

Volume 2 • Number 1 • January 2013

all
azimuth

All Azimuth

A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace

www.foreignpolicyandpeace.org

**Published by Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research, İhsan Doğramacı Peace Foundation**

The Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research was created under the auspices of the İhsan Doğramacı Peace Foundation.

The main purpose of the Center is to help develop agendas and promote policies that contribute to the peaceful resolution of international and inter-communal conflicts taking place particularly in the regions surrounding Turkey. It also aims to analyze and interpret contemporary policies from a critical, comparative but, at the same time, constructive and peace-oriented perspective.

The Center, in order to achieve its purpose, prepares research projects and programs, works to provide a suitable dialogical environment for social scientists, publishes research outcomes, holds conferences, round-tables, and workshops on national and international levels, offers fellowships, appoints candidates for the İhsan Doğramacı Peace Award, and publishes All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace.

The Center, in its activities, observes the highest academic standards, norms, and freedoms. In doing so it attaches significance to the theoretical and methodological aspects of foreign policy analysis and works to construct bridges between policy and theory. Together with All Azimuth, the Center also aims to provide a platform for homegrown conceptualizations of international relations and foreign policy research.

Chief Editors

Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, Center for Foreign
Policy & Peace
Ersel Aydinli, Bilkent University

Editors

Esra Çuhadar Gürkaynak, Bilkent University
Pınar İpek, Bilkent University
Müge Kinacioglu, Hacettepe University
Özgür Özdamar, Bilkent University

Copy Editor

Rana Nelson

Publisher

Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research
İhsan Doğramacı Peace Foundation
Ankara, Turkey

ISSN 2146-7757
All Rights Reserved

Printing House

Elma Teknik Basım Matbaacılık
Çatal Sokak 11/A Maltepe / ANKARA
Tel: (90-312) 229 92 65

Printing Date
14.09.2012

Editorial Board

Şahin Alpay, Bahçeşehir University
Melih Altunışık, Middle East Technical University
Mohammed Ayooob, Michigan State University
Hüseyin Bağcı, Middle East Technical University
Nimet Beriker, Sabancı University
Daniel Druckman, George Mason University
Cooper Drury, University of Missouri-Columbia
Willem Frederik van Eekelen, Former Minister of Defense of the Netherlands & Former Secretary General of the WEU
Atila Eralp, Middle East Technical University
Onur Gökc  , Bilkent University
Metin Heper, Bilkent University
Patrick James, University of Southern California
E. Fuat Keyman, Sabancı University
Müge Kinacioglu, Hacettepe University
Ludger K  hnhardt, Bonn University
Heath W. Lowry, Princeton University
Ersin Onuldur  n, Ankara University
Ziya On  s, Ko   University
Nihat Ali Özcan, Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey
Haluk Özdemir, Kırıkkale University
  lter Turan, İstanbul Bilgi University
Peter Volten, Center for European Security Studies
Nuri Yurdusev, Middle East Technical University
S. Enders Wimbush, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, Washington, D.C.

This journal is indexed and abstracted by:

CIAO
EBSCO
European Sources Online
Gale
Index Copernicus International
JournalSeek
ProQuest
Ulrich's

Published two issues per year. Articles are subject to review by anonymous referees. Submissions should be made in English by e-mail and should conform to the instructions on the inside back cover and the journal's website.



All Azimuth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

V2, N1, January 2013

In This Issue	3
---------------	---

ARTICLES

Norway and Turkey: Possibilities of Cooperation through the Eyes of Turkish Opinion-Makers <i>Daniel Heradstveit, Siri Neset, and G. Matthew Bonham</i>	5
---	---

Humanitarian Intervention as a ‘Responsibility to Protect’: An International Society Approach <i>Şaban Kardaş</i>	21
--	----

COMMENTARIES

Mediation: The Best Way Forward in Conflict Prevention and Resolution <i>Ertuğrul Apakan</i>	39
---	----

Good Governance of the Security Sector in Turkey <i>Willem van Eekelen and Merijn Hartog</i>	43
---	----

Europe in Transition: Lessons to be Learned <i>Ludger Kühnhardt</i>	47
--	----

REVIEW ARTICLE

Notes from NOREF and İhsan Doğramacı Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research: Summary and Reflections on the Turkish and Norwegian Approaches to the Arab Spring and Peacebuilding <i>C. Esra Çuhadar and Monica Rafael Simoes</i>	53
--	----

In This Issue

In this issue of *All Azimuth* we take a special interest in the Arab Spring and mediation from Turkish and Norwegian perspectives. Several of the articles in this issue reflect this interest. In November 2012, Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research organized a workshop in cooperation with the Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center (NOREF) and with the support of the Center for Strategic Research of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs where Turkish and Norwegian academics discussed Arab Spring and peacebuilding with the participation of academics from various Arab countries.

The issue begins with a research article by Daniel Heradstveit, Siri Neset, and G. Matthew Bonham in which they explore possibilities of cooperation between Norway and Turkey on issues of peacebuilding. They discuss both opportunities and challenges to further such cooperation based on elite interviews the authors conducted in 2012 in Turkey. They touch upon themes such as whether an increased cooperation between Turkey and Norway could affect “Turkophobia” in Europe and whether Norway would find itself in a trade-off situation between furthering its peacebuilding agenda and economic interests.

In the second research article, Dr. Şaban Kardaş tackles the problems emerging from the practice of humanitarian intervention especially within the context of recent Arab uprisings. While looking at humanitarian intervention, Kardaş makes use of English School’s international society approach. Drawing from Hedley Bull’s discussion about fundamental goals of international society, Kardaş argues that a balance between preserving the current system and creating a space for humanitarian intervention is possible.

Following the two research articles, the first policy commentary is written by the former Turkish Ambassador to the United Nations (2009-2012), Ertuğrul Apakan. His article highlights the need and support for mediation both at national, regional, and international levels pointing out to the growing importance activism regarding mediation within the UN agenda as well as the leadership role Turkey has assumed in supporting mediation efforts. The article dwells on the recent role of UN in leading mediation initiatives and how a successful mediation process could work. The article especially provides valuable information regarding Turkey’s important and leading role and efforts in this regard.

The second commentary by Williem von Eekelen and Merijn Hertog presents outcomes of capacity building programs conducted by the Center for European Security Studies (CESS) on civil-military relations and good governance in the security sector in Turkey. The first of these programs contributed to the advancement of understanding with regard to the role of army in a democracy in line with the EU Copenhagen criteria. Second program they discuss deals with the position of Turkish army in politics and suggest reforms in civil-military relations in order to remove the obstacles for accession to the EU. The final program discussed, though its report has not been published yet, targets enhancing civilian capacity building in the security sector.

The third commentary written by Prof. Ludger Kühnhardt, explores how the EU has positioned itself in the post-Cold War era with regard to integration. The article discusses from a historical point of view the endless series of crises *in* integration which are treated differently by the author from the crises *of* integration. To determine whether the debt crisis is yet another crisis in integration, Kühnhardt introduces ten assessment points.

The final piece in this issue of *All Azimuth* is a summary of the joint workshop held



on 1-2 November 2012 by the Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research and NOREF titled “Seminar on Turkish and Norwegian Approaches to the Arab Uprising.” The workshop report does not attribute any statement to any of the participants and is a reflection of Esra Çuhadar and Monica Rafael Simoes on the discussions held during the workshop. It introduces various viewpoints shared with regard to Turkish-Norwegian cooperation in the Arap uprisings, mediation and peacebuilding efforts of the two countries to this end, and the pros and cons of the Turkish model.

Norway and Turkey: Possibilities of Cooperation through the Eyes of Turkish Opinion-Makers

Daniel Heradstveit and Siri Neset

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

G. Matthew Bonham

Syracuse University

Abstract

The authors conducted interviews with opinion-makers in Turkey in 2012 to explore the feasibility of cooperation between Turkey and Norway on issues of peacebuilding. Norway was viewed by respondents as a country with soft-power capabilities and a focus on human rights, democratic values, and the rule of law. Some opinion-makers also emphasized that both countries have a similar position on Palestine, a pivotal issue in the Middle East. Obstacles to cooperation include the geographical distance between the two countries, the lack of common institutions, Norway's lack of experience with different ethnicities and faiths, Norway's failure to object to the 2005-2006 Danish cartoon scandal regarding Mohammed, Norwegian criticism of Turkey's policies toward the Kurds, and its imprisonment of dissidents without due process of law. Despite these issues, respondents expressed enthusiasm about future cooperation, and view Norway as a far better potential collaborator than any other European country, in part because it, like Turkey, is outside the EU but a member of NATO. The issue of trade-offs between Norway's use of soft power and its economic aspirations, namely oil investments in other countries, was also explored. The article concludes with a discussion of the possibility that increased cooperation between Turkey and Norway may give rise to "Turkophobia", an extension of "Islamophobia", a simplistic interpretative framework that rests on cultural misunderstanding and miscommunication.

Keywords: Turkish-Norwegian cooperation, peacebuilding, democracy, soft power, trade-offs, Turkophobia

1. Introduction

Turkey's dynamic and unprecedented economic development in recent years, followed by a number of domestic and international peacemaking initiatives has sparked Norwegian interest in closer ties with Turkey. Inspired by this development, the authors of this article investigated whether there is potential for closer cooperation between Norway and Turkey on peace efforts and democracy promotion in the wake of the Arab Spring.¹

The Arab Spring has challenged beliefs about the incompatibility between Islam and

Daniel Heradstveit, Professor Emeritus, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. E-mail: daniel.heradstveit@nupi.no. Siri Neset, Research Fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. E-mail: sne@nupi.no. G. Matthew Bonham, G. Matthew Bonham, Professor, International Relations and Political Science, Syracuse University. E-mail: gmbonham@maxwell.syr.edu.

¹ This ongoing research was initiated by Daniel Heradstveit and Siri Neset and received funding from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center.



democracy. Many in the Arab world have pointed to Turkey as an example of how to create a democratic regime in an Islamic country: the Turkish Model.²

With the rise of Turkey's Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*; AKP), the Turkish Model exemplifies that a party with roots in political Islam can evolve into a democratic party of government.³ The AKP has further demonstrated capabilities to resolve the leading challenge to the Muslim world today, namely, the management and political integration of Islam.⁴ Some voices in Turkey, however, both within the AKP and the opposition, do not echo the view that the present government lives up to the Turkish Model. The opposition has complained that Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has not applied at home the democratic recommendations he has advocated abroad.⁵

The research community studying the Turkish Model also reaches a mixed verdict. Manal Lofti, for example, highlights the fact that Turkey is shaped by its particular history and therefore cannot be a model for other countries in the region—in other words, the Turkish Model is not replicable.⁶ Emad Kaddorah agrees with this view, saying that instead of imitating the Turkish Model, neighboring states should initiate their own positive models because each state has its own attributes and features.⁷

Under the present government, the Turkish Model is increasingly referred to as the “Turkish inspiration”. Tarik Oğuzlu claims that Turkey can only *inspire* Muslim countries in the region, for example, regarding preserving secular and democratic governments in a society where the majority of people are Muslims, or strengthening the idea that legitimate leadership only becomes a possibility by winning freely held elections.⁸ Likewise, Nora Fisher Onar calls the Turkish Model “a model-in-progress”, but states it cannot be contested that this model has shown that the combination of Islam, democracy, and secularism works.⁹ These components of the Turkish model are evidence that our standard view of Islam needs to be revised. Onar also argues that this model-in-progress continues to offer a timely example for the region.¹⁰

Sinan Ülgen identifies five characteristics of the Turkish Model:

- (1) Secularism, Democracy, and Political Islam: The Turkish political system has been able to accommodate political Islam, the principle of secularism as well as democracy.
- (2) Civil-Military Relations: the Turkish military has played a major role as the watchdog for republican principles in the country.
- (3) Market-State Relations: The Turkish Model is characterized by economic liberalization and trade integration, which have led to the development of a business class independent of the government.
- (4) Links to the West: Since the founding of the Turkish republic, Turkish leaders have anchored Turkey in the West,

² Marwan Muasher et al., “Can the Turkish Model Gain Traction in the New Middle East?” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 19, 2011, accessed November 2, 2012, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2011/12/19/can-turkish-model-gain-traction-in-new-middle-east>.

³ “Turkish Model has shortcomings,” Oxford Analytica, February 21, 2011, accessed February 5, 2013, http://www.relooney.info/0_NS4053_1608.pdf.

⁴ Graham E. Fuller, “Turkey’s Strategic Model: Myths and Realities,” *The Washington Quarterly* 27 (2004): 51-64.

⁵ “Turkish Model has shortcomings.”

⁶ “Turkey from Ataturk to Erdogan,” Asharq al-Awsat, November 9, 2007, accessed February 9, 2013, <http://www.aawsat.net/2007/11/article55260861>.

⁷ Emad Kaddorah, “The Turkish Model: Acceptability and Apprehension,” *Insight Turkey* 12 (2010): 113-129.

⁸ Tarık Oğuzlu, “Is the ‘Turkey As a Model’ Idea Turning into Reality from Perception?” ORSAM, December 5, 2011, accessed February 11, 2013, <http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/showArticle.aspx?ID=951>.

⁹ Nora Fisher Onar, “Turkey Inc.: Rethinking the Model’s Regional Role,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 29, 2012, accessed February 10, 2013, <http://carnegieendowment.org/sada/2012/03/29/turkey-inc.-rethinking-turkey-s-regional-role/a5k9>.

¹⁰ We may add that it is also an example for the West.

seeking memberships in Western, multilateral organizations like NATO. (5) State Traditions: Turkey has a long history of bureaucratic traditions carried over from the Ottoman Empire, which has led to popular confidence in the countries [sic] institutions.¹¹

The Arab Spring has opened up a new window of opportunity for Turkey's policies on peace and democracy in the region. Today, aware of its increasing potential for influence, Turkey states that it pursues a multi-dimensional foreign policy that is pre-emptive rather than reactive. Security for all, political dialogue, economic interdependence, and cultural harmony are the building blocks of Turkey's vision for the New Middle East.¹²

Norway has good potential to be an active third party in promoting democratic thinking in the wake of the Arab Spring. Turkey and Norway are both members of NATO and both outside the EU. The two countries are well positioned to collaborate to improve and stabilize democratic systems, reinforce civil society, and initiate interfaith dialogue. They could also collaborate to develop mediation and peacebuilding expertise and capacities.¹³

2. Our Approach

To learn more about the possibilities for collaboration between Turkey and Norway, we conducted interviews in 2012 with elite opinion-makers in Turkey. Our goal was to understand how Turkey might view Norway as a partner for promoting democracy and initiating peace efforts in the Arab Middle East. Our underlying assumption is that positive interaction would follow from such cooperation.

Elite interviewing is a potent source of data-collection for political scientists doing empirical research. There are many approaches to such interviewing, and we decided to conduct in-depth interviews with open-ended questions to allow us to discuss at length respondents' thoughts on key issues relevant to the research topic.¹⁴ This format also allowed respondents to talk freely without the constraints of having to answer questions according to fixed categories.

Although the interview instrument was open-ended, the questions were standardized. We followed the advice of Philip E. Converse to use the original item introduced when asking the question a second time, regardless of measurement error, instead of having to compare results from different question wordings.¹⁵

In social science there is no consensual definition of "elite," so the statistical population cannot be defined, which means it is not possible to construct a representative sample in a statistical sense.¹⁶ Thus, after consulting with experts on Turkey we drew up a list of persons qualified for interviewing. Further, having obtained an interview, we asked the respondent

¹¹ Muasher et al., "Can the Turkish Model?"

¹² "Policy of Zero Problems with our Neighbors," Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, accessed November 10, 2012, <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/policy-of-zero-problems-with-our-neighbors.en.mfa>.

¹³ The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs signed an agreement in January 2012 to promote cooperation between research groups working in Middle Eastern countries. "Press Release," The office of the Prime Minister, accessed November 6, 2012, <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/smkr/press-center/Press-releases/2012/increased-cooperation-between-norway-and.html?id=668571>.

¹⁴ For recent discussions on similar approaches, see Oisin Tansey, "Process Tracing and Elite Interviewing: a Case for Non-probability Sampling," *Political Science and Politics* 40 (2007): 765-772; Jeffery M. Berry (2002), "Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing," *Political Science and Politics* 35 (2002): 679-682; and Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005).

¹⁵ Cited in Joel D. Aberbach and Bert A. Rockman, "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews," *Political Science and Politics* 35 (2002): 675.

¹⁶ Daniel Heradstveit, *Arab-Israeli Conflict: Psychological Obstacles to Peace* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1979; New York: Columbia University Press, 1981): 40.



to name other possible interviewees.¹⁷ This technique is known as chain sampling. A clear disadvantage of chain sampling is that the respondents may choose persons of their own liking, and so we deemed it important to combine the two methods. The interviews were carried out in Istanbul and Ankara in March and April 2012 with well-informed Turkish elite from academia, politics, journalism and think tanks.¹⁸

Our methodology involved time-consuming subsequent response coding. Although we asked interviewees to discuss eight issues, we explore only three in this article: the image of Norway, the relationship between Turkey and Norway, and the possibilities for more cooperation between Norway and Turkey on issues of peacebuilding after the Arab Spring.¹⁹ To code the interviews, we created two main categories and four sub-categories. We called the first main category “The image of Norway”, and its subcategories “Wonderful Norway” and “The problematic side of Norway.” We called the second main category “Cooperation between Norway and Turkey”, and its subcategories “Issues that promote cooperation” and “Obstacles to future cooperation”.

In analyzing the data we relied on the hermeneutical approach. Maurizio Ferraris defines hermeneutics as “the art of interpretation as transformation,” and he contrasts it with a view of theory as “contemplation of eternal essences unalterable by their observer”.²⁰ Hans Georg Gadamer describes hermeneutics “as the skill to let things speak which come to us in a fixed, petrified form, that of the text”.²¹

The starting point for our analysis is the potential for extended cooperation between Norway and Turkey around democracy promotion, interfaith dialogue and peacebuilding. In reading the texts it became clear to us that some topics merited closer attention. The first was Norway’s positive international image and its potential for a “spillover” effect to Turkey. The second was whether proposed trade-offs in Norwegian foreign policy with regard to oil exploration might interfere with its soft power approach. Third, concern was expressed regarding the potential for Turkophobia in Norwegian society, especially in the aftermath of right-wing extremist Anders Behring Breivik’s attacks in Oslo and at Utøya on July 22, 2011.

3. The Turkish Image of Norway

In this article we concentrate on results directly related to Turkish-Norwegian cooperation, beginning with the Turkish image of Norway and its role in the world.²²

When asked about their perceptions of Norway, respondents most frequently mentioned Norway’s soft-power capabilities, followed by norm-related issues. According to one of our respondents, Norway is “the one and only” on soft power. Norway’s focus on human factors, human rights, democratic values, and the rule of law were noted as examples of Norway’s norm-setting power: “Norway has the ability to both inspire and challenge other countries normatively”. Respondents also stressed Norway’s high standard of living, wealth, freedom, and equality as factors that contribute to its soft power capabilities.

¹⁷ We interviewed 12 people from Istanbul and Ankara in this exploratory study.

¹⁸ The opinion-makers signed a consent form after being informed of the potential risks involved.

¹⁹ The other issues discussed were: the “tug of war” between secularism and Islamism in Turkey; the state of democracy in Turkey; perceptions of the Turkish model; the Turkish image of the United States; and the leadership styles of Prime Minister Erdogan and his Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu.

²⁰ Maurizio Ferraris, *History of Hermeneutics* (Atlantic Highlands, NY: Humanities Press, 1996).

²¹ Hans Georg Gadamer, “Interview: Writing and the Living Voice,” in *Hans-Georg Gadamer on Education, Poetry and History*, eds. Dieter Misgeld and Graeme Nicholson (New York: State University of New York Press, 1992): 63-71.

²² There is, to our knowledge, no previous research on how Turks view Norway and the Norwegians.

As a small power, Norway is viewed as somewhat limited in how it can operate on the international scene. Further, Turkish opinion-makers emphasized that Norway is not seen as a military power. Nevertheless, Norwegian governments have exploited what their country can do internationally by propagating norms and soft power, and respondents feel that Norway makes its presence known. This perception is definitely influenced by Norway's values in domestic politics and foreign policy. Norway is a well-functioning democracy. Its stubbornness in promoting norms in international relations is well known and it has achieved much in this regard, based on the "general decent image" of Norwegians as "do-gooders" internationally. Norway, furthermore, is known for its active participation in development issues and for its foreign aid policy. Although Norway is a small country, respondents view it as an important one, providing a model for others.

Norway is perceived as a peaceful nation, but some opinion-makers see this to be partly as a consequence of its relatively isolated geography. One respondent noted that Norway is fortunate to have a long coastline, with no neighbors imposing on its territory. Respondents feel that Norway conducts itself in a manner most appropriate to its geographic position and small population (about five million), i.e., emphasizing soft power and human rights over hard power. Norway is in no position to build a large army or navy and acquire weaponry that would make it competitive with larger countries.

One interviewee put forward the idea that Norway might be vulnerable to the dangerous phenomenon of Islamophobia or fascism because of its homogeneous population with the same religious background.²³ In other words, the country lacks experiences in living together with different ethnicities, as well as different religious faiths. "Norwegians don't know how to live with diversity," the respondent claimed. This is a potential threat to Norway as a country—Breivik's attacks, which killed 77 people, may be an omen of things to come. Islamophobia on a more general level could also be transformed into "Turkophobia."

Turkish opinion-makers also mentioned that Norway's image of a global peacemaker could backfire in the long run because Norway is also perceived as an oil-producing country. At the outset, most of its oil came from the North Sea and therefore presented no foreign policy problems. But today, when Norway also operates in other countries, the Norwegian oil industry may spark issues contradictory to the country's peace and reconciliation efforts.

4. The Potential for Cooperation between Norway and Turkey

When it comes to the idea of collaborating with Norway on promoting peacebuilding in the Arab Middle East, we cite the respondent who said, "Obviously... Norway is the best choice for Turkey and Turkey is the best (if not [the] only – who else?) option for Norway." Generally, Norway is considered a far better collaborator than any other European country: "As a matter of fact, we can assure you that this will be a non-controversial issue in Turkey".

Some interviewees admitted that although Norway and Turkey do not have many things in common, the fact that neither Turkey nor Norway is a member of the EU and that they are both members of NATO would be helpful in developing an extended relationship. Turkey's role as an international actor is increasing, but closer cooperation with Norway in the field of peace and reconciliation is potentially of great importance. One opinion-maker phrased it as follows: "Norway's soft power and the Turkish model could be a success—both in the Middle East and Asia."

²³ Looking only at population statistics, one may think that Norway is a highly heterogeneous society. There is, however, strong pressure for immigrants to conform to Norwegian culture, resulting in a relatively homogeneous society.



Other respondents claimed that Norway is practically unknown in Turkey and suggested that Norway should do more to become better known. For example, Norway could do more to attract Turkish tourists, considering its many exotic and interesting features, such as the fjords. Still, it is not easy to create interest for Norway in Turkey, and it is rare that you read something about Norway in the Turkish newspapers.

4.1. Issues that promote cooperation

Some respondents emphasized that Norway and Turkey hold the same view of Palestine. This is a good point of departure, because the Palestinian conflict is pivotal to the whole Middle East. The Arab Middle East needs an “honest broker” like Norway, a country that is attached neither to Palestine nor Israel. Turkey, due to recent events, such as the Gaza war and the MV Mavi Marmara incident, has lost credibility as a broker between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and thus Turkey would greatly profit from an alliance with Norway.²⁴

Opinion-makers also mentioned that closer cooperation between Norway and Turkey could have a positive effect on democratic values in both countries. From Norway, Turkey could gain deeper insight into a well-functioning democracy, while Norway could gain more knowledge from Turkey about how to live with diversity. One person also stated that Norway could increase the value of the Turkish Model and make it stronger and more credible. Finally, the importance of Norwegian experience and sophistication to Turkey regarding conflict resolution was repeated.

4.2. Obstacles to future cooperation

The Turkish elite were reluctant to say anything negative about the idea of cooperation with Norway. They did, of course, say that any dishonesty, ill will, or manipulation on the part of either nation could cause problems. The Turkish opinion-makers stressed the importance of “putting the cards on the table.” They also said that Israel could cause problems for this cooperation.

One obstacle to cooperation is that Norway and Turkey are far apart geographically. Another is that the countries lack common institutions. Third, Turkish and Norwegian scholars currently have little interaction, and fourth, the countries’ civil societies have few links.

4.2.1. The Danish cartoons

When explicitly asked about possible Norway-Turkey cooperation obstacles, the 2005-2006 Danish cartoons that parodied Mohammed and caused a global outcry were mentioned, even though respondents are well aware that the cartoons were published in Denmark. Because of Denmark’s geographic proximity to Norway, however, respondents view Denmark as being culturally similar to Norway, and thus that Norway may agree with anti-Islamic sentiments. We were warned that if Norway did something like this, it would clearly have a negative effect on any cooperation with Turkey. Interestingly, there was no mention of religious differences between the two countries, although some people made reference to

²⁴ Only one respondent noted that Norway has been falling out of Israel’s good graces since the Oslo Accords. Due to increasing sympathy for the Palestinians by the Norwegian public and the government, Norway is no longer seen as a neutral party or possible mediator by many Israelis.

Islamophobia, which is said to be widespread in Europe. Linked to this notion was the idea that cultural misunderstanding could cause problems in cooperation between Turkey and Norway.

4.2.2. Peacebuilding

Turkish opinion-makers emphasized how advanced Norwegians are in peacebuilding compared to Turkey. “When the Norwegians referred to peacebuilding, the Turks have no clear meaning of what this really means.” One respondent noted how this lack of knowledge is reflected in how Turkey deals with the Kurdish problem. A good way for Turkey to begin the peacebuilding process is to move more intelligently on issues with the Kurds.

At the outset of this research effort we thought of two potentially difficult issues in the relationship between Turkey and Norway: Turkey’s Kurdish issue and its practice of jailing opponents of the regime without due process. We therefore included these issues in our conversations.

4.2.3. The Kurds

Our respondents spoke frankly about the Kurdish issue. They warned Norway that if it supported the PKK, Turkey would “show the red flag” against cooperation. They admitted that government policies were not ideal in the treatment of the Kurds. Historically, the Kurds have been mistreated by the Turkish state; however, this general historical picture must take into account today’s Kurdish policy. Interviewees claimed that in the last five years ways of handling the problem have improved, although they admitted that the situation has declined in the last two years.

Respondents expected more sympathy from Norway on the Kurdish issue because of its complexity. It is rarely mentioned, for example, that the issue presents a security problem for Turkey. Respondents feel that the European public and governments lack an understanding of the problem and make superficial criticisms of Turkey without offering constructive solutions.

According to some of our respondents, Turkey is facing potential ethnic divisions that threaten its survival. Turkey experienced such a division during the Ottoman period, when the Empire fell apart. Norway, on the other hand, is a product of rather recent state formation, and has no historical experiences with the disintegration of an empire.

One respondent disagreed with the above statements, finding no fault with the amount of criticism from Norway on the Kurdish issue; greater criticism stems from France, Germany, and Sweden. That respondent felt that the Norwegians are careful not to criticize the Turkish government too much, because the Norwegians are involved in talks between the Kurds and Turkey.

4.2.4. Jailing without rule of law

The Turkish opinion-makers argued that when criticizing the state of democracy and problems of minorities in Turkey, people would be better to describe them with some humility, given the difficulties that Turkey must handle simultaneously. On the other hand, it would be wrong for Norwegians not to acknowledge that there are problems with democracy in Turkey. One respondent claimed that Turkey is only halfway down the road to becoming a democratic country. If Norway does not acknowledge the weakness of democratic institutions in Turkey, then Norwegians would lose credibility in Turkey and in the eyes of other countries in the Middle East.



Turkey's elite were perfectly willing to talk about the country's weaknesses in its democracy. One told us, for example, that a friend gave a lecture at an organization with connections to the PKK. This person was now in jail. It is fair, said our respondent, to criticize human rights breaches in Turkey, and claimed that these problems are increasing.

Interestingly, the government is now jailing a different stratum of society. Previously, minorities were the most vulnerable. Today, minorities have a much better position in Turkish society and are much freer, which is to the credit of the AKP. Now, however, the middle class is most subject to human rights abuses; specifically, journalists, authors, politicians, dissidents, intellectuals and members of the military who oppose the present government's policies.

Some respondents explained that the view of the opposition is that the AKP aims at developing an all-powerful state, in other words, a clearly anti-democratic government. Respondents stated that illegal jailing is now worse than it has ever been. Human rights abuses continue to be standard practices and liberal freedoms are shrinking. In the past, the courts illegally intervened in politics. Today, this situation is reversed, and now it is the government that does not abide by the rule of law and creates obstacles to freedom and the rise of democracy.

Despite criticisms of the Kurdish policy and of jailing dissidents, respondents do not see these as major impediments to closer relations between the two countries. The Turkish elite are enthusiastic about what both countries can stand to gain through such cooperation.

5. Soft Power, Trade-Offs, and Turkophobia

In the next section we will discuss three issues of potential importance to the future of Turkish-Norwegian cooperation: soft power, trade-offs, and Turkophobia.

5.1. Norway's soft-power capacity

We have already reported that when asked about Norway, respondents most often mentioned its soft power capabilities.

In the academic literature, soft power is defined as a country's ability to obtain its goals in world politics because others admire its values and want to follow its example, i.e., they do not use "hard power" or coercion.²⁵ In other words, soft power creates political capital. According to the 2011 global ranking of soft power by the Institute for Government, Norway was ranked eleventh and Turkey twenty-third with respect to soft power. On governance and diplomacy Norway was ranked second and sixth, respectively.²⁶

According to Norway's *Power and Democracy Report*, its soft power approach has been sophisticated since the early 1990s:

Norway has been built up as an international brand name, as a particularly peace-loving nation, eager to donate resources and with specific tasks in world politics. The branding takes place through its engagement policy—the work for conflict resolution, peace, democracy, and human rights—around the world. The image of Norway as a moral and humanitarian great power has become a new national symbol in line with other symbols shaping Norwegians' national identity.²⁷

²⁵ Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).

²⁶ Jonathan McClosky, "The New Persuaders II: A 2011 Global Ranking of Soft Power," Institute for Government, 2011, December 1, 2011, accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/new-persuaders-ii>.

²⁷ "Makt og Demokrati. Makt og Demokratietrediningens Sluttrapport" ("Power and Democracy"), *Norwegian Official*

After the initial success of the Oslo Accords, Norwegian officials recognized that such a method could be further utilized in the international arena. Then-State Secretary Jan Egeland stated: "...our status, in, for example, the Middle East, enables us in other settings to meet on a higher level and in more comprehensive talks. They are interested in our assessment. This way we may get information back that is important to Norway."²⁸

The so-called Norwegian Model incorporates the idea that a small state may have advantages that ensure impartiality and neutrality, and thus instill confidence in that country as a third party.²⁹ The Norwegian Model also emphasizes the usefulness of close cooperation between authorities, NGOs, and academia, as well as a long-term perspective on peacebuilding, including aid and economic support for reconstruction.

After the Oslo Accords, the world community increasingly picked up the concept of the Norwegian Model as a way of proceeding in peacemaking.³⁰ By 2002, the Norwegian peace enterprise had grown into a considerable part of Norwegian foreign policy, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs established the Peace and Reconciliation Unit to coordinate its efforts.

Norway's foreign policy strategy seems to have paid off. When the authors of this article conducted field research in Turkey in the spring of 2012, our respondents confirmed Norway's positive image. They stated that Norwegian governments have genuinely demonstrated what Norway can do on the international scene by propagating norms and soft power as the way forward. Therefore, in spite of its size, Norway achieves its goals.

Today, maximizing Norwegian soft power continues to be a major foreign policy goal. As former Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre states:

We have devoted substantial resources to developing a foreign policy strategy where we focus Norwegian efforts and resources towards areas where Norwegian policy can make a difference as well as areas where we can have an impact. We have devoted our attention to issues that are important on their own, but which also present possibilities to develop new norms and to develop new networks with important countries.³¹

Recently, *realpolitik* has been introduced in the discourse of Norwegian foreign policy. Støre elaborates on this concept by stating that Norwegian foreign policy needs direction to best channel the country's economic, political, and human resources: "We have to prioritize to have an impact." According to Støre, two questions guide Norwegian efforts: Is this important to Norwegian interests? and Can Norwegian efforts make a difference?³²

The bottom line of this policy is the necessity of maintaining Norway's positive image in the world community. Our Turkish respondents feel that cooperation between Turkey and Norway would reflect well on Turkey. "Any government in Turkey ready to collaborate with Norway would strengthen its position," said one. And as another phrased it, "Norway's soft power and the Turkish model could be a success, both in the Middle East and Asia." Norway, in line with its *realpolitik*, obviously would also be interested in Turkey as a door opener to the Middle East.

Reports, NOU 2003: 19. Translation by the authors.

²⁸ "Freds-suksess som 'byttemiddel,'" *VG* (30 January 1995): 22. Cited in Øystein H. Skåland, "Norway is a Peace Nation: A Discourse Analytic Reading of the Norwegian Peace Engagement," *Cooperation and Conflict* 45 (2010): 35-54.

²⁹ That is the advantage of not having a colonial past, a great power's interests, historical or vested interests, nor the muscle to pressure parties.

³⁰ "Norge i fredens tjeneste: Norske bidrag til fred og forsoning," Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, July 7, 2000, accessed December 26, 2000, <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/documents/Reports-programmes-of-action-and-plans/Reports/2000/fredenstjeneste.html?id=467585>. Translation by the authors.

³¹ Jonas Gahr Støre, "Utenrikspolitikk i Forandringens tid," *Samtiden* 4 (2010): 4-19.

³² Støre, "Utenrikspolitikk," 4-19.



Do trade-offs in Norwegian foreign policy interfere with its soft-power approach?

Every country at times must make decisions about trade-offs. In the next section we will discuss to what extent Norwegian policies on soft power are modified by trade-offs in Norwegian foreign policy. Small countries that invest highly in imagery, as discussed above, have more to lose when they make foreign policy decisions that contradict their images.

5.2. Trade-off problems

As reported above, one of our opinion-makers expressed the view that Norway could confront a conflict between its economic aspirations and its peacemaking, reconciliation, and development efforts.³³ Furthermore, not only might it be difficult to combine these aspirations, it might even be counterproductive: peacebuilding efforts might directly obstruct important economic possibilities for Norwegian industry.

Robert Jervis argues that political actors strive to maintain a minimum of important values and therefore will avoid choosing between different equally important values if that means that some values would have to be discarded to promote others.³⁴ A political actor will especially try to avoid this kind of trade-off if the end game is uncertain and when both (or more) seemingly incompatible values are important. In Norway some foreign policy goals are apparently incompatible, namely, Norway's focus on the international rule of law and multilateral solutions versus its alliance policy and the need for a reliable and solid security foundation within NATO.³⁵ Norway must thus make trade-offs, such as it did in the US-led 2003 invasion of Iraq; as we know, Norway chose to refrain from supporting its US ally in the absence of a clear mandate from the UN.

Another area of tension involves Norway's image as a peacemaking country versus its human rights activities. It is often difficult for Norway to consolidate its involvement in peace diplomacy and be heavily engaged in human rights issues. The perceived necessity of pragmatism related to the role of a negotiator collides with the vociferous nature of the activist. In Norwegian foreign policy this discord is most evident in the handling of the Palestinian-Israeli issue.

A third area (noted by only one respondent, however) where Norway may have to engage in trade-offs concerns its interests as a global oil superpower versus its advocacy of human rights in the UN and other forums. In practical terms this means whether or not to speak out against human rights abuses in oil-rich countries if that risks Norwegian companies like Statoil losing major contracts.

Our respondents acknowledged that Norway may be confronted with a difficult question: Should Norway make peace or make money in countries known for their lack of democratic principles, dictatorship, and massive breaches of human rights? Depending how Norway answers that question, it may be in a situation where people's view of the country has shifted from that of a peacemaking champion to a profitmaking champion, from oil extracted from countries with corrupt authoritarian regimes.

Although these trade-offs continue to exist in Norwegian foreign policy, the decisions made in such cases do not appear to have tarnished Norway's image in Turkey. This situation

³³ In this article we only discuss Norwegian trade-offs. We are well aware that Turkey also has trade-off issues that could influence its relationship with Norway, but these will be dealt with at a later stage in our research.

³⁴ Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

³⁵ Leiv Lunde et al., *Norske Interesser: Utenurikspolitikk for en globalisert verden* (Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2008).

might be a reflection of Norway's delicate handling of these trade-offs or that the Turkish media rarely mentions Norway.

In the above sections, we discussed issues related to Norwegian foreign policy, but it is also highly relevant to examine the Norwegian domestic landscape, where we are witnessing processes of change with implications for Norway's image in Turkey.

5.3. Turkophobia

Turkey is a country between European and Islamic civilizations. The Turkish state is secular, but its population's main religion is Islam. The country is situated in Europe and Asia, and its leaders cooperate with colleagues from neighboring Middle Eastern countries, as well as with colleagues in Europe.

Turkey lies between two categories, Europe and Asia. It has served the Turkish government to underscore this location. This location was earlier reflected in Turkish foreign policy through the "bridge metaphor," which was used to highlight Turkey's geographic position as a bridge between different cultures. Lerna K. Yanik concludes that "the continuous use of [the] 'bridge' metaphor might reinforce Turkey's "liminality," placing Turkey in a less classifiable category than the regular "othering" practices."³⁶

Turkey cannot be placed firmly in one category or another, and it can be assigned to several, two of them being "Europe" and "Islam." The theory of group processes and categorization states that the process of categorization gives rise to two inevitable consequences: (1) a sharpening of the perceived differences between categories and (2) a leveling of the distinctions within categories.³⁷

Which of the two above-mentioned categories (that are salient in Norwegian society) have evaluative and descriptive implications regarding Turkish-Norwegian cooperation?³⁸ The category most likely to be used is the one that at the time of a decision is most "accessible" and, further, the one that best fits the situation at hand.³⁹ In other words, what are the connotations being evoked when Norwegians talk about Turkey and Turks?⁴⁰

One respondent stressed that a future obstacle to cooperation between Norway and Turkey could be the development of Turkophobia in Norwegian society. According to this opinion-maker, this situation could follow if a more general development of Islamophobia occurs as a result of the Oslo/Utoya tragedy. This point of view is supported by a 2012 survey by the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Norway.⁴¹

Breivik's horrifying attacks revealed a new side of Norway. During Breivik's trial, Professor Lars Gule, who has been following Norwegian right-wing extremist discussion groups on the Internet for years, estimated during his testimony that Breivik has between 12,000 and 15,000 sympathizers in Norway.⁴² Central to Breivik's ideology, which provided the basis for his actions, is the "two-faced" enemy image, consistent with that of the counter-

³⁶ Lerna K. Yanik, "The Metamorphosis of 'Metaphors of Vision': 'Bridging' Turkey's Location, Role and Identity after the End of the Cold War," *Geopolitics* 14 (2009): 531-549.

³⁷ Henri Tajfel, "The Anchoring Effects of Value in a Scale of Judgments," *British Journal of Psychology* 50 (1959): 294-304.

³⁸ See Jason P. Mitchell, Brian A. Nosek, and Mahzarin R. Banaji, "Contextual Variations in Implicit Evaluation," *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 132 (2003): 455-469.

³⁹ Jerome S. Bruner, "On Perceptual Readiness," *Psychological Review* 64 (1957): 123-151.

⁴⁰ Connotations in this case are those meanings evoked in the meeting between the sign/category and the cultural conditions and values of the audience.

⁴¹ These results will be discussed below.

⁴² There are, however, few people who openly support Breivik's actions.



jihadist movement.⁴³ This image is composed of internal enemies and external enemies; the former include left-wing/Marxist/internationalists/multicultural elites within academia, politics, and the media and the latter include Islam and Muslims.

Central to this enemy image of Muslims are the following beliefs: (1) Islam is not only a religion, but it is also an ideology of hate; (2) there is no leeway for reform or moderation within Islam and thus there is no such thing as a moderate Muslim. All Muslims are consequently extremists; (3) Islam has an extraordinarily ability to homogenize its followers; (4) Islam and Muslims are in the process of taking over Europe; (5) The “Islam-problem” is a result of a deliberate policy by the left-wing, multicultural elites in Europe.⁴⁴

The respondent noted above argued that if cooperation goes well between the two countries, the Norwegian public most likely would emphasize the indisputable European traits of Turkey, but in the case of conflict, Norwegians might quickly change to a more negative image of Turkey, where the key variable would be Turkey’s Islamic character.

According to Samuel L. Gaertner, when two groups engage in a positively experienced cooperative task, a re-categorization process takes place.⁴⁵ The groups search for a common identity and create a “we” super-ordinate group identity. In the case of Norway and Turkey, this common ground would most likely be the “Europe” to which both countries belong. In other words, if there are positive sentiments in Norwegian society regarding cooperation, Turkey would be placed in the “Europa” category. Norway’s common Europeanism will be the defining characteristic of this category. This super-ordinate in-group categorization also leads to the tendency to see the other member’s unique features, which again gives members greater leeway within established norms.⁴⁶ Moreover, research has shown that more shared-category memberships translate into more positive evaluations.⁴⁷

On the other hand, should cooperation create negative feelings between the two countries, the result might be an increasing designation of Turkey into the “Islam” category. Within the West, terrorism in the name of Islam has added very negative connotations to the concept of Islam. One consequence of the categorization processes described above is the fact that we are constantly reminded about the negative aspects of Islam. In the case of Turkey, the tendency might be to categorize it as “Islamic,” ignoring the all the other characteristics that make it far more complex, such as the fact that Turkey has very strong secular traditions along with its Islamic religion. This aspect of Turkey makes it very different from other countries in the Islamic world. Furthermore, differences between human beings and groups in Turkey will be lost in this process of stereotyping. Turks will be made to look alike and be viewed as being different from Norwegians. In other words, what happens is a leveling of distinctions within the category “Islamic.” If this type of thinking gains ground in a country like Norway, it could be increasingly difficult to maintain cooperation with Turkey. The inclination will be to look at Turkey through the lenses of identifying differences, instead of looking for common ground.

⁴³ Siri M. Neset, Daniel Heradstveit, and G. Matthew Bonham, “The Lone Wolf behind the Norwegian Tragedy: The Ideological Foundations of Anders Behring Breivik” (paper presented at the 35th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Chicago, Illinois, July 6-9, 2012).

⁴⁴ See Bjørn Stærk, “En Nettreise gjennom Islam-kritikkens Tiår,” *Samtiden* 4 (2011): 32-49.

⁴⁵ Samuel L. Gaertner et al., “The Common In-Group Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias,” *European Review of Social Psychology* 4 (1993): 1-26.

⁴⁶ Musafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, *Social Psychology* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956).

⁴⁷ Michael J. Magdal, Miles Hewstone, and Brian Mullen, “The Effects of Crossed Categorization in Intergroup Evaluations: A Meta-analysis,” *British Journal of Social Psychology* 37 (1998): 303-324.

These negative attributions to Islam can collectively be labeled as “Islamophobia,” and its rise stems from a mixture of radical Islam creeping out after 9/11, the war against terror, and bombings in Europe, as well as European disputes over headscarves, building mosques, and reactions to the caricature drawings. Islamophobia (and other such constructs) emerges from simplistic interpretative frameworks like “good versus evil” or “Christianity versus Islam”. Islamophobia itself is further triggered by the stance of a radical minority on the peaceful ground of the majority of religious groups. Too often, this leads to generalizations that have become common in Europe. According to Gökhan Saz, Turkophobia can be viewed as the extension of this stylized Islamophobia.⁴⁸ Islamophobia rests on cultural misunderstandings and miscommunication. This problem is reinforced by the lack of political vision, and the virtually non-existing policies of integration for the Turkish population in Europe.

Although Saz refers to the EU countries, Norway also harbors negative connotations of Islam, both in its official discourse and in Norwegian society in general. The Progress Party, one of Norway’s largest political parties, has a clear anti-immigrant profile, and it has been known to reproduce stereotypes about Islam.⁴⁹ The Council of Europe’s European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) reveals in its latest report that “during the run-up to the September 2005 general elections, the Progress Party disseminated a brochure establishing, through text and images, very clear links between serious security issues and persons of foreign origin”.⁵⁰ A survey from 2012 by the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities indicates that there is a substantial presence of anti-Muslim sentiments in the Norwegian population.⁵¹ The results reveal that 10% would strongly dislike having a Muslim as one of their neighbors, and 11% would strongly dislike having a Muslim introduced into a circle of friends. Moreover, 38% would strongly dislike having a Muslim marry into the family. Also, ECRI finds that more generally, “the expression of anti-immigrant views in political and public debate has become more common in Norway in recent years. In particular...[there has been] a rise in the association of Muslims, on the one hand, and terrorism and violence on the other, as well as generalizations and stereotypes concerning persons of Muslim background.”⁵²

We have not found specific reference to Turkophobia in Norwegian discourse, and can only speculate about why. It seems that Norwegians do not link Turks and Turkey with Muslims and Islam. This cannot be explained by geography alone; more important are the cultural and ideological factors upon which Turkey’s republic was built. Its founder, Ataturk, was inspired first and foremost by the French Revolution, which had a counter-ideology to the Ottoman Empire. By moving Turkey’s capital from Istanbul to Ankara in 1923, Ataturk made it symbolically clear from the outset that the new republic had nothing in common

⁴⁸ Gökhan Saz, “Turkophobia and Rising Islamophobia in Europe: A Quantification for the Negative Spillovers on the EU Membership Quest of Turkey,” *Journal of Social Science* 19 (2011): 479-491.

⁴⁹ Kent Andersen and Christian Tybring Gjedde, “Drøm fra Disneyland,” *Aftenposten*, August 27, 2010, accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikker/article3783373.ece>.

Also, Kirsti Haga Honningsøy, “Grotesk utsagn fra Hagen,” NRK, August 14, 2011, accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/norge/1.7749407>. Also, Sindre Bangstad, “Norway: Terror and Islamophobia in the Mirror,” Open Democracy, August 27, 2011, accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/sindre-bangstad/norway-terror-and-islamophobia-in-mirror>.

⁵⁰ Council of Europe: European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, “ECRI Report on Norway (Fourth Monitoring Cycle),” February 4, 2009: 27, accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/49e8891af.html>.

⁵¹ Christhard Hoffmann, Øivind Kopperud and Vibeke Moe, “Antisemittisme i Norge? Den Norske Befolkingens Holdninger til Jøder og andre Minoriteter,” The Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities, May 2012, accessed December 18, 2012, http://www.hlsenteret.no/publikasjoner/HL_Rapport_2012_web.pdf. English summary on page 8.

⁵² ECRI, 27.



with the Ottoman Empire. He wanted to create a modern republic built on modern Western principles. Ataturk introduced secularism as the main creed of the new republic and dealt with religion in a heavy-handed manner. Religious utterances in public spaces were forbidden, as was wearing headscarves. The implications of Ataturk's ideology also put relative distance between Turkey's Arab neighbors and Europe's profits, which explains Turkey's consistent attachment to Europe since then. Its pending application to become a member of the EU is the most visible sign of this political orientation in recent years.

In addition to Turkey's historical connection to Europe and state secularism, we find that in Norwegian discourse the Kurdish people and the Turkish people are clearly recognized as separate ethnic groups. When speaking with Norwegians about Turkey, what first comes to mind is tourism, i.e., the city of Istanbul and Turkey's vacation resorts in the south.

Despite our respondents welcoming closer cooperation between Turkey and Norway, the rise of Islamophobia (and possibly its corollary Turkophobia) in Norwegian society cannot be ignored. In our opinion, this construct is not likely to become widespread, but as history shows, more often than not, the unlikely happens. For this reason, we find it highly relevant to include this area in our research.

6. Conclusion

Our respondents agreed that Turkey and Norway have a unique opportunity after the Arab Spring to benefit from closer cooperation on issues of democracy and peace. They maintain that the two countries can complement each other; Norway's soft power and the Turkish Model together are bound to create a positive interaction effect on mutual efforts to promote democratic developments in the Arab Middle East.

Bibliography

- Aberbach, Joel D., and Bert A. Rockman. "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews." *Political Science and Politics* 35 (2002): 673-676.
- Andersen, Kent, and Christian Tybring Gjedde. "Drøm fra Disneyland." *Aftenposten*, August 27, 2010. Accessed December 18, 2012. <http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikker/article3783373.ece>.
- Bangstad, Sindre. "Norway: Terror and Islamophobia in the Mirror." *Open Democracy*, August 27, 2011. Accessed December 18, 2012. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/sindre-bangstad/norway-terror-and-islamophobia-in-mirror>.
- Berry, Jeffery M. "Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing." *Political Science and Politics* 35 (2002): 679-682.
- Bruner, Jerome S. "On Perceptual Readiness." *Psychological Review* 64 (1957): 123-151.
- "ECRI Report on Norway (Fourth Monitoring Cycle)," Council of Europe: European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), February 4, 2009: 27. Accessed December 18, 2012, <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/49e8891af.html>.
- Ferraris, Maurizio. *History of Hermeneutics*. New York: Humanities Press, 1996.
- Fuller, Graham E. "Turkey's Strategic Model: Myths and Realities." *The Washington Quarterly* 27 (2004): 51-64.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. "Interview: Writing and the Living Voice." In *Hans-Georg Gadamer on Education, Poetry and History*, edited by Dieter Misgeld and Graeme Nicholson, 63-71. New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Gaertner, Samuel L., John F. Dovidio, Phyllis A. Anastasio, Betty A. Bachman, and Mary C. Rust. "The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias." *European Review of Social Psychology* 4 (1993): 1-26.

- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005.
- Heradstveit, Daniel. *The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Psychological Obstacles to Peace*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1979; New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Hoffmann, Christhard, and Øivind Kopperud, and Vibeke Moe. "Antisemitisme i Norge? Den Norske Befolkningsens Holdninger til Jøder og andre Minoriteter." Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities, May 2012. Accessed December 18, 2012. http://www.hlsenteret.no/publikasjoner/HL_Rapport_2012_web.pdf.
- Honningsøy, Kirsti Haga. "Grotesk utsagn fra Hagen." NRK, August 14, 2011. Accessed December 18, 2012. <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/norge/1.7749407>.
- Jervis, Robert. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Kaddorah, Emad. "The Turkish Model: Acceptability and Apprehension." *Insight Turkey* 12 (2010): 113-129.
- Lunde, Leiv, Henrik Thune, Eiler Fleischer, Leo Grunfeld, and Ole Jacob Sending. *Norske Interesser: Utrenrikspolitikk for en Globalisert Verden*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm, 2008.
- "Magt og Demokrati. Magt og Demokratiutredningens Sluttrapport." *Norwegian Official Reports*. NOU 2003: 19. Oslo: Statens Forvaltningsteneste, 2003.
- McClory, Jonathan. "The New Persuaders II: A 2011 Global Ranking of Soft Power." The Institute for Government, December 1, 2011. Accessed December 18, 2012. <http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/new-persuaders-ii>.
- Migdal, Michael J., Miles Hewstone, and Brian Mullen. "The Effects of Crossed Categorization in Intergroup Evaluations: A meta-analysis." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 37 (1998): 303-324.
- Mitchell, Jason P., Brian A. Nosek, and Mahzarin R. Banaji. "Contextual Variations in Implicit Evaluation." *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 132 (2003): 455-469.
- Muasher, Marwan, Thomas de Waal, Thomas Carothers and Sinan Ülgen. "Can the Turkish Model Gain Traction in the New Middle East?" Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 19, 2011. Accessed November 2, 2012. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2011/12/19/can-turkish-model-gain-traction-in-new-middle-east>.
- Neset, Siri M., Daniel Heradstveit, and G. Matthew Bonham. "The Lone Wolf behind the Norwegian Tragedy: The Ideological Foundations of Anders Behring Breivik." Paper presented at the 35th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Chicago, Illinois, July 6-9, 2012.
- "Norge i fredens tjeneste: Norske bidrag til fred og forsoning." Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, July 7, 2000. Accessed December 26, 2012. <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/documents/Reports-programmes-of-action-and-plans/Reports/2000/fredenstjeneste.html?id=467585>.
- Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
- Oğuzlu, Tarık. "Is the 'Turkey As a Model' Idea Turning into Reality from Perception?" ORSAM, December 5, 2011. Accessed February 11, 2013. <http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/showArticle.aspx?ID=951>.
- Onar, Nora Fisher. "Turkey Inc.: Rethinking the Model's Regional Role." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 29, 2012. Accessed February 10, 2013, <http://carnegieendowment.org/sada/2012/03/29/turkey-inc.-rethinking-turkey-s-regional-role/a5k9>.
- "Policy of Zero Problems with our Neighbors." Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2011. Accessed November 10, 2012. <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/policy-of-zero-problems-with-our-neighbors.en.mfa>.
- "Press release: Increased Cooperation between Norway and Turkey." Norway, The Office of the Prime Minister, January 10, 2012. Accessed November 6, 2012. <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/smk/press-center/Press-releases/2012/increased-cooperation-between-norway-and.html?id=668571>.
- Saz, Gökhan. "Turkophobia and Rising Islamophobia in Europe: A Quantification for the Negative Spillovers on the EU Membership Quest of Turkey." *Journal of Social Science* 19 (2011): 479-491.



- Sherif, Musafer, and Carolyn W. Sherif. *Social Psychology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Skånland, Øystein Haga. "Norway is a Peace Nation: a Discourse Analytic Reading of the Norwegian Peace Engagement." *Cooperation and Conflict* 45 (2010): 35-54.
- Stærk, Bjørn. "En Nettreise gjennom Islam-kritikkens Tiår." *Samtiden* 4 (2011): 32-49.
- Støre, Jonas G. "Utenrikspolitikk i Forandringens tid." *Samtiden* 4 (2010): 4-19.
- Tajfel, Henri. "The Anchoring Effects of Value in a Scale of Judgments." *British Journal of Psychology* 50 (1959): 294-304.
- Tansey, Oisin. "Process Tracing and Elite Interviewing: a Case for Non-probability Sampling." *Political Science and Politics* 40 (2007): 765-772.
- "Turkey from Ataturk to Erdogan." *Asharq al-Awsat*, November 9, 2007. Accessed February 9, 2013, <http://www.aawsat.net/2007/11/article55260861>.
- "Turkish Model has Shortcomings." Oxford Analytica, February 21, 2011. Accessed February 05, 2013. http://www.relooney.info/0_NS4053_1608.pdf.
- Yanik, Lerna K. "The Metamorphosis of 'Metaphors of Vision': 'Bridging' Turkey's Location Role and Identity after the End of the Cold War." *Geopolitics* 14 (2009): 531-549.

Humanitarian Intervention as a ‘Responsibility to Protect’: An International Society Approach

Şaban Kardaş

TOBB University of Economics and Technology

Abstract

This article proposes to explain the post-Cold War practice of humanitarian intervention by drawing on the English School’s international society approach. It argues that although the sovereignty versus human rights debate traditionally was framed in dichotomized terms, the post-Cold War practice of humanitarian intervention illustrated the possibility of a via media approach to these competing normative claims. Post-Cold War developments regarding the place of the conventional norms of sovereignty and non-intervention on the one hand and the growing space for the protection of human rights on the other, have eased worries about the prospect for order in the international system and created a suitable environment for including of humanitarian intervention without jeopardizing that order. To contextualize this development, the article will argue that Hedley Bull’s discussion of such key terms as the international society, the centrality of states, the importance of norms, and normative change helps explain intervention in today’s world. By building on that framework, the article draws attention to the enabling and constraining factors highlighted by the international society approach, and as such, concludes that the English school suggests both promise and caution regarding the prospects for humanitarian intervention in modern international relations.

Keywords: humanitarian intervention, responsibility to protect, international society, sovereignty, non-intervention.

1. Introduction

Humanitarian intervention has been a subject of academic interest in modern international law, ethics, political theory, and international relations for the last two centuries. Although the idea to use force for other-regarding purposes has a long history and is morally compelling, its application into state practice has been inconsistent, depending mainly on international rules and practices regarding the use of coercive force, the international community’s attitude toward intervention into domestic affairs, and the place of humanitarian considerations in state conduct. Because the principles of non-intervention, non-use of force, and sovereignty underpin the post-World War II international system, the room allowed for humanitarian intervention in state practice has been limited.

In the post-Cold War era, the scope of human rights expanded thanks to the new international environment, while the traditional norms of non-intervention and sovereignty were subjected to a new interpretation. Moreover, the end of the Cold War, and the emerging international system were characterized by increasing possibilities for international cooperation among



major powers. Therefore, in the new era the UN Security Council was able to realize its powers under the UN Charter's Chapter VII and thus came closer to orchestrating the collective security system laid down in it. As a result, humanitarian intervention made its way into the practice and study of international relations in the first decade of the post-Cold War period.

The enthusiasm for intervention dissipated by the new millennium, and several proposals to codify a doctrine of humanitarian intervention in international law bore no fruit. Through various practical and conceptual innovations, however, humanitarian intervention came to be recognized as a reality of the modern interstate system. The half-hearted international consensus was captured by the idea of 'sovereignty as responsibility,' which has been advocated by the United Nations and some Western states in the form of the 'responsibility to protect' (R2P) doctrine. Under this emerging norm, extreme cases of human suffering caused by a state's failure to respect or protect individual rights of its own citizens, could warrant intervention by the international community.

Interestingly, as much as instances of intervention, the inaction of the international community in similar cases of human suffering too rendered humanitarian intervention one of the most controversial topics of our time. The UN-authorized intervention in Libya and disinterest in intervention in Syria in the last two years have reignited the debate on the relevance of humanitarian intervention for the modern-day international system. Countries that have objected to invoking the R2P doctrine to address the tragedy in Syria have referred to the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention in domestic affairs. In many ways, the Syrian case is a fresh reminder to refocus attention on a centuries-old problematic relationship between human rights and sovereignty. The crux of this issue revolves around the incompatibility between promoting human rights on an international level and the principle of non-intervention, which is a derivative of the norm of sovereignty.

In what follows, it will be argued that although the sovereignty versus human rights debate traditionally has been framed in dichotomized terms, the practice of humanitarian intervention in the first decade following the end of the Cold War illustrated the possibility of a *via media* approach to these competing normative claims. Moreover, the article will argue that the English School provides a relevant theoretical framework to explain this new consensus on humanitarian intervention. Drawing largely on Hedley Bull's work on international society, it will expand on how English School concepts such as the international society, the centrality of states, the importance of norms, and normative change help explain intervention in today's world. In particular, they help describe not only the conditions under which incorporating humanitarian intervention would be possible but also the resistance to this concept in state practice.

2. How did We Get Here? An International Society Approach to Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian intervention may be defined as

forcible action by a state, a group of states or international organizations to prevent or to end gross violations of human rights on behalf of the nationals of the target state, through the use or threat of armed force without the consent of the target government, with or without UN authorization.¹

¹ For more on the definitional issues, see Saban Kardaş, "Humanitarian Intervention: A Conceptual Analysis," *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 2 (2003): 21-49.

Because the use of force is regulated by the UN Security Council (SC), any humanitarian intervention can be categorized according to the existence of a UN authorization. By interpreting its Chapter VII powers in an expansionary manner, the SC was successful in accommodating humanitarian intervention within the UN system and providing it with a certain degree of legitimacy in the first decade of the post-Cold War era. Moreover, despite its unsettled legal position, the practice of humanitarian intervention without SC authorization also endured during this period and was received positively on moral and political grounds by many actors. As a result, incorporating humanitarian intervention into state practice has taken two distinct forms: UN Security Council-authorized interventions and unilateral interventions. Although the latter is more controversial than the former due to its shaky legal standing, a growing international acceptance emerged around the concept throughout the 1990s.

International relations scholars have produced a wide body of literature to explain the place of humanitarian intervention in modern-day international relations, especially as how it relates to the main pillars of the international system. As Donnelly puts it, humanitarian intervention presents “a genuine moral dilemma in which important and well-established principles (human rights and non-intervention) conflict so fundamentally that reasonable men of good will may disagree on how that conflict is to be resolved.”²

Indeed, at the heart of the debate on humanitarian intervention lies that tension, which is in fact an offspring of different approaches to international relations. Therefore, it became almost a stereotype to talk about the legal/political tension between human rights and state sovereignty, non-intervention, and non-use of force in most of the scholarly works on humanitarian intervention. Moreover, traditionally, this relationship was understood in dichotomic terms,³ and in that sense, prioritizing one norm over the other was also understood as subscribing to two opposite notions of the international system, or two interpretations of international relations.⁴

The appearance of humanitarian intervention in state practice, then, in the post-Cold War era was viewed as a substantial transition from a states system based on respect for sovereignty and non-intervention to a cosmopolitan system where individual rights trump a state’s right to sovereignty, and where some sort of universal governance prevails. Despite the accumulation of state practice on humanitarian intervention and the erosion of the norms of sovereignty and non-intervention, it is difficult to claim that we have moved beyond the state-centric modern world system. Nor would it be accurate to describe the current system as purely anarchic. Therefore, one can posit that we stand somewhere between these two extreme positions. Similarly, although universal ideas have assumed increased importance in state practice, they have not transformed the realist power politics where coercion matters. What we need therefore is a theoretical construct that will help us capture the actual reality of the grey zone. The key concepts of the English school provide such an alternative framework.

² Jack Donnelly, “Human Rights, Humanitarian Intervention and American Foreign Policy: Law Morality and Politics”, *Journal of International Affairs* 37 (Winter 1984): 320.

³ Kate Kelly and David P. Forsythe, “Human Rights, Humanitarian Intervention, and World Politics,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 15:2 (May 1993): 312; Ihsan Dağı “Human Rights, Foreign Policy and the Question of Intervention,” *Perceptions* 6 2 (June-August 2001): 105-119.

⁴ Welsh also underlines that it is a debate about the boundaries of the moral community, the consequences of intervention, and the density of the values that underpin international society.” Jennifer M. Welsh, “Taking Consequences Seriously,” in *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, ed. Jennifer Welsh. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 53.



2. 1. The nature of the international system and the primacy of the society of states

The tendency to conceive humanitarian intervention and the Westphalian international system as incompatible owes a great deal to realism's legacy. Realism takes the international system as anarchical, consisting of sovereign nation-states, with no overarching authority to govern the relations among the members of the system. Moreover, realists' understanding of the international system is also static, such that system change is difficult to achieve; hence they allow limited room for normative/ideational change.

Scholars writing within the English School tradition question such rigid, sharp characterizations of the international system. They have a broader and more diverse perspective, partly because of their emphasis on historical analysis. In his *Anarchical Society*,⁵ Hedley Bull first defines a *system of states* (international system), which comes into being “when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another’s decisions, to cause them to behave—at least in some measure—as parts of a whole.” This necessitates regular contact in the sense that the interaction between states is sufficient to make the behavior of each a necessary element in the calculations of the other. States can interact directly or indirectly, and this interaction can be in the form of cooperation or conflict. A *society of states* (international society) is formed “when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common 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.” As such, international society presupposes an international system, but an international system may exist that is not an international society.

It is the injection of a ‘societal’ element into a mechanical system that turns an international system into an international society. Bull further identifies three approaches to the idea of the international society, namely Hobbesian, Grotian, and Kantian, and adds that the Grotian idea of international society has always been present in intellectual thinking and state practice. Bull also notes that the basic goals of international society include a) preserving the system and the society of states itself, b) maintaining the states’ independence (external sovereignty), c) peace (subordinate to the preservation of the state’s system), and d) common goals of social life. When regularized patterns of activity emerge between and among states that sustain those basic goals of the society of states, we can talk about international order. I will return to these different goals while discussing humanitarian intervention below.

The above way of approaching the international system provides a better means than what is offered by other international relations theories for explaining how humanitarian intervention has found a place in the practice of modern international relations, and what it implies for the nature of the international system. Some advancement has been made in upholding universal values, which limits the autonomy of nation-states; however, it is more appropriate to define the current international system as a Grotian world, where a certain degree of norm-guided behavior coexists with states’ drive for independent, autonomous action.

The aversion to humanitarian intervention is best captured by Bull’s first fundamental goal of the international society: the preservation of the system and the society of states. One implication of this primacy of the survival of the international system or society is

⁵ Hedley Bull, *Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

reflected in the supposed tension between order and justice (i.e., realization of human rights), which I will discuss in detail below. In the realist approach to international relations, due to their destabilizing effects issues of secondary importance (such as promoting human rights) were sacrificed to the maintenance of international order. In his discussion about the limited place given to human justice in international affairs, Bull cogently captures this point. He comes closer to the realist position and argues that the framework of international order “is inhospitable also to demands for human justice,” and that “the society of states … displays its conviction that international order is prior to human justice.”⁶

The same emphasis on the primacy of systemic stability also explains the changing attitude toward humanitarian intervention, and gives us important clues to limitations on the applicability of this new norm. As will be explained in the next section, on the changing interpretations of the conventional norms of non-intervention and sovereignty, humanitarian interventions have not been justified on a purely humanitarian/ cosmopolitan basis; instead, they have been legitimized to the extent that they have had some impact on international peace and security. As such, the practice of humanitarian intervention in the post-Cold War era served the goal of preserving the precarious and imperfect order in the international system by addressing the destabilizing effects of civil wars and humanitarian crises.

This new practice appeared to be a *via media* solution, which endeavored to find a balance between concerns for maintaining the current system on the one hand and allowing a room for humanitarian values on the other. The application of the concept thus remained selective, depending on the specific political conditions within which a humanitarian crisis emerged. As such, humanitarian intervention does not signify a transition to a post-Westphalian system. Therefore, as will be further discussed below, its future application and evolution will also be bound by the realities of the existing international order, which most probably will resist a wholesale incorporation of the concept into state practice.

2.2. Elements of society and the emphasis on common norms as regulating state conduct

Any theoretical framework to explain the practice of humanitarian intervention must accommodate the role of ideas and norms in affecting state behavior. Sovereignty and non-intervention are norms that govern state conduct. As we move our focus to such normative principles as human rights, the need to explain the place of universal ideas becomes even more pressing.

English School scholars accept that the international society is anarchic in the sense that there is no common orderer. Yet they part company with those who reject the societal dimension of international relations on the grounds that it is organized anarchically. For instance, Bull claims that the common belief that “states have to submit themselves to a common authority in order to realize a society does not apply to the international realm.” Thus an ‘anarchical’ society is always possible, and that element of society has always been present and remains present in the modern international system. It exists “because at no stage the conception of the common interests of states, of common rules accepted and common institutions worked by them has ceased to exert an influence.”

As underlined by Chris Brown, according to English School scholars, although current

⁶ Bull, *op.cit.*, 85.



international society is not perfect it is still bound and regulated by shared norms.⁷ As Brown further notes, its approach to norms is both descriptive and normative. For the English School, norms have constraining and enabling impacts on state behavior and strategies.⁸ States generate norms to regulate their affairs because norm-governed behavior better serves the primary goals of international society. This concept is found in Bull's treatment of how order is maintained in international society, where he argues that order is a consequence of common interests, rules, and institutions. Rules function to provide guidance as to what behavior is consistent with the common goals of international society.

This conceptualization of norms as regulating state behavior in a way to serve the common goals of the international society provides the English School with a powerful means to explain the practice of humanitarian intervention. In this sense, both Westphalian principles and humanitarian values can be seen as different sets of norms, with differing degrees of relation to the basic goals of international society. Hence, both sets of norms play certain functions for maintaining order in an anarchic international society. The developments relating to those norms have important implications for the practice of humanitarian intervention. On the normative level, what happened throughout the 1990s was the coalescence of two complementary processes: a normative shift regarding the place of human rights, particularly as far as it related to the domestic-international demarcation, and a redefinition of the norms of non-intervention and sovereignty.

2.2.1. Human rights as a legitimate international concern

In her constructivist explanation of the developments regarding intervention, Martha Finnemore maintains that the shift in the 1990s cannot be understood without considering the changing normative context in which it occurs.⁹ Because the traditional legal/political interpretation of sovereignty confined the issues of human rights to the national jurisdiction of sovereign states, human rights was by default of no legitimate concern to other states; thus they were dropped from the agenda of international relations.¹⁰ As the Cold War had made non-intervention a universal norm, with its end, norms pertaining to the protection of individual rights have increasingly received general acceptance within the international community.¹¹ Achievements in the field of human rights have reached a stage where the question of whether human rights violations are subject to international scrutiny is no longer controversial.¹² Consequently, the idea that violations of these basic rights are no longer matters purely within states' domestic jurisdiction, and therefore that the non-intervention norm cannot be invoked as a barrier against international interference for the protection of these rights, gained ground during this period.

⁷ Chris Brown, "World Society and the English School: An 'International Society Perspective' on World Society," *European Journal of International Relations* 7.4 (2001): 427.

⁸ Brown, *op.cit.*, 437. On norms and power, see: Wheeler, "Humanitarian Responsibilities of Sovereignty," in *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, ed., Welsh, *op.cit.*, 30-32.

⁹ Martha Finnemore, "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention," in *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identities in World Politics*, ed. P. Z. Katzenstein, (New York: Colombia University Press, 1996) 154.

¹⁰ Jack Donnelly, *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 157.

¹¹ Danish Institute of International Affairs, *Humanitarian Intervention: Legal and Political Aspects* (Copenhagen: 1999), 36; Thomas G. Weiss, "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas," *Security Dialogue* 31.1 (March 2000): 13.

¹² Nigel S. Rodley, "Collective Intervention to Protect Human Rights and Civilian Populations: The Legal Framework," in *To Loose the Bands of Wickedness*, ed. N. S. Rodley. (London: Brassey's, 1992), 24. Also see: Francis Kofi Abiew, *The Evolution of the Doctrine and Practice of Humanitarian Intervention* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999), 98-99.

These developments have been further strengthened by the growing belief that maintaining international peace and security and protecting fundamental human rights are interdependent.¹³ In the post-Cold War period, a consensus emerged that massive and widespread violations of human rights stemming from government repression, internal conflict, and failed states, and the human suffering these conditions generate, may constitute threats to international peace and security. Therefore, such matters do not fall exclusively within states' domestic domains. The SC, acting as the representative of the international community, may take necessary measures, including the use of force, to address such situations.¹⁴ Against this background, the SC has assumed a more assertive role in protecting human rights by invoking its powers regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. In so doing, the SC has engaged in a broader interpretation of what amounts to a threat to peace. Similarly, the interdependence between human rights and international security has been the basic driving motive of unauthorized interventions.¹⁵

The new normative concern for universal human rights has had an enabling impact on broadening the scope of intervention. Consequently, international opposition to acts of intervention on humanitarian grounds has diminished in breadth.

2.2.2. Redefinition of sovereignty and non-intervention

The post-Charter international state system was inspired by the so-called Westphalian legacy. The Westphalian norms, particularly sovereignty and non-intervention, which for a long time constituted an obstacle to human rights promotion, are derived from the anarchical conceptualization of the international system.¹⁶ Because such a system is composed of sovereign units, states are granted exclusive jurisdiction over the territory they control and the people living in it. The logical corollary of sovereignty is the norm of non-intervention, which prohibits states from taking action in the internal affairs of other states.

It was noted earlier that there is tension between these twin norms and human rights, and traditionally, this tension was resolved in favor of the non-intervention side of the equation because sovereignty and non-intervention were treated as sacrosanct principles. It was traditionally understood that intervention into each other's domestic affairs was not in accord with the proper behavior of sovereign equals; hence was prohibited, however laudable the motives might be. Therefore, the strongest criticism against humanitarian intervention has been implicitly based on this 'statist paradigm,' which prioritizes the rights of states over the rights of individuals, thus prioritizes the norms of sovereignty and non-intervention over human rights.¹⁷ Defenders of the Westphalian principles, including English School scholars, note the importance of these norms in maintaining international order and point out the disruptive implications of humanitarian intervention. As such, they draw our attention to the factors that constrain the place of humanitarian intervention. They also, however, recognize the prospect that, with changes in international relations, the rationale underlying these norms

¹³ Albrecht Schnabel, "Humanitarian Intervention: A Conceptual Analysis," in *Peacekeeping at a Crossroads*, eds. S. Neil Mac Farlane and Hans-Georg Ehrhart (Clemesport: The Canadian Peacekeeping Press, 1997), 27.

¹⁴ Francis Kofi Abiew, "Assessing Humanitarian Intervention in the Post-Cold War Period: Sources of Consensus," *International Relations* 14.2 (August 1998): 62.

¹⁵ In the case of Kosovo, only two NATO members referenced purely humanitarian concerns. The rest of NATO relied on previous SC resolutions, which defined the situation in Kosovo as posing threats to regional peace and security.

¹⁶ R. J. Vincent, *Human Rights and International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 113-114.

¹⁷ Robert H. Jackson, "Armed Humanitarism," *International Journal* 48 (Autumn 1993): 582-583. Also see Welsh, *op.cit.*, 63-67.



might also be altered. In such cases of change, in order to better serve the maintenance of world order, these norms might be subjected to reinterpretation.

2.2.2.1. Non-intervention

As a historical fact, the idea that non-intervention holds a primary place had a distinctly utilitarian rationale. The norm of state sovereignty and its corollaries, which are the products of centuries-long Western historical development characterized by the atrocities inherent in wars for ideological and religious purposes, have important moral standing, and the non-intervention principle has not served badly in maintaining world order since the enactment of the UN Charter.¹⁸ In his pluralist approach to international society, Bull treats non-intervention, along with a reciprocal recognition of sovereignty, as part of the rules of coexistence in an anarchic society because it serves important purposes. As analyzed by Lori Damrosch, non-intervention has two principal functions: to minimize interstate conflict and to preserve state autonomy.¹⁹ Since these norms are expected to support the functioning of the international order, hence the basic goals of international society, Bull obviously would value the minimization of interstate conflict because it would also uphold security, one of the goals of social life. On the issue of autonomy, Bull writes:

[T]here is the goal of maintaining the independence of external sovereignty of individual states. From the perspective of any particular state what it chiefly hopes to gain from participation in the society of states is recognition of its independence of outside authority, and in particular of its supreme jurisdiction over its subjects and territory. The chief price it has to pay for this is recognition of like rights to independence and sovereignty on the part of the other states.²⁰

Similarly, R. J. Vincent underlines that non-intervention allows a degree of pluralism and variety within the states,²¹ which strengthen and protect state autonomy. As such, this principle also upholds the right of the people in the state to self-determination. This idea goes back to John Stuart Mill and is advocated in modern times by Michael Walzer. His idea of communal integrity leads to the conclusion that states are moral entities and should therefore enjoy the right of non-intervention.²² By endeavoring to restrain the use of armed force and reduce war among states, the non-intervention norm somehow implies an orderly world, where different societies may coexist in a relatively peaceful atmosphere of harmony and concord. This set of norms, therefore, was enshrined in the UN Charter and gained wide acceptance among the international community as fundamental values to be upheld. These principles were considered so valuable that they allowed no room for humanitarian intervention in breaches of the international order, even for the purpose of alleviating human suffering. This position is best summarized by Nicholas Wheeler and Justin Morris. They note that, from a realist perspective, the main weakness of the defenders of humanitarian intervention is that because they focus on individual cases of human suffering, they fail “to see that issuing a license for

¹⁸ Adam Roberts, *Humanitarian Action in War: Aid, Protection and Impartiality in a Policy Vacuum* (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 305, 1996), 20; David Fisher, “The Ethics of Intervention,” *Survival* 36 1 (Spring 1994): 52.

¹⁹ Lori F. Damrosch, “Introduction,” in *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflict*, ed. Lori F. Damrosch (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993) 8. Also compare Stanley Hoffmann, “Sovereignty and the Ethics of Intervention,” in *The Ethics and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention* ed. Stanley Hoffmann (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996), 12. Moreover, see Roberts, *op.cit.*, 19.

²⁰ Bull, *op.cit.*, 16–17.

²¹ Vincent, *op.cit.*, 117.

²² Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (New York: Basic Books, 2000). Also see: Welsh, *op.cit.*, 60–62.

humanitarian intervention is likely to bring about a generalized erosion of the norms of non-intervention and non-use of force, and with it a long-term reduction in general well-being.”²³

Yet, in the current era of spreading ethnic conflicts and state collapses resulting in extreme human suffering on the one hand, and growing global awareness and increasing possibilities for international cooperation on the other, a need for revisiting this dilemma has been increasingly recognized. (Here it is important to note that the UN Charter also advances norms pertaining to human rights.) Then, the question can be put as follows: What happens when these two sets of values are in conflict with each other and the non-intervention norm stands as an obstacle to justice and the realization of basic human rights? Hence, the question posed by Adam Roberts: “Can that rule [of non-intervention] really apply when the situation is so serious that the moral conscience of mankind is affronted? What is the ethical or logical foundation of the rule that makes it so rigid, so uncomprehending of misery, that it cannot allow for exceptions?”²⁴

Or, as Stanley Hoffmann starkly puts it, refusing unilateral intervention completely may improve global social order, yet, by allowing grave injustices to persist, it could also harm justice, which is another respectable value for the world community.²⁵ For this reason, in certain conditions a blind attachment to the norm of nonintervention would create inconsistencies with the real world and put the very idea of that norm into question, and this weakness has been the primary concern expressed by scholars and practitioners about the scope of the principle of non-intervention.

Cognizant of the tension between order and justice and the relationship between this tension and the norm of non-intervention, Bull devotes a chapter to this problematic relationship.²⁶ He highlights the incompatibility between demands for individual/human justice and cosmopolitan justice and international order. He thinks that only interstate justice can be accommodated within the current system. Although his realist side dominates and he sees order as a precondition for the realization of other values, including justice, he still concedes to contextual judgments; i.e., the decision about order versus justice should be evaluated on the basis of the merits of a particular case. This leaves international society an important avenue by which to accommodate concerns for justice.

Along the same lines, Bull later observes that the non-intervention norm in its absolute meaning does not reflect reality and therefore begs to be modified and adapted to meet the circumstances and needs of the present time.²⁷ As Hoffmann points out, “there are many cases in which the effects of non-intervention might be worse than those of intervention, either on political or moral grounds.”²⁸ Against this background, Roberts notes that, “one might even say that if a coherent philosophy of humanitarian intervention were developed,

²³ Nicholas Wheeler and Morris, Justin, “Humanitarian Intervention and State Practice at the End of the Cold War,” in *International Society after the Cold War: Anarchy and Order Reconsidered* eds. Rick Fawn and Jeremy Larkins (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996) 166. See also J.L. Holzgrefe, “The Humanitarian Intervention Debate,” in *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas* eds. J.L. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 23-24.

²⁴ Roberts, *op.cit.*, 20.

²⁵ Hoffmann, “Sovereignty and the Ethics of Intervention,” 22. Also see Stephan A. Garrett, *Doing Good and Doing Well: An Examination of Humanitarian Intervention* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1999) 51.

²⁶ Bull, *op.cit.*, Chapter IV.

²⁷ Hedley Bull, Conclusion to *Intervention in World Politics* ed. Hedley Bull (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 187. For the shift in approaches to non-intervention, also see Daniel Ortega, *Military Intervention and the European Union* (Paris: Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, Chaillot Paper 45, March 2001), 23. A good account of the challenge against non-intervention can be found in R. Little, “Recent Literature on Intervention and Non-intervention”, in *Political Theory, International Relations and the Ethics of Intervention* eds. Ian Forbes and Mark Hoffmann (London: Macmillan Press, 1993), 24.

²⁸ Hoffmann, “Sovereignty and the Ethics of Intervention”, 20.



it could have the potential to save the non-intervention rule from its own logical absurdities and occasional inhumanities.”²⁹

A coherent and universally agreed-upon philosophy of humanitarian intervention has not yet been agreed upon,³⁰ but developments in the post-Cold War period amounted to a significant shift in this direction. Achievements regarding the internationalization of human rights and the contracting scope of domestic jurisdiction have already been noted. The emergence of the practice of UN-authorized humanitarian intervention was also quite influential in undermining the absolute interpretation of the norm of non-intervention. This practice made it clear that under circumstances of extreme humanitarian emergency, traditional norms of sovereignty and non-intervention can be overridden by the international community for the purpose of ending human suffering, provided that political conditions allow for the realization of such an intervention. This has been, moreover, the common theme expressed by three successive UN secretaries general in the 1990s, which thus paved the way for the new consensus on humanitarian intervention around the new concept of responsibility to protect.

Indeed, the developments in the post-Cold War period that culminated in the R2P doctrine were basically a reconsideration of the principles of non-intervention and state sovereignty. As a result, though these developments did not transform the norm of non-intervention, they created conditions favorable to the emergence of humanitarian intervention as an acceptable form of policy to end human suffering.³¹ As such, they also helped redefine the norm to make it better fit the realities of current world politics.

This was in a sense the realization of what Bull observed about the future of intervention in world politics: intervention through multilateralism and collective action. He notes that “if, however, an intervention itself expresses the collective will of the society of states, it may be carried out without bringing that harmony and concord (of the society of sovereign states) into jeopardy.”³² In the same vein, Damrosch notes that the shift from unilateral intervention to collective involvement allows preserving the values of conflict containment and autonomy implicit in the non-intervention norm.³³ The practices of the UN, as the expressed will of international society, helped eliminate the objection to humanitarian intervention. Although opposition to unauthorized intervention still continues, the fact that the post-Cold War cases of humanitarian intervention without SC authorization were conducted by different regional organizations or a group of states that enjoy great legitimacy among the society of states should be kept in mind. Further, these interventions were carried out in a multilateral fashion and therefore come closer to Bull’s observation; they expressed the collective will of at least a certain part of the society of states. Their multilateral character puts important checks and balances on the way the intervention was conducted and therefore did not let the interventions jeopardize order. For this reason, these acts of intervention were realized without posing any serious threats to the international order.³⁴

²⁹ Adam Roberts, “The Road to Hell: A Critique of Humanitarian Intervention,” *Harvard International Review* 16 1 (Fall 1993): 11.

³⁰ For a critical account, see: Thomas Weiss, “The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era,” *Security Dialogue* 35 2 (2004): 135-153.

³¹ The idea that the Westphalian structure is being modified but that a new one has not emerged is advocated by Weiss, “The Politics of.”

³² Bull, “Conclusion,” 195. For his remarks on the impact of “the growing legal and moral recognition of human rights on a world-wide scale” regarding the problem of humanitarian intervention, see p.193.

³³ Lori F. Damrosch, “Concluding Reflections”, in *Enforcing Restraint*. ed. Damrosch. *op.cit.*, 354.

³⁴ The most controversial case in this regard was the NATO intervention in Kosovo, which had the potential to deteriorate

2.2.2.2. Sovereignty

The objection to humanitarian intervention is also justified with reference to an absolute understanding of the principle of sovereignty. Within such a conceptualization, due partly to the autonomy principle inherent in it (discussed above), sovereignty is the fundamental guarantee for the enjoyment of people's basic rights. If there will be attempts to promote and implement international human rights, according to the above way of thinking, such attempts must pay due attention to the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention.³⁵ Therefore, an intervention amounting to a breach of sovereignty is also seen as a violation of the basic rights of the people. In other words, foreign interference is seen as a greater evil than the violation of some human rights by the sovereign authority itself. Although they accept the importance of human rights, the supporters of this view stress that the main and sole responsibility for the realization of these rights rests in national states. This view has been voiced by non-Western countries as well.³⁶ For this reason, concerns for human rights cannot override sovereignty.

Bull also recognizes the idea that individual justice can only be achieved through the agency of states, and that the implementation should be confined to the domestic level lest it lead to disorder in the international society. As such, the English School provides a strong explanation for the inherent tendencies among states to decry incorporating humanitarian intervention into state practice.³⁷

In the context of the humanitarian intervention debate, the terms in which sovereignty and intervention are examined need to be altered under the existing realities. It is increasingly agreed upon that humanitarian intervention is different in essence from other forms of intervention. This difference can be best stated by an analytical distinction between the internal and external aspects of sovereignty. Intervention in general aims at the external dimension of sovereignty in order to affect the relations of the target state with other sovereign counterparts. Humanitarian intervention, however, relates to the internal aspect of sovereignty.

It is true that for the citizens of a state to be free and enjoy their rights, there must be an independent political space for them. The state in question must thus be free from external interference, which is what the external aspect of the sovereignty and non-intervention norms assures. As discussed above, in addition to minimizing interstate conflict, these norms also aim at preserving a state's autonomy. Yet, in the post-Cold War era, a common understanding emerged that preserving autonomy should not be seen as an end in itself but as a means for realizing the basic human rights of individuals living within the boundaries of sovereign states. Kofi Annan reflects this new understanding by maintaining that

[s]tate sovereignty, in its most basic sense, is being redefined—not least by the forces of globalization and international co-operation. States are now widely understood to be instruments at the service of their peoples, and not vice versa. At the same time individual sovereignty—by which I mean the fundamental freedom of each individual, enshrined in the charter of the UN and subsequent international treaties—has been enhanced by a renewed and

the relations between Western countries and China and Russia. Yet, despite this potential danger, the intervention was successfully concluded without the feared expectations realized. Even Russia later joined the international efforts for the reconstruction of Kosovo and KFOR.

³⁵ Kimberly Stanton, "Pitfalls of Intervention," *Harvard International Review* 16 1 (Fall 1993): 15.

³⁶ See, for instance, Chu Shulong, "China, Asia and Issues of Sovereignty and Intervention," *Pugwash Occasional Papers* 2 1 (January 2001): 42.

³⁷ For a contemporary statement of that position, see Mohammed Ayoob, "Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty," *International Journal of Human Rights* 6 1 (2002): 81-102.



spreading consciousness of individual rights. When we read the charter today, we are more than ever conscious that its aim is to protect individual human beings, not to protect those who abuse them.³⁸

From this perspective, the question of humanitarian intervention has little to do with the external aspect of sovereignty; rather it is related to the internal aspect and how sovereignty is constructed. Indeed, humanitarian intervention is about the very essence of the relation between sovereign authority and its citizenry. As noted by liberal political theory,³⁹ the internal aspect of sovereignty is built on the assumption that the sovereign authority is charged with the duty to create a suitable atmosphere for the people living within its jurisdiction to fulfill their basic rights. The problem, then, starts when the sovereign authority fails to provide the conditions essential to the fulfillment of basic rights (the problem of failed states) or itself abuses these rights (the problem of oppressive governments). Humanitarian intervention, in this light, aims at rectifying the relationship between the government and the governed and the way the internal aspect of sovereignty is constructed. In other words, it has no direct bearing on the external aspect of sovereignty.

Thus, the argument that sovereignty is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of the basic rights of individuals has undergone an important transformation without undermining the power of the sovereignty norm itself. Today, most humanitarian emergencies are taking place in countries where the sovereign authorities are unable to provide the conditions to enjoy basic rights. Although the decolonization process created a great number of new states and there was nominally a Westphalian system throughout the Cold War years, in reality most of these states lacked the attributes of internal sovereignty. In most cases, there was no domestic cohesion and the central authorities were barely able or unable to monopolize the use of force, which is the defining character of being ‘sovereign.’ Yet, Cold War politics helped these states avoid confronting their underlying problems. With the shield provided by Cold War conditions cast aside and the globalization process underway, the discrepancy between the real conditions prevailing in the developing world and the absolute interpretations of sovereignty have become more and more visible. As a result, the world has been faced with a range of “totally or partially failed, troubled or murderous states whose claims to sovereignty are [or were] either unsustainable or unacceptable.”⁴⁰ This is actually where the dilemma of non-intervention starts. Rulers who lost internal legitimacy by their inability to provide an autonomous domestic sphere have been mostly protected by the external aspect of sovereignty, which was expressed by the principle of recognition in the international community. They remained in power at the expense of the society as a whole, which led to the protection of injustice by the non-intervention norm itself.

In this regard, the post-Cold War practice of humanitarian intervention reflected a new understanding of the twin principles of sovereignty and non-intervention. Rather than going beyond traditional Westphalian norms, this new way of thinking sought to reconcile international intervention with traditional state sovereignty in what Francis Deng first called ‘sovereignty as responsibility.’⁴¹ This notion has influenced most of the conceptual

³⁸ Kofi Annan, “Two Concepts of Sovereignty,” *The Economist*, September 16, 1999, 49.

³⁹ For a summary of the liberal case on intervention, see Stanley Hoffmann, “The Politics and Ethics of Military Intervention,” *Survival* 37 4 (Winter 1995-1996): 35.

⁴⁰ Hoffmann, “The Politics and Ethics,” 31.

⁴¹ Deng, Special Representative to the UN Secretary-General, articulates his approach in a number of publications. Francis M. Deng, *Protecting the Dispossessed: A Challenge for the International Community* (Washington DC: Brookings, 1993); Francis M.

attempts to generate consensus on the issue, and it underscores a state's responsibilities and accountabilities to domestic *and* international constituencies. Accordingly, for a state to claim the prerogatives of sovereignty it must meet internationally agreed-upon responsibilities, which include respecting human rights and providing life-sustenance to its citizens. In this conceptualization it is important that the first level for protecting individual rights remains the state in question. As such, this approach represents an attempt to allay the concerns of developing countries, mentioned above. Only when a state fails to meet such obligations, then is it legitimate for the international society of responsible states⁴² to intrude in that state's affairs and even undertake military intervention.⁴³

This post-Cold War practice showed that when such an act is carried out by the SC opposition seems to dissolve. In cases of extreme human suffering there is also a growing support for, or at least acquiescence to, unauthorized intervention. Therefore, it could be concluded that this interpretation of humanitarian intervention approaches the notion of sovereignty as responsibility and offers a promising amendment to the unrestricted interpretation of non-intervention and sovereignty.⁴⁴ The consensus around the R2P doctrine underscores this trend in international politics.⁴⁵

As such, this reinterpretation also serves to consolidate the international system, rather than undermine it. Despite his warnings against the incorporation of human justice into state conduct, noted above, Bull nonetheless admits that the continuation of the states system necessitates that the element of international society in it should be preserved and strengthened. This commitment requires maintaining and extending consensus about common values, as well as common interests.⁴⁶ Moreover, he also believes that prospects for international society are bound by the prospects of a cosmopolitan culture, which will increasingly need to absorb non-Western traditions. To the extent that it helps advance common values and generates a universal consensus on minimum standards of behavior, the practice of humanitarian intervention is likely to enhance the societal dimension in the international system, hence strengthen it.

This practice also realizes the last goal of international society identified by Bull: upholding the common goals of the social life. Unlike many realists, Bull does not isolate international society from the domestic realm; rather, he treats it as an extension of human social life. In Bull's understanding, the elementary goals of social life include securing life against violence, keeping promises and observing agreements, and ensuring the possession

Deng, et al., *Sovereignty as Responsibility* (Washington DC: Brookings, 1995).

⁴² This new understanding raises an important moral question about the other side of the coin: responsibility of other states to intervene to halt humanitarian crises. This concept imposes significant limitations on the external sovereignty of powerful outsiders; i.e., they cannot remain silent to human suffering elsewhere. A good moral philosophical argument that there are specific limits to states' right to ignore the ill-treatment of residents within the territories of other states can be found in Henry Shue, "Limiting Sovereignty," in *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, ed. Welsh, *op.cit.*, 11-28.

⁴³ However, the criticism that these new developments undermine the existing rights of democracy, i.e., sovereign equality and self-government preserved in the UN Charter framework, has not disappeared. These concerns were mainly raised by the neo-left and liberal left. For a strong argument to that effect, see David, Chandler, "New Rights for Old? Cosmopolitan Citizenship and the Critique of State Sovereignty," *Political Studies* 31 (2003): 332-349.

⁴⁴ Wheeler, employing the international society approach and constructivism, provides a powerful analysis of the emergence of this new norm: Wheeler, "Humanitarian Responsibilities," 32-41. See also Wheeler, *Saving Strangers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁴⁵ However, it has been suggested that sovereign authority has been understood to involve varied and evolving responsibilities since it was first articulated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Luke Glanville, "The Antecedents of 'Sovereignty as Responsibility,'" *European Journal of International Relations* 17 2 (2011): 233-255.

⁴⁶ Even his notion of common interest, which is one of the instruments of maintaining order, is related to the elementary goals of the international society.



of things. By securing life against violence, humanitarian intervention thus becomes an important instrument in realizing the goals of international society, hence further contributes to its proper functioning.

2.3. State-centrism and the restoration of actorhood

The state remains the primary actor in the international society approach. Although English School scholars recognize the possibility of alternatives to the states system, they also point out strong tendencies to perpetuate it. Therefore they emphasize maintaining and strengthening the existing society of states.⁴⁷ This state-centrism is a source of strength that adds to the explanatory capability of the English School, and it applies to both ends of intervention: the actors and the objects.

2.3.1. The actors: state-driven process

Indeed, a careful examination of the new consensus on humanitarian intervention suggests that states and state-controlled institutions are still the major actors in its intellectual and practical aspects. Despite the involvement of NGOs and the UN Secretary-General, the main push for the R2P approach came from liberal Western states. Although the UNSC has the legal authority to authorize interventions for humanitarian purposes, actual decisions to intervene and the conduct of interventions still remain dependent on state policies, particularly those of great powers. The conduct of interventions especially is still bound by the availability of effective means of armed coercion, which is still under the sole possession of individual states, or regional alliances such as NATO. So, as expressed by Bull, in the absence of a supreme government or solidarity among themselves, states took the initiative to realize common rules. States are, in that sense, the primary institutions or agents of international society. Bull underlines thus that individual justice and protection of human rights can be realized only through the mediation of states. He also notes that protection of human rights will be selective and through the mechanisms of international politics.

Nation-states will continue to be with us for some time, and they would likely oppose a process which would lead to the emergence of supranational authority structures above themselves, hence undermining the current system drastically. For this reason, despite the enhanced place given to humanitarian intervention, it still remains an exception rather than a rule. States opposed to the emergence of a norm that would create legal and political obligation to intervene in every case. As argued earlier, currently, the decision to intervene is still conditional on political conditions, i.e., the readiness of states to bear the material and human costs of humanitarian intervention.

As a result, post-Cold War norms on humanitarian intervention have been permissive rather than binding. Thus, the application of the concept remained selective, depending on the specific political conditions within which a humanitarian crisis emerged. Some human rights violations still remained untouched, as in Chechnya. The declining interest in humanitarian intervention in the post-September 11 era, and the long-time inability of the international community to stop the bloodshed in Burundi and Darfur have been reminders of how untenable the post-Cold war consensus on humanitarian intervention was. As the American commitment to global norms has been eroded by the concern to counter threats to US national

⁴⁷ Bull maintains that the “world political system is currently a system of states but there is nothing to suggest that it may not be transformed one day. There could be new forms of universal political organizations.”

interests, the use of force has assumed a new rationale, the international community has developed aversion to permissive uses of force, and the global hegemon itself has become the violator of fundamental rights, the post-September 11 period witnessed a declining place for humanitarian intervention. The inability to mount a more credible reaction to the ongoing conflict in Syria also underscores this decline.

2.3.2. Objects of intervention: restoration of sovereignty

While discussing the reinterpretation of sovereignty, it was underlined how humanitarian intervention came to redefine the internal dimension of sovereign statehood. With its emphasis on the primacy of the state as the main actor in world politics, the English School has an analytical superiority over cosmopolitan approaches. As argued earlier, under the current consensus, the state becomes the first to address the rights of individuals. Only after it fails to fulfill its obligations can international society step in to enforce such rights.

What happens to the state in question after intervention is also important. One significant consequence of the cases of humanitarian intervention in the post-Cold War period has been their post-conflict reconstruction.⁴⁸ In none of the cases did the intervening states attempt to occupy the country in question; rather they initiated major projects to rebuild it. This post-Cold War practice has important implications for the tension between sovereignty and intervention. Humanitarian interventions have been aimed at strengthening, not overcoming, a state and state sovereignty. The target states were provided a helping hand to (re)emerge as sovereign states. On this point, the English School also has analytical advantages. This process involved consolidation but at the same time a *redefinition* of sovereignty. While strengthening the norm of state sovereignty, the new practice added important qualifications to it, as discussed above.⁴⁹ That is, in this new understanding, sovereignty does not guarantee a state an automatic right to protection under the non-intervention norm. To claim this right, a state now has to fulfill its duties, one of which is to respect the fundamental human rights of its own citizens. In other words, the legitimacy of state is redefined to include respect for individual rights.

This new normative assumption now constitutes one of the basic preconditions for membership into international society. From this perspective, humanitarian intervention becomes an important tool for restoring state authority to create more members of the society of states that are respected. By strengthening states possessing little attributes of sovereignty, this process strengthens the existing states system, which is based on sovereign nation-states. The idea that a state's right to enjoy the privileges of sovereignty depends on its possession of certain qualifications has always been underlined by the scholars of the English School, and it dates back to the founders of modern international law—natural law tradition—such as Grotius, Wolf, and Vattel, whom English School scholars highly value.⁵⁰

3. Conclusion

I have endeavored to make a case that the existing Westphalian order has built-in brakes

⁴⁸ Keohane also argues for unbundling the concept of sovereignty for the establishment of legitimate authority after intervention. Non-Westphalian conceptualizations of sovereignty need to be developed. Robert O. Keohane, "Political Authority after Intervention: Gradations in Sovereignty," in *Humanitarian Intervention*, eds. Holzgrefe and Keohane, *op.cit.*, 275-298.

⁴⁹ These qualifications are also the basis for further criticism for the new practice of interventionism. Chandler calls it replacing sovereign equality with cosmopolitan "sovereign inequality." Chandler, *op.cit.*, 343.

⁵⁰ Holzgrefe, *op.cit.*, 25-28.



against incorporating humanitarian intervention. Yet, post-Cold War developments regarding conventional norms of sovereignty and non-intervention in world politics on the one hand, and the growing space for the protection of human rights on the other, have eased worries about the prospect for order in the international system and created a suitable environment for including humanitarian intervention. Through reinterpreting Westphalian principles in light of the post-Cold War era realities of international relations (such as increased intrastate violence, and the linkage between human rights and security, which were the underlying reasons behind the post-Cold War cases of humanitarian intervention) humanitarian intervention has enhanced the prospects for preserving the states system, rather than undermining it. The post-Cold War practice of humanitarian intervention thus can be considered a *via media* solution, which endeavors to find a balance between concerns for maintaining the current system on the one hand, and allowing a room for humanitarian values on the other.

In this article I attempted to show that the international society approach, particularly Bull's discussion about the fundamental goals of international society and the norms of sovereignty and non-intervention, provides important insights for understanding the place of humanitarian intervention in conceptual discussions and state practice. The English School directs our attention to the enabling and constraining factors of that approach, and as such it suggests both promise and caution about the prospects for humanitarian intervention. By highlighting the primacy of the international order and the primacy of the nation states, the English School explains the existing tendencies for the opposition to wholesale incorporation of humanitarian intervention and alerts us that this incorporation will likely never fully take place. Similarly, through its emphasis on the power of the Westphalian order's founding norms, and their function for preserving the society of states, the English School further underlines the difficulties involved in incorporating humanitarian intervention into them. On the other hand, it also highlights the importance of maintaining the peace and common goals of social life, and the need for shared values for strengthening the societal element of the international system. As such, this school points out factors permissive to the 'limited' incorporation of humanitarian intervention. Likewise, by highlighting the prospects for reinterpreting the traditional norms of non-intervention and sovereignty, it shows the likelihood of accommodating humanitarian intervention within the confines of existing international society without necessarily moving it in a cosmopolitan direction.

Bibliography

- Abiew, Francis Kofi. "Assessing Humanitarian Intervention in the Post-Cold War Period: Sources of Consensus." *International Relations* 14 2 (August 1998): 61-90.
- . *The Evolution of the Doctrine and Practice of Humanitarian Intervention*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999.
- Annan, Kofi. "Two Concepts of Sovereignty." *The Economist*, September 16, 1999.
- Ayoob, Mohammed. "Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty." *International Journal of Human Rights* 6 1 (2002): 81-102.
- Brown, Chris. "World Society and the English School: An 'International Society Perspective' on World Society." *European Journal of International Relations* 7 4 (2001): 423-41
- Bull, Hedley. *Anarchical Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- . Conclusion to *Intervention in World Politics*, edited by Hedley Bull, 181- 95. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Chandler, David. "New Rights for Old? Cosmopolitan Citizenship and the Critique of State Sovereignty." *Political*

- Studies* 31 (2003): 332-349.
- Dağrı, İhsan. "Human Rights, Foreign Policy and the Question of Intervention." *Perceptions* 6 2 (June-August 2001): 105-119.
- Damrosch, Lori F. "Concluding Reflections." In *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*, edited by Lori F. Damrosch , 348-67. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.
- . Introduction to *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*, edited by Lori F. Damrosch, 1-26. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.
- Danish Institute of International Affairs, *Humanitarian Intervention: Legal and Political Aspects*. Copenhagen: 1999: 36
- Deng, Francis M., et al.. *Sovereignty as Responsibility*. Washington DC: Brookings, 1995.
- Deng, Francis M.. *Protecting the Dispossessed: A Challenge for the International Community*. Washington DC: Brookings, 1993.
- Donnelly, Jack. "Human Rights, Humanitarian Intervention and American Foreign Policy: Law Morality and Politics." *Journal of International Affairs* 37 (Winter 1984): 311-328.
- . *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Finnemore, Martha. "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention." In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identities in World Politics*, edited by P. Z. Katzenstein, 153-175. New York: Colombia University Press, 1996.
- Fisher, David. "The Ethics of Intervention." *Survival* 36 1 (Spring 1994): 51-60
- Garrett, Stephan A.. *Doing Good and Doing Well: An Examination of Humanitarian Intervention*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1999.
- Glanville, Luke. "The Antecedents of 'Sovereignty as Responsibility'." *European Journal of International Relations* 17 2 (2011): 233-255.
- Hoffmann, Stanley. "Sovereignty and the Ethics of Intervention." In *The Ethics and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention*, edited by Stanley Hoffmann, 12-37. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996.
- . "The Politics and Ethics of Military Intervention." *Survival* 37 4 (Winter 1995-1996): 29-51.
- Holzgrefe, J.L. and Robert O. Keohane, eds. *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Holzgrefe, J.L. "The Humanitarian Intervention Debate." In Holzgrefe and Keohane, *Humanitarian Intervention*, 15-52.
- Jackson, Robert H.. "Armed Humanitarism." *International Journal* 48 (Autumn 1993): 579-606.
- Kardaş, Şaban. "Humanitarian Intervention: A Conceptual Analysis." *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 2 (2003): 21-49.
- Kelly, Kate, and David P. Forsythe. "Human Rights, Humanitarian Intervention, and World Politics." *Human Rights Quarterly* 15 2 (May 1993): 290-314.
- Keohane, Robert O.. "Political Authority after Intervention: Gradations in Sovereignty." In Holzgrefe and Keohane, *Humanitarian Intervention*, 275-298.
- Little, R. "Recent Literature on Intervention and Non-intervention." In *Political Theory, International Relations and the Ethics of Intervention*, edited by Ian Forbes and Mark Hoffmann, 13 - 31. London; Macmillan Press, 1993.
- Ortega, Daniel. *Military Intervention and the European Union*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union, Chaillot Paper 45, March 2001.
- Roberts, Adam. *Humanitarian Action in War: Aid, Protection and Impartiality in a Policy Vacuum*. London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 305, 1996.
- . "The Road to Hell: A Critique of Humanitarian Intervention." *Harvard International Review* 16 1 (Fall 1993): 10-13.
- Rodley, Nigel S.. "Collective Intervention to Protect Human Rights and Civilian Populations: The Legal Framework." In *To Loose the Bands of Wickedness: International Intervention in Defence of Human Rights*, edited by N. S.



- Rodley, 14-42. London: Brassey's, 1992.
- Schnabel, Albrecht. "Humanitarian Intervention: A Conceptual Analysis." In *Peacekeeping at a Crossroads*, edited by S. Neil Mac Farlane and Hans-Georg Ehrhart, 19-44 . Clementsport: The Canadian Peacekeeping Press, 1997.
- Shue, Henry. "Limiting Sovereignty." In Welsh, *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, 11-28.
- Shulong, Chu. "China, Asia and Issues of Sovereignty and Intervention." *Pugwash Occasional Papers* 2 1 (January 2001).
- Stanton, Kimberly. "Pitfalls of Intervention." *Harvard International Review* 16 1 (Fall 1993): 14-16.
- Vincent, R. J.. *Human Rights and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Weiss, Thomas G.. "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas." *Security Dialogue* 31 1 (March 2000): 1-23.
- . "The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era." *Security Dialogue* 35 2 (2004): 135-153.
- Welsh, Jennifer M. ed. *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Welsh, Jennifer M.. "Taking Consequences Seriously." In Welsh, *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, 52-70.
- Wheeler, N.. "Humanitarian Responsibilities of Sovereignty." In Welsh, *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, 29-51.
- . *Saving Strangers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Wheeler, Nicholas and Morris, Justin. "Humanitarian Intervention and State Practice at the End of the Cold War." In *International Society after the Cold War: Anarchy and Order Reconsidered*, edited by Rick Fawn and Jeremy Larkins, 135 – 171. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996.

Mediation: The Best Way Forward in Conflict Prevention and Resolution

Amb. (Ret.) Ertuğrul Apakan¹

1. Introduction

In recent years, we have seen a growing interest in and support for mediation as a means of preventing conflicts and resolving disputes, not only at the United Nations (UN) headquarters, but also at regional and national levels. As the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations since 2009, I have witnessed the momentum built around the concept of mediation. Turkey, as the co-chair of the Group of Friends of Mediation, played a leading role in this process. Its membership in the UN Security Council in 2009-2010 also helped Turkey pursue and contribute to this matter within the Council.

Today's security environment demands the UN's increased attention through different means and tools. Out of the 67 peacekeeping operations that have been deployed in UN history, 54 have been established since 1988. The Security Council currently has over 70 conflicts in its agenda. Two-thirds of these conflicts are related to Africa and the least developed countries. A bulk of UN expenditures is allocated to peacekeeping operations, and the increasing burdens and costs of peacekeeping in the midst of a global financial crisis have also contributed to the rediscovery of preventive diplomacy and mediation as significantly less-costly crisis management options.

Mediation and other means of prevention and peaceful conflict settlement are among the UN's core missions. Chapters I and VI of the UN Charter include provisions about these concepts and tools. The founders of the UN saw merit in mediation, and specifically reflected it in Chapter VI, Article 33. However, mediation was not able to blossom at that time, because the years that followed saw the onslaught of the Cold War.

In 1992, upon the call of the Security Council, then-Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali prepared his 1992 milestone report, an "Agenda for Peace". Then, at the 2005 World Summit, the UN Member States agreed in the Outcome Document that they have a joint responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to resolve conflicts, and that the mediation capacity of the Secretary-General should be strengthened.

Most interstate conflicts are related to power politics and geopolitical realities. Internal causes of conflict arise from political, security and economic dynamics². Therefore, innovative approaches to conflict resolution should be sought and used. In this context, protecting civilians becomes a priority. As a result, mediation and preventive diplomacy are gaining more and more importance in the UN's work.

While Turkey was a member of the Security Council, a summit was held in September 2010 under the chairmanship of Turkish President Abdullah Gül, where a milestone

Ertuğrul Apakan, Turkish Ambassador (Ret.). E-mail: ertugrul.apakan@gmail.com

¹ I'd like to thank my former colleagues Aziz Sevi and İlker Kılıç for their contributions to this article in September 2012.

² *World Development Report 2011 – Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington: The World Bank, 2011).



Presidential Statement encompassing peacekeeping, peacemaking, peacebuilding and preventive diplomacy, including mediation, was adopted. The Security Council underlined the increasing importance of mediation and its cost-effectiveness, and pledged to make more and better use of it.

In terms of using mediation to resolve disputes on the ground, recent success stories include the mediation initiatives in Kenya in 2007 and in South Sudan in 2011. There have also been some unsuccessful attempts in last two decades, particularly in Rwanda and Somalia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. These countries had faced cycles of repeated violence, weak governance and instability. This is also valid for other Sub-Saharan countries where new forms of conflict and violence threaten security and development. Against this backdrop, the growing cooperation between the UN, the African Union and sub-regional organizations such as ECOWAS brings cohesion and complementarity to the mediation efforts in the continent.

Mediation seems to be unsuccessful in the case of some complex and intractable conflicts in the Middle East. In Syria we are still experiencing an on-going political and humanitarian crisis, bloodshed and violence. The joint mediation initiatives by the UN and the Arab League did not yield any result.

Building on the *acquis* accumulated by the UN on mediation, the ministers of foreign affairs of Turkey and Finland decided to establish a Group of Friends within the UN. When the two countries launched the Mediation for Peace Initiative in 2010, they were convinced that the UN has a special role to play in leading mediation efforts. They know that UN engagement in itself lends credibility and legitimacy to mediation processes. Additionally, the UN's institutional capabilities and experiences in mediation surpass those possessed by any single organization or country in the world.

The Group of Friends acts as a bridge between the UN Secretariat, Member States, NGOs and civil society. It directly and indirectly supports activities carried out by the UN's Mediation Support Unit, which has valuable assets such as the Standby Team of Mediation Experts and as well as an additional roster of mediators. The UN is in a prime position to assure cooperation and coordination in mediation efforts so that different players complement and mutually reinforce each other's endeavours.

The Group of Friends also aims to provide more opportunities for civil society and NGOs and women to participate in mediation processes and network. Furthermore, a division of labour between Track 1 and Track 2 is crucial: more complementarity and cross-fertilization is necessary to establish innovative thinking in tackling different aspects of the conflict at hand.

The Group of Friends of Mediation has now grown to 34 Member States and eight regional and international organizations from around the globe. The mix of views, experiences and realities that members bring to the group's discussions and activities produces a synergy in diversity.

The purpose of the Group is to establish a more effective and more comprehensive network with the Secretariat, regional and sub-regional organizations, as well as with NGOs and civil society. With this understanding, in 2011 the Group of Friends spearheaded a General Assembly Resolution 65/283 entitled: "Strengthening the role of mediation in the peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution". For the first time, the UN adopted a Resolution on mediation, which has become a central piece of its mediation architecture.

This Resolution brings a new vision to UN, to regional and sub-regional organizations and to NGOs, providing a base on which we can build future efforts.

It was encouraging that following the adoption of this Resolution, the President of the General Assembly for the sixty-sixth session identified mediation as the main theme. Among other activities on this matter, he convened a high-level meeting of the General Assembly on 23 May, 2012. Hence, in his five-year action agenda (the priorities for his second term in office) the Secretary-General announced that he placed preventive diplomacy at center stage.

Apart from its efforts at the UN to promote mediation, Turkey has for some time been vigorously trying to resolve differences between countries and find solutions to chronic problems. Doing so, Turkey has benefited from a range of assets emanating from its historical, social and cultural ties, and from growing economic capabilities. In this context, Turkey's efforts at conciliation in Iraq and with the Middle East Peace Process, and in the Balkans, Central Asia, Afghanistan and Somalia, are just a few examples of its concrete endeavours in this regard.

The Alliance of Civilizations initiative, jointly co-sponsored by Turkey and Spain, and the Mediation for Peace prescribe the same cure for the maladies they address: dialogue. It is only through dialogue that we can ease tensions and conflicts between different parties; be it interfaith or political, economic or cultural. Dialogue is the only way to attain mutual understanding, reconciliation and peace.

Since many conflicts are of a chronic nature, persistence and perseverance are of critical importance. Mediators should avoid short-term, quick-fix solutions that tend not to be viable in the long run.³ Success might sometimes only be achieved after many failed attempts.

Mediation is a methodology as well as a process in the context of conflict management. There is no single recipe for successful mediation, just as no conflict is the same as another. Therefore, mediation efforts must be flexible, creative, innovative and adaptable to changing conditions. The mediator should speak in the same language to all sides of a conflict or dispute. Cultural differences must also be recognized and local approaches and people must be included in the mediation efforts.⁴

Mediation is at its best when it is complemented by others' efforts and when it facilitates ongoing endeavours. In that respect, there is no better actor than the UN for coordinating overall mediation work. There have been significant enhancements in the organization's capacity to support political and mediation missions from within the theatre of conflict.⁵ So far the UN has opened offices in Central Africa, West Africa and Central Asia to help prevent conflict and consolidate peace. They are making a very important contribution to the UN's efforts in preventing conflicts.

In this respect, Turkey is convinced that the proposed UN mediation center in Istanbul, would become an integral part of the UN's capabilities in preventative diplomacy and mediation. Taking into account its unique geographic position at the center of Afro-Eurasia and its proximity to many conflict zones, Istanbul offers an ideal location for such a mediation center.

³ "International Mediation – A Vision for the Future," (High-Level Seminar in Helsinki, Finland, June 28-July 1, 2012).

⁴ *Summary Report of the Istanbul Conference on Mediation, February 24-25, 2012* (New York: United Nations A/66/800, May 12, 2012).

⁵ Arthur Boutellis and Christoph Mikulaschek, "Strengthening Preventive Diplomacy and Mediation: Istanbul Retreat of the UN Security Council," July 2-3, 2011,

<http://www.ipinst.org/publication/meeting-notes/detail/353-strengthening-preventive-diplomacy-and-mediation.html>.



At this critical juncture, when we witness increased threats and challenges to peace and security in many parts of the globe and the ongoing transformation process in the Arab world, it is necessary to render mediation more effectively at regional and national levels. The experiences in recent years have shown that if mediation is utilized in a timely manner, it is possible to prevent or stop atrocities, loss of lives, human suffering and violations of human rights. Therefore, it would be useful for the international community to further the concept of mediation at the UN and beyond for a more peaceful and stable future.

Bibliography

- Boutellis, Arthur and Christoph Mikulaschek. "Strengthening Preventive Diplomacy and Mediation: Istanbul Retreat of the UN Security Council," July 2-3, 2011.
<http://www.ipinst.org/publication/meeting-notes/detail/353-strengthening-preventive-diplomacy-and-mediation.html>.
- "International Mediation – A Vision for the Future." High-level seminar in Helsinki, Finland, June 28-July 1, 2012.
- Ban, Ki-moon. *Report of the Secretary-General on "Strengthening the role of mediation in the peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution."* New York: United Nations A/66/811, June 25, 2012.
- United Nations. "Summary Report of the Informal High-Level Meeting of the General Assembly on 'The Role of Member States in Mediation, 23 May 2012'." <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/index.shtml>.
- United Nations. Summary Report of the Istanbul Conference on Mediation, February 24-25, 2012. New York: United Nations, A/66/800, May 12, 2012.
- World Bank, The. *World Development Report 2011 – Conflict, Security, and Development*. Washington: The World Bank, 2011.

Good Governance of the Security Sector in Turkey

Willem van Eekelen and Merijn Hartog*

Centre for European Security Studies (CESS)

The Centre for European Security Studies (CESS or the Centre) in the Netherlands has conducted three consecutive capacity-building programmes on civil-military relations and good governance of the security sector in Turkey since 2004. This was done in close cooperation with local partners from Ankara and Istanbul and financially supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. As the last programme, which commenced in 2010, draws to a close, the time has come to reflect on the outcomes of the work of CESS in Turkey.

The first programme, which ran between 2004 and 2006, focused on ‘Governance and the Military: Perspectives for Change in Turkey’, and published its report in a *Harmonie Paper* of 2006 (named after the main building of Groningen University). Its declared aim was to contribute to an increased understanding in Turkey of the appropriate role of the armed forces in a democracy and thereby to help the country move closer to complying with the EU’s political (Copenhagen) criteria for membership. The Centre is convinced that Turkish membership would benefit Turkey and the EU: anchored in NATO and in the EU, Turkey would be better able to make a geopolitical contribution in a vitally important region of the world. Further, incorporating Turkey, as a secular state and the world’s second-largest democracy with a predominantly Muslim population (after Indonesia), would be a strong affirmation of the EU’s pluralistic values, both internationally and within each member state. The acceptance of shared values would also have a stabilising impact on domestic issues in the West.

The second programme, which was implemented between 2006 and 2009, dealt with the relevance of the Turkish security system to the ongoing negotiations for accession to the EU. The Erdoğan government in its first period introduced impressive reforms, also in the security sphere, which removed civil-military relations from the main subjects of accession negotiations. These instead concentrated on the 33 chapters of the *acquis communautaire* that had become common practice in previous talks about EU enlargement in general. Nevertheless, without ‘further alignment’ of Turkish and Western practices, the issue of civil-military relations could ultimately become a stumbling block. The second programme ended with the publication of a *Harmonie Paper* entitled ‘Perceptions and Misperceptions in the EU and Turkey: Stumbling Blocks on the Road to Accession’. Both this paper and the

Willem van Eekelen, Board Member of CESS, former Minister of Defence for the Netherlands and former Secretary-General of the Western European Union. E-mail: wfvaneekelen@casema.nl. Merijn Hartog, Programme Manager, CESS. E-mail: merijnhartog@cess.org

* The author was the first Turkish Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary appointed to Israel, from 1991 through 1995. Retired, he is a full-time lecturer in the Department of International Relations of the Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences at İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. The views expressed and assessments made in the article are exclusively his own, based on his professional and academic experience, impressions, shared views and comparative interpretations of past and present events.



previous one of 2006 aimed at understanding the salient position of Turkey's military in its politics and society and suggested gradual reforms. Much attention was given to the need for more involvement of parliament in the process of transparency and accountability. In the past, members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), on paper, the principal oversight body for government policy, had shown only limited interest in security sector reform, probably due to the influential role of the army.

Unfortunately, the Cyprus issue would become the real stumbling block after the rejection of the Annan Plan by the Greek Cypriots and the untimely entry of the country into the EU. Moreover, in France and Germany there was little enthusiasm for Turkish entry and the negotiations fizzled out. Understandably, Turkey felt slighted and the accession process stalled. For a short time, its policy of 'zero problems' with neighbours seemed successful, but the recent upheaval in the Middle East and the rise of Muslim fundamentalism are likely to make links with the West more important again.

In the second programme, CESS acknowledged the need for more civilian capacity building and included training activities for government officials, academics and civil society representatives. In the third programme, operating between 2010 and 2013, it shifted its focus to enhancing civilian capacity for good governance in the security sector. The target group in this third programme is directed towards parliament (including deputies, but especially staff and advisors), the Court of Accounts, civil servants, academics and representatives of civil society organisations. Thus, the emphasis of CESS' work in Turkey mirrored the political developments over the period and generally moved from the military side of the civil-military equation to the civilian side. This shift occurred partly because, despite the diligent efforts of Naval Captain Ritske Bloemendaal, retired Netherlands Defence Attaché in Ankara, it proved difficult to engage military officers in CESS' work. In the first programme the military seemed only to expect an uncritical clarification of their current policies and practices; fortunately, in the next two programmes, several retired military officers assisted in CESS' efforts. The third report, which is an outcome of the third programme, will be published shortly.

Characteristic of the CESS approach was the emphases on transparency and accountability for all institutions involved. The Centre's maxim for the government was that it should reveal, explain and justify: reveal its policies and their underlying reasons, explain them to parliament and to the people at large and finally, justify them in parliament and in open public debate. In civil-military relations CESS has advocated a balance of trust, in which the military accepts the primacy of politics and the government takes professional military advice seriously. That remains difficult in Turkey even today, but much has changed, and the significant influence of the military on policy has greatly diminished.

It is an understatement to declare that Turkey has experienced significant political transformations in recent years. The most evident changes in the security sector irrefutably took place in the relationship between civilian and military leadership. Prominent developments that signify this changing relationship are the ongoing *Ergenekon* and *Balyoz* cases, in which, respectively, approximately 300 people are being charged with membership in a clandestine terrorist organisation, and in which hundreds of military officers are under indictment for plotting a military coup in 2003. Both these cases and consequent conspiracy theories and

coup allegations have hurt the army's standing; its status as the most trusted institution in the country seems to have been plummeting since 2002.¹

It should be noted, however, that Turkish society is deeply divided about the *Ergenekon-Balyoz* trials, which is understandable in a country that holds the military profession in high esteem and where a military career was an important means of social mobility. One of the main reasons for the increasing scepticism about the trials directly relates to a prevalent lack of faith in the impartiality of the Turkish justice system. The issue in this respect is not so much that the judiciary is not independent from the government, but that part of the Turkish population does not believe the country possesses an impartial legal system. Without a solid foundation of popular trust the fundamentals of the rule of law will crumble.

Another reason for concern about the trials is the expanding nature of the Ergenekon case especially. After the arrest of senior military officers at the start of the case in 2007, arrests became more widespread in the following years. Nowadays not only are military officers under indictment, but also journalists, academics, civil society representatives and government executives, which spills over into the general domain of human rights.

Another noticeable development that acutely reshuffled civil-military relations was the collective and voluntary resignation of top military officials in July 2011 in protest against the many arrests of senior military officers in the aforementioned cases. This seemed to be a move of last resort by an increasingly powerless and desperate military, who intended to show the government that they could still shake up the political system. However, Prime Minister Erdoğan's quick response of appointing a new chief of the army rendered this rash move by the military basically ineffective.

Alongside these investigations, trials and resignations, a legislative reform process was instigated ten years ago, which was a significant step in asserting civilian control over the military and which also had a bearing on good governance in the security sector in general. These legislative reforms aimed first at the composition, structure, roles and functions of the National Security Council (NSC), which was until the early 2000s perceived as the platform from where the military wielded its power over politics. As of 2003, the NSC has become again a consultative body instead of the policymaking institution it had been since 1982. Furthermore, since 2004, the secretary general of the NSC has been a civilian instead of a military officer. However, it is important to note that the reforms especially seemed to aim at demilitarising the NSC rather than democratising national security policymaking. The reforms were thus deemed to be a transfer of power from the military to the executive authorities, and most of the policymaking process is still closed to parliament, civil society and the public. There is still not enough debate or media reporting regarding policymaking issues.

A significant legislative development, which is generally supported in Turkey and which will also influence civil-military relations, is the ongoing constitution-making process. The new constitution will replace the one from 1982, which granted military officers a far-reaching mandate to control the political arena and restrained the power of civilian leaders. In itself, the drafting of a new constitution is a positive development, and once in place, the constitution will surely increase Turkey's prestige and strengthen its role as an actor in the

¹ Soner Cagaptay, "The Turkish Military Snaps," *The Washington Institute: Improving the Quality of US Middle East Policy*, July 29, 2011, accessed January 23, 2013, <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/the-turkish-military-snaps>.



international arena.

Nevertheless, the lack of transparency in the constitution-making process remains cause for concern. To generate public confidence and political legitimacy it would have been better if the authorities had kept Turkish society informed throughout the drafting process. Following the initial meetings of the parliamentary commission that is drafting the constitution, transcripts of the proceedings were released, but no new transcripts have published for more than a year now.² A lack of transparency by means of regular updates could be fertile ground for the conspiracy theories that Turkish society has always been prone to. In the end, the credibility of the commission and the constitution it produces would be best served by an open drafting process.

Yet another legislative development that has received wide attention in the third CESS programme is parliamentary financial control of the defence sector. Legislation has been put in place for members of parliament and the Court of Accounts to be able to assert their right to control defence and military spending. As recent deliberations on the defence budget in the TGNA have again pointed out, however, parliamentarians do not make sufficient use of that right. Therefore, it seems urgent to increase knowledge and expertise on defence and security matters within these institutes, and to train their administrative cadres, i.e. staff and advisors, accordingly.

Further to this education, a culture of accountability should be promoted, requesting proactive reporting by the government about its policy and spending. Up to now, the government has apparently only been providing explanations after money has been spent, particularly when it relates to large investments in infrastructure, communications and military equipment. A critical parliament and an active civil society are necessary to pursue transparency and accountability.

Reducing the political influence of the army was an unambiguous move towards firm civilian control of the security sector, thereby aligning Turkey with practices in other NATO countries. The Turkish government seems to have achieved this goal, and deserves praise and encouragement for it; however, this does not automatically mean that control of the security sector in Turkey is becoming more democratic. Even admitting that democracy can take many forms, both in electoral systems and parliamentary practices, it is clear that challenges remain in this globalising world, for Turkey and for its partners. It has been a privilege for CESS to be allowed to contribute to the definition of these challenges. Its cooperation with many Turkish institutions has been a rewarding experience for all involved.

Bibliography

- Cagaptay, Soner. "The Turkish Military Snaps." *The Washington Institute: Improving the Quality of US Middle East Policy*, July 29, 2011. Accessed January 23, 2013. <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/the-turkish-military-snaps>.
- Varol, Ozan. "Constitution-making in Turkey: Towards a Presidential System?" I-Connect: Blog of the *International Journal of Constitutional Law* and ConstitutionMaking.org (December 3, 2012). Accessed January 9, 2013. <http://www.iconnectblog.com/2012/12/constitution-making-in-turkey-towards-a-presidential-system/>.

² Ozan Varol, "Constitution-making in Turkey: Towards a Presidential System?" I-Connect: Blog of the *International Journal of Constitutional Law* and ConstitutionMaking.org, December 3, 2012, accessed January 9, 2013, <http://www.iconnectblog.com/2012/12/constitution-making-in-turkey-towards-a-presidential-system/>.

Europe in Transition: Lessons to be Learned

Ludger Kühnhardt

Center for European Integration Studies, Bonn University

1. Introduction

In this age of instant global media coverage, it is easy to lose perspective as well as one's view of the horizon. A week is a long time in politics, as the saying goes. A week of media coverage may be even longer, one might add. And after months of coverage, a single issue may have turned from fact to fiction or from fiction to fact. An event can become a process, a challenge can become a problem, a difficulty can become a crisis. Cause and effect may become blurred by the subtle power of media and the shorthand that is inevitably used to frame a phenomenon. Explanations can give way to labels, for better or worse.

The European Union (EU) has been on this roller coaster for the last three years. When Lehmann Brothers of the United States (US) went bankrupt in 2008, the root causes of the crash were swiftly connected with that country's mortgage crisis (subprime bubble). Too many too-cheap mortgages had made too many Americans the owner of a house that they could suddenly no longer finance. It seemed to be solely an American problem to have lived beyond one's means; Europe was only challenged by finding a way to avoid the spillover effects from the US financial crisis. Three years later, however, the tides of fortune had changed. The sovereign debt crises of Portugal, Ireland, Greece and Italy turned into a crisis of the euro, if not of the European Union. Not only were causes and effects confused; context and implication had also become confusing.

In an effort to put these events into perspective, I offer ten points of reflection:

1. With the end of the Cold War in 1991, the search for a new world order began. For two decades now, this search has been framed as the "post-Cold War era", and in Europe it has been filled with an astounding series of transformative events. The Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1991, came into force in 1993, and turned the European Community into the European Union. This treaty paved the way for the Economic and Monetary Union, eventually leading to the introduction of the euro in 2002. It also opened the door to the evolution of a political union, which has so far remained nebulous, and largely focuses on foreign and security matters. The reluctance of national leaders to synchronize the economic and monetary unions with a political union—which has so far remained unconsolidated and thus inadequately addresses foreign and security matters—was largely based on the assumption that a common currency could exist without a common foreign policy.

In 1999, negotiations for EU enlargement to the post-communist countries of Central and Southeastern Europe (with Turkey also being recognized an EU candidate country) eventually led to the membership of ten such countries, and of Malta and Cyprus in 2004 and 2007. In search of better democracy, more transparency and increased efficiency, the EU initiated a



revolutionary process of constitution building in 2002. The constitutional treaty failed in referenda in France and the Netherlands in 2005, but its substitute, the Lisbon Treaty, was signed in 2007 and came into force in 2009. Since then, however, the EU has been occupied with the fiscal crisis, all too easily labeled “the euro crisis”.

The past two decades have been substantial, dynamic and metamorphic for the European Union. The project of regional integration has been consolidated and extended both in depth and scope, and challenges testing the absorption capacity of EU citizens have been met. As the post-Cold War era comes to a close, the European Union is confronted with an unprecedented internal challenge and with an unprecedented set of global issues that are often discussed under the label of “global power shifts”. These events leave the EU with two options: either live up to the global context in which Europe operates today, or return to protectionist, myopic navel gazing. If it chose the latter course, the EU would not turn self-preoccupation and parochialism into a virtue, because such an approach would only give way to mutually exclusive, but simultaneously reinforcing variants of populism, if not neo-nationalism across the region. Hence, the only real option is the former.

2. Processes of regional integration are not perfect operations of social engineering, but are man-made and actor-based, and thus will inevitably be subject to moments of trial and error, detours and unintended consequences. Unforeseeable events, indirect effects of exogenous or endogenous phenomena or causalities as a result of conflicting aims are inherent in any history of regional integration. Thus, the only meaningful distinction to make is between crises *of* integration and crises *in* integration.

For more than five decades, European integration has been accompanied by the latter kind of crisis, and more than once, it has triggered deeper integration. The open question regarding the current fiscal crisis in the EU, which has generated a certain crisis of confidence in European integration per se, is the following: How can we know whether it is yet another crisis *in* integration or a much more dramatic crisis *of* integration? The honest answer is: We cannot know with definite, scientific certainty. What people build up, people can destroy. But until proven wrong, we can deduce from history lessons and current causalities that the current set of challenges for the European Union is also a crisis in integration, and one that may eventually strengthen and deepen the integration project. The next necessary steps in the process will produce the appropriate leadership for the task; since the beginning of the sovereign debt crisis, practically all incumbent national governments have lost elections and been replaced by a new set of leaders across the EU.

3. The argument against this crisis-in-integration hypothesis is based on the primacy of a static national perspective. As the fiscal crisis that has emerged since 2008-2009 puts trust in the European project to the test, the majority of voters may eventually resort to the proven political system that combines identity, democracy and accountability: their respective nation-states. If this occurs, the EU may implode in the absence of a trans-national identity, solidarity and democracy; at best it will fade into marginality.

The argument in favor of the crisis-in-integration hypothesis stems from three factors: First, from the normative assumption that the political will to continue with the EU (and its promise of an “ever deeper union” among its states and people) will prevail, because there is no other choice if Europe wants to control its destiny. Second, from the functional assumption that European integration has reached a state of irreversible institutional solidity that will inevitably be followed by the appropriate structures and responses. Third, from the

media hype and political cacophony that frame the current crisis as one of the euro rather than as one of fiscal mismanagement.

4. Media shorthand refers to a euro crisis; a sense of disconnecting perceptions and perspectives among different EU member states; and a certain re-nationalization of European politics and, more importantly, of European attitudes. This perspective highlights the perceived limits of European integration. It views the project as lacking accountability, a long-term identity and the transformative commitment of common leadership.

The counterargument proceeds as follows: The current crisis stems from grave policy failures in several EU member states, rather than in the EU and its organs. National actors in several member states have held the EU hostage with their irresponsible beggar-thy-neighbor policies, creating a sovereign debt crisis from overspending, which was supported by banks in other member states that pushed the recipient countries to become addicted to soft loans without ensuring sufficient productivity, competitiveness and fiscal austerity.

It can indeed be argued that the sovereign debt crisis in the EU has demonstrated and escalated the inappropriate asymmetry between a Europeanized currency now shared by 17 EU member states and the continuous primacy of national macroeconomic decision making and rule observance. The failure in implementing the ambitious objectives of the 2000 Lisbon Agenda—aimed at turning the EU into the most dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world—was rooted in insufficient national observance of the necessary structural reforms. The same fate may befall the 2010 Lisbon Agenda (which is awaiting implementation), as long as the monetary union is not coupled with a full-fledged economic union. Either the European Union will continue to be burdened by macroeconomic and fiscal asymmetries or, exercising good economic governance (perhaps by establishing the proposed European Ministry of Finance), it will be able to successfully manage these asymmetric realities between strong and weak, and export-oriented and non-competitive economies in a truly federal system of decision making and rule compliance.

5. The current crossroads of European integration is a test in trust and solidarity. For more than two centuries, political thought in Europe has focused on notions of freedom and variations of equality and justice. Solidarity (the third normative category associated with the legacy of the French Revolution), has been neglected. It has not been Europeanized, and, in its more theological, spiritual and religious connotation—brotherhood—it has not been politicized. Trust and solidarity cannot be imposed; they are a matter of give and take, a two-way street in which both sides agree to predictable, reliable and reciprocal consensus, and to the associated rights *and* duties necessary to maintain a viable and sustainable concept of these values.

In real terms, these concepts mean that all EU member states must treat each other as partners, including fully respecting mutually agreed-upon norms, rules and policy principles. In the end, this is what the net contributors to the bail-out of countries with overly sovereign debts have done. And it is what they expect the recipients of such union transfer resources to fully do now by applying strict austerity measures that enable them to return to a level of fiscal credibility in accordance with EU norms and international rating agency criteria.

The more difficult part of this course of action is to arrange these operations in a way that generates support and legitimacy in the respective societies. Because the EU has gone beyond the mechanics of a union of states in providing this assistance, its bail-out policies will and have deeply affect(ed) its citizens and taxpayers; the EU's reciprocal interdependency has



never been more tested. The fragile level of its citizens' solidarity and trust is the biggest liability for the EU, and will probably remain so for years to come. It is likely only after trust has been restored that the most integrationist fiscal measure to cope with similar situations in the future—the establishment of euro-bonds—will be able to gain acceptance.

6. The EU and private banks decided to reduce Greek debt by 50 percent, and many economists expect that a rescheduling of the other half of its debt may be inevitable. Politicians are trying to hold off on such decisions until the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), with its joint public and private banking responsibility, has been properly consolidated in 2013, followed by a banking union. Several national elections (including Germany's in autumn 2013) will follow that, prior to the next European Parliament election in 2014, after which a new European Commission will be installed. Debt rescheduling within a currency union has never happened; caution and hesitancy at moving toward such a decision are thus fully understandable. The fear that debt rescheduling for Greece could trigger a similar effect in other EU member states is salient, especially regarding Italy.

For now, only three options beyond the level of technical economic measures to cope with the root causes of the debt crisis are feasible:

- *Continuous limited debt relief and limited bail-out without clear debt rescheduling.* As a consequence of this option, investors would realize that the euro zone countries are unwilling or unable to fundamentally cope with the excessive spending trends in some member states. Without fiscal discipline, investment would not enter the euro zone or even leave it. To prevent the import of inflation, interest rates would increase, which would continue and even deepen the debt crisis.
- *Greece (and possibly other euro zone countries with overly high sovereign debts) defaulting despite the EU's crisis management practices since 2010.* Because lender banks are heavily affected, a cascade of bank crashes and/or bank nationalizations may occur. The result could be a breakdown in the cohesion of the current euro zone, with some countries leaving and/or a two-tier monetary system emerging. The end of the single market would have disastrous effects on the EU's global credibility and on Europe's internal cohesion.
- *A substantial and deep new wave of economic and political federalism emerging.* This situation could include a strong system of economic governance, such as the imposition of fiscal rules and austerity measures, the introduction of euro bonds and a new and sophisticated financial regulation system that would prevent a re-emergence of the current crisis. Member states would need to render further economic and political sovereignty to the EU organs for this to occur.

7. Currently, the 17 euro-zone governments include 40 political parties. A wide spectrum of interests and policy positions is represented, echoing a broad spectrum of policy orientations. In spite of some innovations that the Lisbon Treaty introduced to improve the interplay between EU organs and national parliaments, the sociological links between EU societies have not made much headway. Elections are won or lost in EU member states, including elections to the European Parliament. It is therefore easy to blame Brussels for challenges or failures, while lauding national governments for anything that succeeds in the EU. As long as Europe-wide political parties cannot properly compete for a majority in the European Parliament (which, if such parties could, would then be able to hold the European Council fully accountable for any important EU governance decisions or omissions), the EU system

remains incohesive. It might also need to establish a European Senate, representing national parliaments at the EU level.

For the foreseeable future, establishing a direct source of income for the EU will remain the most crucial challenge in overcoming its current structural inadequacies. So far, EU member states are highly reluctant to accept the proposal by the EU Commission (and supported by the European Parliament) to establish a direct EU tax. This method, of course, would lead to reductions in direct national contributions to the EU budget. For now, the EU practices the reverse of the situation that triggered the American War of Independence: while the battle cry of the US' founding fathers was "No taxation without representation!", one might say that despite more-or-less general co-decision-making mechanisms between the European Parliament and the European Council, the reality there is one of "representation without taxation". This situation would be untenable should accountability for fiscal matters be increased in the EU.

8. The current stage of European integration is intrinsically suffering from a widespread attitude to perceive the EU based on its limits rather than on its opportunities. Internally, this myopic attitude translates into populism; externally, it translates into seeing global trends as a threat rather than an opportunity for transformative partnership. This outlook is especially visible (and deplorable) in the bureaucratic and hesitant reaction of the EU (at the levels of the EU organs, member states, civil society and media) to the Arab Spring of 2011. Instead of embracing the genuine quest for dignity, freedom and universal human rights expressed by a non-violent yet frustrated young generation across the Arab world, Europe adopted a mixture of wait-and-see-skepticism focused on migration worries. With this attitude, the opportunity was lost to turn the Arab Spring into a new strategic approach aimed at forming a partnership for democratic transformation in the Arab world, coupled with a new and proactive initiative for a revival of peace negotiations in the stalled Middle East, aiming at a two-state solution, with recognition and security for Israel on the one hand and a viable Palestinian State on the other.

Under the current European frame of mind, it is unlikely that the EU as a whole will make a move in any direction on the matter of membership negotiations with Turkey. As long as many societies view Europe based on its limits, their leaders will not pursue policies that embrace opportunity and promote vision. Hence, the Turkey issue will continue to be handled as it has since negotiations opened formally in 2005: no one wants to be blamed for any negative effect that may follow from stopping the negotiation process, while at the same time no one has the courage to move the agenda forward. Therefore, organized frustration is the only available scenario in EU-Turkey relations right now.

9. It is extremely difficult to predict the outcome of a political process that will stretch over years and even decades. When the European Economic Community was founded in 1957, only a few committed personalities were convinced that it in a matter of decades a common currency would become the logical and inevitable consequence of the path that began with the Rome Treaties. When the Maastricht Treaty finally set the stage for the advent of the euro, no one could anticipate the developments ahead. In 2002, when the EU introduced the euro, the disastrous scandal of four wars in the Balkans opened the eyes of the last skeptics to the fact that Europe as a whole would need a robust foreign and security policy to project its values and principles beyond its immediate borders. No monetary union can function long term without economic governance and no foreign and security policy can function without a true



strategic consensus and outlook. In 2011, the EU was doubly shocked: it was no coincidence that the crisis over Greece's debt and over the humanitarian intervention to bring the Libyan dictatorship of Gaddafi to an end happened at the same time. Both countries—although fully unrelated as far as the character of their respective crisis was concerned—had been kept for all too long on the periphery of issues that were essential to the functioning and well-being of “core Europe”.

Now more than ever, internal policy cohesion and coherent global strategic positioning must be addressed together to move from thinking in terms of limits to thinking in terms of opportunities. Maastricht 1991; Greece and Libya 2011; how Europe looks internally and how it operates globally in 2031 remains to be seen. We only know that by then, Europe's share of the global population will have shrunk further (to approximately seven percent). Should Europe wish to remain master of its own destiny, the European Union will need to become truly federal by choice or it will become marginalized by force.

10. Since the end of the Cold War, region building has become a new feature of the global order. Older regional groupings have been overhauled, and new ones such as MERCOSUR (an economic and political agreement among, to date, five South American countries) have been founded. Often, the EU served as a point of reference for these alliances, if not a model. The EU must now itself learn from others: from the strategic thinking of the US, from the optimistic dynamism of China, India and Latin America, from the quest for renaissance in Africa. This necessary change of attitude is not a zero-sum game. It is not simply about global power shifts and it is not about the oft-cited decline of the West. It is about how to advance the normative and legal, institutional and structural and procedural and policy ingredients of global governance to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century. In this process of global configuration, the European Union can play its role as a book of experience, as a source of diversity in unity, as an inspiration in coping with challenges and as a yardstick for managing change in a regional context.

Notes from NOREF and İhsan Doğramacı Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research: Summary and Reflections on the Turkish and Norwegian Approaches to the Arab Spring and Peacebuilding*

Ç. Esra Çuhadar

Bilkent University

Monica Rafael Simoes

Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center (NOREF)

The Arab uprisings and the transition processes following the regime changes in these countries have occupied the foreign policy agendas of Turkey and Norway during the last two years, even though these events affected the two nations in varying degrees and ways. Turkey, as a direct or regional neighbour of these Arab countries, has been experiencing this process more directly and has been greatly affected economically, socially, and politically, especially from the influx of almost 200.000 refugees. Norway, on the other hand, which has been experiencing this process rather indirectly and from a greater distance, has still been impacted in a variety of ways. Regardless of the magnitude of the tremors felt by Turkey and Norway, both countries desire to act upon the developments in a constructive manner and be constructive forces to help this transition. A Turkey-Norway collaboration may sound like an unusual partnership, but a common agenda for peacebuilding and conflict resolution led two organizations, the Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center (NOREF) and the İhsan Doğramacı Peace Foundation's Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research at Bilkent University in Ankara, to explore the potential of this partnership in relation to the Arab uprisings. The two groups collaborated in a workshop held with Turkish and Norwegian academics under the co-sponsorship of the Strategic Research Center (SAM) of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 1 and 2 November 2012 in Ankara. The workshop focused on the Arab uprisings from a peacebuilding and conflict resolution perspective. Presenting the views anonymously, this article summarizes and reflects on some of the discussions held during the workshop.

Turkey is increasingly becoming a relevant actor in global politics and strongly attractive to its neighbours in the Arab world. Several factors have made this possible: Turkey's geographical location and unique historical ties with regional countries; its inspiring growing economic successes in maintaining financial stability, attracting foreign direct investment, and increasing exports worldwide; and its successful democratic reforms implemented in the last decade (such as in the area of civil-military relations) that have contributed to its emergence as a stronger democratic power. This reform process has also been reinforced by

Ç. Esra Çuhadar, Asst. Prof. Dr. Department of Political Science, Bilkent University. E-mail: esracg@bilkent.edu.tr. Monica Rafael Simoes, Adviser, Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center (NOREF). E-mail: monica.rafael@peacebuilding.no.

* This article summarizes and reflects upon the discussions held at the workshop, titled "Turkish and Norwegian Approaches to the Arab Uprisings and Peacebuilding", without making specific attributions to any person. The views presented here also do not necessarily represent any consensus or agreement. We would like to thank all participants for sharing their views. Needless to say, we claim full responsibility for the content and any mistakes in this article.



the accession negotiations that Turkey has been conducting with the European Union (EU) since 2005. Turkey's economic and political transformations are reflected in its increasingly active and wide-ranging foreign policy. Thus, as an emerging power, Turkey has begun taking on increasing responsibilities at regional and global levels, including the role of mediator and offering development assistance in many conflicts in neighbouring regions.

Norway's own set of values and norms make it a worldwide celebrated model of democracy and balanced economic development. This country also has a social pact and welfare state model that has been the outcome of a political dialogue among actors with different interests. Norway engages closely with the EU's values and ideas and has strong alliances with the United States (US) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), whilst simultaneously developing an independent and engaged foreign policy promoting national interests and contributing to a more equitable and just world. With a strong tradition of cooperation with and support to the so-called Global South, Norway participates in and promotes processes of negotiation, dialogue, and reconciliation in a series of countries. Currently, Norway is interested in playing a relevant role in efforts leading to the democratization of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region.

The workshop explored and analyzed the potential role of Norway and Turkey in the transition processes in Arab societies. In this context, the sessions comparatively discussed the mediation and conflict resolution approaches of the two countries; considered the challenges of reconciling peace, justice, and security and development needs; reflected upon the potentially different consequences and needs of violent and non-violent transitions in Arab societies; and discussed Turkish experiences in democratization as possible references for Arab transitions. The next section will focus on each of these thematic issues.

1. On Mediation and Peacebuilding

Mediation is one of the conflict resolution and foreign policy tools that Norway and Turkey both attribute great importance to. Norway has long been credited around the world for its mediation activities in the Middle East, South America, and Asia. Similarly, Turkey's mediation efforts during the last decade have made it one of the most visible actors in the international arena today. Regarding this topic, the discussions addressed the characteristics, power, resources, and impartiality of mediators and the timing of mediation.

Turkey and Norway are both easily seen as facilitators in mediation processes because they emphasize inclusiveness of all actors, dialogue for all, and are able to apply a multidimensional approach. They also refrain from using "muscle" in mediation, a model closely associated with the superpowers, and instead mostly rely on soft power capacities such as development aid and economic assistance.

Although Turkey's mediation efforts before the Arab Spring have not produced conclusive and flashy success stories, they certainly facilitated the process of communication between various disputants and created the image of a constructive power in the Middle East. However, very recently, Turkey's official policy of inclusive dialogue and participation, has suffered challenges and Turkey is now often accused of having lost its mediating leverage in the region because of depreciations in its impartiality (i.e. broken relations and ties with Israel after the flotilla incidence; strained relations with Syria due to the conflict in this country; criticisms articulated by liberal and secular factions in Egypt and Iraq for pursuing a Sunni or sectarian agenda). Despite these criticisms, Turkey continues to be eager to invest in increasing its civilian capacities for mediation.

Turkey's mediation contributions thus far should perhaps be viewed as contributions to the "process" rather than to the "outcome." Turkey has had a very active role in several mediation initiatives, such as Israel-Syria, Iran and the West, the Balkans, Lebanon, Iraq, Somalia, the Philippines, and Sudan. Changes in the international system, regional demands, and decision-makers' (i.e. AKP and Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu's) policy agendas have naturally informed Turkey's mediation role and choices. During the last several years, Turkey has also contributed immensely to making mediation a more effective tool within the UN system. Towards this end, it has taken a leadership role in initiatives within international institutions (i.e. founding the Friends of Mediation group, UN General Assembly resolution on mediation, UN Secretary General's report on mediation, and the releasing of the 'Effective Mediation Guidelines 2012' by the United Nations). In terms of the values Turkey brings into mediation, a suggestion was made to call Turkey an "insider mediator"; meaning that although Turkey is not within the parties, it is a third party that intimately knows the region's cultural codes and frames of reference. In this sense, Turkey's model for mediation was considered different from the "impartial mediator" model adopted by Norway.

Norway's mediation activities are always dependent on an invitation from a party to a conflict, and it aims for agreement to be reached by the parties rather than for a solution "mediated" by a super power (i.e. US role in the case of Bosnia). At the same time, Norway maintains its own views and principles in the processes to which it is invited to take part in. Its well-known policy of inclusive dialogue does not mean recognizing or legitimizing all parties, but rather presenting an understanding that such a dialogue will be the key to long-term commitment to the process and peaceful settlement. In this sense, Norway and Turkey hold similar positions towards parties in conflict. Norway is also known as a "team player" in peacebuilding, in that it often cooperates and coordinates with other countries and third parties in peace processes.

Given these similarities and differences in their approaches to and capacities for mediation, can the two countries cooperate in dialogue and mediation activities in global conflicts? Participants highlighted how the similarities and differences might contribute to or detract from successful outcomes.

Similarities could trigger cooperation between the two countries: both are close to, though outside of, the EU, with a great level of independence in their foreign policies, which are nonetheless framed within NATO dynamics. Both countries are experienced in engaging in conflict situations as third parties and in high-level engagement in many different situations. Finally, there is a shared common interest to contribute to peaceful resolutions of conflicts and tensions, especially in the Middle East.

Differences among both actors should also be taken into consideration. The positions of the two countries vis-à-vis the transitions in the Middle East are not very clear at the moment. Whilst Norway is perceived as an outside and distant observer with interests in the region (shipping, oil, other economic interests) and a major financial promoter of the UN, Turkey has an urge to act as a third party and a need for closer engagement in and ties for promoting democracy and peaceful transitions in the region (whether it will be able to move forward on this remains to be seen). That social change and conflict resolution involve different dynamics and require different approaches was identified as a challenge for both countries' desires to operate in the region. The attitudes of the two countries about this natural dilemma and how they tackle it have yet to emerge.



Some concerns about such cooperation between Norway and Turkey were also put forward, namely how to overcome various differences; how to harmonize different potential visions of the international order; and how to reconcile long-term projects in a rapidly changing international environment.

Concerns were also raised regarding identifying legitimate parties to talk to and engage with in a conflict. Who is “legitimate” changes according to a country’s history and dynamics (e.g. Israel-Palestine; South Africa). Questions on whether such efforts should always be related to impartiality (i.e. possibly legitimizing oppressors or criminals) were discussed. Differences between mediation and third-party intervention (e.g. NATO in Libya) were highlighted. Arguments that some parties to a conflict are not legitimate (e.g. Assad’s regime) and thus should not be engaged in mediation activities, versus that all parties to a conflict should be supported, were also put forward. In the latter case, mediation could be brought in later, for example, during the process of transitional justice.

2. Turkey and the Arab Uprisings

Turkey is assuming an increasingly relevant role in global politics and economics and has become of great interest to its neighbours in the Arab world. The country has adopted greater responsibilities at regional and global levels, including the role of mediator and broker in many conflicts in neighbouring regions.

Turkey’s foreign policy before the Arab Spring was presented as one of “zero problems with neighbours” and pursued stronger economic and political relations with neighbouring countries. The objectives were to become an attractive force and align its interests with those of the region (prosperity and stability), mainly by means of soft power. At the same time, before the Arab uprisings, Turkey was identified overall as a model for the region, appealing to a varied set of actors: whilst some emphasized the richness of Turkish secularism, others stressed its close relations with the West, and still others praised how the Turkish Islamist movement was evolving in a democratic manner.

At present, with the civil war in Syria escalating, relations with Israel coming to a halt, paralyzing disagreements with the Iraqi central government, the collapse of the Turkish-Armenian protocol ratification process, etc., Turkey’s zero-problems policy is facing challenges. Instead, an emphasis on balancing security and democracy or peace seems to have emerged. Previous to the Arab uprisings, the zero-problems goal was meant to solve bilateral problems, but bilateral relations became entangled and sometimes incompatible with regional dynamics after the Arab Spring. The Turkish model of democracy and harmony thus now faces some limitations, and is not clearly articulated. Does it mean the model of Turkey’s ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP), i.e. moderate Islam in domestic politics? Does it embody a model indicating a certain type of state-religion framework? Does it refer to a successful model of economic transformation and growth? Or does it mean a model of democratic consolidation in a predominantly Muslim country?

Turkey as a model is a twofold political (external and internal) discourse: its image as a model for the region combined with a discourse of non-imposition. During discussions in the workshop on lessons learned from the Turkish experience, participants examined the questions posed in the previous paragraph. Some suggested that the Arab uprisings revealed an overestimation of Turkish capabilities and capacities, which has been recently demonstrated in its domestic and foreign policy nexus especially facing the crisis in Syria.

A major challenge facing Turkish foreign policy in the current regional environment is to resist the strong forces attempting to drag Turkey into regional polarization and sectarian politics and violence. Turkey is trying to overcome them by combining the roles of regional actor and mediator, but the dimensions of its bilateral and regional aims are intertwined or tangled. Thus, the strategic and tactical aspects of this manoeuvre are not straightforward.

3. Norway and the Arab Uprisings

Norway has a celebrated model of democracy and economic development, and a strong tradition of cooperation with and support to the Global South.

Norway perceived the underlying causes of the Arab Spring as political and economic, thus leading to its responses based on support to democracy-building and economic development, focusing on the real needs of real people and on a strong engagement with civil society.

The country is interested in playing a relevant role in supporting MENA's democratization, thus it has worked/is working in the region focusing on the issues of political Islam and political stability, youth movements, women's participation in politics, media, religious dialogue, and soft power.

Norway has strong global credibility and is perceived as neutral. As a result, it can play a role in the post-Arab Spring scenario that other Western countries are unlikely to, both in matters of constitutional/political issues (e.g.. providing guarantees to Syrian Alawite minorities) and of transitional justice.

4. Consequences of the Arab Uprisings

The Arab uprisings have undoubtedly have led to a shift in the dispersion of power in the region and elsewhere.

Arab politics will undoubtedly be different in the future, hopefully with a greater degree of political participation, and certainly with higher expectations of a better life, of more competitive political systems, and of holding elections that actually reflect the will of citizens at large. The broader trajectory of the revolution implies promises of democracy and competing dynamics in the region. However, fostering/accelerating democracy there is a challenging task that will require time, caution, and profound analysis and knowledge of the dynamics, actors, interests, and politics at stake.

New regional political dynamics will not be the only force to influence politics in that area, however; some legacies will likely persist, such as (i) sectarian and ideological polarization; (ii) the countries' political economies (corruption, informal economies, and other pre-existing structures); and (iii) political clientelism. These legacies will restrict long-term political thinking and intensify regional rivalries (i.e. Syria).

5. The Challenge of Reconciling Peace, Security, Development, and Transitional Justice

Peace, security, development, and transitional justice can be engineered in a joint way, as long as national political developments incorporate solving social political struggles. Political consensus and legitimacy must exist. Stability is often seen as a higher priority than legitimacy and consensus, but new actors in politics such as youth in the streets now attribute utmost importance to political legitimacy. These actors highlight establishing consensus in order to maintain a functioning political system and end mass unrest in these societies.



To achieve peace and security, it is fundamental to reestablish the legitimacy of the state, or in other words, encourage inclusive statebuilding (such as in the case of the Alawites in Syria or the Sunnis in Iraq). Different countries have had very different and rich experiences regarding transitional justice, and in establishing such processes in other countries it would be relevant to look at (i) the substance/transition process roadmap (e.g. Bahrain, Yemen) and (ii) the scope of transitional justice where its ends are a political issue (i.e. Egypt and Libya).

On economic development, some concerns relate to understanding how or whether political economies are reconfigured after a transformation in the region and what opportunities exist for the people who asked for regime change; whether power struggles will result in compromises and institutional power sharing, turning out to be beneficial for long-term development, and determining which factors will make this happen (or not happen); and whether the new political regimes can create stability without reinvigorating the repressive institutions and practices of the past.

When developing policies, grassroots-level and communal groups/actors should be placed at the center of analysis, and local sensitivities must be taken into account. The workshop debate stressed the importance of engaging in strategic dialogue with actors in the field before beginning technical outreach (the need to make normative decisions before technical decisions) and the needs to understand the complexity and consider economic and sectarian perspectives to understand different actors' positions.

Several participants also made reference to the importance of analyzing internal problems in the region from a structural perspective, taking into account postcolonial situations, to avoid the risk of reproducing similar extractive institutions. Participants also noted the lack of experiences with reconciliation and transitional justice in the region and suggested caution about importing external models, such as the South African one.

6. Key Issues in the Transition

In analyzing tendencies and actors in MENA, the workshop, examined how, historically, the majority of armed revolutions in Arab states were led against non-democratic governments (e.g. Egypt, Algeria, Syria) and how multiple armed challengers influenced the revolution period and the aftermath. It was stressed that the probability of a country turning into a democracy after an armed conflict is very low and the probability of relapsing into violent conflict is high.

Key determinants of transition are the presence of violence or non-violence in the transition process and how effectively security sector reform (professionalization and depolitization) and demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration (DDR) processes will be carried out. The group discussed the effects of different forms of violence in transitions (e.g. in Tunisia, Syria, and Lebanon) and how sectarian violence is leading to hatred, existential fear, the fragmentation of society, and the isolation of certain minority groups.

In the forthcoming transitions, institution building will be fundamental to ensure that the processes successfully unfold, and to provide people safety and instill confidence. Institutions provide safety because they offer channels to address difficult issues, e.g. decentralization; however, a relevant point was made about the international dearth of knowledge on institution building. Most experience in that area comes from East Asia (i.e. South Korea, where the idea is that strong institution building will lead to a truer democracy), but the context in which Arab uprisings are taking place is very different.

In terms of cultural transition, protecting the multicultural, multiethnic, and multireligious nature of these societies is crucial for the future of the region. Sacred places are being attacked by extremist groups with the objective to destroy multiculturalism. Without preserving common heritage and symbols of coexistence, it will be difficult for future generations to connect with their culture and recognize and appreciate multiculturalism.

7. Role of External Actors

As a consequence of the Arab Spring, there is a continuing decline in external powers' capacity to shape regional affairs. For external actors to become involved in the region, it is fundamental that they examine (i) their legitimacy to act (i.e. what relations they may have had with brutal regimes or repressive non-state actors); (ii) their legacy in the region (if any, i.e. whether they have had a traditionally divisive impact or not, e.g. Russia, the US, the EU); and (iii) past trajectories (e.g. the experience of the Balkans) and the mistakes carried out in them.

The group analysis focused on how a holistic transition in Arab societies will require contributions from other actors (e.g. Iraq, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the US, Russia, the UK) and how the international community should always act responsibly, but specifically post-conflict, i.e., in areas of reconciliation; in ensuring political guarantees to isolated groups (e.g. in post-Assad Syria); in contributing to strengthening civil society; and in assisting with the institution-building process and with establishing interreligious councils. The responsibility of researchers to label situations in a manner that will aptly inform political decision-making was also addressed.



Manuscript Submission:

Manuscripts submitted for consideration must follow the style on the journal's web page (<http://www.foreignpolicyandpeace.org/doc/authors-guideline.doc>). The manuscripts should not be submitted simultaneously to any other publication, nor may they have been previously published elsewhere in English. However, articles that are published previously in another language but updated or improved can be submitted. For such articles, the author(s) will be responsible in seeking the required permission for copyright.

Manuscripts must be submitted by e-mail to: submissions@all-azimuth.bilkent.edu.tr

Editorial Office

Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research
İhsan Doğramacı Peace Foundation
Bilkent University, G Building, Room: 157
06800 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey
Tel: (90-312) 290 2985 (pbx)
Fax: (90-312) 290 3078
e-mail: editors@all-azimuth.bilkent.edu.tr
web: www.foreignpolicyandpeace.org

This journal is owned by Ersel Aydnlı, on behalf of the Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research.



In This Issue

3

ARTICLES

- Norway and Turkey: Possibilities of Cooperation through
the Eyes of Turkish Opinion-Makers 5
Daniel Heradstveit, Siri Neset, and G. Matthew Bonham

- Humanitarian Intervention as a ‘Responsibility to Protect’: An International Society Approach 21
Şaban Kardaş

COMMENTARIES

- Mediation: The Best Way Forward in Conflict Prevention and Resolution 39
Ertuğrul Apakan

- Good Governance of the Security Sector in Turkey 43
Willem van Eekelen and Merijn Hartog

- Europe in Transition: Lessons to be Learned 47
Ludger Kühnhardt

REVIEW ARTICLE

- Notes from NOREF and İhsan Doğramacı Center for Foreign Policy and Peace Research: 53
Summary and Reflections on the Turkish and Norwegian Approaches to the Arab Spring and
Peacebuilding
C. Esra Çuhadar and Monica Rafael Simoes



FPPR

www.foreignpolicyandpeace.org
Ankara-Turkey

