

The European Common Foreign and Security Policy and Turkey's Contribution

Uğur ÖZGÖKER

Prof. Dr.

Head of Department

Department of International Relations (English)
Istanbul Arel University, FEAS

Zekeriya Alperen BEDİRHAN

Undergraduate Student

Department of International Relations (English)
Istanbul Arel University, FEAS

Abstract

On November 1st, 1993, the European Community that was an economic union gained a military and political dimension and it created the European Union with the Treaty on the European Union or The Maastricht Treaty. European Community, which became an economic union with the European Union Treaty, also known as The Maastricht Treaty and came into force on November 1st 1993, gained a military and political dimension, and then the European Union was created. This supra-nation organization's new common policy in military branch is the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Especially, in the rising globalization era, when the borders are exceeded, The EU is stuck between protectionist policies and endless freedom. One of the main reasons of this is the fear to lose values, wealth and the stability of the fiction of the EU. In this study, we will analyze the historical process of the CFSP and its elements. In addition to this, the study will also present the relations between Turkey and the EU within the context of the CFSP.

Keywords: Historical Process of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Elements of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Relations Between Turkey and the EU within the context of the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

1. Introduction

The raison d'être of the European Union is to establish an economic, political, cultural, social integration in the European continent. Historically, the competition to maximize interest between Germany and France, races in capitalist accumulation and armament, imperialistic ambitions like needs of new markets, raw material and exploitation searches (Mulligan, 2010: 7), polarization between states and nationalism has been the casus belli and European countries dealt with two world wars due to these reasons. Therefore, presence of the EU is crucial not only for the stability of Europe but also for a peaceful world order.

After the Second World War because of the implemented European defense and security policies, NATO and the Warsaw Pact pursued ideological visions and balance of power in a mutual way. European security vision was based on the two sides of iron curtain. Main actors of this bipolar system were the US, the USSR and their alliances. Politically, all states are allegedly equal but in reality economic level determines the position of a state in hierarchy. Hegemonic powers are the polarization of this game.

According to this approach, European countries sided with NATO or came under the security umbrella of the US orbit and their competitor was the East Block or the Soviet Russia. Another examination about this polarization can be done with the limitless capitalist accumulation that triggers competition between these hegemonic states. According to Immanuel Wallerstein (Wallerstein, 2004: 56), "...the competition between strong states is tempered by a contradiction. While each is against the other in a sort of putative zero-sum game, they have a common interest in holding together the interstate system, and the modern world-system as a whole. So the actors are pushed simultaneously in opposite directions: toward an anarchic interstate system and toward a coherent and orderly interstate system. The result, as might be expected, is structures that are normally in between the two types." Actually, this zero-sum policy led to Aron paradigm that "in a rigid bipolar system an Strategic Medium Power is very likely to be forced to adhere to one of the two camps, especially if its geostrategic location is considered critical by their leaders" (Oran, 2010: 9). On the other hand, amid of this atmosphere, some of these countries can follow the balance of power policy to gain more profit and rise their level in hierarchy.

In this era, divided actors of Europe assumed the other side to be an enemy. Therefore, fundamental ideological ideas, deeply and powerful interest units shaped military and diplomatic efforts between alliance countries to provide collective security and stability. After the Second World War, European integration theories tried to solve security problems, especially the conflict between France and Germany is one of the important agents of the idea of the establishment of European Community. Hence, in 1950, with Pleven Plan, some attempts began to establish a common army. Studies to set the European Defense Community were refused by the French parliament. In this context, the Fouchet Plan proposed by President Charles De Gaulle of France in 1961 became unsuccessful. However, in the conditions of the 1950s, economic integration was a rational step as the opposite sides were not eager to unite in military and foreign policy issues. Thus, the concept of common foreign policy did not occur in agreements until 1993.

In this study, historical background of the European Union Common Foreign and Security Policy will be presented and internal agents and external dynamics will be analyzed with the elements of the CFSP. In the globalization era, superpowers are losing their effects and multipolar system will be sovereign. Moreover, terrorism, separatist movements, economic crises and energy issues, Russian threat over East Europe are shaping the policies of the European Union. In this context, the European Union wants to destroy stereotype comments about itself. Especially, Belgium Foreign Minister Mark Eyskeyn said that "Europe is an economic giant, a political dwarf, and a military worm" (Özdağ, 2013: xvii). In a shadow of these provocative words, the European Union tries to strengthen its political and military structures simultaneously to become a global power. However, it needs to overcome some obstacles about integration. In this study, military contribution of not only member countries but also one of the crucial candidate countries, which is Turkey, will be investigated. Furthermore, benefits of Turkey's geostrategic position will be explained and some points will be suggested with regard to the effect of Turkey.

2. Historical Process and Institutions

In Europe, realizing, after two world wars, that they lost their hegemony over the world and became a ruled continent due to the wars between each other, European countries began some initiatives in the zone of security and defence. Especially, Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister of France, advised that production of coal and steel should be controlled by a supra-nation organization for sustainable peace. (Çaşın, M. H., Özgöker, U., & Çolak, H., 2007: 341). As a result, in 1951, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established by the Treaty of Paris that was signed by Belgium, West Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and Netherlands. In these countries, decisions about coal and steel industries were reported to the High Authority, which is an independent and supranation institution. However, the efforts to provide security have a long past as compared with the first treaty of the ECSC.

After WWII, European security became a necessary topic of the European countries. and the number of the studies about this subject has risen. **Fistly**, the Western Union (WU) or the Modified Treaty of Brussels was signed by the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg on March 17th, 1948. On October 23rd, 1954, West Germany and Italy were participated in the WU with the Paris Agreements and it was renamed the Western European Union (WEU). Member countries are the UK, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Luxembourg and Greece. In addition to these, Iceland, Norway and Turkey are the associate members and Australia, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Sweden are the observers.

Fundamental aims of the establishment of the WEU were defined in the Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence signed in Brussels on March 17th, 1948, as amended by the "Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty" signed in Paris on October 23rd, 1954 (CVCE, 2016):

1. To strengthen the economic, social and cultural ties by which they are already united;
2. To co-operate loyally and to co-ordinate their efforts to create in Western Europe a firm basis for European economic recovery;
3. To afford assistance to each other in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and in resisting any policy of aggression;
4. To promote the unity and to encourage the progressive integration of Europe;
5. To desire for these purposes to conclude a treaty for collaboration in economic, social and cultural matters and for collective self-defence.

The WEU is a significant and long-lasting initiative in European security and defence searches. Until 1984, the WEU was observed harmonious with the NATO. After this year, it moved like a separated security institution. Especially, on October 27th, 1984, the Rome Declaration emphasized that the WEU should gain an active role and deal with crises territories.

Secondly, in this era, because of the threat of the USSR, protection of the US over Europe rose as the East European countries remained the ideological limits of the USSR. In this territory, the USSR did not achieve its expansionist policies over Greece, Turkey and Iran. In this context, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was signed on April 4th, 1949 with the pioneering of the US. The NATO is an intergovernmental military alliance and was established to provide collective defence within the context of Article 51 of the Charter of the UN that emphasizes the inherent right of individual or collective selfdefense of independent countries (Şöhret, 2013: 63). According to Ira Straus, creation of the NATO is the symbol of Atlanticism that is an economical, political, defensive collaboration between Europe, United States and Canada and the author also argues that "At first sign the NATO provides a traditional intergovernmental security guarantee, but at second sight it has organized common defense measures so as to make its guarantees stick and reassure its members of the strict reliability of those guarantees" (Straus, 2015: 20).

Thirdly, René Pleven, the French Prime Minister supposed the Pleven Plan which suggests an independent European army to be established without the US. Furthermore, Federal Germany should participate in developing security structures. The European Defence Community (EDC) was established by the BENELUX countries, France, Federal Germany and Italy on May 27th, 1952. However, due to the impression of French Communist Party, Vietnam defeat, Charles de Gaulle's opposition to American defence system over Europe, the Plan collapsed in the French Parliament. In this way, West Europe did not accomplish about a combined defence and security structure.

Fourthly, during 1960s, improvements in economic integration led to political cooperation in the intergovernmental dimension. In 1970, the Davignon report was published and The European Political Cooperation (EPC) was created by the European Economic Community members. Consensus between foreign ministers of member countries became a core of foreign policy collaborations. Despite the achievements of diplomatic zone, EPC did not become effective and functional in the security and defence zone. Mechanism of The European Political Cooperation reached an institutional base with the Single European Act in 1986. The Single European Act led to some developments about coordination and harmonization of foreign policy. However, after the dissolution of Soviet Union, this mechanism was seen as ineffective. Member states of EEC did not show enough common interest in Europe and moved in line with their own interest. Foreign policy cooperation in EC was regulated in the The Single European Act's provisions regarding European cooperation in the field of foreign policy. This policy is a milestone of political integration. In the process of building of Europe, concept of common foreign and security policy was perceived as a taboo. (Ozgoker, 2009) Member countries of the European Community cooperated in international political subjects and developed dialogues with each other but until the Maastricht Treaty they could not create a common foreign and security policy.

Fifthly, after The Single European Act and the results of intergovernmental conference about political integration, the Treaty on the European Union or the Maastricht Treaty established the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) that is one of three pillars of the European Union. In 1993, the Maastricht Treaty entered into force and the CFSP took over the authorities of the European Political Cooperation.

In this way, inside the Union, a separate intergovernmental pillar was created. Before that, member countries reported and consult about each foreign policy issue. Furthermore, while they were improving common attitudes and common principles and targets, they were also expanding joint action opportunities and were becoming a suitable power. However now, they have to pursue restrictive obligations.

Two fundamental institutional bases and political priorities of the Common Foreign and Security Policy mechanism should be emphasized: Firstly, the European Union aimed that European diplomacy should be rendered effective in the international system with the CFSP. Secondly, with the Western European Union mechanism, working for a more effective structure of European security and defence should become the second priority of the EU.

The objectives of the common foreign and security policy are defined in Article J.1 (2) of the Maastricht Treaty (ACT, 1992: 123):

- to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union;
- to strengthen the security of the Union and its Member States in all ways;
- to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter;
- to promote international cooperation;
- to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Another approach in the Maastricht Treaty is the Western European Union that the defence dimension of security is an indispensable part of European integration process. Therefore, the WEU should be improved as a branch of defence of the EU and the European branch of the NATO. Member countries of the EU became full member of the WEU. Turkey and Norway, which have the NATO membership, became associate and observer members. With the Petersberg Declaration in 1992, main tasks of the WEU were determined and adapted according to contemporary conditions. These tasks are humanitarian aid, rescue operations, evacuation operations, peacekeeping and crisis tasks. Originally, the WEU is a defense alliance but it gained a military status with this declaration. However, defense against attacks was taken over by the NATO.

Sixthly, The Maastricht Treaty has been amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam on June 17, 1999 but the European Parliament remained ineffective in the determination of policy and taking decisions. In addition to these, the CFSP can not be checked by the Court of Justice of the EU and the European Council moves as a main determinative institution. Main reason is that member countries are not eager for a transition of the CFSP from and intergovernmental organization to a supragovernmental one.

Sevently, after all of these events, the CFSP was questioned and the European Defense and Security Policy occurred. In 1990s, with the studies of the Security and Defense Identity and the WEU, new structures were tried to be fed from the NATO. In this context, the NATO based European security will take over the enforced European branch of the NATO. In 1998, the Saint-Malo Declaration that was made by the UK and France. In 1999, the Cologne and the Helsinki Summit held to renew the fictionalization of the European Security and Defense Identity and creation of the European Security and Defense Policy.

After the 1999 Helsinki Summit, Feira and Nice Summit contributed to shape the European Security and Defense Identity in 2000. In June 2000, in Feira Summit, the situation of some countries that have the NATO membership but the EU membership was discussed. According to the decisions of the summit, member countries of the NATO and candidate countries of the EU should need to integrate European security structure. In addition to these improvements, on September 21, 2001, in the Extraordinary European Council Meeting, a willpower was built to complete some lacks and needs of common foreign and security policy and creation of the European Security and Defense Policy that has operational capability. Obviously, 9/11 attack triggered improvements of common foreign and security policy in the Council. On the other hand, on December 14-15, 2001, in Laeken Summit, an important progress was made in the implementation of the decisions of Cologne and Helsinki Summit. The EU moves independent from the NATO in the European Emergency Response Capacity but it gains the advantages of intelligence, communication, logistics facilities of the NATO and this approach demonstrates that there is a dilemma between the European Security and Defense Policy and the NATO or between the US and the EU about European security issue.

Eightly, the Treaty of Lisbon or the Reform Treaty that was signed in 2007 but entered into force in 2009 created a separated new body named as High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy that became the Representative of the Council's Common Foreign and Security Policy, President of the External Relations Council and Vice President of the Commission at the same time. With this treaty, name of the European Defence and Security Policy that is the most crucial branch of the CFSP and focuses on military and defence zones, was changed and became the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). In Article 28/1 of the Treaty of Lisbon (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007), tasks of the CSDP are joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including the support to the third countries in combating terrorism in their territories.

Another important amendment of the institutional structure in the treaty, the EU presidency, was created to represent the CFSP, however, it can not contradict with the High Representative of the Foreign and Security Policy. In the CFSP, one of the most authorized institution is the Foreign Affairs Council, whose tasks are the formulation of the Union's Foreign affairs and coordination based on strategic principles of the European Council. In addition to this, creation and implementation of member states' foreign policies or national representatives in the third countries and international institutions can not be affected by the Final Act's related provisions with the CFSP (Alagöz, 2010).

In the EU, the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER) is still in an important status in the CFSP. Moreover, the Political and Security Committee shall exercise the political control determine the strategic direction of the crisis management operations under the responsibility of the Council and of the High Representative (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007). The Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM) established in 2000 has an adviser role. The Policy Unit directly depends on the High Representative and determines strategies for priority subjects and draws main lines of the application. The Situation Centre (SitCen) and its sub-unit Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability-CPCC supports the CFSP. The High Representatives' another institution, The EU Military Committee, and its sub-unit, the EU Military Staff, provide military collaboration and solidarity, and military expertise. The European External Action Service-EEAS serves like a foreign ministry and diplomatic corps for the EU under the authority of the High Representative. Except all these institutions, The European Defense Agency (EDA), the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS), European Union Satellite Centre (EUSC) and the Special Represent work for the High Representative.

Finally, Syrian refugee crises in the aftermath of the Syrian civil war, security threats of terror attacks led to a new cooperation between the EU and NATO. In February, 2016, NATO and the EU agreed to cooperate in the Aegean Sea to address the effects of the migrant crisis. The Secretary General's Annual Report 2016 (NATO, 2017: 77) shows that "this marked the first time that NATO and an EU civilian agency (Frontex) had cooperated in the field. Later in the year, in the margins of the NATO Summit in Warsaw, NATO Secretary General Stoltenberg, together with President of the European Council Donald Tusk and President of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker signed a Joint Declaration in which they identified seven key areas for closer cooperation: countering hybrid threats, operational cooperation including, maritime issues, cyber security and defence, defence capabilities, defence industry and research, exercises, defence and security capacity building."

On March 6, 2017, the Foreign Affairs Council (Council of the EU, 2017) met and adopted some conclusions about the progress of the EU global strategy in the area of security and defence. The Council agreed to establish of a military planning and conduct capability (MPCC), within the existing EU Military Staff of the European External Action Service. Moreover, in a press release, some priorities were determined: Improving the Common Security and Defense Policy crisis management structures, Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), Coordinated Annual Review on Defence (CARD), Developing Civilian Capabilities and Implementation in various other areas. On the other hand, the UK, which executes Brexit process to leave the EU, and its Secretary of State for Defence, Michael Fallon, suggested that EU should improve cooperation mechanism with NATO and has military headquarters and planning unit instead of creating new military structures (Erbaş, 2017). After this meeting, some worries rose about centrifugal tendencies in case member countries of the EU fail to integrate with each other because security and defence policy restricts sovereign rights of member countries and a creation of common army is at the top level of integration. Therefore, EU seeks the answer for the question 'who is the enemy?'. Huntington's *the Clash of Civilisations* within the context of terrorism, immigration and rising nationalism and Russian threat over East Europe can help to find a certain solution.

According to Beril Dedeoğlu, imprisoned German in Europe is the key actor in this topic because she is eager to establish a common army but this can speed up separation process of some members (Dedeoglu, 2017).

3. Turkey's Position

Republic of Turkey is a candidate member of the EU. Until 1952, Turkey had been a member of the NATO. In addition to this, Westernization and US oriented foreign policies kept Turkey close in the periphery of Europe. "Turkey is also the largest non-EU contributor to the CSDP missions. Ankara provided the second-largest contingent of 255 military personnel to EUFOR Althea, the EU's force in Bosnia, and 48 law enforcement officers to the police mission in Bosnia" (Grabbe, H., & Ülgen, S., 2010: 6). Turkey has participated in the operations, the police missions, the military peacekeeping operation in the past. Within the context of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, full membership of Turkey can contribute to the targets of foreign policy of the EU. Turkey follows multidimensional foreign policies because of its geostrategic location. Turkey is a bridge between the East and the West. Thanks to the historical links with Turkic societies in Central Asia and Islamic countries in the Middle East, the Arabian Peninsula and even the South Africa will gain benefit and increase the influence of the EU. In this way, the EU will play an active role in the peaceful processes against conflicts.

A growing portfolio of the EU will gain some sources with Turkey. For instance, Turkey has water resources of the Middle East and the Arabian peninsula that are the Euphrates, the Dicle Rivers to Syria and Iraq and the Ceyhan and Seyhan Rivers to Arab and Israel conflict. Turkey's water policy and water guarantee will turn the EU's policy and the EU will reach a source that has a reason and a solution (Caşın, M. H., Özgöker, U., & Çolak, H., 2007: 499). Capacity of hard power of Turkey will support the EU which has often been accused of lacking the strength that would allow it to become a global strategic actor (Demir, 2012: 11). Turkey has the second largest military in NATO. Power of the Turkish Army will fill the gaps of the EU in the hard power area. They will also overcome the problematic areas to bypass terrorism with struggle. Table 1 shows how superior is the force level of Turkey than the force levels of the UK and France in many areas.

Table 1. Comparative Force Levels

	Turkey	France	UK
Total Population	79,414,269	66,553,766	64,088,222
Manpower Available	41,640,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Active Military Personnel	410,500	205,000	150,000
Active Military Reserves	185,630	195,770	182,000
Aircraft(all types)	1,007	1,282	879
Tank Strenght	3,778	423	407
Towed Artillery	697	233	138
Flet Strenght	194	118	76

Source: <http://www.globalfirepower.com/>

Soft power instruments of Turkey, which are non-military and economic powers, will contribute the EU with Turkey's diplomatic links with regions and countries, shared culture and religion with many actors (Demir, 2012: 15). Besides, Turkey is a model country to these Islamic and authocratic countries as she has a strong past in democracy and with its secularism harmonized with Islam. Fundamentalist or radical Islam spread in Islamic countries such as Iran, Afghanistan, Algeria, Pakistan and Syria. Turkey's political and economical improvements show that political values of the West can be implemented by an Islamic country. This synthesis will protect multiculturalism and the alliance of civilizations can be achieved. By the way, Turkey can be representative country to the Central Asia that remains the backyard of Russia and Turkey's interaction in this region can enforce relations, and it can also help transportation of natural sources as natural gas from the Central Asia to Europe via Turkey.

According to win-win policy, cooperation between Brussels and Ankara will provide more options to these two actors. A structured foreign policy dialogue, mutual trust, climate of negotiations will shape the future and Turkey and the EU should be a part of this future.

4. Results

The European Common Foreign and Security Policy has evolved and gained a more significant role during the historical process. The CFSP is the most crucial element to the integration in the EU according to some theorists. Therefore, main actors of the member countries of the EU, international organization such as NATO, bureaucrats, technocrats, experts and academics tend to deal with this inert subject.

Historically; firstly, the Western Union (WU) and the Western European Union (WEU) in 1948 and in 1954 emerged. Secondly, in 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created for the European security in the orbit of the US. Thirdly, René Pleven's Pleven Plan and its result The European Defence Community (EDC) in 1952 failed. Fourthly, the Davignon report in 1970 and The European Political Cooperation (EPC) and its reached institutional base with the Single European Act in 1986. Fifthly, in 1993, the Maastricht Treaty entered into force and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) occurred. Sixthly, the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999 indicated that member countries' hesitations could not be fixed. Seventhly, the European Defense and Security Policy occurred. In 1990s, with the studies of the Security and Defense Identity and the WEU, new structures tried to cooperate with the NATO. Helsinki, Feira, Nice and Laeken Summits were organized. Eighthly, in 2007, the Treaty of Lisbon or the Reform Treaty created the High Representative to the CFSP. A lot of institutions were established and their tasks were determined. Finally, Syrian Civil War and its result Syrian Refugee Crises led to new collaborations in some areas between the NATO and the EU. In 2017, the Foreign Affairs Council met and created new units in the military mechanism.

These improvements show that the Common Foreign and Security Policy is one of the main challenges for the EU that is not ready to act against the security threats. Especially, Russian threats not only in the political borders but also in energy security issues can be avoided by the CFSP. Rising terrorist attacks in the European continent is another threat to partnership and prosperity. The NATO can not remain a guardian under the political ambitions of the EU. The US hegemony or its unipolar world order was disturbed by Russia and China. Nowadays, under the multipolar world system conditions, the EU should become a global actor because of its strategic position, economical power and power balance. Hence, the EU should fulfill lacks of the CFSP and construct a strong common army immediately.

In addition to this, Turkey's military strength, its deep ties to the West and the East in economic, military and political organizations can also provide advantages to the CFSP. In the long-term, Turkey is a valuable strategic partner and in the future of the EU, she will become an effective actor. Turkey's full membership will expand the limits of western values in the rise of authoritarianism age.

As a result, the EU is a considerable supra-nation organization and its vital base that is the Common Foreign and Security Policy should be built. This troublesome integration process should be overcome with new enlargement steps. Therefore, to maximize interest and security of the organization in the world order the EU should be interested in Turkey seriously.

References

- Mulligan, William (2010). *The Origins of the First World War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Oran, B., Akdevelioğlu, A., & Akşin, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1919-2006: Facts and Analyses with Documents*. University of Utah Press.
- Özdal, B. (2013). *Avrupa Birliği, Ortak Dış Politika ve Güvenlik Politikası ile Ortak Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası Oluşturma Süreçlerinin Tarihsel Gelişimi, Siyasi Bir Cüce, Askeri Bir Solucan Mı? Dora Yayınları, 1*.
- Caşın, M. H., Özgöker, U., & Çolak, H. (2007). Küreselleşmenin Avrupa Birliği Ortak Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikasına Etkisi. *Avrupa Birliği, İstanbul*.
- CVCE. (2016, October 25). Modified Brussels treaty (Paris, 23 October 1954). Retrieved February 28, 2017, from http://www.cvce.eu/obj/modified_brussels_treaty_paris_23_october_1954-en-7d182408-0ff6-432e-b793-0d1065ebe695.html
- Şöhret, M. (2013). Avrupa Birliği'nin Güvenlik Yapılanmasının Tarihsel Gelişim Süreci ve Mevcut Durumu. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2013(13)*.
- Straus, Ira (June 2005). "Atlanticism as the core 20 th century U.S. strategy for internationalism" . *Streit Council*. Annual Meeting of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations.
- Özgöker, U. (2009, April). Avrupa Birliği Ortak Dış ve Güvenlik Politikası. Retrieved March 11, 2017, from <http://www.subconturkey.com/2009/Nisan/koseyazisi-Avrupa-Birligi-Ortak-Dis-ve-Guvenlik-Politikasi.html>
- ACT, F. (1992). Treaty on European union. *Official Journal C, 191, 29*.
- Treaty Of Lisbon. (2007). Retrieved March 18, 2017, from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12007L%2FTXT>
- Alagöz, E. A. (2010). Lizbon Antlaşması Işığında Ortak Dışişleri ve Güvenlik Politikasının İşleyişi. Retrieved March 18, 2017, from <http://www.bilgesam.org/incele/784/-lizbon-antla%C5%9Fmasi-isiginda-ortak-disisleri-ve-g%C3%BCvenlik-politikasinin-isleyisi/#.WM0TrIGLTIU>
- NATO. (2017, March 13). The Secretary General's Annual Report 2016. Retrieved March 14, 2017, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_142149.htm
- Council of the EU. (2017, March 6). Council conclusions on progress in implementing the EU Global Strategy in the area of Security and Defence. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/03/06-conclusions-security-defence/>
- Erbaş, F. (2017, March 10). AB'nin ortak savunma hedefi gerçekçi değil. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <http://aa.com.tr/tr/analiz-haber/abnin-ortak-savunma-hedefi-gercekci-degil/768216>
- DEDEOĞLU, B. (2017, March 10). AB Neden Güvenlik ve Savunma İhtiyacında? Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <http://akademikperspektif.com/2017/03/10/ab-guvenlik-savunma-ihtiyacinda/>
- Grabbe, H., & Ülgen, S. (2010). The Way Forward for Turkey and the EU: A Strategic Dialogue on Foreign Policy. *Rep. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.
- DEMİR, S. (2012). Turkey's Contribution to the European Common Security and Defense Policy. *Turkish public administration annual, (38)*.