

Practice of the bureaucracy of the Foreign Service in Turkey can be characterized as rational and typical. Due to the rational features Foreign Service primarily strives to maintain continuity within the state and achieves this with the aid of its own traditions. The lack of arbitrary changes in Undersecretariats of Foreign Affairs (whom always been a diplomat within the bureaucracy) and a strict recruitment of its personnel play an important role in maintaining this stability. The Foreign Service does not meddle in domestic affairs and does its best to keep domestic affairs from intervening in its own life; this in turn limits its involvement in political struggle and contributes to its relative autonomy. Nevertheless, there is one dominant principles in the Foreign Service when it comes to the precise and unquestioning implementation of the government's policies that central pillar of Turkey's foreign policy is Westernism. Turkish diplomats, who were the original pioneers of cultural Westernization with all its benefits up until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, shifted their attention from the Empire to the national state structure, as both bureaucratic cadres and practitioners of nationalism, in the process of building the Turkish nation-state. The main feature distinguishing them from other bureaucratic elites was the paradoxical mission they assumed in the overlapping historical phases of Westernization, the perpetuation of the Empire, and the building of the nation-state. In light of the various historical experiences of Turkish democracy, and specially when we consider the intra-institutional disputes Turkey has been experiencing lately (military, government and constitutional court), mission of the Foreign Service as an institution, in the Turkish adventure of Westernization, modernization, Europeanization, or whatever label should be attached to it and where it stands in the making of foreign policy today, need to be reconsidered. I argue that bureaucracy of Ministry can take a more active role not only in implementation of foreign policy in the international arena, but also in practice and presentation of it at the national level. This

requirement of a more involvement in domestic affairs, should not challenge the traditional relative autonomy of Ministry when we consider the other examples in the international level.

Foreign Ministries throughout the world have been faced with a variety of challenges and proposals for change and adaptation since the end of cold war. The challenges include changes taking place in both international and internal factors that affect foreign policy making in general. Specially in the case of European Union, two main themes emerge- first, increasingly contested notion that foreign ministries, embassies and diplomats are the sole or the most apt defenders of national interests abroad and secondly, the issue of whether governments and foreign affairs administrations have reacted consciously and strategically to several fundamental changes to the diplomatic agenda. A system common to all member states now operates where the foreign ministries provide the institutional framework of day to day coordination. They monitor the activities of government departments and coordinate between national capitals and Brussels. Although there is a big discussion going on whether the role of Foreign Ministries are arbitrators or gatekeepers, all the foreign ministries went under several organizational changes and they reevaluated their missions by involving more to domestic decision making.

AKP can use this activism in foreign policy as a tool to redesign and reorganize its domestic policy regarding in the implementation of Copenhagen criteria, democracy, human rights and in the public discussion of Kurdish issue, with the active involvement and participation of *the* traditional institution of Turkish republic, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. “Strategic depth of Turkey” can be effectively presented with the assistance of this important civil bureaucratic institution not only to international audience but more importantly to national one by adapting recent discourse of French Ministry of Foreign Affairs ‘it is something new but which is legitimate continuation of our past’.