
AICEI PROCEEDINGS

The Influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the European Union as a Global Actor and the Question of Turkey's Membership

Selcen Öner

Abstract

This paper explores the influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the EU's position in the world as a global actor. In economic terms, the EU has been an influential actor. However, to be an influential global actor, the EU also needs to be strong in the fields of security and defence. The main goals of the Lisbon Treaty were to increase the efficiency of decision-making mechanisms following previous enlargements and to address new global challenges such as the fight against terrorism, climate change and energy security. The Lisbon Treaty introduced new positions such as the President of the Council and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The effectiveness of these positions, the relations between them, and their interaction with the President of the Commission and the leader of the member state holding the Presidency, will influence the position of the EU as a global actor.

The Lisbon Treaty opened the way towards the future accession of Croatia, Turkey and Macedonia. The accession of Turkey would positively affect the position of the EU as a global actor in terms of energy politics and the fight against terrorism. Turkey is a transit country of important energy networks for Caspian, Middle Eastern and Russian oil and gas. In addition to her geostrategic importance and military capabilities, Turkey also has civilian contributions to make to the security of Europe, such as participation in EU peacekeeping operations. If the EU wants to have a more proactive foreign policy in different regions of the world, such as the Balkans and the Middle East, Turkey's membership will be an asset.

Keywords: *Middle East, Turkey, security policy, foreign policy, European Union, membership.*

The position of the EU as a global actor depends on the EU's effectiveness as an actor in the world, its ability to speak and act on behalf of its Member States in different policy fields, especially in the fields of security and defence. It also depends on the external recognition of the EU as an entity by other actors. In economic terms, especially in terms of trade, the EU has already been an influential actor, as can be observed by its position in the World Trade Organization (WTO). However, to be an influential global actor the EU also needs to be strong in the fields of foreign policy, security and defence. Rather than having a proactive foreign policy, the EU has a reactive foreign policy based on reactions to crises.

On the other hand, there is a need to adapt the institutions and the decision-making procedures of the EU to the latest enlargements towards the Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs). The goals of the Lisbon Treaty were to make the EU more transparent, democratic and coherent, to increase the efficiency of its institutions and to overcome new global challenges, such as the fight against terrorism and the problems of climate change and energy security. In order to be a global actor, the EU needs to find its own solutions to such global problems in the 21st century.

The EU is a new type of global actor. Although the Lisbon Treaty has a weaker influence on the EU as a global actor compared to the Constitutional Treaty, the goal is to construct a stronger and more coherent external voice for the EU. Hence this paper explores the influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the EU as a global actor. The positive effects of the Treaty on the global role of the EU are discussed together with remaining deficiencies.

Is the EU a Global Actor?

The EU is a unique entity which differs from either a state or an international organization. The 'actorness' of the EU usually refers to its external actions and its room for manoeuvre. "Europe is the most institutionalised regional actor" (Hettne, 2008: 12). If there exists a consolidated internal actor identity, this will probably lead to some sort of external actorness (Hettne, 2008: 2). The EU may be a global actor if it is able to act in different fields on behalf of its member states (Boxhoorn, 1996: 137–142). It has been successful in certain policy fields such as environment policy and common commercial policy and is able to act on behalf of its member states in these areas.

In the Cold War era, there was a common enemy and the European Community (EC) was part of the Western Bloc. In the post Cold War era, the EC was transformed into the EU and has been able to differentiate itself from the USA; however, it has been harder for the EU's member states to find a common position, especially in the fields of security and defence, because there has not emerged any common 'other'.

It is usually easier to find a common interest in terms of economics rather than security or defence. The EU's presence in the world economy has increased enormously, especially with the establishment of the single market and the Common Commercial Policy. Moreover, the introduction of the Euro is the most important symbol of the EU's external identity in economic terms. In terms of trade, the EU has already been an influential actor, as can be observed in its position in trade disputes with the USA in the WTO. The Commission represents the EU at the WTO on behalf of its member states.

Traditionally, the EU is usually referred to in the international system as a 'civilian power'. Its primary instruments are aid and trade. It signs cooperation agreements with third countries or regional blocks. On the other hand, there has been a growing consensus within the EU that it must also improve its position as a global power in terms of security (Laffan, 2004: 80). According to Smith (2003), "the EU's international identity has often been characterized as unique or *sui generis*". Some of the foreign policy instruments of the EU to achieve its objectives are "...legal agreements with other actors, support for international agreements and conventions, institutionalized dialogue, the conditional promise of EU membership, support for Non-Governmental Organisations" (Smith, 2003: 14–15). Only a few of these instruments can be employed by the EU, such as the offer of EU membership, bloc-to-bloc agreements, and regional dialogue. According to Smith, the EU is not so much unique in its choice of foreign policy objectives as in the way it pursues these objectives, which distinguishes it from other international actors which have similar objectives. How it tries to realize these objectives is related to the special characteristic of the EU that it is mainly based on "the replacement of power politics with the rule of law between states and a reconceptualization of the practice of state sovereignty" (Smith, 2003: 199).

The EU tends to use persuasion and positive incentives rather than coercion; however, sometimes non-violent coercion is used, as for example in the application of negative conditionality (Smith, 2003: 198). The EU uses both carrots and sticks in its relations with third countries, especially during

the latest enlargement towards the CEECs and in its relations with the African Caribbean Pacific (ACP) countries. The policy of “conditionality” has been a very strong instrument of the EU, as can be observed during the enlargement towards the CEECs.

The EU has important deficiencies in becoming a pro-active global actor (Keyman and Öniş, 2004: 27). One of the most important problems of the EU is a lack of political leadership (Grant, 2002: 85). In addition to this, the member states of the EU do not want to transfer national sovereignty in defence and they do not want to spend more money on their military budgets. Thus, the main instruments of the EU are still mainly economic and diplomatic (Smith, 2003: 18–21).

According to Eurobarometer surveys, most of the peoples of Europe are in favour of having a stronger role for the EU in the fields of security and defence (as cited in Krotz, 2009: 559). However, interests and foreign policy priorities differ among the member states. France and the UK hold permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council and have military bases in different parts of the world, which gives them a global approach to international issues. Germany primarily focuses on the east; France looks mainly to the south; and the UK looks primarily to the USA (Chopin and Lefebvre, 2010: 7). Thus it is not so easy for member states to reach a compromise in the fields of foreign policy, security and defence.

Comparison between the Constitutional Treaty and the Lisbon Treaty

There is a need to adapt the institutions of the EU and its decision-making procedures to the latest enlargements towards the CEECs to make the EU more efficient. The ratification crisis of the Constitutional Treaty negatively affected the position of the EU as a global actor, though this was overcome to a certain extent with the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty.

The Lisbon Treaty was rejected at the first referendum in Ireland, but after 16 months a second referendum was held. In the aftermath of the economic crisis and with better propaganda, the Treaty passed the second referendum. Certain non-binding assurances were provided by EU figures, such as the assurance that Ireland's abortion restrictions will be respected. Following Ireland's ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, the Czech President Vaclav Klaus signed the treaty after he had received the promise of an opt-out from the “European Charter of Fundamental Rights” because of fears that ethnic

Germans expelled after World War II could apply to the European Court of Justice (ECJ) for property claims (Newman, 2009).

Legally there is no important difference between the Constitutional Treaty and the Lisbon Treaty; politically and discursively, however, the Constitutional Treaty would be more influential on the EU as a global actor. Analysts have argued that 96–98% of the Constitutional Treaty remains unchanged in the Lisbon Treaty (Newman, 2009). The symbols of the EU which were mentioned in the Constitutional Treaty were not mentioned in the Lisbon Treaty. In the Constitutional Treaty, the new post of “Union Minister for Foreign Affairs” was mentioned, and this has been given a new title of “High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy” with the Lisbon Treaty. Concepts such as a constitution, president, foreign minister, along with symbols reminiscent of those of a nation state are not used in the Lisbon Treaty.

The Lisbon Treaty also incorporates the main modifications of the Constitutional Treaty in terms of external actions. Unlike the Constitutional Treaty, which brings together different aspects of the EU's external activities, the Lisbon Treaty separates Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) from the other aspects of the EU's external actions. The distinctive characteristic of the CFSP is emphasised by two declarations related to the CFSP which were attached to the Lisbon Treaty. Like the Constitutional Treaty, the Lisbon Treaty abolishes the three-pillar structure of the EU which was introduced with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. However, in the field of security and defence, the 2nd pillar remains in a *de facto* sense (Wouters, Coppens and De Meester, 2008: 148). The Lisbon Treaty does not include any provision about the supremacy of EU law over the laws of the member states, as was mentioned in the Constitutional Treaty. Thus the existence of the principle of the primacy of EU law is dependent on the case law of the ECJ (Wouters, Coppens and De Meester, 2008: 189).

The Influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the Institutional Structure of the EU

The goals of the Lisbon Treaty were to make the EU more efficient, transparent, democratic and coherent. In terms of overcoming the democratic deficit of the EU, the Lisbon Treaty gives citizens and national parliaments a stronger voice in terms of influencing the decisions of the EU. The national

parliaments of the member states have been given a stronger role in examining EU laws before they are passed. The powers of the European Parliament (EP) have been increased. With the introduction of the new Citizens' Initiative, one million people from a number of member states can petition the Commission to bring forward new proposals (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 1).

With the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU will have a legal personality which is closely related to the "actorness" of the EU. This will strengthen the negotiating power of the EU, making it more effective in the world and a more visible partner for international organisations and third countries. It can sign international agreements and join international organisations. It introduces a specific legal basis for humanitarian aid and the possibility of creating a European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps (The EU in The World, 2010).

The Charter of Fundamental Rights which was signed in 2000 has become binding, which means that when the EU proposes and implements laws, it must respect the rights that are mentioned in this Charter (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 9). Citizens of the EU can now apply to the ECJ on the basis of this Charter if they think that there has been a breach of the rights enshrined in the Charter, thus affording another option for protection of human rights in addition to application on the basis of the European Convention on Human Rights to the European Court of Human Rights as an institution of the Council of Europe.

The Lisbon Treaty will increase the visibility of the EU in the world. The goal of the EU leaders is to attain more consistency in external actions. There will not be an EU foreign minister, as referred to in the Constitutional Treaty; rather, the name of this position has been transformed to the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, who is also Vice-President of the Commission and chairs the External Relations Council. The High Representative has a "bridging" function between the Commission and the Council (Wouters, et al., 2008: 152). The President of the European Council was introduced with the Lisbon Treaty for a renewable term of two and a half years, instead of a President of the EU as was mentioned in the Constitutional Treaty.

The High Representative of the EU for Foreign and Security Policy carries out foreign policy on behalf of the Council and represents the EU's positions in the world (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 13). He/she will be

assisted and supported by the European External Action Service, which will include people from the Commission staff, the Council Secretariat and staff from the Member States; however, its level of autonomy and the proportion of the component parts are not clear (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 16). The Lisbon Treaty lays down guidelines but does not clarify the tasks in detail for these newly created positions (Guerot, Ulrike, 2009).

Former Belgian Prime Minister Herman Van Rompuy was chosen as the President of the European Council and Catherine Ashton, former Commissioner for Trade, was chosen as the High Representative, which implies that the political leaders of the member states have favoured less well-known political figures for this post over more high-profile figures. The President of the European Council is a chairperson rather than a leader. The president must reconcile different points of view and should encourage the emergence of compromise. The president is tasked with increasing inter-institutional cooperation and thus must work in harmony with Ashton and Barroso, the President of the Commission (Chopin and Lefebvre, 2010: 3). In addition, the new President has to cooperate with the leader of the country which holds the Presidency. The High Representative, meanwhile, must seek to reconcile any clashes between the Commission and the Council because of the 'double hat' nature of the position. Thus the personalities assigned to the crucial positions which were introduced with the Lisbon Treaty will influence the level of success of the reforms that were introduced by the Lisbon Treaty. (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 15). Barroso wrote in an editorial that "the Lisbon Treaty allows us to achieve a greater coherence and gives us a much greater capacity to act" (as cited in Denee, 2010). The coherence in external relations of the EU depends also on the manner of communications and the sharing of competences among the people appointed to the new posts. It also depends on the level of their cooperation with the Commission president and the political leader of the member state which holds the Presidency.

Through the introduction of the President of the European Council and the High Representative, the EU's actions will become more visible (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009). However, the new arrangements with the Lisbon Treaty do not fulfil Kissinger's expectation about a single European telephone number. The troika structure was ended with the introduction of new posts, but the external representation of the EU is still complicated (European

Commission, 2009: 5). Different persons are responsible for various aspects of the external relations of the EU.

The external representation of the EU is conducted by several actors, such as the President of the Commission, the state which holds the rotating presidency, and the High Representative. As Chopin and Lefebvre argue, following the Lisbon Treaty the President of the Council and the President of the Commission should represent the EU at summits with third countries. At meetings with ministers of foreign affairs from third countries, the High Representative should represent the EU (2010: 4). In the Lisbon Treaty, it is not clear who represents the EU at which meetings, and this may cause some problems in terms of establishing coherence in the external relations of the EU. On 18 March 2010, a spokeswoman for the Commission stated in a press briefing that “the two presidents have decided that the EU delegation will be composed of both presidents in one single delegation. That’s quite normal as their roles are complementary” (Pop, 2010). They decide who will speak on which subject when they both represent the EU at international meetings such as G20. The President of the Council represents the EU abroad in foreign policy and security matters. In other policy fields, such as climate change, Barroso will speak on behalf of the EU. In overlapping fields such as energy, which is related to both security and a commission policy area, they will decide on a case-by-case basis as to who will talk on behalf of the EU (Pop, 2010).

The Influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the External Relations of the EU and the Position of Turkey

Before the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, the first pillar made the EU a global actor in trade negotiations in terms of both presence and actorness (Hettne, 2008: 12). The EU can be considered a global actor in the field of trade and it is the biggest aid donor to the developing world (Development, 2010). However it has not been a global actor so far in terms of security and defence.

There has been a problem in the sharing of competences between the EU and the member states. The Lisbon Treaty makes clearer what the competences of the EU are, what the competences of the member states are, and which competencies are shared among them. The EU has exclusive competency in the fields of competition policy, the monetary policy of the

Eurozone, and common commercial policy (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 14). In these policy fields it is easier for the EU to operate as a global actor.

Certain policy fields such as taxation and defence still require unanimity (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 5). Although the pillar structure has been abolished, in terms of decision-making procedure the CFSP *de facto* remains an intergovernmental pillar. In the policy fields where QMV is used, there may be some “emergency brakes” which allow states to refer issues to the European Council if they feel that their vital national interests are at stake.

In the Lisbon Treaty the external objectives of the EU include coping with current challenges such as climate change, humanitarian aid, economic competitiveness and the fight against terrorism. With the mutual solidarity clause, the need to act together when any state is under terrorist attack or the victim of a man-made or natural disaster is mentioned (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 9). For the first time there is a section on energy. In order to be a global actor, the EU needs to find its own solutions to such global problems.

A crucial aspect of the external role of the EU is the conclusion of international agreements. The EP's involvement both in the process of negotiation and the conclusion of international agreements has been increased with the Lisbon Treaty (Wouters, et al., 2008: 167).

The Lisbon Treaty rearranges the CFSP and European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) under the new heading of Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP). According to Article 28B of the Lisbon Treaty, the “Petersberg Tasks” have been extended to include “...joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories” (2009).

In the Nice Treaty, the Political and Security Committee oversees such tasks, while according to the Lisbon Treaty the High Representative “acting under the authority of the Council and in close contact with the Political and Security Committee, shall ensure coordination of the civilian and military aspects of such tasks” (The Lisbon Treaty and Its Implications, 2008: 5–6).

With the introduction of “permanent structured cooperation” in the field of defence, states that are willing and able to meet certain standards can pursue further military cooperation. Thus, enhanced cooperation among several member states becomes easier, because they can take decisions with Qualified Majority Voting (QMV). The EU still has no standing army and there is no intention of establishing such an army (Guerot, 2009). In terms of justice and crime, the Lisbon Treaty strengthens the EU's ability to fight against international cross-border crime, illegal immigration, human trafficking, arms and drugs trafficking.

The Lisbon Treaty will have some implications in terms of coherence and visibility in the context of the UN (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008, 17). Considerations regarding the establishment of an EU seat at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) formed part of the discussions of the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) on political union which led to the Maastricht Treaty. During the Convention which prepared the Constitutional Treaty, the representation of the EU at the UN was discussed again. This proposal was rejected because of legal and political considerations. As a precondition for an EU seat at the UN, there is a need to accept the use of QMV in CFSP. Without realizing such a precondition, having an EU seat at the UN would be meaningless and might even negatively affect the position of the EU. Divisions among the member states of the EU in terms of security and foreign policy—as occurred in the case of Iraq—may cause major problems in terms of coherence within the framework of the UN (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 13). For example, in November 2009 the member states were divided in voting at the UN General Assembly on a resolution on human rights violations during the Israeli intervention in Gaza (Chopin and Lefebvre, 2010: 7).

With the granting of a legal personality to the EU, it can now sign treaties with the UN. However, the positive effects of this cannot be realized until the UN has made reforms to accept the membership of regional organizations. Since the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, the rotating Presidency has presented the common positions of member states at the UN. According to the Lisbon Treaty, the President of the European Council and the High Representative do not represent a member state and thus will have to speak in accordance with Article 39 of the UNSC, which is a provisional rules procedure for observers and other parties, instead of Article 37, which is for member states. These representatives would speak behind the nameplate of

the EU rather than that of a member state (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 14). The High Representative could give the EU a single voice at the UN. The new provision of Article 34.3 states that "When the Union has defined a position on a subject which is on the UNSC agenda, those Member States which sit on the Security Council shall request that the High Representative be invited to present the Union's position" (as cited in Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 15). Actually this is only a codification of the established practice of inviting the High Representative, when that post was occupied by Solana, to UNSC open meetings to express the common positions of the EU in the field of CFSP. Thus the presence of the High Representative in the Security Council will continue to depend on the invitation of the member states. The High Representative would be equipped with the necessary tools to play a role in the UN if the member states support him/her and if they are able to reach a compromise (Langenhove and Marchesi, 2008: 15).

The EU tries to promote the values of the EU in the wider world and to contribute to peace, security and sustainable development in the world, solidarity among peoples, free and fair trade, and the eradication of poverty. In addition to these aims, the EU tries to contribute to the protection of human rights, especially the rights of children, the development of international law, and particularly respect for the principles of the UN Charter. The Lisbon Treaty tries to give the EU the necessary tools to achieve these goals (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 3).

In the 21st century, Europe is faced with crucial challenges such as climate change, energy security, and global economic crisis (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 2). With the existing treaties, the EU could not cope with such challenges; thus the Lisbon Treaty was introduced in order to accommodate the latest enlargement towards the CEECs, to equip the EU with stronger instruments and more efficient decision-making structures to cope with such global challenges.

The Lisbon Treaty has strengthened the EU's role on climate change. This means that the EU will become a stronger global actor in terms of combating global warming, which is one of the main problems facing the world. Energy supply is a key challenge for the world and the Lisbon Treaty has some new provisions for the better functioning of the energy market, particularly in terms of energy supply, establishing energy efficiency, and the development of new and renewable energy sources. The Lisbon Treaty mentions the EU's

commitment to a European policy on sustainable energy (Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty, 2009: 9).

With the Lisbon Treaty, the crisis of the EU after the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty was overcome, opening the way towards further enlargement to include Croatia, Turkey, and the Western Balkans. Turkey's membership, in particular, will have important effects on the position of the EU as a global actor, especially in terms of security, and particularly energy security and defence. Quadras, who was the ex-vice-president of the European Parliament, stated that with Turkey the EU will "contribute much more effectively to fostering peace and democracy in neighbouring countries" (2004: 27).

The EU imports approximately 60% of its energy needs from regions neighbouring Turkey and secure access to these resources is crucial for the EU (Karaosmanoğlu, 2001: 161-162). It is expected that demands for energy will increase in coming years and thus the security of supply and its diversification will become increasingly crucial for the EU. Turkey's strategic position in the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Crude Oil Pipeline and natural gas pipeline projects on the East-West Energy Corridor will help both towards ensuring security of supply for the EU and towards diversifying sources by introducing Caspian oil and gas as an alternative to supplies from Russia (Eriş, 2002: 27-30). Turkey is a transit country of important energy networks for Caspian, Middle Eastern and Russian oil and gas. Secured access to these resources is important for the EU. Turkey's membership will enhance the EU's influence in the Middle East, Balkans and Caucasus. If the EU wants to have a more proactive foreign policy, Turkey's membership will be seen as an asset.

One of the goals of the EU mentioned in the Lisbon Treaty is to combat terrorism. Turkey has significant experience in counter-terrorism measures and in conducting low-intensity operations (Karaosmanoğlu, 2001: 161). According to Keyman and Öniş, Turkey constitutes a challenging test-case for the EU. Turkey's place in the EU would primarily depend upon the country's democratization and economic and political stability, but also upon the decision that the EU takes about its role in the world. If the EU prefers to have an inward-oriented vision, this will limit its role as a global actor. According to this inward-looking vision, Turkey would be seen more as a security liability than an asset, primarily because of her location and problematic neighbours (2004: 13-26). In the Lisbon Treaty it can be observed that the EU wants to

improve its position in the world as a global actor, which implies that Turkey can play an important role in that respect.

Conclusion

The Lisbon Treaty is an important step in the history of the EU. With the Lisbon Treaty the EU remains a unique entity that is more than an international organisation but less than a state. It moves a little further towards a federal structure rather than an intergovernmental one, which may positively affect its position in the world. But there is still a long way to go.

The Lisbon Treaty incorporates most of the main modifications which were introduced by the Constitutional Treaty in terms of the external actions of the EU. It may bring increased consistency to the external actions of the EU (Wouters, et al., 2008: 196-197). The influence of the Lisbon Treaty on the position of the EU as a global actor in high politics is dependent on certain other factors, such as the individuals assigned to the newly created positions, the relationships and manner of sharing competencies among them, the will of member states to reach compromises in the fields of security and defence and the emergence of a common 'other' of the member states.

Henry Kissinger once asked, "Who do I call if I want to speak with Europe?" (as cited in Mock, 2010). There is still no concrete answer to this question even after the Lisbon Treaty. The EU overcame the ratification crisis of the Constitutional Treaty in France and the Netherlands in 2005, but there are still problems in terms of speaking with one voice in the external relations of the EU, especially in the fields of foreign policy, security and defence. Thus it can be argued that the Lisbon Treaty is a medicine which can solve certain problems of the EU to a certain extent; however, the EU, which is a constantly evolving entity, will always have to adapt itself to changing circumstances and will need new treaties in the future.

With the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, the crisis of the EU after the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty was overcome. Before the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, some political figures argued that the EU would have to solve its internal problems before proceeding with the enlargement process. The ratification of the Lisbon Treaty has thus opened the way towards further enlargement, primarily towards Croatia and Turkey, which have continued with their negotiation processes. The membership of Turkey would positively affect the position of the EU as a global actor in terms of energy politics and

the fight against terrorism, both of which are mentioned as goals of the EU in the Lisbon Treaty. Turkey is a transit country of important energy networks for Caspian, Middle Eastern and Russian oil and gas. She will contribute to a diversification of energy supplies. Thus, after the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, the membership of Turkey will be more compatible with the goals of the EU and will improve the position of the EU as a global actor.

References

- Boxhoorn, B. (1996). European Identity and the Process of European Unification: Compatible Notions? in Michael Wintle (Ed.) *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Chopin, T. and Lefebvre, M. (2010). Three Phone Numbers for Europe: Will the Lisbon Treaty Make the European Union More Effective Abroad?, *US-Europe Analysis Series*, No.43.
- Denee, M. P. (2010). New Face of the EU: What Does The Future Hold?, *The Real Truth*, January 10, 2010, retrieved on March 19, 2010: www.realtruth.org/articles/100108-006-europe.html?print_view=yes
- "Development", *Europa*, retrieved on April 12, 2010: http://europa.eu/pol/dev/index_en.htm
- Eriş, M. G. (2002). Turkey's Potential Contribution to the EU, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol.1, No. 3.
- Guerot, U. (2009). After Lisbon: Is Europe Becoming a Global Power?, retrieved on March 19, 2010: http://ecfr.eu/content/entry/commentary_after_lisbon_is_europe_becoming_a_global_power_guerot/
- Hettne, B. (2008) EU as a Global Actor: An Anatomy of Actorship, *EU in International Affairs Conference*, Grande Salle.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L., (2001). Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Kimliği Açısından Türkiye –Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri, *Doğu-Batı*, Vol, 4, No. 14.
- Keyman, E. F. and Öniş, Z. (2004). Helsinki, Copenhagen and Beyond: Challenges to the New Europe and the Turkish State, in Mehmet Uğur and Nergis Canefe (Eds), *Turkey and European Integration: Prospects and Issues in the Post-Helsinki Era*, London, Routledge.
- Krotz, U. (2009). Momentum and Impediments: Why Europe Won't Emerge as a Full Political Actor on the World Stage Soon, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.47, No.3.
- Laffan, B. (2004). The EU and Its Institutions as Identity Builders, in R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse and M. B. Brewer (Eds), *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Langenhove, L. Van and Marchesi, D. (2008). Lisbon Treaty and The Emergence of Third Generation Regional Integration, *Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman Paper Series*, Vol.8, No.9.

- Mock, V. (2010). Need to Call Europe? Still Impossible, retrieved on 25 March 2010, <http://www.rnw.nl/english/article/need-call-europe-still-impossible>
- Newman, A. (2009). Lisbon Treaty Builds EU Super-State, retrieved on March 19, 2010: <http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/world-mainmenu-26/europe-mainmenu-35/2509-lisbon-treaty-builds-eu-super-state>
- Pop, V. (2010). Van Rompuy and Barroso to Both Represent EU at G20, *euobserver.com*, retrieved on March 19, 2010: www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/world-mainmenu-26/europe-mainmenu-3...
- Quadras, A.V. (2004). EU-Turkey: A Good Match?, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No.4.
- Smith, K. E. (2003). *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- "The Lisbon Treaty and Its Implications for CFSP/ESDP" (2008), *Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union*, Directorate B-Policy Department. "The EU in The World", *Treaty of Lisbon: Taking Europe in the 21st Century*, Official website of the EU, retrieved on 25 March 2010: http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/glance/external_relations/index_en.htm
- "The Treaty at a Glance", *Treaty of Lisbon: Taking Europe in the 21st Century*, Official website of the EU, retrieved on 25 March 2010: http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/glance/index_en.htm
- Wouters, J., Coppens, D. and De Meester, B. (2008). The European Union's External Relations after the Lisbon Treaty (2008), in Stefan Griller and Jacques Ziller (Eds.), *The Lisbon Treaty*, Vienna, European Community Studies Association of Austria Publication Series.
- Your Guide to the Lisbon Treaty* (2009). European Commission, DG for Communication, Brussels.