LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS, HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

MSc DISSERTATION COVERSHEET

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STUDENT

STUDENT'S NAME	Elif CELIK
DEGREE PROGRAMME AND YEAR	Msc International Relations
MODULE TITLE	Dissertation
ASSIGNMENT TITLE	The Capacity of EU as a Global Actor and Its Constructed Identity as a 'Normative Power': The Case of the Syrian Conflict
DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION	30.11.2016
SUPERVISOR'S NAME	Prof. Helen DRAKE

I certify that the attached piece of work is written by me and that material obtained from other sources is acknowledged by means of a reference. I have read and understand the Department's 'Coursework Code of Practice' http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/eu concerning preparation and submission of assessed work.

Signed:

FOR INFORMATION : MARKING CRITERIA USED BY TUTORS AND EXAMINERS

General structure and organisation Strength of supporting arguments Analytical treatment of subject Coherence of conclusion Sufficient referencing	Presence of a main proposition Understanding of key concepts Awareness of alternative approaches Evidence of wide reading Correct referencing Good use of English

AGREED MARK

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INTERNAL EXAMINERS

DATE RECEIVED	
FIRST MARKER'S NAME	
MARK AWARDED	
COMMENTS	
SIGNATURE	

DATE RECEIVED	
SECOND MARKER'S NAME	
MARK AWARDED	
COMMENTS	
SIGNATURE	

“The Capacity of EU as a Global Actor and Its Constructed Identity as a ‘Normative Power’: The Case of the Syrian Conflict”

Submitted by:

Elif CELIK, B512321

Supervisor:

Prof. Helen DRAKE

Msc International Relations

Loughborough University

Abstract

The European Union, which is a sophisticated, privileged and complex regional and socially constructed entity with its unique multilevel governance (MLG) framework, has accomplished a generation of political and economic integration as a pioneer of post-World War II. Although there is a rich literature on EU as a global actor with a variety of concepts, little work has been devoted to outline its failures and its capacity to respond to the majority of international crises due to its complex way of governance which brings in various actors as decision makers. Great expectation rises from EU without considering its capacity and limited resources due to its positionality as a global actor and its constructed identity as a normative power. Its identity is used as an instrument on the world stage by promoting democracy and human rights that seems attractive constantly to numerous refugees who desire to be situated within EU and to many other nations. Despite the existing turmoil issues in majority of EU states, they are still willing to be a part of the union or to collaborate closely to be one of the democratic states that follow international norms and regulations. This dissertation questions if EU remains a global actor and highlights its putative normative power by overviewing a series of major international crises and analyzing the case of the Syrian refugee crisis; how Turkey-EU negotiates to resolve the contemporary issue through the lenses of The English School Theory (TEST) and Social Constructivism by qualitative methodology based on textual analysis through the summits. Consequently, ‘the world of our making’ can be considered as the result of EU’s and Turkey’s diplomatic approach in responding to the refugee crisis, a crisis that, to date, remains unresolved.

Acknowledgement

I am deeply grateful for her encouragement to start this program who has been such a great inspiration, my dearest cousin **Merve CELIK**, RIP.

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to Head of the Department **Dr. David BERRY,** Director of PGT studies **Dr. Christina OELGEMOLLER** and my dissertation supervisor **Prof. Helen DRAKE** and all academic staff as I am gratefully indebted to their valuable support throughout the term. I also express my great appreciation for Postgraduate Programme Administrator, **Angela BARKER** for guiding us and keeping us updated throughout the program.

I wish to thank Director of the Center for Research on Globalization and Democratic Governance **Prof. Ziya ONIS** from Koc University, Istanbul without his guidance and constant help this dissertation would not have been possible.

I am sincerely grateful to Labour Councillor for Loughborough Dishley and Hathern **Keith HARRIS** for his time and support.

I would also like to thank my family both in Istanbul and Loughborough and my housemate, my neighbours in Istanbul and friends who have always been there during thick and thin times.

Additionally, a thank you to non-academic staff at the library, IT services, and security to avail me the facilities on campus whenever I needed. Particularly the support from library staff, who arranged some of the academic journal papers through inter-library loans.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

Brexit: British exit (UK leaving the EU)

CFSP: Common Foreign and Security Policy

CSDP: Common Security and Defence Policy

ECB: The European Central Bank

ECJ: The European Court of Justice

ECSC: European Coal and Steel Community

ESDP: European Security and Defense Policy

EEC: European Economic Community

EFP: European Foreign Policy

ENP: European Neighbourhood Policy

EP: European Parliament

EU/Union: The European Union

IR: International Relations

IRT: International Relations Theory

MLG: Multilevel Governance

SEA: The Single European Act:

TES: The English School

TEST: The English School Theory

TEU: Treaty on European Union

TFEU: Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

UK: United Kingdom

UN: The United Nations

UNHCR: United Nations Refugee Agency

US: United States

USA: United States of America

WWII: 2nd World War

GAMM: Global Approach to Migration and Mobility

ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

Introduction

The European Union (EU), which is an exclusive and complex regional and socially constructed entity with its unique MLG framework, has achieved a generation of political and economic integration as a pioneer of post-World War II (Pinder and Usherwood 2013). Though there is a rich literature on EU as a global actor with a diversity of concepts, in contrast, little work has been dedicated to figure out its failures and its capacity to respond to the majority of international crises that is in decline due to its complex way of governance which brings in various actors as decision makers (Kenealy et al. 2015).

EU is widely considered as a global actor and can be best defined as a 'normative power' given its boundaries and competences as a non-state actor; its identity as a normative power is implemented on the world stage by promoting democracy and human rights throughout the range of its political, civilian and economic methods (Diez and Manners 2007; Burchill et al. 2009). Its identity seems attractive consistently, even if it contradicts its normative principles in practice and the existing majority of EU states' turmoil issues, particularly to refugees for safety reasons and to its candidate countries. That desire to be a part of the union or to work very closely with EU in order to be one of the 'right states', in other words 'democratic states' that obey EU's norms and regulations (Kenealy et al. 2015). This is due to its formed identity as many follow its forced constructed regulations and attempts to "westernize, Europeanise and democratize' themselves (Nugent 2010:48)". Thus, it has a great influence over many nations through political, civilian and economic means. Nevertheless, EU contradicts its identity due to its MLG where some actors,

decision makers and member states clash with the principles of its concept as a normative power (Pagoulatos and Tsoukalis 2012). This can be due to social and cultural differences, where actors are socially constructed to prioritize what best suits their interests amongst decision makers which can block, delay or create dilemma throughout the decision making process and implementation of EU policies.

This dissertation examines the capacity of EU as a global actor and its constructed identity as a normative power by overviewing its power dynamics using a chain of international crises and analyzing in particular the case study of the Syrian refugee crisis which was unleashed by the Syrian conflict (Corporate Author 2016d). Further in this dissertation, the term 'crisis' will refer to the Syrian refugee crisis unless mentioned otherwise.

The argument of EU's gradual decline as a global power holds the position after studying EU's timeline and case studies of past major international crises. This dissertation focuses particularly on the case of this contemporary crisis where EU failed to respond and this failure damaged its reputation and its identity as a normative power, especially Turkey-EU deal over the refugee crisis as criticized by UNHCR (European Commission 2016d; Corporate Author 2015d; Corporate Author 2016e).

The case study will be framed through TEST and constructivism approach by conducting qualitative study based on textual analysis through the fundamental chronological summits between Turkey and EU over the Syrian conflict. It is significant to emphasize a particular case study besides providing samples of other cases as Vromen (2010:257) states that "In focusing on just a few cases, qualitative researches clearly do not view all possible cases as equal but that a chosen case is

‘substantively important’ that is, worth studying and examining in detail”. “For the qualitative researcher, explanation and understanding of human social and political behaviour cannot be independent of context. Therefore, the qualitative researcher attempts to express the full picture (Ibid). Vromen (2010) specified that case study as technique is more oriented to produce qualitative data and this research applies this technique.

TEST is chosen as a theoretical framework to analyze Turkey-EU deal over the case study due to its tenets to solve an anarchic world’s problems through cooperation embedded in diplomacy (Dunne and Schmidt 2014). Constructivism is selected as it can view the issue from a wider perspective due to its relative tenets emphasizing ‘identity’ as a basis of interest in a socially constructed world and terms like human rights, diplomacy, refugee, interest are intersubjective and can be changed over time through actors (Ibid). The diplomatic negotiation between Turkey and EU over the conflict through the agreements proposes supposed mutual benefits in terms of gains (Corporate Author 2015b). The theory answers the main question on how Turkey and EU negotiate over the conflict, and the theoretical perspective answer is that the issue is being sorted through value and interest-based cooperation, whereas the constructivist approach tends to comprehend how actors are socially constructed like the concepts of power, interest and human rights that are intersubjective albeit it is not concerned with “…which actors to study or where they are constructed (Wendt 1999:7;Ibid)”.

The Scope of the Study

The scope of this study covers the EU from 1999 to 2016. Within this period, the study reviewed the major international crises and EU's response. Based on the literature review 1999 was a defining period for the EU as it was referred to as a key milestone in EU's history (Shepherd 2009). Although there might be relevant issues of the EU outside this period and the response of EU can also be examined, that would not be within the scope of the study. Also, this study is not an exhaustive study of every crisis that EU faced and because of time constraints it is limited to the cases mentioned in this study. This study covers Syria but also includes other countries.

Research Significance

The significance of this research is that the contemporary crisis that has drawn international attention as EU's deal with Turkey is widely being criticized particularly by UN for violating the international human rights laws (Spindler and Clayton 2016; Corporate Author 2016e). Hence, Human Rights as a term is intersubjective and its definition varies according to nations' perspective (Barnett 2014). Furthermore, Turkey is one of the most important countries to analyze its negotiation with EU over the crisis as it is considered as a buffer zone against refugee crisis and ISIS (Ergun 2016). Also, many analysts believe that it has been exploited by ISIS and some see it as a battle ground for regional supremacy between America and Russia (Singh 2015). Therefore, a study such as this is currently significant since it provides an academic background to the issues of the Syrian Crisis and EU's response. This study also can be used as a background for further extensive research in the field. Based on the findings, it ought to be acknowledged that diplomacy does not work for certain international crises that need urgent response, albeit the contemporary world

is constructed to solve problems through diplomacy. An alternative mechanism for such crises would be desirable.

Research Aim and Objectives

The overall aim of this research is to explore EU's capacity as a global actor and to define its identity as a normative power particularly with regards to its potential to resolve crises that occur within and beyond its borders. Also, to underline the fact that diplomacy may not solve the international crises that need urgent response.

Research Objectives include:

- to identify pitfalls of EU in correspondence to its response to international crisis
- to explore social identity issues in a socially constructed world with regards to EU and Syrian Crisis
- to investigate how the Syrian refugee crisis has been negotiated between Turkey and EU
- to analyse circumstances that resulted in making EU more serious about the refugee crisis
- to determine EU's capacity and willingness for crisis resolution

This dissertation consists of three main chapters. The first chapter will examine EU and its positionality as a global actor to demonstrate its gradual decline; including its chronological background, its main governance concepts pursued by its position as a global actor and identity as a normative power that entails power dynamics viz. civilian (economic), military and particularly normative concept with a series of past international crises. The second chapter focuses on the theoretical framework of

TEST and Social Constructivism; to be utilized in viewing the Syrian case study; including IR background and tocompare and contrast the theories. The third chapter stresses Turkey-EU negotiations over the Syrian refugee crisis containing origins of the crisis and the aforementioned summits to examine EU's code of conduct to resolve the issue through the lenses of both theories.

Chapter 1: The European Union in Crises and its Positionality

Chapter Outline

This chapter overall comprises EU in crises and its positionality on the world stage as the findings later will contribute to the analysis of the case study in Chapter 3 and in conclusion to evaluate EU's capacity as a global actor and its relatively recent constructed identity as a normative power (Forsberg 2011). The chapter structure is detailed is as follows:

Firstly, EU's background and its timeline is briefly examined to highlight its successes and hard times chronologically since its origins to evaluate its contemporary position. Please see Appendix A for the detailed timeline information.

Secondly, its unique MLG framework combining its 'intergovernmental' and 'supranational' features are further explained and analyzed to demonstrate as one of the significant causes of EU's decline as a global actor due to its complex way of governance that brings in diverse decision makers as actors that may cause predicaments during the decision making process.

Thirdly, EU's origin is studied as a global actor and sample of major crises are provided that EU failed to respond to through its power dynamics, namely civilian power, military power and normative power that is widely argued in academia (Diez and Manners 2007). This section focuses more on the relatively recent term of normative power to be demonstrated further in Chapter 3 within the case study (Ibid). Hence, EU's power dynamics with its capacity and capability with a series of crisis are elaborated.

Brief EU Background and its Timeline

EU, formerly EEC was created in 1958 in the aftermath of the WWII that was devastating and had brought dreadful suffering to virtually all European countries (European Commission 2016c; Pinder and Usherwood 2013). This situation forced Europeans to consider having an enduring peace and avoid any potential future conflict, initially with the creation of ECSC over half a century ago to foster economic cooperation amongst six countries (Ibid). Its role and main goal was to provide a durable peace, prosperity, security and to lead its states to the preservation of an assurance of future stability in Europe (Ibid).

EU was constructed on the idea of a common market that would allow the member states free trade, a free travel zone and no economic barriers; through the creation of an enormous 'Single Market'; which is still to develop its full potential, cooperation within EU has further developed (European Commission 2016d; European Commission 2016c; Zartman 1976). EU, "is a unique economic and political union" that currently consists of twenty-eight member states and it is "based on the rule of law" and is run on treaties; like an international organisation, agreed by all member states (Ibid; European Commission 2013:3). The treaties represent EU's goals embracing the rules of the institutions, the procedures for how decisions are made and the relationship between EU and its member states (European Commission 2013).

Expanding from six members to twenty-eight members, EU's enlargement process has been a remarkable success, even though it has been facing a variety of social, economic and political problems, not only within the Union itself but also involving those outside of its boundaries, which will be illustrated later in this chapter (Wallace et al. 2015). EU seems to have managed to achieve its main targets of eradicating violence conflict and increasing cooperation amongst member states since it was established. It has also been remarkably fruitful on German and French coalition that "had been at war with each other three times in the preceding eight decades (Pinder and Usherwood, 2013:1)".

EU has advanced considerably in several fields since the 1950's despite the fact that the second decade of the twenty-first century can be considered as the most challenging time in the history of European integration (Nugent 2010). The key era of EU's timeline is justified below. Please refer to Appendix A for detailed information on EU's timeline.

In the years between 2000 and 2009, EU has undergone further expansion with the fifth enlargement round and by the spread of the main currency 'euro' for numerous Europeans until the financial crisis devastated the economy in September 2008 (European Commission 2016d). Hence, EU suffered the worst recession in its history post WWII (Ibid). Consequently, EU continued to experience crises and nineteen of twenty-eight members endured almost daily turmoil and subsequently it re-entered recession in 2012 and as a consequence in 2013 unemployment rose significantly, particularly among young people (Juncker 2014).

Consequently, since 2010 up to today, it is considered as a challenging period as turbulent years for the union caused by the global economic crisis strikes hard in Europe (Ibid). Climate change remains on the agenda; recently a new security policy was established after the annexation of Crimea by Russia; religious extremism increased in the Middle East and due to conflict in various countries many people were fleeing homes and seeking refuge in Europe (Ibid). The union does not only confront the abovementioned issues but also combats several terrorist attacks on its member states (European Commission 2016;Ibid). The governments of Greece, Ireland and Portugal successively claimed emergency loans from their partners to cover their financing needs and Spain and Italy staggered for many months, “on the brink of requiring similar treatment (Kenealy et al. 2015:4)”. Then, Athens, Lisbon, Rome and Madrid faced street protests in response to teetering economies, “high unemployment, and austerity policies brought to the fore significant issues of legitimacy (Ibid)”. Lastly, given the ‘Brexit’ public consensus in June 2016, mainly due to immigrant flow and constant turmoil of majority EU member states demonstrates the first crack within the union itself (Corporate Author 2016a; Kenealy et al. 2015).

Brief Main EU Governance Concepts: Intergovernmentalism, Supernationalism and MLG

A variety of theories and concepts have been introduced to explain the further developments of EU by scholars and these generally share two main core assumptions; on the one hand, “the initial primacy and ongoing centrality of states as opposed to transnational or supranational actors” and on the other hand, “the assumption that those states and other actors behave as utility maximizing rational actors (Pollack 2012:3)”. Hence, the community and the union can be best conceptualized within two main abstract forms: ‘intergovernmental‘ that stipulates that member states as member states regulate the outcome and decisions are taken by unanimity; where the role of supranational institutions are less prominent and ‘supranational’ that advocates the more supranational institutions of EU; such as The European Commission, the European Parliament and the Courts and member states do not have a veto (Nugent 2010; Cini 2013:72; Pinder and Usherwood 2013:6).

Bogdandy (2012) sees it as a ‘supranational federation’ and hence neither an international organization nor a nation state with its multilateral decision making process. However, White (2001:40) expounds it as an “intergovernmental process” in particular for its foreign policy. Nevertheless, European Commission (2013:3) positions EU as “between the fully federal system found in the United States and the loose, intergovernmental cooperation system seen in the United Nations”. Thus, EU is neither a fully federal system nor an international organization, albeit carrying characteristics of both. Even though Classical Intergovernmentalizm was based upon realist assumptions, “it differed in its concept of the state’” with this conception that states “represent communities of identity and belonging” and it is one of the most

vibrant approaches that “was given further impulse in the 1990’s by the liberal intergovernmentalizm of Andrew Moravsick, which remains influential (Pollack 2012:3; Cini 2016:69)”. Liberal intergovernmentalism’ enlightens governments’ behaviour and explains how the community and the union work (Pinder and Usherwood 2013). It further seeks an explanation of the role of governments and their power of decision in the union’s affairs with their status as the signatories of the Unions’ treaties and “their monopoly of the ultima ratio of armed forces (Ibid:6)”.

Another key concept of EU is the MLG which “…should be located along the intergovernmentalism / supranationalizm dimension”; as power is distributed amongst supranational, national and subnational levels (Pagoulatos and Tsoukalis 2012:65). MLG has difficulty in explaining why European integration happens and progresses but it seeks to understand the nature of EU and its policy making (Ibid). In the MLG perspective, national governments are exclusively limited, as neither the Council nor the treaties provide member states full control over policy-making (Ibid). Additionally, because of the “autonomous function of the EU supranational actors, EU intergovernmental decision-making has often been confronted and derailed by the participation and opposition of a wide range of domestic actors (Ibid)”. Thus, “MLG approaches challenge the primacy of states as key actors in EU politics (Pollack 2012:4;Ibid)”. Hence, “MLG posits that the sovereignty of individual states is diluted both by the collective and decision making process among governments and by the autonomous role of the EP, the Commission, ECJ and ECB (Pagoulatos and Tsoukalis 2012:65).

In empirical terms, the complexity of EU governance concerning the decision making process can lay down major predicaments within the union itself as well as for the union’s external affairs. Consequently, the legitimacy of European governance has

been criticized following inadequacy of “EU’s response to the 2008 banking crisis and the Eurozone’s subsequent debt crisis” and so forth (Christiansen 2013:111). Thus, EU does not only endure relative international crises that have a direct effect on its member states but also tolerates national bailouts of some of its member states.

Broadly, due to the unique way of its MLG, EU policy-making is mostly criticized “on grounds of democracy, transparency and efficiency as a global power but it continues to deliver an impressive amount and array of policy outcomes (Hayes-Renshaw 2015:118)”. Hence, Kenealy (et al. 2015:4) also states that the uninitiated institutions of EU seem remote, “Its remit unclear, and its policies perplexing”. This can be due to its MLG which comprises various socially constructed actors.

EU as a Global Actor and Its Constructed identity as a 'normative power'

The majority of the founders of the original EEC including Jean Monnet had a determination to create a new sort of international power like USA (Peterson and Gottwald 2015; Pinder and Usherwood 2013). Thus, EU's determinations to be a global actor is a consequence of European integration (Peterson and Gottwald 2015). Hence, EU has been promoted by academics in various forms as a civilian power, a military power and a normative power (Bache et al. 2015). Hence, it is not easy to conceptualize its position on the world platform considering its unique complex entity (McCormick 2014).

EU constantly desires to be a "stronger regional and global player" that can, like the United States (US) or China, influence developments anywhere in the world and draw on its full range of economic, political and security instruments (Peterson and Gottwald 2015:209; European Committee 2016)". Its development is formed by increasing the number of players; "28 member states, seven EU institutions including a Central Bank, two consultative bodies with legal status, an External Action Service and an investment Bank" and "a clutch of agencies, and countless private interests, experts, foreign actors and citizen groups" has an impact on what the EU does or not and an influence on EU's contemporary position on the world platform (Kenealy et al. 2015:4).

Wallace (et al. 2015:4) claims that "The Union itself is an increasingly coherent and important actor on the world stage" considering its growth from economic regulation to political and military affairs. However, EU's inefficient response to the majority of international crises as a global actor indicates its decline on the world stage and this

might be due to the significant "...lack of centralized decision making capacity with a single executive" and to the fact that "distinctive national foreign policies endure in Europe besides actors' diverse culture (Smith 2002:4,6;Ibid:209)". Consequently, EU's foreign policy is considered "ambiguous and more outstanding only with its successful enlargement policy (Kirchner and Sperling 2007:217)". Thus, it has been challenging to speak of EU as having a concrete foreign policy like other states (Ibid).

EU works collaboratively with a variety of international organizations and has influence to an extent over organizations such as considering UN General Assembly's implementation of new sustainable development goals with the political support of EU to achieve sustainable development and poverty eradication (Peterson and Gottwald 2015). It remains as the "world's largest donor of development assistance in 2015 (European Committee 2016d;Ibid:208)". Definitely, EU has been more active and has expanded since its origins as its policy remit has stretched to cover "agricultural, monetary, regional, environmental, social, immigration, foreign and security policy" and so on, although it constantly disappoints the expectations as a global actor (Kenealy et al. 2015:4; Peterson and Gottwald 2015:208). As Bache (*et al.*, 2015:511) states, EU is well positioned to promote significant values like democracy and human rights and "this should be the primary foreign policy focus". EU seems widely accepted as a normative power. EU needs certainly to be a normative power, although it might often clash with its principles in practice due to fragmented governance.

Peterson and Gottwald (2015:209); claim that "the EU is a strange and often ineffective global actor". Its ineffectiveness might be due to the existing variety of complexity within the Union itself, particularly regarding distinctive social, economic and political factors. For instance, distinctive national foreign policies are tolerated in

Europe and indicate few signs of vanishing (Ibid). Nevertheless, European Foreign Policy has a reputation in world politics regardless of what EU and its member states do either collectively or at an individual basis (Ibid). The Union's external policy determinations is extended to traditional foreign and security policy "but distinct national policies persist in Europe and the EU suffers from weak or fragmented leadership (Ibid:208)".

EU Power Dynamics

i) Civilian Power

In the 1970's, Francois Duchene (1972:43) called EU a 'civilian power' due to its economic power corresponding with its limited armed forces. It may no longer be reputed as a civilian power to any extent, considering its own economic problems reflecting the nineteen member states' financial turmoil out of twenty eight, even if it is categorised as the world's largest aid donor when considered collectively (European Commission 2015a; Kenealy et al. 2015). Besides that, EU failed to respond adequately to the International Financial Crises which started in the US in early 2007 with the collapse of the subprime mortgage market (Bordo 2008; European Commission 2014). Therefore, EU's re-recession experience in 2012 and aforementioned difficulties indicate that EU cannot be considered as a civilian power (Ibid).

ii) Military Power

Salmon and Shepherd (2003) argue EU is a military power considering its progress of ESDP. However, EU may not be classified as a military power, as it holds no hard power nor military materials (Smith 2016). Hence, the majority of "EU states have long accepted the supremacy of NATO on defence matters" and considerably counts on NATO in terms of security and defence issues, despite its existing CFS (Peterson and Geddes 2015:195). The crisis demonstrated below indicates that EU hardly holds a military power and is apparently unlikely to become one. It had several chances to use its military power although it did not please see instances below.

In 1999, EU's response to the war between Kosovo and Serbia can be considered as a diplomatic failure, which was resolved with NATO's military intervention (Malcolm 1998; Corporate Author 2016b). The policy and capability of EU developments indicate that Kosovo was 'a milestone in the history of the EU' indeed as this crisis acted as a 'decisive catalyst for the continuing transformation' of the EU's global role (Shepherd 2009). Incidents in Kosovo at that time confirmed that the EU was not ready and was unable to prevent or end violent conflict within Europe. Since then, EU has taken considerable steps in improving its security capabilities, working in collaboration with NATO, and with UN particularly in conflict management although it still remains ineffective (Ibid; European Council 2015a).

From 2003 to 2011, EU's response to war in Iraq is also considered as another political failure where the brutal authoritarian government of Saddam Hussein collapsed by the American invasion of Iraq that unleashed a vast sectarian civil war (Wong 2008; Crowe 2003). Crowe (2003:546) states that CFSP "could be doomed to perpetual ineffectiveness, thereby ensuring that the large member states conducted their major policies outside the EU—inevitably less effectively than if they acted together, as the Iraq crisis has shown".

iii) Normative Power

The relatively recent term 'normative power' was initially coined by Ian Manners in 2002, in which a created set of norms and values specific to EU are embedded, and has been influential in academia (Forsberg 2011:1184). European Commission (2016a) explicitly lists those core values as "human rights both internally and around the world, human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights". Manners (2008) clarifies how the EU promotes the aforementioned

principles through its actions and policies in its relationships with external parties through persuasion and imprisonment.

Universal norms determine the forms of normative power, like 'Europeanisation', it arises in the form of ideas, values and policies (De Zutter 2010). EU have managed to create a normative identity by promoting those principles through regional agreements, treaties and conventions and those can be found explicitly in the following: the TEU (1992), the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997), European Convention on Human Rights (1953), Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000) (Wallace et al. 2015). For instance, the Lisbon Treaty article 3, elaborates the union's norms and standards "In its relations with the wider world, the Union shall uphold and promote its values and interests and contribute to the protection of its citizens. It shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples, free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and the development of international law, including respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter (European Commission 2007)".

Besides those, the Copenhagen criteria Article 49 and Article 6 require candidates to adopt values such as "guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities (European Commission 2016a)". In fact, the criteria with their obligatory values to be adopted also hint at EU's sanctioning power and great influence over its prospective candidates besides member states.

Due to EU's constituted significant position on the world stage, the Union faces high expectations in dealing with global matters effectively. Therefore, many criticize its actions towards international crises. As (Sjursen 2006) states, there might be a

normative dimension to foreign policy, albeit it is tricky to imply and question the legitimacy of the EU's norms with regard to putative normative power. It is clear that EU's normative power identity only works in theory even if it is broadly desired to work in practice.

a) In 2010-2011 EU failed to respond to the Arab Spring which started in 2010 with the first demonstrations in Tunisia (Dias 2016; European Commission 2015b). Before the Arab Spring, EU assumed it could endorse "political reform through economic liberalization", which approach proved ineffective due to the fact that the EU's response to the Arab Spring has generated limited results and did not follow Its principles of democratic change (Burke 2013:1). European funds are overextended albeit North African agricultural exports remain unwelcome in Europe and security concerns often undermine concern for democracy (Ibid). A reasonable approach to reform in the southern neighborhood is required, so that EU considers different circumstances in each of the countries and it "should invest in civil service reform, education, judicial reform, a regional free-trade agreement and building security relations across the region (Ibid)". It should also "increase its democracy assistance to the region through training and capacity-building" and if it desires to remain a credible actor, "Brussels should only fund democracy promotion in those countries where reforms are happening (Ibid)". Furthermore, Peterson and Gottwald (2015:219) state that the Union's response to the 2011 Libyan Crisis was mostly considered as "incoherent and ineffective" when the Libyan dictator, Muammar al-Gaddafi, threated to initiate a bloodbath against his own people.

b) In 2014 after the Arab Spring failure, EU remained unable to respond effectively when Russia occupied the Ukrainian region of Crimea in 2014, “adopting sanctions that many considered timid” (Ibid:210). Europeans have explicitly been criticised for their timorous reaction to the Russian intervention in Crimea (Mearsheimer 2014). The differences amongst the manner of EU member states towards Russia and the weak authority of EU institutions, have proven failed attempts to implement significant sanctions against Moscow (MacFarlane and Menon 2014;Ibid).

c) EU’s response can also be considered as a failure to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict peacefully for long, due to its policy in the field, particularly the framework of economic development which in consequence “subordinates the economy to a political process that has become stalled and dysfunctional (Abdel-sha 2015:3)”. Palestine has received more than €6 billion EU funding since 1994 as an official ENP country “..But neither has Europe’s vision of helping Palestinian economic development been realized, nor have its interests been met in ensuring the security of Israel or advancing stability in the region (Ibid:2)“. Status quo policies by EU mean Gaza is descending gradually “into its living hell on earth and with it further diminishes the international political reputation of Europe and the West, thence its capacity to influence the world, as its actions are in such blatant contradiction to its principled declarations (Emerson et al. 2009:3)”.

d) EU’s response to the contemporary Syrian Refugee crisis can be considered insufficient and inefficient even reflecting all the attempts and initiatives of

international efforts which will be analysed in more depth in Chapter 3 (Kingsley and Rankin 2016). EU's initiated negotiations with third world countries such as Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey to block the flow of the refugees towards EU, which are poorer and worse equipped to offer sufficient help than EU (Pfohman 2015; European Commission 2016f). Shifting the responsibility for refugees and migrants from EU to poorer non-EU countries can emphasize the image of Europe as being "elderly and haggard, feeling less and less a protagonist in the world (Ibid)". Consequently, many people urge EU Ministers to ensure that the reception standards are in conformity with human rights standards and provide a long-term solution (Ibid).

e) EU attempted to change the totalitarian state of North Korea through diplomacy but the situation remains unresolvable (Corporate Author 2015c). The authoritarian state "stands accused of systematic human rights abuses", as Amnesty International reports that numerous people "are held in detention facilities, in which it says that torture is rampant and execution commonplace (Ibid)".

f) Finally, in 2015 EU's response to the coup attempt in Turkey was also considered as a failure, which generated mistrust of the current government to its European allies due to lack of support (Corporate Author 2016c). Despite this, "The EU will nevertheless continue to insist that the rule of law is respected" with its constituted identity as a normative power, democracy and human rights promoter (Ibid).

Chapter 2: THEORETICAL FORMATIONS IN IR

This chapter explores tenets of both TEST and Constructivism in IR as both theories will be used to frame the case study in Chapter 3. Please see Appendix B for the brief terminology of IR theories that would ease understanding of the theories with given sophisticated terms. The chapter structure is detailed is as follows:

Firstly, a brief IR background is provided in chronological order to inform the reader about the origins of the theories as almost all are interlinked and inspired by the former theory (Jackson and Sørensen 2007). That is to avoid any potential misinterpretation amongst the other theories like TEST as combination of mainstream theories namely; liberalism and realism and with their neo-neo variants as known neoliberalism and neorealism so the reader is informed briefly about the basic assumptions of those theories (Ibid).

Secondly, TEST's tenets are provided in detail with its brief origins which is fundamental as it would be used to frame the case study later in Chapter 3.

Thirdly, constructivism and its tenets are detailed with its background that is significant as it is the second theory to be utilized to frame the case study as well.

The last part of this chapter will compare and contrast both TEST and constructivist approach in IR to highlight the differences between theories with their core assumptions and limitations.

Brief IR Background

The contemporary discipline of IR dates back to the establishment of a Chair in International Politics at the University of Aberystwyth in Wales in 1919 following the end of World War I (WWI) in 1918 (Armstrong 2014; Dunne et al. 2007). The Chair's purpose was to study the origins of war and to attempt to prevent another possible future Great War (Ibid). The relationships of states and their impact on issues of war, peace, justice and trade were pursued and practised by philosophers, diplomats, interwar thinkers, scholars, economists and academicians who had a wide range of different views and covered different aspects of the examination of the cases by theorizing them through either criticism or at an explanatory level (Burchill et al. 2009; Linklater 2009).

The mainstream theories that were largely accepted in the 20th century by two continents, in Europe and in America namely, are known as Classical Liberalism (CL), Classical Realism (CR) and their neo-neo variants (Jackson and Sørensen 2016; Armstrong 2014). After the failure of CL which failed to protect its promise of peace due to the shattering World War II (WWII), CR arose as a reaction (Ibid). Afterwards, both theories were further developed by introducing their neo-neo variants (Ibid). CL from the enlightenment period is called ‘‘utopian' ‘or ‘idealist' and is concerned with trade, institutions, cooperation and human rationality viz. how humans interact to have a mutual gain and common interests, mainly economic (Dunne 2014). It posits cooperation to prosper economically together. Whereas CL also deals with the problem of the state of nature or anarchy in international relations through international law, international rules and institutions, CR is sceptical of the cooperative aspect of human nature and is concerned more with power, interests,

self-preservation and security matters (Dunne and Schmidt 2014; Burchill et al. 2009).

Briefly the key differences between classical liberalism and classical realism versus their neo-variants are due to their ontological and epistemological assumptions (Ibid). For the ontological difference, Neo-neo variants focus more on the structures of an international system rather than the actors or internal affairs of the states. As for the epistemological difference of CL and CR versus neo-neo, the principal one is that they study the political world like the natural world (Ibid). Thus, neo-neo theories are a product of the positivist trend in political science whereas CL and CR focus on questions of philosophy such as questioning the state of nature (Jackson and Sørensen 2016). These are philosophical concepts rather than systematic theories and rules that govern politics. Neo-neo variants were inspired by the natural sciences and economics and thus are more scientific and systematic (Ibid). As economics is one of the success stories of positivism, IR scholars pursued positivism (Ibid). Neo-neo variants aim to find predictable rules and behaviour in international politics (Ibid).

TEST

One of the mainstream theories of International Relations is TEST that dates back to the beginning of the 1950's and was misinterpreted and ignored initially because it was seen as a straight variant of realism, even though, in fact, it has more in common with neoliberalism rather than neorealism (Dunne et al. 2007). The theory can be perceived as an attempt at reconciliation of mainstream theories with a more sociological account of International Relations that brings in non-material factors such as values and norms into the explanations of international relations, rather than just focusing on material interests and power like (neo) liberalism and (neo) realism and the main distinction of its epistemological aspect with neo variants can be reckoned as a post-positivist approach, since interests now encompass the non-material element of value (Burchill et al. 2009).

TEST places more emphasis on structures as well as actors and creates a world society to maintain peace and its stress is on main actors like states and also International organizations like non-governmental such as the Red Cross, Oxfam and governmental organizations such as the United Nations and non-state actors like ISIS and activists. States' behaviour is determined by values and norms in an anarchic world (Ibid). Anarchy is governed by non-materialistic and qualitative factors such as Ideas, norms and values (Dunne et al. 2007; Burchill et al. 2009).Although one of the TEST's ontological assumptions as anarchism, it challenges a great degree of order and lack of violent conflict in contemporary world affairs and as a solution(Ibid). Martin Wight identified three sets of traditions in IR scholarship and that combination is called 'via media' (in-between) (Dunne et al. 2016; Burchill et al. 2009).This combination includes realism associated with power politics; rationalism with cooperation and lastly revolutionism with creation of a new peaceful 'utopian'

and perpetual idea in international order (Ibid). Basically, this set of tradition picks the good points of both theories of realism and liberalism and combines them, although one cannot exist without the other, i.e. cooperation and prosperity cannot exist without security and one cannot have security without cooperation with states abiding by international law and norms (Burchill et al. 2009:88;Ibid). Hence, diplomacy can be the solution in an anarchic world.

Hedley Bull (1977:22) is one of the key modern TEST theorists and a student of Martin Wight who advances his arguments as he developed the idea of order and acknowledged that ‘’order is part of the historical record of international relations; modern states have formed, and continue to form, not only a system of states but also an international society’’. Some scholars did not realize that some sort of order always existed and it could be traced back to the medieval period and it was a Christian order at that time (Ibid). After the Enlightenment it was a European dominated order and following modernity it is a global order, which is dominated by the West (Ibid). International order has moral value since it is influential to the goal of order in human society, highlighting that order still exists while there is anarchy and maintained by shared moral values even if no state is in charge (Bull 1977; Wendt 1992). Hence, the anarchic system is an anarchic society indeed, an international community bound together by shared morality and intelligence (Ibid). The concern of order is contested and states have the value of preserving order in addition to power politics (Ibid). Order is the main target of states guiding international politics and it can be either considered as peace for the liberals or balance of power for the neorealist (Ibid). Order can be clarified as states keen to pursue some sort of stability. Non-material concepts such as justice and law can only develop once there is order as indicated by Wight: ‘’the fundamental political task at all times [is] to

provide order, or security, from which law, justice and prosperity may afterwards develop (Wight 1977:192)".

Bull (1977) advanced methods of surviving for states in an anarchic world both in realists' balance of power and self-preservation and in liberals' cooperation through the idea of transforming peace into an international level from the domestic level of society by considering the state of nature and developing norms and values which then generate international society.

International politics are recently governed by states albeit it is assumed to be inconsistent as the international society is recognized as a relationship amongst all humans not amongst states (Dunne et al. 2007). Hence, although states seem the main actor recently, nonetheless individuals matter. The main goals of all societies can be signified as follows: the sanctity of promises and limitation of violence, the upholding of property rights such as mutual recognition of sovereignty, while the main goals of international society can be illuminated as preservation of international society and the maintenance of independence such as sovereignty of states and peace (Burchill et al. 2009; Dunne et al. 2016).

In contrast to the assumptions of realism, the international system elaborates much more order than realists are willing to admit (Dunne et al. 2007). Thus, TEST submits that states mostly abide by international norms or laws, even though they cannot be prosecuted whereas realists are pessimistic about this (Ibid). Consequently, states are dependent on international norms and laws to an extent. In comparison with Liberalism and its conviction of ineradicable violence due to constant presence of some form of power politics so it does not admit a successful creation of international society, neither does realism (Ibid).

Nevertheless, TEST's paradox is about maintaining peace, although one may have to go to war to preserve peace. Due to this puzzle TEST is divided into two visions: firstly, pluralist which stresses preserving the cooperation framework by mutual respect and acceptance of differences which advocates non-intervention with the view that states preserve the self-government and stresses the importance of state sovereignty within this international society, and international society is an ideal solution to the problem of order in a cosmopolitan world and its missions consist of separation and reinforce the units in a state system. Secondly, the solidarists believe that it is the international society's responsibility to protect the population within the 'failed state' through intervention (Burchill et al. 2009; Dunne et al. 2016). So, it promotes the collective enforcement of a new standard of ethics akin to respect for human rights (Linklater 2009). The solidarist vision could be considered as Western powers' attempt to dominate and to push their culture. International society presents prospective to advance in a more multicultural direction towards world society such as the United Nations, partly a solidarist society (Burchill et al. 2009;Ibid). Human rights violators can appeal to the United Nations Charter ''(Article 2, paragraph 7)'' which states that the international community does not have the right ''to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state (Burchill et al. 2009:104)". Hence, the UN Charter preserves national sovereignty by siding with the pluralists, whereas the fairly recent document of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) sides with the solidarist, as it is a reflective redefinition of sovereignty from something presumed to something earned through responsible governance implying that sovereignty ought to be gained by being a good state and the countries that are unable to protect human rights and provide inadequate social care are considered as failed states **(**Ibid). This is how humanitarian intervention progressed as a concept

(Ibid). TEST impediments are due to loose international law and its principles (Jackson and Sørensen 2007). Hence, humanitarian intervention remains as an ethical dilemma as interventions in states based on humanitarian reasons can be abused for non-humanitarian purposes.

Social Constructivism

The revival of Constructivist thinking was augmented by the end of the Cold War, as the main stream IR theory had difficulty to explain the end of the Cold War with the collapse of the neorealist idea of balance of power (Barnett 2014). Thus the majority of scholars condemned rationalist/materialist approaches, viz. neo-neo variants, as they study the social phenomena like natural phenomena with a positivist epistemology and as a consequence an ideational and holistic approach to international politics was initiated (Wendt 1999).Constructivism as a term first entered the thesaurus of IR in the late 1980's and was applied initially to both modern and post-modern approaches, which shared an assumption that the political world is a social and constructed phenomenon as opposed to a given and objective one (Fierke 2001).Hence, it is important to distinguish Social Constructivism as a meta-theoretical approach across social sciences and Social Constructivism in IR. Social Constructivism is a meta-theoretical approach in social sciences by theorists who make a critique of foundationalist ontologies and positivist epistemology by reasoning that one cannot study social phenomena with positivist epistemology; e.g. a tree does not change its behaviour when scientifically classified, whereas in social life, once people's identity is labelled (Barnett 2014). It changes one's behaviour against those people and also those people's behaviour in return (Ibid). Thus, it posits that there is no 'universal' or 'absolute' truth and reality is socially constructed; through interaction, practice and history, not objective but intersubjective (Jackson and Sørensen 2007;Ibid). Social Constructivism in IR applies the same ontology and epistemology to understand the international order in contrast to rationalist/positivist (materialism) approaches, whose adherents believe international relations are driven

by material factors such as measurement of power, the distribution/balance of power and anarchic structure, whereas for social constructivists, international relations and states' behaviour are driven by social factors such as ideas, norms, values, perceptions and identities, thus employing post positivist epistemology (Wendt 1999; Dunne et al. 2016).Hence, the main contributions of social constructivists moved the debate of IR from explaining to understanding the different concepts of international relations though still seeking some sort of predictability in the IR field (Ibid).

There are two basic tenets of 'constructivism' that are gradually accepted by scholars: "(1) the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and (2) that "the identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature (Wendt 1999:1)". The first represents an "idealist" approach to social life and the second one is a "structuralist" approach, as it stresses the "emergent powers of social structures which oppose the 'individualist' view that social structures are reducible to individuals (Ibid)". Therefore, constructivism could be considered as "structural idealism" (Ibid).

Constructivism commences with deeds; "Deeds done, acts taken, words spoken-these are all that facts are (Onuf 1989:36)". Simply put, in the 'world of our making' "people and societies constitute each other" continuously and reciprocally. Thus, they are the product of the other's construction (Ibid). Therefore, "the human world is not simply given and/or natural but that, on the contrary, the human world is one of artifice that is constructed through the actions of the actors themselves' (Kratochwil 2001:17)". Onuf (1989:43) states the fact that "We are always within our constructions, even as we choose to stand apart from them, condemn them,

reconstruct them" might be due to the fact that the human world is "the result of constructed praxis (Kratochwil 2001:17)".

Alexander Wendt is one of the key authors of Social Constructivism and well-known for his article of "Anarchy is what states make of it (Fierke 2001)". In this article, he investigates the social construction of anarchy as a concept that dominated the debate between realists and liberalists and explains that anarchy is not a natural state of the international system, which is neither conflict nor co-operation. These structures that determine state behaviour are socially constructed (Ibid). He introduced the notion of identity as a key factor influencing state behaviour and identities are considered the basis of interest (Ibid). Thus, identities and interests and perceptions of states such as 'friends' or 'foes' are socially constructed (Finnemore 1996;Ibid).

The notion of 'othering' is also presented by constructivists as the act of constructing artificial relationships of similarity and difference among people like the case theme in 'War on Terror', where interested agents constructed the notions of the West versus radical Islam/terrorists/the Middle East (Burchill et al. 2009; Dunne et al. 2016). It is important to recognize how "people and nations manipulate language to "construct" themselves (Kowert 1998:105)". Identity occurs through the "distinguishing" function of language as "language- directives and commissives in particular – and it also depends on the identities of self and other (Ibid)". Language is utilized as a social mechanism that produces and reinforces meaning and identity, though it can be manipulated by speakers, particularly with those with power (Ibid). Language can be considered as the repository of what exists (Ibid). The basis of sociality is considered as shared knowledge, which leads to an idealist view of structure as a "distribution of knowledge (Wendt 1999:20)". "The processes of communication is a process of

making sense" as "...Speaking is doing is knowing" and communication and knowledge are considered as a social act (Kowert 1998:104). Also, "Possibilities and power are intersubjectively constituted and made meaningful through language (Fierke 2001:117)". As Onuf (1989:237) clarifies the term "power" by referring to the capabilities implemented in conduct.

Despite the existence of international law and institutions, the ability of this superstructure to counter the material base of power and interest is considered limited (Ibid). This implies that the international system is not a very 'social' place, as it provides intuitive support for materialism in that field (Ibid). On the construction side, "the primary actors in international politics, states, are much more autonomous from the social system in which they are embedded (Ibid)". The foreign policy behaviour is often determined largely by domestic politics, "the analogue to individual personality, rather than by the international society (Ibid)". Furthermore, points of consensus are about "its boundaries of possibility within any given context and how particular acts, including how material resources will be put to use, are constituted as meaningful and therefore reasonable (Fierke 2001:118)". It is more likely "the nature of the policy process is affected by the identity of the actors involved" and, as a consequence, inconsistent policy can occur and can also hinder the decision making process (White 2001:40). Implementation problems often occur during the final stage of the policy making process on "how decisions are translated into behaviour and action" and how to get things effectively done (Ibid:53).

Furthermore, Wendt (1999) explains the cyclical, mutually reinforcing relationship of structure and agency as an ontological debate. Agency can be considered as the act of doing things, like any actor that has power to change the structures or social movements and actors can be considered as individuals, international institutions or

states (Wight 2006;Ibid). Many classical theorists are structure focused, whereas constructivists tend to focus more on agency (Dunne et al. 2016). States change and construct the structures of identity through their interaction, which in turn influence the way agents interact (Wendt 1999; Fierke 2001). His approach to structure and agency does not prefer one over the other and explains the transformation in international relations as structure-oriented approaches viz. structural (neo) realism or liberal institutionalism struggled with. However, Wendt also highlights that "System change ultimately happens through states" and places more importance on agency and their actions than structures created by agency which then become institutionalized (Wendt 1999:9). EU can be considered as "an instituion which is a process of internalizing new identities and interests (Wendt 1992; Jones 2007:51)". Agents do the ruling by getting other agents to accept their ideas and beliefs, indeed as it is done by example and by "indoctrination" and this form of rule is considered as hegemony as states desire "power, security and wealth (Onuf 1998:75; Finnemore 1996:1)". Hence, States are socialized to desire "certain things by the international society in which they and the people in them live (Finnemore 1996:2)". They are not only socially constructed but also historically contingent "because they are intersubjective and collectively held, norms are often the subject of discussion among actors (Ibid)". Actors may specifically articulate norms in justifying actions, or they may call upon norms to persuade others to act (Ibid:24)". The values are exemplified in the norms described (Ibid).

International regimes are assumed to consist of "principles, rules, norms, and procedures (Onuf 1998:70)". Norms are considered the law (Finnemore 1996:2). Therefore, "..rules say what they say, and institutions are slow to change, because

agents make rational choices in circumstances that always give the advantage to some agents over others (Onuf 1998:75)". Therefore, "fundamental change of the international system occurs when actors, through their practices, change the rules and norms constitutive of international interaction (Zehfuss 2001:63)". Anarchy is considered as a "rule by no one in particular, and therefore by everyone in association, as an unintended consequence of their many, uncoordinated acts (Onuf 1998:77)". Thus, states should be the primary unit of analysis to study the global regulation of violence (Wendt 1999). Gradually, "the international social structure has also privileged claims of human equality (Finnemore 1996:28)". World politics is considered closely bound up with "the concepts through which we observe it (Wendt 1999:38)". The cases of humanitarian protection and poverty alleviation examine norms which can be considered ethically "good" (Finnemore 1996:32). However, "there is nothing inherently "good" about social norms" as "social norms can prescribe ethically reprehensible behaviour - slavery, violence, intolerance, as well as charity and kindness (Ibid)". Hence, concepts about who is human and deserving of protection and concepts about legitimate intervention are socially constructed (Ibid). Living in an international society means that "what we want and, in some ways, who we are is shaped by the social norms, rules, understandings, and relationship we have with others (Ibid:128)".

Social reality is generated through interactions and behaviour, and the normative aspect of social institutions and their morality can be questioned as all constructed by agency which is continuous and reciprocal (Zehfuss 2001). Thus, "the normative context also changes over time, and as internationally held norms and values change (Finnemore 1996 :2)".

The “logic of appropriateness” contrasts with a “logic of consequences (such as that embodied in utility maximization) in ways important to the research here (Finnemore 1996:29:30)”. The first is determined by social structure (Ibid). “Social structures of norms and rules govern the kinds of action that will be contemplated and taken” which also express responsibilities and obligations, thus determining who will contemplate and take action (Ibid). The logic of consequences is determined by agents (Ibid). Actors attempts to maximize utilities through strategies (Ibid). Norms, rules, and routines will be generated as part of this process albeit these tend to serve the interests of powerful actors (Ibid).

Materialists and idealists are more likely to grasp the impact of ideas differently, “as materialists privilege causal relationships, effects, and questions, whereas idealists privilege constitutive relationships, effects,and questions (Wendt 1999:25)”. Systemic theories explain international politics regarding “structure” of the international system, while reductionist theories explain international politics regarding the properties and interactions of “agents” (Ibid:12). Rationalist approaches have been utilized in the service of agentic theories in which “agents are states and interests are some combination of military security and wealth (Finnemore 1996:28)”. TES and the sociological institutionalists discuss that the extensive power of the West and its notions of rationality are the grounds of an international social structure (Ibid). Neo-realists claim that anarchy “predicts little about state behaviour, and it does not predict whether states will be friends or foes, will recognize each other’s sovereignty, will have dynastic ties, will be revisionist or status quo powers, and so on” as “anarchy and distribution of power are insufficient to tell us which is which (Wendt 1992:396,37)”.

TEST versus Social Constructivism

The ontological difference amongst TEST and Constructivism is that TEST posits non-material factors but gives more importance to structure, while constructivism holds that structure and agency mutually reinforce each other and some constructivists place more weight on agency (Wendt 1999). Neo-realists view the structure of the international system as a distribution of material capabilities due to their approach with a materialist lens, and Neoliberals view it as capabilities and institutional superstructure, and Constructivists view it as a distribution of ideas due to their idealist ontology (Ibid). "In the long run empirical work might indicate the best concept, "but the "observation" of unobservables is always theoryladen, involving an inherent gap between theory and reality (the underdetermination of theory by data) (Ibid:5)". "Neither constructivism nor rational choice provides substantive explanations of international political behaviour until coupled with some theoretical understanding of who or what are relevant agents and structures as well as some empirical understanding of what those agents might be (Finnemore 1996:28)". Furthermore, TEST posits that non-material factors such as norms and values are determinants of the states' behaviour whereas constructivist stretches it over as social factors such as ideas, norms, values, perceptions and identities, and both encompass post positivist epistemology (Burchill et al. 2009).

With regard to constructivist perspectives of European integration, it is true that "intersubjective context of negotiations and decision making in EU affects integration outcomes (Schimmelfennig 2012:36)". Article 237 of The Rome Treaty that underlines the fact that any European State can become a member of the Community (Juncos and Borragan 2013). The European state like entity can be

intersubjectively constructed and can be privileged countries and those countries which have been labelled as European already initiate 'othering' and marginalize people through laws and norms (Ibid:229). For instance, the proposed membership of Morocco in 1987 was declined as it was not considered as a European state whereas Turkey and Cyprus did not face such a barrier and not yet accepted but remain under consideration, albeit neither Turkey nor Cyprus are geographically located within Europe just like Morocco (European Commission 2016d;Ibid:229). Identity matters as Morocco has an identity but also multi-layered actors that hold power influence the decision of the candidate country's eligibility. Furthermore, this sort of marginalizing damages EU's identity and image on the world stage. Another instance which can be considered to damage EU's identity is its distinctive reaction between Kosovo's migrants in 1999 and contemporary Syrian migrants, majority EU countries strong willingness demonstrated to welcome Kosovars even if Kosovo Officials voiced concern that majority of refugees might not return to Kosovo when the crisis was over, whereas EU's strong attempt to prevent migrants flow from Syria cannot be disregarded (Corporate Author 1999; Corporate Author 2015b).This might be due to Kosovo citizen's constructed identity from the Europeans' perspective. However, EU society could not handle the Syrian refugee crisis the same way as other countries such Kosovo. The EU's reaction, collectively or not, differs not only depending on the circumstances of each case but also depends on that specific country's identity, albeit the EU's identity as a normative power which holds strong position as a democracy, human rights, equality promoter also get damaged due to such contradictions with its principles.

Europeans do not necessitate a common identity to promote European integration as "Europeans should accept that they will be different –from one another and from new

arrivals as well as outside the world as far as “they live in peace and prosperously and not what they call each other or themselves (Jones 2012:699)”.

Jones (2012 :694) concerns over EU for being “a community in which only a handful of Europeans participate” which implies ‘othering’ arbitrarily and does not seem in conformity with EU’s ‘utopian’ principles. He identified “The notion of identity as causality derives from the study of nationalism (Ibid:691)”. Hence, common identity might generate European ‘xenophobia’ and ‘othering’ (Ibid).

Chapter 3: Findings and Analysis of the Case: Syrian Conflict

This chapter is significant as it analyses findings of the dissertation overall and investigates particularly how Turkey-EU negotiated over the contemporary Syrian refugee crises; by fleshing out all the recent summits chronologically, which will be framed through the lenses of TEST and Social Constructivism. The chapter structure is detailed is as follows:

Firstly, origins of the crisis will be explored to grasp the cause of the issue.

Secondly, Turkey-EU negotiation over the crisis will be briefly provided including Turkey-EU relations background.

Thirdly, Turkey-EU summits over the crisis will be investigated through the summits after providing how EU initiated and when for the crisis resolution.

Fourthly, findings will be framed through both theories TEST and Social Constructivism, comparing and contrasting of theories in order to express how each theory can explain the case from different perspectives within their certain limitations.

Finally, EU's code of conduct over the crisis will be discussed further due to it becoming concerned about the crisis only after affecting EU; its capacity and willingness.

Syria Conflict Origins

The Syrian refugee crisis commenced in 2011 following the citizens' anti government demonstration that increased the government's violent suppression. As a consequence prodemocracy protesters initiated fighting back against the regime, resulting in a horrifying civil war following the rise of rebels and unexpected ISIS and the death toll is estimated at '250.000' so far (Corporate Author 2016d).

Hence, a great number of Syrian citizens started fleeing to other securer states and the majority have targeted EU countries and have taken drastic life risks to be able to settle in one of the stable countries with their families (Corporate Author 2015a). The reason Syrian refugees target EU countries may be because of EU's constituted identity as a normative power and they believe that this sphere is the only democratic place where they would be welcomed, respected and secured. Nevertheless, the increase in the number of Syrian refugees in Europe has turned out to be problematic and caused disturbance which should not happen considering EU's identity as a normative power with its relative core principles of human rights and democracy (Manners 2008; European Commission 2016d). Therefore, EU announced emergency talks to deal with the escalating migration crisis and has started working in collaboration, particularly with the following countries namely: Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan to block the flow of refugees to EU states (European Commission 2016e;Ibid).

Turkey-EU Negotiation over the Syrian Refugee Crisis

Turkey's association with the young EEC traces back to 1959, as it considered one of the first countries to seek close cooperation (European Delegation 2016).

This cooperation was settled in the framework of an "association agreement", called the Ankara agreement, that was signed in 1963 to establish a "Customs Union" so that "Turkey could trade goods and agricultural products with EEC countries without restrictions (Ibid)". Following on Turkey's application, submission for full membership to join EEC that was the predecessor of EU in 1987, its accession negotiations started in 2005 (Ibid). Since then, Turkey and EU negotiation over the Syrian refugee crisis can be considered a turning point in history for Turkey's relationship with EU as it re-energised and accelerated Turkey's accession process (European Council 2016a).

Balkir and Williams (1993:3) highlights that "Turkey's relationships with Europe are long-rooted whether looked at in terms of trade, military power, culture or diplomacy" and the relationships have been significant in shaping the evolutions of Europe and European states as well as of Turkey itself. Hence, EU plays a major role shaping the Turkish foreign policy, due to the fact that Turkey is a EU member candidate and must to obey its rules and regulations that are implemented through EU's sanction policy instruments (European Commission 2016e; European Committee 2016c).

Owing to contemporary refugee crisis that has affected EU immensely, EU has accelerated its relationship with Turkey promptly by providing some sort of incentives and in return has agreed to quicken Turkey's EU membership negotiations in order to protect its borders by preventing and limiting refugees' entrance through Turkey (Corporate Author 2015b). This deal has been criticized widely, particularly by

UNHCR for explicit violation of human rights as EU's code of conduct does not conform with its normative principles (Spindler and Clayton 2016).

The unexpected refugee crisis has facilitated both Turkey and EU to hasten their relations in putative mutually beneficial terms, where particular conditions apply for both countries (Corporate Author 2015b). Consequently, Turkey gets certain promises, terms and conditions to accelerate EU membership by implementing EU's current policies and receives an aid as an incentive of 3 billion euros, while in return EU aims to keep the Syrian refugees off its borders (Ibid).

Turkey-EU Summits over the Syrian Cause

EU's initial Meeting for the Crisis initiated on 16 and 17 November 2015, Brussels EU ministers discussed Syria with UN Special Envoy Staffan de Mistura, including the recent developments, considering current diplomatic efforts, consisting of the discussions in Vienna on 23 October and 14 November (European Council 2015a). The High Representative Mogherini emphasized the sense of urgency for Europe to find a political solution to the Syrian Conflict with best conditions for defeating Da'esh (Ibid). In this meeting, the Council discussed migration, after the Valetta Summit on migration held on 11 and 12 and November and cooperation with Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon was discussed with various dimensions, going beyond the issue of refugees and the management of refugee flows and borders (Ibid). EU has been the leading humanitarian contributor in response to the Syria crisis and targeted to gather the opposition groups to the table to start the political transition in Syria (Ibid).

This 2015 meeting is important as diplomacy initiatives were taken to find the solution for the conflict in Syria and it was discussed how to cooperate with Turkey. However, even if the humanitarian level and gathering opposition groups have been discussed, there has been no further step taken to solve the conflict. Furthermore, EU defence ministers and NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg emphasized the need to do more in terms of capacity building to prevent and manage crises (Ibid). This meeting indicates that EU evidently failed to predict the extent of the refugee crisis and was entirely unprepared to cope with the huge transition of populace.

29th November 2015 Summit

The meeting of EU leaders and Turkish counterparts was held on 29 November 2015 in Brussels where Turkey and EU committed to overcome the common challenges (European Council 2015b). The meeting was a significant step towards resolution of the Syrian refugee crisis and as a consequence a 'Joint Action Plan' was activated to progress their cooperation for support of Syrians under temporary protection and migration management to address the crisis generated by the situation in Syria as well as re-energizing Turkey's agreed accession process (Ibid).

In this meeting, EU committed to support Turkey with certain incentives such as visa liberalization for Turkish citizens in the Schengen zone, initial financial aid of three billion euros and humanitarian assistance in order to keep the refugees off its borders (Ibid). In other words, the influx of irregular migrants would be stemmed (Ibid), once the requirements are met by Turkish counterpart (Ibid). It is clear that diplomacy has been utterly used between Turkey and EU leaders to solve the crisis when both sides negotiated on the basis of mutual benefit where EU targets to keep the refugees off its borders and Turkey gets certain incentives with the condition of fulfilling EU's requirements.

"Both sides agree that the Turkey-EU readmission agreement will become fully applicable from June 2016 "and consequently agreed to cooperate actively on migrants to prevent travel to Turkey and EU for those who are not in need of international protection and to return those rapidly to their country of origin (Ibid). However, no criteria have been set or mentioned on how to differentiate people who do not need international protection (Ibid).

Furthermore, it has been acknowledged that “Turkey hosts more than 2.2 million Syrians and as it has spent 8 billion US Dollars” (Ibid). Syrians still seek to move EU states which can trigger various reasons; either Turkey’s capacity and capabilities are not adequate to host vast numbers of refugees or attraction of EU’s identity that attracts some refugees even if it is on at the risk of their life (Ibid).

07th March 2016 Summit

Following the summit in November 2015 where Turkey-EU relationship was strengthened and the Joint Action plan was launched, EU leaders held the second meeting on 7 March 2016 with Turkey to reinforce their cooperation on the migration and refugee crisis and to achieve concrete results, as it was highlighted that despite the small progress, the number of illegal entries from Turkey to Greece still remained high (Ibid). Then, Turkey committed to accept in implementing the bilateral Greek-Turkish readmission agreement to accept the immediate return of all migrants coming from Turkey to Greece that are not considered in need of international protection for those crossing from Turkey into Greece and to take back all irregular migrants detained on Turkish waters (European Council 2016c; European Council 2016b). The implementation of the Turkey-EU joint action plan and basis of the principles is discussed (Ibid).

Also, it is reported that NATO activity is very important in the Aegean Sea to stem migrant crossings (Ibid). It seems UN counts on NATO and this demonstrates its inadequate capacity to solve the crisis.

This meeting does not determine any new commitments on member states regarding relocation and resettlement (Ibid). Though some broader proposals for migration crisis were agreed on to work on details mutually to ensure those abide by European and International law as follows (European Council 2016c).

- “to return all new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey into the Greek islands with the costs covered by the EU;

- to resettle, for every Syrian readmitted by Turkey from Greek islands, another Syrian from Turkey to the EU Member States, within the framework of the existing commitments;

- to accelerate the implementation of the visa liberalization roadmap with all Member States with a view to lifting the visa requirements for Turkish citizens at the latest by the end of June 2016;

- to speed up the disbursement of the initially allocated 3 billion euros to ensure funding of a first set of projects before the end of March and decide on additional funding for the Refugee Facility for Syrians;

- to prepare for the decision on the opening of new chapters in the accession negotiations as soon as possible, building on the October 2015 European Council conclusions;

- to work with Turkey in any joint endeavour to improve humanitarian conditions inside Syria which would allow for the local population and refugees to live in areas which will be more safe (Ibid)".

18th March 2016 Summit

The third important agreement since November 2015 took place amongst members of the European Council and Turkish counterpart to deepen Turkey-EU relations and to address the migration crisis on 18 March 2016 (European Commission 2016b).

It focused on ending the irregular migration from Turkey and on adjusting it instead by legal channels of resettlement of refugees to EU in order to get organized and controlled migratory flows (European Council 2016a).

Additional action points agreed on as follows:

- In accordance with EU and international law, "All new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey into Greek islands as from 20 March 2016 will be returned to Turkey (European Council 2016a)". EU is committed to cover the costs of return operations of irregular migrants (Ibid).

- Asylum applications will be processed independently by the "Greek authorities in accordance with the Asylum Procedures Directive, in cooperation with UNHCR (Ibid)". So, UNHCR plays a key role in the resettlement process for supervision.

Migrants' applications can be considered as inadmissible by officials without examining the substance and those will be returned to Turkey and for each Syrian

being returned to Turkey, another Syrian will be relocated to EU under the Readmission Agreement scheme between Turkey and EU (European Commission 2016b). It is also stated that all migrants will be protected with respect to relevant international standards (Ibid).

After the commitment of Turkey to end the illegal migration flow to EU, the visa liberalization roadmap for Turkish citizens was committed to be accelerated at the latest by the end of June 2016 if Turkey fulfills all the remaining requirements imposed by EU (Ibid).

EU's initial commitment of 3 billion euros under the facility for refugees in Turkey was input before the end of the March and an additional 3 billion euro will be disbursed if Turkey meets the conditions by the end of 2018 (Ibid).

Furthermore, both sides reconfirmed their commitment to re-energize the accession process as planed in their joint statement of 29 November 2015 (Ibid). It was clearly underlined that EU membership process of "Chapters will continue at an accelerated pace without prejudice to Member State's positions in accordance with the existing rules (Ibid)". However, this was reversed after the failed coup in Turkey (Birnbaum & Cunningham 2016).

Diplomacy in an Anarchic World

The Syrian refugee crisis case that led to cooperation between the EU and Turkey is undoubtedly due to shared certain common interests and values and such commonality can be evidently demonstrated in practice and theory with Bull's statement as ‘’A society of states (or international society) exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions (Bull 1977:13)”. It is true that ‘’ the actors must have some minimal common interests such as trade, freedom of travel, or simply the need for stability’’ can demonstrate the condition of current diplomatic cooperation between EU and Turkey over the Syrian refugee crisis which involves common interests (Dunne et al. 2007:140).

Bull (1977) stresses the dominance of western power's culture rather than global culture; one dominant culture should be avoided and it should be distributed and influenced on an equal level viz. the determinants ought to be the entire society. Turkey-EU summits demonstrates that the determinants are not the entire society but are powerful actors as decision makers.

The High Representative of the EU Federica Mogherini (European Committee 2016a) underlined the fact that anarchy still exists at the annual Heads of Delegation conference by stating "No one of our Member States can exercise sovereignty effectively in the global world of today alone” as “The world is a dangerous place” and encouraged member states to adopt a stronger coordination and harmony“ -“..to make Europe an even stronger regional and global player and this is in the interest of our citizens and also in the interest of the rest of the world.". She pointed out that

“this is a key moment in the development of the Union as an international diplomatic and political force (Ibid)”. She also stressed the fact of the existence of anarchism and that diplomacy can be considered as an instrument to resolve world issues (Ibid). This also demonstrates that “actors are socially constructed” not only in belief of anarchism but that actors are constructed socially for numerous matters (Wendt 1999:7).

Hence, TEST adherents share a belief of constructivism that anarchy is, to use Wendt’s famous expression, “what states make of it (Wendt 1992; Dunne et al. 2016)”. This statement encapsulates that all depends on how states deem and implement their rights against and responsibilities to human kinds and how far they are organized to use diplomacy, tolerantly and wisely in order to form common moral and political ground (Ibid).

EU can be considered having a solidarist view as Federica states that the EU plays a fundamental role in facilitating the future of Syria and adds that “…we are ready to work on the re-destruction of the country but we need a political transition to start.. (European Committee 2016b)”. This code of conduct can confirm humanitarian intervention within normative frame. Besides that, this also triggers questions about EU having a democracy only for member states.

Identity Matters in a Socially Constructed World

EU's identity is a key concept that influences its conduct and others towards it (Fierke 2001). EU foreign policy behaviour is often determined predominantly by domestic politics, "the analogue to individual personality, rather than by the international society (Onuf (1989:237)". "the nature of the policy process is affected by the identity of the actors involved (White 2001:40)". States change and construct the structures of identity through their interaction, which in turn influences the way agents interact (Wendt 1999; Fierke 2001). "..rules say what they say, and institutions are slow to change, because agents make rational choices in circumstances that always give the advantage to some agents over others (Onuf 1998:75)". Thus, states like EU and Turkey should be the primary unit of analysis to consider the global regulation of violence considering famous idiom "world of our own making" (Wendt 1999; Onuf 1989).

Humanitarian protection and poverty alleviation assess norms which are considered ethically "good" (Finnemore 1996:32). However, "there is nothing inherently "good" about social norms" as "social norms can prescribe ethically reprehensible behaviour - slavery, violence, intolerance, as well as charity and kindness (Ibid)". Thus, conceptions like who is human and deserving of protection and notions of legitimate intervention are socially constructed (Ibid). Living in an international society can refer to "what we want and, in some ways, who we are is shaped by the social norms, rules, understandings, and relationship we have with others (Ibid:128)". EU's normative power is constructed by agency and its context can be changed over time as international norms and values change (Zehfuss 2001;Finnemore 1996).

EU and Turkey attempts to maximize utilities through strategies whilst dealing over the crisis resolution where norms, rules, and routines are generated as part of this

process although these are more likely to serve the interests of powerful agencies such as EU (Finnemore 1996).

EU has influence over Turkey due to its attractive identity as Onuf (1989:60) states "Human agents author rules and deploy resources in accordance with those rules so as to secure and ensconce advantages over other agents". It imposes its influence through "a political formula alleging the autonomy of states as the primary vehicle for the exercise of influence, and an acceptance of the pattern of influence and its rewards as consonant with the formula's requirements (Ibid:238)" and EU attempts to reward Turkey through visa liberalisation and re-energizing its membership considering Turkey's long term interest to be an EU member.

Hoffman and Graham (2015:1) defines power as politics that underpins idea of such concepts "state, freedom, equality, justice, democracy, citizenship and punishment". For instance, EU's power in relation to authority over Turkey inevitable, considering its demands to resolve the Syrian refugee crisis. In the accession process, the EU offers an extremely strong incentive. Hence, the candidate countries are usually much more dependent on the EU and eager to join the Community than vice versa" (Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2009). Furthermore, EU's act of preventing Syrian refugees crossing borders and implementation to force them leaving the EU contradicts with its normative principles (Collett 2016). It is clear that some member states or actors can have ''…different conceptions of human rights and global justice…'' whilst considering the refugee crisis and the great powers dominate international society's rules to suit their interest best (Burchill et al. 2009:89). Hence, "The EU has been concerned, like others. to look after its own interests… (Pinder and Usherwood 2013:125)". EU's influence over Turkey can be best explained with the statement of "..Constitutive effects of EU rules and policies it facilitates the study the ways in which EU membership shapes the interests and identities of actors (Bache et al. 2015:67)".

Diplomacy versus Identity

As stated, Turkey and EU have carried out extensive studies on a complex and comprehensive plan to end the immigrant crisis since 2015 through diplomacy, though the crisis remains unresolved (Yeginsu 2016; European Council 2015b). Nevertheless, social facts are subject to human agreement and “are taken for granted (Barnett 2014:159)”. Terms like “money, refugees, terrorism, human rights, and sovereignty” can be considered as social facts (Ibid). For instance, “Before the twentieth century, ‘refugee’ as a legal category did not exist, and it was not until the First World War that states recognized people as refugees and gave them rights (Ibid:160)”. It is constructed and how to deal with refugees is also constructed through certain codes of conduct simply put through the global actor’s norms and values. TEST suggests diplomacy as a solution to resolve problems in an anarchic world (Linklater 2009). However, the outcome of the diplomatic deal of Turkey and EU indicates that constructed diplomacy can be inefficient for certain crises that need urgent response, although for any sort of conflict resolution, diplomacy seems as a worldwide constructed mechanism that is being utilized massively regardless of resolving the concern.

TEST can explain diplomacy as a crisis solution in an anarchic world, though it lacks the concept of identity. Hence, TEST fails to explain particularly the concept of identity. Hence, it cannot explain ‘othering’. Diplomacy and identity seems interlinked as EU changed the identity of its structure by hastening its relations with Turkey through its interaction, which influenced in turn the way Turkey interacts. Turkey

attempted to take on board all EU's conditions to get the benefit of visa liberalization for Eurozone and re-energising Turkey's EU access negotiations, where EU is pre-empting its power over Turkey by aiming to keep refugees off its borders with Turkey.

TEST seems inadequate to explain one's power over others. For instance, EU has influence over Turkey due to Turkey's aforementioned long-term determined EU membership candidate status and those circumstances give EU more advantage over Turkey, as EU can make demands on and control Turkey in a way which suits best its own interest. Diplomacy seems identity based as EU's identity seems a significant concept that effects its conduct and draws others towards it.

Did EU Become Concerned Only After the Refugee Crisis?

EU seems to react prominently on issues that affect the Union directly, such as immigrants' concerns and this can create biases consequently in political representation that becomes problematic only when it starts to affect the Union. EU has started dealing with the migration challenges from 2015, albeit the refugee crisis has been present since 2011 (European Committee 2016a). EU seems to have democracy only for its own citizens, considering its provision on Democratic Principles, Article 9 "In all its activities, the Union shall observe the principle of the equality of its citizens, who shall receive equal attention from its institutions, bodies, offices and agencies. Every national of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union (European Commission 2008:20)". EU's concern appears only for its citizens, as the eradicating the refugee crisis seems more important than the conflict Syria considering the statement of Tusk, President of the European Council states that *".. days of illegal migration to Europe are over* (European Council 2016b)*". This code of conduct demonstrates that EU can have normative concepts only in theory. Hence,* EU seems to serve only for its own interests like the provisions on the institutions, Article 13 (item1) demonstrates that "The Union shall aim to serve its interests, "those of its citizens and those of the Member States (European Commission 2008:22)" .

Furthermore, the Union's renowned constructed identity 'normative power 'is used as an instrument in "promoting respect for human rights across the world and promoting international law through dedicated human rights dialogues, advocacy in multilateral forums and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Right" although it does not comply with its principles in practice (Juncker 2014).

Does EU have capacity and willingness?

A stronger Europe is a must when it comes to foreign policy, considering the rise in the number of worrying global crises that remain unresolved like as the Syrian refugee crisis (Peterson and Gottwald 2015:208). EU has constantly been accused of an inability to manage crises without considering its limited capacity, divergences between the attitudes of EU member states viz. willingness and the division of power between its institutions. Thus its response to the Syrian refugee crisis is no exception (Bowering 2015). Hence, EU "institutions have accused one another of failing to act, a practice that will have to stop if the EU is to make decisions...(Ibid)". EU desires to address the political, economic, social and security challenges but it constantly seems inefficient (Burke 2013).

The EU's reaction is considered slow, as the EU is divided; with its fragmented leadership governance, and the media represent the image of an incoherent and uncoordinated EU's foreign policy (Koenig 2011). EU's internal divisions over Libya, over the Iraq war, illustrate the limits and incapability of the CFSP (Ibid). While EU cannot change the structure of national foreign policies, it ought to increase its 'leadership for coherence' (Dias 2016;Ibid). Based on the findings, EU seems to have insufficient capacity to deal with international crises and to spread human rights and democracy worldwide in practice. However, EU could deal indeed with any sort of crisis as a global actor, albeit due to serious political, economic and social distinct concerns within the union, including its fragmented governance and oppositional problems within the governments might be some of the reasons that EU has been side-lined for the majority of the international crisis as mentioned earlier. Therefore, EU ought to be reformed, as it desires to remain as a global actor.

Considering the EU's irrevocable failures corresponding majority of global crisis abovementioned. EU's decline to play this capacity is inevitable though it might remain as a global actor only as a donor unless it resolves its member states' turnoil issues. Besides those, EU's ongoing failures to respond to international crises initiated debates that EU suffers from "chronic problems of disunity, incoherence and weak leadership" despite the fact that the Union "has gradually developed its CSDP for crisis management or humanitarian intervention (Peterson and Gottwald 2015:208-209)". EU was exclusively side lined during the war in Iraq in 2003 due to disunity on agreeing a common policy and similar instances are given earlier of when EU failed to respond to international crises (Ibid). EFP can be challenged by all manner of competitors: among its member governments, among EU institutions and between them and national foreign ministers (Ibid). This should be one of the reasons why Kirchner and Sperling (2007:217) consider that EU has no foreign policy as it fails to respond to international crises constantly, in particular that it needs an urgent response to provide humanitarian aid in many nations aforementioned. EU's incapability to respond to certain international crises might be due to the complex way of its governance which generates a perplexing decision making process (Smith (2002).

EU generally seems entrusting NATO to act as it meant to have more of a soft power since its inception and using NATO when required . However, This may also its inadequate capacity. Additionally, EU's general response to humanitarian crises and emergencies are more based on material incentives and only provided short time relief and rather than a permanent solution (Juncker 2014).

Conclusion

This dissertation consists of three main chapters. The first chapter examined EU and its positionality as a global actor to demonstrate its gradual decline including its chronological background. Its main governance concepts is followed by its positionality as a global actor and identity as a normative power that entails power dynamics viz. civilian, military and particularly normative concepts with a series of past international crises.

The second chapter is focused on the theoretical framework of TEST and Social Constructivism. It utilizes the Syrian case study; including the IR background and compares and contrasts the theories. The third chapter stresses the Turkey-EU negotiations over the Syrian refugee crisis, containing the origins of the crisis and the aforementioned summits to examine EU's code of conduct to resolve the issue through the lenses of both theories.

In conclusion, the world constantly has been constructed through agencies like EU. TEST notion uses the term of 'diplomacy' to resolve international relations' issues, though it might not work for certain crises that need an urgent response, such as the Syrian refugee crisis, given the limitations of the EU's capacity, capabilities and putative willingness.

TEST tenets of diplomacy as a solution in an anarchic world can be inadequate to resolve certain crucial issues that need emergency action, although it seems broadly used in world affairs. Constructivism posits that terms like diplomacy, immigration, refugees and human rights are all socially constructed, intersubjective and can be changed overtime through actors. However, constructed 'utopian' regulations seem

not to work in practice considering EU's constructed principles in theory. This can be due to actors' different backgrounds that clash with the ''utopian'' ideal. EU's growth can be considered as a force in international relations, which has a significant influence over the lives of those who live within its borders and those living in countries which aspire to membership (Alston et al. 1999). However, its constructed human rights policies seem to not to be complying with the principles in practice (Ibid).

Finally, EU has confronted a variety of crises since its origins as outlined in Chapter 1. It has accomplished a very successful unity and harmony in human history, indeed including its achievement of turning the communist east towards the democratic west. As a consequence, it has been attractive to many other aforementioned nations (Pinder & Usherwood 2013). Nevertheless, EU's complex governance, constant failures to respond to international crises, existing distinctive national policies amongst its member states', and present cultural diversity can indicate EU's decline as a global actor. Hence, EU governance remains uncertain due to its "legitimacy in the face of Europe's ongoing challenges (Wallace et al. 2015:488)". As a result, Euroscepticism has gradually risen (Ibid).

Consequently, EU may no longer be considered as a global actor considering its capacity and limitations which are in decline within its role. On the basis of social, economic and military aspects it remains inadequate to respond to the majority of international crises.

Also, It cannot be identified as a normative power even if its desire can be seen through its 'utopian' principles and it mostly clashes with its ideologies demonstrated with a series of case studies and in particular by the Syrian refugee crisis.

EU can be reformed so that it can begin to strengthen its capacity as a global actor, particularly by posing sanctions and resolving international crises. It seems that EU's global power is in decline, though EU still seems to have authority over candidate countries. EU's reputation and identity as a normative power seems in decline for the reasons listed in this dissertation. Therefore, the more EU cannot respond to international crises, the more EU's identity seems to weaken.

Bibliography

Abdel-sha, S., 2015. Realigning EU Policy in Palestine Towards a Viable State Economy and Restored Dignity. Available at: https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/publications/research/20151028EUPolicyPalestineAbdel-ShafiFinal.pdf [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Alston, P., Bustelo, M.R. & Heenan, J., 1999. *The EU and Human Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Armstrong, D., 2014. The globalization of world politics : an introduction to international relations. In J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owens, eds. *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 596.

Bache, I. et al., 2015. *Politics in the European Union* 4th ed., UK: Oxford University Press.

Balkir, C. & Williams, A.M., 1993. *Turkey and Europe*, London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.

Barnett, M., 2014. Social Constructivism. In J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owens, eds. *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Birnbaum, M. & Cunningham, E., 2016. Turkey's migrant deal with Europe may collapse under post-coup-attempt crackdown. *The Washington Post*. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/turkeys-post-coup-crackdown-may-cause-its-migrant-deal-with-europe-to-collapse/2016/08/22/f60a74e0-6651-11e6-9161-aa7c674b6ede_story.html?utm_term=.b0961061126c [Accessed November 19, 2016].

Bogdandy, A. V, 2012. Neither an International Organization nor a Nation State: The EU as a Supranational Federation. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. UK: Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Bordo, M.D., 2008. *An Historical Perspective On The Crisis Of 2007-2008*, Cambridge. Available at: http://www.nber.org/papers/w14569.pdf [Accessed

November 9, 2016].

Bowering, A., 2015. Failing to provide a coordinated response to the refugee crisis risks weakening support for the EU. Available at: https://www1.dehavillandeurope.eu/insight-blog-eu/refugee-crisis-europes-obstacles-coordinated-response [Accessed August 4, 2016].

Bull, H., 1977. *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics* 3rd ed., New York: Palgrave.

Burchill, S. et al., 2009. *Theories of international relations* 4th ed., Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burke, E., 2013. Running into the sand? The EU's faltering response to the Arab revolutions. *Centre for European Reform*. Available at: https://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2013/esy_eb_arab_18dec13-11005.pdf [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Christiansen, T., 2013. Governance in the European Union. In M. Cini & P. Borragán, eds. *European Union Politics*. UK: Oxford University Press, p. 450.

Cini, M., 2016. European Union Politics. In M. Cini & N. P. Borragan, eds. *European Union Politics*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Cini, M., 2013. Intergovernmentalism. In M. Cini & N. Pérez-Solórzano Borragán, eds. *European Union Politics*. UK: Oxford University Press, p. 450.

Collett, E., 2016. The Paradox of the EU-Turkey Refugee Deal. *Migration Policy Intsitute (MPI)*. Available at: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/paradox-eu-turkey-refugee-deal [Accessed November 5, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2007. A timeline of the EU. *BBC News*. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3583801.stm [Accessed October 5, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2016a. Britain and Europe. "The road to Brexit." *Economist*. Available at: http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21708257-britains-prime-minister-must-resist-her-partys-dangerous-instincts-road-brexit [Accessed September 15, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2016b. Kosovo profile. *BBC News*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-18328859 [Accessed November 8, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2016c. Luxembourg admits EU “failed to understand” Turkey’s coup attempt - EUROPE. Available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/luxembourg-admits-eu-failed-to-understand-turkeys-coup-attempt.aspx?pageID=238&nID=104113&NewsCatID=351 [Accessed October 20, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2015a. Migrant crisis: EU calls emergency talks. *BBC News*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/34104714 [Accessed August 12, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2015b. Migrant crisis: Turkey and EU strike deal to limit refugee flow. *BBC News*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-34957830 [Accessed October 20, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2015c. North Korea country profile. *BBC News*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-pacific-15256929 [Accessed October 9, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2016d. Syria: The story of the conflict. *BBC News*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-26116868 [Accessed October 3, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2015d. The Guardian view on the EU response to the refugee crisis: a challenge it has failed to meet. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/14/the-guardian-view-on-the-eu-response-to-the-refugee-crisis-a-challenge-it-has-failed-to-meet [Accessed November 10, 2016].

Corporate Author, 1999. Turkey welcomes first mass resettlement of Kosovo refugees. *CNN*. Available at: http://edition.cnn.com/WORLD/europe/9904/05/kosovo.refugees.04/ [Accessed October 20, 2016].

Corporate Author, 2016e. UN says EU-Turkey refugee deal would violate law - AJE News. Available at: http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/03/eu-turkey-refugee-

deal-contravene-law-unhcr-160308160629966.html?utm_source=example.com&utm_medium=link&utm_campaign=article [Accessed November 7, 2016].

Crowe, B., 2003. A common European foreign policy after Iraq? *International Affairs*, 79(3), pp.533–546. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1468-2346.00321 [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Dias, V.A., 2016. A Critical Analysis of the EU's Response to the Arab Spring and its Implications for EU Security. Available at: http://www.etc-graz.at/typo3/fileadmin/user_upload/ETC-Hauptseite/human_security/hs-perspectives/pdffiles/issue1_2014/Vanda_Amaro_Dias_-_EU_s_Response.pdf [Accessed November 15, 2016].

Diez, T. & Manners, I., 2007. Reflecting on normative-power Europe. *Power in world politics*, (2006), pp.173–188.

Dunne, T., 2014. The globalization of world politics : an introduction to international relations. In J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owens, eds. *The globalization of world politics : an introduction to international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 596.

Dunne, T., Kurki, M. & Smith, S., 2007. *International relations theories : discipline and diversity* 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunne, T., Kurki, M. & Smith, S., 2016. *International relations theories : Discipline and Diversity* 4th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunne, T. & Schmidt, B.C., 2014. An introduction to international relations. In J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owens, eds. *The globalization of world politics:An introduction to international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emerson, M., Tocci, N. & Youngs, R., 2009. Gaza's hell: Why the EU must change its policy. *Centre for Eurpoean Policy Studies*. Available at: http://aei.pitt.edu/11099/1/1776[1].pdf [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Ergun, D., 2016. Europe Must See Turkey as a Partner, Not Just a Buffer Zone Against ISIS. Available at: http://europe.newsweek.com/europe-see-turkey-

partner-not-just-buffer-zone-against-isis-415167?rm=eu [Accessed July 15, 2016].

European Commission, 2016a. Accession criteria (Copenhagen criteria). Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhague.html [Accessed September 5, 2016].

European Commission, 2008. Common Provisions. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 51(C115), pp.17–22.

European Commission, 2016b. EU-Turkey statement, 18 March 2016. *International Summit*. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/press-releases-pdf/2016/3/40802210113_en.pdf [Accessed June 10, 2016].

European Commission, 2015a. EU development aid. European Year for Development. Available at: https://europa.eu/eyd2015/en/content/eu-development-aid [Accessed October 17, 2016].

European Commission, 2016c. EUROPA - The EU in brief. Available at: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief_en [Accessed June 5, 2016].

European Commission, 2016d. EUROPA - The history of the European Union. Available at: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history_en [Accessed November 5, 2016].

European Commission, 2016e. European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations - Check current status. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/check-current-status/index_en.htm [Accessed July 5, 2016].

European Commission, 2013. *How the European Union works*, Luxembourg: Publications office of the European Union.

European Commission, 2016f. Humanatarian aid and civil protection. Syria crisis. ECHO Factsheet. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/syria_en.pdf [Accessed November 14, 2016].

European Commission, 2015b. The EU's response to the "Arab Spring." Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-11-918_en.htm [Accessed October 5, 2016].

European Commission, 2007. Treaty of Lisbon. *EUR-Lex*. Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2016.202.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:C:2016:202:TOC [Accessed June 15, 2016].

European Commission, 2014. Why did the crisis happen? - European Commission. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/explained/the_financial_and_economic_crisis/why_did_the_crisis_happen/index_en.htm [Accessed June 19, 2016].

European Committee, 2016a. EU must play stronger role in global affairs, Mogherini tells Ambassadors - European External Action Service. Available at: https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/9492/eu-must-play-stronger-role-in-global-affairs-mogherini-tells-ambassadors_en [Accessed October 5, 2016].

European Committee, 2016b. Federica Mogherini's doorstep at the presentation of the European External Investment Plan in New York - UNGA 2016 - European External Action Service. Available at: https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/migration-partnership/10119/federica-mogherinis-doorstep-at-the-presentation-of-the-european-external-investment-plan-in-new-york---unga-2016_en [Accessed November 15, 2016].

European Committee, 2016c. Sanctions Policy. Available at: https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/sanctions-policy/423/sanctions-policy_en [Accessed September 20, 2016].

European Committee, 2016d. *The EU in 2015*, EU. Available at: http://publications.europa.eu/en/web/general-report [Accessed November 13, 2016].

European Council, 2016a. EU-Turkey statement, 18 March 2016 - Consilium. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-

releases/2016/03/18-eu-turkey-statement/ [Accessed June 10, 2016].

European Council, 2015a. Foreign Affairs Council, 16-17/11/2015 - Consilium. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/fac/2015/11/16-17/ [Accessed October 9, 2016].

European Council, 2015b. Meeting of heads of state or government with Turkey - EU-Turkey statement, 29/11/2015 - Consilium. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/11/29-eu-turkey-meeting-statement/ [Accessed September 10, 2016].

European Council, 2016b. Meeting of the EU heads of state or government with Turkey, 07/03/2016 - Consilium. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2016/03/07/ [Accessed June 28, 2016].

European Council, 2016c. Statement of the EU Heads of State or Government, 07/03/2016 - Consilium. *International Summit*. Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/07-eu-turkey-meeting-statement/ [Accessed June 25, 2016].

European Delegation, 2016. History. Available at: http://avrupa.info.tr/en/eu-and-turkey/history.html [Accessed October 5, 2016].

Fierke, K., 2001. Constructing international relations. In K. Fierke & K. Jorgensen, eds. *Constructing international relations*. New York: M.E.Sharpe.

Finnemore, M., 1996. *National Interests in International Society*, USA: Cornell University Press.

Forsberg, T., 2011. Normative Power Europe, Once Again: A Conceptual Analysis of an Ideal Type*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(6), pp.1183–1204. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02194.x [Accessed November 13, 2016].

Francois Duchene, 1972. Europe's Role in World Peace. In *Europe Tomorrow: Sixteen Europeans Look Ahead.* pp. 32–47.

Hayes-Renshaw, F., 2015. How Policies Are Made. In D. Kenealy, J. Peterson, & R.

Corbett, eds. *The European Union : how does it work?*. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 283.

Hoffman, J. & Graham, P., 2015. *Introduction to Political Theory* 3rd ed., New York: Routledge.

Jackson, R. & Sørensen, G., 2016. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches* 6th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R.H. & Sørensen, G., 2007. *Introduction to International Relations : Theories and Approaches* 3rd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, E., 2012. Identity and Solidarity. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Jones, S.G., 2007. *The Rise Of European Security Cooperation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Juncker, J., 2014. The EU in 2015 “A Stronger Global Actor.” Available at: http://publications.europa.eu/en/web/general-report#chapter9 [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Juncos, A.E. & Borragan, N.P., 2013. Enlargement. In M. Cini & N. Borragán, eds. *European Union Politics*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Kenealy, D., Peterson, J. & Corbett, R., 2015. *The European Union : How Does it Work?*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kingsley, P. & Rankin, J., 2016. EU-Turkey Refugee Deal. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/08/eu-turkey-refugee-deal-qa [Accessed September 13, 2016].

Kirchner, E.J. & Sperling, J., 2007. *EU security governance*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Koenig, N., 2011. The EU and the Libyan Crisis – In Quest of Coherence? *The International Spectator*, 46(4), pp.11–30. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03932729.2011.628089 [Accessed

November 15, 2016].

Kowert, P., 1998. Agent versus Structure in the Construction of National Identity. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, eds. *International Relations in a constructed world*. USA: M.E.Sharpe.

Kratochwil, F., 2001. International relations theories : discipline and diversity. In K. Fierke & K. Jorgensen, eds. *Constructing international relations*. New York: M.E.Sharpe, p. 350.

Kurki, M. & Wight, C., 2013. International Relations and Social Science. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki, & S. Smith, eds. *International relations theories : discipline and diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 368.

Laursen, F., 2012. The Treaty of Maastricht. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Lavenex, S. & Schimmelfennig, F., 2009. EU rules beyond EU borders: theorizing external governance in European politics. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(6), pp.791–812. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501760903087696 [Accessed November 15, 2016].

Linklater, A., 2009. The English School. In S. Burchill et al., eds. *Theories of International Relations*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

MacFarlane, N. & Menon, A., 2014. The EU and Ukraine. *Survival*, 56(3), pp.95–101. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2014.920139 [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Malcolm, N., 1998. *Kosovo : A Short History*, London: Macmillan.

Manners, I., 2008. The normative ethics of the European Union. *International Affairs*, 84(1), pp.45–60.

McCormick, J., 2014. *Understanding the European Union. A Concise Introduction* 6th ed., London: Palgrave Higher Education.

Mearsheimer, J.J., 2014. Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*, 93. Available at: http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/fora93&id=1075&div=&collection= [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Michalski, A., 2014. The Enlarging European Union. In D. Dinan, ed. *Origins and evolution of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 422.

Nugent, N., 2010. *The government and politics of the European Union*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Onuf, N., 1998. Constructivism: A Users Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, eds. *International Relations in a constructed world*. USA: M.E.Sharpe.

Onuf, N.G., 1989. *World of Our Making*, Columbia: University of South Caroline.

Pagoulatos, G. & Tsoukalis, L., 2012. Multilevel Governance. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. UK: Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Peterson, J. and & Geddes, A., 2015. The EU as a Security Actor. In D. Kenealy, J. Peterson, & R. Corbett, eds. *The European Union: how does it work?*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, J. & Gottwald, M., 2015. The EU as a Global Actor. In D. Kenealy, J. Peterson, & R. Corbett, eds. *The European Union : how does it work?*. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 283.

Pfohman, S., 2015. The failure of the EU Migration Response. Available at: http://www.caritas.eu/blog/the-failure-of-the-eu-migration-response [Accessed October 20, 2016].

Pinder, J. & Usherwood, S.M., 2013. *The European Union : a very short introduction*, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pollack, M.A., 2012. Realist,Intergovernmentalist, and institutionalist Approaches. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Salmon, T.C. & Shepherd, A.J.K., 2003. *Toward a European Army: A Military Power in the Making?*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.

Schimmelfennig, F., 2012. Constructivist Perspectives. In E. Jones, A. Menon, & S. Weatherill, eds. *The Oxford handbook of the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 893.

Shepherd, A.J.K., 2009. A milestone in the history of the EU: Kosovo and the EU's international role. *International Affairs*, 85(3).

Singh, D., 2015. Russian Domination of the Syrian Battleground. *Indian Defence Review*, 30(4). Available at: http://www.indiandefencereview.com/news/russian-domination-of-the-syrian-battleground/ [Accessed September 5, 2016].

Sjursen, H., 2006. The EU as a `Normative' Power: How can this be? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(2), pp.235–251.

Smith, H., 2002. *European Union foreign policy : what it is and what it does*, London: Pluto Press.

Smith, K.E., 2016. Still "civilian power EU?" *London School of Economics*. Available at: http://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/projects/cidel/old/WorkshopOsloSecurity/Smith.pdf [Accessed November 13, 2016].

Smith, S., 2013. Introduction: Diversity and Disciplinarity in International Relations Theory. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki, & S. Smith, eds. *International relations theories : discipline and diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 368.

Spindler, W. & Clayton, J., 2016. UNHCR expresses concern over EU-Turkey plan. *UN*. Available at: http://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/latest/2016/3/56dee1546/unhcr-expresses-concern-eu-turkey-plan.html [Accessed May 10, 2016].

Vromen, A., 2010. Debating Methods: Rediscovering Qualitative Approaches. In D. Marsh & G. Stoker, eds. *Theory and methods in political science*. Palgrave Macmillan, p. 392.

Wallace, H., Pollack, M. & Young, A., 2015. An Overview. In *Policy-making in the European Union*. UK: Oxford University Press, p. 574.

Wendt, A., 1992. *Anarchy is what state make of it: The social Construction of Power Politics. International Organisation, 46-2. Reprinted in James Der Derian 1995, "International Theory: Critical Investigations".*, London: Macmillan.

Wendt, A., 1999. *Social theory of international politics*, UK: Cambridge University Press.

White, B., 2001. *Understanding European Foreign Policy*, London: Palgrave.

Wight, C., 2006. *Agents, Structures and International Relations : Politics as Ontology*, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wight, M., 1977. *Systems of States*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Wong, E., 2008. Overview: The Iraq War. *New York Times*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/ref/timestopics/topics_iraq.html [Accessed September 5, 2016].

Yeginsu, C., 2016. Refugees Pour Out of Turkey Once More as Deal With Europe Falters. *New York Times*. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/europe/turkey-syria-refugees-eu.html?_r=0 [Accessed October 5, 2016].

Zartman, I.W., 1976. *The 50% Solution: How to Bargain Successully with Hijackers, Strikers, Bosses, Oil Magnates, Arabs, Russians, and Other Worthy Opponents*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zehfuss, M., 2001. Constructivism in International Relations. In K. Fierke & K. Jorgensen, eds. *Constructing international relations*. New York: M.E.Sharpe.

De Zutter, E., 2010. Normative power spotting: an ontological and methodological appraisal. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17(8), pp.1106–1127. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13501763.2010.513554 [Accessed November 13, 2016].

Appendices

Appendix A: EU Timeline Snapshot

Cooperation Initiatives were taken by member states for a peaceful Europe in 1945, then the custom duties were eliminated amongst member states whilst trading (European Commission 2016d). Hence, EU has been growing rapidly since 1960 and has been more active internationally as it carried out its first enlargement round in 1973 with the incorporation of Denmark, Ireland and United Kingdom joining EU within a short period (Ibid). In between the second and the third enlargement rounds followed in 1981 and 1986 (Michalski 2014; European Commission 2016d). The Single European Act was also signed in 1986 and opened up to member states free trade zone across the EU borders as a consequence creating the 'Single Market' (Ibid). In 1990 following the fall of the Berlin Wall, reunification of East and West Germany was carried out (Ibid). Between the years 1990 and 1999 the period was called "a Europe without frontiers" with the collapse of communism in central and eastern Europe, and Europeans become closer (Corporate Author 2007;Ibid). In 1993, the Single Market was completed through the free movement of goods, services, people and money. It was also the era of two important treaties: the 'Maastricht' Treaty on European Union in 1993; that "created the current EU" and the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999 (Laursen 2012:132; European Commission 2016). Environmental concerns and how to act together for security and defense are matters which have arisen (European Commission 2016). In 1995, with the forth enlargement round three more new members joined EU namely: Austria, Finland and Sweden and through the 'Schengen' agreement; the creation of the free travel zone, gradually enabled "people to travel without having their passports checked at the borders and increased the number of young people studying in other countries with EU support" (Michalski 2014; European Commission 2016d).

In the years between 2000 and 2009, EU has experienced further expansion by the spread of the main currency ‘euro’ for many Europeans and with the fifth enlargement round in two phases in 2004 when EU gained ten countries and in 2007 followed by Bulgaria and Romania joining (Ibid). A financial crisis blew the global economy in September 2008 and “The Treaty of Lisbon was approved by all EU countries before entering into force in 2009, which provides the EU with modern institutions and more efficient working methods by updating the founding treaties of EU namely; TFEU and TEU (Bache *et al.*, 2015:202; European Commission 2016b).

In 2009, The Union experienced the worst recession due to financial crisis after the end of the second world war and from 2010-2012, the Eurozone, nineteen of twenty-eight members, suffered from almost daily turmoil and as a result the union re-entered recession in 2012 and as a consequence in 2013 unemployment increased considerably, in particular between young people (Juncker 2014). Therefore, since 2010 up to today, it has been called ‘a challenging decade’ and tough years for the union as the global economic crisis strikes durable in Europe (Ibid).

Appendix B: Brief Explanation of IR Terminology

The study of IR has classically committed on “the analysis of the causes of war and the conditions of peace (Smith, 2013:1)”. Theories are fundamental to explain and to understand IR (Ibid). Each theory has a different approach and framework to ease understanding of the complex world affairs through their distinctive ontological, epistemological and methodological/ethical assumptions and of their given distinctive certain limitations (Ibid). Therefore, some theories might be unable to explain a certain issue or might be to some extent too short to enlighten it.

Contemporary International Relations Theory (IRT) covers both theories that are mainstream i.e. those which are widely accepted as fundamental knowledge and thus are considered as the roots of the IRT, and also viz. alternative critical theories (Dunne et al. 2007). Mainstream theories are more likely explanatory and are also called ‘problem solving’ theories, whereas alternative theories that embrace more criticisms; tend to focus on power relations and more on understanding rather than explaining world affairs (Jackson and Sørensen 2016). However, it can also be possible for a theory to be both explanatory and critical (Dunne et al. 2007). Application of a standard theory in the IR field can be useful only for particular cases given its certain limitations and due to the distinct ontological, epistemological and ethical assumptions of each theory (Ibid).

As mentioned earlier, each IRT contains its own assumptions on the basis of ontology, epistemology and ethics (Dunne et al. 2007). They study and assess ontological claims on defining human nature as what one believes in, and how it is believed is explained through the epistemological assumptions of a certain theory (Ibid). For instance, the statement that international structure is multifaceted indicates an ontological point of view and that what is believed in and how it is believed in can be explained through epistemological assumptions either by the means of the positivist approach based on quantitative methods akin to statistical facts at an explanatory level or by the post-positivist approach based on qualitative methods at an understanding level rather than emphasizing through observation or interpretation that shelters value and ethical aspects (Ibid). Hence, explanatory theories focus on observation as being the only way of generating valid knowledge through quantitative data whereas the understanding side underlines the importance of the interpretation

of the “unobservable and immeasurable, context of action” through qualitative data ((Kurki and Wight, 2013:21).Philosophical ethics enlighten the international reaction to knowledge in various ways such as by being critical and implementing this knowledge for good purposes (Ibid).