'EUROPE-AS-HEGEMONY' AND DISCOURSES IN TURKEY AFTER 1999: DIALOGUE WITH THE EUROPEANISATION LITERATURE

by

Başak Alpan, Ph.D.

balpan@metu.edu.tr

Middle East Technical University, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Inönü Bulvarı, 06531, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

It is not a prophecy to say that one of the most common concepts that those working on 'Europe' would encounter at various points in different capacities would be 'Europeanisation'. This buzzword has also been crucial in understanding and explaining for Turkey's European orientation path, which acquired a new dimension and has been carried to a more substantive and institutional level with the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 when Turkey was granted formal candidacy status in its application to join the EU. Especially after this date, the concept of 'Europeanisation' and the literature attached to it have almost automatically been employed to assess the relationship between Turkey and different aspects of European integration. For this aim, firstly, I present a tri-fold picture of the European studies. According to this categorisation, the studies dealing with the notion of 'Europe' could be categorised into three groups: the studies which takes 'Europe' as a fixed concept ('Europe-as-fixity'), those which subscribe to a notion of 'Europe' solely as a construct ('Europe-as-construct') and the studies which take 'Europe' as a contestation ('Europe-as-contestation'). After critically locating the Europeanisation literature within this categorisation, I argue that there is both a historical and epistemological need for the Europeanisation literature to address to the conflictual nature of the notion by focusing on how the discourses on 'Europe' hegemonised the Turkish political terrain after 1999 and I introduce the notion of 'Europe-as-hegemony'. The overall argument is that the hegemony of 'Europe' does not originate from the automaticity of the relationship between the European and domestic level as stipulated by the Europeanisation literature, but rather from the power of discourses on 'Europe' and their ability to hegemonise the political realm. In this respect, this paper offers a novel approach to the Europeanisation literature with a particular focus on the Turkish context where *the political* is not only given and constructed but is also reflexive and open to contestation and negotiation.

1. Introduction

Bülent Somay, in the Epilogue of an anthology of Zizek's works (Somay and Birkan, 2002), cites a joke mentioned by Zizek in his famous book *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (1989). A conscript who tries to evade military service pretends to be mad. His symptom is that he compulsively checks all the pieces of paper he can reach, constantly repeating: 'that's not it!' He is sent to the military psychiatrist in whose office he also examines all the papers around, including those in the wastepaper basket, repeating all the time: 'that's not it!'. The psychiatrist finally convinced that he is really mad gives him a written warrant, releasing him from military service. The conscript casts a look at it and says cheerfully: 'that's it!'. This short story points to the obsessive search of the Left for a decent ideology after the 1980s. The 'discharge paper' for Turkey for a long time has been and probably still is 'being of Europe', i.e. 'Europeanisation'. Starting from the 19th century, the choice for Turkey's European orientation path derived from a deep-rooted state tradition, referring to both a careful perception of the Turkish foreign policy options and a rather emotional attachment to the idea of being among the 'European'. This 'never-ending story' acquired a new dimension and has been carried to a more substantive and institutional level with the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 when Turkey was granted formal candidacy status in its application to join the EU (Müftüler-Baç, 1998).

This new dimension of Turkey's journey towards Europe overlaps with what is called in the literature, 'Europeanisation', a relatively new trend in political analysis (for most outstanding examples of Europeanisation literature, see Cowles et. al., 2001; Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmaier, 2005). Whilst the Europeanisation literature would typically be the first approach any researcher focusing on the 1999-2008 period in Turkey with a particular reference to 'Europe' and domestic debates would resort to, this paper argues that the hegemony of 'Europe' in this respect does not originate from the automaticity of the relationship between the European and domestic level as stipulated by the Europeanisation literature, but from the power of discourses on 'Europe' in terms of their ability to contribute

to the construction of antagonisms and demarcating political frontiers after 1999. In this respect, this paper aims to focus on the significance of the discourses and the notion of 'hegemony' in particular and *the political* in general to understand the process of Europeanisation with a particular focus on the Turkish political landscape. From a broader perspective, the current attempt here addresses the need by the Europeanisation literature to look at 'Europe' as a political and contested realm. If the Europeanisation literature aims to explain the European integration and 'change', it should go beyond explaining 'change' at the domestic level through 'de-parliamentarisation, growing bureaucratisation and increase in policy-making' (Goetz et.al., 2008) and present a more political and reflexive account of 'Europe' in general. This is also in accordance with recent critiques posed against the literature by the Europeanisation scholars themselves such as Radaelli, Graziano and Vink. As I will elaborate on in the forthcoming section, the need on the part of the literature to redefine 'the European impact' (Graziano and Vink, 2007) and to pay attention to broader political science questions such as power and legitimacy (Radaelli and Exadaktylos, 2009) shifts the literature's scope and shows that the literature and this thesis have a more interactive platform to share than the difference between the two in terms of scope and aim would point to.

'Europe-as-hegemony', the term I will be using very often throughout the paper, is the name of the struggle itself for the hegemonic positions of political identities rather than a given concept with upper case, which would be the case in case of Europeanisation literature. Europeanisation literature, which will be the focus of the next section, poses an automatic and uncontroversial top-down relationship between the European level and domestic level and this relationship is inherently asymmetrical by definition. However, from the perspective of this project, we need to look at the relationship between 'Europe' and Turkish domestic politics from the lens of 'hegemony' and how the former shapes and hegemonises politics. This is an on-going, unfixed and contested process based on political struggle.

However, it is very difficult to deal with and operationalise the concept of 'hegemony', as has already been pointed out by many scholars talking about the concept in its Gramscian sense (Tünay, 1983; Morton, 2007) which is understood 'as a contested, fragile and tenuous process, rather than simply a structure or edifice' (Morton, 2007: 78). What I understand by the term *hegemony* is the conviction on the part of political identities that a particular discourse is the *lingua franca* of politics so that each and every political identity has to talk that language in order to assert its location within politics. Therefore, discourses are essential to understand the notion of

4

'hegemony'. However, it is important to underline at this point that in order to have a clear picture of 'Europe' as a contestation, the notion I will be using throughout the paper, 'Europe-as-hegemony', denotes an attempt, i.e. *a hegemonic struggle*, rather than the *hegemony* itself.

In order to support the above claims, I will, in the first section, locate this paper's attempt to identify 'Europe-as-hegemony' in Turkish politics within the broader academic literature on the notion of 'Europe'. In this section, I will also give a general account of the Europeanisation literature on Turkey. By investigating the main claims of the Europeanisation literature, the claim of the paper that the Europeanisation literature is unable to adequately examine the concept of 'Europe' as a hegemonic struggle through discourses is presented. In this respect, I present a tri-fold picture of the European studies. According to this categorisation, the studies dealing with the notion of 'Europe' could be categorised into three groups: the studies which takes 'Europe' as a fixed concept ('Europe-as-fixity'), those which subscribe to a notion of 'Europe' solely as a construct ('Europe-as-construct') and the studies which take 'Europe' as a contestation ('Europe-as-contestation'). The claim here is that there is both a historical and epistemological need for the Europeanisation literature to go beyond taking 'Europe' for granted and solely as a construct and to address to the conflictual nature of the notion. Thus, on a very broad level, the first section attempts to locate the Europeanisation literature within the academic realm and argues that Europeanisation should address Europe as a contestation ('Europe-as-contestation') and a hegemonic struggle.

Secondly, I will argue that we should aim to understand 'Europe-as-hegemony' in Turkish politics after 1999 and show how 'Europe' emerged as a hegemonic struggle if we want to have a full grasp of Europeanisation in the Turkish context. It is important to note that the second part of the paper is a part of a broader project and identification of 'Europe-as-hegemony' in this paper is not exhaustive. The main aim of this section is to point to the analytical need to identify how 'Europe' emerged as a hegemonic struggle through discourses in the aftermath of 1999 in Turkish politics.

2. Locating 'Europe-as-hegemony' within the field: Dialogue with the literature on 'Europe' and Europeanisation literature

It is not a prophecy to say that one of the most common concepts that those working on 'Europe' would encounter at various points in different capacities would be 'Europeanisation'. With the broadest aim of understanding European integration, starting from the 1990s on, there has been an eruption of the literature on Europeanisation (see Ladrech, 1994; Wessels and Rometsch, 1996: Börzel, 1999; Harmsen, 1999 for earlier examples of the literature). It is, broadly speaking, a term that is employed to label or describe a process of transformation, but many different scholars have used Europeanisation as a tool for analysis of different aspects of the social reality and the term as such has been exposed to an important conceptual transformation. In this section, I will give a brief outline of the literature on Europeanisation by referring to a general classification of the studies dealing with the notion of 'Europe'. According to this categorisation, the studies dealing with the notion of 'Europe' could be categorised into three groups: the studies which takes 'Europe' as a fixed concept ('Europe-as-fixity'), those which subscribe to a notion of 'Europe' solely as a construct ('Europe-as-construct') and the studies which take 'Europe' as a contestation ('Europe-as-contestation'), where the examples of Europeanisation literature The claim here is that there is both a historical and epistemological need for the Europeanisation literature to go beyond taking 'Europe' for granted and solely as a construct and to address to the conflictual nature of the notion.

Interestingly enough, the early examples of the Europeanisation literature assumes an automatic and uncontested top-down relationship between the European level and domestic level and therefore, could be located in the first group of studies ('Europe-as-fixity'). On the other hand, starting from 1990s, the Europeanisation literature, through its new preoccupation with ideas, collective identities, language and values, increasingly extended as to include the second group of studies as well ('Europe-as-construct'). However, from the perspective of this paper, I argue that we need to look at the relationship between 'Europe' and domestic politics from the lens of 'hegemony' and how the former shapes and hegemonises politics. In this respect, the current attempt offers a new analytical perspective to the Europeanisation literature where *the political* is not only given and constructed but is also open to contestation and negotiation.

2.1. 'Europe-as-fixity' studies: Earlier Examples of Europeanisation

After the institutional foundation of Europe in the 1950s, a great deal of studies, which interpreted the newly emerging structure, depended upon the debate on the nature of this construction. The theories of European integration provided a more general interpretation on its institutional structure, generating theoretical models for the process of integration. In the 1960s and 1970s, the focus of European integration studies had shifted to regional integration, which had attracted both international relations scholars and political scientists. One of the factors that made the cooperation between them productive was the dominant theory of the time, i.e. neo-functionalism. Neo-functionalism that was originally developed by Ernst Haas extended the existing theories in both fields by recognising interconnections between domestic and international politics (Smith and Ray, 1993). The idea that states were no longer regarded as unitary social actors went beyond the dominant state-centric approaches of international relations; and the conception of the state for neo-functionalists focused on sub-national groups, political parties, competition and bargaining on the national policy (Schmitter, 2004; Sandholtz and Zysman, 1989; Tranholm-Mikkelsen, 1991). On the other hand, going beyond the domestic focus of the comparative politics, neo-functionalism emphasised how regional and international contexts influence state policy. National policy was not determined merely by national level factors but transnational coalitions and regional influence also entered the picture (Smith and Ray, 1993). According to Haas, the founding father of neo-functionalism, regional integration was the process of 'how and why states cease to be wholly sovereign, how and why they voluntarily mingle, merge and mix with their neighbours so as to lose the factual attributes of sovereignty while acquiring new techniques for resolving conflict themselves' (Haas, 1968).

Approximately at this point the new theoretical mainstream in international relations (regarding European integration in particular) which speaks for the new levels and actors but the state enters the picture and the concept of 'Europeanisation' finds its earlier traces. By the same token, supranational governance, as theorised by Stone Sweet and Sandholtz (1997, 1998, 2001), can be counted as the contemporary counterpart of Haas's work. Their theory of supranational governance is based on the assumption that the growth of supranational polity competence is explained by the growth of interaction amongst private economic agents (such as multinational corporations) (Stone Sweet and Sandsoltz, 1998). The growth of this

transnational society is furthered through the applicability of the rule of law, transparency, and accountability and the institutions of the EU, mainly the Commission, are charged with establishing European-level competencies. Institutionalization emerges as an outcome but, at least partly, also as the means by which the European political space emerges and evolves (Stone Sweet et.al. 2001:225).

In this respect, one of the most extensive conceptions of the notion of 'Europeanisation' is that provided by Olsen (Olsen, 2002). According to this framework, Europeanisation has five possible repercussions: changes in external boundaries, developing institutions at the European level, central penetration of national systems of governance, exporting forms of political organization and a political unification project (Olsen, 2002: 923-924). Out of these five conceptions of 'change', Olsen focuses on two key dimensions of institutional change. 'First are changes in political organization (...) [and] second are changes in structures of meaning and people's minds' (Olsen 2002: 926). However, this focus on codes of meaning and worldviews is helpful for his broader aim of redefining political ideas, _that give direction and meaning to capabilities and capacities' (Olsen, 2002: 926).

Kohler-Koch and Eising (1999) argue that Europeanisation is a process by which understandings of governance in Europe are changed. They argue, for instance, that Europeanisation has changed shared notions of governance in the EU member states by establishing the principle of partnership between public and private actors and by inserting regions into a complex set of layers of governance. Thus, the Europeanisation process is basically characterized by, first, rule transfer and, secondly, the governance mode in which the myriad of levels, actors and sectors at the domestic level transfer the given rules.

Similarly, Cowles et. al. (2001) defines Europeanisation as:

> The emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal, and social institutions associated with political problem solving that formalise interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specialising in the creation of authoritative European rules (Cowles et. al., 2001:3).

What is noteworthy in these earlier definitions of Europeanisation is that, starting from Haas's neo-functionalist framework, the general tendency in the academia has been to explain

'Europe' as an independent variable, be it a supranational entity or an intergovernmental framework. I call this first group of studies as 'Europe-as-fixity'. Within the literature, the association of the notion 'Europe' in general and European integration in particular with the EU institutions (ex. Risse-Kappen, 1996; Jachtenfuchs and Kohler-Koch, 1995), enlargement (ex. Schmimelfennig and Sedelmaier, 2002, Hughes et.al., 2004; Pridham, 2005; Preston, 1997), interest group activity (ex. Grossman, 2004; Lehmkuhl, 2000) could be read along those lines.

The main problem with this first group of studies is that they define the relationship between domestic level and the European level as a top-down relationship where the domestic level is categorically determined by the European level. This top-down approach obscures the conception of Europeanisation as a two-way process, rather focusing on 'downward causation' from the EU level to domestic structures. (Bache, 2003: 3). This renders 'Europe' a fixed, categorical, teleological realm which the domestic level has to adjust itself according to. The earlier versions of the Europeanisation literature are also criticised for limiting the domestic impact of Europe to changing policy practices, and thus neglecting the more indirect ways in which European integration affects domestic politics (Vink, 2002).

'Europe-as-fixity' studies also lacks a proper reference to politics. The narrow definition of 'impact' solely as a policy change or misfit between the domestic level and the European level leaves no room for a clear definition of *the political*. Politics in this respect has objectively specified rules and *the political* is consensual. In this picture, 'Europe' 'exemplifies a distinctly modern form of power politics' (Moravscik, 1998: 5).

2.2. 'Europe-as-construct' studies

Starting from 1990s, thanks to the launch of the Eastern enlargement, the Balkan enlargement and the EU accession with Turkey, the concept of Europeanisation and the literature attached to it developed a particular variant. Within this perspective, Europeanisation increasingly meant anchoring of a country or a region within the EU stream and the literature started talking about more elaborate and specified rules, mechanisms and procedures of Europeanisation. Although the concept of Europeanisation was first used to explain the policy transformation within the EU member-states, it has been adopted to the study of non-member

states as it more adequately captures the transformation of domestic structures. When it came to the enlargement of the EU, normative considerations and a value-based assessment of the process rather than objectively specified interests were at the forefront as the EU served as a 'modernisation anchor' for those candidates which are less democratic (Inotai, 1997). For instance, in the case of the Eastern enlargement, 'reunification of the continent', 'return to Europe' and so on have all been used to imply normative-emotional considerations rather than material calculations and interest-driven expansion' (Samur, 1997: 31-for examples of social constructivism in the European studies, see Checkel, 1999; Christiansen, Jorgensen and Wiener, 1999; Smith, 1999; Zehfuss, 2002).

This new interest in domestic level can best be seen in Radaelli's seminal definition of Europeanisation (Radaelli, 2003). For Radaelli, Europeanisation means 'a process of construction, diffusion and institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, "ways of doing things", and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourses, identities, political structures and public policies' (Radaelli, 2003:30). Whilst defining Europeanisation, Radaelli departs from a core concern of finding out whether there is something new with the very concept to be engaged with a totally different research design (Radaelli, 2004). As his general conclusion is that Europeanisation is not a new theory, nor an ad-hoc approach, rather a way of organizing and orchestrating existing concepts; 'Europeanisation should be seen as a problem, not as a solution' (Radaelli, 2004:1). By the same token, Europeanisation is not the *explanans* (the solution, the phenomenon that explains the dependent variables), but the *explanandum* (the problem that needs to be explained) (Radaelli, 2004-*emphasis original*). It now makes more sense to start the consideration of Europeanisation from the actors, problems, resources, style and discourses at the domestic level as 'by using time and temporal causal sequences, a bottom-up approach checks if, when and how the EU provides a change in any of the main components of the system of interaction' (Radaelli, 2004: 4).

Similarly, for Kabaalioğlu, the process of Europeanisation also entails the adoption of European values and mentality:

> It is no way confined to a mere adaptation of European institutions and *acquis communitaire* but also necessitates the adoption of values that are commonly shared by

Europeans. Hence, the candidate countries need to determinedly alter their mentality to the way of doing things at the European level (Kabaalioğlu, 2005: IV).

Generally speaking, this new interest of the European studies in domestic level in general and in values, ideas and actors in particular also overlapped with the the social constructivist turn (for examples of social constructivist turn see Kratochwil, 1989; Wendt, 1992). Social constructivist approach has usually been deemed appropriate in this case, because 'the EU aspires to be more than an international society: a supranational one. This means that the EU needs to create its own norms, values and practices to a greater extent than any international society. A democratic-market oriented discourse has been identified from the start as the main base on which to build and sustain such a supranational political community' (Samur, 1997: 31). Studies on principled issue-networks (Sikkink, 1993) and on 'epistemic communities' (Haas, 1992) suggested that politics were determined not only by instrumentally defined self-interests, but also by collectively shared values and consensual knowledge. 'The legitimacy crisis of the EU which became apparent during the ratification debates of the Maastricht Treaty in many Member States, has opened intellectual space for examining the role of ideas and collective identities in European politics' (Risse-Kappen, 1996: 59).

All in all, one of the key terms in this context has been the 'EU conditionality', particularly the Copenhagen criteria, which act as a catalyst for domestic reforms in the fields of politics, finance, law, education, etc. Therefore, starting from the second half of the 1990s, the Europeanisation literature had a vast amount of references to the concept of the EU conditionality. 'The concept of Europeanisation implies a different approach when the issue of enlargement is concerned: the incorporation of Central and Eastern Europe into the EU integration process by means of principles of democratisation, the rule of law, market economy and to human rights' (Kabaalioğlu et. al., 2005: 1). As Oğuzlu argues, democratisation along the EU accession process requires both the establishment of democratic regimes in candidate states and the internalization of the EU's identity (Oğuzlu, 2004). Within this perspective, Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier define Europeanisation in Central East Europe as a process in which states adopt EU rules Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier, 2005). 'The rules in question cover a broad range of issues and structures and are both formal and informal (...), [which] comprise rule for regulation and distribution in specific policy areas, rules of political, administrative, and judicial processes, and rules for the set up and

competences of state and sub-state organisations' (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 7). In this respect, the dominant logic underpinning the EU's conditionality, according to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, is the bargaining strategy of *reinforcement by reward*: the EU provides external stimuli for a candidate country in order to comply with its conditions (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004: 662).

In a nutshell, recent contributions to the European integration literature have pointed out that the Europeanisation process could be influential even beyond the EU's geographic boundaries, principally with regard to candidate countries. In this respect, Moga makes a distinction between the *traditional Europeanisation*, which is mainly limited to the EU member states, and *enlargement-led Europeanisation*, which affects candidate countries and is conditionality-driven (Moga, 2010).

Therefore, the so-called 'bottom-up' approaches give more room to the social processes at the domestic level to Europeanisation, trying to overcome the neglect of the domestic level as the sole bearer of the European level. Radaelli's conception in particular is quite revolutionary both in terms of considering Europeanisation in terms of actors, problems, resources, style and discourses at the domestic level and with regard to clarifying the epistemological confusion about it. The notion of 'Europe' in this picture is of constructed nature and is inspired by 'a theory of a society that stresses the open-ended process by which *the social* is shaped' (Rumford and Delanty, 2005: 12). However, it still lacks the adequate focus on the domestic discourses and the notion of 'hegemony'. Although the notion of 'Europe' is constructed at the domestic level and is fully influenced by actors, discourses and ideational processes, Europeanisation is still provided with a teleological and uncontested content. For instance, some examples of the second generation of Europeanisation studies which talk more of the domestic level refer to the concept of 'discourse' extensively, albeit by linking the use of 'Europe' to discourses in order to legitimate reforms: 'Actors use European integration as part of strategies of "communicative discourse" to obtain assent to reforms. Discourse is a weapon for certain actors; and offers public evidence for the use of European integration as a resource'(Thatcher, 2004: 287). Moreover, the emergence of a particular discourse is seen as a result of broader institutional contexts. 'Discourse is always situated in broader institutional contexts, with institutions and culture framing the discourse, defining the repertoire of acceptable and expectable actions' (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004:193).

Similarly, within the framework of this second group of studies, politics is not an unchanged and teleological process but is open to reconstruction and change and *the political* is not completely consensual about which all involved actors and identities are fully informed. However, it is not totally conflictual either as the redefinition of *the political* in general and the political frontiers in particular are not the focus of the analysis.

Not surprisingly, Turkish scholars' interest in the Europeanisation literature which intensified after 1999, could be classified in this second category. At a very general level, the Europeanisation literature within the Turkish context is very similar to the Eastern and Balkan enlargement. It is usually used synonymously with 'democratisation' (e.g. Aydın and Keyman 2004; Müftüler-Baç, 2005; Öniş, 2009; Kubicek, 2005; Ulusoy, 2008) and 'democratic consolidation' (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005; Kubicek, 2005). In this respect, the tendency to pose a causal relationship between the European level and the domestic level within the framework of an inherent asymmetry is endemic and generic in the literature on Turkey. There are also intense references to the policy responses to the *acquis* and changes within the state machinery and legal structure (Tocci, 2005a), showing it as an ultimately one-way and unproblematised process. The tendency to present the exigencies set by the European level and the developments 'on the ground' within causality also shows itself at the identification of the impact of Europeanisation on Turkish domestic politics. The EU demands and the responses at the domestic level are presented simultaneously and the Europeanisation within this context is generally presented as an 'external trigger' that would lead to a re-alignment of Turkish politics (Öniş, 2007, 2009; Tocci, 2005).

All in all, the problematic nature of the Europeanisation literature shows itself in a different way in the Turkish case. The relationship between the European level and the domestic level is still unproblematic and categorical. The taken-for-grantedness of the concepts like 'goodness-of-fit' and 'misfit' is replaced by the uncontested emergence of the European level as a panacea for democratisation and modernisation within the framework of the examples of Europeanisation literature in Turkish context. Even if there are studies talking about discourses on Europeanisation, they usually focus on how different actors within the Turkish setting have used Europeanisation as a means of expanding their domain of action.

2.3. 'Europe-as-contestation' studies

Especially after the demise of the Cold War, a new need to explain the drastic transformations of the social structure and new social and political identities emerged which has been the main issue within the analytical agendas of critical theory, post-Marxism, post-structuralism, postmodernism and alike. European studies also shifted its focus to this new academic 'demand' and a myriad of studies aiming to reconceptualise an identity-based politics flourished. Especially with the signing of the treaties of Maastricht (1991) and Amsterdam (1997), the EU reached a degree of integration where identification with 'Europe' went beyond hitherto known forms of intergovernmental cooperation. The newly emerging forms of identification with Europe now involved a new conception of 'identity' and novel and extended practices of politics. New studies trying to understand 'Europe' as an identity (ex. Maier and Risse, 2003; Diez Medrano and Gutierrez, 2001; Hülsse, 1999, Jimenez et.al, 2004), a public sphere (ex. Barenreuter, 2005), a possibility for multicultural citizenship (ex. Lavdas, 2001), a political geography (Agnew, 2001; Kuus, 2004; Moisio, 2002; Smith, 2002) and a metaphor (ex. Drulak, 2006; Musolff, 2000) could be read along those lines. 'According to such a perspective, political practice in a democratic society does not consist in defending the rights of preconstituted identities, but rather in constituting those identities themselves in a precarious and always vulnerable field' (Mouffe, 2000: 148). Within those studies, 'Europe' is taken as a performative, mobile, hybrid, partial and fluid identity and *the political* is understood as a conflictual and unfinished field always open to contestation and negotiation. The current attempt here to understand how 'Europe' hegemonised Turkish politics and demarcated political frontiers falls within this third category of the European studies as it also understands *the political* as an unfixed and contested realm.

Starting from late 2000s, the Europeanisation scholars also showed intensive effort to address to a broadened conception of politics and to find new trajectories for the future research. According to Radaelli and Exadaktylos, the field is ready to move towards the exploration of 'more ambitious questions, such as: what does the Europeanisation tell us about the politics of integration, power and legitimacy?' (Radaelli and Exadaktylos, 2009: 208). Similarly, Mair

points out that the field of European studies is mature enough to relate specific European-focused research to more wide-ranging patterns of mass political and institutional development (Mair, 2007: 165).

As an example, Radaelli and Pasquier emphasise the significance of the concept of temporality' and the role of 'Europe' in politics and claim that the narrow understanding of 'impact' on the part of the Europeanisation literature should be broadened (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 37). Another important direction shown by Radaelli and Pasquier is the need on the part of the literature to draw on the classical categories of political science. In understanding how domestic political systems are penetrated by the logic of the EU politics and policy, the Europeanisation literature, in this respect, should extend its scope to concepts such as 'politicisation' and 'socialisation' and long-term dynamics such as conflict, cleavages and the distribution of political resources (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007: 43).

Similarly, Mair also argues that the literature relied too much on 'standardised quantitative variables that can be used directly in highly abstract cross-national research' (Mair, 2007: 162). Instead, what is needed here is a more systematic comparison of political discussion at the national level as revealed in parliamentary debates, or in contests surrounding referendums, or in the ebb and flow of the arguments used in national election campaigns. 'We need to know more about how Europe actually plays in national political discourse, as well as about the way in which it is conceived' (Mair, 2007: 162).

The need for dealing with broader questions of political science is also accompanied with paying attention to sociological questions. Although not posed as a direct critique, Delanty and Rumford's work could be read along these lines, where the latter is criticised on the grounds that it is primarily concerned with conceptualising the emerging shape of the European polity' (Delanty and Rumford, 2005: 1). By situating Europe and the EU within a broader global context, they aim to evaluate Europeanisation as a cosmopolitan process strictly bound up with societal transformations, new social models and normative ideals, which would open up 'a field of social possibilities' instead of focusing on the change of the institutions and state (Delanty and Rumford, 2005: 4-10). They argue:

> Europe is being socially constructed out of disparate projects, discourses, models of societies, imaginaries and in conditions of contestation, resistances and diffused through

processes of globalization. What is being claimed in this is that Europeanisation is a process of social construction, rather than one of state building and one in which globalization, in all its facets, plays a key role in creating its conditions. (Delanty and Rumford, 2005:6)

Although Delanty and Rumford do not focus on how Europeanisation influences political frontiers at the domestic level and stress this process as 'hegemony', the location of the concept within a broader context of globalisation in a more society-informed manner and the link sustained between Europeanisation and 'discursive and socio-cognitive transformation within the society' (Rumford and Delanty, 2005: 19) offer a novel and unique approach to the Europeanisation literature.

3. 'Europe-as-Hegemony' in Turkish politics after 1999: a Possible Dialogue with the Europeanisation Literature?

As I argued above, the recent need on the part of the Europeanisation literature to pay attention to the debates and contests culminating around 'Europe' at the domestic level clearly shows that the new trajectory of the literature is tilting towards seeing 'Europe' as a contestation where the domestic actors define and redefine their positions and roles. This is the third group of studies I mentioned in the first section, with which this study is aligned as well. In this respect, the claim of this section is that the notion of 'hegemony' and the hegemonic struggle through discourses might constitute a novel platform for the Europeanisation literature on which the 'European impact'on Turkish politics is redefined. There is a need on the part of the Europeanisation literature to define the political actors as undecisive and unintentional in order to to understand how 'Europe' becomes an issue within the political arena. As the advanced phases of this research shows, the articulation of subject positions on 'Europe' in Turkish politics is a gateway to understanding how these discourses and subject positions acquire performativity through the hegemonic struggle and transform the political identities of the engaged actors by demarcating political frontiers. In this respect, it is exactly a noteworthy attempt on the part of more sociologically-informed variants of Europeanisation literature to take 'Europe' as 'a new horizon of meaning' (Visier, 2009: 7).

Therefore, if the Europeanisation literature would pay attention to the questions of power and legitimacy as Radaelli and Exadaktylos point out (2009), it is necessary to take a closer look at the political sphere. This is even more relevant in case of the candidate states where the 'uncertainty and power asymmetry embedded in the notion of conditionality' (Sunay, 2008: 1) go beyond the technicalities of the policy processes of the candidate states and is politicised by the political actors. In this respect, the notion of 'intervening variable' is widely used by the Europeanisation literature which point out to the specific domestic conditions that explain the variable domestic impact of 'Europe' (e.g. Radaelli, 2004; Poguntke et.al., 2007; Grabbe, 2003). However, a closer look at the politicisation of the notion of 'conditionality' and the antagonisms that the conditionality articulates at the political landscape, which has been the case in Turkish politics after 1999, open the door to a broader reconceptualisation of how domestic level interacts with discourses and thereby enrich the debate culminating around 'conditionality' constituting a new research horizon for the literature.

It is important to reiterate that 'Europe-as-hegemony', the term I frequently used throughout the paper, is the name of the struggle itself for the hegemonic positions of political identities rather than a given concept with upper case, which would be the case in case of Europeanisation literature. Rather than assuming an automatic and uncontroversial top-down relationship between the European level and domestic level, which is inherently asymmetrical by definition for the Europeanisation literature, we need to look at the relationship between 'Europe' and Turkish domestic politics from the lens of 'hegemony' and how the former shapes and hegemonises politics. This is an on-going, unfixed and contested process based on political struggle.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I aimed to focus on the significance of the discourses and the notion of 'hegemony' in particular and *the political* in general to understand the process of Europeanisation with a particular focus on the Turkish political landscape. For this aim, firstly, I presented a tri-fold picture of the European studies. According to this categorisation, the studies dealing with the notion of 'Europe' could be categorised into three groups: the studies which takes 'Europe' as a fixed concept ('Europe-as-fixity'), those which subscribe to a notion of 'Europe' solely as a construct ('Europe-as-construct') and the studies which take

'Europe' as a contestation ('Europe-as-contestation'). The claim here is that there is both a historical and epistemological need for the Europeanisation literature to go beyond taking 'Europe' for granted and solely as a construct and to address to the conflictual nature of the notion.

Interestingly enough, the early examples of the Europeanisation literature assumes an automatic and uncontested top-down relationship between the European level and domestic level and therefore, could be located in the first group of studies ('Europe-as-fixity'). On the other hand, starting from 1990s, the Europeanisation literature, through its new preoccupation with ideas, collective identities, language and values, increasingly extended as to include the second group of studies as well ('Europe-as-construct'). However, from the perspective of this paper, I argue that we need to look at the relationship between 'Europe' and domestic politics from the lens of 'hegemony' and how the former shapes and hegemonises politics. In this respect, the current attempt offers a new analytical perspective to the Europeanisation literature where *the political* is not only given and constructed but is also open to contestation and negotiation.

In order to support the above claim, I argued that we should aim to understand 'Europe-as-hegemony' in Turkish politics after 1999 and show how 'Europe' emerged as a hegemonic struggle if we want to have a full grasp of Europeanisation in the Turkish context. As this paper is a part of a broader project which aims to understand 'Europe-as-hegemony' in the Turkish context after 1999, I do not giva full account of the identification of 'Europe' as a hegemonic struggle in Turkish politics The main aim of this section has been to point to the fact that it is an analytically noteworthy attempt to identify how 'Europe' emerged as a hegemonic struggle through discourses in the aftermath of 1999 in Turkish politics.

REFERENCES

Agnew, J. (2001), 'How many Europes? the European Union, Eastward Enlargement and Uneven Development', *European Urban and Regional Studies,* 8, pp. 29–38.

Aydın, S. and E. F. Keyman (2004), 'European Integration and the Transformation of Turkish Democracy', *CEPS EU-Turkey Working Papers,* 2, 1 August 2004.

Bache, I. (2003), 'Europeanisation: a Governance Approach', *paper presented at 8th EUSA Biennial Conference*, March 27-29, 2003, Nashville, Tennessee, USA

Bärenreuter, C. (2005), 'Researching the European Public Sphere and its Political Functions: a Proposal' in T. Nesbit and J. Steinberg (eds.) *Freedom, Justice, and Identity*, ed. Vienna: IWM Junior Visiting Fellows' Conferences, 18.

Börzel, T. (1999), 'Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to Europeanisation in Germany and Spain', *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 37: 4, pp. 573–596.

Checkel, T. J. (1999), 'Social Construction and Integration', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6:4, Special Issue, pp. 545-60

Christiansen, T., K. E. Jorgensen and A. Wiener (1999), 'The Social Construction of Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6: 4, Special Issue, pp. 528-544

Cowles, M., J. Caporaso and T. Risse (eds.) (2001) *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press

Diez Medrano, J. and P. Gutierrez (2001), 'Nested Identities: National and European Identity in Spain', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24:5, pp. 753 – 778

Drulak, P. (2006), 'Motion, Container and Equilibrum: Metaphors in the Discourse about European Integration', *European Journal of International Relations*, 12: 4, pp. 499-531

Featherstone, K. and C. Radaelli (eds.) (2003), *the Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Goetz, K. H. and J.H. Meyer-Sahling (2008), 'The Europeanisation of National Political Systems: Parliaments and Executives', *Living Reviews in European Governance*, 3:2 [online article]

Grabbe, H. (2003), 'Europeanisation goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process' in Featherstone, K. and C. Radaelli (eds.) (2003), *the Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Graziano, P. and M. P. Vink (eds.) (2007), *Europeanisation: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Grossman, E. (2004), 'Bringing Politics Back in: Rethinking the Role of Economic Interest Groups in European Integration', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11: 4, pp. 637-654

Harmsen, R. (1999), 'The Europeanisation of National Administrations: A Comparative Study of France and the Netherlands', *Governance*, 12:1, pp.81-113

Hughes, J., G. Sasse and C. Gordon (2004*), Europeanisation and Regionalization in the EU's Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe,* London: Palgrave MacMillan

Hülsse, R. (1999), 'The Discursive Construction of Identity and Difference - Turkey as Europe's Other?', *discussion paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Mannheim, 26-31March, 1999*

Inotai, A. (1997), 'What is Novel about Eastern Enlargement of the European Union? – The Costs and Benefits of Eastern Enlargement of the European Union', *Working Papers*, No. 87, Institute for World Economics, Budapest

Jachtenfuchs, M. and B. Kohler-Koch (1995) 'The Transformation of Governance in the European Union'. Ms, Mannheimer Zentrum für Europaische Sozialforschung. Mannheim.

Jimenez, A. M. R., J.J. Gorniak, A. Kosic, P. Kiss and M. Kandulla (2004), 'European and National Identities in EU's Old and New Member States: Ethnic, Civic, Instrumental and Symbolic Components', *European Integration Online Papers (EIOP),* 8:11

Kabaalioğlu, H, (2005), 'Foreword'in H. Kabaalioglu, M. Dartan, M.S. Akman and Ç. Nas (eds.) (2005) *Europeanisation of Sotuh-Eastern Europe: Domestic Impacts of the Accession Process,* Istanbul: Marmara Univeristy European Community Institute Publications

Kabaalioğlu, H, M. Dartan, M.S. Akman and C. Nas (eds.) (2005) *Europeanisation of Sotuh-Eastern Europe: Domestic Impacts of the Accession Process,* Istanbul: Marmara Univeristy European Community Institute Publications

Kalaycıoğlu, E. (2003), 'The Political Criteria: Fair or Strict Conditionality?', *paper presented at the Conference on 'Turkey, the EU and the 2004 milestone: Is this time for real?',* Oxford, Britain, 14-15 March 2003.

Kohler-Koch, B. and R. Eising (1999) (eds.), *the Transformation of Governance in the European Union,* London: Routledge

Kratochwil, F. (1989), *Rules, Norms, and Decisions,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kubicek, P. (2005), 'The European Union and Grassroots Democratisation in Turkey', *Turkish Studies*, 6: 3, pp. 361-377

Kuus, M. (2002), 'Sovereignty for Security: the Discourse of Sovereignty in Estonia', *Political Geography*, 21, pp. 393-412

Ladrech, R. (1994), 'Europeanisation of Domestic Politics and Institutions: the Case of France', *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 32, pp. 69–88.

Lavdas, K. A. (2001),'Republican Europe and Multicultural Citizenship', *Politics*, 21:1, pp. 1-10

Lehmkuhl, D. (2000), 'under Stress: Europeanisation and Trade Associations in the Member States', *European Integration Online Papers (EIOP)* 4: 14

Maier, M.L. and T. Risse (eds.) (2003), 'Europeanisation, Collective Identities and Public Discourses, Project', final report, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, Florence

Mair, P. (2007), 'Political Parties and Party Systems' in P. Graziano and M. P. Vink (eds.) (2007), *Europeanisation: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 154-166

Moga, T. (2010), 'Connecting the Enlargement Process with the Europeanisation Theory: the Case of Turkey', *CES Working Papers*, 2:1, pp. 47-61

Moisio, S. (2002), 'EU Eligibility, Central Europe, and the Invention of Applicant State Narrative', *Geopolitics,* 7, pp. 89–116.

Moravcsik, A. (1993), 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: a Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, pp. 473-524

Moravcsik, A. (1998), *The Choice for Europe*, UK: UCL Press

Morton, A.D. (2007), *Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy,* London: Pluto Press

Mouffe, C. (2000), 'Politics and Passions: the Stakes of Democracy', *Ethical Perspectives*, 7:2-3, pp. 146-150

Musolff, A. (2000), *Mirror-Images of Europe. Metaphors in the Public Debate about Europe in Britain and Germany.* Munich: Iudicium.

Müftüler-Baç, M. (1998), 'the Never-ending Story: Turkey and the European Union', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34: 4, pp. 240-258

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

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

Olsen, J. (2002), 'the Many Faces of Europeanisation', *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40:5.*

Öniş, Z. (2009), 'Contesting for the Center: Domestic Politics, Identity Conflicts and the Controversy over EU Membership in Turkey', *Bilgi University European Institute Working Paper*, no: 2.

Poguntke, T., N. Aylott, E. Carter, R. Ladrech and K. R. Luther (eds.) (2007), *the Europeanisation of National Political Parties: Power and Organisational Adaptation*, UK: Routledge

Preston, C. (1997), *Enlargement and Integration in the European Union*, London: Routledge

Radaelli, C. (2003), 'the Europeanisation of Public Policy', in K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.) (2003) *The Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.27-56

Radaelli, C. (2004), 'Europeanisation: Solution or Problem?', *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)*, 8:16, available at: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm (last viewed on 12 February 2011)

Radaelli, C. and T. Exadaktylos (2009)'New Directions in Europeanisation Research' in M. Egan, N. Nugent and W.E. Paterson (eds.) (2009) *Research Agendas in EU Studies: Stalking the Elephant*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Radaelli, C. and R. Pasquier (2007), 'Conceptual Issues' in P. Graziano and M. P. Vink (eds.) (2007), *Europeanisation: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 35-45

Risse-Kappen, T. (1996), 'Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis meet the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34: 1, pp. 53-80

Rumford, C. and G. Delanty (2005), *Rethinking Europeanisation: Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanisation,* London: Routledge

Samur, H. (2004), 'the Power of Discourse in the EU Playground', *Journal of European Affairs,* 2:2, pp.32-36

Sandoltz, W. and J. Zysman (1989), 'Recasting the European Bargain', *World Politics*, 42, pp. 95-128

Schimmelfennig, F. And U. Sedelmeier (2002), 'Theorizing EU Enlargement: Research Focus, Hypotheses, and the State of Research', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9: 4, pp. 500-528

Schimmelfennnig, F. and U. Sedelmeier (2005), *the Europeanisation of Central and Eastern Europe,* USA: Cornell University Press

Schmitter, P. (2004), 'Neo-functionalism', in A. Wiener and T. Diez (2004) *European Integration Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sikkink, K. (1993), 'Human Rights, Principled Issue Networks, and Sovereignty in Latin

America', *International Organization,* 47: 3, pp. 41 141.

Smith, A. (2002), 'Imagining Geographies of the ―New Europe‖: Geo-economic Power and the new European Architecture of Integration', *Political Geography,* 21, pp. 647–670.

Smith, S. (1999), 'Social Constructivisms and European Studies: a Reflectivist Critique', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6:4, Special Issue, pp.682–91

Smith, D. and J. L. Ray (1993), 'the 1992 Project' in D. Smith and J. L. Ray (eds.) *the 1992 Project and the Future of Integration in Europe*, Armonk: M.E. Sharpe

Stone Sweet, A. and W. Sandholtz (1997),'European Integration and Supranational Governance', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4:3, 297-317

Stone Sweet, A. and Sandholtz, W. (1998) *European Integration and Supranational Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Stone Sweet, A., W. Sandholtz and N. Fligstein (2001), 'The Institutionalization of European Space' in A. Stone Sweet, W. Sandholtz and N. Fligstein (eds.), *The Institutionalization of Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sunay, N. (2008), 'The Perceived (Il) legitimacy of the EU Conditionality: the Role of Uncertainty and Asymmetry of Power', *paper presented the ECPR Standing Group on the European Union, Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics, 25-27 September 2008, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia*

Thatcher, M. (2004), 'Winners and Losers in Europeanisation: Reforming the National Regulation of Telecommunications', *West European Politics*, 27:2, March 2004

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

Tünay, M. (1993), 'the Turkish New Right's Attempt at Hegemony' in A. Eralp, M. Tunay, and B. Yesilada (eds.) (1993), *the Political and Socioeconomic Transformation of Turkey*, London: Praeger Publishers

Tranholm-Mikkelsen, J. (1991), 'Neo-functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC', *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 20: 1, pp. 1-22

Ulusoy, K. (2008),'Governing Turkey towards the European Union', *Society and Economy*, 30: 2, pp.339-358

Vink, M. (2002), 'What is Europeanisation? and other Questions on a New Research Agenda', *paper prepared for the 2nd YEN Research Meeting on Europeanisation*, University of Bocconi, Milan, 22-23 November 2002

Visier, C. (2009), 'Turkey and the European Union: the Sociology of Engaged Actors and of their Contribution to the Candidacy Issue', *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, 9, Special Issue: 'EU-Turkey: Sociological Approaches', pp.2-11

Wendt, A. (1992), 'Anarchy is What States Make of it', *International Organisation*, 46, pp. 391-425

Wessels, W. and D. Rometsch (1996), 'Conclusion: European Union and National Institutions', in D. Rometsch and W. Wessels (eds.), *the European Union and the Member States*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Zehfuss, M. (2002), *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Zizek, S. (1989) *the Sublime Object of Ideology*, London; New York: Verso.