The Militarization of the Turkey's Democracy Promotion Policy in the Arab Middle East (AME)

Bilal Çıplak[1], Ahmet Keser[2]

[1,2]*(Department of Political Science and International Relations, HasanKalyoncuUniversity, Gaziantep, Turkey)*

ABSTRACT: *This research examines why Turkey started to act against its principle of non-intervention by taking part in military actions in Libya and Syria, through process-tracing technique. The research derives evidence from statistical data, content analysis, and face-to-face interviews. We initially explain the strategic interests of Turkey in the two countries, and then indicate how Turkey acted to save its strategic interests during the uprisings between 2011 and 2016. This research is important as it contributes to the literature on the use of military power in relation with deterrence, democratization, and nationalism. It also broadens our understanding of liberal peace theory that emphasizes the non-violent nature of democracies. Finally, this research helps better understand Turkey's foreign policy behaviors, sensitivities, regional power capacity and it is role in Democracy Promotion field, which is a completely new phenomenon in international security policy area.*

Keywords: *Democratization, Liberal Peace, Militarization of Foreign Policy, Policy Change, Policy Transfer, Regime Change, Turkey's Democracy-Promotion*

I. Introduction

Turkey's DP policy towards the Arab World is strongly related to the United States' (US) Grand strategy to fight radicalization in the Middle East (ME) in the wake of September 11 terrorist attacks in New York. As argued by Al-Momani (2011:159), a very important number of non-democratic states exist in the ME and the Arab World. Furthermore, none of the Arab countries is considered fully democratic while only very few were showing indicators of some minor transition to democracy prior to the spring in 2011 (ibid). Even though the subject is not new for those who have long studied the region or the wider problem of democratization (Brumberg, 2005:2), it is also a fact that this incident was a harbinger, accelerating the efforts of the US related to democracy promotion (DP) and fighting against radicalization within the Arab ME.

In order to fight radicalization, the US designed a two-legged strategy: liberal interventionism in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Broader ME and North African (BMENA) initiative in 2004 (Dalacoura, 2010). During the international gathering in Sea Island, the US introduced Broader ME and North African Initiative to a league of nations, which included almost all Europeans, Arab countries, Iran, Turkey, Canada, and Russia (G8, 2004). BMENA initiative was designed to promote economic development, human rights, good governance, and information communities in the ME, all of which were considered to contribute to de-radicalization in the region. Turkey and the US became the co-chairs of the initiative (BMENA Report, 2004).

Turkey fiercely supported the US idea on democratization in the ME for a number of reasons. Initially, Turkey, similar to the US, desired to operate in an environment in the ME, identified by inexpensive energy, peace, entrepreneurship, economic development, freedom, and human rights (Bagci and Sinkaya, 2006). Furthermore, rejection of the March-1 Bill by the Turkish Parliament, which concerned the use of Turkish air space, harbours, and land by the US to occupy Iraq, caused a backlash in Turkish-American relations (Aydogan, 2012). Turkey's participation in the initiative would help Turkey to reconstruct its damaged ties with the US. Moreover, the BMENA Initiative provided Turkey with a chance of discussing the security threats, such as spill-over effect of ethnic and sectarian violence, emanating from the American occupation of Iraq on Turkey's national security, with the US as well (Bagci and Sinkaya, 2006). Finally, AKP, which has perceived Turkey as a regional power, has aspired to adopt a proactive role in shaping the future of the ME.

However, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Prime Minister of Turkey then, had some reservations on DP in the ME. During his address at Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Erdogan indicated that democratization in the ME had to happen as an internally driven process in an incremental fashion (Erdogan, 2003). Because "the reality of democratization is, indeed, much more complicated than official Western discourse imagines, as even a preliminary dissection of the very concept reveals (Hinnebusch, 2006:374).

Within this frame Erdogan expressed his opposition on military interventions by the Western powers to support democratization in BMENA. According to Erdogan, the West's role in DP in BMENA had to be confined to supporting civil society and pressuring the BMENA governments that the West had good relations with to open up for democratization (Erdogan, 2003). This approach is consistent with many commentators' arguments during the preparation phase of the Dayton Peace Agreement to secure the future of Bosnia, which

was an example of DP in Europe as: "civil society development should be central to the democratization and peace-building process" (Chandler, 1998:79). The aforementioned role of civil-society is also a reflection of the United Nations' (UN) comprehensive definition of democratization as: "top-down international regulation…, accompanied by bottom-up assistance to develop a democratic political culture through civil society-building" (UNSGR, 1996:par.124).

However, since the beginning of the process called the Arab Spring (AS), Turkey sometimes acted in a way that appeared as if Turkey was acting against its previously denoted principled policy of non-intervention towards the ME. Although Turkey clearly provided its peaceful support to people that demanded democratization in the Arab world, its support for democracy was being militarized at least in two Arab countries, such as Libya and Syria.

This research examines why Turkey started to act against its principle of non-intervention towards the Arab world, by taking a part in military actions. We employ process tracing and content analysis techniques to explain the process through which Turkey took role in military campaigns to tackle the dictators in Libya and Syria. The research derives evidence from statistical data, face-to-face interviews, and secondary sources. We initially explain Turkey's DP efforts with real world data, and then examine how Turkey's DP policy was been militarized in these two countries.

This research is important for many reasons. To count a few: initially, the use of military power has been hotly debated by scholars from different fields, such as history, political science, and international relations. Scholars examine the application of military power in relation with factors, such as deterrence, democratization, and nationalism. This research, by examining the case of Turkey —a regional power, rapidly growing economy and a democracy in transition— makes a significant contribution to the scholarly literature. This research also broadens our understanding of liberal peace theory that emphasizes the non-violent nature of democracies, and helps better understand Turkey's foreign policy behaviours, sensitivities, and regional power capacity.

In the following sections, the activities through which Turkey supports democratic mechanisms and disseminates democratic norms in the ME are explained. To do this, initially, the research gives World Bank statistics that demonstrate Turkey's Official Development Assistance, and then gives specific examples of to what areas the financial support has been invested.

II. Method

Bilgin (2006:vii) asserts that content analysis is a useful tool for turning the chaotic data collections into comprehensible information. This research prefers content analysis technique as a methodology for the analysis of the interview and literature documents related to Turkey's DP. This research's objective is to investigate the motivations and/or imposition mechanisms affecting Turkey's DP in the AME and tools used by Turkey during this process. More specifically, whether Turkey's DP efforts in the AME have been militarized in the final stage or not will be investigated.

III. The State of Literature

There is a rapidly growing literature on democracy, regime change, democratization, and its relationship with factors as diverse as economic development (Lipset, 2000), the interests of socio-political and socio-economic elite (Cox, 1996) that supports or that avoids democratization, class-relations (Aviles, 2012), and the emergence of radical movements (Aviles, 2012). All of these factors are among the issues domestic to the states. However, the idea about international factors being also important for democratization (Carothers, 1999; McFaul, 2005) has started to gain more credibility, particularly since the collapse of the USSR and the establishment of the EU as a political union. Currently, the international roots of democratization have been examined within the framework of DP literature, and the amount of work related to this topic has reached to a considerable level. Scholars of democracy and regime change incrementally pay more attention to the causes of democratization that originate from the international environment, such as DP efforts of outsiders (Carothers, 2010; McFaul, 2007).

Concerning the DP in BMENA, we agree with Pace, Seeberg and Cavatorta (2009:3) that, it remains a central pillar of the foreign policy of both the European Union (EU) and the US to promote democracy in the region, in spite of the fact that 'democracy by imposition' efforts have failed in Iraq. Some scholars argue that the EU's DP is a projection of its democratic identity in its relations with other states. The recent literature incrementally recognizes the importance of strategic interests of the EU in promoting democracy in other countries as well (Youngs and Wittes, 2009). Also, it is clear that the US and the EU have promoted democracy in former USSR member states to include them in the Western camp as a way to reduce the Russian influence in the region (Carrothers, 1996).Therefore, the argument on DP has come to the conclusion that democracy is promoted for a broad set of reasons. However, to express it shortly, democracy is promoted for a combination of strategic interests and normative concerns (Wolff and Wurm, 2011). In another word, when states promote

democracy, they act on the basis of the premise that democracy is good both for the promoter and the target states (Ikenberry, 2000).

Nevertheless, there are so many cases where DP efforts resulted in undesired outcomes. Although Qaddafi is not governing Libya anymore, Libya has been divided into three different entities, and there is an environment of chaos there. Similarly, Iraq has turned into a platform where the members of radical organizations are being trained, and at the present, a large part of Iraq is being governed by extreme organizations such as Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS/ISIL/DEAS). Both Libya and Iraq were being intervened to overthrow their so-called dictators and to install a democratic rule of governance.

This being said, DP has escaped from the monopoly of the Western governments (McFaul, 2005; Peksen and Comer, 2012). Currently the civil society organizations, international organizations (Carothers, 2010), and developing states, such as Turkey (Bagcı and Sinkaya, 2006), Indonesia, and Brazil, are also promoting democracy in different parts of the world. The rapidly developing market economies such as Turkey and Brazil are particularly interested in political order in their own neighbourhoods. Surely, their economic and security interests play a crucial role in this behaviour of them. A second motivator may be the famous axiom, which is mainly "the idea that democracies never fight wars against each other" which is almost qualified as a law of international relations, invoked for the justification of the democracy encouraging policies in abroad by American statesmen (Mansfield and Snyder, 1995:79). Of course these state centric motivations may not be able to explain the DP efforts alone without taking the impacts of non-state and inter/intra-national actors into consideration. Nevertheless, the involvement of non-state actors along with states and the involvement of developing countries that have distinct identities along with the traditional promoters of democracy that are the Western states have complicated the understanding of DP. Thus, DP needs to be studied more seriously, including the new actors in the field.

When states promote democracy, there are two set of tools available to them. These are hard and soft power tools. These are also been called "carrots and sticks strategy", which suggests that states acting in line with the conditions of the promoters are being rewarded and states that oppose these conditions are being punished. Concerning carrots strategy related to the Arab ME, Diamond (2010: 101) asserts that "external support for Arab regimes, historically coming in part from the Soviet Union but now mainly from Europe and the US…". Within this frame it is needed to investigate DP phenomenon deeper within the following paragraphs.

Although there is no consensus on the definition of the term "DP" among the scholars, we briefly define DP as the acts of outsiders (states, NGOs, International Organizations) in target states to install, spread, advance, and institutionalize democratic norms, values and institutions. Of course during these efforts the "excellence of institutional framework cannot compensate for political culture they enclose, but inadequate institutions can leak, crack or overflow" (Taagepera, 1998:68). Interestingly enough, the AS has witnessed the promotion of democracy by non-democracies, such as Qatar as well which cannot be claimed to have a developed and strong political culture. Volpi's (2013:970-971) assessment as "what characterizes the democratic revolutions of the AS… is that, they are unplanned, spontaneous political transitions… not ideologically and politically organized" may have an explanatory capacity regarding this phenomenon.

In the following section, we would like to give some details about Turkey's DP in the ME and elsewhere, and then we will try to discuss the reasons for Turkey's involvement in military solution to tackle the dictators in Libya and Syria.

IV. A General Overview of Turkey's ODA And DP in Practice

Turkey started to provide ODA in as early as 1970s to some countries in Africa. The literature indicates that "adherents of the democratization hypothesis… invoke mainly two arguments: that of a strengthened civil society and that of economic transformation, which are supposed to trigger democratization" (Schlumberger, 2000:104). After the resolution of the USSR, Turkey established Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (Türkiyeİşbirliğive KalkınmaAjansı-TIKA) to support the newly independent Central Asian Turkic Republics through ODA. TIKA delivers ODA in coordination with the Turkish Foreign Affairs Ministry in accordance with Turkey's interests (Kulaklıkaya and Nurdun, 2012).

By 2003, Turkey had invested USD 14.04 million in Central Asia. However, until then, TIKA turned into a global level organization, providing aid to over a hundred countries (See: Table-1). However, after 2002, the election of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) to power, Turkey witnessed a significant increase in provision of ODA. AKP started to pay particular attention to the Arab ME. As it could be seen in "Table-1", the ODA to the ME goes from USD 2.44 Million in 2003 to USD 109.17 Million in 2007 and to USD 1124 Million in 2012. Turkey's ODA to the other parts of the world also indicates a progressive increase. In 2012, Turkey became the fourth largest ODA provider, after the US, EU, and Britain. As a result, OECD invited Turkey to join Development Assistance Countries (DAC) committee (See: Table-2).

"Table-3" indicates the amount of aid Turkey spent on the Arab countries in the ME in 2003-2012. While in 2003, the largest amount of aid was being delivered to Iraq and Iran, by 2006 war-torn countries, such as Afghanistan, Palestine and Iraq become the largest recipients of the Turkish ODA. Since 2011, the AS countries, such as Syria, Egypt, and Libya, received the lion-share of the Turkish ODA (See: Table-3). The reason for such a large allocation of aid to these countries was Turkey's strategic decision to help the newly elected Arab governments for whom the AKP was a role model to succeed (Interview with MPs, 2012).

Turkey has utilized ODA for DP in a wide range of areas and countries. Education, peace-building/enforcing, improving the capacity of state institutions, political parties and individuals from a diverse set of countries are only some of the most obvious of them. The activities conducted by Turkey within the frame of DP are presented in the Tables (4-6) according to the results of our content analysis. In the following section we will focus on the militarization of Turkish DP in Libya and Syria.

4.1 Syrian Case

In order to better understand Turkey's behaviours under the AKP administration during the AS, we need to shortly examine the history of the Turkish-Syrian relations. Turkey and Syria had antagonistic relations until 1998. Syria's claims over Hatay, Syria's support to the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), and their disputes over the use of Tigris waters were some of the important reasons of this antagonism. Turkey and Syria signed the Adana Agreement in October 20, 1998, after Syria expelled Abdullah Ocalan, the leader of the PKK, from its soil, leading to positive development of the Turkish-Syrian relations since then (Turkey MFA, 2014).

However, the AS created a destabilizing impact over the ME. Syria faced mass protests for political, social, and economic change. The Asad-regime had "a mixed personalist, and single-party rule … supported by a strong internal security architecture" (Miller et al., 2012: XXVIII). In this framework, the most important demand of the protestors was the instalment of democracy. After Asad's harsh response to the protests, the country was rapidly been engulfed into violence and chaos, where several opposition groups, with varying moderate and radical orientations, emerged.

Developments in Syria threatened Turkey in four particular ways. These were the "refugee crisis" which emerged when the conflict between the opposition forces and the Asad-regime intensified, the process of the "Kurdish formation" in Rojava, the "sectarian polarization" between Sunnis and Alawites region-wide, and the problem of the "radical-religious formations," such as ISIS. Realists, such as Schweller (2010), would agree with the premise that when a country's national security or territorial integrity is at risk, a foreign policy approach emphasizing economic interests could be negligible, and that has been the case of Turkey in Syria.

Turkey is tightly connected to Syria in particular and the ME in general because of shared history, geography, similar ethnic and sectarian make-ups, and culture. This was the reason for Erdogan's declaration that: "we do not see Syria as a foreign problem, Syria is a domestic issue for us… We have a border of 910 kilometres with this country, we have historical and cultural ties; we have kinship" (The AKP 2014). The developments have proven Erdogan true. As of February 2016, Turkey contains over 2.688 Million Syrian refugees, and Syria has never been such a domestic problem for Turks before.

The refugees display differences in their ethnic, sectarian, religious, and political characteristics. The group of Syrian refugees in Turkey includes, Arabs, Turkmens, Kurds, Alawites, Sunnis, Christians, religious fanatics, and Ezidis. This means that the problems and networks these groups have back home are brought to Turkey via immigration. Also, Turkish groups that share similar identities with the Syrian groups, such as Turkish Alawites, Kurds, and highly religious citizens have naturally been impacted by the Syrian refugees in Turkey. Turkey had to develop a policy that protected its national integrity and economic interests while taking into consideration the rightful demands of the Syrian protestors for change in their own countries. Creating a balanced approach between national interests and human rights has surely been a difficult process for Turkey as for many Western democracies.

As discussed above, the developments in Syria since 2011 have impacted Turkey in four substantial ways. The very first challenge to Turkey could be called as the Syrian refugee crisis. After the conflict escalated in Syria, 2.688 million Syrians sought refuge in Turkey. Kilis province of Turkey contains over 120 thousand refugees, which is more than its local population, 90 thousand. Also, the neighbouring city Gaziantep homes 356 thousand refugees (GIG, 2016). Some Syrians crossed the Turkish borders with a valid passport, but the most did not have valid documents during their arrival to the Turkish gates. Due to the harsh security environment in Syria, Turkey turned a blind eye to the entrance of the Syrian masses which have surely included radical elements as well.

Syrian influx has had a substantial impact on economic and social life in Turkey. Hitherto, Turkey established over 24 high quality refugee camps (a total amount of 280 thousand refugees live in the camps), and has spent over USD 10 billion for refugees both living in the camps and out of the camps. Furthermore, after the arrival of the Syrian refugees to the southern Turkish cities, such as Kilis and Gaziantep, the demand for rental houses suddenly increased, and their prices tripled in average. Moreover, the arrival of Syrians created a high

level of competition in market place for the low-skilled Turkish workers, resulting in economic, social and cultural challenges for the Turkish society.

A particular group of Syrians has caused substantial security concerns in Turkey. The lack of time after the emergence of the conflict in Syria made the comprehensive examination of each refugee's file impossible during their entrance to Turkey. Along with the ordinary refugees, suicide bombers and the spies of the antagonistic Syrian regime found the opportunity to enter Turkey as well. For example, in 2013, a car full of bombs exploded in Reyhanli town of Hatay, and left 114 deaths and 155 injured behind. The most important aspect of the explosion was the fear that it created in the public. The investigations revealed significant facts about the politics behind the explosion. The attackers were Turkish citizens, NasirEskiocak and ErginOrdek who confessed their meetings with Assad and his high ranking officials several times, to plan the attacks (Sahin, 2014). A confidential interviewee claimed that the goal of the attackers was to explode the car in downtown Ankara. However, when the Turkish Intelligence Service (National Intelligence Organization – MillİstihbaratTeşkilatı -MIT) noticed the plan, the attackers staged the explosions in the nearest place, Reyhanli, a town in the Turkish-Syrian border. Many people in Reyhanli claimed at different times that Eskiocak and Ordek were distant members of Asad's family living in Turkey. Since then, Turkey has faced five more suicide attacks, carried out by individuals affiliated with ISIS, PYD\PKK, and Asad Regime.

The second threat to Turkey came from the Kurdish Formation in Rojava, Syria. In order to understand the type of danger that Rojava Formation causes for Turkey, it is important to take a look at Turkey's relations with its Kurds. Since the late 1970s, the PKK, a Marxist armed Kurdish group, has staged attacks against the civilians of different ethnicities in Turkey and Turkish security forces. The goal of the PKK has for a long time been establishing a Kurdish state in the southern and the eastern parts of Turkey. Hitherto, around 40 thousand Turkish citizens have lost their lives. Turkish authorities have spent over USD 150 Billion (Ozdemir, 2015) in its fight against the PKK. The conflict with the PKK has resulted in social traumas, economic problems, security issues, and particularly strong concerns for territorial integrity.

In the last 10 years, the Turkish government has implemented a number of projects that addressed the cultural and political needs of the Turkish Kurds, such as opening a state TV that broadcasts in the Kurdish language, granting permission to teach the Kurdish language by private and civil society organizations, and permitting the Kurdish parents to use Kurdish names for their kids. Such moves by the Turkish state under the AKP government narrowed the ideational space over which the PKK operated. Furthermore, since the beginning of the second term in office in 2007, the AKP has engaged in peace negotiations with the PKK. Therefore, the Turkish state has been extremely careful for the peace process not to be interrupted. The conflict between the PKK and the Turkish state could have finally ended after 30 years, as if PKK were not re-started to organize attacks just after the June 7, 2016 elections. If the peace process were not interrupted by PKK, then the social, economic, and political resources could have been benefited in more fruitful areas for the development of Turkey.

The Kurdish groups in Rojava are assembled by the Syrian Kurdish National Council. However, Democratic Unity Party (PYD) emerged as the most powerful Kurdish group in the council. There were two particular concerns of Turkey regarding the activities and the model of the PYD. First, the Rojava Formation's main goal was to establish an independent Kurdish state, and this would happen progressively. However, if the PYD successfully realized this goal, or a part of that goal, such an achievement could encourage the Turkish Kurds to take the same route. Second, due to the strong ties between the Rojava Kurds and the PKK, any achievement of the PYD would end up strengthening the PKK. Although, at various times, the AKP administration tried to approach the PYD, PYD's close ties with the PKK hollowed the baseline of this policy. Further, Turkey's peace process with its Kurds was interrupted after the Rojava Formation when Turkish Kurds started to demand the areas where Kurds make the majority to have an autonomous status. As a result, any development concerning Kurds in the region puts Turkey in constant alarm.

The third threat to Turkey originates from the Alawite-Sunni conflict in Syria. Turkey has established its religious infrastructure on the basis of the Sunni doctrines after the establishment of the Turkish state in 1923. Therefore, since then, Turkish Alawites have given a struggle of recognition and social justice. On the other hand, although Alawites in Syria are just a small minority, Syria is being governed by them. Turkish Alawites naturally identify themselves with Alawites in Syria. Therefore, Turkey's support for the opposition forces in Syria is being understood by Turkish Alawites as a move to replace the Alawite Asad regime with Sunnis. Similar to the Turkish Alawites, 54% of the Syrians think that Turkish policies towards Syria are motivated by sectarian dynamics (SETA 2013).

Developments in Turkey in 2013 indicated that Turkey's concerns for Alawite-Sunni relations on its soil were not that wrong. During Gezi Park protests, several young protestors lost their lives, mostly because of the clash with police officers. Strangely enough, all of the 6 individuals that died at different times throughout the protests shared the same Alawite background. These deaths further strained the Alawite population in Turkey as they started to think that there was an intentional violent campaign against them. On the other hand,

the Turkish state was also being highly frustrated by the death of Alawite youths. Turkish officials claimed that a hidden force, an international group of capital owners that had tight relations with some of the Turkish top businesses and the connected media (Interest Lobby), was pulling Turkey into the sectarian conflicts in the ME. Therefore, Turkey has closely monitored the developments in Syria, which has become a direct "domestic issue" for Turks.

The fourth factor that poses a threat to Turkey's national security is the radical formations in Syria. In February 3, 2014, the media, using the Turkish intelligence services as their sources of information, revealed that 20 suicide bombers, who were the members of ISIS, crossed the Turkish borders to stage suicide attacks in three major cities of Turkey, namely Ankara, Istanbul, and Hatay (Taraf, 2014). Meanwhile, high numbers of Turkish youths were crossing the Turkish-Syrian border to join ISIS.

ISIS has a group of warriors that originate from a highly diverse set of countries, from the EU to Asia. A very special training which alters youths' primary loyalty from their country of origin to the values uphold by ISIS is provided to them. If demanded, the adherents could explode themselves at a certain location in their countries of origin. Considering their high numbers, the Turkish origin adherents present Turkey with a crucial security threat. The ISIS suicide bombings in Ankara, Gaziantep, and Suruç between 2012 and 2016 were all staged by the Turkish citizens.

According to the information provided by a CIA spokesperson, the estimated number of ISIS members as of September 2014 had reached to 20.000-31.500. The US Chief of General Staff Martin Dempsey claimed in his address to Armed Services Committee of the US Senate that 2/3 of ISIS members were stationing in Syria (Blanchard, HumudveNikitin, 2014: 9). Furthermore, the UN 2015 statistics indicate that the number of the Muslim youths that participated in ISIS and Al-Qaida was summed to 30.000 from 100 countries. Within this framework, a minimum of 700 British, 800 German, 930 French, 3000 Tunisian, 2500 Saudi, and 800 Turkish citizens joined ISIS. Nevertheless, some other records indicate much higher attendance rates from the aforementioned countries. In Turkey, Gaziantep, Konya, Diyarbakır, and Adıyaman have become the centres of recruitment for ISIS (Hürriyet, 2016).

The problem of terrorism that Turkey needs to overcome is strictly connected to the problem of border control. The escalation of conflict in Syria caused difficulties in controlling the long Turkish-Syrian border. As a result, Turkey's national security and the AKP's overly relaxed border-control policy were being seriously debated. The AKP started to receive harsh criticisms in Turkey for being overly involved in Syrian conflict by accepting 2.68 million refugees, not being able to control the borders, and being unable to prevent the acts of terrorism in Turkish cities. Consequently, Turkey's over-engagement with Syria has domestically caused problems for the government.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that the AKP's over-engagement with Syria, particularly in a conflicting manner, was not something desired by the AKP administration. In fact, Turkey had already had substantial Foreign Direct Investment (FDR) in Syria when the conflicts escalated. Furthermore, the relations between Turkey and Syria were elevated to strategic levels. Therefore, Turkey had substantial interests in maintaining the stability in Syria. According to the Turkish policymakers, the wave called the AS created an irreversible process for change in the ME. Peoples' demand for change would not be easily spurned. In this sense, for long term stability in the ME, which was the only condition for political and economic progress, the peoples' rightful demands for change had to be addressed.

Turkey's support for democratization turned into backing the opposition at all costs against the Assad regime when the conflict in Syria lasted much longer than Turkey expected. Also, the Turkish society started to be harmed by the developments in Syria as previously explained. By supporting the Syrian opposition, Turkey aimed to remove Asad from power, start a peaceful transition in Syria by holding elections, and this way also eliminate the threats towards its own national security. This attempt of Turkey is also consistent with the assessment as "the electoral system is a crucial factor behind the unsatisfactory course of the democratization process in many countries" (Elklit, 1999:28).

Turkey's initial idea was that the removal of Assad would naturally cause a short term of political unease, but in the long run democratic change would be beneficial for the region as a whole. However, the Turkish administration had understood the difficulties of change in Syria in a harsh way. YasarYakis, the former foreign affairs minister of Turkey, was quite critical about Turkey's Syrian policy and reiterated that: "In foreign policy, you never put all of [your] eggs in one basket. Turkey had bet that Assad would fall in no time and that it would be the first to reap the rewards… The way things stand now, if Turkey continues to insist on a Syria without Assad it will be left isolated" (Yakis, 2014).

However, to be fair, Turkey did not immediately support the opposition that demanded Asad to leave the office. Previously, Turkey utilized diplomacy to pressure Assad to introduce some reforms demanded by his people: This took around seven months. When Assad resisted, and cracked-down on the protestors in a violent way, Turkey understood that diplomacy was not an effective instrument to convince Asad. Turkey, then, started

to provide support to the Syrian opposition while implementing an open door policy for the refugees to save them from the harm in this process.

During the on-going conflicts, unwanted developments in Syrian opposition made Turkey to revise its previously positive approach to the Syrian opposition. When the conflict between the regime forces and the opposition intensified, new actors were also added to the struggle. The Syrian Kurds formed an autonomous Kurdish region in Rojava; The ISIS started to fight for the statehood in the region; Al-Nusra and Al-Qaida also joined the struggle in Syria. There were also so many smaller groups whose voices have hardly been heard by the world, such as Turkmens, Christians, and Ezidis. The only time, the world pays attention to these groups is when they face a total slaughter or execution. Turkey started to witness the complicacies in Syria. Then, considering the aforementioned four significant interests of Turkey, Turkey had to develop a more nuanced Syrian policy taking all of the new actors into consideration. The provision of military assistance to the Free Syrian Army along with the US indicated that the Turkish DP policy was surely being militarized in Syria. However, Turkey was slowly been engulfed into supporting armed groups.

After the intensification of the conflict in Syria, Asad and the Syrian Kurds had a deal about the control of the land in the north of Syria. The authority of the North-East Syria where Kurds made the majority was granted to the Kurds. Kobani was one of the cities under the Kurdish control. At the end of Sumer 2014, the ISIS started to attack Kobani. 200 thousand Kurds immediately crossed the Turkish border. The US started to pressure Turkey to join the coalition of Arab and European nations that was formed to fight ISIS. The negotiations between Turkey and the US lasted for several months. Finally, Turkey joined the coalition in 27 August 2015. Turkey opened its Diyarbakır, İncirlik, Batman, and Malatya-Erhaç airports to the operations of the US, against ISIS to support the Kurds of Kobani. A few months later, after ISIS staged a suicide bombing in Suruç where 32 activists lost their lives, Turkey started to join the air operations along with the coalition forces. However, Turkey, benefitting from the windows of opportunity, hit the PKK and the PYD targets a long with that of ISIS. Furthermore, Turkey downed the Russian military aircraft for crossing the Turkish-air space without Turkey's permission and despite the Turkish officials' warnings in 24 November 2015 (Interview with Former TAF Colonel and Assoc.Prof. Erdurmaz, 2016). As a result, Turkey's policy towards Syria has been militarized, and Turkey's concerns for strategic interests have played the key role in this.

In the following section, Turkey's economic interests as another reason for Turkey's DP will be explained. We also demonstrate how Turkey's DP is militarized in Libya to protect its economic interests.

4.2 Libyan Case

Turkey's economic relations with the countries in the ME rapidly developed under the AKP administration. By 2011, the Turkish businessmen's investment in the ME reached to a considerable level. Construction was a particular sector that Turkey was investing in the ME. Therefore, within the process of the AS, Turkey started to be more concerned with protecting its economic interests in countries where she had significant economic activities, but did not have immediate security threats.

In the area of construction, among the regional markets, Libya had a particular importance for Turkey. Turkey developed strong economic relations with Libya under Gaddafi rule. Before the AS (and still), Turkey was among Libya's greatest trade partners, along with Italy, Germany, the UK, and South Korea (Turkey Ministry of Trade, 2014). Turkey's export to Libya totalled to USD 2 billion, and its import totalled to USD 500 million by 2011. In 2011, Turkish construction firms operated in 100 construction sites in Libya to implement 214 major construction projects. Over 25 thousand Turkish employees worked for the Turkish construction companies. The value of these construction projects totalled to USD 15 billion (Koray 2013).

To provide some details about the Turkish companies and the construction projects they were involved, SEGA was building the whole infrastructure of Libya's Al Qaryah ash Sharqiyah city in Jabal al-Gharbi district. Cevahir Group was building the Benghazi Mall in Benghazi. Çeltikoğlu implemented the Wadi El Mejaneen sewer system project of the city of Tripoli (Sabah Gazetesi, 2011). Turkish construction companies were also involved in many other projects, such as constructing railways, hotels, malls, schools, and hospitals (Sabah Gazetesi, 2011). It would not be exaggeration to argue that Libya was being built by the Turkish construction companies. In the course of the AS, while Turkey found the democratic development of Libya essential, it was also strongly concerned with its investment in Libya. Consequently, Turkey's policies towards the protestors and the Gaddafi regime displayed inconsistencies throughout the revolt.

The protests in Libya started in the first week of February, 2011. Initially, Turkey tried to understand the situation in Libya to make the right decisions both to save its economic interests (Dursunoglu, 2011) and not to harm the democratic demands of the protestors. In the early stages of the protests, Gaddafi promised to protect Turkey's investment in Libya. Furthermore, Turkey did not put the armed protests in Libya in the same category with the peaceful protests in Egypt. Turkey also observed that while a large segment of the Egyptian society was represented in the Tahrir Square, only a small group of armed fanatics were calling on Gaddafi to

step down from the office. Thus, initially, Turkey remained unresponsive to the demands of the protestors in Libya, resulting in harsh criticisms against Turkey in the Libyan and the international media.

Even after the Libyan crisis became internationalized, Turkey was still insisting on that the protests in Libya were not as significant. In February 22, 2011, Turkish officials indicated that they were negotiating compensation from Gaddafi for their losses during the protests (Dursunoglu, 2011). In February 28, 2011, Turkey strongly opposed the NATO intervention in Libya. In March 3, 2011, Ahmet Davutoglu reiterated that "No group in Libya wants an external intervention, which would worsen the situation." Davutoglu also added that Turkey expressed her opinions, "We don't want Libya to become the second Iraq", to Clinton and Obama (Dursunoglu, 2011).

The international actors, not paying attention to the differences between the protestors in Libya and Egypt, took steps to tackle Gaddafi. In February 21, 2011, Ibrahim Dabbasi, the Libyan Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN called the UN to impose a no-fly-zone over Libya. The next day, Nikolas Sarkozy, the French President, called on the EU to impose sanctions against Gaddafi, and started to provide a robust support to the armed protestors in Benghazi.

However, meantime, Turkey was trying to attract attention to the prematurity of the political conditions in Libya for change. Turkey's ambassador to Libya, LeventŞahinkaya again expressed the opinion that the protests in Libya were not as large as they were depicted in the global media. Furthermore, he fingered at the on-going pro-Gaddafi protests, which were much larger than the protests of the opposition, in Tripoli to indicate the extent of the societal support Gaddafi enjoyed (Kaya, 2011). Turkey claimed that the views that suggest a no-fly-zone over the Libyan skies were unintelligible considering the circumstances then.

Nevertheless, the protests would continue to grow. In February 27, 2011, Mustafa Abdul-Jalil, who was the former justice minister of Gaddafi, established National Transitional Council. In March 15, 2011, Lebanon's Ambassador to the UN, Nawaf Salam, proposed the UN to pass a resolution on no-fly-zone in Libya. France and the UK, who had already voiced similar ideas, provided a robust support to this proposal. On March 17, 2011, the UN passed the UN Security Council Resolution 1973. After the resolution 1973 was passed, France organized military campaigns against Gaddafi. On March 21, 2011, France organized a conference in Paris to discuss the crisis in Libya. However, Turkey was not invited.

Turkey was being highly concerned by France's unilateral decisions and irresponsive approach that excluded Turkey and that pushed Libya to a highly chaotic point. Turkey's perception of the imprudent French attitude towards Libyan protestors was that France was trying to maximize its interests in Libya's energy sector by installing a pro-French rule in Libya without thinking the potential threats that its Libyan policy contains. France was buying 15% of the Libyan oil before the AS (Regan, 2011), making France the second largest costumer of the Libyan oil, after Italy (28%).

After Mustafa Abdul-Jalil's claim that the new Libyan government would prefer to work with the countries that helped Libya the most in its reconstruction process (or in the process of the removal of Gaddafi from power)," Turkey's opinion of the attitude of France towards the Libyan energy was being reinforced (Koray, 2011). This was irritating for Turkey, who until then remained unresponsive to the demands of the protestors. If Turkey provided full support to Gaddafi, and if the opposition achieved success, the future of the Turkish economic activities in Libya would be under a great risk (Dursunoglu, 2011).

However, beginning from March 14, 2011, Turkey would progressively adopt a mediator role to resolve the conflict without a military intervention (Koray, 2011). Turkey started to summon Gaddafi to introduce reforms to address the rightful demands of the protestors. Non-invitation of Turkey to Paris Conference made Turkey fear that it was being treated as an outsider by France (Dursunoglu, 2011). Meanwhile, the protestors, supported by France, were strongly criticizing Turkey for supporting Gaddafi, who they saw as a dictator (Dursunoglu, 2011).

Turkey realized that the balance of power was being progressively transforming in favour of the opposition in Libya, placing all Turkey's economic interests in Libya at risk. Therefore, Turkey would need to restructure its policies towards the Libyan opposition. After France's military attacks against Gaddafi on March 22, 2011, Turkey started to promote NATO's involvement in the Libyan crisis on the basis of the UN Security Council Resolution 1973. Turkey's goal was to prevent France's sole leadership in this process. As Turkey was a NATO member, the active involvement of NATO would empower Turkey's position in Libya (Dursunoglu, 2011).

Turkey's involvement in Libya via military operations carried out by NATO started to militarize Turkey's policy towards the country. On March 23, 2011, NATO started to monitor the arm embargo against Gaddafi, which was previously being carried out by France, UK, and the US. NATO took charge of the mission on March 31, 2011. The Turkish parliament would allow Turkey to participate in the military intervention in Libya on March 24, 2011, including the enforcement of no-fly-zone. However, the way Turkey acted was in direct contrast with what it had promoted until a few weeks ago.

Turkey would continue its mediation role until April 9, 2011. Despite NATO's involvement, Turkey would insist that the crisis in Libya should be resolved by Libyans alone. Similarly, Turkey declared that Turkey's role would be restricted to the provision of humanitarian assistance to and evacuation of civilians from Libya. Turkey would also take part in inspecting the arm embargo against Gaddafi (McGreal, Sherwood and Milne 2011). Furthermore, Turkey promoted the inclusion of the Arab states within the NATO forces to enlarge the basis of the intervention against Gaddafi, which Turkey thought would bring more legitimacy to this intervention (Dursunoglu, 2011). The US supported this idea, and invited the Arab League states to partake in the limited air strike against Gaddafi. As a result, the goal was accomplished; no individual country would determine Libya's future alone, and Turkey would not take an active role in direct military action in Libya.

The negotiations between the leaders of the Libyan opposition and Turkey, which was strongly supported by the US, played a significant role in altering Turkey's support from Gaddafi to the Libyan opposition. On May 23, 2011, Turkish officials held a meeting with Mustafa Abdul-Jalil in Turkey, and indicated that National Transitional Council was the legitimate representative of the Libyan people (The Tripoli Post, 2011). This is the point when Turkey stopped claiming mediator role and supporting the opposition. Furthermore, Turkey provided the Libyan opposition with financial assistance which totalled to USD 300 million (Watson, 2011). The USD 100 million was delivered to the Libyan opposition in the form of cash donation to buy food and pay salaries. The second portion, USD 100 million, would be in the form of credit donation; and the third part of the assistance would be in the form of credit loans to be delivered to the National Transitional Council. The provision of the financial assistance happened shortly before the opposition entered Tripoli in 2011 (Watson, 2011).

Turkey was compelled to partake in military intervention later on. When the Gaddafi regime survived longer than it was expected, European countries started to indicate their discontent with the duration of the military intervention under the NATO leadership (Dursunoglu, 2011). On May 23, 2011, Norway called back its planes, and Italy called upon the NATO to stop the operations. When the coalition started to break, the US strongly criticized the countries, including Turkey, for not providing military support. Until then, Turkey was contributing to the alliance with five ships and one submarine to enforce the naval blockade and arm embargo: this way, Turkey was successfully keeping itself out of direct military action in Libya. However, the US' pressure compelled Turkey to join the military intervention by providing the alliance with six F-16 Fighting Falcons. Turkey's Izmir Port and Incirlik military base were also available for the use of NATO during the intervention in Libya. The NATO ended its mission on October 31, 2011.

After the intervention, Libya had to go through a reconstruction process. This was what Turkish construction companies were waiting for. Turkey's efforts in Libya paid off. Hitherto, Turkish firms have held 544 projects in Libya with a total value of USD 27.7 billion (Turkey Ministry of Trade, 2014). Turkish investment in Libya has exceeded 37 billion dollars already. Currently, Libya is the third biggest market for the investment of the Turkish firms. While the trade volume between Turkey and Libya before the AS was around USD 2.5 billion, in a year, at the end of 2012, the trade volume between the two countries had reached USD 3.5 billion (Koray, 2013).

V. Figures And Tables
Table 1 – The Total Amount of Turkish ODA by Regions

The Total Amount of Turkish ODA by Regions for the years 2003-2012 in Million USD									
Regions	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
Europe	4.52	30.19	96.59	81.64	80.88	97.24	105.74	139.84	77.18	87.83
North of Sahara	0.1	0.59	8.37	3.33	2.91	6.4	3.23	3.64	58.48	569.97
South of Sahara	0.08	3.25	3.39	21.53	28.08	45.33	43.73	34.44	211.3	179.5
North & Central	..	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.89	2.12	0.81	7.83	0.82	1.02
South America	..	0.15	0.03	0.1	0.23	0.48	2.09	2.89	0.75	1.4
Far East Asia	5.25	11.01	46.01	35.65	13.43	13.74	13.9	9.95	12.18	10.79
South & Central Asia	14.04	130.68	332.49	397.45	308.06	433.32	355.44	492.27	565.87	436.08
Middle East	2.44	53.77	43.99	102.96	109.17	116.4	139.44	222.37	292.64	1124.24
Oceania	..	..	1.59	..	1.39	3.6	0.12	0.66	0.51	0.06

Source: OECD Database

*Source: OECD Statextracts, http://stats.oecd.org/#
*DAD: Development Assistance Database
* Afghanistan is not a BMENA country.

Table 2 – Turkey's Development and Humanitarian Assistance

Turkey's Development and Humanitarian Assistance based on Years in Million USD										
Aid type	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
TOTAL OFF&PRI	107.52	1128.2	1051.9	1663	1337	1576.8	1519.65	1718.2	2363.5	3436.48
OFFDEV ASSIST	66.63	339.16	601.04	714.3	602	780.36	707.17	967.42	1273	2533.3
Source: OECD http://stats.oecd.org/#										

Table 3 – Turkey's ODA to BMENA Countries

Turkey's ODA to BMENA Countries for 2003-2012 in USD Million										
Countries	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Algeria	0.07	0.05	1.05	0.75	0.18	0.19	0.22	0.51	0.49	1.1
Egypt	0.03	0.26	1.2	0.62	0.72	0.95	0.91	1.3	3.51	503.92
Libya	..	..	3.77	1.05	1.07	1.71	0.91	1.01	53.11	3.1
Morocco	..	0.26	1.06	0.35	0.38	0.49	0.49	0.45	0.75	1.44
Tunisia	..	0.02	1.29	0.56	0.56	1.29	0.7	0.34	0.61	60.39
Iran	1.02	12.23	3.91	5.15	7.44	15.45	14.8	16.62	11.34	12.8
Iraq	1.25	24.57	12.92	18.85	46.68	47.68	51.33	39.31	27.83	19.39
Jordan	0.03	0.44	0.62	1.04	1.1	1.4	0.93	1.75	1.58	3.53
Lebanon	0.02	0.34	0.3	36.1	15.7	26.59	11.53	26.82	7.06	7.95
Syria	0.1	1.93	4.56	3.62	5.69	4.11	4.62	9.52	162.03	1019.93
Palestine	0.01	4.49	11.16	20.34	14.22	20.18	48.2	27.83	25.92	51.23
Yemen	0.01	0.03	0.1	0.04	0.08	0.44	1.24	6.01	0.45	4.52
Afghanistan	0.7	8.74	28.56	57.65	71.61	141.96	96.46	107.32	130.89	151.75

*Source: OECD Statextracts, http://stats.oecd.org/#
*DAD: Development Assistance Database
* Afghanistan is not a BMENA country.

Table 4 – Contents of Motivations/Impositions

Content of Motivations / Impositions for Turkey in the ME		
Categories	Sub-categories	Contents
Systemic Pressure	Libya	1- French: Acting unilaterally in Libya forced Turkey into military intervention 2- The USA and anti-Gaddafi Coaltion: Prolonging duration of military operations caused some Western powers (e.g.: Norway, Germany) to withdraw their forces from Libya, this phonemon's pressure on US, which forced Turkey to take part in military response against Gaddafi.
	Syria	1- At the end of Sumer 2014, the ISIS staged attacks on Kobani.* 200 thousand Kurds immediately crossed the Turkish border. 2- The US started to pressure Turkey to join the anti-ISIS coalition* Turkey joined the coalition in 27 August 2015. 3- Turkey alocated Diyarbakır, İncirlik, Batman, and Malatya-Erhaç airports to fight ISIS. 4- After ISIS staged a suicide bombing in Suruç where 32 activists lost their lives, Turkey joined the air operations as well. 5- Russia: Actying a dominant role in support to Syrian regime and PYD/PKK pushed Turkey furhter to take part in coalition forces' military activities and support Syrian Opposition.
Strategic Interests	Economic Interests (Libya)	25000 Turkish labor, 100 major projects, USD 3-4 Billion Investment
	Security Interests (Syria)	1- The sporadic impact of Alewite-Sunni conflict in Syria on Turkey's similar sectarian make up 2- The sporadic impact of Kurdish Formation in Syria on Turkey's Kurds 3- The sporadic impact of Radical Formations in Syria on Turkish citizens (Suicide/Car bombings, recruitment and the spread of radical ideologies) 4- The impact of the influx of Syrian Refugess (2,688 millions) on Turkey's social, economic and political structures 5- The impact of Syria's chaotic environment on the controlability of 910 km Turkish-Syrian border
Source: Own study		

Table 5 – Contents of Tools - Military

Content of Tools on Military Tools		
Categories	**Sub-categories**	**Contents**
Military Tools	Peace Building	* TAF is **involved in peace building efforts** in countries, such as **Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Lebanon**. * Turkey's spend USD 36 million in 2006, USD 51 million in 2009, USD 77 million in 2011, and USD 87 million in 2012 on peacebuilding efforts (TIKA 2012).
		TAF as a NATO army is engaged in "activities of programme assistance and technical cooperation in training, transport, energy, cultural cooperation, administrative and civil infrastructure sectors", as well as serving in **"peace-building operations"** (TIKA 2012).
	Peace Enforcing / Militarization of Democratization Progress	* Turkey joined the coalition in 27 August 2015. * Turkey allocated Diyarbakır, İncirlik, Batman, and Malatya-Erhaç airports to fight ISIS. * After ISIS' suicide bombing in Suruç, Turkey joined the air operations as well.
		* In March 15, 2011, Lebanon's Ambassador to the UN, Nawaf Salam, proposed the UN to pass a resolution on no-fly-zone in Libya.
		After France's military attacks against Gaddafi on March 22, 2011, Turkey started to promote NATO's involvement in the Libyan crisis on the basis of the UN Security Council Resolution 1973. (Dursunoglu, 2011).
Source: Own study by using TİKA documents (2012) and Dursunoglu (2011)		

Table 6 – Contents of Tools – Capacity Building

Content of Tools on Capacity Building		
Categories	**Sub-categories**	**Contents**
Capacity Building	Training / Education activities and Scholarship Programs for students	* Awarding successful students * Higher education in Turkish universities, Military and Police academies. *Turkey's "Grand Student Project", launched in 1990 provided 40 thousand international students with education oppurtunity in Turkey until 2011 (TIKA, 2012).
		* Awarding 354 Iraqi students monetarally and providing them with matarial aid, such as clothing. * Turkey also enabled 24 doctoral students with scholarships from Gaza Islam University under the Academic Support Program (TIKA, 2012).
		1- As a part of "Research and Doctoral Scholarship for Foreigners", Turkey brought 9 Palestinian, 3 Iraqi, 58 Iranian, and 1 Syrian student, in addition to students from many other countries for their postgraduate studies. 2- Turkey provided assistance to 174 Syrian, 232 Palestinian, 504 Iraqi, and 660 college students from Sudan in 2010. 3- Turkey also created programs for master students to continue their educations in Turkish universities. (TIKA, 2012)
		* Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) organize various courses **to promote the participation of women in public life** in Balkans and Southeast Asia. * TAF have also been **supporting/building schools in countries** they operate (TIKA, 2012).
	Training of Civil Bureaucrats / Public Administrators / Army and Police Officers / Policy Transfer	* Turkey promotes democracy in the surrounding countries by mentoring the officials of the target states about economic matters. For example: * Turkey's Undersecretariat of Treasury trains the surrounding countries' officials in the areas of Private pension system, capacity building for supervisory authority, financial services, exchange regime and OECD liberalization codes, public debt and risk management, insurance, and establishing a single treasury account system. * This program included countries as diverse as Iran, China, South Africa, Colombia, Macedonia, and Tunisia (TIKA, 2012).
		Turkey's mentoring indicates Turkey's foreign policy priorities. After the Arab Spring, Turkey would turn its attention, and **reallocate the biggest part of resources to the BMENA region** (TIKA, 2012).
		* Harmonization of the rules creates a greater clarity and predictability in both the Turkish and targets' markets. This is particularly helpful for businessmen who have investment in these countries. * **Know-how transfer** is a significant part of Turkish democracy promotion. **The diffusion of democratic values happens in the process of interaction** (Kirişci, 2011).
		*Turkey provided consultancy services in sectors, such as health, finance, and security to a number of countries in 2010. (TIKA Report, 2014) * The total number of Turkish experts assigned to train the officials of the target countries was 1795 in 2010. The number of officials of the target states who were provided in-service training by Turkish experts in 2010 was 12143. * 123 Turkish experts provided Syria with consultation and know-how services. * Turkey assigned 111 Experts to Palestine, 100 to Afghanistan, 99 to Lebanon, and 72 to Iraq in 2010.
		* Political training is carried out by the AKP. Over 20 political parties mainly from Asia and Africa asked the AKP to train them in areas, such as political campaigning, party organization, and party out reaching. * Muslim, non-Muslim, Islamic, conservative, nationalist, and liberal parties demanded training. * These parties come from diverse places, such as the Kurdish Regional Government/Iraq, Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, and some other countries from Africa and Asia.
		Political Party training includes 1- How to organize a successful party, 2- How to carry out election campaigns, 3- How to connect to youths and women, 4- How to deal with authoritarian governments, and 5- How to maintain grassroot campaigns. 6- How the AKP operated in Turkey's democratic setting, by showing them the Turkish parliament, party organizations, ministries, municipality governments, etc.
		* Partnership for Peace Training Center. 1- TAF trained the personnel from the armed forces of Lebanon, Tunisia, Libya, Pakistan, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Albania and many more other countries. 2- TAF has also been supporting Turkey's Syrian Refugee Policy (TIKA 2012).
		* Turkish National Police have been training police officers of Tunisia, Macedonia, Bangladesh, Somalia and many other countries. * The training program aimed to create a "common understanding in fighting crimes and to harmonize professional terminology" (TIKA 2012) among the attendee countries.
Source: Own study by using TİKA documents (2012, 2014) and Kiriscioglu (2011)		

VI. Conclusion

The Syrian and the Libyan cases taught Turkey that she had to develop a nuanced approach that balanced her interests with the rightful demands of people that demanded democratization. In both cases, creating such a balanced approach was highly difficult not only for Turkey, but also for the West that found the democratization of the Muslim world important, yet was being constrained by her strategic choices.

In the course of AS, Syria, Egypt, and Libya, started to receive the lion-share of the Turkish ODA. Turkish DP was mainly concentrated in education, media, political party training, supporting women rights, administrative capacity building, justice institutions, banking, and border control through the transfer of know-how.

However, Turkey also took part in military action in Libya and Syria. The results show that in Syria, problems related to radical formations, ethnic and sectarian unease, refugee influx, and difficulties in border control put Turkey's national security and territorial integrity at risk. On the other hand, in Libya, the systemic pressure engulfed Turkey into military response, and Turkey's investments in construction sector oiled Turkey's concerns there. According to our findings, in initial stages of both cases, Turkey tried very hard to prevent military actions against the two countries. Nevertheless, Turkey itself was being engulfed into military responses later on.

The current situation in Libya demonstrates that Turkey was not wrong in its initial concerns about the features of Libya, taking into consideration the violent nature of its protestors, compared to peaceful protestors of Egypt. After the removal of Gaddafi, Libya successfully held elections. Nevertheless, violence and terror never disappeared there. Weapons distributed to the Libyan protestors by France have been utilized against other groups in Libya at present. Furthermore, Libya has De-Facto been divided into at least three administrative political units. Both Turkey and European countries have little presence in Libya due to the lack of security currently. Organizations, such as ISIS, Al-Qaida, and Al-Nusra, have gained further influence among Libyans. Currently, the Western alliance is paying the price of their unconsidered policies driven by interests rather than values in Libya.

Howsoever, Turkey put forward some legitimate reasons for not providing support for the opposition. Because of the false depiction of the Libyan protestors in the international media, states' competition over the Libyan economic resources, and the impatience of the Libyans for change, made the hidden dangers of change in such a way invisible. Currently, the whole world needs to deal with the security threats emanating from the unstable countries in the ME. Democratic world have learned its lesson in a hard way one more time taking into consideration the suicide-bombings in Belgium, Paris, Istanbul, Ankara, and Gaziantep in the last one year.

References

[1] Al-Momani, Mohammad, 'The Arab 'YouthQuake': Implications on Democratization and Stability', *ME Law and Governance*, 3, 2011, 159–170.

[2] Brumberg, Daniel, *DemocratizationversusLiberalization in the Arab World: Dilemmas and Challengesfor U.S ForeignPolicy*, ArmyWarCollege, Strategic StudiesInstitute, (July, 2005), PA:1-18

[3] Dalacoura, Katerina, 'US ForeignPolicy and DP in the Middle East: TheoreticalPerspectives and PolicyRecommendations', *Ortadoğu Etütleri,*2010, 57-76.

[4] G8, *GreaterMiddle East PartnershipWorkingPaper*, 2004, G8.

[5] BMENA Initiative, *PartnershipforProgress and a CommonFuturewith the Region of the BroaderMiddle East and North Africa*, Sea Island SummitDocuments, 2004.

[6] Bagci, Huseyin, and Sinkaya, Bayram, 'GreaterMiddle East Initiative and Turkey: AK Party'sPerspective', *Akademik Ortadoğu*, 2006, 20-36, 27.

[7] Erdogan, Recep T., 'Democracy in the Middle East, Pluralism in Europe: TurkishView', *Journal of TurkishWeekly*, (January, 2003).

[8] Hinnebusch, Raymond, 'Authoritarianpersistence, democratizationtheory and the ME: An overview and critique', *Democratization*, 2006, 13(3):373-395.

[9] Chandler, David, 'Democratization in Bosnia: The Limits of CivilSocietyBuildingstrategies', *Democratization*, 1998, 5(4):78-102.

[10] UNSGR – 'AgendaforDemocratization', *UN Secretary-General Report*, (Dec. 1996), A/51/761, par.124.

[11] Lipset, Seymour M., 'The Indispensability of the PoliticalParties', *Journal of Democracy*, 2000, 49-55.

[12] Cox, William R.,*PromotingPolyarchy: Globalization, the US Intervention, and Hegemony*, Cambridge UniversityPress, 1996.

[13] Aviles, William, 'The PoliticalEconomy of Low-IntensityDemocracy: Colombia and Honduras and Venezuela', InCox, Ronald W., by *CorporatePower and Globalization in US ForeignPolicy*, Routledge, 2012.

[14] Carothers, Thomas, *AidingDemocracyAbroad: Learning Curve*, Carnegie EndowmentforinternationalPeace Publications, 1999.

[15] McFaul, Michael, 'DP as a World Value', *the Washington Quarterly*, 2005, 147-163.

[16] McFaul, Michael, 'UkraineImportsDemocracy: ExternalInfluences in the OrangeRevolution', *International Security*, 2007, 45-83.

[17] Pace, Michelle; Seeberg, Peter and Cavatorta, Francesco, 'The EU'sDemocratizationAgenda in the Mediterranean: a Critical inside-outApproach', *Democratization,*2009, 16(1):3-19.

[18] Youngs, Richard, and Tamara C Wittes, 'Europe, the US, and MiddleEasternDemocracy: Repairing the Breach', *Saban Center Paper Series*, 2009.

[19] Carothers, Thomas, *AssessingDemocracy Assistance: the Case of Romania*, Washington D.C.: Carnegie EndowmentGroup, 1996.

[20] Wolff, Jonas, and IrisWurm, 'Towards a Theory of External DP: A ProposalforTheoreticalClassification', *Security Dialogue*, 2011, 77-98.

[21] Ikenberry, John G.,*Democracy and National Security in the Post-WarEra*, New York: Oxford UniversityPress, 2000.

[22] Peksen, Dursun, and Comer, Katherine D., 'Understanding the Domestic and International Sources of Democratization: An Introduction', In*Liberal Interventionism and DP*, by Dursun Peksen. Maryland: Lexington, 2012.

[23] Mansfield Edward D. and Snyder, Jack, 'Democratization and War', *ForeignAffairs*, 1995, 74(3):79-97.
[24] Diamond, Larry, 'WhyAreThere No ArabDemocracies?', *Journal of Democracy*, 2010, 21(1):93-104.
[25] Taagepera, Rein, 'How ElectoralSystemsMatterforDemocratization', *Democratization*, 1998, 5(3):68-91.
[26] Volpi, Frédéric, 'Explaining (and re-explaining) PoliticalChange in the ME during the AS: Trajectories of Democratization and of Authoritarianism in the Maghreb', *Democratization*, 2013, 20(6):969-990.
[27] Schlumberger, Oliver, 'the Arab ME and the Question of Democratization: Some Critical Remarks', *Democratization*, 2000, 7(4):104-132.
[28] Kulaklikaya, Musa, and Rahman, Nurdun, 'Turkey as a New Player in Development Cooperation', *InsightTurkey*, 2010, 131-145.
[29] InterviewwithMembers of the TurkishParliament by the authors of the article, 2012.
[30] Interviewby the authors of the articlewithFormerMember of Parliament Ali Sahin (June, 2012).
[31] Interviewby the authors of the articlewithMember of Parliament Emrullah Isler(July, 2012).
[32] Interviewby the authors of the articlewithAssoc.Prof.(Col.Ret) Serdar Erdurmaz(July, 2012).
[33] Interviewby the authors of the articlewithMember of Parliament Nursel Aydogan(July, 2012).
[34] Turkey MFA, International Organizations, OSCE, (2013), www.dib.gov.tr.
[35] Miller, Laurel E.; Martini Jeffrey; Larrabee, F. Stephen; Rabasa, Angel; Pezard, Stephanie; Taylor, Julie E. and Mengistu, Tewodaj, 'Democratization in the Arab World: Prospects and LessonsfromAround the Globe', *Report as part of RAND Corporation Monograph Series*, NationalDefenseResearchInstitute, 2012, XXVIII.
[36] Schweller, Randall L.,*US DP: Realist Reflections*, in: Cox et al. 2000, 41-62.
[37] GIG, TurkeyMinistry of Interior, Directorate General of Migration Management, (2016), http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/entry---exit_915_1024_4744_icerik
[38] Sahin, Mehmet, 'Reyhanli Bombacilari Hakim Karsisinda',(2014),http://www.zaman.com.tr/gundem_reyhanli-bombacilari-hakimkarsisinda_2198891.html.
[39] Ozdemir, Sadi, '1.2Trilion TL', *Hurriyet*, (2015), http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/1-2-trilyon-tl-28328271
[40] SETA, *PublicOpinionPollTurkishPerception in the Arab World*, SETA pub.,2013.
[41] Taraf, 'IntiharBombacilarininTurkiye'de Eylem YapacagiIddiasiDogrumu', *Taraf Daily*, 2014.
[42] Blanchard, Christopher M.;Humud, Carla E. and Nikitin, Mary Beth D., 'ArmedConflict in Syria: Overview and U.S. Response', *CRS Report PreparedforMembers and Committees of Congress*, CongressionalResearch Service, (January 14, 2014), 1-15.
[43] Elklit, Jørgen, 'ElectoralInstitutionalChange and Democratization: You Can Lead a Horse to Water, but YouCan'tMakeItDrink', *Democratization*, 1999, 6(4):28-51.
[44] Yakis, Yasar, (2014), http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/f15ef0e2-7f95-11e3-b6a7-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2tg00tvQI.
[45] TurkeyMinistry of Trade, *Countries and Regions*, (March 3, 2014),
http://www.economy.gov.tr/index.cfm?sayfa=countriesandregions&country=I&rregion=4.
[46] Koray, Abdulgani, 'Turkiye'nin Libya OlaylarindaIzledigiPolitikayi Realizmin InsanDogasi, Guc, ve Ahlak UnerindenAciklamak', *Sosyal Bilimler Elektronik Dergisi*, 2013,1.
[47] Sabah Gazetesi, 'Libya'da İş Yapan Türk Şirketleri', (2011),
http://www.sabah.com.tr/Ekonomi/2011/02/24/libyada_is_yapan_turk_sirketleri
[48] Dursunoglu, Alptekin. 'Türkiye'nin Idealist Dış Politikasının Libya Savrulması', (2011),
http://www.ydh.com.tr/HD9130_turkiyenin-idealist-dis-politikasinin libyasavrulmasi. html.
[49] Kaya, Levent Sahin, *Sabah Gazetesi*, (2011), http://www.sabah.com.tr/Ekonomi/2011/02/18/libyayi_misirla_karistirmayin.
[50] Regan, James, *France to UseOilStocksif Libya SupplyStopped*, (2011), http://uk.reuters.com/article/2011/02/22/france-oil-libyaidUKLDE71L2BI20110222.
[51] Koray, Suphi, 'Kaddafi Sonrasi Libya UzerinePazarliklar', *Marxist Tutum*, 2011, No:79: 10.
[52] McGreal, Chris; Sherwood, Harriet and Milne, Seumas, 'Libyanminister to takeTurkishpeace plan to Gaddafi', *The Guardian*, (2011), http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/apr/07/libya-minister-turkish-peace-plan-gaddafi
[53] The Tripoli Post, 'TurkeyOffersUnconditionalSupport to LibyanRebels', 23.8.2011, (2011),
http://www.tripolipost.com/articledetail.asp?c=1&i=6737.
[54] Watson, Ivan, *CNN World*, CNN Media, 25.8.2011, (2011), http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/africa/08/25/libya.turkey.funds/.