criteria, the negotiation process was essential – regardless of its outcome – and that relations between the EU and Turkey must ensure that Turkey remain fully anchored in European structures.[11] Taking into consideration the Commission's report and advice, the European Council decided to open the accession negotiations with Turkey on 17 December 2004.

The recent structural changes in Turkish politics, as verified in the European Commission's Regular Reports on Turkey, are actually a result of the mobilization of subnational ethnic and religious groups in Turkey at European level. This situation is particularly evident in the statements of the Commission's last (2004) Regular Report on Turkey regarding the legal personality, property rights and internal management of non-Muslim religious communities, the status of Alevis, and the broadcasting of Kurdish and other languages. European governance challenges the centrality of the nation-state and creates an institutional basis on which subnational ethnic and religious groups in Turkey aim to place their political demands and to even establish linkages in Brussels. This situation requires Turkey to instigate a substantive discussion on sub-national social and political actors. In addition, by showing who – religious or ethnic minorities, separatists, neo-liberals, state bureaucrats, or the military – determines the meaning of the terms "state", "nation", "civil society"' and "multi-level governance", and how each of these groups redefines these concepts in the light of Turkey's bid to enter the EU, it is possible to delineate the parameters of change in state-society relations and the gradual emergence of new mentalities and practices of governance in Turkey. This change assumes that the transformation of state structures and the rise of multi-level governance in Turkey – in correspondence with examples in Europe – will actually constitute a bottom-up process rather than a one-sided top-down effect. Therefore, the present paper sees the impact of European governance on the Turkish political structure as being actually deeper than the framework drawn by democratic conditionality. In particular, the coming decades will leave little space for governments that would try to deal with regional and local administrations and to sustain the political community in Turkey in a traditional manner. Therefore the search for various ways of incorporating political pluralism into a redistribution of power from the centre to the periphery, of strengthening civil society networks and articulating them with new political party lines to the governmental machinery is a serious alternative.

Moreover, as the following analysis in a larger historical framework will show, it can be seen that Turkey has been under the stress of transformation of European governance in similar terms for the past two centuries. In fact, by analysing the Ottoman reform process, this study seeks to situate Turkey's current struggles with EU accession against the backdrop of its historical struggle – in response to past European threats – with the traditional organisation of public power within the state. This historical framework would provide the rationality for the European challenge to the nation-state and the necessity for state transformation in Turkey. The paper discusses a period of reformation in the past and a contemporary period of reformation, and suggests generally that continuity exists between these two periods. In other words, this study aims to show how current political reforms in Turkey are the result of ongoing historical processes in which European modes of governance are adopted in response to Western political and institutional superiority. Specifically, it indicates how Ottoman/Turkish policy-makers and government officials have adapted political thought, mentalities and practices originating in Europe in order to establish new parameters of statehood.

Finally, implicit throughout the paper is the relation between democracy, civil society and the state. This is evident in the transition from a multi-ethnic and multi-religious Ottoman Empire to a republican regime in which citizens join as much as possible their private lives with a particular national order in which subnational interest groups redefine the relation between state and civil society. However, today, as Turkey bids for entry into the supranational framework of the EU, there is a shift from a

---

[10] EC (2004), *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, 6 October 2004*, Brussels, p. 9 [COM (2004) 656 final].

[11] Ibid., p. 10.

geopolitical concept organised around the sovereign, territorially delimited state to a more heterogeneous and politically inclusive community. Here we find the impact of European governance on Turkish politics, not only in terms of providing a new geopolitical concept for the democratizing political forces in Turkey, but also in terms of contributing to the state's capability to channel and create mechanisms of governance for these challenging bottom-up processes.

The First Response to European Challenge: Ottoman Reform

The Ottoman Empire still ruled most of the Arab lands and the Balkans in the early 19th century. It was composed of culturally autonomous nationalities bound to each other with very loose administrative ties. The Ottomans had a closed system in which vertical and horizontal mobility was rare, and the social space was clearly divided into sectors of activity according to religious criteria. This system was transformed as a result of radical changes in the economy and in education. European economic penetration, after the free trade treaties concluded in 1838 in the Eastern Mediterranean, mobilized the already existing ethnic and religious differences towards a new form of autonomous political institutionalization. At the same time, the education of the Muslim population, so as to provide the necessary staff for the expanding military and administration, created a certain class of intellectuals and bureaucrats who associated their fate with that of the Ottoman State.

The French Revolution was a turning point. European strength vis-à-vis the Ottoman Empire became evident to the Ottomans with Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798. The Ottoman lands became the arena of a Great Power struggle until the First World War. Revolutionary ideas and nationalism infiltrated and mobilized nations under Ottoman rule.[12] By the 19th century the situation in the Balkans had become serious. Russian expansion and the rise of Mohammed Ali of Egypt brought the ultimate destiny of the empire into question. Faced with this extremely urgent situation, a reform process – the immediate aim of which was to "save the state" and bring the empire back to its old victorious days – was initiated. The first reformist sultan, Selim III (1789-1808) faced resistance and was overthrown in 1807. However, Mahmud II (1808-1839) was able to initiate a crucial reform process widely known as *Tanzimat* (Regulations). The abolition of janissaries in 1826 and the signature of the *Sened-i Ittifak* (Deed of Alliance) with locally powerful Ayans greatly removed the major sources of resistance to Mahmud II's centralizing reforms.[13] The reforms continued under Abdulmejid (1839-1861) and Abdulaziz (1861-1876). Finally, Abdulhamid II (1876-1909) ended the political reforms – which had culminated with the Constitution of 1876 limiting the sultan's powers – by suspending the Constitution one year later. However, under his rule the modernization of the empire continued, particularly in the areas of education and communication.

The major topics of Ottoman reform were the promotion of Ottomanism as a counter-ideology to nationalism, the reform of provincial administration, and an Ottoman constitution. The Ottomans aimed to respond to nationalism in the Balkans with Ottomanism, based on identification with the empire and the granting of full equality to non-Muslim subjects. The *Tanzimat* leaders believed that to save the empire a new egalitarian citizenship, a feeling of brotherhood and a concept of patriotism had to be cultivated.[14] The Ottomans intended to prevent the foreign protection of subjects by the Rescript of Gulhane of 3 November 1839 (proclaiming their security of life, liberty and property), the Reform Edict

---

[12] Lewis, B. (1953), "The Impact of the French Revolution on Turkey", *Journal of World History*, Vol. I, pp. 105-125.

[13] Inspired by the examples of Prussia and Russia, the first steps towards centralization aimed at creating a strong state were taken early in the *Tanzimat* period under Mahmud II, when the janissary corps was abolished and a new model army was established in 1826, a military offensive was launched against locally powerful Ayans, and tax farming was abolished.

[14] Inalcik, H. (1940), *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara.

of 1856, the nationality law of 1869 and the 1876 Constitution.[15] Rather than functionally oriented religious ties, *Tanzimat* put forward an idea of citizenship on a purely territorial basis.[16] However, the challenge of nationalist movements to the Ottoman system was much more profound than had been understood by the *Tanzimat* leaders, who thought that these movements were the results of dissatisfaction with local conditions, foreign provocation or banditry. Ottomans saw the urgency of improving public administration in the provinces in order to implement *Tanzimat* reforms and remove the major source of discontent of the empire's subjects.

Challenged by Europeans on the battlefield, the Ottomans first understood that the military superiority of Europe was related to training and technology. They then began to import foreign military equipment, techniques and instructors. However, Ottomans also realised that one of the most important reasons for European political strength was the organisational basis of the European state. This realisation led to a rational division of tasks within the government and the creation of mechanisms to enforce compliance to ordinances and to improve policy-making, co-ordination and planning.[17] A centralized system was imminent, which would prevent the exploitation of the population by local landlords and increase government revenue needed for the reform. However, a level of autonomy of local government was necessary for an efficient administration.[18] Mustafa Resid Pasha (1800-1858), the major architect of *Tanzimat* reforms, gave different degrees of authority to provincial governors according to their needs. The Province Law of 1864, modeled from the French system of departments, was issued to strengthen provincial administration. Redrawing the boundaries of provinces to make larger units and subdividing them hierarchically into sanjaks, kazas, nahiyes, communes, and villages, the administrative reform reorganised the governor's office into departments of civil, financial, police, political and legal affairs.[19] However, it soon became clear that improvements in public administration were not addressing the major source of discontent. Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians and Romanians were not satisfied with constitutional changes based on egalitarian citizenship, since the desire for independence lay at the core of their dissatisfaction.[20]

Tanzimat also initiated a struggle within the governing elite, which was resolved in favour of the bureaucracy. Centralization, by copying Western institutions, strengthened the status of bureaucrats who had knowledge of Western languages and familiarity with Europe, the secularization of education and law, and the bureaucratization process – such as making the *Sheyhulislam* an officer of the government and creating separate government departments to control foundations, gradually reducing the powers of *ulema*.[21] Weiker argues that the lack of understanding of the social context of European

---

[15] Salzman, A. 1999), "Citizenship in Search of a State: The Limits of Political Participation in the Late Ottoman Empire", Hanagan, M. and C. Tilly, *Extending Citizenship, Reconfiguring States*, Rowman and Littlefield, Oxford, pp. 45-51.

[16] Davison, R. (1954), "Turkish Attitude concerning Christian-Muslim Equality in the Nineteenth Century", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 59, pp. 844-864.

[17] Lewis, B. (1961), *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 40-128.

[18] The nationalist reaction against Ottoman rule was tremendous. Davison, R. (1954) notes that, confronted with the danger of separatism, Midhat Pasa, known as the most talented administrator of the *Tanzimat* and appointed to govern a model province of the Danube, worked on the scheme of converting the Ottoman Empire to a kind of federal state similar to Bismarck's Germany.

[19] Kaynar, R. (1954), *Mustafa Resit Pasa ve Tanzimat*, Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara.

[20] As Christian subjects were granted the equal privilege of serving in the armed forces along with Muslims, the principle of equality did not raise ardent support either. Christians preferred to pay an exemption tax rather than serve in the military, as they had previously done, and Muslim Turks did not want to serve under Christian officers.

[21] As the Kuleli incident demonstrated, reforms also provided a pretext for reactions based on support of *Shariat* and denunciation of the government for its reform edicts prepared in overt submission to foreign influence. For this reactionary plot organised by army officers, Muslim theologians and students on 17 September 1859, see: Igdemir, U. (1937), *Kuleli Vakasi Hakkinda Bir Arastirma*, Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara.

modernization made bureaucrats blind to the modifications necessary to implement reforms that provided insights into the Ottoman social structure.[22] Observing some inevitable failures but criticizing the misconception that the reforms were ineffective, Lewis concludes that "by 1871 the reform had already gone far enough to make a simple policy of reversion to the past impracticable. The destruction of the old power had been too thorough for any restoration to be possible; for better or for worse, only one path lay before Turkey, that of modernization and Westernization. She could move fast or slowly, straight or deviously; she could not go back."[23]

Beyond the rationalization of governmental machinery, *Tanzimat* initiated a much more profound process of secularization.[24] The press played a crucial role in expanding secularization by releasing European ideas, such as liberalism, nationalism, patriotism, constitutionalism, and representative government beyond the frontiers of the empire.[25] One of the main problems of *Tanzimat* was the institutionalization of the limits of the sultan's power, which had been realised in a major achievement: the Constitution of 1876, formulated by Midhat Pasha, leading figure of a reformist circle of intellectuals and bureaucrats called the Young Ottomans. Considering their ideas as a significant step of intellectual modernization beyond the West, Mardin observes that their feeling of "saving the state" – and their trust in the ability of existing institutions based on Islam to adapt themselves to the structural changes in the empire – was so strong that the idea of representative government simply turned into nothing more than a mighty attempt.[26] When Abdulhamid II suspended the Constitution, the Young Ottomans silently accepted administrative posts instead of inciting a new revolt. The Constitution was not restored until the Young Turks, a revolutionary group of intellectuals and officers from a rather different social base than the Young Ottomans, came to power in 1908.[27]

A New State Emerges

The Young Turks were the product of the reforms in education conducted during the reign of Abdulhamid II. Inspired by the ideas of liberalism and constitutionalism, they struggled against the sultan's despotic rule.[28] When Tsar Nicolas II and King Edward VII met at Reval in June 1908 to resolve the long-lasting "Eastern Question", the Young Turks saw that the partition of the empire had been decided.[29] They had one central motive in their move against Abdulhamid II: to "save the state". The Second Constitutional period, opened by the Young Turk revolution in 1908, was actually a period of turbulence. The cries for freedom soon resulted in a series of wars, political conspiracies, provincial rebellions and violent inter-communal clashes.[30] The empire was finally drawn into the First World

---

[22] Weiker. W. (1968), "The Ottoman Bureaucracy: Modernization and Reform", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 451-470.

[23] Lewis, B. (1961), op.cit., p. 128.

[24] Berkes, N. (1962), *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, McGill University Press, Montreal.

[25] Emin, Ahmed (1914), *The Development of Modern Turkey as Measured by its Press*, AMS Press, New York.

[26] Mardin, S. (1962), *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 396-399.

[27] Edip, Halide (1930), *Turkey Faces West*, Yale University Press, New Haven, pp. 98-99.

[28] Ramsaur, E.E. (1958), *The Young Turks: Prelude to the Revolution of 1908,* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[29] Feroz, Ahmad (1996), "The Late Ottoman Empire", in M. Kent (ed.), *The Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, Frank Cass, London, p. 4; Ahmad, F. (1968), "The Young Turk Revolution", *Journal of Contemporary History*, pp. 19-36.

[30] Kansu, A. (2000), *Politics in Post-Revolutionary Turkey*, Brill, Leiden.

War. Notwithstanding its efforts to control the situation, the government lost its authority in the provinces, paving the way for the world war to turn into a civil war. [31]

The end of the Ottoman Empire and the birth of the Republic of Turkey were completely sequential. Out of the wartime anarchy, external invasion and danger of disintegration, the republic emerged as a Hobbesian state with a heavily security-oriented outlook.[32] When the Treaty of Sèvres was signed, the nationalist struggle in Anatolia had already been initiated by Mustafa Kemal, appearing as the leader of the nationalist movement in 1919. The Lozan Treaty was signed on 23 July 1923, after the four-year nationalist struggle. Lozan Treaty not only ended World War I for the Ottoman Empire but also recognized the creation of a new state in Turkey, which emerged as a political regime based on six principles: republicanism, nationalism, laicism, populism, reformism and étatism.[33] During the 1930s, influenced by the tendency in Europe, the republic was declared a party state. In June 1936 the party and the state were united – with the leader of the RPP as the Interior Minister and the governors of the provinces as provincial heads of the party. Based on the above six principles, the republic emerged as the nationalist institutional edifice, completing the secularization process of the previous century and earning its place in Turkish history as an agent of political modernization and economic development. Recognizing only one form of identity, namely Turkish, the new state accepted the sovereignty of the people forming a nation as its basis and absolutely rejected the traditional polity by abolishing the sultanate and caliphate. It unified the legal and education system, abolished religious orders and took control of religion. Finally, adopting an organic conception of state-society relations, the state initiated a major programme of economic development and rejected social divisions on any grounds.[34]

In the context of post-war democratization in the West, the multi-party regime was established in Turkey as a result of growing rivalry within the governing elite after the death of Mustafa Kemal in 1938. The opposition, the Democratic Party, defeated the RPP in general elections in May 1950.[35] During the multi-party era, the regime adapted itself to changes by selectively incorporating social, cultural and ethnic differences in the country and providing impressive economic growth.[36] Aiming to prevent destructive class conflict by redistributive mechanisms of consensus between the military, bureaucracy and economic fractions of the governing elite, the regime assumed a national

---

[31] Emin, Ahmed (1930), *Turkey in the World War*, Yale University Press, New Haven, p. 106; Macfie, A.L. (1998), *The End of The Ottoman Empire (1908-1923)*, Longman, London.

[32] This security discourse, arising from the fear of an external plot to disintegrate Turkey, became an integral part of government policy in the decades that followed. The aborted Treaty of Sèvres in 1920, which designed the territorial partition of Turkey among the allied powers, became an embodiment of Ottoman collapse and Turkish national revival. Referred to as the "Sèvres Syndrome", the historical legacy briefly described above symptomatically revealed itself in Turkey-EU relations, especially when they touched upon issues of high nationalist resonance, such as human rights and the Cyprus problem. On the "Sèvres Syndrome", see: Kirisci, K. (1998), "Turkey", in S. Stavridis *et al*. (eds.), *The Foreign Policies of the European Union's Mediterranean States and Applicant Countries in the 1990s*, Macmillan Press, London; Jung, D. (2001), "The Sèvres Syndrome: Turkish Foreign Policy and its Historical Legacy", in B. Moller (ed.), *Oil and Water: Cooperative Security in the Persian Gulf*, I.B. Tauris, London, pp. 131-159.

[33] The parliament, convened in Ankara during the nationalist struggle, declared the republic as a form of government on 29 October 1923 and elected Mustafa Kemal as its first president, with the right to appoint the prime minister. Ismet Inonu, known for his crucial victories against the Greeks during the national struggle, became the first prime minister. The Republican People's Party (RPP), the political apparatus of the regime created by Mustafa Kemal by merging the defense of rights committees that had organised the national struggle, included these principles in the party programme and in the Constitution at its 1931 congress. For the nationalist struggle and early years of the republic, see: Kemal, M. (1927), *Nutuk*, TBMM, Ankara.

[34] Berkes, N. (1962), *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, McGill University Press, Montreal, pp. 431-503.

[35] Karpat, K. (1959), *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to Multi-Party System*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[36] Ozbudun, E. (1976*), Social Change and Political Participation*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

development strategy based on indicative plans, together with a new constitution in 1961.[37] When party mechanisms were unable to channel the political challenges brought by urbanization and industrialization, the basic structure of the regime was enforced by military coups – in 1960, 1971 and 1980. During the Cold War, Turkey was progressively integrated into the international system by becoming a member of major international institutions and situating itself in the Western Alliance. While NATO membership secured the frontiers of Turkey, signing an association agreement with the EC was regarded as the inevitable result of the process of Westernization and national economic development, conceived as the two integral projects of the regime.[38] By the early 1980s, the changes in the international structure symptomatically showed itself in the divergence of attitude between the U.S. and the EC –, hitherto perceived as the two pillars of a unitary bloc – towards the military regime in Turkey. Soon the end of the Cold War supplemented the dramatic changes already underway in domestic economic and political structures, and Turkey entered the 1980s with a stabilization programme. A harsh economic rivalry arose between Istanbul and the rest of the country, even leading to the establishment of competing business organisations, and the political conjuncture conditioned the rise of new parties, which led to a divergence of opinion within the governing elite as to how to realise the central goals of the regime. For that reason, with the coup of 1980 and the subsequent stabilization plan, it is possible to speak about a certain break in the continuity of the republican regime in Turkey in terms of economic mentality and political structures. As the following pages will show, the relations with the EC, which gained momentum during the 1980s with the official Turkish application for membership, constituted both a catalyst and an integral part of social changes and of the gradual emergence of democratic governance in Turkey.

Social Change and Democratization in the Post-1980 Period: The EU Effect

The post-1980 period was charcterized by the increasing pressure of the private sector to governments on political questions, such as democratization and the reform of state. The military intervention brought a new political system with the new constitution. The new regime also introduced a new economic system that was fundamentally different from the previous one of import substitution industrialization. In fact the bussiness community in Istanbul, which had already put pressures on governments during the late 1970s to liberalize the economy, warmly supported this new system, based on export orientation.[39] The membership application to the EC engineered by the Ozal Government in 1987 was actually a strategic decision aimed at opening European markets for Turkish exporters. However, the business community and the governing elite in Turkey also desperately saw the necessity to adopt itself to global norms, not only in the economic sense but also in the political sense, by completely restoring democracy in Turkey.[40]

When the rapid liberalization of the economy faced with its first grave political repercussions and the war between military forces and separatist Kurdish guerilla movement (PKK) in the southeast proliferated during the 1990s, TUSIAD – the main organisation of the Istanbul-based large businesses

---

[37] Eralp, A. (1990), "The Politics of Turkish Development Strategies", in A. Finkel and N. Sirman (eds.), *Turkish State, Turkish Society*, Routledge, London, pp. 219-258; Pamuk, S. (1981), "Political Economy of Industrialization in Turkey", *MERIP Reports*, pp. 26-32.

[38] Eralp, A. (1993), "Turkey and the European Community in the Changing Post-war International System", in C. Balkir and A. Williams (eds.), *Turkey and Europe*, Pinter Publishers Ltd., London, pp. 24-44.

[39] Arat, Y. (1991), "Politics and Big Business: Janus-faced Link to the State", in M. Heper, *Strong State and Economic Interest Groups: The Post-1980 Turkish Experience*, Walter de Gruyter, New York and London, pp.135-148.

[40] Keyder, C. (1997), "Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s", in S. Bozdogan and R. Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, University of Washington Press, Washington, p. 47.

– emerged as a leading pro-democratizing force in Turkey.[41] For instance, apart from underlining a wide range of proposals, such as constitutional reform, change in the nature of civilian-military relations, reform of the party system and granting of language rights to Kurds, TUSIAD emphasized in its report on democratization Turkey's European perspective together with the necessity of socialization with basic EU norms in social and political spheres.[42]

The Turkish political scene during the post-1980 period was marked by growing strength of political Islam, culminating with the rise of the Welfare Party to government in 1996.[43] This party's increasing popularity corresponded to the growing economic rivalry between Istanbul and the rest of country, as shown by the rise of the MUSIAD – the Association of Independent Industrialists and Businessmen – as a competing business organisation to TUSIAD.[44] Mainly supported by Anatolian capital and religious communities, MUSIAD had linkages with political Islam, chiefly represented in Turkey since the 1980s by religious parties, such as the Welfare Party. In fact, Turkey-EC relations also crystallized the domestic power struggle in Turkey between mainstream parties and newcomers to the Turkish political scene as reflected in the assertion of Tansu Ciller, Prime Minister at the time of the realization of the Customs Union, to her European counterparts on several occasions that the isolation of Turkey from Europe would lead to the rise of fundamentalism in Turkey, in a parallel way with trends in the rest of the Middle East. Ciller argued that the improvement of relations with the EC through the Customs Union would sustain the "Europeanness" of Turkey against the charges coming from the Islamists. However, the Turkish political landscape changed again with the establishment of a surprising coalition government comprised of the True Path Party and the Welfare Party just after the launching of the Customs Union. Her initiative to establish a government with apparently Islamist political party caused a serious decline of the Turkish Government's credibility in European eyes.[45]

A growing civil society with economic, religious and ethnic pluralism brought a serious challenge to the traditional understanding of state and politics in Turkey.[46] One of the central dimensions of this challenge was that Turkish politics fell under the influence of the EC in the sense that Turkey's domestic political and social problems, which deteriorated under the military regime, gained a transnational character. The EC became an interlocutor for their resolution in the post-1980 period. The military regime in Turkey received serious European pressure coming from the major European institutions such as Council of Europe, EC, Amnesty International, asking the immediate return to democracy and end of the human rights abuses.[47] The criticism of the EC towards the human rights situation in Turkey corresponds to Turkey's application for membership in February 1986. This

---

[41] This can be observed in the series of reports that TUSIAD published on Turkey's immediate social and political problems. See: TUSIAD reports entitled *Sanayilesmede Yonetim ve Toplumsal Uzlasma* (1992); *Ulusal Katilim ve Uzlasma Sempozyumu* (1992); *Optimal State: Towards a New State Model for the 21st Century* (1995); and *Local Government in Turkey: Problems and Solutions (1996)*.

[42] TUSIAD (1997), *Perspectives on Democratization in Turkey*, TUSIAD, Istanbul.

[43] Konrad Adenauer Foundation (1996), *An Investigation on the Welfare Party* (in Turkish), Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Ankara.

[44] Bugra, A. (1999), *Islam in Economic Organizations*, TESEV, Istanbul.

[45] Eder, M. (1999), "Becoming Western: Turkey and the European Union", in J. Gruel and W. Hout (eds.), *Regionalism across the North-South Divide: State Strategies and Globalization*, Routlege, London, pp. 79-94. This strategy of demonizing Islamists to attain advantages from the EU completely collapsed with the rise to power of the AK Party, which issued a series of reform packages that radically democratized Turkey during the past two years. The AK Party's moderate stance has provided it with a clear legitimacy and credibility in European eyes and has challenged the traditional image of Islamists, projected to the rest of the world by the ardent secularist sectors in Turkey.

[46] Toprak, B. (1996), "Civil Society in Turkey", in A. Norton, *Civil Society in the Middle East*, Brill, Leiden, pp.87-118.

[47] Amnesty International (1985), *Turkey: Testimony on Torture*, London; Helsinki Watch Report (1987), *State of Flux: Human Rights in Turkey*, New York.

decision also increased European public interest in Turkey's domestic politics, leading to public scrutiny of human rights problems.[48]

Particularly the European Parliament (EP) insisted on specific political and legal reforms regarding human rights and democratization in Turkey just after the membership application. A series of EP resolutions underlined that in addition to the lack of parliamentary democracy and respect for human rights, Turkey's policy towards the Armenians, Kurds, Greece and Cyprus were unavoidable barriers fro her EU membership.[49] The EP's resolution on the Armenian issue[50] was followed by another resolution on the "situation of the Kurds in Turkey" in April 1992.[51] The Kurdish question became a major source of contention in EU-Turkey relations during the post-1980 period, especially because of its transnational properties with a media and Kurdish parliament in exile, activities of cultural institutes and financial contributions to the guerilla movement in Turkey from Kurds living in European countries, drugs traffic, and the open support of some European politicians.[52] In fact the growing voice of civil society in the post-1980 period owes a great deal to its transnational character, with societal actors' networks beyond the boundaries of the state in Turkey. This Showed itself clearly in the growing tensions between Turkey and the EU. In this context the domestic social and political problems of Turkey such as the Kurdish question gradually became European problems.

In fact, perceived in terms of growing societal pressures and of the human rights issue with transnational dimensions, the challenge that Turkey faces has deeper roots in the transformation of state structures in Europe, which goes back to the early integration process. Throughout the post-war integration, a revolution comparable to the French Revolution took place in Europe. This time the revolution was gradual, peaceful and silent, which corresponded to the nature of the integration process. In geographical proximity to the centres of change and an integral part of the post-war international order, Turkey was the first country to feel the impact of these structural transformations and the revolution in Europe. After almost a century, the republic seemed to be successful in state-building, having created a centralized administration and national economic structures, and in nation-building, having assembled ethnic and religious groups into this institutional edifice. However, European governance brings again a tremendous challenge by mobilizing ethnic and religious groups that had been excluded from the centres of power by the fervent Westernization under the republic and by creating a pretext for restructuring of the state in Turkey. The following pages concentrate on the post-war transformation of the state in Europe and put forward the rationality for this challenge.

The Challenge of European Governance

European Integration and the Nation-State: History and Theory

After the collapse of the Holy Roman Empire, the political spaces in Europe were not fixed. Overlapping and often competitive claimants of sovereignty characterized the politics of the feudal era.

---

[48] Dagi, I. (2001), "Human Rights and Democratization: Turkish Politics in the European Context", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 51-68.

[49] European Parliament (1988), *Resolution on 20 May 1988*, pp. 205-207; Birand, M.A. (2000), *Turkiye'nin Avrupa Macerasi (1959-1999)*, Doğan Kitap, Istanbul.

[50] European Parliament (1987), "Resolution on Political Solution to the Armenian Question", *Official Journal of the European Communities*, No. C190, Brussels.

[51] *Official Journal of the European Communities*, No. C125, 18.5.1992, pp. 218-219.

[52] Van Bruinessen, M. (1998), "Shifting National and Ethnic Identities. The Kurds in Turkey and the European Diaspora", *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 39-52; Van Bruinessen, M. (2000), *Transnational Aspects of the Kurdish Question*, RSCAS, Florence, pp. 27-28; Lyon, A.J. and E.M. Ucarer (2001), "Mobilizing Ethnic Conflict: Kurdish Separatism in Germany and the PKK", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 925-948.

However, as a result of its coherent and efficient internal structure, the state's sovereign territorial authority proved superior to that of its contemporary rivals.[53] With the Treaty of Westphalia, mutually exclusive, geographically fixed political arenas structured a modern state system based on territoriality.[54] The international system, based on the principle of sovereignty, prevented further political fragmentation and enabled states to better mobilize society and avert anarchy. However, the questioning of borders became an integral feature of this system.[55] Not an absolute configuration of actors and their rationality, but the conventional nature of boundaries and the essential fluidity of political spaces characterized the state system.[56] A new form of statehood and multi-level governance in Europe, discussed in the following pages, demonstrate this reality.[57]

After two world wars, the integration process gave a new lease of life to the nation-state in Western Europe. Its revival was an integral part of the post-war reconstruction, with a complete transformation of politics through the decline of diplomatic and military activism. Kahler states that "nationalism as a political program was replaced (Gaullism excepted) by the new international demands of anticommunism and, more significantly, by the premise of economic prosperity".[58] Arguing that the integration process rescued the nation-state, Millward states that "the surrenders of national sovereignty after 1950 were one aspect of the successful reassertion of the nation-state as the basic organizing entity in Europe."[59] Together with Sorensen, he further claims that the nation-states choose to transfer sovereignty since "their principal national interest will be not only to define and limit that transfer of sovereignty very carefully but also meticulously to structure the central institutions so as to preserve a balance of power within the integrationist framework in favor of the nation-states themselves."[60]

The classical theories of integration focused on this central question: the fate of the nation-state in Europe.[61] For instance, functionalism argued that the states aimed to ensure economic and social progress by commonly eliminating the barriers dividing Europe.[62] The neo-functionalists saw the dynamic of integration in the logic of action, "spillover" among the sectors. Haas stressed that the states were involved in integration in order to find new techniques for resolving conflicts with each

[53] Spruyt, H. (1994), "Institutional Selection in International Relations: State Anarchy as Order", *International Organization*, Vol. 48, No. 4, pp. 527-557.

[54] Ruggie, J. (1993) "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations", *International Organization*, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 139-174,

[55] Tilly, C. (1990), *Coercion, Capital and European States*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 127-160.

[56] Kratochwil, F. (1986), "Of Systems, Boundaries and Territoriality: An Inquiry into the Formation of the State System", *World Politics*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 50-52.

[57] Sorensen, G. (1997), "Analysis of Contemporary Statehood: Consequences for Conflict and Cooperation", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 261-264.

[58] Kahler, M. (1987), "The Survival of the State in European International Relations", in C. Maier, *Changing Boundaries of the Political: Essays on Evolving Balance between the State and Society, Public and Private in Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 290.

[59] Milward, A.S. (1992), *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*, Routledge, London, p. 438.

[60] Milward, A.S. and V. Sorensen (1993), "Interdependence or Integration? A National Choice", in A.S. Milward, R. Raineri, R. Romero and V. Sorensen, *The Frontier of National Sovereignty: History and Theory, 1945-1992*, Routledge, New York, p. 19.

[61] Caporaso, J.A. and J.T.S. Keeler (1995), "The European Union and Regional Integration Theory", in C. Rhodes and S. Mazey (eds.), *The State of the European Union, Vol. 3: Building a European Polity?*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, pp. 29-62.

[62] Mitrany, D. (1966), *A Working Peace System*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago (first published in 1943); Haas, E.B. (1964) *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

other.[63] Stressing the key role of the elite, operating across states and supranational institutions, neo-functionalists concentrated on social processes, the external effects arising out of the common policies towards the rest of the world, and the political resistance against the operations of "spillover" mechanisms.[64] Both functionalism and neo-functionalism were influential during the early years of integration, from the signing of the Rome Treaty in 1958 to the completion of the Customs Union in 1968. The optimism of functionalist theories faced a major setback, however, in the Empty Chair Crisis of 1965-1966, which became a symbol of nationalism and institutional resistance of the nation-state to European integration.[65] The integration process could proceed only by an accord between the major states, the Luxembourg compromise, which prevented the institution of majority voting, the increase in power of the European Parliament, and the creation of independent revenue for the Community.[66]

The immediate steps of European integration were taken due to a variety of factors, such as economic and political reconstruction, demands for peace after two world wars, anchoring Germany to Europe, and mutual solidarity against the Soviet threat. When Haas announced the obsolescence of integration theory in 1975,[67] both the Bretton Woods system – guaranteeing post-war international economic stability – and the coalition of political forces, backing the individual Keynesian welfare states in Europe, were already broken. National economies entered into a long period of decline, and major political changes were underway. Post-war economic integration nevertheless also brought a growing interaction among Europeans, including the first enlargement of the Community, with the incorporation of Great Britain, Denmark and Ireland in 1971. Economic integration, expanding communication mechanisms, and geographical proximity brought increasing cross-border population movements, leading to a common space in Western Europe, supported by expanding administrative interaction and legal integration among the nation-states.[68] When the integration process was relaunched from the 1980s onwards with the Single European Act (SEA, 1987) and the internal market was completed by 1992 with the European Union Treaty, a new wave of integration theories faced the necessity of reconsidering the relations between the states and Community institutions shaped by the changing structure of social and economic forces.[69]

The first major response came from the intergovernmentalists, who emphasized the essential role of interstate bargains in the progress of European integration. For Sandholtz and Zysman, the completion of the internal market was an inevitable decision taken by European governments in the

---

[63] Haas, E.B. (1970), "The Study of Regional Integration: Reflections on the Joy and Anguish of Pretheorizing", *International Organization*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 607-646.

[64] Schmitter, P. (1969), "Three Neo-Functional Hypotheses about Regional Integration", *International Organization*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 161-166; Schmitter, P. (1970), "A Revised Theory of Regional Integration", *International Organization*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 836-868.

[65] Hoffman notes that the Empty Chair Crisis of 1965-66 demonstrated that a chief executive of the state, de Gaulle, could halt the process of integration. See: Hoffmann, S. (1995), "Obstinate or Obsolete? France, European Integration and the Fate of the Nation-State", *The European Sisyphus, Essays on Europe, 1964-94,* Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.

[66] Lambert, J. (1966), "The Constitutional Crisis: 1965-66", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3; Nicoll, W. (1984), "The Luxembourg Compromise", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 35-43.

[67] Haas, E.B. (1975*), The Obsolescence of Regional Integration Theory*, Institute of International Studies, Berkeley.

[68] Wallace, W. (1994), *Regional Integration: The West European Experience*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 31-57.

[69] Ross, G. (1992), "Confronting New Europe", *New Left Review*, Vol. 191, pp. 49-68; Cornett, L. and J.A. Caporaso (1992), "'And still it moves!' State Interests and Social Forces in the European Community", in J. N. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds.), *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 219-249.

face of Japanese economic competition and pressure from the newly industrialized countries.[70] Cameron argued that European "stagflation" – characterized by inflation, slow growth, deteriorated balance of trade, and rising unemployment – pushed governments and the Community to search for an optimum solution.[71] Claiming that interstate bargains were open to the influence of economic interest groups, Cowles diagnosed the significance of business groups in a detailed study of the European Roundtable of Industrialists (ERT) to set the agenda of 1992 decision-making.[72] Moravscik wrote a crucial paper. By pointing out the coincidence of the election of a conservative government in Britain, the French turn from Keynesianism to neo-liberalism in 1983, and the Kohl Government in the Federal Republic of Germany, he underlined the political conjuncture that would enable the rise of a common interest among the major powers in developing the internal market.[73] Intergovernmentalists relied on two major premises: the states are the principal actors of European integration, and regionalist politics is a series of two-level games where national governments occupy the crucial links between the domestic and international levels.[74] Conceiving the European Community as a successful international regime designed to manage economic interdependence by negotiated policy co-ordination,[75] Moravscik underlines the significance of preferences and power of member states to understand the choices of governments to shift decision-making powers to European institutions.

These theories could be conceived as state-centric and society-centric in terms of explaining the dynamics of the integration process. While nation-states are the main actors for intergovernmentalists, neo-functionalists concentrate on the transforming capacity of the economy and civil society. Historical evidence shows that nation-states are actually integral parts of the integration process. Intergovernmentalists are nevertheless far from conceiving the radical transformation of the main properties of the states – territoriality and sovereignty – in this process. Neo-functionalists provide tools to explain how political opportunities can be exploited by economic and social agents and elite actors in alliance with international institutions. However, they are silent when it is necessary to conceptualize the finality of spillover in a radically different form. A new wave of integration theory – with the novel concept of "multi-level governance" – emphasizes both the transformation of states by the rise of government without statehood and the conceptualization of a new form of polity emerging by intermingling social, cultural, legal and administrative structures in Europe. This "multi-level governance" requires the use of conceptual tools and data from other social sciences, such as comparative politics, international relations, law and international political economy.

Marks, Hooghe and Blank underlined the structural transformation of European integration from the early 1980s onwards as the steps leading to a new form of polity, defined as multi-level governance.[76]

---

[70] Sandholtz, W. and J. Zysman (1989), "1992: Recasting the European Bargain", *World Politics*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 95-128.

[71] Cameron, D. (1992), "The 1992 Initiative: Causes and Consequences", in A. Sbragia, *Euro-Politics: Institutions and Policy-Making in the New European Community*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 23-74.

[72] Cowles, M.G. (1995), "Setting the Agenda for a New Europe: the ERT and EC 1992", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 501-526.

[73] Moravcsik, A. (1991), "Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and the Conventional Statecraft in the European Community", *International Organization*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 19-56.

[74] The intergovernmentalists conceived nation-states as the major actors of international relations. However, anarchy, absolute sovereignty and power politics are conceptualized in a rather moderate way under the banner of international institutions. Basically, intergovernmentalists derive their core ideas from two-level theories whereby national executives are simultaneously involved in international negotiations and bargaining with domestic interest groups. See: Putnam, R. (1988), "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games", *International Organization*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 427-460.

[75] Moravcsik, A. (1993), "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 4, p. 474.

[76] Marks, G., L. Hooghe, and K. Blank (1996), "European Integration since 1980s: State-Centric versus Multi-Level Governance", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 341-378.

The emergence of multi-level governance departs from two mutually enforcing changes taking place in the European institutional and social landscape. As a result of the crucial changes after the SEA towards increasing reliance on qualified majority decisions in the European Council, the empowerment of the European Commission and the European Parliament in agenda-setting and law-making, accompanied by the definitive power of the European Court of Justice in legal integration, underline the rise of an institutional scheme in which the Council, the Commission and the Parliament interact rather than attempt to dominate each other. The authors also stressed the significance of deeper social processes operating at European level. Contrary to the premise of the intergovernmentalists regarding the distinction between the inside and outside of states, the multi-level governance approach observes the capacity of subnational movements to transcend nation-states so as to find autonomous recognition at European level. Claiming that multi-level governance emerges spontaneously in response to the demands coming from regional and ethnic groups for self-rule and to the concerns for economic welfare, leading governments to co-operate internationally, [77] Marks and Hooghe claim that "in the European Union, domestic and international politics are almost seamless."[78]

Subnational movements, particularly regions, gain a supranational character through European institutional channels, such as subnational offices in Brussels, European-wide lobbies, the Committee of the Regions, links with the Commission, and transnational networks cross-cutting national boundaries.[79] The SEA and the European Union Treaty gave a significant voice to subnational actors at EU level through the 1988 reform of structural funds and the Delors I package, covering a five-year financial programme from 1988 to 1993 with new decision-making and implementation rules.[80] Local and regional partners recognised Brussels as one of the central interlocutors of resource allocation, policy-making, technical expertise, selection of partners, sectors and areas.[81] Implementation procedures based on partnership and subsidiarity allowed the dehierarchization of the decision-making process, with different tiers of governance – regional, national and supranational – taking care of different aspects of policy-making in a complementary way. The structural features of multi-level governance, based on interplay and negotiation between local, regional, national and supranational territorial tiers in Europe, emerged in this implementation process. [82]

However, multi-level governance operates in a variable form throughout the EU with respect to constitutional factors, intergovernmental relations and enterpreneurship.[83] The key point in the

---

[77] Hooghe, L. and G. Marks (2001), *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford, p. 74.

[78] Ibid., p. 78.

[79] Keating, M. and L. Hooghe (1996), "Bypassing the Nation-State? Regions and the EU Policy Process" in J. Richardson, *European Union: Power and Policy-making*, Routledge, London, pp. 40-52.

[80] By creating the operating principles of funds, such as concentration, programming, partnership and additionality, the 1988 reform had categorical significance. While concentration clarifies the priority objectives for lagging regions, declining industrial areas, unemployment, worker adoption and rural development, programming refers to the design of specific economic programmes. The partnership principle demands the participation of relevant actors from EU, national and subnational levels in all phases of the planning and implementation of programmes. Finally, additionality requires that EU funds be provided in addition to national funds. Rather than changing the direction of the 1988 reform, the reform of 1993, with the extensive support of the European Commission, contributed to improving the structures developed since 1988.

[81] Marks, G. (1992), "Structural Policy in the European Community", in A. Sbragia, *Euro-Politics: Institutions and Policy-Making in the "New" European Community*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., pp. 191-224.

[82] Marks, G. (1993), "Structural Policy and Multi-level Governance", in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal, *The State of the European Community*, Ryne Rienner, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 391-411.

[83] Jeffery, C. (2000), "Sub-National Mobilization and European Integration: Does it Make any Difference?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 1-23; Hooghe, L. and M. Keating (1994), "The Politics of European Union Regional Policy", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 367-93; Benz, A. and B.

relatively smooth operation of multi-level governance leading social, political and territorial restructuring is that European states accept this effect of the process of incorporation into a larger institutional body. The EU provides a certain level of security and institutionalized surveillance in the face of pressures on its gatekeeping power coming from bottom-up processes.[84] In this context, cohesion policy, as a technique of government, was crucial in channeling the denationalization of civil society and preventing centrifugal forces. Regional movements shifted to co-operative regionalism and became a part of the wider institutional edifice of the EU.[85] Subnational actors – from trade unions to regional movements and other social movements, such as environmentalists and anti-nuclear movements – were given a different form of recognition at national and EU levels. However, framing subnational representation as a top-down creation obscures the alternative political spaces created by bottom-up processes, the capacity of subnational actors for further politicization of the EU, and the profundity of multi-level governance.[86]

Economic, Social and Institutional Basis of Multi-level Governance

The emergence of multi-level governance has deeper roots in societal transformation, breaking existing political boundaries and structures in Europe from the late 1960s onwards. The 1970s saw radical political changes as the principal aspects of democracy were contested and political activity beyond traditional channels grew.[87] New social movements challenged institutionalized politics based on the Keynesian idea of technocracy supplemented by technocracy at European level.[88] Ingelhart, referring to these societal changes as a "silent revolution", emphasized the rise of an affluent society and the post-materialist values set by post-war Europe. [89] The regionalist politics emerging in this context was first identified as a romantic reaction. Soon it became evident that regionalist demands for either autonomy or for participation in nation-state politics were much more profound reactions, related to the failures of centralized modernization and Keynesian political economy.[90] Arguing that peripheral consumption of nationalism could only be handled by institutional concessions from the state, Sharpe

Eberlein (1999), "The Europeanization of Regional Policies: Pattern of Multi-level Governance", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 329-48.

[84] Pollack, M. (1995), "Regional Actors in an Intergovernmental Play: The Making and Implementation of EC Structural Policy", in C. Rhodes and S. Mazey (eds.), *The State of the European Union, Vol.3: Building a European Polity?*, Lynne Rienner, Colorado.

[85] Borzel, T. (2001), "Europeanization and Territorial Institutional Change: Towards Cooperative Regionalism?", in M.G. Cowles, J. Caporaso and T. Risse, *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, pp. 137-159.

[86] Marks, G. and D. Adam (1996), "Social Movements and the Changing Structure of Political Opportunity in the European Union", in G. Marks, F.W. Scharpf, P.C. Schmitter and W. Streeck (eds.), *Governance in the European Union*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 95-120; Marks, G. (1997), "An Actor-Centred Approach to Multi-Level Governance", in C. Jeffrey (ed.), *The Regional Dimension of the European Union*, Frank Cass, London, pp. 20-38.

[87] Berger, S. (1979), "Politics and Antipolitics in Western Europe in the Seventies", *Daedalus*, Vol. 108, pp. 27-50.

[88] Offe, C. (1985), "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics", *Social Research*, Vol. 52, pp. 817-68.

[89] Ingelhart, R. (1971), "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, pp. 991-1017; Ingelhart, R. (1977), *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[90] Hueglin, T.O. (1989), "Better Small and Beautiful than Big and Ugly? Regionalism, Capitalism, and the Postindustrial State", *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 209-221.

claimed that channeling activity through the EC was a part of these concessions.[91] Underlining the emergence of new political opportunity structures,[92] Kitchelt observed that the "silent revolution" in Europe was much more profound than a mere change of values.[93]

A radical institutional and legal transformation was also underway at EC level during the 1970s. Crucial changes occurred in the administrative area. Analyzing data of administrative interaction from 1975 to 1985 of international organisations, such as NATO, the Council of Europe and EFTA, as well as the EC, Wessels observes that the EC showed the most developed form of co-operation among national and international officials. This co-operation led to the emergence of a policy cycle at European level characterized by a widespread degree of "fusion", i.e. "interlocking" of national and EC civil servants (as well as politicians and lobbies). Defining the EU as a system of shared sovereignty with partial and uncertain policy autonomy between levels of governance and patterns of contention, combining territorial with substantive issues, Wessels concludes that "this pattern of administrative and political interactions reflects a trend by which member states 'pool' their sovereignties and mix them with competencies of EC into a system to which the notion of 'cooperative federalism' can be applied."[94]

Another radical transformation taking place from the early 1960s onwards occurred in the legal sphere. Since the early years of integration, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) gradually expanded its jurisdiction through the creative interpretation of laws and the development of a legal system that penetrated national legal structures. In particular, the operation of two judicial doctrines, namely direct effect and supremacy, led to the creation of a European legal system. While the doctrine of direct effect – introduced in 1963 – accepted the laws enacted in Brussels once they had been enacted by national parliaments, the doctrine of supremacy – supplemented by the judicial review procedures of article 177 of the EU Treaty – gives to the ECJ the power of arbitration and elevates Community law above national law. Weiler underlines that by persuading, co-opting and cajoling the principal actors – the national judiciary, governments, legislatures and academia – the ECJ was able to establish hegemony as the final arbiter of the constitutional aspects of integration. For Weiler, this hegemony, created over a lengthy period and in a fragmented way with some resistance but without any major challenge, was actually a "quiet revolution" in Europe. [95]

Multi-level governance is based on the above-mentioned societal transformations, the fusion of administrative structures, and the operation of supranational legal-institutional mechanisms. However, changes in the political economy of governing bodies in post-war Europe should be integrated into this framework in order to have a complete picture of the present political architecture of the EU. Immediately after the Second World War, Keynesian welfare states emerged as the major political institutions in Western Europe, claiming to secure prosperity, accommodate destructive class conflict, and create a consensus in the distribution of welfare in the post-war years.[96] From the early 1970s onwards, under the pressure of global economy, welfare states- characterized by the economics of

---

[91] Sharpe, L.J. (1989), "Fragmentation and Territoriality in the European State System", *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 223-238.

[92] Kitschelt, H. (1986), "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-nuclear Movements in Four Countries", *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 57-85.

[93] Kitschelt, H. (1995), "A Silent Revolution in Europe?", in J. Hayward and E.C. Page (eds*.), Governing the New Europe*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 123-165.

[94] Wessels, W. (1990), "Administrative Interaction", in W. Wallace (ed.), *The Dynamics of European Integration*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, p. 238.

[95] Weiler, J. (1994), "A Quiet Revolution: The European Court of Justice and Its Interlocutors", *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 510-534.

[96] Espig-Andersen, G. (1992), "Three Political Economies of the Welfare State" in J. E. Kolberg (ed.), *The Study of Welfare State Regimes*, M.E. Sharpe, London, pp. 92-123; Espig-Andersen, G. (1985), "Power and Distributional Regimes", *Politics and Society*, Vol. 14, pp. 223-256.

demand management and the politics of elite brokering- started to decline.[97] The launching of the integration process from the early 1980s onwards – bringing fundamental changes to European politics – was a response to this decline, by creating economies of scale and initiating market-correcting measures at European level. Schapf observes that this process has involved both "negative integration" and "positive integration".[98] While negative integration requires states to comply with the principles of the common market by liberalization under the supranational surveillance of the European Commission and the ECJ, positive integration aims to cover the side effects of liberalization by regulation at European level in areas such as consumer protection or environmental policy.[99] In response to neo-liberal demands for progressive market expansion at the expense of social policy, the EU – if not a welfare state – represents a quest for public power beyond the nation-state so as to secure economic prosperity, social peace and justice.[100]

Europeanization: A New *Tanzimat*?

Europeanization

As discussed in the previous section, the economic, social and political challenges to the nation-state in Europe resulting from the decline of the Keynesian political economy, deregulation of markets, and mobilization of subnational groups in the supranational arena, led to the emergence of a novel institutional structure, referred to as multi-level governance. This new structure, supplemented by the fusion of national administrations and the application of supranational legal-institutional mechanisms, is based on the multiplicity of governing levels – local, regional, national and supranational – and the variety of actors, such as ethnic and regional groups, associations, and economic interests operating across those levels. This new structure has emerged as a spontaneous result of the half-century integration process in Europe, crowned by the recently issued White Paper on European Governance, which proposes to open up the policy-making process so as to involve more people and organisations in shaping and delivering EU policy.[101] As the White Paper suggests, European governance actually denotes a complete recontextualization of politics and the transformation of political structures in Europe. As the democratic governance of a growing denationalization of societal dynamics, it emerges from the shift of authority below the nation-state and the creation of authoritative supranational institutions above the nation-state. This new form of governance integrates nation-states to the European institutional scheme by reshaping their territorial structures, empowering subnational governing levels, and mobilizing social and political movements.

For this reason it is not incorrect to state that the European effect – recently referred to as Europeanization – is directed at the core of national political structures and at the rationality of national politics and policy-making. Defining Europeanization as the emergence and the development at European level of distinct structures of governance, Risse, Cowles and Caporaso underline the

---

[97] Skidelsky, R. (1979), "The Decline of Keynesian Politics", in C. Crouch (ed.), *State and Economy in Contemporary Capitalism*, Croom Helm, London, pp. 55-87.

[98] Scharpf, F.W. (1996), "Negative and Positive Integration in the Political Economy of European Welfare States", in G. Marks, *et al*., *Governance in the European Union*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 15-39.

[99] The cohesion policy, a policy instrument behind multi-level governance, is also a crucial part of these market-correcting measures. Multi-level governance draws its governing institutional framework from a quest for regulated capitalism at European level. See: Hooghe, L. (1998), "EU Cohesion Policy and Competing Models of European Capitalism", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 457-477.

[100] Streeck, W. (1996), "Public Power Beyond the Nation-State: The Case of the European Community", in R. Boyer and D. Drache (eds.), *States against Markets: The Limits of Globalization*, Routledge, London, pp. 299-315.

[101] EC, "European Governance: A White Paper", Brussels [COM (2001) 428 final].

operation of a crucial process at European level in terms of its impact not only on formal structures – such as national legal systems, national and regional administrations – but also on the shaping of informal structures – such as business-government relations, public communications, nation-state identities, and collective understanding of citizenship norms.[102] The impact of Europeanization goes beyond the level of specific policy choices. It is structural, affecting the patterned and regularised relations among domestic actors.

As a mode of institutional adaptation, Europeanization varies from country to country with respect to national structures and policy sectors. Highlighting the political nature of this process, adaptational pressures create tensions and inconsistencies. A smooth convergence of formal and informal structures is just one side of the European impact on national structures. Divergence with respect to the national contexts of action, implementation and sectors is a common mode in Europeanization.[103] Denoting a process towards an "ever closer union" of European nation-states towards a unique polity, Europeanization supports a dense network of trans-national activities leading to rules, regulations, and governmental tasks that are covered by supranational institutions and spontaneous dispute-resolution mechanisms.[104] National and EU policy domains simply collide in the course of this increasingly porous process.[105]

The process of implementation shows in particular the level of convergence between national and EU policy domains, the transformation of public spheres in European states towards a European public sphere, and the resulting emergence of European public policy. Europeanization actually exposes policies produced by European policy-making stuctures, characterized by multiplicity of actors, never-ending negotiations, and continuous interaction among various national, transnational and local levels. As Community institutions have no infrastructure, policy implementation is left principally in the hands of national actors. Emphasizing that European directives and regulations occupy an increasing role in fixing broad policy objectives, Schmitter notes that "their effective implementation will still depend on the *bonne volonté* of a very divergent set of national, provincial and local agencies".[106]

However, to prevent the passive resistance of national actors through delays, lax interpretation, fraud, corruption of original goals, and ill will of judicial authorities, the EU relies mainly on the growth of institutional rules and the functioning of the market rather than on instruments of control, such as customs officials, policemen or enforcement agencies. The rules set up by the treaties and the Court's interpretation actually turn all political actors – social movements, economic interest groups and European citizens in general – into potential defenders of Community policies. The European impact, stronger at the levels of both policy-making and implementation, dismantles the structure of old coalitions of interest and traditional circuits of decision-making while at the same time creating new

---

[102] Risse, T., M.G. Cowles and J. Caporaso (2001), "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction", in Cowles, *et al., Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, p. 1.

[103] Wallace, H. (2001), "The Changing Politics of the European Union: An Overview", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 581-94; Olsen, J. (2002), "The Many Faces of Europeanization", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp.921-952.

[104] Fligstein, N. and J. McNichol (1998), "Institutional Terrain of the European Union", in W. Sandholtz and A.S. Sweet (eds.), *European Integration and Supranational Governance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 59-91.

[105] Le Gales, P. (2001), " *Est Maître Des Lieux Celui Qui Les Organise*: How Rules Change when National and European Policy Domains Collide", in A.S. Sweet, W. Sandholtz and N. Fligstein (eds.), *The Institutionalization of Europe*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 137-154.

[106] Schmitter, P. (1996), "Some Alternative Futures for the European Polity and their Implications for European Public Policy", in Yves Meny, Pierre Muller and Jean-Luis Quermonne (eds.), *Adjusting to Europe: The Impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Policies*, Routledge, London, p. 35.

conditions and forcing changes and adaptations.[107] Finally, rather than harmonization, Europeanization refers to a progressive emergence of common norms of action that are beyond the control of any particular member state but decisively influence the behaviour of public policy actors. Europeanization constitutes a permanent challenge to national politics by its integration of a normative strategic environment through the emergence of a European political agenda, a new space for the representation of interests, and new modes of decision-making.

Turks face the European Challenge again

As argued in the first part of this study, after the French Revolution the Ottomans initiated an ambitious process of reform to create a state having the same organisational and ideological strength as nation-states in Europe. In addition to reforms in the military and in education, the Ottomans created a centralized administrative structure so as to govern effectively, attempted to apply a novel idea of citizenship based on equality and territoriality as opposed to separatist nationalism, and established a legal-institutional infrastructure to protect the rights of citizens. This institutional, legal and ideological transformation restored the rule of the state vis-à-vis local and peripheral challenges, and brought a series of political changes, leading to a limitation of the sultan's power by means of a constitution. However, under the pressure of European economic penetration and institutional superiority, the reform process carried out by the Ottomans could not sustain the state as it was. The empire was dramatically challenged by separatist nationalism and gradually disintegrated. It was defeated in a series of wars and eventually collapsed during the First World War. However, this process of collapse went hand in hand with a process of revival. The nation-state in Turkey, born out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire, owed its organisational, institutional and ideological strength mainly to the reform process initiated in the early 19th century. In fact, the whole Turkish experience corresponded to a multi-dimensional transformation of the state, from a monarchy to a republic and from a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional population to a Turkish identity.

Today Turkey is again under the pressure of governmental changes in Europe. As explained in the second part of this study, gradual but revolutionary changes in social and political structures during the post-war period led to the emergence of multi-level governance in Europe. European nation-states have been integral parts of this transformation. They have been integrated into the multi-level governing structure as one of its levels, by means of institutional transformation that has affected their main properties – territoriality and sovereignty. They are undergoing a process of adaptation directed to the core of national politics, policy-making and implementation, namely Europeanization. However, like the nation-state in the 19th century, multi-level governance today has a structural impact beyond the boundaries of Europe. Turkey is the first country to feel this structural impact because of its historical sensitivity to social and political changes in Europe. Turkey is the first country to be faced with this tremendous challenge, first of all because of its geographical proximity to Europe, in the same way that the Ottoman Empire was faced with the challenge of nationalism and the nation-state in the 19th century. In addition to its geographical proximity, the fact that Turkey is part of the institutional and legal framework drawn by the post-war European integration process makes the European impact on Turkish politics and political structure that much more powerful and profound.

After almost a century, the nation-state in Turkey faces an enormous challenge towards its institutional monopoly in assembling subnational ethnic and religious groups into a coherent identity. The mobilization of subnational groups, together with centrifugal forces at European level, seriously challenges the political project on which the nation-state in Turkey relies. This situation reintroduces an historical motive in the Turkish political agenda and makes "saving the state" as relevant as it was in the 19th century. On the way to EU membership it seems evident that the nation-state in Turkey will

---

[107] Meny, Yves, Pierre Muller and Jean-Luis Quermonne (1996), "Introduction", in Yves Meny, Pierre Muller and Jean-Luis Quermonne (eds.) *Adjusting to Europe: The Impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Policies*, Routledge, London, pp. 7-8.

be unable to sustain itself in its present state. As a means of adapting to new governing structures in Europe, Europeanization necessitates radical institutional, legal and political reforms in Turkey. In fact, Europeanization provides the crucial key for the creation of a new *Tanzimat* in Turkey as a way of accommodating the challenge of multi-level governance. It provides a new framework to "save the state" again in Turkey, by transforming it along the lines of European governance.

Multi-level governance in Europe conditions profound changes in Turkish politics by providing channels of political opportunity to those societal sectors that had been hindered by fervent Westernization under the republic. The secular nation-state receives the impact of European governance in several respects, such as territorial restructuring, redefinition of the political community, and empowerment of civil society. For that reason Europeanization constitutes a new mode of governance, through the creation of meso-governments at local and regional levels that are carefully integrated in the national government and function transparently, the introduction of a broader idea of citizenship with respect to the recognition of ethnic and religious pluralism in Turkey, and finally, the restructuring of civil society networks by supporting grassroots participation and associability. The reform packages that have been accepted in Turkey in relation to EU membership inaugurate a state that has a relatively centralized, multi-level governing structure.

As argued in the first part of this study, the governing elite in Turkey conceived relations with the EU with respect to two integral goals of the republic. These goals were regarded as either the continuation of a two-century-long process of secularization or a supportive instrument of national economic development. These national ideals contextualized EU-Turkey relations and highlighted the cultural and economic basis of foreign policy in Turkey. However, until now, by conceptualizing relations with the EU just in terms of national goals or as a foreign policy concern, the governing elite has been unable to see the crucial transformation that European states underwent in the post-war period. Consequently, neither the rise of European governance as a novel form of structuring social and political relations nor its immediate effects on the Turkish political structure has been given their close consideration. In a similar vein, anti-European circles, consistently hijacking EU debates by inciting the fear of disintegration symbolized in the revival of the aborted Sèvres Treaty, are also far from understanding the nature of the post-war integration process, which was based on "the rescue of the nation-state" in Europe. Neither the governing elite nor the anti-European circles in Turkey are able to conceive the major source of centrifugal challenges to the nation-state, their structural character emerging from the impact of European governance, and the ways of accommodating these challenges through the legal-institutional mechanisms of Europeanization.

The institutionalization of multi-level governance in Turkey would not only strengthen governing structures to accommodate these centrifugal challenges, but would also create the necessary mechanisms of integration with the European politico-institutional sphere. However, initiated by the reform packages completed in connection with EU membership, Turkey faces a very delicate process of consolidation of a democratic regime that is radically different from the previous one. One example of the seriousness of the present Turkish political transformation was the collapse of the coalition government led by Bulent Ecevit under the pressure of reforms. Leaving aside the critical decisions on the abolition of capital punishment and the property rights of minority foundations, the acceptance of the use, education and broadcasting of languages other than Turkish was a path-breaking reform in terms of acknowledging the existence and accepting the flourishing of identities other than the Turkish identity.[108] This situation has clear repercussions on the conceptualization of citizenship and on the identity of the nation-state in Turkey. As claimed above, the relations with Europe during the 19th century brought institutional renovation and secularization of thought to the Ottoman lands, leading to the rise of a nation-state in Turkey. In fact, democratization was not the central motive or dynamic of these relations. However, today, the impact of European governance and Europeanization radically alter Turkish politics and the Turkish political structure by initating a profound process of

---

[108] EC (2002), *Regular Report on Turkey's Progress towards Accession*, Brussels, pp. 17-47 [SEC (2002) 1412].

democratization, together with a return to the recognition of ethnic and religious pluralism in Turkey, which represents a major step away from a coherent Turkish identity.

In addition to the recognition of cultural heterogeneity in Turkey, the highly centralized administrative structure is also being reshaped on the way to EU membership. Again under the pressure of the EU, the AK Party recently put forward a long delayed administrative reform that would significantly empower local governments and civil society in policy-making and implementation.[109] This reform, returned to parliament by the president in August 2004 on the grounds that it was unconsitutional,[110] seriously challenges the extremely centralized structure of the Turkish state, if it is implemented in a proper way. It can be the key to strengthening local democracy in Turkey. However, as delineated in the reasons of the president's return of the legislation to parliament, in its present form the draft reform law has serious deficiencies that might lower the level of administrative capacity even further rather than raising it. First of all, some preconditions are lacking in Turkey for the application of this kind of advanced public administration model without bringing about a decline in administrative quality and performance. In this context, public administration reform should focus on creating feasible financing mechanisms to ensure the balanced development of local administrative capacities, assess the costs of reforms in view of the tight economic policies that are required to sustain macroeconomic stability, and upgrade local control capacities and human resources management to avoid politicization.

Leaving aside the details of the administrative dimension, as the reform of public administration is crucial in terms of implementing EU laws and regulations, it is situated at the centre of Turkey's Europeanization, which is in essence a process of democratization. In other words, apart from being essential to the correct functioning of the EU, effective national administration is vital in terms of furthering political reform in Turkey. The weakness of Turkish administration could undermine the reforms that have already been accomplished as well as EU efforts in this context. As analysed in the first part of this study, the Ottoman experience of the 19th century provides us with some crucial clues as to the existence of a certain tension between the major sources of citizens' discontent and the efforts of state reform. It was underlined that mainly as a result of the superficial treatment of problems by Ottoman officials and the fact that state reforms were imposed by outside powers, these reforms did not adequately address the major sources of discontent among citizens. The Ottoman experience in some respect is comparable to the present Turkish experience, but today there is a qualitative difference. It was previously underlined that in several respects relations with the EU were no longer a foreign policy issue. Europeanization – referring to the adoption of European rules, regulations, and principles (and mentalities) of governance – is actually a domestic affair. European policies are therefore to be implemented as if they were national policies, and the basic principles of European governance, defined in a novel form by the concept of multi-level governance, turn out to be the guiding principles of Turkey's governing structures.

In fact, both the recognition of identities other than the Turkish one and the new administrative structure lead to the institutionalization of political opportunity structures through which the vital forces of the country could mobilize. As a result of these pathbreaking political reforms carried out in order to meet the Copenhagen criteria, the future will see the institutionalization of a relatively centralized multi-level governance structure, with a relatively – not absolutely – defined political community and cultural identity in Turkey. However, this process is not just a governmental enterprise or a top-down project. On the contrary, it mainly relies on bottom-up initiatives and extensively depends on how the vital political forces of the country would use, exploit and exercise the political opportunity structures set up by the reform packages.

The institutionalization of new governing structures and the consolidation of the new radical democracy initiated by the reform packages will inevitably be met with the resistance of the guardians of the established political system in Turkey. Turkey has long been characterized as a conflictual

---

[109] *Kamu Yonetimi Temel Kanun Tasarisi (2003)*, T.C. Basbakanlik, Ankara.

[110] TESEV (2004), "Sayin Cumhurbaskaninin geri gönderme gerekceleri isigi altinda Kamu Yönetimi Reform Yasalarinin son durumu", TESEV, Istanbul.

society that is structured by violence. Terrorism, intercommunal clashes, and ethnic and religious conflicts – the roots of which go back to the Ottoman Empire and the dramatic disintegration of the empire- have prevented for such a long time any radical change towards a more open and democratic political system in Turkey. The introduction of a new system of governance with a new idea of political community would therefore require extremely serious governmental efforts in order to create a broad consensus among the political forces of the country. The major task of the present and future governments will be the establishment of a delicate balance between ethnic and religious groups – whose political demands have gained a significant momentum, strength and legitimacy with the acceptance of the reform packages – and the established bureaucratic, military, and intellectual sectors of the country.

Turkey has long been identified with social conflicts. The prevalence of violence during the last three decades, and the response to that violence with violence, has prevented the peaceful expression of political demands and the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means in Turkey. After the European Council's Helsinki Summit, Turkey was able to sustain a relatively peaceful period, which made it possible to issue the reform packages leading to substantial transformation of the nation-state in Turkey. However, the reform packages have actually initiated an extremely fragile period of transition, corresponding to the process of implementation of these reforms. There is always the possibility of falling again into the same trap of violence that would lead to the intervention of extra-democratic circles in the normal functioning of the political system. Achieving a new level of consensus, based on an inclusive, egalitarian and tolerant coalition of political forces for the creation of a consensual society will therefore be the primary governmental task until Turkish politics is completely recontextualized within the broader political-institutional framework of the EU.

Conclusion

The concluding remarks will be brief. Throughout the article it has been argued that the major framework established by democratic conditionality for membership was not sufficient to conceptualize the depth of the European impact on Turkish politics. Democratic conditionality establishes the operating framework of the European enlargement process, and the governments in Turkey have issued democratizing reform packages, as discussed above, within this framework under pressure from the EU. However, it is the contention of this article that the European impact on Turkish politics is much more profound than the framework of democratic conditionality. It actually goes to the core of the political structure in Turkey. The European impact is spontaneous and structural, closely related to the transformation of European governance during the post-war decades.

The article further argues that each time governing structures radically change in Europe, Turkey dramatically faces the challenges caused by these radical changes. European governance, as conceived throughout the article, has a two-century-long trajectory, from nation-states to the creation of a multi-level polity in Europe. Nation-states, inheriting the fixed properties of sovereignty and territoriality recognized after the Treaty of Westphalia, emerged as the major organising entity in Europe after the French Revolution. The multi-level polity emerged as a result of "silent revolutions" taking place in social, political, legal and institutional spheres in post-war Europe. Under the pressure of governmental changes in Europe – the rise of the nation-state and nationalism – during the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire engaged in a radical process of political, legal and administrative reform – namely *Tanzimat* – paving the way for the creation of a European model of nation-state in Turkey. In fact, as a result of the reforms carried out to create a state having the organisational and ideological strength of nation-states in Europe, the Ottoman Turks were able to transform the governing structures of the ancient regime, which made it possible to "save the state" in the early 20th century.

This time the republic receives the impact of European governance, with the necessity to create governing mechanisms that would incorporate Turkey into multi-level governance in Europe. The nation-state in Turkey is expected to meet the challenge of European governance by initiating a

profound process of political, legal and institutional adaptation, namely *Europeanization*. Different from the previous nature of relations with Europe based on secularization, the peculiar feature of Turkey's Europeanization is the installation of a radical democratic political structure in Turkey, with rules, procedures, practices, mentalities and guiding principles of governance.

In other words, democratization constitutes the essence of Europeanization in Turkey. When conceived in a two-century-long trajectory, both the Ottoman Empire and the republic had to deal with the impact of crucial changes in European governance in similar terms, such as the redefinition of political community, territorial restructuring of the state, and the recognition of social, cultural and political heterogeneity of the people. Like the nation-state, multi-level governance creates structural impact beyond European boundaries. Turkey immediately feels this impact as a challenge to existing governing structures and mentalities, first of all because of its geographical proximity to Europe. In addition, as Turkey has been part of the legal-institutional framework established throughout the process of European integration, the impact of European governance on the Turkish political structure becomes much deeper. The European challenge is so profound that the complete Europeanization of the Turkish political structure, which requires the radical transformation of basic governing structures, seems the only way of saving the state again.