

THE ANALYSIS OF TURKEY'S APPROACH TO PEACE OPERATIONS

A Ph. D. Dissertation

by
UĞUR GÜNGÖR

Department of
International Relations
Bilkent University
Ankara
February 2007

To Didem

THE ANALYSIS OF TURKEY'S APPROACH TO PEACE OPERATIONS

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

UĞUR GÜNGÖR

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

February 2007

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

Prof.Dr. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

Asst.Prof.Dr. Ömer Faruk Gençkaya
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

Asst.Prof.Dr. Mustafa Kibaroglu
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations.

Asst.Prof.Dr. H. Tarık Oğuzlu
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof.Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

THE ANALYSIS OF TURKEY’S APPROACH TO PEACE OPERATIONS

Güngör, Uğur

Ph.D., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu

February 2007

This dissertation aims at analyzing the motivations that lie at the roots of Turkey’s involvement in peace operations, mostly organized under the leadership of the United Nations in the post-Cold War era. The main contention is that participation in such operations has been an identity-constructing activity in the sense that Turkey has tried to reinforce its eroding western identity in the 1990s through this particular way. This dissertation also discusses alternative motivations behind Turkey’s involvement in peace operations, such as security-related considerations in a neo-realist vein and domestic influence of ethnic and religion pressure groups, but argues that these accounts fail short of offering convincing explanations.

Methodologically, the research for this dissertation will be thematic, not theoretical. The purpose of this study is not to make value judgments concerning Turkey’s participation in peace operations, but instead to describe, understand, and explain its role.

Based on Turkey’s experiences in peace operations, this dissertation reaches the following conclusions. First, Turkey’s western image has improved. Second, Turkey

could transform its security identity and interests in line with the changing security conceptualizations in the West. Third, the modernization process of Turkish armed forces has become much easier following Turkey's presence in such operations. Fourth, the prospects of Turkey's membership in the EU have increased following Turkey's cooperation with EU members in various peace operations in different regions of the world. Fifth, participation in peace operations has contributed to the improvement of Turkey's relations with the United States which have gradually deteriorated in the post-Cold War era.

Keywords: peacekeeping, peace force, motivation, security, identity, participation, military, United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, European Union

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’NİN BARIŞ OPERASYONLARINA YAKLAŞIMININ ANALİZİ

Güngör, Uğur

Doktora, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu

Şubat 2007

Bu tez çoğunlukla Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde Birleşmiş Milletler liderliğinde düzenlenen barış operasyonlarına Türkiye’nin katılmasının temelinde yatan güdülerini analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Tezin ana iddiası şudur; Türkiye’nin yıpranan batı kimliğini 1990 larda bu yol aracılığıyla güçlendirmeye çalışmış olması anlamında bu tip operasyonlara katılım kimlik yapıcı bir faaliyet olmuştur. Bu tez Türkiye’nin barış operasyonlarına katılmasının ardındaki güvenlikle ilgili hususlar ve etnik ve dinsel baskı gruplarının ülke içindeki etkileri gibi diğer güdülerini de tartışmakta fakat bu açıklamaların ikna edici açıklamalar sunmakta yetersiz olduğunu savunmaktadır.

Yöntemsel olarak, bu tez için yapılan araştırma teorik değil konusal olacaktır. Bu çalışmanın maksadı Türkiye’nin barış operasyonlarına katılımıyla ilgili değer yargılarına varmak değil, bundan ziyade Türkiye’nin rolünü tanımlamak, anlamak ve açıklamaktır.

Türkiye’nin barış operasyonlarındaki deneyimlerine dayanarak, bu tez şu sonuçlara ulaşmaktadır. Öncelikle Türkiye’nin batılı imajı gelişmiştir. İkinci olarak, Türkiye batının değişen güvenlik tanımlamalarına uyumlu olarak kendi güvenlik kimliğini ve güvenlik çıkarlarını dönüştürebilmiştir. Üçüncü olarak, Türkiye’nin bu tip operasyonlarda varlık göstermesini müteakip Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinin modernizasyon

süreci daha da kolaylaştırmıştır. Dördüncü olarak, Türkiye'nin dünyanın değişik bölgelerindeki değişik barış operasyonlarında AB üyeleri ile işbirliğini müteakip Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliğine üyelik ihtimali artmıştır. Son olarak, barış operasyonlarına katılımı Türkiye'nin Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde kötüleşen ABD ile ilişkilerinin iyileşmesine katkıda bulunmuştur

Anahtar Kelimeler: Barışı koruma, barış gücü, güdüleme, güvenlik, kimlik, katılım, askeri, Birleşmiş Milletler, Kuzey Atlantik İttifakı, Avrupa Birliği

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is the result of five years of work whereby I have been accompanied and supported by many people. It is a pleasant aspect that I have now the opportunity to express my gratitude for all of them. This dissertation would not be completed without the help and support of them.

The first and foremost of whom is Prof. Dr. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, my dissertation supervisor and the head of the Department of International Relations at Bilkent University. His academic guidance and constructive contributions have led me to successfully to focus my attention on the right direction without diverging from the main idea of the dissertation.

Second, I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. H. Tarık Oğuzlu, for his useful insights into my argumentation. Without his suggestions, I would not be able to improve the academic quality of my dissertation as it is now.

I also wish to thank Mrs. Betty Arlar and Miss Piatt Carley for revising the English of my manuscript.

My sincere thanks go to my family. Thank you Mom and Dad for supporting me in every moment of my life. I am very grateful for my wife Didem, for her love, understanding and support during the Ph. D. period. One of the best experiences that we lived through in this period was the birth of our son Berke, who provided an additional and joyful dimension to our life mission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS	
PEACE OPERATIONS	10
2.1. The Cold War Era: The Genesis of Peace Operations	11
2.1.1. Terminology	14
2.1.2. Political Basis for Peace Operations	21
2.1.3. Legal Basis for Peace Operations	35
2.1.4. The Nature of Peace Operations	41
2.1.5. The Application of Peace Operations	43
2.2. The post-Cold War Era	48
2.2.1. The Reasons for Expansion and Change	50
2.2.2. Features of the New Peace Operation	53
2.2.3. Case Studies	72
2.2.3.1. United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I and II)	73
2.2.3.2. United Nations Operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina	78

2.2.3.2.1. The United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR)	84
2.2.3.2.2. The Peace Implementation Force (IFOR)	86
2.2.3.2.3. The Stabilization Force (SFOR)	88
2.2.3.2.4. EU-led Force (EUFOR)	91
2.2.3.3. United Nations Operations in Kosovo (KFOR)	92
2.2.3.4. International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF)	98
CHAPTER III: TURKEY’S APPROACH TO PEACE OPERATIONS	102
3.1. Cold War	103
3.2. Post-Cold War	110
3.2.1. United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II)	112
3.2.2. United Nations Operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina	114
3.2.2.1. The UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR)	115
3.2.2.2. The Peace Implementation Force (IFOR)	118
3.2.2.3. The Stabilization Force (SFOR)	119
3.2.2.4. EU-led Force (EUFOR)	122
3.2.3. Kosovo Force (KFOR)	123
3.2.4. International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF)	128
3.3. Explaining Turkey’s Participation in Peace Operations	133
3.3.1. Security-related Factors	133
3.3.1.1. Political-Strategic	134
3.3.1.2. Turkey’s Security Challenges and Security Culture	136
3.3.1.3. Importance of the Balkans	139
3.3.1.4. Organizational Factor	143
3.3.1.5. Operational Factor	146

3.3.2. Domestic Factors	148
3.3.2.1. Public Opinion and Pressure Groups	148
3.3.2.2. Historical and Cultural Factors	151
3.3.2.3. Religion	154
3.3.2.4. Refugees	154
3.3.2.5. Economics	155
3.3.3. The Ideational Factors	156
3.3.3.1. Relations with Europe/West	157
3.3.3.2. Turkey's Image as a Security Producing Country	159
3.3.3.3. EU Membership	162
3.3.3.4. Security Understanding of the West	167
3.3.3.5. Turkey's Western/European Image	171
3.3.3.6. Relations with the US	175
CHAPTER IV: THE IMPACT OF PARTICIPATION IN PEACE	
OPERATIONS ON TURKEY	180
4.1. Security-related Impact	180
4.1.1. Political-Strategic	180
4.1.2. Organizational and Educational (Training)	187
4.1.3. Tactical	196
4.1.4. Operational and Planning	201
4.1.5. Logistic	206
4.1.6. Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC)	209
4.2. Domestic Impact	214
4.2.1. Public Opinion Impact	214
4.2.2. Historical and Cultural Impact	215

4.2.3. Religious Impact	216
4.2.4. Economic Impact	217
4.3. Ideational Impact	219
4.3.1. Security Understanding of the West	219
4.3.2. Western Values	220
4.3.3. Relations with the US	224
4.3.4. Turkey's Image as a Security Producing Country	226
4.3.5. Turkey's Western/European Image	228
4.3.6. EU Membership	231
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	236
BIBLIOGRAPHY	258

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Present Peace Operations (1948-2006)	280
2.	Past Peace Operations(1948-2006)	281
3.	The Number and Percentage of Peace Operations by Regions and Periods	283
4.	Vetoes Cast in the Security Council	284

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AJP	Alliance Joint Publication
AOR	Area of Responsibility
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
BLACKSEAFOR	Black Sea Maritime Task Group
CIMIC	Civil Military Cooperation
CIVPOL	Civilian Police
CSBM	Conference Security Building Measures
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation
DOMREP	Dominican Republic
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
EAPC	Euro Atlantic Partnership Council
EC	European Community
EOD	Explosive and Ordnance Disposal
ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
EU	European Union
EUFOR	European Union led Force
GOA	Government of Afghanistan
HUMINT	Human Intelligence
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICO	Islamic Conference Organization
IFOR	Implementation Force

ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JNA	Yugoslavian National Army
KFOR	Kosovo Force
KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army
KMNB	Kabul Multinational Brigade
KVM	Kosovo Verification Mission
LOT	Liaison Observation Team
MISAB	Monitor the Implementation of the Bangui
MNB	Multinational Brigade
MND	Multinational Division
MNTF	Multinational Task Force
MPFSEE	Multinational Peace Force South East Europe
MSC	Military Staff Committee
MTA	Military Technical Agreement
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCO	Non-Commissioned Officer
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NORDPOL	Norway, Denmark and Poland
OAU	Organization of African Unity
ONUC	United Nations Operation in the Congo
ONUCA	United Nations Observer Group in Central America
ONUMOZ	United Nations Operation in Mozambique
ONUSAL	United Nations Operation in El Salvador
OOTW	Operation Other Than War

OSCE	Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe
PFP	Partnership for Peace
PSYOPS	Psychological warfare
SC	Security Council
SCR	Security Council Resolution
SEEBRIG	Southeastern European Brigade
SEECF	South East European Co-operation Process
SFOR	Stabilization Force
SRSF	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
STANAVFORMED	Standing Naval Force Mediterranean
TAF	Turkish Armed Forces
TBBM	Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (Turkish Grand National Assembly)
TBTF	Turkish Battalion Task Force
TCC	Troop Contributing Countries
TCG	Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Gemisi (Ship of the Turkish Republic)
TIPH	Temporary International Presence in Hebron
TOE	Tables of Organization and Equipment
UN	United Nations
UNAMIR	UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda
UNCRO	UN Confidence Restoration Operation
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force
UNFICYP	United Nations Force in Cyprus
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

UNIPOM	United Nations India-Pakistan Observation Mission
UNITAF	Unified Task Force
UNMIH	United Nations Missions in Haiti
UNMIK	United Nations civilian administration in Kosovo
UNMISSET	United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor
UNMOGIP	United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan
UNOSOM	United Nations Operation in Somalia
UNPA	United Nations Protected Areas
UNPREDEP	UN Preventive Deployment Force
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSF	United Nations Security Force
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UNTAES	United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium
UNTAG	UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UNTEA	UN Temporary Authority
WEOG	Western Europeans and Other States Group
WEU	Western European Union
WFP	World Food Programme
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
ZOS	Zone of Separation

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations (UN) peace operations began in 1947 in Greece and Indonesia as international observer missions. They evolved in size, complexity, legitimacy, and effectiveness and went through periods of innovation, development, and expansion at times with periods of difficulty, failure, and disillusionment. During the Cold War, the UN undertook 13 peace operations of varying scope and duration. In recent years, there has been a remarkable growth in demands for the services of the UN in the field of international security. Since 1948, there have been 61 United Nations peace operations. The Security Council (SC) created 48 peace operations in the years between 1988 and 2006. There are currently 16 peace operations under way involving 96,682 peacekeepers. UN peacekeepers are currently involved in India and Pakistan, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Kosovo, Cyprus, Palestine, Lebanon, Western Sahara, Congo, on the Golan Heights in the Israel-Syria, Georgia, Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Burundi, Sudan and Timor-Leste.¹

New conflicts that are likely to challenge the UN in the twenty-first century will have a very different character from those that the UN was designed to address. Conflicts are likely to be intra-state rather than international conflicts, triggered by a range of factors, including social, ethnic or religious strife, the violation of human rights, poverty, inequitable distribution of resources, environmental degradation,

¹ See TABLE I and TABLE II for present and past UN peace operations, respectively.
<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/bnote.htm>.

large-scale migration, drug trafficking, organized crime, and terrorism. These conflicts will be generated by a variety of causes. Dissatisfied populations identify with ever-smaller groups, often based on ethnicity, which may or may not respect national boundaries. Competition for scarce resources intensifies as anger and frustration grow among people trapped in poverty. These elements provide fertile soil for violence within or between States.

The violence is fed by massive numbers of virtually all kinds of weapons readily available worldwide, such as nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weaponization, long range missiles, electro-dynamic weapons, and weapons of mass destruction. The results are human suffering, often on a massive scale, threats to wider international peace and security, and the destruction of the economic and social life of entire populations. International cooperation is needed to deal with these and other global problems. Peace operations responded to both these inter-State and intra-State conflicts. In recent years, peace operations have more often addressed conflicts within States. Peacekeepers have been given more challenging mandates, such as promotion of national reconciliation, organization and supervision of elections, protection of human rights, and humanitarian tasks.

Peace operations, in general, have contributed to international peace and stability, but they have not always achieved all of their goals. Sometimes they failed, but they have provided officials and researchers with valuable lessons by reflecting on limitations and deficiencies. Despite all of their imperfections and shortcomings, peace operations have become a significant instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. The UN peace operation, built on a half-century of experience in the field, is an indispensable tool. Its legitimacy is universally

recognized, derived from its character as an action taken on behalf of a global organization with 192 Member States.

Turkey's contribution to the UN peace efforts is increasing. Turkey's policy, since its inception, has always been to integrate with the community of modern nations. Therefore, it has become a vigorous supporter of values of the western world and the ideals of the UN. To this end, it has supported peace initiatives by the UN, NATO, and other regional organizations in order to prevent or terminate regional and ethnic conflicts. Within this framework, Turkey's participation in UN military operations started in 1950 when it participated in the Korean War with a brigade. Between the years 1950-1953 a total of 15.000 Turks served in Korea on a rotational basis. Following the Cold War, efforts to support peace were deployed more often. Since 1988, the Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) have actively participated in various peace operations with various observation functions: 9 peace operations with military observers, and 9 peace operations with military contingents.² Since that time, UN peace operations have been a distinctive feature of Turkey's security and foreign policy. Turkish commitment to peace operations is reaffirmed in the Ministry of National Defense White Paper 2000 which states that "Turkey provides support to the Peace Operations carried out under the sanctions or control of the UN, NATO or the OSCE for world and regional peace, in the direction of the principle of Peace at home, Peace in the World."³

The major significance of this study arises from the fact that Turkey's contributions to peace operations have so far not been researched from a scholarly

² For detailed information, see 'Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı, Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinin Barış Destekleme Harekatına Katkıları' at <http://www.tsk.mil.tr/uluslararasi/barisidestekharekatkatki/index.htm>

³ *White Paper*, 2000
<http://www.msb.gov.tr/Birimler/GnPPD/GnPPDBeyazKitap.htm#WHITE%20PAPER>

perspective. Since the beginning of the first peace operations, there have been many articles and books written on various aspects of peace operations such as *Evolution of Peacekeeping*, “General Characteristics of Peace Operations,” *Lessons of the Past: Experiences in Peace Operations*, *Concept for post-Cold War Peacekeeping*, “the Environment and Tasks of Peace Operations,” “UN Peacekeeping Operations and How Their Role Might Be Enhanced,” etc. However, there are only a few studies about a specific country’s contributions to peace operations, its motivations, and impact of its participation in these operations (Jockel, 1994; Crawford, 1995).

In the 1990s, Turkey led an active policy in the field of UN, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union (EU) peace operations. Turkish policy on peace operations became part of its foreign and security policy. But the stakes, risks, and implications of these operations for Turkey have not been closely investigated. In fact, there has not been any study on Turkish policy towards peace operations, nor does Turkey have a peace operations policy guide. The present study covers Turkey’s contribution to peace operations mainly in military sectors. Turkey’s other significant civilian contributions made through peace operations are not mentioned in this dissertation. My purpose is not to write a policy paper. The aim is rather to establish the first academic study written on the topic.

Methodologically, the research for this dissertation will be thematic, not theoretical. In other words, I will use the terminology of peace operations and the concepts of the discipline of International Relations. I may even benefit from the insights offered by the theories of IR. This, however, does not imply that the research will intend to prove or disprove a particular IR theory, nor will it imprison itself in a given theoretical structure. There is not a theory on peacekeeping but there are

doctrines. The purpose of this study is not to make value judgments concerning Turkey's participation in peace operations, but instead to describe, understand, and explain its role. My empirical data collection will primarily rely on my own qualitative research consisting of interviews with officers who have served within Turkish contingents in various peace operations in the past but also with some officers from the Turkish Army working in related branches. Interviews with officers who have served in peace operations in the past are of great importance for this dissertation since there is a lack of literature on the subject. Concerning my discussion of the ideational motivation and impact I will not collect empirical data myself but rely on the existing literature on the subject. The main contribution of this dissertation to the field will be the analysis of motives that helped shape Turkey's participation in peace operations.

This dissertation has three main chapters dealing with three specific research questions. The first chapter will answer the first question: how one can analyze the attempts of the international community at undertaking peace operations during the Cold War and post-Cold War eras? What were the main factors in this regard? What was the relationship between such operations and the prevailing security conceptualizations of the time periods under consideration? This chapter will first of all describe the changing nature of the UN peace operations which have evolved out of the collective security's failure. The common belief is that the UN has developed peace operations to help control and resolve armed conflicts. However, it seems to be an insufficient description of the UN peace operation mandate. We need to better define, basically on the basis of the provisions of UN Charter, what a peace operation is, what it does, and where it fits into the larger array of tools for conflict management within the UN Charter.

The first part of Chapter I deals with the problems concerning the definition of certain fundamental concepts. Following the end of the Cold War, the use of peace operations as an instrument of management and resolution of conflicts has attracted the attention of a considerable number of international relations analysts. This renewed interest in peace operations in general has led to the birth of a great number of classifications and definitions. The first part accordingly examines the definitions of the fundamental concepts such as conflict prevention, conflict management, conflict resolution, peace-making, peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, peace enforcement, and peace-building which are listed in the UN document “An Agenda for Peace” and NATO document “Peace Support Operations AJP-3.4.1.”

Being the initial part of the study, Section 2.1 explores the genesis of peace operations, which took place in the period of the Cold War. Moreover, apart from the genesis of the UN peacekeeping, the legal and political basis of peacekeeping has to be studied in the initial chapter for both a clear understanding of the concept and oncoming observations with regard to Turkey’s participation in the peace operations. A strictly related matter is the principles supervising and guiding the peace operations. The second part of Chapter I overviews all of these fundamental aspects of the UN peace operations.

The third part of the Chapter examines the UN peace operations which have been launched in the post-Cold War era. This part also touches upon the reasons why the peace operations had to expand and change in their nature. This also allows for making observations on the characteristics of peace operations. The main goal is to demonstrate that such operations have increasingly gained an ideational dimension and played a vital role in the re-construction of the western identity through the projection of the constitutive norms of the West onto conflict-laden geographies.

Such transformative peace operations have also been in accordance with the changing security understanding of the West, according to which democratization and liberalization in the non-western world through peace operations has been one of the most important western security strategies. The more security has gained a human/societal/interdependent/transregionalised character, the more peace operations gained an ideational dimension.

The second chapter will answer the second question: how one can explain Turkey's participation in such operations. This chapter will examine alternative sets of motivations behind Turkey's active involvement in peace operations in the 1990s in three different sub-titles, namely the 'Ideational Factors', 'Security-related Factors' and 'Domestic Factors.' These factors will be compared and contrasted in light of Turkey's experiences in various peace operations. This dissertation aims at analyzing the motivations that lie at the root of Turkey's involvement in peace operations, mostly organized under the leadership of the United Nations in the post-Cold War era.

Under the title of 'Ideational Factors' I will examine whether Turkey's participation in such operations were informed by Turkey's concern to be seen as western as well as considered a legitimate member of the international community. Is Turkey's approach to peace-operations a function of its relationship with the western international community? Despite this ideational motivation, alternative explanations can also be offered as to why Turkey has become increasingly involved in peace operations. Theoretically speaking, security-related considerations in a neo-realist vein can offer a rival account. To this logic, the changing dynamics in Turkey's regional environment might have endangered Turkey's security and Turkish

authorities might have, in turn, considered participation in peace operations as an effective strategy to deal with the emerging security challenges.

Under the title of ‘Security-related Factors’, I will examine Turkey’s participation in such operations from a security perspective. Has Turkey behaved as such in order to increase its security? Has Turkey joined these operations because it felt itself threatened by the developments in those crises situations? To what extent can Turkey’s participation in such operations be attributed to Turkey’s security culture? Has Turkey’s security culture been a facilitating factor in this regard?

Under the title of ‘Domestic Factors’ I will examine to what extent pressure groups inside Turkey have played a role in this regard. Domestic Factors might prioritize the efforts of pressure groups inside the country as the main motivating factor. To this view, Turkey’s decisions in taking part in peace operations might be influenced by the lobbying efforts of Turkish people who have kinship relations with the Muslim people of neighboring countries in the Balkans and Caucasus.

Of these alternative accounts, this dissertation will underline the ideational concern of being recognized as western as the main motivating factor. This ideational concern also has a security dimension, but not in the neo-realist vein as described above. This security dimension concerns Turkey’s aspirations to be recognized as a part of the western international community. Turkey’s most important security interest since the foundation of the Republic has been to gain western identity. This has been thought of being the only realistic way not to experience the fate of the Ottoman Empire. Stated somewhat differently westernization has been a security strategy (Oğuzlu, 2002:61-82). While this was relatively easy during the Cold War era, the credentials of Turkey’s western identity began to be seriously questioned in

the 1990s. Therefore, active involvement in peace operations might have been seen as a panacea to help re-emphasize Turkey's western identity in the West.

The third chapter will answer the third question: What is the impact of participation in such operations on Turkey? Has the act of participation served Turkey's interests? This chapter will examine the impact of Turkey's active involvement in peace operations in the 1990s in three different sections, namely under the headings 'Ideational Impact,' 'Security-related Impact' and 'Domestic Impact' by answering these questions: Has Turkey's western image improved? Has Turkey transformed its security identity and interests in line with the changing security conceptualizations in the West? Has the modernization process of the Turkish Armed Forces become easier following Turkey's presence in such operations? Has Turkey's participation in peace operations changed Turkey's security culture radically? Has it contributed to the elimination of security concerns in a neo-realist vein or to Turkey's security in this way? Have the prospects of Turkey's membership in the EU increased following Turkey's cooperation with EU members in various peace operations across the globe and how? Has Turkey's participation in peace operations contributed to the improvement of Turkey's relations with the United States which have gradually deteriorated in the post-Cold War era?

The conclusion will simply summarize the findings of the research and discuss the possible consequences of Turkey's participation in peace operations on its western identity, security interests, relations with the EU, military modernization process, etc.

CHAPTER II

THE CHANGING NATURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE OPERATIONS

The main goal of this chapter is to analyze the changing nature of peace operations, mostly led by the United Nations. This is important because the motivations that guided peace operations during the Cold War era are radically different from the motivations that have helped shape peace operations in the post-Cold War era. While the peace operations of the Cold War era can be understood as typical conflict-management exercises, those of the post-Cold War era are rather conflict-resolution exercises colored by strong ideational concerns. Peace operations in the 1990s have, to a significant extent, been motivated by the ideal concern of projecting the constitutive norms of the western international community on to the problematical non-western areas. In this regard, many peace operations in the post-Cold War era are, in fact, nation-building exercises in the image of the West. Such ideational features of the post-Cold War era peace operations are in harmony with the changing meaning of security.

Against such a background this chapter will first discuss the nature of peace operations during the Cold War era and then the attention will switch to peace operations during the post-Cold War era. The chapter will mainly cover four case

studies, namely Somalia-Bosnia-Kosova-Afghanistan, with a view to demonstrating the changing nature of peace operations.

2.1. The Cold War Era: The Genesis of Peacekeeping Operations

Neither the states nor the international community have always been able to settle their disputes peacefully or by undertaking the requisite collective action whenever peace is threatened. The UN has seldom been united and effective in its use of force for the prevention of aggression and it has never managed such use in the manner prescribed in its Charter, except in Korea and Kuwait. The system proved inoperable when confronted with the realities of the post-World War II era. However, the failure to implement Articles 43-48 of the Charter did not lead to a complete abandonment of efforts to develop collective uses of armed force. Yet, as long as the bipolar struggle laid important constraints on an effective Security Council, the scope of collective security remained very limited indeed.

Collective security is one of the approaches which has been adopted for responding to threats to international peace and security. The second approach is collective defense (Smith, 1994:3). These two approaches have similarities in their reliance on collective modalities of response against an aggressor. Because of these similarities, the terms are sometimes used interchangeably. Although the two can overlap, they often mean rather different terms. Therefore, before defining collective security, the distinction between collective defense and collective security needs to be established.

Collective defense establishes a commitment by members of a limited alliance to act for mutual self-defense. Another word for collective defense is alliance. In the alliance system, a determinate enemy is required for a determinate purpose

(deterrence, defense or specific target, or geographical area). Alliances must necessarily be built on the formula $A+B+n$ against $X+Y+n$ (Joffe, 1992:36). Collective defense depends on the formation of alliances by limited numbers of states against commonly recognized threats. Members of the alliance agree to come to the assistance of any member only when one of them is threatened or militarily aggressed. Conflicts that do not involve the members of the alliance do not necessarily merit any collective alliance response. NATO stands as an example of a collective defense institution.

In contrast, collective security adopts a universalistic approach. It requires universal participation in a system of multilateral responses to any potential threat to any individual state. Collective security does not require predetermined enemies. It is built on the formula $A+B+X+Y+n$ against Z . Z as the presumed aggressor can be any member of the system, unknown beforehand (Joffe, 1992: 36-37). As Inis Claude noted, collective security recognizes no traditional friendships and no inveterate enmities and permits no alliances with or alliances against (Claude, 1971:255). Collective security assumes that wars are likely to occur and the aggressor ought to be punished. Every member of the international community must respond by sanctioning the actions of any aggressor that breaches or threatens to breach the peace. The UN stands as the primary example of an institutional structure founded on the principle of collective security.

Taking the above assumptions into consideration, this system necessitates the willingness of nations to fight for the status quo (Claude, 1971:254). As Morgenthau states, the purpose of collective security lies in the “defense of the status quo” (Morgenthau, 1973: 65). Others, highlighting the military aspect of the concept, have, like Martin Wight, described collective security as “internationalized defense”

(Buffoy, 1994:491). In light of these facts, collective security can be defined as a system in which each state in the system accepts that the security of one is the concern of all. Each state agrees to join in a collective response to aggression to defend the status quo. The idea of collective security, which was first introduced at the negotiations that led to the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, has a history almost as long as the systems of states.

After 1945, the ambitious scheme for collective security in Chapter VII (Enforcement Chapter) of the UN Charter was not implemented. The most obvious reason was the inability of the Permanent Members of the Security Council to reach an agreement on identifying the aggressor. Article 43 agreements, necessary to place national forces at the disposal of the UN, have never been concluded, because there was ideological mistrust and many states were reluctant to see their forces in distant, controversial, and risky military operations. Nonetheless, the determination and imagination of people to seek new concepts and devise new methods instead of the collective security system in an effort to make order out of chaos and prescribe peaceful measures forced member states of the UN to take measures. Because of its inability to carry out its task within a framework of collective security, the UN was compelled to seek alternative ways of securing peace, even if only on a minor scale.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine and elaborate upon the debate surrounding “collective security.” Instead, this dissertation will primarily focus on the methods developed in the UN for responding to many situations of international and internal violent conflicts, and ensuring international peace and security. The Charter has envisioned two mechanisms for ensuring international peace and security: 1) regional alliances, and 2) UN authorizations for the use of force. In practice, the UN has developed peacekeeping as a useful instrument for the

management of conflict. Despite important exceptions, there has been a tendency to prefer low risk methods of control (economic sanctions, air exclusion zones, arms embargoes, and attempts to broker cease-fire) or limited involvement with the consent of the parties (peacekeeping forces, observer missions, and humanitarian activities) (Roberts and Kingsbury, 1993: 39).

Today, the most common way in which the UN helps maintain international peace and security is through peace operations. Peacekeeping was set up as an instrument to supervise peaceful settlements or freeze the situation with the consent of all parties (Nopens, 1995: 23). Peacekeeping came into being as an invention of the UN to fill the gap in the system provided by the Charter. It was not specifically defined in the Charter, but evolved as a non-coercive instrument of conflict control at a time when the Cold War constraints prevented the Security Council from taking more forceful steps permitted by the Charter (Ghali, 1992: 89).

2.1.1. Terminology

In the post-Cold War, the use of peace operations as an instrument for the management and resolution of conflicts has attracted the attention of a considerable number of international relations analysts. This renewed interest toward peace operations in general has led to the birth of a great number of classifications and definitions. A short list includes terms such as: enhanced peacekeeping, peace enforcing without force, wider peacekeeping, peacekeeping-plus, prickly-peacekeeping, peace-stabilizing, peace-preserving, order restoring, aggravated peacekeeping, peace-pushing, peacekeeping with muscles, peace support, etc.

Mackinlay and Chopra listed nine different kinds of operations: observer mission, traditional peacekeeping, preventive peacekeeping, supervision of a cease-

fire between irregular forces, assistance in the maintenance of law and order, protection of the delivery of humanitarian assistance, assurance of the rights of passage, sanctions, and enforcement (Mackinlay and Chopra, 1992: 113-131). The methods of conflict management are listed and defined under various categories both in the literature and official publications. In 'An Agenda for Peace' developed by former UN Secretary- General Boutros Ghali, January 31, 1992, the methods of peace operations are defined as follows:

Preventive diplomacy: Preventive diplomacy is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

Peace-making: Peace-making is action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. Peace-making operations are generally initiated when the combatants agree to halt their fire and usually conclude when armistices are signed.

Peacekeeping: Peacekeeping is the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well. Peacekeeping is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.

Post-conflict peace-building: Peace-building is one of the conflict management methods and aims at promoting political, economic, social, and psychological environment in the conflict region following provision of peace. Preventive diplomacy is to avoid a crisis; post-conflict peace-building is to prevent a recurrence.

As of July 2001, the NATO document ‘**Peace Support Operations AJP-3.4.1**’ which aims to develop and describe military doctrine for the conduct of Peace Support Operations, these definitions were redefined as follows:

Conflict prevention: Conflict prevention activities are normally conducted in accordance with the principles of Chapter VI of the UN Charter. Conflict prevention activities may range from diplomatic initiatives, through efforts designed to reform a country’s security sector. These activities make it more accountable to democratic control, to preventive deployments of forces designed to prevent or contain disputes from escalating to armed conflict. Other conflict prevention activities may include military fact-finding missions, consultations, warnings, inspections, and monitoring (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No. 0212).

Peace-making: Peace-making covers the diplomatic activities conducted after the commencement of a conflict aimed at establishing a cease-fire or a rapid peaceful settlement. They can include the provision of good offices, mediation, conciliation, and such actions as diplomatic pressure, isolation, sanctions or other operations as directed by the North Atlantic Council (NAC) (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No.0221).

Peacekeeping: Peacekeeping operations are generally undertaken in accordance with the principles of Chapter VI of the UN Charter in order to monitor and facilitate the implementation of a peace agreement (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No.0216).

Peace enforcement: Peace enforcement operations normally take place under the principles of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. They are coercive in nature and are conducted when the consent of all parties to the conflict has not been

achieved or might be uncertain. They are designed to maintain or re-establish peace or enforce the terms specified in the mandate (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No.0217).

The British Army defines peace enforcement as “operations carried out to restore peace between belligerent parties who do not consent to intervention and who may be engaged in combat activities” (Wider Peacekeeping, 1994: 2-5). The “Report on Improving the UN's Capacity for Peacekeeping” defines peace enforcement as:

Action under Articles 42 and 43 of Chapter VII of the Charter, including the use of armed force, to maintain or restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression (Nopens, 1995: 84).

Peacekeeping is premised on cooperation and, except for self-defense, its methods are inherently peaceful. It relies on peaceful means of achieving its goals and assumes the consent of most, if not all, parties. On the other hand, peace enforcement abandons the principles and techniques which sustain consent and presumes resistance by one or more parties. Therefore what divides peacekeeping from peace enforcement is not the level of violence, but simply consent. Consent of the parties concerned, as it were, emerges as the fundamental and key differential factor (Wider Peacekeeping, 1994: 2-11). It involves taking sides. The peace enforcer becomes, in effect, a party to the conflict and assumes the need to use force for its ends (Evans, 1993:128). Peace enforcement occurs when peacekeeping goes wrong. If a cease-fire breaks down, a revolt breaks out, or the peacekeepers lose the support of one side and become targets of a warring faction, the use of force can pacify the aggressor (Holmes, 1993: 329). With the advent of peace enforcement, impartiality may be neither possible nor desirable.

Peace-building: Peace-building covers actions that support political, economic, social and military measures aimed at strengthening political settlements

of a conflict. This includes mechanisms to identify and support structures that tend to consolidate peace, foster a sense of confidence and well-being, and support economic reconstruction. All too often, once the conflict has been brought to an end, the attention of the international community moves on, the peace-building phase of the mission plan is under-resourced, and the operation stalls (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No.0222).

Humanitarian Relief: Humanitarian relief activities are conducted to alleviate human suffering. They may be conducted independently or as an element of a peace operation. Humanitarian relief provided by military forces of the Alliance may precede or accompany humanitarian activities provided by specialized civilian organizations. However, the prime responsibility for the provision of humanitarian aid and assistance rests with specialized civilian, national, international, government, or non-government organizations and agencies. (NATO, 2001: AJP 3.4.1, No.0225)

This proliferation of terms reflects the existing confusion on the organization and conduct of peace operations. Every UN intervention has a particular political, military, cultural, geographical, and economical environment. Trying to force the peace operations phenomenon into categories creates weak classifications and produces new hybrids. In general, all of the detailed divisions of UN operations are useless. Therefore, I will use the general term 'Peace Operation'

Peace Operation: Peace Operation is a more general term which is used for the general scope of activities such as peacekeeping, peace enforcement, peace support, peace-making, peace building, etc. It refers to activities covering the full range of operations carried out under a strong political diplomatic lead (conflict prevention, peace-making, and peace-building) and operations conducted under a military lead (peacekeeping and peace enforcement). It signifies mainly the operation

undertaken in the post-Cold War era. Peace operations are briefly defined as operations, which are carried out by multinational forces for peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. Conflict prevention, peace-making, peace-building, peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations are included in these operations.

Conflict Prevention, Conflict-Management and Conflict-Resolution: In principle, conflict prevention, conflict-management and conflict-resolution are regarded as applicable in different phases of a conflict. Conflict prevention measures are designed for the early phases, before a conflict has become manifest (open). Management measures are applied in later phases when a conflict is manifest, but before violence has occurred. Conflict-resolution could, on the other hand, be applied in the de-escalation phase after a violent conflict has occurred.

Conflict prevention is a set of instruments used to prevent or solve disputes before they have developed into active conflicts (Clément, 1997:18). Conflict-management is a theoretical concept focusing on the limitation, mitigation, and/or containment of a conflict without necessarily solving it (Swanström and Weissmann, 2005:5).⁴ On a general level, conflict prevention and conflict-management are broad terms for methods and mechanisms used to avoid, minimize, and manage conflicts between different parties (Swanström and Weissmann, 2005:5). Fred Tanner has defined conflict-management as the limitation, mitigation and containment of a conflict without necessarily solving it (Tanner, 2000:541). William I. Zartman has argued that conflict-management refers to eliminating violent and violence-related actions and leaving the conflict to be dealt with on the political level (Zartman, 1997:

⁴ Swanström, Niklas L.P., Ed, Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management in Northeast Asia, Uppsala & Washington: CACI & SRSP, 2005. Central Asia -Caucasus Institute and Silk Road Studies Program, a Joint Transatlantic Research and Policy Center affiliated with Johns Hopkins University-SAIS and Uppsala University at http://silkroadstudies.org/new/inside/staff/staff_web/niklas_swanstrom.htm

11). Wallensteen has also claimed that conflict-management typically focuses on the armed aspects of a conflict (Wallensteen, 2002:53).

There are two sets of conflict management activities: mediation and peacekeeping (Greig and Diehl, 2005:623). Of all of the conflict-management techniques performed by international organizations, mediation and peacekeeping have the greatest direct impact on conflicts. Conflict-management attempts only to settle conflicts into a status quo (for example, Linklater and Macmillan, 1995: 5). It aims to facilitate the resolution of disputes between states. Conflict- resolution moves beyond this state-centrism by concentrating on the human needs, human security, and the structural causes of conflict.

Conflict-resolution developed out of a need to find a process that could facilitate “resolution,” rather than management, of intractable conflicts- often ethnic conflict. Conflict-resolution attempts to bring the individual back into the realm of conflict management and made the case that conflict can be resolved at the diplomatic level only with the consent of the individual citizen. It aims to transform conflict “into peaceful nonviolent process of social and political change” rather than attempt to eliminate conflict (Miall, and et al., 1999:22). Conflict-resolution refers to the resolution of the underlying incompatibilities in a conflict and mutual acceptance of each party’s existence (Wallensteen, 2002: 53), while conflict-management refers to measures that limit, mitigate and/or contain a conflict without necessarily solving it. They are in fact, often applied in different stages of a conflict and address fundamentally different issues. In sum, conflict-management and conflict- resolution are different concepts, but at the same time they are closely interrelated. Conflict-management is required in order to enable the initiation of preventive measures aiming at resolving the dispute.

Against the background of such definitional issues, the next part will simply discuss the nature of peace operations during the Cold War era. In doing this one of the assumptions will be that such peacekeeping operations can be defined as typical conflict management exercises and peacekeeping essentially plays a conflict management role (Greig and Diehl, 2005:625). The post-Cold War era does, on the other hand, demonstrate that peace operations have increasingly transformed into conflict resolution exercises.

2.1.2. Political Basis for Peace Operations

Peace operation is one of the measures initiated by the United Nations as part of the overall process for the management of violent conflict. It is, in fact, “the predominant mechanism” used by the United Nations for conflict control and management (Urquhart, 1993:92). Peace operation is not, and never was intended to be an alternative to a system of collective security. But in the absence of such a system, as outlined in Chapter VII of the Charter, peace operations were considered as a useful instrument of the management of conflict.

The concept of a peace operation was gradually devised to undertake certain functions. As Holmes states that the kind of peacekeeping we have developed did not, of course, have its roots in Article 43; it developed when the effort by the Military Staff Committee to implement Article 43 failed.⁵ Peace operations evolved out of necessity (Holmes, 1964: 85). In other words, due to the lack of a clear Charter basis, these operations were ‘improvised in response to the specific requirements of individual conflicts’ (Weiss, Forsythe and Coate, 1997: 53). Peace operations are not explicitly provided for by the UN Charter. They have been developed in an ad hoc

⁵ the Military Staff Committee (MSC) is comprised of the chiefs of staff of the five Permanent Members, who will advise the Council on military matters. As the Cold War tensions emerged, the MSC never really ever functioned.

manner through the practice of the World Organization. They were a product of necessity rather than design.

One of the main incentives behind the development of UN peacekeeping was the Cold War political climate in which it evolved. During the Cold War era, the superpowers had an interest in bringing to an end proxy wars before they were themselves dragged into direct confrontation. Thus, peacekeeping tended to be limited to preserving an agreed truce between opposing national armed forces while alternative mechanisms were used to address a conflict's underlying issues.

The main concern was to localize conflicts and tensions and prevent them from escalating to a great power confrontation. Localizing the conflict has been an objective in all of the peace operations. When explaining the concept of “preventive diplomacy,” Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld described it as “the filling of vacuums by the United Nations” in order to prevent the competitive interference of the parties concerned (Claude, 1964: 286-289). Inis L. Claude in his *Power and International Relations* accurately explained the underlying political objective of peacekeeping:

This, it should be noted, is not a device for defeating aggressors-and certainly not for coercing great powers...but for assisting the major powers in avoiding the extension and sharpening of their conflicts and the consequent degeneration of whatever stability they may have been able to achieve in their mutual relationships... The greatest potential contribution of the United Nations in our time to the management of international power relationships lies not in implementing collective security... but in helping to improve and stabilize the working of the balance of power system, which is for better or for worse, the operative mechanism of contemporary international politics. The immediate task, in short, is to make the world safe for the balance of power system and the balance system safe for the world (Claude, 1962: 283-284).

If peacekeeping is envisaged to contribute to the smooth functioning of the balance of a power system (regional or global), then it should not impair the validity

of the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. It should essentially defend the status quo (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:91). On the one hand, peace operations essentially defend the status quo. On the other hand, they are not intended merely to be a guardian of the status quo, but rather, help to facilitate efforts towards a comprehensive settlement of the regional conflict in which they are involved (Rikhye, 1990:4). The purpose here is to prolong cease-fires in order to give time to the parties concerned for negotiations to succeed in resolving substantial disagreements. As a product of peace operations' role in helping suspend a conflict and gaining time, the belligerents can be brought closer to the negotiating table. In addition to stabilizing the situation and separating conflicting states or factions, peace operations have had the task of preventing further atrocities and human suffering and creating a favorable climate conducive to peace-making (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:91).

According to Wiseman, "Peacekeeping is not an end but a means to an end" (Wiseman, 1983: 210). It is not, in itself, a solution to violent conflict but only a mechanism to relax tension and to prevent the situation from deteriorating and provide a measure of stability while peace talks proceed or start. In other words, it is a "mechanism to assist the ongoing peace-making process" (Evans, 1993: 100) and is intended to be an interim step to buy time for conflict resolution and diplomacy. It is primarily a political and diplomatic activity. As Perez de Cuellar stated, "peacekeeping operations symbolize the world community's will to peace and represent the impartial, practical expression of that will."⁶

⁶ Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar (served as the fifth United Nations Secretary-General, from 1 January 1982 until 31 December 1991) said this when accepting the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of the UN peacekeepers in 1988.

Peacekeeping was developed progressively and pragmatically, largely due to the visions and efforts initiated by Lester G. Pearson, the Canadian Foreign Minister at the time of United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) operation, and Dag Hammarskjöld, then Secretary-General of the UN. Dag Hammarskjöld was widely considered as the father of UN peacekeeping. As part of his report to the Security Council concerning the UNEF's establishment in 1956, the first peacekeeping experience in UN history, he defined the principles of peacekeeping.

Before examining the principles of peacekeeping, it is first necessary to define UNEF I as it was the first peacekeeping force and made for almost all future peacekeeping efforts. UNEF I was the first “dramatically innovative venture” into peacekeeping (White, 1993:193). This mission established fundamental peacekeeping guidelines which have remained relevant today. In the Suez Crisis, the Cold War did not adversely affect the operation of the Security Council because both the US and the Soviet Union wanted the withdrawal of France and Britain from Egyptian territory. But effective action in the Security Council had been blocked since two permanent members, France and Britain, were involved in this crisis. So the question was passed to the General Assembly. Hence, the normative framework for a peacekeeping force was first established in resolutions adopted during the General Assembly's First Emergency Special Session (1-10 November 1956) convened under the “Uniting for Peace” resolution.⁷ This session resulted in the deployment of the UN Emergency Force (UNEF) on November 15, 1956, after the Suez Crisis.

⁷ UNGA Resolution 377 (1950). This is a procedure for transferring discussion of a problem to the General Assembly if the Security Council is unable to make decisions on the problem because of the use of vetoes.

What made UNEF I different was that all of its components were new; it was unprecedented. First, UNEF I was under the direction of a neutral officer appointed by the UN, unlike any previous peace observation missions in which their own national commanders directed units. In this sense, the troops were truly international servants. Second, the major powers did not contribute any force to UNEF I. This strategy had been used in a few observation missions in the past, but now it became a guiding principle for peace operations. Third, UNEF I did not want to affect the military balance in the area or to favor one side or the other in its activities. So it was designed to be a strictly neutral force in action and in purpose. It was authorized to use force only in self-defense. Finally and perhaps most importantly, UNEF I acted as an interposition force between the rivals. This was the first time the UN served as a physical barrier between hostile parties. For the first time, the words “UN command, emergency force, secure and supervise a cease-fire” appeared in a UN mandate.⁸ UNEF I involved not only an expansion of numbers of personnel, but also a new level of complexity beyond any previous mission. Therefore, UNEF I is important because it was the first peacekeeping force, and its mode of operation became the model for almost all future efforts in peacekeeping.

Dag Hammarskjöld defined the principles of peacekeeping as requiring that:

- A mission must have the authorization of the Security Council or the General Assembly;
- UN involvement in a conflict requires the consent of the parties to that conflict;
- A mission must maintain operational neutrality and so must not influence the political balance of power between warring parties;

⁸ See the mandated functions of UNEF I in *United Nations Peacekeeping Information Notes*. (August 1996:9). New York: UNDPI.

- Peacekeepers should not use coercive force, except in self-defense;
- And personnel for an operation must be recruited voluntarily from UN member states, excluding the Permanent Five members of the Security Council and states with interests in the conflict.⁹

Three interrelated guiding principles of the above-mentioned principles are accepted as the pillars of traditional peacekeeping. First, unlike the enforcement action provided for in Chapter VII, peacekeeping operations are dependent on consent and not on coercion. Second, they must be completely neutral. Third, their military personnel are empowered to use force except in self-defense. Hammarskjöld described the principle of non-use of force except in self-defense as the prohibition against any initiative in the use of armed force.¹⁰

In his 1995 Supplement to An Agenda for Peace, then Secretary-General Boutros Ghali stated that there is a clear link between respecting the three tenets of peacekeeping (consent, impartiality, and limited use of force) and operational success; “Analysis of recent successes and failures shows that in all successes those principles were respected and in most of the less successful operations one or another of them was not” (Ghali, 1995: paras.33-4). The removal of one of the principles would impair the other two principles and consequently destroy the whole structure (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:92). The first principle of peacekeeping is that an operation must be based on the consent of all of the parties in the conflict, including the recognized state government. It is also important to remember that the peacekeepers need to obtain the consent not only for the establishment of the operation, but also for how the operation will be carried out. Consent to the establishment of the operation may not be a guarantee that they will cooperate in fulfilling the mandate.

⁹ See A/3943, paras. 70-71, 166-167 and 179; and A/3302, paras. 10-12.

¹⁰ See A/3943, paras. 179-180

For example, during the conflict in Cambodia, both the Khmer Rouge and the Phnom Penh regime consented to UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), but they also refused to cooperate with several aspects of its mandate (Bratt, 1997: 63).

The presence of consent is also indispensable to attain the mandate of a peacekeeping operation. In order to perform their mandate effectively, the peacekeepers must rely on cooperation with all parties concerned. Consent also helps considerably, an operation's ability to limit casualties. Particularly, the peacekeepers should not be seen as an alien force intervening into the conflict, but rather as invited guests. In the final account, the chances that the parties to the conflict attack the peacekeepers are greatly reduced. Although it has not been a guarantee for peacekeeping success, the consent to the deployment of the peacekeeping force is necessary to ensure the support of the parties to the conflict for the operation. Consent for a peacekeeping operation should be considered as the first sign that the parties are willing to compromise and negotiate. The United Nations assumes that the parties, in giving their consent, agree to cooperate with the peacekeepers. Under such conditions, use of force becomes both unnecessary and counterproductive (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:92). Therefore, the principle of consent is closely linked with that of non-use of force except in self-defense.

The second principle of peacekeeping is the adherence to the principle of the non-use of force except in self-defense. In a peacekeeping mission, soldiers are not allowed to utilize force as a means of imposing the will of the UN. The Peacekeeper's Handbook illustrates the generally accepted rules governing the use of force by United Nations peacekeeping troops:

A peacekeeping soldier may use his weapon only in defense of his life or in conjunction with his fellow soldiers to defend UN positions and/or property against attack. Such action is only meant to be taken in the event of physical attack and then only as a last resort; it is not

for the UN troops to initiate the action (International Peace Academy, 1984: 439).

There is also a widespread assumption among politicians, journalists, and academics that the use of force is in itself incompatible with impartiality. The moment peacekeepers use force beyond the purpose of self-defense, they become accused of “taking sides.” Disarmament provides a good example of how the principle of the limited use of force enhances operational performance. UNTAC did not resort to force when faced with the refusal of the Khmer Rouge to disarm. Instead, it decided to concentrate on its electoral functions (Bratt, 1997: 65).

The third principle of peacekeeping is impartiality, the extent to which peacekeepers act in the interests of international peace and security, rather than the interests of special states or other external actors. A wide range of studies (Fetherston, 1995; Goulding, 1993; James, 1990) has emphasized the vital importance of peacekeeping impartiality. In recent years, impartiality has come to mean not impartiality between the belligerents, but impartiality in carrying out UN Security Council decisions (Roberts, 1994: 115). It is widely assumed that peacekeeping forces operate as objective and disinterested parties in special areas of crisis. Such impartiality is regarded as a desirable objective in its own right; it also provides peacekeepers with a sense of legitimacy which helps facilitate the success of the operation. Alan James, one of the most distinguished authorities on this topic notes that: It is impartiality which gives peacekeeping its distinctiveness, “impartiality is the life blood of peacekeeping” (James 1990: 211).

Maintaining impartiality increases the possibility of a more successful operation because it ensures that the peacekeepers do not become a party to the conflict. The purpose of impartiality is to show that the UN is an honest broker with no interests other than to assist the warring parties to obtain a peaceful resolution of

the conflict (Bratt, 1997: 63). There is an interaction between the principle of consent and that of impartiality. Peacekeepers should treat all of the parties on the same footing of equality. If the UN relies on the consent of only one of the conflicting parties, overlooking the other party or parties, the operation would cease to be impartial. To remain impartial, forces involved in peace operations cannot take sides in disputes. Once the UN violates impartiality and takes sides, its role as an honest broker breaks down and any initiative it takes becomes suspect. Additionally, the peacekeepers can perform their mandate more effectively if they do not fear for their safety. Otherwise, too much time and too many resources are spent on protecting the peacekeepers and not enough on ways to improve the performance of their mandate. When peacekeeper casualties greatly increase due to the loss of their impartiality, their ability to limit casualties is reduced (Bratt, 1997: 65).

One of the various factors that has affected the performance of UN peace operations both in Cold War and post-Cold War internal conflicts is the maintenance of the three traditional principles of peacekeeping: consent, impartiality, and the non-use of force except in self-defense (Bratt, 1997: 46). To what extent has the UN observed these three fundamental principles of traditional peacekeeping in the Cold War and the post-Cold War era? If it deviated from them, to what extent and in what ways? The United Nations peacekeeping practice deviated from these principles to a considerable extent on the occasion of the Congo operation 1960-1964 (ONUC). ONUC deserves special mention because it was by far the most important instance of peacekeeping during the Cold War and the UN's largest, and bloodiest peacekeeping mission. From 1960 to 1964, under a broad vague mandate from the Security Council and under the control of the Secretary-General, ONUC conducted military missions unseen before or since in the annals of the UN.

ONUC came about in response to fighting between Belgian and Congolese troops who had mutinied against their white officers immediately following the independence of Congo from Belgian colonial administration (Cervanek, 1995: 49). In July 1960, following the breakdown of order on Belgian decolonization the Security Council constituted ONUC at the request of the Congo government to provide technical assistance to the newly independent government and to assist in maintaining law and order until the Congolese security forces could fulfill their tasks (White, 1994: 149). After deliberation, the Security Council stated that the situation in the Congo was a “threat to international peace and security” and that all measures, including the use of force, be used to end the civil war.¹¹ Later the Security Council authorized ONUC to undertake enforcement action to prevent civil war, maintain the territorial integrity, and complete the removal of mercenaries.¹²

The Congo operation broke new ground in the history of UN military involvement. Because, for the first time, the Secretary-General directly deployed a military force under Chapter VII. This case is interesting in the contemporary context for four reasons. First, it was initially deployed as a peacekeeping operation. ONUC, as all other peace operations, was deployed with the consent and invitation of the parties. But when it became clear that the peacekeeping would not enable it to achieve its objectives, the Security Council authorized it to use force on a considerable scale to end the secession of Katanga. This was the first, and until Somalia, the only case of a transition from peacekeeping to peace enforcement (Goulding, 1993:452). Second, command and control of the whole operation was delegated by the Council to the Secretariat, not to a member state or group of states. Third, it was the first example of a UN peacekeeping operation expanded to include

¹¹ See, SC Res. 161 of February 27, 1961

¹² See, SC Res. 169 of November 24, 1961

very substantial civilian elements mandated to create and strengthen local institutions and designed to reconstruct a ruined state and to avoid a recurrence of conflict. Fourth, it was deployed in a country where the institutions of state were collapsing.

The UN's reputation suffered tremendous damage as a result of this mission. After the Congo crisis, the UN Security Council refused to intervene in civil wars in Africa, citing the difficulties of keeping peace in the shadow of a Cold War (Adebajo and Landsberg, 2000:165-166). Congo was the ancestor of later UN involvement in civil wars where the military task was more complex and demanding. It put peace operations in a wider framework of securing and maintaining peace and did not limit it to the solving of the specific aspects of a particular crisis (Nopens, 1995:34).

In UNEF, the UN had to deal only with the external aspects of the conflict without getting involved in the domestic politics of Egypt. Therefore, it had no difficulty strictly following the guiding principles of peacekeeping. In the Congo Crisis, for example, it was extremely difficult for ONUC to remain in the established framework. The complexities of the internal conflict broke down the delicate line between the maintenance of minimum public order and involvement in domestic issues. The force was increasingly involved in domestic politics and finally became a party to the conflict. It was implicitly authorized by the Security Council to have recourse to arms beyond self-defense.

Unlike ONUC, United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) has strictly observed the afore-mentioned three basic principles of traditional peacekeeping (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:95). Like the previous peace operations, UNEF and ONUC, UNFICYP is a pragmatic success. It was set up on an ad hoc basis and now serves under the authority of the United Nations Secretary-General. However, it differs from UNEF and ONUC in that it is functionally and organizationally much

more developed and it applies a much wider range of improved methods for dealing with the conflict (Karaosmanoğlu, 1972: 39). The first political purpose of the UN in Cyprus was to localize the conflict and to insulate the intercommunal conflict area from the intervention of Greece and Turkey, averting a possible war between these two nations. The second major purpose of the UN presence in Cyprus is to contribute to the resolution of the conflict by creating on the island an atmosphere of calm and non-violence. UNFICYP aims to prevent a settlement by force and to encourage one by negotiation (Karaosmanoğlu, 1972: 42). UNFICYP has remained as a prototypical case of traditional peacekeeping in internal conflict. UNFICYP to a great extent avoided undesired involvement in domestic affairs. Its guiding principle is to remain neutral and not to fire unless fired upon. In a broad sense, it is a means of persuasion rather than an instrument of enforcement. It has strictly obeyed the principle of non-use of force except in self-defense.

The most significant departures from the basic principles of the United Nations peacekeeping took place in the post-Cold War era. In the post-Cold War circumstances, the principles and practices which had evolved in the Cold War period seemed self-limiting. Being designed during the Cold War period and suited mainly for the international conflicts, principles of consent and impartiality often don't fit the pattern of necessary requirements for the resolution of intra-state conflicts. The nature of intra-state conflict has complicated the ability of the UN to act as an impartial force (Duke, 1994: 388). Moreover, it can be argued that for intra-state conflicts these principles limit the flexibility necessary for conflict resolution and give a certain degree of international recognition to different secessionist and separatist regimes, warring fractions, guerilla movements, and terrorist groups by equalizing them with the official governments and requesting their consent for

international involvement. Therefore, in the post-Cold War era, the three traditional principles of consent, impartiality, and non-use of force except in self-defense became inadequate when the UN was confronted with internal conflicts and civil war situations. They are just as difficult to uphold in internal conflicts where there are no clear geographical front lines and where the warring parties do not divide neatly into two hostile camps.

The UN operations in Bosnia and Somalia, however, suggest that the UN has moved rather far from the established principles of peacekeeping. In these operations, the Security Council went far beyond the three fundamental principles by disregarding the consent of certain parties to the conflict; acting impartiality, against certain parties, and using armed force beyond self-defense. The military operations in Somalia violated every one of the traditional principles of peacekeeping. UNOSOM II, which lacked the consent of the conflicting Somali side, suffered extremely high casualty rates for a peacekeeping operation. Although this could be regarded as a consequence to a loss of impartiality and an escalation in the use of force, it is important to remember that these are related to the two traditional principles of peacekeeping. Thus, the fundamental cause of UNOSOM II's casualties was the absence of consent from the Somali parties.

The consequences of violating impartiality were grave as clearly demonstrated in Somalia when US forces, under UN authorization, pursued a disarmament campaign against General Aideed. This led to UNOSOM II becoming a party to the conflict, thus ending any credible role that the UN could play in conflict resolution. The disarmament mandate and the manhunt for Aideed imposed during UNOSOM II became a direct threat to the position of the clans within the local power structure and were resisted accordingly. By attempting to disarm the warring

factions and capture Aideed, peacekeeping forces forfeited all pretenses of impartiality and became active belligerents in the conflict. UNOSOM II's credibility and operational effectiveness were destroyed when it resorted to using force and it could no longer effectively facilitate conflict resolution in Somalia. UNOSOM II increased, rather than limited, the number of casualties among combatants, civilians, and peacekeepers. Moreover, UNOSOM II was diverted from implementing the other aspects of its mandate.

In Bosnia, absence of cooperation from all parties made it increasingly difficult for UNPROFOR to fulfill its mandate of meeting pressing humanitarian needs and protecting threatened civilian populations. Peacekeepers came under direct military attack. The use of force would give credibility to UNPROFOR, even though it would increase its vulnerability (Roberts, 1994: 102). In response to growing international pressure to take action, the Security Council adopted a resolution under the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter calling upon all states "to take all measures necessary" to facilitate, in coordination with the UN, the delivery of humanitarian aid to Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia.¹³ UNPROFOR II was established under the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Missions were to be conducted in the absence of a prearranged and sustained cease-fire and without the consent of the parties to the conflict. In February 1993, the Council specifically cited Chapter VII as a basis for UNPROFOR's duties in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.¹⁴

Although the traditional principles of consent, impartiality and non-use of force except in self-defense have been contested and challenged, particularly in the debate concerning the application of peacekeeping in post-Cold War conflict, they

¹³ SC Resolution 815, 30 March 1993

¹⁴ SC Resolution 807, 19 February 1993

still define the essence of peacekeeping today. The failed experiments in Somalia and Bosnia have reaffirmed the importance of these principles.

2.1.3. Legal Basis for Peace Operations

There is no explicit legal basis for peacekeeping in the Charter. In the absence of ‘Article 43 Agreements’ the Organisation has to find the legal basis for each peacekeeping operation. This task involves the questions of functional interpretation of the UN Charter in order to make it clear which governing bodies of the UN are competent to establish peacekeeping forces.

The legal basis of the practice has mostly depended on Chapter VI and VII of the Charter, albeit implicitly. The only authoritative guidance in this regard is provided by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on *Certain Expenses of the United Nations* (ICJ Reports, 1962:163-164). In 1962, the International Court of Justice affirmed the legality of peacekeeping on the basis of the purposes and principles of the World Organization through a functional interpretation of the Charter. The *Certain Expenses* case is an advisory opinion directly concerned with the constitutionality of peacekeeping. Today, the legality debate seems to have diminished since the World Court’s decision in the *Certain Expenses* case during the early 1960s. Today, there is a broad consensus on the legality of peace operation (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:92).

In the *Certain Expenses* case a financial crisis over payment for the UN’s peacekeeping operations in the Middle East (UNEF I) and in the Congo (ONUC), led the UN General Assembly to request an advisory opinion from the Court on the question of whether these expenditures constituted expenses of the organization within the meaning of Art. 17(2) of the UN Charter. The request raised the question

of whether the General Assembly was entitled to authorize peace operations or whether exclusive competence in the field of peace and security lay with the Security Council. The World Court in this case clearly stated that the UN General Assembly had the power to create peacekeeping forces.

As the International Court of Justice has confirmed, the primary responsibility of the Security Council in the area of international peace and security is not an exclusive one. The assessment by the ICJ of UNEF and ONUC as non-enforcement actions were designed to demonstrate that establishment of those forces was not exclusively within the powers of the Security Council. Other governing bodies of the UN may also assume certain responsibility in this field. Besides Security Council, the bodies relevant in peacekeeping context are the General Assembly and the Secretary-General. The Charter of the United Nations does not contain express authorization for any organ of the UN to establish peacekeeping forces. Therefore, relevance of any UN body for establishing peacekeeping forces should be focused upon in light of the functions and powers entrusted to it under the Charter.

Chapter VI, Pacific Settlement of Disputes, provides for investigation, mediation and settlement for the Security Council, the principal UN body vested with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and the General Assembly in solving regional and local disputes. It is generally admitted that ‘the Security Council is empowered to establish peacekeeping forces in the case of a chapter VI situation’ (Simma, 1995: 590-591). Chapter VI of the UN Charter gives a prominent role to the Security Council in seeking solutions to international disputes. In other words, the Council can launch a peacekeeping operation to contribute to the peaceful settlement of a dispute which is ‘likely’ to endanger international peace and security. However, under Chapter VI the Council is empowered to deal not only with

disputes in a strict sense, but also with situations which may, in case of their continuance, endanger international peace and security (Kelsen, 2000: 401).

On the basis of an extensive interpretation of Articles 33 and 36, the Council can formulate recommendations relating to the establishment of a peacekeeping operation as an ‘appropriate method of adjustment.’ The enumeration of settlement procedures in Article 33, probably the most important article in Chapter VI, is not exhaustive. Bruno Simma’s Commentary (1995: 511) is clear on the issue;

Although the catalogue of Art. 33(1) lists nearly all mechanisms of dispute settlement which are known in international practice, it has been deliberately left open-ended (‘other peaceful means’). Parties are consequently free to combine different types or to modify them in such a way as may seem most appropriate for the solution of a pending dispute.

Article 33 of the Charter obligates States to settle their disputes by negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial methods. According to article 33(2) the Council may “call upon the parties to settle the dispute by such means.” It can be deduced from article 33 that the Security Council, under 36(1), can recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment for the settlement of a specific conflict. For that reason, a peacekeeping operation that the parties agree to can be considered under articles 33 and 36 as an auxiliary or preparatory method aimed at facilitating the solution of a conflict. One can conclude that Chapter VI of the UN Charter may provide legal basis for the establishment of peacekeeping forces.

On the other hand, Chapter VII defines how and when the Security Council may authorize the use of military force. It deals with the “existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression.” It also calls for the severing of diplomatic relations, disrupting economic relations, and boycotts with the aggressor. According to article 39, the Security Council may either take coercive measures or make recommendations with a view of maintaining or restoring international peace

and security. Such recommendations may undeniably serve as a basis for peacekeeping operations.

As for Articles 41 and 42, the International Court of Justice clearly stated in the *Certain Expenses* case that peacekeeping operations are not enforcement actions (ICJ Reports, 1962: 166, 171). It has been argued therefore, by some scholars that articles 41 and 42 of the Charter are not in a position to provide legal basis for the establishment of peacekeeping forces. Article 42 of the UN Charter empowers the Security Council in case the non-military measures are inadequate or would be inadequate, to take military actions for maintenance or restoration of international peace and security. According to the original Charter scheme, the Security Council should have been provided with military units for taking military enforcement actions on the basis of agreements concluded on the basis of Article 43 of the Charter. Such agreements have never been concluded. The Charter, however, does not require troops to be placed at the disposal of the Security Council according to Article 43. In the *Certain Expenses* case, the International Court of Justice clearly indicated that the absence of conclusion of Article 43 agreements shall not render the Security Council impotent when it is facing urgent needs to discharge its responsibilities in the area of peace and security (ICJ Reports, 1962).

According to the prevailing opinion, the most proper legal basis for peacekeeping operations may be Article 40 of the Charter (Higgins, 1981: 144). Certain jurists consider peacekeeping operations as provisional measures in terms of Article 40 of the Charter. Article 40 of the Charter empowers the Security Council to “call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable.” “The peacekeeping is simply a provisional measure

aimed at stopping the fighting. It does not, at least in its basic form, sort out the underlying problem” (McCoubrey and White, 1996: 5).

Article 29 of the Charter enables the Security Council “to establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.” Article 29 of the Charter may provide merely institutional or procedural background for establishment of peacekeeping operations, for alone it is insufficient to explain the legal basis of peacekeeping operation as such as it follows from its nature (Hilf, 1994: 485). The recourse should therefore be made to one of the powers of the Security Council analysed above.

The legal basis of peacekeeping operations established by the Security Council is provided for in the UN Charter by virtue of operation of:

- Recommendatory power under article 36(1) and 39 in conjunction with article 29
- Provisional measures under article 40 in conjunction with article 29
- Powers to take measures under articles 41 or 42 in conjunction with article 29

The General Assembly has both recommendatory and institutional powers in establishing peace operations. The Court in the *Certain Expenses* case affirmed that Article 11(2) and Article 14 of the Charter providing for powers of General Assembly similar to those of the Council under article 36 may serve as a basis for establishment of peace operations. As we have seen when looking at the World Court’s judgment in the *Expenses* case, Article 11(2) only forbids the Assembly from ordering member states to adopt coercive measures, whether military or economic. This does not prohibit the Assembly from creating a consensual peacekeeping force (White, 1996: 50). The Court in the *Certain Expenses* case directly referred to article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which deals with power of the General Assembly to issue recommendations to States concerning the “questions relating maintenance of

international peace and security.” The Court indicated that this provision empowers the General Assembly to organize peace operations by means of recommendations. The General Assembly could act unless enforcement measures against a State are involved (ICJ Reports, 1962: 164).

The first step by the General Assembly to assert its own role in the area of peace and security was the resolution 377 ‘Uniting for Peace’ adopted in 1950 concerning the situation in Korea and dealing with the residual role of the General Assembly in maintenance of international peace and security. The Uniting for Peace Resolution adopted in 1950 stated;

If the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or acts of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

This provision makes it clear that the General Assembly did not consider its residual competence in the area of peace and security as limited to enforcement measures. And if the General Assembly asserts its power to recommend forcible measures, it shall naturally be considered as also asserting its power to organize peacekeeping operations on the basis of consent given by the parties. Following the example of UNEF, the Court indicated that the General Assembly may establish peace operations either under article 11 or under article 14 (ICJ Reports, 1962: 172). The General Assembly also has institutional power in establishing peace operations. Article 22 empowers the General Assembly to establish subsidiary organs for performance of its functions and this power may be used for the establishment of a peacekeeping force. UNEF, in particular, has been established under this article

(Hilf, 1994: 386-387). It has been thus established that Chapters IV, VI and VII of the UN Charter are in a position to provide legal basis for peace operations. Also, in an institutional sense, peacekeeping forces established by the UN are subsidiary organs of this organization based on Article 7, Article 22 and Article 29 of the UN Charter.

According to another view which is political rather than legal, a peace operation is often referred to as a “Chapter VI and a half” activity, meaning that it fell somewhere between Chapter VI “On the Pacific Settlement of Disputes” and Chapter VII on “Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression.” It goes beyond purely diplomatic means for the peaceful settlement of disputes described in Chapter VI, but falls short of the military or other enforcement provisions of Chapter VII. Since there was no specific reference to peace keeping in the Charter, former Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld coined an expression and stated that a peace operation might be put in a new Chapter “Six and a half” referring to an expansion of Chapter VI (Weiss, and et al., 1994: 48).

2.1.4. The Nature of Peace Operations

Peace operations have never been purely military while carrying out their functions mentioned above. They have always included civilian personnel to carry out essential political or administrative functions. They have traditionally fallen into two broad categories: observation missions and peace operation forces. Peace operation forces generally carry out a wide variety of tasks such as the monitoring and enforcement of cease-fires, interposition between belligerents, election monitoring, protection, and delivery of humanitarian aid and the maintenance of government and public order. Peace operation forces are significantly different from both traditional military forces

and observer missions in several ways. Whereas a traditional military mission involves the defense or attempted seizure of territory, the role of a peace operation force is to occupy a given area and act as an interposition force between the rivals. As understood, peacekeepers have no offensive role in the conflict. The activities which peace operation forces carry out involve patrolling the deployment area and searching for violations of the cease-fire agreement as a conciliator between the hostile parties. These are not functions regularly carried out by a military force.

Peace operation forces are also different from observation missions in several ways. They assume different roles and are constituted differently. The net effect is that they cannot properly be compared on the same dimensions as observation missions, and they are likely to be influenced by different factors. However, the division between observation and peace operation forces is unclear because there are gray areas in which one function merges into another. Nevertheless, these distinctions are important in order to understand the legal principles governing peace operations. The major difference between peace operation forces and observation missions is that observation missions are not designed to act as interposition forces that restore order or defend territory, although they may be placed in a neutral zone between the rivals. Furthermore, they may also patrol areas and help resolve cease-fire disputes.

Whereas the size of a peace operation force ranges from 1,000 to 40,000, observation missions are often much fewer in number. Indeed, a single individual may constitute such a force. Observation missions consist largely of officers who are almost invariably unarmed. Their function is limited to reporting the state of hostilities. Observation teams are not meant as buffer forces. They only observe the cease-fire and are not usually large enough to make the cease-fire as effective as peace operation forces do. The difference between an observation mission and a

peace operation force is also more evident in their respective military equipment and use of military force. Unlike observers, peace operation troops must protect themselves. Peace operation forces must also provide a visible deterrent to the threat of defensive military actions by patrolling buffer and other demilitarized zones. Small unarmed observation missions are generally considered inadequate for this task. Missions of observers have been initiated as a type of assistance offered by the states to the UN, while the missions of peace operation forces have been based on voluntary contributions and the consent of the states.

2.1.5. The Application of Peace Operations

Many violent conflicts which have dominated international relations since World War II have been debated in the Security Council. However, the Council has but on rare occasions, been able to agree on pressures against those that have broken the peace or threatened to do so. The UN has not always been a suitable or effective vehicle for peace operation activity in all situations. In other words, peace operations have not been a remedy to all violent conflicts. In fact they have not been used very often. There have been a number of international crises, including the Soviet armed interventions in Hungary 1956 and Czechoslovakia 1968, the United States' incursions into Guatemala 1954, Vietnam (late 1950s to early 1970s), Ethiopia and Somalia in 1977, Tanzania and Uganda between 1978-79, China and the Soviet Union in 1969, India and China 1962, Afghanistan in 1979, and Grenada in 1983, in which peace operations played no part (White, 1993: 51). The first and foremost reason for not using peace operations in these crises has been the lack of willingness of states to bring their conflicts to the UN. They did not want public debates over the issues at the UN and to come under the international spotlight. They felt unease

concerning national sovereignty issues, particularly if a peace operation force was likely to be authorized.

The second important reason why peace operations have not been applied to all violent conflicts is that peace operations can work only in favorable political conditions. A peace operation does not work well if there is not some peace to keep. Attempts to use it in unsuitable conditions will probably be volatile. The peace operation bodies can be afflicted by huge difficulties and the task may be close to impossible, especially if there are no viable geographical lines separating combatants and the types of weapons used are easily available and difficult to control (Wiseman, 1983: 16).

These considerations often resulted in a situation in which a violent conflict has only been brought to the UN as a last resort. In commenting on this problem, Urquhart notes that “the position of the UN has declined to a last resort, last minute, reluctantly accepted safety net” (Urquhart, 1987: 254). For the Security Council, the question of whether to act upon a violent conflict because it threatens international peace and security may only be discussed when the situation has reached an intensity level making it impossible to ignore. Moreover, insufficient resources have led to situations where the Council has been unable to take concerted action even though help was requested (Fetherston, 1995: 38).

The UN has been called upon to play a marginal or nominal role in areas where the super power interests were directly involved. The Czechoslovakian and Hungarian crises in the Soviet bloc, and the conflicts in Latin America, which were within the sphere of influence of the United States can be given as examples. The resolution by the General Assembly calling upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces from Hungary was ignored. The Soviet Union saw it necessary to protect its

interests by using its veto in the Security Council. The American backed coup in Guatemala in 1954 illustrates how the United States protected its interests in its own bloc. The United States prevented the issue from being raised at the Security Council. The reason why a peace operation played no part in Czechoslovakia in 1968 was simply because the situation in Czechoslovakia affected the vital interests of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union behaved in the same way as the US.

As for the Vietnam case, there were certain factors which restricted the ability of the UN to deal with the conflict in Vietnam. The Vietnamese situation was more complicated. The gradual escalation of the conflict in Vietnam limited the potential of United Nations' action. The Vietnam War only involved one super power directly and so the other superpower, the Soviet Union, was quite content to block any peace operation.

The UN peace operation also played no part in Afghanistan. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979 was different in geopolitical terms from its previous interventions in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, because it represented the first time the Soviet Union had pushed its troops beyond the zone inherited after the Second World War. The resolution by the Non-Aligned group in the Security Council calling for "the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan" was vetoed by the Soviet Union.¹⁵ The United States warned the Soviet Union not to advance any further towards the Gulf. The US was treating the intervention as politically allowable, because the US did not want to escalate this conflict into a global military confrontation.

Contrary to intra-bloc conflicts, inter-bloc conflicts often occurred on the "power frontiers" between the "spheres of influence" of the super powers. Good

¹⁵ See, UN doc. S/13729 (1980)

examples of such violent conflicts were the Berlin blockade in 1948 and the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 (White, 1993: 13). The UN peace operations were not applied to these conflicts either. In super power confrontation situations, as in Berlin and the Cuban missile crisis, the UN played only a peripheral role. As for the conflict between India and China in 1962, the UN was not an appropriate body to deal with this dispute because one of the major players, the People's Republic of China, did not represent China at the UN until 1971.

During the Cold War, the attitude of the two superpowers had a crucial impact on the performance of traditional peace operations. The UN was excluded from playing any peace operation role within the super powers' own "spheres of interest" not only in disputes in the western hemisphere, but also in conflicts arising within socialist states (Wiseman, 1983: 377). Experience has shown that in order to set up such operations, the United Nations had to secure not only the consent of the main parties directly concerned, but also the support, or at least the acquiescence, of the two superpowers. However, despite those difficulties, UN peace operations were an important stabilizing factor during the Cold War; they contained several potentially dangerous conflicts and insulated them from superpower rivalry.

To conclude, the main purpose of setting up peacekeeping operations was to help contain local conflicts to their limited area so that such conflicts did not escalate in such a way to engulf major superpowers (Richmond, 2001:317-348). The principle of non-involvement in domestic affairs of states was regarded as sacred, in harmony with the prevailing security conceptualization of the time period under consideration, and this kept the number of peace operations to a minimum. External sovereignty used to be more important than internal sovereignty.

The main characteristics of peace operations during the Cold War era consisted of the following. First, force was to be used only in self-defense. Second, the force used should be proportional. Third, deployment of peace troops required the consent of the parties concerned. Fourth, major powers abstained from providing operations with troops. Fifth, troops used to carry light arms. Finally, missions were mainly authorized to oversee armistices and to separate belligerent parties from each other (Richmond, 2004:83-101). Peace operations of the Cold War era were short of having ideational aspects and can not be explained by any ideational perspective. They could rather be considered as strategic initiatives undertaken with a view to helping preserve the balance of power between two rival blocks. They were missions empowered to 'manage' conflicts rather than 'resolve' them. The peace operations undertaken during the Cold War era were conflict-management activities rather than conflict-resolution activities.

Indarjit Rikhye insisted that peace operations fulfilled three key roles. First, they provided a mechanism for resolving conflict without the direct intervention of the Cold War superpowers, thereby reducing the risk of cataclysmic escalation. Second, peace operations mobilized international society to make a commitment to the maintenance of peace. Third, peacekeeping provided 'a diplomatic key opening the way to further negotiations for a peaceful resolution of conflicts' (Rikhye, 1984:221, 234 and 245). Cold War UN peacekeeping was supposed to prevent overt violence, prevent the global and regional escalation of localized conflicts, and provide the conditions of stability in which peacemaking could occur (Richmond, 2004:86). This instrumental approach to peace operations developed alongside the proliferation of peace operations in the 1990s. New approaches attempted to identify the 'symptoms' that peace operations ought to address, the concepts and tools that

peacekeepers have at their disposal, and the most effective way and time to utilize them. The first task is to identify the characteristics, functions and types of different peace operations (Bellamy, 2004: 20).

United Nations peace operation has only been employed in a limited number of wars and crises during which a consensus developed over UN involvement. More often than not, peace operations have dealt with regional violent conflicts which have a wider potential for threatening international peace and security, in which the great powers are likely to become involved. In almost every case, peace operation has been applied to areas beyond the dominance of super powers. Yet, what remains surprising is the number of times that the Security Council (and sometimes the General Assembly) has been able to set up peace operations in spite of the Cold War.¹⁶ The majority of these operations (seven of the 13) were deployed in the Middle East, a region of clear geo-strategic importance to the permanent members of the Security Council.

2.2. The post-Cold War Era

According to some authors, the UN peace operations in the post-Cold War era are best defined as “Second-generation operations,” “the New Peacekeeping,” “Wider Peacekeeping,” or “Expanded Peacekeeping” (Ratner, 1995: 17). It will be more convenient to use the term “the New Peacekeeping” and “Second generation” in this study since the term “generation” focuses upon the changing nature of the operations, not only the time period in which they commenced. It points to a clear shift in the purpose of the operations.

¹⁶ United Nations Emergency Force I (UNEF I) in 1956 and United Nations Security Force (UNSF) in 1962 were authorized by the General Assembly.

The demand for and the scope of peace operations has steadily increased in the post-Cold War era. The United Nations has authorized or deployed a series of new missions. The international politics witnessed a remarkable revival of the United Nations. In order to understand the reasons for this expansion, it will be better to examine the international climate in this new era. The post-Cold War era marked the downfall of the bipolar system that had governed the understanding and conduct of international relations since the end of the Second World War (Mawlawi, 1993: 391-413). Beginning with the Gorbachev era, changes such as the success of the 1986 CSCE negotiations in Stockholm on the development of confidence building measures, the conclusion of arms reduction agreements (the 1987 Treaty on Intermediate Nuclear Forces, the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the 1991 and 1993 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties), the destruction of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of Germany, the changes of regimes in Eastern Europe, the collapse of communism in the USSR, and the emergence of the Commonwealth of Independent States have put the UN in a totally different situation (Roberts and Kingsbury, 1993: 428).

The threat of a US-Russian nuclear confrontation has virtually disappeared since the end of the Cold War and the number of major armed conflicts has decreased slightly (SIPRI, 1993: 86). However, the specter of war, both civil and international, has not ended. Over the same period minor armed conflicts have increased (Wallensteen and Axell, 1993: 332). The end of the Cold War has brought many long-standing rivalries and feuds to the surface that had been suppressed before. Many conflicts in the post-Cold War era have derived from ancient and enduring features of international politics. They originated from partitions and disputes following the end of WW I. Conflicts have increasingly resulted from tensions

between regional or intrastate parties rather than from the influence or intervention of external factors, because there were uncertainties about the legitimacy of new post-colonial states, regimes, institutions and frontiers. Many urgent crises which crowd the UN's agenda today derive from these uncertainties as well as the regional animosities and communal cleavages. In this complicated new environment, the United Nations has set up 47 peace operations.

It is interesting to note that Africa has been the area in which peace operation has been most utilized in the post-Cold War era with 20 peace operations (54 per cent of post-Cold War total) (TABLE III). Despite the fact that most of the UN peace operations were in the Middle East during the Cold War (53.8 per cent of the Cold War total), the Middle East has become a region in which peace operations have been least established in the post-Cold War era (only one operation, 2.7 per cent of the post-Cold War total) (TABLE III).

2.2.1. The Reasons for Expansion and Change

The end of the Cold War increased the need for international peace operations in several distinct ways, each of which presented different problems and opportunities for the UN. The main reason for the increase in the number of peace operations and observer missions has been the increased capacity of the UN Security Council to agree on action in particular crises. The decline of East-West tensions and the agreements between the USA and Russia to put an end to numerous local and regional conflicts led to greater cooperation between the super powers. So the five permanent members of the Security Council found themselves able to agree on numerous problems and demonstrated a greater political will to use the Security Council to seek solutions to conflicts (Evans, 1993: 100).

The decline in the use of the veto was a symbol of this. For instance, from 1945 to 1990 the permanent members of the Security Council cast the following number of vetoes: China, 3; France, 18; United Kingdom, 30; US, 69; and the Soviet Union, 114. Then, between June 1990 and May 1993 there was not a single veto. One exception occurred in May 1993 when Russia blocked a resolution on financing the peacekeeping force in Cyprus. With this exception, the post-Cold War capacity of the Security Council to reach agreement has survived and constituted a key reason for the increase in the number of peacekeeping operations (TABLE IV). It has begun to function more effectively and therefore opened up the possibility of working out strategies for resolving protracted social conflicts and consequently has been able to put more peacekeepers into the field.

A further reason for the expansion of peace operations has been the large number of minor armed conflicts. During the Cold War years, the competition between the two super powers contributed to regional stability. Each super power ensured the survival of its respective allies but at the same time prevented them from embarking on military adventures. The end of this strategic competition between the US and the Soviet Union created an environment much more amenable to minor armed conflicts breaking out between small states, most importantly, those in Cambodia, Central America, Angola and Mozambique (Ratner, 1995: 14). So these minor armed conflicts transformed the global context of peace operations and significantly broadened its potential as a technique of peaceful settlement (Fetherston, 1995: 19).

The next reason behind the expansion has been the settlement of conflicts. The end of the Cold War facilitated the settlement of conflicts. In many instances the collapse of the bipolar world and of the Cold War allowed peaceful initiatives in the

old conflicts caused by the spheres of influence inherent in the East-West rivalry. With the end of the Cold War, the factions were no longer propped up by outside states, and were ready to settle. The regional peace agreements in Afghanistan, Angola, Namibia, Central America and Cambodia are the examples of this approach. They created a demand for impartial international forces to assist in implementing their provisions, such as monitoring cease-fires, troop withdrawals, and elections (Roberts, 1994: 96). The UN became the instrument for concluding and overseeing these settlements (Ratner, 1995: 14).

The fourth reason has been the breaking up of states. Since the super power support which suppressed internal divisions withdrew, the number of states falling victim to domestic violence, often ethnically based, has increased. Many of the divisions within states have become more serious than before. In extreme cases, this has led to the break up of states. In the decline and collapse of two large communist federal states - the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the total number of such states has more than tripled. The breaking up of these large multinational states and empires has almost always caused severe dislocations, including the emergence or re-emergence of ethnic, religious, regional, and other animosities (Roberts, 1993: 9). The newly emerging regimes and frontiers were called into question. These crises forced the UN to contemplate new responses and called for action under UN auspices.

A further reason has been a widespread mood of optimism. The UN's contribution to the settlement of numerous regional conflicts in the Transition Period including the Iran-Iraq war, the South African presence in Namibia, and the Soviet presence in Afghanistan, raised expectations for quick solutions. The peoples of the world felt the UN could have a much more central role in international security and peace operation and could tackle these problems. As a result of this expectation, in

the post-Cold War era, the UN found itself overburdened by many new tasks and a very wide range of urgent problems.

Another major reason has been an ongoing process of globalization. In a modern world the process of globalization, leading to the unprecedented movement of goods, people, ideas, challenges and threats, makes countries much more interdependent. Developed states have created unparalleled prosperity within their own borders. Those states have realized that in order to continue improving world living conditions they need security and stability. Therefore, developed countries are naturally extremely concerned about maintaining a stable and secure world by preventing conflicts or by at least containing them as fast as possible.

Last but not least, another reason, which had a key role in the expansion of the peace operations has been the importance given to the multilateralism in international relations. States contemplating whether to intervene in a violent conflict situation often have come to it in a multilateral, especially UN, context. The reason why states want to use the UN is that the multilateral approach helps neutralize domestic political opposition, increase the opportunities to acquire useful allies, reassure the international community that operations have limited and legitimate goals, and reduce the risk of large scale force being used by adversaries or rival powers (Roberts, 1993: 10). The major powers are, therefore, more willing to see a response emerge from within a UN framework.

2.2.2. Features of the New Peace Operation

As pointed out above, the changing nature of peacekeeping derived from a permissive political context in which the five permanent members of the UN Security Council cooperated in the maintenance of international peace and security. There have been

dramatic changes in the nature as well as in the volume of UN activities in the field of peace and security. In addition to the increase in the application of peace operations, the types of missions which have been mandated have also altered. The objectives of peace operations have in fact, changed considerably from helping in the maintenance of cease-fires during the Cold War peacekeeping operations during the 1990s, to increasing involvement in peace-building missions.

While most peace operations established during the Cold War had mainly traditional peacekeeping tasks of a military character (such as the supervision of cease-fires or the control of demilitarized buffer zones), many new peace operations were multi-dimensional and combined traditional peacekeeping tasks with various activities of a humanitarian and state building nature. We can draw similarities between conflict-management and peacekeeping on the one hand since conflict-management measures are applied in later phases when a conflict is manifest, but before violence has occurred as happened in peacekeeping. On the other hand, conflict-resolution and peace enforcement are similar because conflict resolution could be applied in the de-escalation phase after a violent conflict has occurred. As peacekeeping had been designed to localize conflicts and tensions and prevent them from escalating to a great power confrontation, conflict-management focuses on the limitation, mitigation, and/or containment of a conflict without necessarily solving it. On the other hand, peacemaking or peace enforcement operations in the post-Cold War era were increasingly involved in internal conflicts within independent and sovereign states as happened in conflict-resolutions. They have the same purposes with conflict-resolution:

- Organizing and supervising free and fair elections (Namibia, Mozambique);
- Monitoring arms flows and demobilizing troops (Central America);

- Supervising government functions, rehabilitation of refugees and disarmament (Cambodia);
- Monitoring human rights obligations (El Salvador, Cambodia);
- Assisting in the delivery of humanitarian relief (former Yugoslavia, Somalia, and Mozambique).

United Nations peace operations during the Cold War meant that peacekeeping forces and military observer missions were designed with an eye to the politics of territorial restraint and juridical sovereignty. The United Nations peace operations did not concern issues of human security, the protection of human rights or the goal of humanitarian intervention reflecting the general insistence of the newly emerging states that state sovereignty be duly protected. This was approved by an April 1999 report of the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), which is titled “Multidisciplinary Peacekeeping: Lessons from Recent Experience.” The report pointed out “mandates should be conceptualized flexibly and could include elements of peace-building and emergency reconstruction of war-torn economies.”

The changing objectives of peace operations have coincided with the changes in the structure of peace operations, the creation of new components, and the assignment of additional tasks. There have been qualitative changes even more significant than the quantitative ones. The following general distinctions should be noted. First, many of today’s conflicts are within states rather than between states. More often than not, the new operations are dealing with internal conflicts (Jockel, 1994: 3). First generation peace operations were primarily deployed in situations of international conflict. During the Cold War, operations were generally deployed only

where two or more states were identified as the principal antagonists (the one exception being the Congo operation).

The governments were reluctant to face the entry of the UN into their domestic disputes without a political settlement. The end of the Cold War removed constraints that had inhibited conflict in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere and contributed to the outbreak of wars within newly independent states. The UN had not encountered such conflicts since the Congo operation of the early 1960s. The conflicts take place not only between regular armies but also between militias and armed civilians. Civilians are the main victims and often the main targets in these guerrilla wars without clear front lines. Therefore a humanitarian aspect has come to the forefront. Humanitarian aid means all kinds of support and service provided to the people in the conflict areas in cases where either the competent authorities cannot provide or are unwilling to provide, protection to the people or in internal conflicts or civil wars where the basic rights and freedoms have been cancelled or gravely breached. This kind of operation minimizes the effects of disaster and protects human rights.

Today, one of the major functions of new peace operations is tackling local human rights abuses. The Security Council links the security to human rights agendas of peace operations. On the ground, the UN often integrated human rights components into peace operations. In the early years of the past decade, the promotion and monitoring of human rights has become a significant part of peace operation strategies in countries like El Salvador, Guatemala, Cambodia, Haiti and Rwanda. In these cases, peacekeepers conducted observations and reported on human rights issues. The success of ONUSAL in El Salvador, which was tasked with the verification of the implementation of the Human Rights Agreement, was critical to

the subsequent wider success of the peace agreement (Malone and Wermester, 2000: 43).

Another major matter of peace operations is the protection of civilians in war through which the Council has addressed the issue of human rights. The Council passed Resolution 1265 in September 1999, which introduced a broad range of measures to protect civilians in armed conflict, including a measure for peace operations to provide special protection and assistance for women and children in war (Malone and Wermester, 2000: 44). Authorization of UNAMSIL in Sierra Leone in early 2000 under Chapter VII of the Charter was a significant development to use force to protect civilians where resources and circumstances allowed.¹⁷ This represented not only a major shift in focus from states to individuals within states on the part of the Council, but an increasing willingness to use force to protect the human rights of individuals.

Another feature of such conflicts is the collapse of state institutions, especially the police and judiciary, a breakdown of law and order, and general banditry and chaos. This is rarely the case in inter-state wars. Peace operation in such contexts is far more complex and more expensive than when its tasks were mainly to monitor cease-fires and control buffer zones with the consent of the states involved in the conflict (Ghali, 1992: 7-9). Thus, peace operations have a state-building function too. One of the important functions of new peace operations is monitoring elections and democratization. It can be argued that the fundamental success of the state building strategies culminates in the establishment of free elections. Sometimes, as in Nicaragua and Haiti, UN election verification has been conducted on its own and not as part of a peacekeeping mission. In other cases, as in Namibia, Angola and

¹⁷ See, SC Res. 1270 of February 22, 2000

Cambodia, monitoring or helping to organize elections has been one of the tasks of a peacekeeping force (Roberts, 1993:98). In missions during the early 1990s, such as UNTAG in Namibia the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), the UN Operation in El Salvador (ONUSAL) and the UN Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ), the Security Council relied primarily on elections as a means of fostering stability and creating legitimacy for new governments.

Election monitoring is particularly significant for two reasons. First, it associates the UN with multi-party democracy. Second, it enables peacekeeping forces to be involved in something more than the mere freezing of conflicts. In some countries UN forces can achieve more by assisting in ballots than by interposing themselves between belligerents (Roberts, 1993: 98). The election-monitoring task of peace operations was expanded in the 1990s, adopting a broader approach to elections and democratization. For instance, the UNMIK mandate in Kosovo included a subsection of the “institution-building component” described as “democratization and institution building,” as well as one on election.¹⁸ Furthermore, in East Timor, the mission included a “governance and public administration” component, in addition to an “electoral operations” component.¹⁹ In both cases, UN staffs have been given multiple short and medium-term electoral duties, from voter registration and creating electoral law to supporting capacity building for self government, in an effort to build institutions that can serve as local conflict management mechanisms.

A second qualitative change is that second-generation operations are aimed primarily at assisting a state or group of states, in executing an agreed political

¹⁸ See, SC Res. 779 of July 12, 1999

¹⁹ See, SC Res. 1024 of October 4, 1999

solution to a conflict. During the Cold War, the UN and its member states seized upon peace operations as a way to preserve a truce, while assuming that other mechanisms would be employed to settle the underlying issues. The second-generation peace operation rejects this limitation. By working from the starting point of a political settlement, it seeks to end the underlying dispute, not simply avoid its aggravation. This change in the past decade has led the peacekeepers to become peace builders. Peace operations have been related to the creation of an operational and political environment in which international actors have come to undertake a series of peace-building activities which would consolidate, without a resort to violence, peace in the short term and decrease the likelihood of future conflicts.

Thirdly, second generation peace operations contain substantial civilian elements and predominantly non-military mandate and composition. As Marrack Goulding points out the recent changes, “new operations usually have a large civilian component” (Jockel, 1994: 3). Since the end of the Cold War, the emphasis on the military has changed and the new missions in this era require substantial investment of civilian personnel with expertise in areas such as elections, human rights, public administration, and economics. Police (CIVPOL) and civilians from various professions became important partners of the military in increasing numbers. This is mainly because the UN is more often involved in internal conflicts than in interstate ones (Goulding, 1993: 456).

Peace operations used to be mostly military operations and the goals and tasks were limited to military mandate during the Cold War era. As a result, they were generally placed under the supervision of a Force Commander, with political functions coming directly from UN Headquarters. However, considering the nature of the new peace operations and the need for rapid decision-making in areas of

considerable political sensitivity, these new missions were mostly placed under the overall supervision of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) to whom both military and civilian components reported. A number of these diplomats achieved widely recognized success in difficult environments. Prominent examples were Alvaro de Soto (ONUCA, Central America, September 1989-February 1992), Iqbal Riza (ONUSAL, El Salvador, July 1991- March 1993), Aldo Ajello (ONUMOZ, Mozambique, October 1992-December 1994), and Lakhdar Brahimi (several missions but perhaps most notably UNMIH, Haiti September 1994-March 1996) (Malone and Wermester, 2000: 40). The increasing use of SRSGs endowed peace operations with a greater political mediation capacity in the field. They were able to spearhead the consolidation of peace at the local level.

The role of civilian police is considered one of the most important components of peace operations in the post-Cold War. The role of UNCIVPOL has expanded dramatically in the previous decade in countries when local police have been unable or unwilling to fulfill their duties and functions. Despite the fact that police units were deployed in some previous missions such as ONUC in the Congo and the UN Temporary Authority (UNTEA) in West New Guinea, a formal UN civil police component was deployed for the first time in 1964 as part of the UN peacekeeping operation in Cyprus (UNFICYP). CIVPOL contingents fulfilled two main functions in the period of the Cold War; monitoring and supervising local law enforcement units and training local police forces (Oakley, Dziedze and Goldberg, 1998:23). A third function, which signified far-reaching goals and significant implication for peacekeeping, emerged in the 1990s, the performance of law enforcement functions.

The Security Council sent a contingent of 1,500 police officers from 25 countries to Namibia in March 1990 with the mandate of monitoring local police forces and assisting in establishing the conditions necessary for holding the oncoming elections. In El Salvador, CIVPOL monitored human rights abuses and helped recruit, screen, and train a completely new police force. In Angola, CIVPOL monitored the demobilization of UNITA forces and the disarmament of civilians. In Cambodia, they not only provided public security, but also arrested suspects for charges brought by a special UN Prosecutor. In Bosnia, CIVPOL monitored agreements to integrate ethnic minorities into the police (Call and Barnett, 1999: 49).

A fourth qualitative change is that, “second generation” peace operations involve numerous types of actors. Besides including the participants of the first generation operations, it also includes guerrilla movements, domestic political parties, regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and civilian participants in the mission, international financial institutions, specialized and technical agencies of the United Nations, private foundations, foreign investors, and academic institutions (Ratner, 1995: 24).

New tasks of peace operations of the post-Cold War era, ranging from election monitoring, human rights observation, training of civilian populations in areas such as public administration, policing and justice, to a variety of socio-economic development activities, directed the organization and its member states to look for new partners in order to carry out more complex and multifaceted Security Council mandates. Some in the UN favored regional organizations but most of these also had limited resources and faced constraints quite similar to those confronting the UN. It is in this context that NGOs became especially useful as a result of their capacity to perform the type of additional tasks demanded by peacekeeping. They

have become significant players in all aspects of the second-generation peacekeeping exercises from early warning to peace-building operations (Abiew,1999:89). Consultations at headquarters with NGOs have been increased (Griffin, 1999: 1).

The NGO's participation in peace operations was very limited during the Cold War. For example, no NGOs were allowed to enter Congo without UN permission in the 1960s. The ONUC military commander closely supervised the four NGOs that operated in the country. But, an improvement has taken place in the relationship between NGOs and the UN concerning the field of humanitarian assistance in the post-Cold War era. The increasing role of NGOs has become one of the most remarkable developments in the peace operations. They have emerged to play an increasingly significant role alongside peace operations. During 'Operation Provide Comfort' in Northern Iraq in the early 1990s, the allied forces had to cope with about 500 NGOs. In Somalia, the number of NGOs was about two hundred. Approximately the same number are now active in Kosovo.

The proliferation of civil conflicts in impoverished parts of the globe, such as Haiti, Somalia, Sudan, and Afghanistan, has clearly demonstrated the interconnections between poverty, underdevelopment, and conflict. This has increasingly forced UN operations to communicate directly with established NGOs that were operating in the areas of social and economic development and emergency relief. Therefore, NGOs came to the front line of civil wars. Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General, approved the growing role and the necessity of the NGOs in a major report on UN reform, "Renewing the United Nations," issued in July 1997 (Annan, 1997: paras 206-214). Under the heading 'Civil Society' he points to how NGOs are shaping national and international agendas in a post-Cold War world. He declares "...NGOs and other civil societies actors are perceived not only as

disseminators of information or providers of services but also shapers of policy, be it in peace and security matters, in development or humanitarian affairs” (Annan, 1997: 59).

It has been noted that NGOs possess certain comparative advantages in terms of their capacities. First of all, they are able to reach the poorest people and access remote areas. NGOs are more closely and directly involved in addressing the issues that are at the roots of the conflict and are thus viewed as being able to contribute effectively to a resolution of the conflict. They have usually been the first to enter a country and the last to leave. Other capacities have included their ability to promote local participation, to operate on low costs, to strengthen local institutions, and empower marginal groups (Abiew, 1999: 89). Added to these qualities, it can be noted that NGOs have been more flexible and pragmatic, and are less partial in the delivery of services in conflict situations. Experience and size for quick action, impartiality, experience in region, flexibility, speed of reaction, comparative lack of bureaucracy, operational, and implementation capacity are their advantages. In addition, the political independence of the NGOs, not bound by the rules of the UN Charter, gives them a strong comparative advantage in increasingly complex internal conflicts (Abiew, 1999: 94). NGOs have provided peace operations with the expertise required. The work that has been undertaken by these organizations in current conflicts cannot be properly fulfilled by governments and international organizations, as they are unable or unwilling to do so (Williams, 1998: 38).

The fifth change is the use of United Nations forces to protect humanitarian operations in the second-generation operations. More often than not, the warring parties prevent the distribution of humanitarian aid provided to civilian victims by humanitarian agencies. This is sometimes because of the exigencies of war, but more

often because the relief of a particular population is contrary to the war aims of one or other of the parties. The combatants may divert relief supplies for their own purposes. Because so many of today's conflicts are more likely to be intra-state rather than international conflicts, triggered by a range of factors, including social, ethnic or religious strife, the violation of human rights, poverty, inequitable distribution of resources, environmental degradation, large-scale migration, drug trafficking, organized crime and terrorism (Goldman, 2001: 43-76 and Parr, 2003: 167-179), the humanitarian agencies have to undertake their tasks in chaotic conditions. This creates political pressure for the United Nations to deploy troops in order to facilitate and protect the humanitarian operations (Ghali, 1995: 11).

It had become clear by the end of the last decade that the use of force to protect the delivery of humanitarian assistance had limited effectiveness. The Council accordingly followed a series of steps to tackle obstacles that were hindering the successful delivery of humanitarian assistance by incorporating, for the first time, humanitarian tasks under the rubric of a "humanitarian component" in Kosovo and East Timor. Rather than coordinating the actions of others and providing protection, humanitarian tasks were, for the first time, attributed to peacekeepers themselves. These tasks covered the delivery of humanitarian assistance, safeguarding the return of displaced persons and providing adequate needs upon their return, rehabilitating key infrastructure and promoting social well-being, and finally restoring civil society (Griffin and Jones, 2001:78). When MONUC was expanded in early 2000 in the Democratic Republic of Congo, its mandate included expanded responsibilities in the field of humanitarian assistance.²⁰ The development of humanitarian assistance

²⁰ See, SC Res. 1291 of February 24, 2000

components and tasks entrusted to them created significant developments in peace operations practice.

A sixth change has been in the nature of United Nations operations in the field. Although the first generation operations were usually deployed after a cease-fire but before a settlement of the conflict in question had been negotiated, the second-generation operations are generally established after negotiations have succeeded. They help the parties implement the comprehensive settlement they have negotiated. When the parties to a conflict have agreed on a settlement, the UN may be asked to oversee its implementation. Such a task may involve a wide range of functions, such as monitoring a cease-fire, demobilizing military units, assisting with elections activities, demining, rebuilding the country's infrastructure, temporarily taking over some of the functions of a national government, monitoring national civilian police and repatriating and rehabilitating refugees (UN doc, 1997:5). Such operations have been deployed in Namibia, Angola, El Salvador, Cambodia, and Mozambique (Ghali, 1992: 11).

In addition to these qualitative changes mentioned above, another important change is that the implementation of Chapter VII, peace enforcement, has grown rapidly since the end of the Cold War. In the post-Cold War circumstances, governments and public opinion in many countries have increasingly questioned whether peacekeeping is enough. Traditional peacekeeping is all very well if the only crises confronting the UN are those which are ready for the peacekeeping treatment. Lightly armed UN peacekeepers have seemed incapable of taking the forceful action required in an increasing number of situations.

In the past, peacekeepers were deployed to keep the peace, not to make war. They were only empowered to use force when directly threatened or when their

central activities were being openly opposed. Their major weapon was moral authority, not military strength (Annan, 1993:4). They seldom resorted to major uses of force. But with the end of the Cold War, there has become a need for a new strategy. Because the UN was incapable of dealing with the new challenges. Some attempts have been made to work out a new strategic role for the UN. Kofi Annan, UN under Secretary-General for peacekeeping operations, said in an article in late 1993:

The international community now wants the UN to demarcate boundaries, control and eliminate heavy weapons, quell anarchy and guarantee the delivery of humanitarian aid in war zones. These are clearly tasks that call for “teeth” and “muscle” in addition to the less tangible qualities that we have sought in the past. In other words, there are increasing demands that the UN now enforce the peace, as originally envisaged in the charter (Roberts, 1994: 104).

The violence in cases like Somalia and Bosnia, forced additional change on peace operations. The signing of peace agreements or cease-fires no longer meant an end to violence. In Somalia and Bosnia dozens of cease-fire agreements were broken. The peacekeepers, as well as humanitarian organizations, were confronted with all kinds of violence. In Somalia, the Security Council therefore felt compelled to provide UNOSOM II with a mandate based on Chapter VII of the UN Charter, allowing for the limited use of force. UNPROFOR in the former Yugoslavia, UNMIH in Haiti, IFOR (The Peace Implementation Force) and SFOR in Bosnia, UNTAES in Eastern Slovenia, the French ‘Operation Turquoise’ in Rwanda, MNF in Haiti, and MISAB in the Central African Republic received similar authorization. New development in the concept of the peace operation has emerged in Bosnia and Somalia, namely in that operations that started as peacekeeping were later mixed with elements of peace enforcement (UNPROFOR) or transformed into peace

enforcement in support of humanitarian actions (UNOSOM II). Peace enforcement, the third generation of peacekeeping, had come into being.

Peace enforcement operations involve using or threatening to use an armed force to compel combatants to cease-fire and seek peace. These operations include:

- Carrying out international sanctions against opposing parties or against the party that is the driving force in the armed conflict.
- Isolating the conflict zones as well as preventing arms deliveries to the area and penetration of the area by armed formations.
- Delivering air or missile strikes against a belligerent refusing to halt its combat actions.
- Rapidly deploying sufficient forces to the combat zones to carry out the assigned missions, including localizing the conflict and disarming or eradicating any armed formations that refuse to stop fighting.

Dobbie (1994) likened the relation between peacekeeping and peace enforcement to the performance of a tight ropewalker at a circus. In peacekeeping there is a respectful silence in the crowd, which reflects the unquestioning consent of the parties to the conflict as the performer walks the tightrope with a balancing pole. In a second-generation peace operation, the performer walks the identical tightrope and carries the same balancing pole. But in addition, he has to balance a tray of teacups on his head. Although he also has the consent of the parties to the conflict, everyone does not approve of his performance. On this occasion, the circus audience is restive and noisy. Some of them are even throwing tomatoes at the tightrope walker. In peace enforcement the scene completely changes. The performer has fallen off his tightrope. His balancing pole and tray of teacups lie smashed on the ground and assisted by the remainder of the circus staff he is engaged in a full-scale

brawl with the spectators. Preserving and developing consent is no longer an easy task.

As understood from the tightrope example, peacekeeping and peace enforcement require different conceptual approaches. Peacekeeping is characterized by impartiality and minimum force and a modicum of consent which will determine the manner, in which peace operations are planned, directed, and conducted at all levels. On the other hand, peace enforcement dispenses with consent (Dobie, 1994: 124) and is conducted on the grounds of military principles as in a war situation. Peacekeeping and peace enforcement are thus separate and mutually exclusive activities that cannot be mixed. To blur the distinction between the two can undermine the viability of the peacekeeping operation and endanger its personnel (Ghali, 1992: 16).

Resorting to the enforcement of Security Council decisions was not new. Council decisions were enforced in Korea in the 1950s and to a lesser extent in the Congo in the 1960s. Nevertheless, the extent to which the Council adopted decisions under Chapter VII during the 1990s was unprecedented. Enforcement actions under Chapter VII in the post-Cold War era took three forms: 1) the collective security operations aimed at combating aggression (peace enforcement in response to cross border aggression), 2) the peace enforcing forces that would support peacekeeping operations (peace enforcement in support of peacekeeping operations) and 3) the peace enforcing forces that would play a role in the domestic affairs of failed, troubled, and murderous states (peace enforcement in support of humanitarian objectives).

The annexation of Kuwait in August 1990 was a clear-cut case of aggression of one member state against another. It was eventually followed by the authorizing of

an enforcement force against Iraq under Chapter VII of the Charter. SC Resolution 678 (29 November 1990) authorized member states cooperating with Kuwait's legitimate government to use 'all necessary means' to expel Iraq from Kuwait. This was the first time that this had happened since the authorization of the Unified Command in Korea in 1950. It represented the first military enforcement action of the post-Cold War era.

The concept of using force in support of peacekeeping operations was relatively new, the only instance being in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The growing demand to halt human rights abuses and Serbian atrocities spurred by the western media put pressure on the UN, the US, and the EU to increase the level of intervention (Holmes, 1993: 331). In response to growing international pressure to take action, the Security Council stretched UNPROFOR's mandate with the SC Resolution 764 on 13 July 1992 to cover security and delivery of humanitarian aid to Sarajevo and its environs. Eventually the Security Council expanded the mandate of UNPROFOR to assist the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the delivery of large-scale humanitarian relief efforts throughout Bosnia.²¹ The Security Council adopted a resolution under the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter calling upon all states 'to take all measures necessary' to facilitate, in coordination with the UN, the delivery of humanitarian aid to Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia.²²

Peace enforcement in support of humanitarian objectives was also a relatively new concept in the UN and attitudes to it are still evolving. UNPROFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina was the first time a peacekeeping operation was established for explicitly humanitarian reasons and was given some specific Chapter VII

²¹ For more information, see, *The United Nations and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, (March, 1994:140). New York: UNDPI.

²² See, SC Res. 815 of March 30, 1993

enforcement authority to assist in the delivery of humanitarian relief and the protection of safe areas. But the most clear-cut example of a humanitarian rationale for peace enforcement remains Somalia.

During the Cold War, UN peace forces deployed in internal conflicts were primarily mandated to keep warring parties apart and to restore order within states. No use of force had been authorized for humanitarian purposes. Despite authorizations that permitted enforcement operations in the Congo, Somalia, Bosnia, and Rwanda crises, the UN did not empower deployments under its direct command to forcible enforcement except in the second phase of UNOSOM.²³ The UN Operation in the Congo (ONUC) had provided relief services for civilians but its mandate was to prevent a breakdown in the central governmental authority. The UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) and UNPROFOR were empowered to use force only in self-defense rather than pursuant to enforce rules.²⁴ UNOSOM I began as a type of first generation mission. But after the US-led humanitarian relief mission handed the operation back to the UN in March 1993, UNOSOM II was permitted to use force to disarm the Somali factions and maintain law and order. Faced with a country where there were no local authorities, the UN decided to embark on its first experiment in forceful humanitarian intervention UNOSOM II.

In the early 1990s there was a clear trend from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. But soon the UN became too cautious and selective with regard to collective action. Decision-making for enforcement operations proved more difficult than for most classic UN peace operations, given the risks for UN personnel. The trend was reserved from peace enforcement back to peacekeeping. The activism of

²³ See, *The United Nations and the situation in Somalia*, (March, 1994: 8-41). New York: UNDPI

²⁴ See, *The United Nations and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia* (March, 1994: 137). New York: UNDPI.

the early 1990s has given way to retrenchment, reform, and regionalization (Griffin, 1999: 3). In his 1995 “Supplement to An Agenda for Peace,” then Secretary-General Boutros Ghali moved away from peace enforcement operations and reaffirmed the validity of the three basic principles of traditional UN peacekeeping, namely consent, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self defense. He also recommended that the UN should not itself seek to conduct large-scale enforcement activities and the implementation of enforcement mandates be delegated to coalitions of willing member states and regional organizations to assume a more active role in conflict management (Ghali, 1995: 33). Current UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan followed this approach and reaffirmed the importance of the coalitions of willing member states in his 16 July 1997 “Programme for Reform:”

The United Nations does not have, at this point in its history, the institutional capacity to conduct military enforcement measures under Chapter VII. Under present conditions, ad hoc member states’ coalitions of the willing offer the most effective deterrent to aggression or to the escalation or spread of an ongoing conflict. As in the past, a mandate from the Security Council authorizing such a course of action is essential if the enforcement operation is to have broad international support and legitimacy (Annan, 1997: para 107).

This approach has largely been followed ever since, and consequently, in order to enforce its decisions the Security Council increasingly resorted to “coalitions of the willing,” such as Operation Uphold Democracy (in Haiti, 1994-95), the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) and subsequent Stabilization Force (SFOR) (in Bosnia since 1995), the Inter-African Mission to Monitor the Implementation of the Bangui Agreements (MISAB) (in Central African Republic, 1997), International Force (INTERFET) (in East Timor in 1999), and International Assistance Force (ISAF) (in Afghanistan in 2000).

To sum up, in practice, the operational range of the peace operations in the post-Cold War is characterized by five main tasks as described in the table below (British Army, 1994:1-2):

Objectives	Tasks
Conflict prevention	Preventive deployment, interposition, early warning, surveillance
Guarantee and denial of movement	No-fly zones, safe-havens, blockades, free passage
Protection and delivery of humanitarian relief	Protection and escort of humanitarian relief and agencies, or infrastructure support
Supervision of a comprehensive peace settlement	Demobilization, disarmament demining, election monitoring, reforming/training of security forces
Military assistance to civil structures in a failed state	Peace enforcement, political trusteeship

The peace operations undertaken during the Cold War era were conflict-management activities whereas the operations undertaken during the post-Cold War era could be better classified as conflict-resolution activities. Unlike Cold War era, peace operations during the post-Cold War era have gradually become western security initiatives in the sense that they would contribute to western security through helping transform the conflict-laden areas in line with the West's liberal-democratic norms (Bjorkdahl, 2006: 214-228 and Richmond and Woodhouse, 2005: 139-156). Just as the enlargement of the European Union and NATO to Central and Eastern European countries has helped stabilize these regions and has improved European security, growing peace operations in the Balkans and other geographies served similar functions (Smith and Timmins, 2000: 80-90).

2.2.3. Case Studies

Developing NATO's crises management capabilities on the one hand and endowing the EU with peacekeeping/peacebuilding capabilities with crises-management and human security dimensions on the other should be interpreted in line with this

changing security understanding (Cornish and Edwards, 2001:587-603). These efforts are not only security oriented but also cover an ideational dimension in the sense that peace operations have enabled westerners to maintain the legitimacy of the core western values in the volatile international system. Peace operations have proved as effective tools through which the West could project its constitutive values to non-western areas. The Western undertakings in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan testify to this understanding.

2.2.3.1. United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I and UNOSOM II)

There was violent fragmentation in Somalia following the downfall of President Siad Barre in 1991. A civil war broke out between two factions - those supporting Interim President Ali Mahdi Mohamed and those supporting General Mohamed Farah Aidid.²⁵ A single ethnic group sharing the same religion, history and language split into heavily armed clans. The fighting resulted in widespread death and destruction, forced hundreds of thousands of civilians to flee the city. Throughout the country, almost 4.5 million of the 6 million Somalis were estimated to be threatened by hunger and disease. Some 700,000 Somalis had sought refugee in neighbouring countries and another 300,000 were exiled elsewhere.²⁶

The deterioration of the incidents of violence in Somalia compelled the UN to intervene in Somalia for humanitarian purposes. The UN, in cooperation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and other organizations, sought to resolve the conflict. The UN became engaged in providing humanitarian aid, in cooperation with

²⁵ *Yearbook of the UN*, Special Edition, UN Fiftieth Anniversary 1945-1995, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1995, p.52

²⁶ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1992, V.46, p.199

relief organizations²⁷. The Security Council in January 1992 concluded that the Somalia's internal situation itself "...constitutes a threat to international peace and security"²⁸ and imposed an arms embargo against Somalia. However, all of these efforts were unable to stop the conflicts and on 24 April 1992, the SC decided to establish the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I) by Resolution 751.²⁹ It took more than three months to establish UNOSOM I. On 28 August 1992, the UN started UNOSOM I operation by Resolution 775 to deliver humanitarian aid and to control the distribution of food.

UNOSOM I was an inadequate effort and ill-suited to tackle clan warfare and general violence.³⁰ The relief effort was hampered by continued fighting and insecurity. In August 1992 the SC decided to deploy some 3,000 additional troops to protect humanitarian aid. But the situation continued to worsen, with aid workers under attack.³¹ It was kept from fulfilling its mission because of the inability or unwillingness of parties to honor agreements made with UNOSOM representatives. The UN succeeded in only delivering 9 percent of the food that arrived to the country (Bir, 1999: 88).

On 3 December 1992, after the situation in Somalia had further deteriorated, the SC, by its resolution 794, determined that "...the magnitude of the human tragedy caused by the conflict in Somalia constitutes a threat to international peace

²⁷ See, *Basic Facts about the United Nations*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1998, p.88, and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom1backgr1.html

²⁸ See, SC Res. 746 of March 17, 1992; SC Res. 751 of April 24, 1992; SC Res. 767 of July 24, 1992; SC Res. 775 of August 28, 1992

²⁹ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1992, V.46, p.199

³⁰ See, SC Res. 751 of April 24, 1992

³¹ See, *Basic Facts about the United Nations*, Dept. of Public Information, 1998, p. 88, and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unsom1backgr1.html

and security”.³² It authorized Member States to form a multinational operation, *Restore Hope* - called UNITAF (Unified Task Force) to establish a safe environment for the delivery of humanitarian assistance. It was a US-led, UN-sanctioned operation that included protection of humanitarian assistance and other peace-enforcement operations. Eventually, Operation Restore Hope which was supported by 25,000 US troops and 10,500 troops from 23 other countries³³ began its intervention in Somalia on 9 December 1992 (Holmes, 1993: 329). UNITAF quickly secured all major relief centers, and by year’s end humanitarian aid was flowing again. UNITAF worked in coordination with UNOSOM I to secure major population centers and to ensure that humanitarian assistance was delivered and distributed. UNOSOM remained responsible for protecting the delivery of assistance and for political efforts to end the war.³⁴

The Secretary-General recommended that the new UN operation in Somalia, which was under Chapter VII of the Charter, should be under UN command and control, though using elements from the headquarters which had already been established by the US led force in Somalia (Goulding, 1993:463). But incidents of violence against humanitarian operations and plundering of relief supplies continued and famine conditions continued to deteriorate. It subsequently became clear that the UNITAF would not succeed in establishing a secure environment. The UN Secretary-General therefore recommended an expansion in UNOSOM’s mandate “...to secure or maintain security at all ports, airports and lines of communication

³² See, SC Res. 794 of December 3, 1992

³³ According to the statistics provided by the US Marine Corps, the UNITAF forces reached their peak 38,301, of whom 25,426 were US forces and 12,875 were from other countries. See, Hirsch, John L. and Oakley, Robert B. (1995). *Somalia and Operation Restore Hope: Reflections on Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* (p. 63). Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

³⁴ *Basic Facts About the United Nations*, Dept. of Public Information, 1998, p.88 http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2backgr1.html

required for the delivery of humanitarian assistance”.³⁵ At the end of March, the SC had increased the authorization to 28,000 UN soldiers and replaced UNITAF with a UN peacekeeping force that was established under Chapter VII of the UN Charter with the mandate and armament necessary to enforce secure conditions for humanitarian operations. UNOSOM II was established in accordance with SC Resolution 814 of 26 March 1993, to take over the protection activities from the UNITAF.³⁶

The SC authorized UNOSOM II to use whatever force was necessary to disarm Somali warlords who might refuse to surrender their arms and to ensure access to suffering civilians. In subsequent months the security situation in the capital, Mogadishu, deteriorated. In June 1993 UN peace forces were involved in incidents in which they both suffered and inflicted severe casualties. On 3 October 1993 some US rangers, deployed in Mogadishu in support of the UNOSOM II mandate came under concentrated fire and 18 were killed and 78 were injured (Hill and Malik, 1996:177). Shortly there after US President Bill Clinton announced that US forces would withdraw by 31 March 1994. The remaining contingents in UNOSOM II were nervous about both their security and their ability to bring an end to the conflict in Somalia. They finally withdrew from Somalia under US protection in early March 1995.³⁷ The removal of national units from UNITAF and subsequent withdrawals from UNOSOM further reduced the capability of UNOSOM II to

³⁵ See, *The United Nations and the situation in Somalia*, April 1993, UN Dept. of Public Information, p.8

³⁶ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1992, V.46, p.200 and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2mandate.html

³⁷ See, *United Nations Peace-keeping*, August 1996, UN Dept. of Public Information, pp. 28-29 and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2mandate.html

undertake a military enforcement operation.³⁸ In Somalia, the delivery protection of humanitarian relief supplies failed.

The mandate of UNOSOM I was to monitor the ceasefire in Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia; to provide protection and security for UN personnel, equipment and supplies at the seaports and airports in Mogadishu and to escort deliveries of humanitarian supplies from there to distribution centers in the city and its immediate environs.³⁹ On 28 August 1992, UNOSOM I's mandate was expanded by SC Resolution 775 (1992), to enable it to protect humanitarian convoys and distribution centers throughout Somalia. The mandate of UNOSOM II was to take appropriate action, including enforcement measures, to establish a secure environment for humanitarian assistance throughout Somalia.⁴⁰

The main responsibilities of UNOSOM II included: monitoring that all factions continued to respect the cessation of hostilities and other agreements to which they had consented; preventing any resumption of violence and, if necessary, taking appropriate action; maintaining control of the heavy weapons of the organized factions which would have been brought under international control; seizing the small arms of all unauthorized armed elements; securing all ports, airports and lines of communications required for the delivery of humanitarian assistance; protecting the personnel, installations and equipment of the UN and its agencies ICRC as well as of NGOs providing humanitarian and reconstruction assistance, continuing

³⁸ The Belgian contingent (950 all ranks) and, French contingent (1,100 all ranks) were withdrawn from Somalia in December 1993. The United States announced, in October 1993, that it would withdraw its troops from Somalia by the end of March 1994. See, *The United Nations and the situation in Somalia* (1994, March) (p.26). New York : UNDPI.

³⁹ See, *United Nations Peace-keeping*, August 1996, Dept. of Public Information, p. 27 and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom1mandate.html

⁴⁰ See, "UN Operations in Somalia I and II (UNOSOM I and II)" in *The Blue Helmets: A Review of UN Peacekeeping*, UN Office of Public Affairs, New York, 1996, pp. 288-289. and http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2mandate.html

demining and; helping repatriate and resettle refugees and displaced people in Somalia; assisting the Somali parties in implementing the “Addis Ababa Agreements”, particularly in their cooperative disarmament and ceasefire efforts; protecting major ports, airports and essential infrastructure; providing humanitarian relief to all in need throughout the country; assisting in the reorganization of the Somali police and judicial system; assisting the political process in Somalia. UNOSOM II was also mandated to assist in the reconstruction of economic, social and political life. On 4 February 1994, the SC, by its Resolution 897 (1994) revised UNOSOM II’s mandate to exclude the use of coercive methods.⁴¹

2.2.3.2. United Nations Operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Bosnia-Herzegovina was one of the six republics of Yugoslavia ruled by Tito. Tito managed to control different nations and ethnic groups under its communist regime, but some nationalist Serbs started unequal treatments in the later years of its regime. When Tito died in May 1980, Slobodan Milosevic who was the leader of Serbia and an extreme nationalist was elected as the president of the Yugoslavia. When Milosevic came to power, Serbian nationalism increased dangerously and Serbs’ unequal treatments and pressure towards other nations and ethnic groups grew incredibly. After terminating the autonomous status of Kosovo, Milosevic declared that they revive the Historical Serbian Kingdom demolished 600 years ago in a speech at the ceremony of 600th year of historical Kosovo War. Upon these developments, other nations clearly understood the Serbs’ revisionist intentions and they decided to separate from Yugoslavia dominated by Serbs.

⁴¹ Somalia, United Nations Operation In Somalia II, UNOSOM II, March 1993 - March 1995 at http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2mandate.html

The first independence declaration came from Slovenia in 1991. After the developments in Slovenia, Croatia declared its independence. Serious fighting in Yugoslavia began in June 1991 when Croatia and its northern neighbor Slovenia declared themselves independent from Yugoslavia.⁴² Serbs living in Croatia, supported by the Yugoslavian National Army (JNA), opposed this move. Serbian response to Croatian independence put the country into civil war. Then, the Republic of Macedonia declared its independence.⁴³ The European Community (EC) sought to resolve the Yugoslav crisis in the framework of the Conference on Yugoslavia, but its efforts proved unsuccessful. By September, fighting had escalated into an all-out war between Croatia and Serbia (Bosna -Hersek Dün-Bugün-Yarın, 1997:1).

In 1991, Slobodan Milosevic proposed that Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Republic of Macedonia unite under the Republic of Federal Yugoslavia, but Bosnia-Herzegovina did not accept this proposal since it was afraid of Serbian domination in such a federation. Finally, the 1992 referendum revealed the intention of Bosnia and Herzegovina as the declaration of the independence. Bosnian Serbs with the support of the Federal Army revealed their opposition to the declaration of the independence by declaring the Republic of Bosnia-Serbia and started organized attacks and violent actions against the Muslim population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, the conflict intensified and extended to Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:17).

The SC chose not to take military sides in the conflict, but rather to use a peace operation as a means to alleviate the consequences of the conflict. This was significant in itself as Europe was not a region where the UN played a major peace

⁴² *The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, UN DPI, p.1

⁴³ Turkey recognizes the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

management role, due to the geo-political sensitivities of the Cold War. The SC did not take any formal action on the Yugoslav crisis to prevent intensification and extension of the conflict until September 1991. On 25 September 1991, to prevent intensification and extension of the conflict, the SC unanimously adopted resolution 713 referring to imposing an embargo on the delivery of all arms and other military equipment to the area.⁴⁴ On 21 February, the SC, by its resolution 743 (1992), approved the report and established the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) for an initial period of 12 months (Hill and Malik, 1996:106). On 7 April 1992, UNPROFOR was authorized for full deployment by resolution 749.⁴⁵

The mandate of UNPROFOR was to prevent the resumption of fighting and to facilitate movement toward settlement of the conflict. But fighting as well as reports of “ethnic cleansing” and other atrocities in Bosnia continued and posed an obvious threat to regional peace and security. Events in Bosnia and Croatia have indicated a situation where warring parties can stop the distribution of aid, prevent UN peacekeeping troop rotation, bombard cities, commit genocide and war crimes with UNPROFOR helpless to act (Roberts, 1994: 101).

Absence of cooperation from all parties has made it increasingly difficult for UNPROFOR to fulfill its mandate of meeting pressing humanitarian needs and protecting threatened civilian populations. Peacekeepers have come under direct military attack. In light of these developments, the need for peace enforcement has been heard from various quarters but in practice this has been difficult. The growing demand to halt human rights abuses and Serbian atrocities spurred by the western media has put pressure on the UN, the US and the EC to increase the level of intervention (Holmes, 1993:331). Various concerned parties have blamed the

⁴⁴ *The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, UN DPI, p.1

⁴⁵ *The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, UN DPI, p.2

ineffectiveness of the EU and UN peace operation in Yugoslavia on the lack of the use of force to punish the aggressors because of the reasons explained below. Arguments defending the use of force state that UN and EU Resolutions, EU cease-fires, economic sanctions and embargos are useless if they do not have some credible military backing. As noted by Christopher Greenwood “it is no longer tenable to assert that whenever a government massacres its own people or a state collapses into anarchy international law forbids military intervention altogether”(Greenwood, 1993: 40).

The flowing of refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced persons, pressured the EU to find ways to stop the flow. France had 50,000 refugees, while Germany had absorbed approximately 300,000 refugees.⁴⁶ This had fueled fears of uncontrolled immigration and was a reason behind the right-wing extremism in France and Germany (Dewar, 1993:33). The use of force in Bosnia and Herzegovina would also relieve the tensions between Christian and Muslim states. Because of western reluctance to intervene in Bosnia, the view in Islamic countries that the West was anti-Muslim was reinforced (Sharp, 1993:31). The use of force would give credibility to UNPROFOR, even though it would increase its vulnerability (Roberts, 1994:102). The cost of military inaction was also high. UNPROFOR was unable to protect the besieged communities, unable to prevent or punish ongoing atrocities and was often seen as being more concerned with their own safety, than the moral rights and wrongs of the war (Roberts, 1994:113). The arms embargo affected the Muslims heavily, depriving them of the right to self defense, when the UN itself could not provide them with protection.

⁴⁶ At the end of the war, there were approximately 1.3 million refugees and nearly 1.3 million internally displaced persons out of a total prewar population of over 4.3 million. Lynn Hastings, 2001. “Implementation of the Property Legislation in Bosnia-Herzegovina,” *Stanford Journal of International Law*, Vol. 37, No.2

In response to growing international pressure to take action, the SC stretched UNPROFOR's mandate, with SC Resolution 764 on 13 July 1992 to cover security and delivery of humanitarian aid to Sarajevo and environs. Eventually SC expanded the mandate of UNPROFOR to assist the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the delivery of a large scale humanitarian relief effort throughout Bosnia.⁴⁷ The SC adopted a resolution under the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter calling upon all states "to take all measures necessary" to facilitate, in coordination with the UN, the delivery of humanitarian aid to Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia following which it took the unprecedented step of renewing UNPROFOR's mandate under Chapter VII to "ensure the security of UNPROFOR"⁴⁸ and to "ensure its freedom of movement for all its missions".⁴⁹ On 6 May 1993 the SC proclaimed six towns (Sarajevo, Tuzla, Gorazde, Srebrenica, Zepa and Bosnia and Herzegovina) in Bosnia and Herzegovina "safe areas".⁵⁰ Continued noncompliance by Serb militias led the Council to pass a resolution under Chapter VII to "deter attacks against the safe areas" and "acting in self defense to take the necessary measures, including the use of force, in reply to bombardments... or to armed incursion into (these areas) or in event of any deliberate obstruction" of humanitarian convoys.⁵¹ This also permitted NATO, in co-ordination with UNPROFOR, to use air power in and around safe areas.

⁴⁷ For more information, see, *The United Nations and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, (1994, March 15) (p. 140). New York: UNDPI.

⁴⁸ SC Resolution 807 of February 19, 1993

⁴⁹ SC Resolution 815 of March 30, 1993

⁵⁰ SC Resolution 824 of May 6, 1993

⁵¹ SC Resolution 836 of June 4, 1993

UNPROFOR II was established as an extension of UNPROFOR I under the enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. In the case of the latter, missions were to be conducted in the absence of a prearranged and sustained cease fire, and without the consent of the parties to the conflict. On February 1993, the SC specifically cited Chapter VII as a basis for UNPROFOR's duties in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵² By June 1993, the SC decided to convert part of UNPROFOR's work in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina- such as the protection of "safe areas"- into peace enforcement that would not depend on the parties' consent; in so doing, it invoked Chapter VII of the UN Charter, "implying the Council's willingness to at least consider peace enforcement".⁵³

In March 1995, the Secretary-General recommended that UNPROFOR be replaced by three operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Republic of Macedonia, stating that such an agreement would respond to the wishes of the three countries. On 31 March 1995, the SC replaced UNPROFOR with three distinct but closely interlinked peace operations: UNPROFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the UN Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO), and the UN Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) in the Republic of Macedonia.⁵⁴

On 14 November 1995, the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Dayton-Paris Agreement or the Peace Agreement) was concluded as a result of a United States-led peace initiative after three years of peace-

⁵² SC Resolutions 807 of February 19, 1993

⁵³ See, RAND Project Memorandum, May 1995

⁵⁴ The mandate of UNCRO was terminated on 15 January, 1996. Effective 1 February 1996, following the termination of the mandates of UNCRO, UNPROFOR and UNPF-HQ (UN Peace Forces headquarters established in Zagreb), UNPREDEP became an independent mission, reporting directly to UN Headquarters in New York. Despite its new status, the operation has maintained basically the same mandate, strength and composition of troops.

making efforts by the international community.⁵⁵ Following the signing of the Bosnian Peace Agreement in Paris on 14 December 1995, the parties agreed to a cease-fire which had begun on 5 October 1995 and withdrawal of the UNPROFOR. The UNSC adopted resolution 1031 transferring authority for peace operations from the UN to NATO and giving NATO a mandate to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement. IFOR was established under the authority of NATO to implement this mandate. On 20 December 1995, IFOR took over from UNPROFOR, whose mandate was thus terminated (Berdal, 1995:228-230).

The IFOR's mission was to ensure compliance with the Agreement by all Parties and to implement its military aspects.⁵⁶ NATO did not impose a settlement on the Parties, but did take the necessary action to ensure compliance. As spelled out in UNSC Resolution 1031, the 60,000 strong, well-armed IFOR operated under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. At the end of December 1996, IFOR handed over responsibility to the 30,000 strong, NATO-led multinational Stabilization Force (SFOR). At their Istanbul Summit in June 2004, NATO leaders decided to bring SFOR to a conclusion by the end of the year as a result of the improved security situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the wider region. The SFOR mission was officially ended on 2 December 2004. In its place, a European Union-led force deployed, known as Operation Althea, EUFOR.

2.2.3.2.1. The United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR)

The crisis which has lasted in the former Yugoslavia for several years turned into all-out war when Serbia began a campaign of armed aggression against Croatia in June

⁵⁵ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1995, V.49, p.544

⁵⁶ For more details on IFOR, see *Basic Fact Sheet: Nato's Role in the Implementation of the Bosnian Peace Agreement*. (1996, January) (N.11). Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press.

1991. The international community responded to this threat to European and world peace by launching the UNPROFOR peace operation in the beginning of 1992. The mandate of UNPROFOR was to prevent the resumption of fighting and to facilitate movement toward settlement of the conflict. The initial mandate of UNPROFOR was to ensure conditions for peace talks, and security in three demilitarized “safe-heaven” enclaves (“United Nations Protected Areas” UNPAs) located in the former Yugoslav republic of Croatia: Eastern Slovenia, Western Slovenia and Krajina.⁵⁷ Upon the extending of conflict to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the mandate and strength of UNPROFOR was enlarged to provide security in that country.

On April 7, 1992, UNSC Resolution 749, authorized the full deployment of UNPROFOR. On June 30, 1992, the mandate was extended to so-called “pink zones” controlling access to the UNPAs (Resolution 762, 30 June 1992), some border control and monitoring of civilian access to the Pink Zones (Resolution 769, 7 August 1992), and control of the demilitarization of the Prevlaka Peninsula near Dubrovnik (Resolution 779, 6 October 1992).⁵⁸ On August 7, 1992, UNSC Resolution 769 was passed which authorised the enlargement of UNPROFOR’s mandate and strength to enable it to perform immigration and customs functions on the international borders of Croatia. Other extensions of the mandate included the protection of the Sarajevo airport from June 1992 (Resolution 758, 8 June 1992), and, from September 1992, protection for humanitarian aid in the whole of Bosnia

⁵⁷ Former Yugoslavia, United Nations Protection Force, UNPROFOR at http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unprofor.htm

⁵⁸ *The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, UN Dept. of Public Information, p.4

and Herzegovina, and protection of civilian refugees when required by the ICRC (Resolution 770, 13 August 1992).⁵⁹

UNPROFOR's task was to stop the fighting and to provide the conditions for a political settlement of the crisis through negotiations. Through several resolutions, the SC gave UNPROFOR a fourfold mandate in Bosnia: to implement the agreement of the parties to open Sarajevo Airport; to assist UNHCR in the delivery of a large scale humanitarian relief efforts throughout Bosnia; to enforce a no-fly zone; and to protect safe heavens or areas (Cervanek, 1995:47). UNPROFOR was to provide all appropriate support to humanitarian organisations and facilitate the return of displaced persons to their homes in the UNPAs, under conditions of full safety. UNPROFOR was also to supervise the withdrawal of the JNA from the whole of Croatia and support humanitarian agencies in the return of displaced persons.⁶⁰

2.2.3.2.2. The Peace Implementation Force (IFOR)

The peaceful UN efforts to solve Bosnian crises did not provide any progress and failed to stop Bosnian Serbs attacks. Bosnian Serbs went on their attacks in particular artillery fire and violent actions towards Bosnian Muslims. When artillery fire killed 37 civilians and wounded 85 civilians in a market place, NATO started to bomb the Serbian targets intensively. Serbs could not resist much and they withdrew their heavy weapons from the vicinity of Sarajevo. Then they accepted both a cease-fire

⁵⁹ *The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia*, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, UN Dept. of Public Information, p. 34, 36

⁶⁰ *The UN and the situation in the former Yugoslavia, Reference Paper Revision 4*, UN Dept. of Public Information, p.4

and negotiating for peace. After long meetings in the US (Dayton, Ohio), the Dayton Peace Agreement was signed in Paris on 14 December 1995.⁶¹

To implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement, a 60,000-strong NATO-led multinational Implementation Force (IFOR) deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 20 December 1995 with a one-year mandate under SC Resolution 1031.⁶² By adopting resolution 1031, the UNSC transferred authority for peace operations from the UN to NATO. IFOR was the Alliance's first large-scale operational peacekeeping mission and first out of area operation.⁶³ After the peaceful conduct of the September 1996 elections, IFOR successfully completed its mission.

The IFOR's primary mission was to monitor and enforce compliance with the military aspects (Annex 1A) of the Dayton Peace Agreement. IFOR's main task was to guarantee the end of hostilities and separate the armed forces of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the one hand, and Republika Srpska, on the other. The military tasks included: to ensure self defense and freedom of movement, to supervise selective marking of boundaries and Zone of Separation (ZOS) between the parties, to monitor and, if needed, enforce, the withdrawal of forces to their respective territories, to assume control of the airspace over Bosnia-Herzegovina and of the movement of military traffic over key ground routes, to establish Joint Military Commissions, to serve as the central bodies for all Parties to the Peace Agreement, to assist with the withdrawal of UN forces not transferred to IFOR, to help to create secure conditions for the conduct by others of non-military tasks associated with the

⁶¹ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1995, V.49, p.544

⁶² *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1996, V.50, p. 288

⁶³ For more information about background of IFOR, see Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe, Updated: 19-Feb-2004, AFSOUTH Fact sheets, Peace Implementation Force - IFOR at

<http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/IFOR/IFORFactSheet.htm>

Peace Agreement, including free and fair elections, to assist UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other international organizations in their humanitarian missions and assist the movement of these organizations, to assist in the observation and prevention of interference with the movement of civilian populations, refugees and displaced persons, and respond appropriately to deliberate violence to life and person and to assist in the monitoring of the clearance of minefields and obstacles.⁶⁴

2.2.3.2.3. The Stabilization Force (SFOR)

The IFOR had successfully achieved its goals by 20 December 1996. NAC decided to the deployment of SFOR on 20 December 1996.⁶⁵ Under UNSC Resolution 1088 of 12 December 1996, SFOR was authorized to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement as the legal successor to IFOR. Like IFOR, SFOR operated under Chapter VII of the UN Charter (peace enforcement). SFOR had the same robust rules of engagement for the use of force, should it be necessary to accomplish its mission and to protect itself. The role of IFOR (Operation *Joint Endeavour*) was to implement the peace. The role of SFOR (Operation *Joint Guard* / Operation *Joint Forge*) was to stabilise the peace. The difference between the tasks of IFOR and SFOR was reflected in their names.⁶⁶ SFOR would conduct an operation including both military tasks and civilian missions. These developments led SFOR to be established as a successor of IFOR.

⁶⁴ Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe, Updated: 19-Feb-2004, AFSOUTH Fact sheets, Peace Implementation Force - IFOR at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/IFOR/IFORFactSheet.htm>

⁶⁵ SFOR Stabilisation Force, History of the NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina at <http://www.nato.int/sfor/docu/d981116a.htm>.

⁶⁶ SFOR Stabilisation Force, History of the NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina at <http://www.nato.int/sfor/docu/d981116a.htm>.

Between December 1996 and December 2004, SFOR helped to maintain a secure environment and facilitated the country's reconstruction in the wake of the 1992-1995 war. In light of the improved security situation in both Bosnia and Herzegovina and the wider region, the Alliance brought SFOR to a conclusion in December 2004. The Dayton Peace Agreement provided the political and legal framework for SFOR. Annex 1A contains the agreement on the Military Aspects of the Peace Settlement. The goals of the agreement were: to provide a safe and secure environment by providing a continued military presence in the Area of Responsibility (AOR), to establish a unified, democratic Bosnia and Herzegovina, to rebuild the economy, to allow the return of displaced persons and refugees to their prewar homes.

SFOR's primary task was to contribute to a safe and secure environment conducive to civil and political reconstruction. Its specific tasks were: to deter or prevent a resumption of hostilities or new threats to peace, to promote a climate in which the peace process could continue to move forward; and, to provide selective support within its means and capabilities to civilian and international organizations involved in this process to stabilize the peace, to target and coordinate SFOR support to key areas including primary civil implementation organisations, and progress towards a lasting consolidation of peace, without further need for NATO-led forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶⁷

SFOR's activities ranged from patrolling and providing area security through supporting defense reform and supervising demining operations, confiscating and destroying unauthorized weapons, to arresting individuals indicted for war crimes

⁶⁷ See, SFOR Stabilisation Force, History of the NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina at <http://www.nato.int/sfor/docu/d981116a.htm>

and assisting the return of refugees and displaced people to their homes.⁶⁸ SFOR troops carried out regular patrols throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina to maintain a secure environment. Multinational specialized units were deployed to deal with instances of unrest. SFOR also collected and destroyed unregistered weapons and ordnance in private hands, in order to contribute to the overall safety of the population and to build confidence in the peace process. In 2003 alone, SFOR disposed of more than 11,000 weapons and 45,000 grenades. SFOR was also one of several organizations involved in demining in Bosnia and Herzegovina. NATO forces carried out some demining themselves and helped to set up demining schools in Banja Luka, Mostar and Travnik. They also helped to establish a sniffer dog training school in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

SFOR, which was completely military operation in the beginning, gave increasing importance to the CIMIC activities with the aim of maintaining peace in the region, and a new era had begun for SFOR. In addition to helping other organizations working on Bosnia and Herzegovina's reconstruction, SFOR launched its own CIMIC projects in areas such as structural engineering and transportation. SFOR participated in the maintenance and repair of roads and railways in collaboration with the local authorities and other international agencies. This work was critical to providing freedom of movement throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina.

To fulfill CIMIC tasks such as conducting civil-military coordination between International organizations and local authorities to support implementation of the Dayton Peace Accord, supporting international organizations in providing humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced people, coordinating the efforts of rebuilding the commerce and infrastructure, facilitating the democratization process

⁶⁸ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1997, V.51, p.313

and supporting state institutions and the rule of law, SFOR had been reorganized according to the new organization which was put into effect on 1 April 2000 as self sufficient rapid reaction force which had high action capability and equipped with light arms rather than heavy arms.

2.2.3.2.4. EU-led Force (EUFOR)

At its Summit on 28 June 2004, NATO had decided to bring SFOR to a conclusion by the end of the year as a result of the improved security situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the wider region. On 25 November, the EU Council adopted the decision to launch a military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina named as EUFOR-Operation ALTHEA. This decision followed the unanimous adoption on 22 November 2004 of UNSC Resolution 1575 and enabled the EU to launch Operation Althea on 2 December 2004. It authorized the Member States acting through or in cooperation with the EU to establish a multinational stabilization force (EUFOR) as a legal successor to SFOR under unified command and control, which will fulfill its missions in relation to the implementation of Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the Dayton Peace Agreement.⁶⁹

This was the third military operation in the framework of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) (following EU Military Operation *Concordia*⁷⁰ in the Republic of Macedonia and EU Military Operation *Artemis*⁷¹ in the

⁶⁹ EU military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Operation EUFOR - Althea) at <http://www.euforbih.org/sheets/fs050103a.htm>

⁷⁰ for detailed information of Operation *Concordia*, see Catriona Mace, "Operation Concordia: Developing a European Approach to Crisis Management," *International Peacekeeping*, 11(3), Autumn 2004, pp. 474-490

⁷¹ for detailed information of Operation *Artemis*, see Stale Ulriksen, Catriona Gourlay and Catriona Mace, "Operation Artemis: The Shape of Things to Come?," *International Peacekeeping*, 11(3), Autumn 2004, pp. 508-525

Democratic Republic of Congo) (European Union Factsheet, February 2005). Operation Althea, took on the main peace-stabilization role previously undertaken by NATO under the Dayton Peace Agreement. In accordance with agreements worked out between the two organizations, NATO is providing planning, logistic and command support for the EU-led operation in the framework of a package of agreements known as “Berlin Plus”.⁷²

2.2.3.3. United Nations Operations in Kosovo (KFOR)

Kosovo obtained autonomous status in 1963 under the Tito regime. Until 1989, the region enjoyed a high degree of autonomy within the former Yugoslavia. Relations between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo grew significantly tenser as Slobadan Milosevic was elected Serbia’s party leader in 1987 with the rise of Serbian nationalism following the fall of the Berlin Wall and Soviet communism (Simonsen, 2004: 291). By 1989, Milosevic was firmly in control of the Serbian republic and embarked on a campaign to consolidate his power throughout Yugoslavia.⁷³ As Slobadan Milosevic came to power, Serbian pressure and unequal treatment increased and the Serbian Assembly altered the autonomous status of Kosovo in 1989, removing its autonomy and bringing it under the direct control of Belgrade, the Serbian capital.⁷⁴

The majority population of Kosovo was progressively denied the right to govern their own affairs, to earn a living for themselves, to have access to the legal

⁷² EU military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Operation EUFOR - Althea) at <http://www.euforbih.org/sheets/fs050103a.htm>

⁷³ Center for Balkan Development, History of the war in Kosovo Written April, 1999 at http://www.friendsofbosnia.org/edu_kos.html

⁷⁴ NATO’s role in Kosovo, A historical overview, Updated: 28-August-2006 at <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/kosovo.htm>

and judicial system, and to be able to educate their children in their own language and culture (Robertson, 2000:5). Kosovar Albanians were fired from their jobs, their schools were closed, they were denied access to state-run health care, and they lost administrative control of the province. After the revocation of Kosovo's autonomy, the Serbian authorities closed schools in the Albanian language, massively dismissed Albanians from state-owned enterprises, and suspended Kosovo's legal parliament and government. Serbia instituted a regime of systematic oppression of the Albanian population in Kosovo, and flagrant violations of the basic rights of Albanians occurred frequently.

Initially the Albanians responded to the repression with peaceful and passive resistance. In 1992 the people of Kosovo held free elections in which they chose their leadership, expressed their determination for the independence of Kosovo in the 1991 referendum, and in the same year the Kosovar parliament declared the independence of Kosovo. They formed a parallel government, found means of continuing Albanian language education outside of occupied premises and providing health care (most Albanian doctors were dismissed from state-owned hospitals by Serb installed authorities).

In early 1998 the Serbian government began a crackdown against the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), a guerilla movement which emerged after it became apparent that the peaceful approach was ineffective in the face of the brutal regime of Milosevic. In February of 1998, conflicts broke out between Serbian military and police forces and Kosovar Albanian forces. During 1998, Serbian security forces conducted a scorched earth policy in Kosovo, raising villages to the ground, creating over one million refugees and internally displaced persons, committing horrific atrocities against unarmed civilians, including women and children, leaving over

300,000 people without shelter, and an estimated 10,000 dead, and mass graves containing bodies of up to one hundred civilians, including women and children, who have been summarily executed. The Kosovar Albanians strenuously opposed the move.⁷⁵ KLA which was established in 1990 pioneered this move.⁷⁶ The international community became gravely concerned about the escalating conflict, its humanitarian consequences, and the risk of it spreading to other countries. President Milosevic's disregard for diplomatic efforts aimed at peacefully resolving the crisis and the destabilizing role of militant Kosovar Albanian forces was also of concern.⁷⁷

On 13 October 1998, following a deterioration of the situation, the NATO Council authorized Activation Orders for air strikes. This move was designed to support diplomatic efforts to make the Milosevic regime withdraw forces from Kosovo, cooperate in bringing an end to the violence and facilitate the return of refugees to their homes. At the last moment, following further diplomatic initiatives, Milosevic agreed to comply and the air strikes were called off. UNSC Resolution 1199 (23 September 1998) expressed deep concern about the excessive use of force by Serbian security forces and the Yugoslav army, and called for a cease-fire by both parties to the conflict. It was agreed, in addition, that the OSCE would establish a Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) to observe compliance on the ground and that NATO would establish an aerial surveillance mission. The establishment of the two missions was endorsed by UNSC Resolution 1203 (24 October 1998).

⁷⁵ NATO's role in Kosovo, A historical overview, Updated: 28-Aug-2006 at <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/kosovo.htm>

⁷⁶ For detailed information of KLA, see Alpaslan Özerdem, 2003. "From a 'Terrorist' Group to a 'Civil Defence' Corps: The Transformation of the Kosovo Liberation Army," *International Peacekeeping*, 10(3): 79-101

⁷⁷ NATO's role in Kosovo, NATO's role in relation to the conflict in Kosovo Updated: 15 July 1999, Historical Overview, Background to the conflict at <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/history.htm>

From October 1998 to March 1999, the KVM, the largest and most challenging OSCE operation up to that date, was deployed to verify the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's compliance with UNSC Resolutions 1160 (31 March 1998) and 1199 (23 September 1998). The purpose of the KVM was to verify the cease-fire, monitor movement of forces and promote human rights and democracy-building. Following deterioration in the security situation, the KVM was withdrawn from Kosovo in March 1999. In support of the OSCE, the Alliance established a special military task force to assist with the emergency evacuation of members of the KVM, if renewed conflict should put them at risk. This task force was deployed in the Republic of Macedonia under the overall direction of NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe.

Despite these steps, the situation in Kosovo flared up again at the beginning of 1999, following a number of acts of provocation on both sides and the use of excessive and disproportionate force by the Serbian Army and Special Police. Some of these incidents were defused through the mediation efforts of the OSCE verifiers but in mid-January, the situation deteriorated further after escalation of the Serbian offensive against Kosovar Albanians.

Renewed international efforts were made to give new political impetus to finding a peaceful solution to the conflict. The six-nation Contact Group⁷⁸ established by the 1992 London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia met on 29 January. It was agreed to convene urgent negotiations between the parties to the conflict, under international mediation. NATO supported and reinforced the Contact Group efforts by agreeing on 30 January to the use of air strikes if required, and by issuing a warning to both sides in the conflict. These concerted initiatives culminated

⁷⁸ France, Italy, Germany, Russia, United Kingdom and United States.

in initial negotiations in Rambouillet near Paris, from 6 to 23 February, followed by a second round in Paris, from 15 to 18 March. At the end of the second round of talks, the Kosovar Albanian delegation signed the proposed peace agreement, but the talks broke up without a signature from the Serbian delegation.⁷⁹ On 20 March, the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission was withdrawn from the region, having faced obstruction from Serbian forces to the extent that they could no longer continue to fulfill their task.

After Serbia's refusal to sign a peace accord for the settlement of the conflict in Kosovo, and upon the failure of political pressures, NATO intervened militarily in Kosovo and commenced air strikes, Operation *Allied Force*, on 24 March 1999 to halt the humanitarian catastrophe that was then unfolding in Kosovo.⁸⁰ On 10 June the UNSC passed a resolution (UNSC Res.1244) welcoming the acceptance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of the principles on a political solution to the Kosovo crisis, including an immediate end to violence and a rapid withdrawal of its military, police and paramilitary forces.⁸¹ The UN established a United Nations civilian administration in Kosovo (known as the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo; UNMIK⁸²) and allowed a NATO-led peacekeeping force to enter Kosovo to ensure security.

Upon achievement of the Peace Agreement, the Secretary General of NATO stated that NATO with the forces which had contributed to Operation *Allied Force*, and to the cohesion and determination of all the Allies, was ready to undertake its

⁷⁹ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1999, V.53, p.338 and Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, Background to the conflict at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/intro.htm>

⁸⁰ *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1999, V.53, p.332

⁸¹ *NATO Handbook*, Brussels: Information and Press Office Publication, 2001, p.127

⁸² See United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, UNMIK Police at <http://www.unmikonline.org/civpol/mandate.htm>

new mission to bring the people back to their homes and to build a lasting and just peace in Kosovo. Following the adoption of UNSCR 1244, General Jackson made immediate preparations for the rapid deployment of the security force. Operation *Joint Guardian* mandated by the UNSC. The first elements of KFOR and UN Transition Kosovo Administration entered Kosovo on 12 June 1999 (NATO Handbook, 2002). As agreed in the Military Technical Agreement, the deployment of the security force, KFOR, was synchronized with the departure of Serb security forces from Kosovo. By 20 June, the Serb withdrawal was complete and KFOR was well established in Kosovo and started its mission.⁸³

Since Kosovo's status remains unresolved, the NATO mandate in the province- which is derived from UN Security Council Resolution 1244 and a Military-Technical Agreement between NATO and the Yugoslav Army - is greater than in any other Alliance-led mission. In accordance with UNSCR 1244 (10 June 1999), the mandate of KFOR is: to deter renewed hostility and threats against Kosovo by Yugoslav and Serb forces; to establish and maintain a secure environment in Kosovo, including public safety and order. KFOR has the mandate to enforce law and order until the UN Mission in Kosovo can fully assume this responsibility; to demilitarize the KLA; to support the international humanitarian effort; to coordinate with and support the international civil presence; to monitor, verify and when necessary, enforce compliance with the conditions of the Military Technical Agreement and the UCK Undertaking; to provide assistance to the UN Mission in

⁸³ See, Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, Background to the conflict at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/intro.htm>

Kosovo (UNMIK), including core civil functions until they are transferred to UNMIK.⁸⁴

2.2.3.4. International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF)

After the terrorist attacks occurred in the United States on 11 September 2001, the relationship between these attacks and the al Qaeda, which was operating in Afghanistan, had come to light. Because the Taliban Regime was in a relation with al Qaeda and because it was allowing Afghanistan to be used as a base for terrorism, a US-led multinational Operation *Enduring Freedom* was carried out against Afghanistan.⁸⁵ During this operation, Taliban regime collapsed and al Qaeda was damaged heavily. When the US-led operation succeeded to eliminate mostly the terrorist command, control and training centers, the next phase of the operation began. On 14 November 2001, five weeks into U.S.-led operations in Afghanistan, the Security Council endorsed an urgent meeting of Afghan political leaders to form an interim, post-Taliban governing regime for the country and to strengthen domestic peace and stability in the transitional period and reconstruct the physical, economic and human infrastructure of Afghanistan.

On December 5, 2001 the meeting, convened in Bonn, Germany, brought together U.N. officials, Afghan leaders, and members of the international community

⁸⁴ See, Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, KFOR Objectives/ Mission at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/objectives.htm>

⁸⁵ The U.S.-led multinational military campaign, *Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)*, has roughly 10,000 troops inside Afghanistan, as well as air support and logistics elements outside of it. Twenty nations including Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Norway have provided troops and support. The role of the OEF, however, is to root out al Qaeda and Taliban forces, not to provide security within Afghanistan. Nevertheless, the presence of these troops provides some residual local security. The Henry L. Stimson Center, *Rebuilding Afghanistan: The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), Peace Operations Backgrounder*, June 2002 at <http://www.stimson.org/fopo/pdf/ISAFbackgrounder.pdf>

to discuss the country's future. They decided to establish and train national security forces with international help and called an UN-mandated force to assist in the maintenance of security for Kabul and its surrounding areas at the Bonn Agreement. As a response to this request, on December 20, 2001, the UN Security Council Resolution of 1386 provided for the creation of ISAF and its deployment to Kabul and the surrounding area, for six months. The Security Council determined that the situation in Afghanistan constituted a threat to international peace and security. On 22 December 2001, two days after the SCR of 1386, an Interim Afghan Administration comprising 30 members under the head of Hamid Karzai was established in Kabul on 22 December 2001 in accordance with the Bonn Agreement. On 12 January 2002, ISAF has begun to function and became fully operational on 18 February 2002.

Initially, individual nations volunteered to lead the ISAF mission every six months. The United Kingdom served as the first lead nation. On 23 May, the Security Council extended ISAF's mandate for an additional six months until December 20, 2002, with the adoption of Resolution 1413 and welcomed Turkey taking the role of lead nation from Great Britain. When the British mandate was over, Turkey assumed the lead-nation role and took over the command of the ISAF on June 20, 2002 for a period of six months.

Normally, Turkey would have handed over command on 20th of December 2002. But, no country was ready to take over. So, the UN Security Council extended Turkey's leadership until 10 February 2003 (Zorlu, 2003: 36). Upon the request of the Germany and the Netherlands, the SC adopted the Resolution 1444 on 27 November 2002 and decided to give the leadership to the joint command of Germany and the Netherlands. Since Germany and the Netherlands could not complete some of the

necessary preparations to assume command of ISAF on December 20, 2002, as planned, Turkey turned over leadership to the joint command of Germany and the Netherlands two months later on 10 February 2003.

ISAF III was led by Germany and the Netherlands with support from NATO from 10 February to 11 August 2003. Until this time, ISAF command rotated among above stated nations on a 6-month basis. However there was tremendous difficulty securing new lead nations. To solve the problem, command was turned over indefinitely to NATO on August 11, 2003. Since August 2003, NATO has held the command of ISAF. Turkey decided to lead ISAF-VII from February 2005 to August 2005 and took over the command headquarters of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan on 13 February 2005. The command changed from Eurocorps, which is a NATO Rapid Deployable Force that has been in charge of ISAF headquarters since 2004 to the “Rapid Deployable Corps in Istanbul.”

The primary role of ISAF is to support the Government of Afghanistan (GOA) in the provision and maintenance of security in Kabul and its environs (within the ISAF Area of Responsibility (AOR)) so that the GOA, as well as the personnel of the UN, can operate in a secure environment in order to enable the GOA the build up of national institutions and security structures in Afghanistan in accordance with the Bonn Agreement and as agreed in the Military Technical Agreement (MTA) signed on 31st of December 2001.

The responsibility for providing security and law and order throughout the country has been left to the Afghans themselves. ISAF’s mandate had been outlined in the UNSC Resolution 1386. In practice the missions of ISAF are: to assist the Afghan Interim Administration in providing security framework around political

institutions and other key sites in Kabul; to advise the Afghan Interim Administration on future security structures and assist in their development; to assist the Afghan Interim Administration in reconstruction; to identify and arrange training and assistance tasks for future Afghan security forces; to conduct protective patrols jointly with the Afghan police in Kabul; to assist in the operation of Kabul International Airport; to support to the humanitarian assistance and infrastructure development; to make the police accountable and effective; to maintain a safe and secure environment conducive to free and fair elections, the spread of the rule of law, and the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

Beside the security issues, ISAF has been helping the Afghan authorities and international assistance organizations in the reconstruction of the country under the terms of civil-military cooperation. CIMIC teams have been constructed for this purpose under the command of ISAF. They also prepared several projects related with education, health, agriculture, and infrastructure, and they have been carrying out these projects as far as possible since the deployment of ISAF.

CHAPTER III

TURKEY'S APPROACH TO PEACE OPERATIONS

While Turkey's involvement in UN-led peace operations has increased in the post-Cold War era, Turkey shied away from such missions during the Cold War years. With the advent of the post-Cold War era, Turkey's involvement in peace operations increased. This chapter aims at analyzing the motivations that lie at the root of Turkey's involvement in peace operations, mostly organized under the leadership of the United Nations in the post-Cold War era. Having mentioned the cases involving the deployment of Turkish troops abroad, I will examine alternative sets of motivations behind Turkey's active involvement in peace operations in the 1990s. Ideational, security-related and domestic factors will be compared and contrasted in light of Turkey's experiences in various peace operations.

Since 1923, Turkey has consistently pursued a foreign policy aimed at international peace based on the principle formulated by the founder of the Turkish Republic Atatürk: 'Peace at home and peace in the world'.⁸⁶ This is considered the keystone of Turkish foreign and security policy. Modernization, primarily understood and practiced as material westernization, was largely a state-imposed project during the last century of the Ottoman Empire and the first decades of the

⁸⁶ See, Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Balkans, Last Updated: 29.11.2005 at <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Synopsis/SYNOPSIS.htm>

Turkish Republic. The West was perceived as the only source of civilization to which Turkey tried to belong. Turkish foreign policy has been put into the service of this national goal of becoming a part of Europe.

Ataturk's main aim was to preserve the security which had been won and in the interim term, to restore relations with the former entente powers. In this way, Turkey could take its place among the respected community of western nations and avoid the risk of wars, which it had suffered between 1912 and 1922 (Hale, 1999:93). The aim of the modernizing elite was to be integrated within the European states system, being a part of European identity in social terms. The Kemalist project was fundamentally a modernization project. In this modernizing process, the ultimate model was Europe. Throughout the nation-building process of the Turkish Republic, Westernization/Europeanization has become a legitimizing factor of all other reforms.

3.1. Cold War

With the end of World War II, some significant changes occurred in the nature of the international system. It evolved from a 'balance of power' structure to a 'bipolar' structure. The transition from the 'balance of power' system to bipolar system has brought systemic changes in the world order. The UN is the institution of a particular historical structure and particular international system. The UN was created to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." This is reinforced in Article 1:1 which states that the purpose of the UN is "to maintain international peace and security." When it was established, the most important values of the UN were the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the states. Article 2:4 prohibits "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." Unless consent was given by the parties in question, intervention was forbidden. The

drafters of the UN Charter felt that the best way to ensure peaceful relations was to codify the principle of nonintervention.

During the bipolar era, which is characterized by the dominance of superpowers of international politics, the attitude of the two superpowers had a crucial impact on the performance of the UN to maintain peace and security. To launch a peace operation, the United Nations had to secure not only the consent of the main parties directly concerned, but also the support of the two superpowers. The rivalry between the two superpowers often prevented the Security Council from taking effective action to contain and control conflicts. Although there had been about 150 conflicts, the United Nations undertook only 13 peace operations during the Cold War, 7 in the Middle East, 3 in Asia, 1 in Africa, 1 in Europe and 1 in Latin America.

Even though Turkey's participation in peace operations has increased in the post-Cold War era, Turkey did not contribute to such missions during the Cold War years. This was despite the fact that seven⁸⁷ out of thirteen peace operations were deployed in the Middle East as mentioned above. Turkey first participated in the UN military operation in Korea in 1950 with a brigade. Between the years 1950-1953 a total of 15,000 Turks served in Korea on a rotational basis (Türkmen, 2002: 161-180). This was the only case concerning the deployment of Turkish troops abroad as part of a peace operation in its broadest sense.

In order to understand Turkey's reluctance in this regard, it would be useful to underline the following points. First, international systemic change from a 'balance of power' to a 'bipolar' system and the rivalry between the United States

⁸⁷ UN peacekeepers were involved in the: United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in Israel-Syria Sector, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I and II) in Sinai Peninsula, the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL), the United Nations Yemen Observation Mission (UNYOM), United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights, and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

and the Soviet Union with the onset of the Cold War dramatically curtailed the maneuvering capability of small and medium sized countries, leaving very little room to maneuver for these countries. This is essentially because the two superpowers dominated the politics within each bloc they led. Kirişçi argues that, it is not surprising to find that Turkish foreign policy did not seem to go ‘beyond the parameters set by the politics of the Cold War’ (Kirişçi, 1994:5). Turkey did not remain completely isolated from these developments but did not contribute actively to the United Nations peace operations established during the Cold War.

In the bipolar international system, Turkish security policy was restricted to a few basic questions: how to defend the country against the Soviet threat, how to protect Turkish interests concerning Greece and Cyprus, and how to maintain and strengthen ties with the West and NATO and how to repel terrorism supported by neighbors like Syria, Iraq, and Iran. These fundamental questions restricted Turkey from deploying its troops outside the country. Turkish security concerns have been focused on the perceived threat from Soviet Union (Hale, 1992:680). Thus, Turkey sought to protect its national security by forging close military and political ties with the United States and the Western Europe through its membership in NATO (Sayarı, 1992:9).

As the Cold War geopolitical imagination was centred on two alternative models of political-economic organisation, the East and the West, Turkey located itself in the West by virtue of its pro-western orientation and membership of European institutions. In this context, membership in NATO was viewed by Turkish policy makers as not only ending Turkey’s anxieties caused by the Soviet Union’s post-war demands (on its eastern provinces and the control of the straits) but also bringing Turkey into the European security system as a ‘fully recognised European

state.’ The roles Turkey played in European institutions have served as occasions on which Turkish policy makers articulated and defined Turkey’s western and/or European identity as well as maintaining its security needs and interests (Bilgin, 2004: 278).

NATO membership became a central component in Turkish foreign and security policy in the Cold War era and solidified Turkey’s western orientation by establishing a long-lasting institutional and functional link with the West (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000:209). Huntington states that, ‘Mustafa Kemal’s country is of course the classical torn country which since the 1920s has been trying to modernize, to westernize, and to become part of the West (Huntington, 1998:138). Once Turkey joined NATO, Turkey’s foreign policy quickly slipped to the backwaters of international politics (Kirişçi, 1994:10). Turkish foreign and security policies were basically conducted in parallel with NATO’s strategies. NATO provided the national security guarantee and Turkey contributed to the policy of credible deterrence by its pivotal status in NATO’s southeastern flank (Kramer, 2000: 202). Hence, not much room was left for the Turkish political elites to worry about national security (Kibaroglu, 1998:163). Therefore, it would not be an overestimation to argue that Turkey’s attitude towards peace operations during the Cold War era was determined by its membership in NATO.

Membership in NATO had two particular effects on Turkey. The first was that Turkey had to streamline its peacekeeping policy with that of the alliance in general and the United States in particular. Given that the US/NATO was lukewarm to the idea of setting up peace operations for troubled conflicts, lest such contingencies might lead to dangerous confrontations between the US and the Soviet Union, Turkey had also hesitated to develop a strong interest in such operations.

During the Cold War, the UN established 3 peace operations in Asia. UN peacekeepers were involved in the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), the United Nations Security Force in West New Guinea (UNSF), the United Nations India-Pakistan Observation Mission (UNIPOM) in Asia. Turkey did not contribute to any of these operations in Asia. Second, the security guarantee offered by NATO membership mainly satisfied Turkey's security interests. Hence, there was no need to construct a linkage between security and internal affairs of states and to develop special capabilities for peace operations (Kramer, 2001).

Second, the most important goal for Turkey during the Cold War was to ensure the territorial integrity and security of Turkey. Turkey focused its energy on internal development and sought to avoid foreign tensions that could divert it from that goal. Instead of projecting power and contributing to peace operations, Turkey focused strictly on protecting borders and maintaining internal order (Makovski, 1999: 93). This was in full harmony with the prevailing security understanding of the time period under consideration according to which the main threat was external and used to stem from the Soviet Union's goal to extend its territorial influence.

Third, most of the regions which peace operations had been established were not a priority area in Turkish security calculations. During the Cold War period, as retired general Şadi Ergüvenç (1995:1), noted, the Middle East was not a priority area in Turkish security calculations. As Philip Robins suggests, the main features of Turkey's foreign and security policy in the Middle East were strict adherence to the principles of non-interference and non-involvement in the domestic politics and interstate conflicts of all countries in the region, and to the development of bilateral political and commercial relations with as many states in the region as possible (Robins, 1991:65-67).

Another important reason was that Turkey was not invited to contribute to peace operations in the region. Mainly because Turkey's western orientation, which led Turkey to adopt political, social, cultural, and economic ideas from the West, had a significant impact on Turco-Arab relations. In its Middle Eastern relations, the Arabs looked upon Turkey as a servant of the West in the region (Deringil, 1992:4). Turkey feared that the Soviet Union was enlarging its influence over Middle Eastern countries, and Turkey could be soon contained by pro-Soviet and hostile Arab states. Therefore, the Soviet threat indirectly influenced Turkey's further distancing from the Middle East. Consequently, Turkey established its security policy within the framework of alignment with the West by staying out of the regional conflicts of its Middle Eastern neighbors (Ari, 2001:415).

During the Cold War, the UN established only 1 peace operation in Latin America: Mission of the Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic (DOMREP). In the Dominican Republic, it was necessary to set up a minor peace keeping body (DOMREP) in 1965, because there was an ideological and class struggle between the left wing forces and the US. The leftists were trying to regain control of the government, which had been seized by a right wing military junta. Turkey did not contribute to this peace operation. Firstly, Dominican Republic was not a priority area for Turkey and DOMREP was in the spheres of influence of the US and it was set up as a face-saving operation. Second, it was a minor peace operation. There were only three persons who contributed to this operation. The military adviser to the Representative of the Secretary-General was provided with a staff of 2 military observers.

The UN established its eighth peacekeeping operation of the Cold War in Cyprus. The United Kingdom applied to the UN Security Council on 15 February

1964 upon the continuation of communal conflicts in Cyprus (Oran, 2001:725). The UN established UNFICYP (United Nations Force in Cyprus) with the consent of the ‘Government of Cyprus’ in 1964 noting that the situation was likely to threaten international peace and security. The Secretary-General in consultation with the governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom decided on the composition and size of the UNFICYP. Since Turkey was part of the problem in Cyprus, it could not contribute to this peace operation.

Another peace operation in the Cold War period was the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC). The UN established this operation initially to ensure the withdrawal of Belgian forces, to assist the Government in maintaining law and order and to provide technical assistance. The function of ONUC was subsequently modified to include maintaining the territorial integrity and political independence of the Congo. Turkey also did not contribute to this operation for several reasons. First of all, the Congo was in geographically not in a priority area in Turkish security calculations. Secondly, to the Third World, Turkey was a member of the western bloc and in their eyes Turkey served western interests. Therefore, Turkey was not invited to participate in this operation.

Fourth, it can be argued that throughout the Cold War period Turkey lived with a “Korean Syndrome” similar in a sense to the negative impact seen among US soldiers abroad following the US experience in Vietnam War (Bağcı and Kardaş: 2004). Last but not least, Turkey’s regional environment displayed far more stability than it has done in the post-Cold War era. Turkey was not exposed to spillover risks since these conflicts did not involve Turkic and other Muslim peoples with whom Turkey had historic ties.

3.2. Post-Cold War

With the advent of the post-Cold War era Turkey's involvement in peace operations increased. Since 1988, the Turkish Armed Forces have joined actively in various peace operations with various observation functions and peace operations with military contingents. Since that time, UN peace operations have been a distinctive aspect of Turkey's security and foreign policy. Turkish commitment to peace operations is reaffirmed in the Ministry of National Defense *White Paper 2000* which states that "Turkey provides support to the Peace Operations carried out under the sanctions or control of the UN, NATO or the OSCE for world and regional peace, in the direction of the principle of Peace at home, Peace in the World".⁸⁸

In the Balkans, Turkey participated in the UN Protection Force in Bosnia-Herzegovina (UNPROFOR) from 1993 to 1995, Implementation Force (IFOR) and Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia-Herzegovina (1996-present), Combined Police Force in Bosnia Herzegovina (1995), UN Preventive Deployment Force in Macedonia (1995-present), International Police Task Force in Bosnia Herzegovina (1997-present), Operation Alba in Albania (1997), Kosovo Verification Force (1998-1999), and Kosovo Force (2001-present). The Turkish land forces participated in UN peacekeeping operations in Bosnia with a brigade. The navy participated in Operation *Sharp Guard* in the Adriatic, whose mission was to monitor and impose the arms embargo on former Yugoslavia. The air force joined NATO's Operation *Deny Flight* in Bosnia and Operation *Allied Force* in Kosovo with a squadron of F-16s.

In the Middle East, Turkey showed great concern for the prevention of local conflicts, which could escalate to a confrontation into which Turkey would

⁸⁸ *White Paper*, 2000 at <http://www.msb.gov.tr/Birimler/GnPPD/GnPPDBeyazKitap.htm#WHITE%20PAPER>

inevitably be drawn. Turkey was concerned about the local sources of regional instability, the dangers of religious and nationalist radicalization, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Therefore, Turkey had a great interest in peace and stability in the region. Within this framework, Turkey contributed to the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (1988-1991), the UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (1991-2003), Operation *Provide Comfort/ Northern Watch* after the Gulf War of 1990-1991 (1991-2003). Turkey was also included in the international observer mission, Temporary International Presence in Hebron (TIPH) (1997-2003), established for the purpose of monitoring and reporting the evacuation of the city of EI-Halil (Hebron) on the West Bank by the Israeli forces and its transfer to the Palestine National Administration.

In Caucasus, Turkey has contributed to the UN Observer Mission in Georgia (1993- present) with 5 officers serving since 21 October 1994 within the framework of the OSCE. In addition to these initiatives and efforts for the promotion of peace and security and stability in its environment, Turkey also participated in the UNMISET (United Nations Mission in Support East Timor) with 2 officers and 20 polices. Turkey had already declared it could contribute with a battalion power force to the ‘United Nations Standby Arrangements System,’ which envisaged the rapid deployment of UN peace forces in the case of a threat against world peace. Turkey authorized its special representative to sign peacekeeping agreements with the United Nations.

Turkey contributed to two basic levels of activities within peace operations; deployment of military observers, and deployment of military contingents. In this section, I will discuss peace operations that Turkey participated in the post-Cold War era by the deployment of its military contingents; UNOSOM II (United Nations Operation in Somalia), UNPROFOR (the United Nations Protection Force), IFOR

(The Peace Implementation Force), SFOR (The Stabilization Force), EUFOR (EU-led Force), KFOR (Kosovo Force), and ISAF (International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan). Turkey's contribution to peace operations by the deployment of military observers will be beyond this study since it does not offer insight into the main focus of this dissertation.

Furthermore, in the Balkans, Turkey actively initiated and/or was involved in the formation of a number of bilateral and multilateral political, economic, military and social projects such as the Black Sea Maritime Task Group (BLACKSEAFOR) in April 2001, the South East European Co-operation Process (SEECF) in February 2000, the Multinational Peace Force South East Europe (MPFSEE), the Southeastern European Brigade (SEEBRIG), in September 1999 and the Southeast European Co-operation Initiative in 1996.

3.2.1. United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II)

A new phase of Turkey's involvement in international peace operations was initiated with its contribution to United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II). The UN sent an invitation letter and asked Turkey to contribute to UNITAF. Turkey actively participated in the UNITAF from then on. It was decided to send a mechanized company sized contingent to UNOSOM after obtaining ratification from Parliament.⁸⁹ Firstly, it was decided by the Council of Ministers to send a preliminary committee comprised of 9 people from the Chief of Turkish General Staff and Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Somalia to assess if conditions were suitable for the Turkish contingent. This committee moved to Mogadishu on 15 December 1992 and carried out a pre-deployment reconnaissance visit to Somalia (Bir,

⁸⁹ Turkish Grand National Assembly, Decision 204, 8 December 1992

1999:14). The mission of the preliminary committee was to meet the requirements of the Turkish contingent related to its site and area of responsibility (AOR) and to understand the situation on the ground in order to better prepare its troops. This initiative led to very good results in terms of the preparation of contingents prior to deployment.

The Turkish contingent set off from Mersin harbour with the TCG (Ship of the Turkish Republic. Turkish: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Gemisi) Ertuğrul landing ship and the TCG Derya logistics support ship accompanied by the TCG Fatih frigate on 19 December 1992. They arrived after the 15-day trip, in Somalia on 2 January 1993 (Bir, 1999:14). After the arrival of the Turkish contingent in Somalia, the preliminary committee returned to Turkey in mid January 1993. Turkey participated in the operation UNOSOM II in Somalia with a 300-strong mechanized company between 2 January 1993 and 22 February 1994 (Turkish General Staff, 2001:5). The main task of the Turkish military contingent in Somalia was the protection of Mogadishu airport (Bir, 1999:46). Somalia had almost no transportation facilities, no railroads and few paved roads. Major airports are at Mogadishu, in the south, and at Hargeysa, in the north. The Turkish contingent was tasked with the vital responsibility of protecting the Mogadishu airport which provides unit connection to world. The other tasks of the Turkish military contingent were to protect UNOSOM II Headquarters, to provide escorts for convoys, to facilitate security and to ensure delivery of food to the starving Somalis.

Following the developments in Somalia, the Belgian contingent (950 all ranks) and the French contingent (1,100 all ranks) were withdrawn from Somalia in December 1993. The United States announced, in October 1993, that it would

withdraw its troops from Somalia by the end of March 1994.⁹⁰ Turkey also decided to withdraw in February 1994. While these countries were withdrawing, there was not a necessity for Turkey to stay in Somalia. The Turkish contingent returned to Turkey on 22 February 1994 as instructed through the decision of the Turkish government. It returned in two groups; as the first group comprising of 225 soldiers and PTT (Turkish Post Office) personnel returned by air, the second group comprising of 86 personnel and vehicles returned by sea.⁹¹ This operation was important in two respects for Turkey. First, Turkey was requested for the first time to provide an operational company to UN peace operation. Second, it is worth noting that the command of UNOSOM II was assumed by a Turkish Lieutenant General, Çevik Bir, for a period. General Bir commanded UNOSOM II from April 1993 to January 1994. The assignment of General Çevik Bir as commander to UNOSOM II was important for Turkey for its security producing image would be more reinforced in the international arena.

3.2.2. United Nations Operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Since the outbreak of hostilities in the former Yugoslavia, Turkey has insistently called on the international community for the prevention of further atrocities and tragedies, urged the finding of a just and lasting solution to the problem and pursued an active policy and supported a peaceful solution that would maintain the independence, unity and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

⁹⁰ See, *The United Nations and the situation in Somalia*, (1994, March) (p.26). New York : UNDPI.

⁹¹ Sabah Newspaper, 4 February 1994

3.2.2.1. The United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR)

Within the framework of efforts that Turkey made since the beginning of the crisis to contribute actively to the international community's efforts and activities aimed at finding peaceful solutions to the Bosnian crisis, Turkey contributed to the decision of the formation of UNPROFOR and applied to the UN to make available its armed forces for UNPROFOR. However, Turkey's request for participation in the UNPROFOR was not approved by the UNSC and in particular by Secretary-General Boutros Ghali in the beginning with reference to its traditional principal decision which impedes contribution of countries which have close historical ties with the region (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:50). Countries which did not approve Turkey's contribution alleged that Turks are Muslims and the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina is taking place among Muslim Bosnians, Ortodox Serbians and Catholic Croatians. Therefore, it is difficult for Turkey not to take sides in this conflict. Another objection which had been raised by these countries against Turkey's contribution was that Turkey had been a sovereign power in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the past (Akgönenç, 1997: 41, 44).

Turkey exerted every effort to contribute to UNPROFOR. It sent both representatives and observers to the London Peace Conference held between 26-28 August 1992.⁹² It also sent representatives to the second Bosnia and Herzegovina Peace Talks held in Geneva on 3 September 1992 (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:46). The new situation resulting from the massacre in Sarajevo and the ultimatum of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on 9 February 1994 put the necessity of additional troops for UNPROFOR on the agenda (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:50). In addition, Serbians stipulated that Russian troops should form a

⁹² *Yearbook of the UN*, Dept. of Public Information, UN, New York, 1992, V.46, p.327

buffer zone between them and the Bosnians in order to lift the siege around Sarejevo. Since Bosnian Muslims wanted to see Turkish soldiers in UNPROFOR, the approval of this stipulation put the contribution of Turkey to UNPROFOR on the agenda, in a way.

Finally, on 22 March 1994, the UN sent a note to the Turkish permanent representative and invited Turkey to contribute to UNPROFOR in the direction of the common wills of the Bosnian and Croatian Governments and UNSC members. For urgent necessity that UNPROFOR force commander determined, the UN Secretary-General requested from Turkey a 2,700 man-sized contingent including a 1,000 man-sized logistical battalion, a 500 man-sized engineering battalion and 1,200 man-sized mechanized infantry battalion. Turkey declared its readiness to comply with the request, negotiated details of deployment and sent a committee to coordinate with UNPROFOR officials (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:50). Later the UNSC adopted Resolution 908 (31 March 1994) referring to reinforcement of UNPROFOR with 3,500 troops because of the opposition of the US on the budget. The SC Resolution 908 (31 March 1994) provided that the number of Turkish troops would be “1,000 plus.” However, the SC adopted Resolution 914 on 27 April 1994 referring to reinforcement of UNPROFOR with another 6,550 troops in addition to 3,500 troops already committed.

Within this framework, after Turkey’s efforts to contribute peacekeeping troops to UNPROFOR concluded positively, the first part of the Turkish contingent (mechanized infantry battalion reinforced with engineering and logistical units) arrived in Split, Croatia on 27 May 1994, and the greater part of the Turkish unit arrived in Split on 27 June 1994. The Turkish unit situated itself in Zenica and on 4 August 1994, it took over its responsibility in the section of a US division as a

subunit of Multinational Division North (MND,N) (Akgöneng, 1997:42). Turkey contributed a regiment size Mechanized Task Force comprising of 1,450 personnel supported with sufficient combat service support and combat support units for UNPROFOR from 4 August 1994 to 31 December 1995. Since the beginning of its deployment, the Turkish contingent underwent six different organizational structures as mentioned below.⁹³

- Turkish Task Force	27 June 1994
- Turkish Brigade	20 December 1995
- Turkish Battalion Task Force	1 April 2000
- Turkish Battalion Task Force Reduction	6 September 2003
- Turkish Battalion	8 June 2004
- Multinational Maneuver Battalion	2 December 2004

Turkey believed that peace and security could be maintained in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo only by means of the full implementation of the General Framework Agreement.⁹⁴ In addition, it also believed that stability in the region could be established by taking substantial measures to return normality to social life. Therefore, Turkey also performed Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) activities in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In the composition of Turkish Unit, there was a CIMIC unit and three mechanized infantry companies, which were supplied with different equipment than a standard mechanized infantry company and an additional mechanized infantry company (as a security company assigned to protect SFOR Headquarters). The combat units had a signal platoon, a signal intelligence team, a

⁹³ *Bosnia and Herzegovina Peace Force Briefing*, unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Unclassified)

⁹⁴ *Turkish Armed Forces Contribution to World Peace*. Turkish General Staff. The Press of General Staff, Ankara, 2001

tactical air control section and an engineering company. The combat service support units had a logistics support unit.

The Turkish AOR was located at the intersection of the three Multinational Divisions of US, France and Canada and consisted of an area of 1,698 km. square. In the Turkish unit AOR, the population of Bosnia is Bosnian 78 percent, Croatian 10 percent, Serbian 4 percent, and others including Albanians, Kosovar, Montenegrins, Gypsies and Sanjac citizens.⁹⁵ The main part of the Unit was situated in Zenica while the Commander of the Turkish Regimental Task Force and guard company were positioned in Sarajevo. The national support unit was located in Split and the force protection team and liaison officers were at the US base in Tuzla. The tasks of the Turkish Unit were to monitor and enforce compliance with the cease-fire of the parties, to assume control of the situation for protecting its AOR from new conflicts, to protect their area of responsibility in the Zenica region from fear of armed attacks, to help create secure conditions for developing peace and to ensure and help the delivery of humanitarian assistance.⁹⁶

3.2.2.2. The Peace Implementation Force (IFOR)

The Turkish unit to fulfill these tasks in its AOR was reinforced to the brigade size and assigned it to IFOR (Turkish General Staff, 2001:8). At the end of January in 1996, a tank company, an artillery company and a mechanized infantry company to provide security for IFOR Headquarter joined the Turkish Regimental Task Force and it reorganized as a brigade. These developments did not affect the previous

⁹⁵ “Subay Astsubay Oryantasyon Brifingi - Officer Non-Commissioned Officer Orientation Briefing,” unpublished, given by the Chief of Tactical Operational Center of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia Herzegovina in January 2001 (Unclassified)

⁹⁶ “Subay Astsubay Oryantasyon Brifingi - Officer Non-Commissioned Officer Orientation Briefing,” unpublished, given by the Chief of Tactical Operational Center of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia Herzegovina in January 2001 (Unclassified)

deployment of the Turkish unit and it fulfilled its tasks without any change in its deployment. Since IFOR provided considerable developments in the peace process, SFOR, with reduced military presence, had a more ambitious mandate. The mandate that the UN gave not only included maintaining peace, but also enforcing it. Upon these developments, Turkey assigned its brigade in IFOR to SFOR, which took over the mission of IFOR.

3.2.2.3. The Stabilization Force (SFOR)

The Bosnia-Herzegovina Turkish Battalion Task Force (TBTF), which had been under the command of Turkish General Staff, joined the 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade Command located in Mamak/Ankara at 13 September 1999. The TBTF served under the operational control⁹⁷ of the US division. The other units of the US division were two US Battalion task forces, a US land-air brigade, NORDPOL (Norway, Denmark and Poland) combat group and a Russian brigade. In the beginning, there was a headquarter company, a mechanized infantry battalion, SFOR guard company, a tank company, an artillery company and logistics support battalion in the composition of the Turkish Unit.⁹⁸ After the reorganization of SFOR, the Turkish brigade assigned to SFOR reduced to battalion size unit in this period (Turkish General Staff, 2001:8). The number of military personnel decreased from 1,333 to 833 persons.

⁹⁷ This command relationship provides full authority to organize commands and forces and employ them as the commander considers necessary to accomplish assigned missions. Operational control does not normally include authority to direct logistics, administration, internal organization, or unit training.

⁹⁸ “Subay Astsubay Oryantasyon Brifingi - Officer Non-Commissioned Officer Orientation Briefing,” unpublished, given by the Chief of Tactical Operational Center of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia Herzegovina in January 2001 (Unclassified)

The Turkish unit fulfilled its tasks without any change in its deployment. The TBTF, comprised of two Mechanized infantry companies as maneuver units and a guard company, connected directly to SFOR headquarters. However, the guard company was commissioned to handle the security of barracks (Sokollu Mehmet Pasha and Butmir in Sarajevo) particularly where the SFOR headquarters had been located and it had no mission within the framework of peace operation activities. The national support unit had been located in Split/Divulje camp, the force protection team (with liaison officers) in Tuzla US base and the other units of TBTF had been located in Zenica Fatih Sultan Mehmet camp. Since the importance of the civilian military cooperation was increased and it played an important role for maintaining peace and stability, a unit of CIMIC was required and joined the TBTF composition.

The tasks of the Turkish unit were⁹⁹ to conduct a peace operation in its AOR by securing the protection of the force, to ensure military compliance in accordance with the General Framework Agreement for Peace; to ensure a safe and secure environment for the civil implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement by securing the protection of the force; to provide support to the activities of other international organizations and agencies; to stabilize and secure the environment in which local and national authorities and other international organizations worked, to patrol in the ZOS (day and night); to establish check points, to monitor and escort military activities of various groups; to carry out joint missions with the International Police Organization and to carry out joint patrolling with neighboring units. Within the framework of CIMIC activities, the tasks of the Turkish Unit were: to provide humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced people who live in camps; to restore state infrastructure; to provide medical support to the thousands of people

⁹⁹ Briefing, unpublished, given by the Commander of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2001

who live suffering in war; to support in education and training, the thousands of Bosnian youth who are the future of the country; to facilitate the democratization process and to support state institutions and the rule of law.

NATO ships belonging to the Alliance's Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) began monitoring operations in the Adriatic in July 1992. These operations were undertaken in support of the UN arms embargo against all republics of the former Yugoslavia (according to UNSC Resolution 713) and the sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) according to UNSC Resolution 757 (Hava Harp Akademisi Komutanlığı, 2004:7). The joint NATO/WEU Operation *Sharp Guard* began on 15 June 1993 replacing the separate NATO and WEU operations.¹⁰⁰ *Sharp Guard* was performed by NATO STANAVFORMED in the Adriatic Sea in parallel with the operations of UNPROFOR and IFOR. To monitor and enforce compliance with UN sanctions in accordance with UNSC Resolutions, the Turkish Navy assigned 2 Frigates: one as a duty ship and the other as a support vessel (TCG *Kocatepe* a destroyer and a mine ship), and a Tanker and a Mine Sweeper to operation *Sharp Guard*. In total, 18 frigates, 2 submarines, 4 tanker vessels and about 5,000 personnel participated in the operation from 13 July 1992 to 2 October 1996 when the operation ended (Turkish General Staff, 2001:9).

Turkey participated in aerial monitoring and the implementation of the flight ban operations in the airspace of Bosnia-Herzegovina with 1 F-16 Squadron from 25 April 1993 to 20 December 1995. In order to supervise the flight ban enforced by the UN on Bosnia-Herzegovina airspace, Turkey contributed to Operation *Deny Flight*

¹⁰⁰ *NATO Handbook*, Chronology, p. 453, and Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe, Updated: 18-August-2003, AFSOUTH Fact sheets, Operation *Sharp Guard* at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/SharpGuard/SharpGuardFactSheet.htm>

with a F16 Squadron consisting of 18 airplanes. They were based at the Ghedi Air Base in Italy to support SFOR operations. First, this squadron was assigned to Operation *Deny Flight* and the Turkish aircraft flew more than 2,820 hours in this operation. From 14 October 1995, the number of aircraft has been gradually reduced to the current strength of 5 aircraft. In addition, 13 F-16s are assigned a 72 hours on-call status in Turkey. In total, 12 F-16 fighter squadrons and 2,500 personnel participated in the operation from the beginning to the present.¹⁰¹

Operation *Active Endeavour* evolved out of NATO's immediate response to the terrorist attacks against the United States of 11 September 2001. Turkey, a longtime NATO ally and one of the strongest naval powers in the eastern Mediterranean, contributed to Operation *Active Endeavour* which began on 26 October 2001 with a frigate and an oil tanker.

3.2.2.4. EU-led Force (EUFOR)

At its Summit on 28 June 2004, NATO had decided to bring SFOR to a conclusion by the end of the year as a result of the improved security situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the wider region. On 25 November, the EU Council adopted the decision to launch a military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina named EUFOR-Operation *Althea*. This decision followed the unanimous adoption on 22 November 2004 of UNSC Resolution 1575 and enabled the EU to launch Operation *Althea* on 2 December 2004.¹⁰²

Under the EUFOR badge, Turkish troops are serving in three locations: as field troops, in the EUFOR headquarter and in the Integrated Police Unit (IPU)

¹⁰¹ Turkish General Staff, Peace Support Operation Briefing, 22 May 2002

¹⁰² *Istanbul Summit Communique*, Press Release (2004), Brussels, NATO, 2004. Updated: 28-June-2004 NATO Press Releases (2004)096 at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>

regiment. Out of the 6,270 troops contributed to EUFOR, Turkey has some 350 troops committed to EUFOR.¹⁰³ The majority of the Turkish troops are deployed in Zenica, working in the Multinational Task Force North (MNTF (N)) which is commanded by Finnish officers, where they carry out the normal framework operations. In addition to this, there are some 40 military personnel located in 6 different Liaison Observation Teams (LOT) providing the Commander of MNTF (N) with valuable situational awareness about the local communities. In both EUFOR and NATO headquarters there are 18 Turkish officers and NCO's working in different positions. Twenty three Turkish Gendarmerie officers and NCO's are part of the Integrated Police Unit.

3.2.3. Kosovo Force (KFOR)

Turkey also contributed to peace operations in Kosovo in the Balkans. The Kosovo Turkish Force was established in 1998. The Kosovo Turkish Battalion Task Force (Kosovo TBTF) Command was organized with the formation of other components under the joint command of the second Mechanized Infantry Battalion of the 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade on 21 March 1999. The 987-troop TBTF, comprised of two Mechanized Infantry Companies, one Tank Company and elements of Combat Support Units, was equipped with the most modern arms, vehicles and equipment and was subjected to orientation military training aimed at carrying out peace operation missions.

After completing its preparations, Kosovo TBTF set off to Kosovo from its camp in Mamak, Ankara on 1 July 1999 by air, railway and highway. It completed its transition on 4 July 1999 in Prizren and took over responsibility of its area, which

¹⁰³ EU military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Operation EUFOR - Althea) at http://www.euforbih.org/organisation/050810_strength.htm

had a with large Turkish population (Prizren, Dragas and Mamusa regions), in Kosovo on 13 July 1999. Upon bilateral agreements, Azerbaijan and Georgian platoons joined the TBTF on 28 September 1999.¹⁰⁴ Since 1999, the TBTF, including platoons from Azerbaijan and Georgia, have been conducting peace operations in its area of responsibility and exerting intensive efforts by mobilizing all its sources, to the people of Kosovo with no discrimination, in order to meet their urgent humanitarian requirements. The Kosovo TBTF is conducting its mission with Tactical Control given to the Multinational Brigade Southwest-MNB (SW) which is responsible for the Southwest sector. The MNB (SW) is comprised of task forces from 13 nations (Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey).¹⁰⁵

The Turkish Battalion area of responsibility (AOR) covers downtown Dragash and 22 villages, the Mamusha area including 5 villages, and a district of downtown Prizren together with 6 surrounding villages.¹⁰⁶ The length of the TBTF AOR border is 81 km. The AOR of the Turkish unit is 540 km². The TBTF is unique KFOR unit because it has in its AOR, two neighboring countries. Although TBTF is officially called the “Dragash Battalion” among KFOR units, Turkey refers to it as the “Turkish Battalion”.¹⁰⁷ The TBTF is deployed in five different camps. The majority of the TBTF is located in Sultan Murat Camp in Prizren, while one Mechanized Infantry Company is in the Dragash Area and another Mechanized Infantry Company

¹⁰⁴ “Kosova Barış Gücü Brifingi-Kosovo Peace Force Briefing,” unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Kosovo (Unclassified)

¹⁰⁵ Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, Multinational Brigade Southwest at http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/mnb_southwest.htm

¹⁰⁶ “The Turkish Battalion, Brothers in arms,” *KFOR Chronicle*, 2002 No.3, p.9

¹⁰⁷ “Task Force Dragas,” *KFOR Chronicle*, 29-Apr-2003, No.4, p.14

is in the Mamusha Area. Some units are deployed in Pristina at KFOR headquarter. Finally, the Maintenance platoon is in Skopje at KFOR headquarters Rear.

Presently, the TBTF is composed of a Battalion Headquarters Company, two motorized infantry companies and one mechanized infantry company as a combat force. It also has one logistical support unit, Liaison and Observation Teams (LOT)¹⁰⁸ and a National support unit. In addition, both Georgian and Azerbaijan platoons contribute to KFOR as a subunit of the TBTF in its AOR. One of the motorized infantry companies is deployed in Mamusa province, 13 km. north of Prizren, while the other motorized company is deployed in Dragas, 25 km. south of Prizren. The National support unit is situated in Pristine and the other units of the TBTF are situated in the Printex Factory in the Prizren region (Sultan Ahmet Camp). A team of the TBTF has also served for a month under the command of the French Brigade in Mitroviça region between September-October 2002.

In parallel with the reduction of the policies of NATO units, the Kosovo TBTF reduced its size to 300 troops on 15 June 2002. The Tank Company and Combat Support Company in the formation of the TBTF were abolished and replaced by the 6th Mechanized Infantry Company. The TBTF is currently comprised of 384 personnel. In addition, 10 officers and 2 NCOs serve in critical and active positions at KFOR headquarter for a 6-month period. Turkey is tenth among the contributing countries of KFOR in terms of resources allocated.

The mission of the TBTF was to ensure establishment and maintenance of peace and security within its area of responsibility and to take necessary measures in

¹⁰⁸ The Liaison and Observation Team (LOT) is a group of soldiers who live not in a military camp but in civilian accommodation among the local population providing the dynamic, responsive and locally-based 'public face' of the Turkish contingent.

order to remove every kind of factor which may hinder its mission in future.¹⁰⁹ The main task of the Kosovo TBTF is to ensure and supervise the implementation of Resolution 1244 and the Military-Technical Agreement signed by NATO and the Republic of Federal Yugoslavia, and the responsibilities accepted by Serbian Forces and Kosovo Liberation Army with the aim of carrying out peace operation in its AOR.

The tasks of the Turkish Contingent / MNB (SW) are two fold; Operational and Humanitarian as follows: Operationally: to deter Serbia from attacking Kosovo and to defend Kosovo in case of any aggression as a subunit of KFOR; to maintain peace and security within its area of responsibility, to provide a safe and secure environment for all citizens living in Kosovo; to ensure the region and border security of Kosovo; to conduct patrol and maintain checkpoint; to monitor, reconnaissance and patrol within its area of responsibility and on the zone of separation; to conduct point and area operations; to conduct search operations; to monitor the DRAGAS and TUZSUZ quarter in Prizren; to continue force protection and military training; to win and reinforce the confidence of the population in its AOR for Turkish Republic, Turkish Armed Forces and KFOR, and; to perform military exercises for improving and maintaining sufficient combat force.¹¹⁰

In humanitarian terms the main task was to work in cooperation with international organizations such as UNICEF, UNMIK, OSCE and NGOs within its area of responsibility. Others were limited to medical care by military doctors, distribution of the humanitarian aid or food, firewood, educational materials,

¹⁰⁹ “Kosova Barış Gücü Brifingi-Kosovo Peace Force Briefing,” unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Kosovo (Unclassified)

¹¹⁰ KFOR Contingent: Turkey, as of 29 May 2006, Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/nations/turkey.htm>

educational programs, infrastructure construction, school repair work, medical care by military doctors.¹¹¹

As for the Operation *Allied Force*, Turkey contributed to this force through two means. It assigned one F-16 Fighter Squadrons consisting of 10 F-16 aircraft.¹¹² They were based in Ghedi Air base in Italy and then NATO asked Turkey to contribute additional aircraft and air bases. Upon these requests, Turkey assigned its second F-16 Fighter Squadron including 8 air craft and three tanker crafts as “on-call” status in Bandırma air base and it opened its air bases including Bandırma, Balıkesir and Çorlu air bases as a second means. NATO planned to deploy 36 F-16 aircraft to Bandırma, 62 F-15 to Balıkesir and 9 tanker aircraft to Çorlu airbases. As 12 F-16 aircraft were being deployed to Bandırma Airbase the peace agreement was signed, the deployment plan was cancelled, and the allied aircraft redeployed. Turkey also assigned frigates, destroyers, and tanker and minesweeper vessels to support these operations (Turkish General Staff, 2001:10-12).

For the *Essential Harvest* Operation in Macedonia, a multinational force was established to disarm the armed militants in Macedonia. Turkey assigned a company to this force and this force became a subunit of the TBTF. The Turkish company served under the tactical control of the Italian Battalion from 11 to 23 September in 2001. After fulfilling its task successfully, the Turkish company returned to Turkey on 27 September 2001. Turkey also participated in Operation *Amber Fox* with staff elements (4 persons) between 27 September 2001 and 14 December 2002.

¹¹¹ KFOR Contingent: Turkey, as of 29 May 2006, Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/nations/turkey.htm>

¹¹² Detailed Information about this branch of the Turkish General Staff can be reached at <http://www.tsk.mil.tr/uluslararasi/barisidestekharekatkatki/index.htm>

3.2.4. International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF)

When it became clear that the September 11 attacks had originated from Afghanistan, the United States invoked Article V of NATO's Charter and launched a military operation, Operation Enduring Freedom, against the Taliban and the al-Qaeda. When Taliban rule in Afghanistan came to an end, it became possible to launch international initiatives to rebuild the country, and to send a multinational peacekeeping force to Afghanistan. Turkey showed its willingness to participate, even to lead, in the multinational peacekeeping force for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Turkey was among the first countries to announce its wish to participate. Turkish soldiers serving in Afghanistan received enthusiastic support among the public.

Turkish officials have argued that in the present unstable international environment peacekeeping is an inadequate form of ensuring security against aggression. They preferred peacemaking or peace enforcement mechanisms (Kirişçi, 1994:34). The Turkish government was quick to obtain parliamentary authorization in October 2001 to contribute troops to the U.S. campaign. The bill, which was met with public opposition (Turkish Daily News, 4 October 2001), also authorized the government to allow the stationing of foreign troops on Turkish territory and permit the use of Turkish airspace and airbases.¹¹³ Turkey emerged as one of the leading actors in the fight against terrorism; hence, it rigorously supported the international coalition. The Turkish government decided to contribute to the campaign by sending a unit of Special Forces to work with U.S. troops in humanitarian operations and train Northern Alliance fighters.

¹¹³ Turkey had already provided the U.S. with overflight rights in September shortly after the attacks: "Turkey opens airspace to US," *BBC News Online*, 22 September, 2001.

Within this framework, Turkey assumed the lead-nation role and took over the command of the ISAF II on June 20, 2002 for a period of six months in accordance with the decision of the Turkish government on 29 April 2002 and the adoption of the SCR 1413 of the UN on 23 May 2002. Personnel joined to the 28th Mechanized Brigade in Mamak/Ankara on 13 May 2002. The Turkish Battalion Task Force completed the preparations with its 624 personnel within the 28th Mechanized Brigade. Personnel were trained and informed about the organization, mission and mandates of ISAF and UN resolutions on ISAF for a three-week period. During this period of time, all personnel underwent medical testing and were vaccinated. The TBTF set off to Afghanistan from Mamak in Ankara on 4 June 2002 and took over responsibility of its area in Afghanistan on 30 June 2002. Since then, the TBTF has been conducting peace operation in its area of responsibility.

Turkish Battalion Task Force units were deployed in 10 camps; ISAF Headquarter camp, Kabul MNB camp, Kabul Airport Command camp, Turkish Battalion Task Force camp, 1st Turkish Company camp, 2nd Turkish Company camp, 3rd Turkish Company camp, Multinational Engineering Group camp and TV Height camp. A Turkish mechanized infantry brigade was deployed in Kabul. Turkish troops also have relieved forces from Iceland that have been responsible for security at ISAF's main logistical hub at Kabul Airport. In addition, both Albanian and Azerbaijan platoons contribute to ISAF as a subunit of the TBTF in its area of responsibility. During Turkey's tenure, ISAF VII troops were also deployed for the first time into parts of western Afghanistan, where rival militias have clashed repeatedly during the past three years.

The contribution of Turkey to ISAF began with a company sized unit comprised of approximately 300 soldiers and staff officers commissioned to the

ISAF and KMNH Headquarters on 19 February 2002. It also consisted of Azerbaijan and Albanian teams serving under the command of Turkish companies and 2 Macedonian officers serving in the Turkish Battalion Command. Furthermore, Turkey contributed nearly 270 troops to ISAF for the first six months and boosted its troops by 1000 after Turkey accepted command of the force.

Turkey initially deployed about 300 Special Forces troops in and around Kabul. In June 2002, Turkey assumed command of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, a multinational UN-mandated force for six months, to assist the Afghan government and the international community in maintaining security. After taking command of ISAF II, Turkey increased the number of its soldiers to 1,400 making it the largest contingent in the peacekeeping force. This number consisted of the TBTF reinforced with combat support and service, officers commissioned in the ISAF and KMNH Headquarters and Kabul Airport. Normally, Turkey should have handed over command of ISAF on 20 December 2002, but no country was ready to make this commitment. So, the UNSC extended Turkish leadership until 10 February 2003 (Zorlu, 2003:36). On 10 February 2003, Turkey turned over leadership to the joint command of Germany and the Netherlands. After turning over command, Turkey has continued to support ISAF with a 180-man military unit. In May 2004, Turkey sent three helicopters and 56 flight and maintenance personnel to work in ISAF. After taking command of ISAF VII on 13 February 2005, Turkey increased the number of its soldiers from 240 to 1,600 in Kabul.¹¹⁴

Currently, Turkey participates in the NATO-led ISAF operation in Afghanistan with 180 officers and NCOs and 555 troops, including 3 utility

¹¹⁴ Sabah Newspaper, 13 February 2005

helicopters (UH-60) and support personnel. In addition, 9 Turkish civilians are deployed to help man the Kabul International Airport. Moreover, since January 2004, Mr. Hikmet Çetin, ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, has served as the Senior Civilian Representative of NATO in Kabul, thus making use of the privileges of a long-lasting Turkish-Afghan friendship with the aim of furthering the Alliance's goal of establishing peace and stability in Afghanistan. On August 2005, Turkey turned over leadership to Italy.

The task of the contingent in Afghanistan was to contribute to peace and security of the Afghan people and the stability and welfare of Afghanistan. Turkish command gave first priority, during the course of its term of duty, to help the Afghan Transitional Government to ensure security and stability in Kabul and its environs (Yeğenoğlu, 2005). In practice the tasks of the TBTF are; providing security for its own units, establishing check points, monitoring and patrolling within its area of responsibility and on the zone of separation, conducting point and area operations, carrying out info operation, contributing to CIMIC activities, advising military and police training and running the military part of the Kabul airport.¹¹⁵ Patrolling teams of the TBTF carried out the tasks as follows: representing the Turkish Republic and Turkish Armed Forces in the best way, providing full control in the AOR, assisting in providing a secure environment in coordination and cooperation with local security forces, gathering information, establishing communication between ISAF and local people and determining the reaction of the local people to the existing applications.

The push toward the transformation of Turkish armed forces in a peacekeeping friendly manner and the decision to send Turkish troops abroad has

¹¹⁵ "ISAF Peace Force Briefing," unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Afghanistan, 2004

mainly come from the military. Before his appointment as Chief of the General Staff in 1998, then Land Forces Commander General, Hüseyin Kıvrıkoğlu argued that the military must become a “force primarily used against external and internal threats that target Turkey’s territorial integrity and the republic regime.” Kıvrıkoğlu moved beyond a mission of deterrence and strategic defense to say that the “rapid deployment of the military in distant places is of vital importance in view of the threats we face and the risks and responsibilities that we may assume.” He outlined a modernization program to provide strategic mobility for joint operations to strike beyond Turkey’s borders.¹¹⁶

Kıvrıkoğlu stated that Turkey needed to develop operational capabilities for ‘forward engagement’ and ‘forward defense’ in addition to deterrence and collective security.¹¹⁷ The White Paper 2000 of the Ministry of National Defense demonstrates the changes in the Turkish military and in Turkey’s foreign policy. According to this book, Turkey’s military strategy rests on four distinct points; deterrence, collective security, forward defense and military contribution to crisis management and intervention in crises. The last two points reflect a departure from previous strategies.¹¹⁸ In 2000, then Foreign Minister İsmail Cem argued that “being well aware of our global and regional role in the pursuit of peace, prosperity and stability, our policy in this regard has been to help reduce tensions and contain conflicts, to encourage the propagation of democracy and the rule of law, with a view to creating

¹¹⁶ “KKK ve Kuvvet 2000, Söyleşi,” *Savunma Ve Havacılık*, Mönch Publishing Group, 12(3):10-18

¹¹⁷ *Ulusal Strateji*, March-April 1999, 68-73

¹¹⁸ *White Paper*, 2000:36
<http://www.msb.gov.tr/Birimler/GnPPD/GnPPDBeyazKitap.htm#WHITE%20PAPER>

a peaceful and stable environment around us.” For this reason Turkey has been actively involved in peace operations and multinational efforts.¹¹⁹

3.3. Explaining Turkey’s Participation in Peace Operations

Having examined the cases involving the deployment of Turkish troops abroad, this section will analyze different sets of motivations behind Turkey’s participation in peace operations. Turkey’s approach to peace operations has been, to a significant degree, informed by the ideational concern of being recognized as a member of the western international community. Participation in such operations has been an identity-constructing activity in the sense that Turkey has tried to reinforce its eroding western identity through participating in peace operations. Despite this ideational motivation, alternative explanations can also be offered as to why Turkey has been increasingly involved in peace operations. Theoretically speaking, security-related considerations in a neo-realist vein may offer a rival account. Another explanation might prioritize the efforts of pressure groups and domestic factors inside the country as the main motivating factor.

3.3.1. Security-related Factors

This explanation is based on the assumption that Turkey’s participation in peace operations has been a function of its security needs. These factors may be discussed under the subheadings: Political-Strategic; Turkey’s Security Challenges and Security Culture; Importance of the Balkans; Organizational Factor and Operational Factor.

¹¹⁹ My country and NATO, Turkey, NATO : the way to the future Last update:29 June. 1999, Ismail Cem, Foreign Minister of Turkey at <http://www.nato.int/turkey/turkey3.htm>.

3.3.1.1. Political-Strategic

The post-Cold War era marked the downfall of the bipolar system that had governed the understanding and conduct of international relations since the end of the Second World War (Mawlawi, 1993: 391-413). With the end of the Cold War, the international system changed from a rigid bipolar' system to a fluid, interim, transforming and globalizing international society. The two superpowers of the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union, agreed to undertake joint efforts to contain regional conflicts rather than preventing the UN from taking effective action. This led to the revitalization of the Security Council and the revival of the UN to maintain peace and security.

The UN has two main purposes. The first is to establish and maintain international peace and security. The second is to improve the political, economic, and social justice of the world's peoples. During the Cold War, the first purpose was more important than the second for the UN because of the conditions of the international system. The most important values of the UN were the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the states as elaborated above. Because of the nature of the bipolar system, the UN could not concentrate on the second purpose and was not concerned with issues such as human security, the protection of human rights, the internal aspects of self-determination and social and economic development.

International systemic changes of the post-Cold War have put the UN in a significantly different situation from the Cold War. Nations that have been oppressed during the Cold War discovered an opportunity for independence in the post-Cold War era. Thus, values such as human rights, self-determination, the rule of law, and fostering social and economic cooperation became more important than the values of sovereignty and territorial integrity. The interpretation of the principle of self-

determination went beyond decolonization. Pursuing objectives like respect for human rights and the rule of law required greater intrusion into the domestic affairs of states than does the maintenance of peace. The UN Security Council interpreted the UN Charter in a more flexible way. Thus, humanitarian intervention came to the forefront.

The end of the Cold War affected the states as well. Developed states have realized that in order to continue improving world living conditions they need security and stability. Therefore, developed countries are naturally extremely concerned about maintaining a stable and secure world, by preventing conflicts or at least containing them as fast as possible. Since the power configuration is not so rigid as in the Cold War era, states can easily maneuver in the post-Cold War. In order to show their respect for the values of the United Nations, developed nations actively participated in peace operations. Turkey is one of the countries that were most deeply affected by the changes in the international system and new values of the post-Cold War.

When the systemic changes following the dissolution of the Soviet Union increased Turkey's vulnerability to regional security concerns, Ankara growingly saw involvement in peace operations, as well as developing its peace keeping capabilities, as an effective security strategy. In this view, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the transformation of the political and strategic landscape of Eastern Europe and Central Asia and the eruption of violent ethno-national conflicts in the Balkans and the Caucasus affected Turkey negatively (Sayarı, 2000:169-182). Turkey found itself at the very center of crises areas, where ultra-nationalist, aggressive and irredentist tendencies were vibrant. Unlike the Cold War era, Turkey geopolitically has become a unique country bordering several regions very different

from each other (Kirişçi, 1997:1). The new security environment created a range of opportunities on the one hand, but posed new risks and different kinds of security challenges for Turkish security policy on the other hand. In contrast with the Cold War era, Turkey's security concerns increased, its security burden became overloaded, and the new security issues influenced Turkey's security understanding.

3.3.1.2. Turkey's Security Challenges and Security Culture

The post-Cold War era confronts Turkish security with a series of potential risks and threats not common to the Cold War era (Sezer, 1995:169). Turkey's security challenges have changed in fundamental ways in the post-Cold War era. Turkey's security horizons are now much wider than they were during the Cold War. First of all, challenges to Turkey's security and foreign policy have been multidirectional. The changes in the post-Cold War era steered Turkey's attention toward the Balkans, the Middle East, the Black Sea, Caucasus and Central Asia (Kirişçi, 1997:16). In parallel to such tectonic changes in Turkey's neighbourhood, not only have traditional threats to Turkey's security increased, but Turkey has also become increasingly exposed to the side effects of intra-state conflicts in all of these regions. As a result, since the end of the Cold War, the new risks and challenges that could affect the western world have fundamentally transformed Turkey from 'flank' to a 'front state.' Turkey is one of the few western countries whose importance has increased in the post-Cold War period (Bir, 1998). Turkey suddenly appears to have been propelled to the forefront of international politics (Kirişçi, 1994:1).

There are sixteen potential crisis areas as determined by NATO experts: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Sandjak, Kosova, Albania, Macedonia, Nagorno-Karabagh in Azerbaijan, Chechnya, Abkhazia in Georgia, Georgia-South Ossetia, Northern Iraq,

Iran, Syria, Cyprus, Vojvodina, Privlaka and Belarus (Bağcı, 2001:596). Indeed, 13 of the 16 conflict scenarios are said to involve regions in the immediate periphery of Turkey. The Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East are regions around Turkey and any possible future international intervention in one of these areas would have direct implications for Turkey's national security interests (Öymen, 2001:56). Kibaroglu (2002) argues that six of these scenarios require direct involvement by Turkey. It has come under the impact of the some of these crises and wars in the region during the 1990s such as the 1990-1991 Gulf War, the Bosnia-Serbia war of 1992-1995, the Kosovo problem, the Armenian invasion of Azerbaijani territory, the Abkhazian problem in Georgia, the Russian involvement in the Caucasus problems and the Chechnya uprising. In addition, its unresolved dispute with Greece over Cyprus and the Aegean pose serious security risks.

The Gulf War created some serious dangers for Turkey. This war created a power vacuum in the region. The breakdown of regional order and stability that began with the Bosnian crisis and continued with the Kosovo conflict placed the Balkans high on the agenda of Turkey's regional security concerns. Turkey is exposed to spillover risks associated with instability in the Russian near-abroad since the ethnic fighting took place close to its borders and involved Turkic and other Muslim peoples with whom Turkey has historic ties.

During the Cold War, Turkey was concerned by the existence of a direct military attack by an enemy. In the post-Cold War era, not only hard-security concerns remained relevant but also soft-security issues have increasingly occupied Turkey's security agenda. Soft security issues such as, ethnic nationalism, religious fundamentalism, ethnic or religious terrorism, social and economic instabilities, illicit trafficking of arms and drugs, refugees and illegal migration became issues of

concern. These issues occupy Turkey's security agenda more than ever before. For the first time since the Second World War, Ankara faced sudden mass movements of refugees into the country (Kirişçi, 1994:20).

The proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) that is strongly believed to exist in the Middle East is another concern to Turkey (Kibaroglu, 1998:173). Turkey is within range of all sorts of WMD that could be launched from Iran, Iraq, and Syria and this exposure is likely to grow in the future as more countries in the region acquire ballistic missile technology and the capability to deploy WMD (Egeli, 1993:8). The absence of Turkish anti-missile capability makes Turkey vulnerable to its three Middle Eastern neighbors amply equipped with WMD (Kirişçi, 1998:22). Ankara sees various kinds of terrorism as one of the greatest threats to its national and global security interests. Moreover, Turkey has faced domestic challenges from Kurdish separatists. The emergence of a power vacuum in northern Iraq following the first Gulf War increased Turkey's exposure to PKK terrorist attacks. Finally, its security has been challenged by the multi-institutionalization of the international security architecture in Europe. During the Cold War years, NATO was the only security framework to protect Turkey's security. In the new era, although NATO is still the most important one, there emerged new organizations with security agendas in addition to NATO.

These challenges to Turkey's foreign and security policy led to fundamental changes in Turkey's national security culture and have made it possible for Turkey to consider more flexible regional policies (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000:210) and to pay more attention to regional cooperative security and multilateralism in foreign affairs. Turkey modified some of its traditional foreign policy principles and undertook new initiatives to meet the challenges of the post-Cold War era (Sayarı, 2000:169). In the

aftermath of the Cold War, Turkish foreign policy gradually lost its reactive characteristics and became increasingly active and assertive in international politics (Kirişçi, 1994:10). Minister of Defence Hikmet Sami Türk concurs: Geographic destiny placed Turkey in the virtual epicentre of a 'Bermuda Triangle' of post-Cold War volatility and uncertainty, with the Balkans, the Caucasus, and the Middle East encircling us. Rather than isolating ourselves from the pressing conflicts at our doorstep, Turkey decided to assume a pivotal role in promoting regional peace, stability and cooperation in contributing to vital efforts to end human suffering and conflict.¹²⁰

After the Cold War, since the changing circumstances have bestowed upon Turkey a special responsibility to actively contribute to the preservation of regional and global peace and stability, Turkey began to pay particular attention to joint action and cooperation in regional problems and incidents that occur in different areas of the world, military partnership agreements (Udum, 2002:73), regional cooperative security and multilateralism in foreign affairs. Turkey's interest in cooperative security and multilateralism extended from its willing involvement in the Gulf War and participation in peace operations to the initiation of regional arrangements such as the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000:210).

3.3.1.3. Importance of the Balkans

It is in such a context that the Balkans became the first area where Turkey played an influential role in peacekeeping diplomacy. Following the fragmentation of Yugoslavia, regional stability was seriously undermined. Violent ethno nationalist

¹²⁰ See Hikmet Sami Türk, 'Turkish Defense Policy,' speech delivered at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 3 March 1999. at <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/media/samiturk.htm>

conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo increased the possibility that a major conflict could spill over into Turkey. To prevent the escalation of the conflicts in the Balkans, Turkey embarked on an activist diplomacy (Çalış, 2001:135-146). Turkey advocated strong measures against Serbia and Serbian militias. The Turkish government had been very active in raising the issue in variety of forums ranging from the Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) to the Conference on Security and Cooperation (CSCE). At these forums the Turkish government expressed its readiness to contribute troops to any peacekeeping force that would be established. This was the first time that Turkey declared its willingness to join an international force since 1950 (Kirişçi, 1994:1-43).

The Balkans has been a fertile ground for conflicts that have characterized the fundamental change in the political and security environment in the region during the post-Cold War era. Turkey attached importance to the creation of an atmosphere of understanding and peaceful co-habitation through closer ties among the Balkan countries, which would lead to the preservation of peace and stability in the region. Thus, Turkey's approach to the conflicts in the Balkans has not been confined to merely the cessation of hostilities, but has also pursued a policy aimed at creating a durable climate of understanding conducive to cooperation across the region. In this respect, Turkey has been at the forefront of international efforts to settle the Bosnian and Kosovo conflicts.¹²¹ Since the outbreak of conflicts in Kosovo, Turkey has insistently called on the international community for the prevention of further atrocities and tragedies and urged the finding of a just and lasting solution to the problem. It pursued an active policy and supported a peaceful solution that would

¹²¹ Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Balkans, Last Updated: 29.11.2005 at <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Synopsis/SYNOPSISIS.htm>

maintain the independence, unity and territorial integrity of Kosovo.¹²² The Balkans, as a region, has played a significant role in European and world history. This strategically sensitive region is Turkey's gateway to continental Europe.

The Balkan Peninsula is of great importance to Turkey, due to its links with Europe. It is an important bridge to Europe for Turkey. Ankara has legitimate interests in the arrangements that are being worked out in the area. It has a benevolent, real and important influence in serving the interests of peace and stability in this part of the world. Turkey has major interests in terms of its security in maintaining peace and security in the Balkans (Hava Harp Akademisi Komutanlığı, 2004: 9). If a lasting peace had not been established and the peace process comes to a dead end, the fighting may spread to Muslim areas of Sandzak on the Serbian Montenegro border and from there to Kosovo. Albania may also intervene to protect the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. As the Republic of Macedonia has a 30 per cent Albanian population, it might join in. Greece might then assist Serbia while Turkey and Bulgaria may enter to assist Bosnia (Sharp, 1993:31). So events may progress in a direction that Turkey does not wish and thus pose a threat to Turkey's security.

Turkey's efforts to pursue a more assertive role in the Balkans, particularly by joining the peace operations, also reflected the impact of Turkish-Greek strategic rivalry on Ankara's decisions. Greece was the only country that could compete with Turkey regarding political and economic influence in the region (Oğuzlu, 2003: 45-62). Turkey's present approach to peace operations in the Balkans has been influenced to an extent, by its past experiences with Greece. Greece pursued irredentist Pan-hellenic policies or the Megali Idea which aimed at unifying all Greeks. Implications of Balkan nationalism left its imprint on current Turkish-Greek

¹²² *Balkanlar ve Türkiye'nin Bölgeye Yönelik Politikaları Sempozyumu*, 15-16 December 1998, Harp Akademileri Basımevi, Yeni Levent, İstanbul, 1999

relations, creating a mutual distrust between the two nations. Given that one of the pillars of Turkey's security culture consists of the continuation of the strategic balance with Greece in and around the Balkans, the Aegean Sea and Cyprus, Turkey's participation in peace operations in these regions would result in the gain of its relative strategic advantages vis-à-vis Greece.

Turkey pursued peace and stability in its region and contributed to peace operations in Kosovo in order to help the settlement of the refugees and to heal the wounds caused by humanitarian disaster. It perceived that developments in Kosovo were products of a revisionist policy and this policy has provided crimes against humanity. Therefore, Kosovo problem should be prevented from escalating more.¹²³ From this perspective, Turkey's participation in peace operations in the Balkans and the Caucasus can also be seen as a strategic action aiming at helping bolster Turkey's regional standings vis-a-vis other regional actors, namely Greece in the Balkans and Russia in Caucasus. The rise of the new Turkic republics in Central Asia and the Caucasus after the disintegration of the former Soviet Union provided Turkey with another important opportunity to expand its regional influence through an activist foreign policy (Sayarı, 2000:172). Throughout the Cold War period, Turkey's relations with Central Asia and the Caucasus were almost nonexistent despite common ethnic and cultural ties. Turkey wants to keep good relations with these countries and help them resolve disputes through peaceful means in the post-Cold War era. The eruption of ethnic and secessionist conflicts in Georgia, Nagorno-Karabakh and Chechnya raised Turkish concerns about their impact on stability and energy security in the Caucasus (Sayarı, 2000:173).

¹²³ *Balkanlar ve Türkiye'nin Bölgeye Yönelik Politikaları Sempozyumu*, 15-16 December 1998, Harp Akademileri Basımevi, Yeni Levent, İstanbul, 1999

3.3.1.4. Organizational Factor

In response to Turkey's growing exposure to a constellation of hard and soft security threats, Turkey's security policy makers should have increasingly found it necessary to improve the operational capabilities of the TAF. Turkey's attainment of soft and hard military security capabilities would make it a more credible and influential power in the region. In parallel to the concept of forward defense, Turkish security policy makers should have found it necessary to transform the TAF from a conscript based conventional army into a professionalizing army consisting of highly mobile and technologically equipped military units (Hickok, 2000: 105-120).

However, the critical point here is that the transformation of the Turkish Armed Forces with a view to dealing with new type of security threats would be seen more legitimate were this transformation process carried out as part of Turkey's efforts to join peacekeeping operations organized under the leadership of the western international community. This is an instrumentalist approach to peacekeeping. The goal is to help legitimize Turkey's efforts to modernize its army, not to eliminate possible sources of insecurity.

Turkey's participation in peace operations could be mainly attributed to the patterns of the Turkish post-Cold War security culture that in Karaosmanoğlu's (2000) terms could be characterized as "defensive realpolitic" aiming at the preservation of the balance of power and status quo. Turkey's security culture has been a facilitator factor in this regard. If a peacekeeping is envisaged to contribute to the smooth functioning of the balance of power system (regional or global), then it should not impair the validity of the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. It should essentially defend the status quo (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002:91).

Turkey has a large standing army with accumulated experience in peacekeeping and as such it could spare its troops for such a mission (Makovsky, 2002: 42, 44). The presence of Turkish soldiers in peace operations wouldn't be only a success but also for prestige. The TAF could show its military capabilities to the other countries contributing troops and to the world for deterrence. By contributing to peace operations, Turkey wants to increase the respect of its armed forces much more among the other countries' armed forces. The contribution to UNOSOM II would gain prestige for Turkey in the international arena. The Turkish Republics in Central Asia, which share historic, cultural, religious and language links with Turkey, were about to gain their independence from the USSR. In the international arena, the positive situation, which resulted from the close links of Turkey with the Turkish Republics, would be more reinforced by contributing to UNOSOM and the assignment of General Çevik Bir as commander to UNOSOM II.

The operation in Afghanistan shows that Turkey is a significant component of not only its region, but also world security environment. Turkey's taking over the command of ISAF VII is the result of NATO's commitments. By making the strategic decision to take part in the Bosnian crisis actively by contributing to the UN and NATO forces also in the military realm, Turkey wants to have a say politically as well in the future political landscape of not only Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also the Balkans (Hava Harp Akademisi Komutanlığı, 2004:9). The active participation of Turkey in IFOR, SFOR EUFOR, KFOR and ISAF was in line with its policy on peace operations, as it evolved in the post-Cold War era with its participation in UNOSOM II. This was in full harmony with the prevailing security understanding of the time period under consideration. This time, through participating in the peace operations aforementioned, it could show its military capabilities and ability to

project power abroad, and thus expand the Turkish sphere of influence (Bağcı and Kardaş, 2003:5). Earlier, Turkey focused strictly on protecting borders and maintaining internal order during the Cold War era instead of projecting power and contributing to peace operations.

Apart from Turkey's limited participation in Somalia, Turkey's role in the ISAF II can be considered as the first example of Turkey's command of a multinational peacekeeping force. The Turkish Army wanted to have the chance to prove that it could be successful as a regional power in order to assume greater responsibilities. By making this strategic decision and taking an active role in the military realm, Turkey sought to have a say in the future political landscape of not only Afghanistan, but also Central Asia. As in the cases of Somalia, Bosnia, Kosova and Afghanistan, Turkey wants to improve the capabilities of its armed forces through carrying out operations in different geographical areas and climatic conditions by participating actively in peace operations in these regions. Because peace operations demand special expertise, Turkey's involvement in peace operations in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan was hoped to increase the professionalization of the Turkish Armed Forces.

Through participating actively in the peace operation in Somalia, the Turkish Army would gain international experience in peace operations, which it could not gain during the Cold War era. It could also share its capabilities with other troop contributing countries and benefit from their experiences in peace operations. Turkish army personnel would gain international experience and improve their English language skills, to enhance the international experience of the Turkish Army related to peace operations, to increase the prestige of Turkish Army among other countries' armies. Operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan show that Turkey is an

important element not only for the security environment of its region but also the security environment of the world.

3.3.1.5. Operational Factor

Turkey wants to show that the Turkish Army has accumulated experience, knowledge and the ability to make plans at the operational and strategic level and carry out these plans in multinational operations and conflictual situations. Contributing to ISAF would increase the Turkish Army's experience in peace operations carried out in an international environment. Most of all, Turkey would rise to be in a position of a "planning country" rather than a "supporting country." As Turkey is a country located in the middle of current and potential conflicts, the TAF has become familiar with many kinds of threats, especially in the context of terrorism for many years. The TAF is the one military force who gained the most training, experience and success in the struggle against terrorism in the world.¹²⁴ Turkey succeeded in beating the terrorists inside and ensured peace at home. The success would boost its respect in the international arena, particularly in its region, and it might play bigger roles in peace operations in the future. It would find an opportunity to share its experiences with terrorism with the other countries' armies and to benefit from their experiences.

Turkey wanted to contribute to peace operations in Afghanistan to share its expertise and experiences about terrorism with other countries and to benefit from the experiences of other countries, as well. Additionally, contributing to ISAF would provide an important deterrent for similar terrorist activities which might happen in

¹²⁴ It can be disputed as there are claims that the UK forces are world leaders in anti-terrorism activities due to their long history in Northern Ireland. Israel also has impressive credentials. However, Turkey has this kind of expertise especially in mountainous area.

Turkey. Through participating in peace operations in Afghanistan, Turkey had the chance to contribute its concrete support to the war against terrorism. It suffered from terrorism for more than 30 years and lost thousands of its citizens. The decision to assume command of ISAF demonstrated Turkey's willingness to assume a leadership role in the war against terrorism and its resolve to combat terrorism.

This dissertation argues that even though Turkey's security has come under serious challenges because of regional developments, this cannot convincingly explain Turkey's participation in peace operations. Stated somewhat differently, such regional security threats are not compelling enough as the primary factor for Turkey to seek its security through peace operations. Ankara has not behaved as such in order to increase its security. Due to its well-established security culture, members of the Turkish military and foreign policy elites have tended to think that their country's participation in peace operations was the result of close strategic security relations with the European powers within NATO (Aydın, 2003a:163-184 and Aydın, 2003b: 306-331).

Turkey did not join peace operations because it felt itself threatened by the developments in those nearly crisis situations. Neither the crisis in the Balkans nor in Caucasus seriously threatened Turkey's vital security interests. Besides, Turkey's own conventional military capabilities would likely deter possible aggressors. Moreover, how could the neo-realist logic explain Turkey's active involvement in the US led peace operations in Somalia or in Afghanistan where Turkey did not have clear security interests, but probably only some indirect concerns? This remains a puzzle.

3.3.2. Domestic Factors

This explanation is based on the assumption that Turkey's participation in peace operations has been a function of its domestic factors. These factors may be discussed under the subheadings as: Public Opinion and Pressure Groups; Historical and Cultural Factors; Religion; Refugees and Economics.

3.3.2.1. Public Opinion and Pressure Groups

Another set of factors accounting for Turkey's involvement in peace operations in the post-Cold War era has been the role of public opinion combined with the evolving concerns of security elites. These factors suggest that ethnic conflicts in its neighborhood generated extensive concern in Turkey due to the presence of large numbers of Turks who had immigrated from nearby regions, particularly the Balkans, over the years (Çelikpala, 2006:423-446). Indeed, in Turkey, civil society institutions are not only relatively weak, but have not been interested in security issues for most of the Republic's history. Although in recent years there has been an upsurge of interest in foreign policy issues, due to 'lobbies drawn from communities within Turkey that trace their origins to such place as Bosnia or Azerbaijan' (Lesser 2000: 184) and a coalition of civil society actors pushing for EU membership, a similar dynamism is not observed in issues involving security and defence. Ankara's security concerns regarding the Balkans have two dimensions. One is related to the traditional rivalries between the Balkan states, such as, for example, the Turkish-Greek conflict. The other dimension is concerned with the security of Turkish/Muslim minorities. These dimensions seem to be related to Turkey's participation in Balkans peace operations.

Some people in the Balkans have been drawn to Turkey for national, historical, cultural and religious reasons. In particular, Bosnians and Kosovars have always been closer to Turkey than other countries in the region and expected support from Turkey. Turks themselves are also an important ethnic minority in the region. Today, according to the 1994 census, about 77,000 Turks live in the Republic of Macedonia. In Kosovo, their number is estimated to be around 60,000, although the 1981 census put their number at around 11,000 (Kut, 2000:51).¹²⁵ According to this census in Kosovo, the Turkish population is centered in Prizren and its village Mamusa. The Turkish migration from Prizren to Turkey began in 1912. The largest migration from Prizren occurred between 1953 and 1964. Migration continued before and after the Kosovo war as well. According to a census in 1992, only 4,461 people had been recorded as Turkish. However, it is a reality that many more Turkish people live in Prizren today compared with 1992. Students in 5 primary schools in Prizren have been educated in Turkish. Today 70 percent of Prizren inhabitants speak Turkish. Some Albanians living in Prizren speak Turkish as well. Although the Turkish population has decreased in the region due to many factors, Prizren still maintains its peculiar Turkish character.¹²⁶

Turkey has had a domestic agenda as well. There are Turkish populations living in the Pristine, Gilan, Mitrovica and İpek regions. Many Bosnians, Kosovars and Albanians in the region have relatives in Turkey (mostly in Bursa, İstanbul and İzmir). From 1923 to 1990, more than 1.6 million people immigrated to Turkey, mostly from the Balkan countries. Turkey also experienced mass influxes of Albanians, Bosnian Muslims and Turks between 1992 and 1995 (Kirişçi, 2004:6).

¹²⁵ The most recent Kosovo census was taken in 1981.

¹²⁶ Kosova Barış Gücü Brifingi-Kosovo Peace Force Briefing, unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Kosovo (Unclassified)

They often come to Turkey to visit their relatives and for shopping. Moreover Turkey has linguistic and ethnic ties with Bosnians who live in the Balkans. Turkey feels responsible for other minorities and peoples that were also victims of the Bosnian conflict. Turkish soldiers contributed to UNPROFOR in order to provide and maintain peace and security not only for Turks but also other minorities living in this region. Turkey wants to solve its problems concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina.

There is a close link between security and states' legitimacy, which is thought to emanate from states' ability to meet the demands of their citizens. Unless states contribute to the welfare of their citizens, they may be regarded as illegitimate and possible sources of international instability and insecurity. States now increasingly feel themselves responsible for what happens in other states (Etzioni, 2006: 363-379). States are now held accountable for what happens within their territories. Similarly, the Turkish decision makers were of the opinion that unless Turkey contributed to the happiness and well-being of its citizens, it would be regarded as a possible source of international instability and insecurity. In other words, by reaching out to the Bosnians, Turkey would keep Turkish citizens happy and therefore not cause any domestic disturbance, which would affect international stability. Therefore, Turkey felt responsible for what happened in the Balkans and wanted to contribute to the peace operations in that region.

Turkish foreign policy has been affected to some extent by the emergence of pressure groups inside the country in recent years. These interest groups have been quite active in relation to Balkan crises, especially those in Bosnia, Azerbaijan, Chechnya, and of course, Cyprus. But the effectiveness of these pressure groups varies and is often limited. For example, it was suggested that if the Chechen lobby were significant, actions like hostage takings on ferries and in hotels would be

unnecessary. Bosnia, however, offered a quite different example, with a well-placed Bosnian “lobby” augmented by the strong support of Turkish public opinion.

The impact of pressure groups on Ankara’s decisions to send troops to international peacekeeping operations in the Balkans and Caucasus is noteworthy. Events in the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East rapidly entered the Turkish security debate and strongly affected public opinion (Lesser, 2000: 183-199), for they captured the attention of groups with strong cultural, ethnic or religious ties to Turkey. However, it is difficult to demonstrate such an impact. First, no academic study has demonstrated such an impact. Second, it would be difficult to explain the presence of Turkish troops in more geographically and ethnically distant places like Somalia, Afghanistan, and Lebanon from this perspective. Moreover, the impact of public opinion on the foreign policy making process has traditionally been very limited in Turkey. Finally, participation in peace operations might have badly affected the already weak economy of the country. Therefore, Turkish people would most likely have rejected sending Turkish troops abroad.

3.3.2.2. Historical and Cultural Factors

Despite having lost many parts of its Balkan territory during the Balkan Wars at the beginning of the 20th century, Turkey has always closely followed developments in this region. Turkey recognized the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Following its declaration of independence, Macedonia was recognized only by Bulgaria and Turkey. Turkey, as a Balkan country, has close historical, cultural, linguistic,¹²⁷ sociological and geographical ties with the Balkans. Turkey, which had been involved in the Balkans since the 14th century until the 1920s, has kept its

¹²⁷ There are more than 8,000 Turkish words currently used in the Bosnian language, Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:10.

historical ties and relationships with Balkan countries up to the present time (Koloğlu, 1993:88). Similarly, Turkey, as the successor to the Ottoman Empire, perceives 'Kosovo... as a debt it owes to its own history'¹²⁸ and the Balkans as an 'inseparable part of history, and culture' (Çeviköz, 1998:181). Since peaceful efforts did not provide any progress, Turkey fully supported Operation *Allied Force* and KFOR to prevent Serbian atrocities. Turkey contributed to peace operations in the Balkans to protect the historical and cultural heritage of the Ottomans (for example, mosques, bridges and so on). It wanted to contribute to the social and economic restructuring of the country and to the rebuilding of those landmark monuments reflecting the historical presence of Ottoman influence.¹²⁹

Turkey has linguistic and ethnic ties with Uzbeks, Turkmen, and Hazaras, who live in Afghanistan. Turks are the second largest ethnic minority in the country. Turkish soldiers contributed to ISAF to provide and maintain peace and security for Turks, Hazaras, Turqomans and other Afghan people as well. Turkey wants to conclude its policies concerning Afghanistan. Turkey has had a good reputation among all groups in Afghanistan for a long time. It had to show its presence in the area for its future interests. A peace mission is the best way to do it. Turkey wanted to sow similar seeds of friendship in Afghanistan, as it had sown and was rewarded with the concrete results in Korea in 1950, and consolidate Turkish friendships. The geographic distance between two countries did not form a barrier for the relations to be improved. On the contrary, the Turkish and Afghan nations improved mutual relations by challenging conditions. Turkey wanted to display the significance which it accorded to Afghanistan by helping it to be a powerful and prosperous country.

¹²⁸ Ecevit, Bülent. (06 April 1999) Anadolu News Agency

¹²⁹ *Balkanlar ve Türkiye'nin Bölgeye Yönelik Politikaları Sempozyumu*, Harp Akademileri Yayınları, İstanbul, 1999, p. 148

Bringing peace to these lands was perceived to be a responsibility for the TAF, on behalf of the Turkish people. As Atatürk, founder of modern Turkey, announced in 1937, "...we must not lose contact with the people who are our brothers." The most important characteristic that makes a nation respectable is the willingness not to evade responsibilities which history brings on it and to realize its mission at any cost. This was something that Turkey felt very deeply about and aspired to bring into effect. In the public opinion and among the elites, the deep historical ties between the two countries are periodically revived to underline the 'necessity' of Turkey's support for the Afghan people: Turkey has had close ties with Afghanistan since King Amanullah invited the Turks during the 1920s to help his army. Afghanistan was the first country to recognize the new Turkish Republic. Turkey helped Afghanistan in its modernization efforts; Enver Pasha and Cemal Pasha played a significant role in enhancing friendly relations between the two countries. Cemal Pasha succeeded in making European countries recognize Afghanistan. In the 1920s and 1930s, under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish republic, Turkey trained Afghan military officers and helped Afghanistan in its state-building efforts. As a result, much of the military terminology used in Afghanistan is in Turkish.

Another factor has been Ankara's close relationship with General Rashid Dostum. Turkey has long had contacts with Afghan opposition groups, especially the forces of General Dostum, and it helped build them into an effective fighting force. Dostum's fighters were largely Uzbeks, a group that has close ethnic links with Turks. The Taliban, fighting against General Dostum, are mostly ethnic Pashtun. That a war against Afghanistan offered the possibility to replace the fundamentalist Taliban regime, which Turkey had consistently opposed, was an important reason

behind Turkey's support for peace operations. For Turkey, it also could alleviate tension at home, where many oppose U.S. attacks against a Muslim country and most are against sending Turkish troops to other peace operations. The participation of Islamic countries, especially Turkey, would prevent the Afghanistan war from being seen as a clash between Christianity and Islam.

3.3.2.3. Religion

One could argue that religious motives played a role in Turkey's contribution to peace operations in Somalia. Turkey, which was unable to prevent ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, much of it directed at Muslims, wanted to help other Muslims in Somalia. The participation of Islamic countries in the peace operation in Somalia, such as Turkey, might have prevented the clash between troop-contributing countries and factions in Somalia, which were Muslim. Thought of in this way, religion also represented an important factor in Turkey's contribution to peace operations in Bosnia. According to a 1992 census in the former Yugoslavia, 43 percent of the population was Muslim Bosnians, 32 percent were Orthodox Serbians, 17 percent were Catholic Croats and 8 percent were other religions (Özdil, 1993:7). Turkey also had a religious motive in Kosovo. Eighty-seven percent of Kosovo's population is Muslim, ten percent is Orthodox Christian and three percent is Catholic.

3.3.2.4. Refugees

The flow of refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced persons also compelled Turkey to find ways to stop the flow and contribute to peace operations. With the outbreak of the war in the Former Yugoslavia, hundreds of thousands of people became refugees (Kümbetoğlu, 1997:227-259). Turkey provided shelter,

protection and rehabilitation for these people with the help of several state institutions and some associations related to the Balkans, and supported every effort to provide humanitarian assistance to the Kosovar deportees (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:47). Turkey wanted to gain international attention for Bosnia. There was a human tragedy in Bosnia and Turkey considered its participation in UNOSOM II as a good opportunity to help rally the international community around the idea that a multinational peacekeeping force should be deployed in Bosnia. Turkey thought that it could succeed in alerting the international community to the tragedy in Bosnia if it served in peace operations in Somalia.

3.3.2.5. Economics

The presence of a Turkish contingent in the region of crisis might have allowed Turkish businessmen to make business contracts. Deploying troops to Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan might have brought investment as well. Turkish capital investment was low in the region since there is a high risk (related to the absence of a market economy and commercial laws, an undeveloped insurance and banking sector, etc.) in Kosovo for businessmen. Some Turkish businessmen initially accepted this risk, but later withdrew from Kosovo leaving problems behind. This led local people to distrust Turkish businessmen.

In ISAF operations, Turkey sought compensation for its military support in the economic field.¹³⁰ The Turkish economy, which had undergone a severe crisis and was under the supervision of an IMF program, was badly hit again by the

¹³⁰ for more on Turkey's motives, see: "Afganistan Politikamızı Ulusal Çıkarlarımız ve Tercihlerimiz Belirliyor," Interview with Hüseyin Bağcı, 2023, No.7, November 2001, pp.22-27; Mehmet Seyfettin Erol, "Fırsatlar ve Zorluklar İkileminde Türkiye-Afganistan İlişkilerinde Yeni Dönem," *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol.2, No.23, March 2002, pp.77-85; Alan Makovsky, "Turkey's Unfinished Role in the War on Terrorism," *Insight Turkey*, Vol.4, No.1, January-March 2002, pp.44-45; Hugh Pope, "Turkey's Role in Afghanistan Presents Opportunity," *Wall Street Journal*, June 6, 2002, p.A16.

September 11th, 2001 shock. Then Turkish Economy Minister Kemal Derviş, after claiming that Turkey must support the international fight against terrorism in Afghanistan and elsewhere because Turkey had suffered from similar threats.

Turkey's support for the Afghan people: Turkey has had close ties with Afghanistan since King Amanullah invited the Turks during the 1920s to help his army. Afghanistan was the first country to recognize the new Turkish Republic. Turkey helped Afghanistan in its modernization efforts; Enver Pasha and Cemal Pasha played a significant role in enhancing friendly relations between the two countries. Cemal Pasha worked hard to make European countries recognize Afghanistan and he succeeded.

3.3.3. The Ideational Factors

Without denying the relevance of the above-mentioned factors which have one way or other influenced governmental decisions in Ankara, I argue that Turkey's involvement in peace operations during the post-Cold War era can better be explained by the dynamics of its relations with the West. In Turkey's wanting to participate in peace operations, the main concern has been ideational. What motivates Ankara to join the western community of nations by contributing to peace operations is neither the structural necessity to survive (as expected by neo-realists) nor the materially formulated cost-benefit analysis (as foreseen by neo-liberals), but the ideational concerns to legitimize/justify its western identity (Hurd, 1999: 379-409).

The meaning that Turkey has attached to participation in peace operations differs from those of the European Union and the United States. For example, while peace operations for the EU have been the basic justification for the existence of

European armed services, they have been of relatively minor importance for the United States and Russia. In contrast to European and American approaches, Turkey has put a great ideational importance in peace operations. They have been important for the re-construction of its western identity as well as the maintenance of its number one security interest, being a part of the West. Ankara seems to believe that its western identity will be best enhanced if it cooperates with the EU and its member states in peace operations.

Ideational Factors may be discussed under the subheadings as: Relations with Europe/West; Turkey's Image as Security Producer; EU Membership; Security Understanding of the West; Turkey's Western/European Image; and Relations with the US.

3.3.3.1. Relations with Europe/West

Even though some difficulties were experienced, the relationship between Turkey and Europe had not been questioned deeply during much part of the Cold War era and questions of identity were ignored. The ideological concerns of the East/West distinction of the era basically colored the relationship. Turkey was attributed as an important strategic partner for the containment of the Soviet Union in security terms. Security priorities had masked the identity differences between Turkey and Europe in that era. Especially, after the collapse of the bipolar world system in the beginning of the nineties, the difference between the Turkish way of modernization and European civilization itself had been clearly exposed. The question of identity remains critical for Ankara in its relationship with Europe and the West.

Turkey, since Ottoman times, has had common issues with Europe. As Aydın points out (1999: 160), in the course of the history, "the Turks have been connected

to the West, first as a conquering superior and enemy, then as a component part, later as an admirer and unsuccessful imitator, and in the end as a follower and ally.” The Ottoman Empire gradually lost its dominant status in Europe and began to perceive Europe as the source of modernization. Turkey has historically displayed a relatively consistent security culture of *realpolitik* which has evolved from a dominant offensive to a dominant defensive one. Moreover, the process of westernization since 18th century has left its imprint on the national security culture. It has motivated Turkey’s western-oriented policies and introduced liberal and internationalist elements into foreign policy.

Turkey’s contribution to western security interests have, in the past, constituted the most important link tying Turkey to the West, and therefore making it easy for Turkey to be recognized as western. The main rationale behind the Westernization/Europeanization reforms of the late Ottoman and early republican eras was to secure the survival of the Turkish state against internal and external threats. Europeanization was therefore conceived as a security strategy (Oğuzlu, 2005: 87). With the end of Second World War, Ankara’s concern of being recognized as western was met by its membership in NATO and close cooperation with the West against the common Soviet threat. More, its security identity and interests were in accordance with those of the western international community. While the West itself defined its security identity/interest in opposition to the Soviet Union and prioritised the preservation of the western style of living as the most important security goal, Turkey did not find it difficult to become socialized into this understanding (Aybet and Müftüler Baç, 2000: 567-582).

3.3.3.2. Turkey's Image as a Security Producing Country

This situation has completely changed in the 1990s with the end of the Cold War. For the first time in the republican era of Turkey-Europe relations, both sides began to feel suspicious of the 'security provider' role of the other. For Ankara, its perception of the EU as a global security actor has not been matched by the post-Cold War international identity of the European Union. As Turkey's accession process unfolded, both sides became aware of a growing difference in their concepts of security. This, in turn, has played a significant role in the unwillingness of the EU to offer Turkey credible membership prospects. Karaosmanoğlu has argued that, whereas the EU turned inside, trying to build up a security community in Europe per se, Turkey has turned outside, trying to improve its security in Eurasia.¹³¹ When the West started to see peace operations through a new perspective, Ankara's interest in peace operations also developed.

Turkey would not have remained outside such a western project, while the credentials of its western identity have come under strong challenges following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and growing criticisms regarding its contributions to the western security. As the Soviet threat to Eastern Europe lost its imminence, and the European Community transformed itself to a 'security community' (Bilgin, 2004: 278), Turkey's contribution to security building in Europe became less significant in the eyes of EU policy makers. In his article, Samuel Huntington identifies Turkey as one of a number of countries where questions of national identity were actively debated during the 1990s. Few countries in the post-Cold War era have had their identity contested as bitterly and interpreted as variously as Turkey. Huntington

¹³¹ Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, "Turkey's Security Policy in Connection with the USA and the EU," in Hasan Celal Güzel et.al., *The Turks*, Vol.5, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Publications, 2002); Ali Karaosmanoğlu, "Türkiye Açısından Avrupa Güvenlik Kimliği: Jeopolitik ve Demokratik Ufuk" in Şaban Çalış, et.al., *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi* (Ankara: Liberte, 2001).

classifies Turkey as a “torn country...whose leaders typically wish to pursue a bandwagoning strategy and to make their countries members of the West” (Huntington, 1993:433-435), but whose history, culture and traditions are non-western.

The intergovernmental nature of NATO membership, the existence of the common external enemy and Turkey’s contribution to the realization of Europe’s strategic security interests prevented the Europeans from perceiving Ankara as an ‘other’ throughout the Cold War years. Turkey was considered to be a part of Europe’s ‘self’ (Aybet and Müftüler Baç, 2000: 567-582). However, this cooperative togetherness started to change with the advent of the post-Cold War era, as the contours of European-ness began to be defined by membership in the European Union (Diez and Whitman, 2002: 43-67).

NATO, as the most experienced and capable organisation in the field of military security has transformed itself and gained a new structure and role. In light of the critical developments in the post-Cold War era, NATO adapted and transformed itself in order to cope with new security challenges. While NATO has gradually lost its European and western character following the transformation of the Alliance from being a western collective defense organization into a semi military-semi political collective security organization, the EU increasingly emphasized liberal-democratic transformation of state-society relations as the most important criterion for membership (Cornish, 2004:63-74; Kurth, 2001:5-16; Webber, and et al., 2004: 3-26). The Cold War era security identity of the EU allowed the EU members to co-exist with Turkey within NATO in such a way that both sides perceived each other as ‘security providers.’ This situation started to change in the

1990s as the EU began to define its security identity on the basis of its deepening and widening processes (Aybet and Müftüler-Baç, 2000:567-582).

The EU and Turkey diverged on the definition of the nature of conventional threats to security. Ankara continued to regard developments in Russia and the Middle East, particularly attempts by the latter to develop weapons of mass destruction and the ballistic missiles to deliver them, as possible sources of conventional threats to its security (Sezer, 1992:227-237). EU members on the other hand, shared the view that today's world posed no conventional threat to Europe's security. To them, the sources of new threats and risks to European security lie in the unstable regions along the peripheries of Europe (Oğuzlu, 2003:4). Therefore, a great many European security analysts believed that Turkey's inclusion in the EU might increase 'conventional threats' to European security because it lies at the epicenter of so many zones of instability, and its hard-security mentality might risk bringing the EU into open conflict with any one of Turkey's Middle Eastern neighbors (Buzan and Diez, 1999: 41-57). The strategic horizons of the EU have also fixated on the European continent. In the absence of conventional security threats, to many EU members, the particular geography of Turkey has increased anxieties among Europeans as to whether it would be a good idea to offer Turkey a credible prospect of membership. Rather than an asset, Turkey's political geography may become a burden on Europe (Buzan and Diez, 1999: 41-57).

Through the Cold War years Turkey was significantly important for European security. This was indubitable in those years and Ankara used this advantage to its favor to gain economic and military support from the West. However, the end of the Cold War shifted the former balance of security. With the removal of the Soviet threat, Turkey's relative importance for the defense of Europe

decreased. In 1991, Ankara committed to the Gulf War on the side of the western alliance to show its strategic importance to the West although it lost a great deal of its economic interests in the region. However, this does not mean that Turkey became an unimportant state in security terms. The emergence of the new geopolitics put Turkey into an important position. On the other side, the end of the Cold War decreased the importance of geopolitical issues, at least for Europeans, as issues related to democracy and human rights gained prominence. Ankara, on the other hand, seemed to face geopolitical opportunities in the post-Cold War era. These differentiating perspectives have become the crux of the problematic relationship between Turkey and Europe.

3.3.3.3. EU Membership

In order to prove its Western/European identity, Ankara wanted to accentuate its centuries-old European orientation by integrating with the European Union, which claims to be the institutional representation of the European identity. However, Turkey has neither become a constituent part of the EU's integration process nor fully embraced the norms of the emerging European identity. Though the Turkish elites knew that the process of Europeanization would have two main dimensions - a domestic reform process aimed at internalizing the constitutive norms of the European international society and participation in the European state system - they preferred to give primacy to the second (Karaosmanoğlu, 2002). Faced with the European refusal of its membership to the EU, participating in peace operations has seemed to be the only way for Turkey to register its Western/European identity.

Ankara sees with distrust, its membership delay in the EU while it is an accepted part of Europe via its membership in NATO. Under such considerations, in

a quest to accentuate its western vocation, Turkey felt obliged to participate in peace operations led by NATO and the EU. Ankara's main motivation has been to consolidate its European identity in the eyes of the EU members by participating in peace operations. On the other hand, strengthening western belonging is an important feature not only of Turkey's quest for identity but part of its security policy and culture (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000: 199-216) as well.

However, there are some problems in Ankara's European Union option. One hesitation of Europe about the integration of Turkey with the Union is precisely the security issues that would arise upon integration. Turkey's inclusion in the Union would shift the borders of the European Union towards the East making the Middle East and Caucasus neighbors of the Union. This also means that the security issues of the aforementioned regions such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, the Middle East peace process and unstable Iranian and Iraqi regimes would be part of the European agenda. Since Europe was reluctant to become involved in these issues, Turkey has been viewed by the Europeans as a "security burden".¹³² Since the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, it has become rather commonplace among EU policymakers to present Turkey as a consumer and not a producer of security in Europe.¹³³ By "security consumer," it is meant that Ankara is overburdened by a number of hard security problems in and around Turkey and this creates new problems for the EU security community.

¹³² See Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, *Europe's Security Parameters*, paper delivered at the Conference on Turkey and Central and Eastern European Countries in Transition: A Comparative Study with a View to Future Membership to EU, Bilkent University, Ankara, 9 March 1996.

¹³³ Turkey is not producing the security but rather consuming security and producing insecurity, German minister Hans-Ulrich Klose is reported to have said at a conference organized by the Körber Foundation in İstanbul in 1997. See Hüseyin Bağcı, Changing Security Perspective of Turkey, in *Turkey at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Global Encounters and vs Regional Alternatives*, Mustafa Aydın, ed (Ankara: International Relations Foundation, 1998), p.81

Turkey's over-emphasis on military security (hard security), and under-emphasis on socio-economic and cultural-political aspects of security (soft security) could have negative implications for its being recognized as Western/European in the post-Cold War era. Given such prevalent representations of Turkey as a burden, and not an asset for building security in Europe, Turkish policymakers spent the 1990s trying to find Ankara a niche in the evolving post-Cold War environment.¹³⁴ With Turkey's participation in peace operations, they seem to have finally found that niche. That is why Ankara's interest in peace operations has developed. Its participation in the peace operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo could be viewed as an instance of Turkey's contribution as a producer of security in both narrow and broad senses of the term.

The EU criticized Ankara in its 2005 Progress Report on the following issues; violation of human rights, religious freedom, civil-military relations and so on. One of the issues in dispute between Turkey and the EU concerns the modalities of Turkey's participation in European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). The establishment of a European defense and security system independent of NATO is leading to friction between Turkey and the EU. Ankara wants to have a vote about the issues related with the ESDP. However, the EU members are against the participation of Turkey in the decision-making processes of ESDP until it becomes a full member of the Union. Ankara is also against the use of NATO's facilities within the framework of ESDP, where it has no vote for the decisions. Its exclusion from the security architecture of Europe raises hesitations about the Union. Since the Nice summit in December 2000 the EU has been arguing that Turkey has no legitimate right to fully participate in the decision-making process of EU military operations

¹³⁴ See Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, Turkey and the European Idea, *NATO's Sixteen Nations* 4 (1993), pp.82-87, for a succinct analysis of post-Cold War soul-searching among Turkish policymakers.

even if these would rely on NATO resources because Turkey is not an EU member (Oğuzlu, 2002:65).

As far as Ankara is concerned, the significance of the EU's attempts at developing the ESDP lies in the possibility that this European initiative might be the harbinger of an emerging EU strategic culture independent of NATO. In such a case Turkey's European identity in security issues might face serious challenges. The Turkish logic has been that if the EU member states were to become less eager to establish their security and international identity independent of NATO, they would become less discriminatory towards Turkey's inclusion within European security structures (Oğuzlu, 2002:64). Since ESDP is not simply a security and defense project, but a planned construction of the European identity, the unwillingness of the EU to offer Ankara a membership status in the decision-making apparatus of the emerging ESDP initiative has added strain to Turkey's aspirations of being considered European (Baykan, 2005: 335-359).

Turkey's chances of EU membership are strongly bound to its performance in successfully adopting distinctive EU values and norms, which are less about security than they are about democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and transparent and impartial procedures. Allegations of torture and the question of human rights in Turkey were perhaps the most critical issues over which it has been most heavily criticized in the post-Cold War environment, and which has helped to make "the state of Turkey synonymous with the notion of human rights abuses" (Robins, 2003: 34).

In such a negative atmosphere participation in peace operations appears to have offered Ankara a window of opportunity to help register its diminishing Western/European identity. The majority of the Turkish elites have believed that to

solidify Turkey's European/western/modern identity, participation in peace operations is an important tool that will provide effective functioning of its relations with the western international community. Many of them regard participation in peace operations as a legitimate globalization strategy, and many believe it will bring Ankara closer to the sources of its Western/European identity. Appearing to contribute to western security interests was hoped to re-establish the most important link tying Turkey to the West. The more useful Turkey became for western security, the more western it would be recognized by the West.

Turkey participated in the maintenance of security in Europe during the Cold War by virtue of its strategically significant geographical location, the size of its army and the pro-western orientation of the Turkish regime that helped bolster the identity of the West.¹³⁵ Given that many locations where Turkey sent peacekeeping units did not directly affect its security in the traditional neo-realist sense, participation in peace operations might have been seen as a policy instrument to help bolster its Western/European identity. Regarding the economic, cultural, social and political factors that make it difficult for the EU to admit Turkey as a member, one needs to make it clear that these concerns are mainly shaped by the EU's post-Cold War era security identity, for the post-Cold War era security understanding of the EU has widened in such a way so as to include as great a variety of dimensions as possible (Oğuzlu, 2002:61). The EU's move to transform itself from a purely civilian power to a military power and its growing interest in the constitution of a European military crisis management capability in a wider geographical area from the Balkans to the Caucasus and from the Middle East to North Africa where Turkey is at the

¹³⁵ for a discussion, see Pinar Bilgin, 'Turkey and the EU: Yesterday's Answers to Tomorrow's Security Problems?', in G.P. Herd and J. Huru (eds), *EU Civilian Crisis Management* (Survey: Conflict Studies Research Centre, Royal Military Academy Sandhurst, 2001) pp.34-51

crossroads of regions (Hürsoy, 2005:419) has created an opportunity for it to prove itself useful as a producer of security in Europe.

Turkey, as a country with significant military capabilities and a growing civilian sector that is active in humanitarian efforts, has been a net contributor to international peace and security in key international organizations such as the UN, NATO and the OSCE. The important point here is that Turkey's development of peacekeeping capabilities and potential contribution to the European military force in peace operations would not only enhance its bargaining power vis-à-vis the EU, in the sense that the EU would benefit from Turkey's military capabilities in an instrumental manner, but also suggest that Turkey is transforming its security identity into that of the European Union around the principles of crises management and human security (Oğuzlu, 2006:83-104).

3.3.3.4. Security Understanding of the West

The post-Cold War era security understanding priorities are as follows: 'human security',¹³⁶ 'the global, interdependent and trans-regionalized nature of security' and the 'closer linkage between internal and external developments.' Developments in security since the end of the Cold War suggest a process that has been chipping away at the foundations of international politics based on self- and collective defence. More analytical attention is being paid to concepts of human security. The number of inter-state wars has decreased significantly since the end of the Cold War, but intra-state threats to human security have gained greater prominence.

Sources of threat to human security are numerous, from political repression and violations of human rights to hunger, disease, illicit drugs and organized crime.

¹³⁶ for a discussion, see Pinar Bilgin, "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security," *International Studies Review* (2003) 5, 203-222

Two military methods for promoting human security are humanitarian intervention and peacekeeping.¹³⁷ Intra-state UN peacekeeping can also promote human security in helping to control and resolve conflicts between hostile domestic parties (Goulding, 1993: 451-465; Adekanye, 1997: 359-366). Turkey has played a growing role in promoting the personal security of individuals. It wanted to contribute to peace operations in situations where human beings suffer from violent conflict, civil disorder and repression. Therefore, it participated in peace operations on the need to end widespread starvation (Somalia in 1992), to restore democracy (Afghanistan, ISAF), to end civil war (Bosnia in 1995) or to stop 'ethnic cleansing' (Kosovo in 1999).

For the first time in history, the Turkish Armed Forces sent a military force to an area –Somalia- without a strategic interest in a strictly humanitarian mission. The operation in Somalia was a historical mission and gave responsibility to all participating countries, including Turkey, as well as the UN. An important reason for Ankara to send a military force, however, was to prevent the death of thousands from starvation. Before UN intervention, 300,000 people died from famine, one million people became refugees and 1.5 million people were threatened by hunger while half of the country's population were threatened by disease.

As the situation in Kosovo deteriorated, Ankara became increasingly concerned about the human rights situation and its potential to spread instability to neighboring countries in the region. By contributing to peace operations, Turkey tried to persuade international community that Serbian aggression to Kosovo was a direct threat to stability in the Balkans and a violation of human rights of Kosovars. Turkey,

¹³⁷ Johan Galtung was probably the first to coin the term 'peacebuilding,' in 'Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peace-building,' in J. Galtung (ed.), *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research*, Vol.2, Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1975, pp.282-304.

which had been accused of violating human rights by European states for years, might have wanted to show its sensitivity for human rights by contributing to these peace operations.

The more Turkey contributes to peace operations, the more secure it would feel, with regard to both hard (conventional) and soft (non-conventional) threats. Turkey's increasing participation in peace operations during the post-Cold War era can be seen as a particular effort to demonstrate that it has successfully been adapting its security conceptualization/identity/culture/understanding to that of the West. Turkey's participation in peace operations would also accelerate the process of its successful socialization into the idea that "during the Cold War era the armies of the western states were deployed on the ground to simply prevent the armies of the totalitarian states from doing "bad things" outside their borders whereas during the post-Cold War era the armies of the western states are deployed to urge weak or failed states to do "good things" inside their borders."

A European Union which is interested in developing its own military crisis management capability would need Turkey because Turkey has become a large, effective and modern military power both in its own region and in NATO. Furthermore, it has a well-trained army experienced in low-intensity warfare. This factor is particularly important for contributing to Petersberg type operations (Bilgin, 2001:34-51).

In the post-Cold War era in which the old security order collapsed, the European continent and its surrounding regions have been passing through a critical period from the end of the Cold War towards a new system in which security, politics, economics, and society are becoming increasingly interrelated. The concept of security, which is one of the most basic issues for human beings, has gained new

definitions, understandings and applications (Sperling and Kishner, 1997; Buzan, 1991). There is now an overwhelming consensus on the notion that the term security has been broadened and multiplied in conceptual, geographical, and functional senses in Europe and in the world as a whole. Conceptually, the term security now implies not only the so-called “hard security,” i.e. feeling secure/safe from foreign military attacks, from the invasion of the foreign armies, and from the danger of strategic or tactical missiles, weapons of mass destruction, and brutal aggressions, as was the case during the Cold War. It also includes the so-called “soft security,” i.e. feeling secure/safe from political oppression, hunger, environmental pollution, social fragmentation, human tragedy, and immigration, unexpected effects of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological) and so on (McInees, 1993).

Thus, functionally, the concept of security now includes social, economic and cultural issues. Not only the state security but also societies and individuals are “threatened” by ethnic nationalism and separatism, terrorism, refugee movements, religious and ideological fanaticism, fatal illnesses (e.g. AIDS), and so on. All of these security concerns and developments are not limited to certain countries or regions, but most of the world is equally affected by such developments outside their borders. In other words, security risks are now interdependent in the global arena. No country is totally immune from these security risks, be they “soft security” problems or “the hard security” problems.

The EU does not offer any role for non-EU allies in non-military aspects of crisis management. Turkey is very active and keen on this field as was evidenced by Turkey’s contribution to the Bosnia and Kosovo cases and to the re-construction of Afghanistan after September 11th. Turkey would like to contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management in political, military and non-military terms to

enhance its western identity. For example, Turkey's participation in the ISAF and signing on to the security logic in the post-9/11 era might have contributed to the EU's decision to start the accession talks with Turkey on the 3rd of October 2005. Similarly, Turkey's eagerness to join the EU-led peacekeeping force in the Congo should be seen as a strategic action on the part of Ankara that would help bolster its European identity.¹³⁸ Turkey does not have any strategic interest in the Congo. Thus, participation there would suggest that Turkey helps the West project its constitutive values onto problem areas.

3.3.3.5. Turkey's Western/European Image

The task of peace operations, which once seemed to belong exclusively to the United Nations, has become a growing area of interest for NATO, the EU and OSCE in the 1990s. Ankara also hopes that stronger links with the UN, NATO, the EU and OSCE within the framework of peace operations will strengthen its western orientation and bolster its European identity. Turkey has adopted a stance directed at Afghanistan's developing its national institutions, ensuring its stability and integrating with the international community. By Turkey assuming command of ISAF, it has achieved this aim and has also accomplished its task as a member of the UN.

Turkey wants to be seen much more in the activities of the UN and wants to play a much more active role in the international arena after the end of the Cold War. Due to the rise of Turkey's security responsibilities in the EU's neighborhood, as a European country but not, as yet, a EU member, it announced its candidature for one of the UN Security Council's non-permanent seats allocated to the Western

¹³⁸ Stament By Ambassador Baki İlkin, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations at the General Debate of the Special Committee on Peacemaking Operations NewYork, 1 February 2005. The text can be reached at <http://www.un.int/turkey/page35.html>

Europeans and Other States Group (WEOG) for the 2009-10 term (Hürsoy, 2005:425). Turkey's motive is to be elected as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council in this term.

Participation in peace operations helps Ankara give the signal that it is a responsible member of the western international community. Ambassador Sergio Balanzino underlined Turkey's position very well:

I cannot imagine a scenario for EU-led crisis management operations that does not involve Turkey in one way or another. Simply put: if the crisis is very serious, NATO will be involved including Turkey [in which the ESDP will not have a role]. If the crisis is less prone to escalation, but still requires a significant amount of force, then the EU may lead, but only with the help of NATO- again Turkey will be involved. If the crisis is at the lower end of the spectrum, the EU may act autonomously, but if it is an operation that affects Turkey's security or Turkey's vital security interests, it will obviously be in the interest of the EU to at least solicit Turkey's views and most importantly to seek its active contribution in resolving the crisis.¹³⁹

The decision to help initiate the BLACKSEAFOR and the Southeast European Brigade should be interpreted in this vein. These initiatives have only an indirect effect on Turkey's security, they undoubtedly contribute to regional security. Primarily, however, decisions are undertaken with the motivation of suggesting to the western allies that Turkey is a security producing country in the region and has always been a part of the solutions, rather than the problems (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000:199-216).

At the multilateral level, Ankara launched two initiatives in the Balkans to create a web of regional cooperation mechanisms. The first initiative is a process called the South-East European Cooperation Process (SEECP). Another initiative is

¹³⁹ Sergio Balanzino, "The State of the Alliance- A Good News Story", speech delivered at the 11th International Antalya Conference on Security and Co-operation, Antalya, Turkey, 29 March-2 April 2001, (Ankara: TBBM, 2001), p.51. The same argument was stated by Lord George Robertson, "Turkey and the European Security and Defence Identity", *op.cit.*, p.49-50.

the Multinational Peace Force South-East Europe (MPFSEE).¹⁴⁰ MPFSEE is an initiative to improve regional states' capabilities to contribute to possible multinational conflict prevention measures and peace support operations. MPFSEE forms part of a series of political, economic and defense initiatives implemented in the late 1990s, between the end of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the restart of war in Kosovo.¹⁴¹ The initial force is a Brigade, named the South-Eastern European Brigade (SEEBRIG). The MPFSEE is to carry out Petersberg-type tasks¹⁴² (humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping tasks; and tasks of combat forces in crisis management including peacemaking) in the service of the UN, NATO, the EU and the OSCE. Its activities are consistent with the purposes and the principles of the United Nations Charter.

This initiative is neither directed against any third state nor intended to form a military alliance of any form against any country or group of countries. It is in line with and supports Partnership for Peace (PfP) programs and allows essential cooperation within the framework of the UN, NATO, OSCE and WEU. During peacetime, Turkey contributes to this force with one mechanized infantry battalion, one reconnaissance company, one artillery battery, one engineer company and some

¹⁴⁰ Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Balkans, Last Updated: 29.11.2005 at <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Synopsis/SYNOPSIS.htm>

¹⁴¹ DOCUMENT A/1804, 3 December 2002, Multinational European forces REPORT submitted on behalf of the Defence Committee by Mr Wilkinson, Rapporteur at http://www.assembly-weu.org/en/documents/sessions_ordinaires/rpt/2002/1804.php#P91_4429

¹⁴² On 19 June 1992, the Foreign and Defence Ministers of WEU member states met near Bonn to strengthen further the role of the WEU and issued the "Petersberg Declaration." This declaration set out, on the basis of the Maastricht decisions, the guidelines for the organisation's future development. WEU member states declared their preparedness to make available military units from the whole spectrum of their conventional armed forces for military tasks under the authority of the WEU. These tasks, the so-called "Petersberg missions," consisted of humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping tasks; and tasks of combat forces in crisis management including peacemaking. In the Petersberg Declaration, WEU members pledged their support for conflict prevention and peacekeeping efforts in cooperation with the CSCE and with the United Nations Security Council.

of its combat service support elements. Additionally, one Signal Company and one brigade Headquarter (HQ) Company will be assigned when the brigade HQ is located in Turkey (White Paper, 2000:52 and Turkish General Staff, 2001:21). Ankara has from its very beginning, initiated two separate processes in contributing to peace and stability in the Black Sea region. One was the implementation of confidence and security building measures (CSBMs) in the Black Sea, which include arms talks, and the other was the establishment of the force in the spirit of PfP known as BLACKSEAFOR.

The BLACKSEAFOR initiative aims at the enhancement of peace and stability and promoting regional co-operation among the Black Sea littoral states. The idea of establishing a multinational on-call naval force in the Black Sea region with the participation of all littoral states to further develop regional co-operation among the naval forces of the littoral countries for the purpose of contributing to regional security and stability, and strengthening good neighboring relations was spearheaded by Turkey. The project was proposed by former Navy Forces Commander Salim Dervisoglu in 1998 and welcomed and endorsed by the other littoral states. It is a tangible outcome of Turkey's vision of bringing together the naval forces of the littoral states for the realization of certain tasks at sea (Ulusoy, 2002: 97). This was in fact, the manifestation of the guiding principle of the Turkish foreign policy that is based on fostering and maintaining regional co-operation and friendship, as reflected in the words of ATATÜRK, "Peace at Home, Peace in the World." BLACKSEAFOR is the reflection of Ankara's active foreign policy in the post-Cold War era in the Black Sea region (Savunma ve Havacılık, 2002: 16).

The Black Sea Naval Co-operation Task Group (BLACKSEAFOR)¹⁴³ has been initiated at the Second Chiefs of the Black Sea Navies (CBSN) Meeting, which was held in Varna, Bulgaria on 11 April 1998 (Journal of Turkish Naval Forces, 2001:14). Efforts to establish the BLACKSEAFOR have continued since then with the meetings of experts under the chairmanship of a Turkish Admiral and with the participation of many diplomats, naval officers and legal authorities of the Black Sea littoral¹⁴⁴ (Journal of Turkish Naval Forces, 2001: 2). The underlying philosophy of this initiative is to strengthen peace and stability within the Black Sea area as well as to promote regional cooperation among the Black Sea littoral states through the enhancement of cooperation and interoperability among their maritime forces (Turkish General Staff, 2001:25).

3.3.3.6. Relations with the US

A similar logic can also be applied to Turkey's relations with the United States. The relationship with the US has been a key aspect of Turkey's foreign and security policy for nearly six decades. Throughout the Cold War, Washington and Ankara have shared a similar approach to international affairs. Turkey's internal and geopolitical positions, coupled with the influence of its military, led to a security-conscious approach to policy-making. The two countries also have similar elements in their strategic culture (Kirişçi, 2002: 200-228). During the Cold War, Turkey regarded its alliance relationship with the United States within NATO as the most important link in terms of shoring up its western identity and national security. The

¹⁴³ In the Baltic, there is similar formation called BALTRON. However, this formation is limited in scope as well as in membership as it only covers mine counter measures and consists of only three Baltic states; Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

¹⁴⁴ For further information see BLACKSEAFOR, Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group at <http://www.blackseafor.org>

security culture of the Turkish Republic made it possible to cooperate with the United States in Eurasia, Central Asia and the Middle East. Both countries are used to operating in the international arena in accordance with the principles of *realpolitik*. The post-Cold War era had initially shaken the fundamentals of the Turkish-American alliance type relationship. The absence of the common Soviet threat in the north, the growing policy differences in the Middle Eastern region- particularly over Iraq, Iran and Israeli-Palestinian issues, the gradual weakening of NATO as the prime channel linking Turkey to the United States, the gradual transformation of the Alliance from being a pure Western/European collective defense organization into a global semi-political/semi-military security organization and the bilateralization outpacing the multilateral character of relations, have combined to shake Turkish-American relations (Oğuzlu, 2004: 98-105; Lewis, 2006: 1-8; Gordon and Taşpınar, 2006:57-70).

The 1990s saw that alliance type relationships of the Cold War years first evolve into ‘strategic partnership’ relationships and lately into ‘cooperation on some issues’ relationships (Güney, 2005:341-359). This process has further continued in the post 9/11 era, despite the initial expectation that Turkey’s Muslim/democratic identity would elevate its status in Washington (Oğuzlu, 2004: 98-105). Now Ankara appears to have come to the conclusion that the United States is a global super power having vital interests across the globe, rather than only being the leader of the western international community. Another conclusion Ankara appears to have drawn from the latest US approach towards the global war on terror is that Washington views international law and organizations, including NATO, from an instrumental perspective.

Under such conditions, Turkish elites have increasingly considered participation in peace operations as an effective strategy to help re-establish Turkey's western (and pro-American) identity. That is why Turkey led the peace force in Somalia, sent a substantial number of military troops to Bosnia and Kosova, and recently joined the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. The dynamics of Turkey's security relations with the western international community constituted an important reason in explaining its decisions to join the peace operation in Somalia. Turkey wanted to display what it could do in the international arena to both Somalians and the rest of the world. Its decision to join UNOSOM II had been motivated by the ideational concern of being included in the international community. Ankara decided to be part of such an operation in a troubled part of Africa because of its relations with the United States and western countries and wanted to register its western identity in the eyes of its western partners through its participation in UNOSOM II.

Co-operative relationship with the United States in the fight against global terrorism has offered the state elite in Turkey a valuable opportunity to underline once again its western identity and its indispensable place within the western international community (Turan, 2002:10-18). By assuming command of NATO forces in Afghanistan, Ankara wanted to improve the bilateral relations with the US and demonstrate the solidarity of the US-Turkey strategic partnership and its resolve to combat terrorism. ISAF experience is also revealing for another reason. It demonstrates that in the post 9/11 world Ankara has signed onto the logic that international security and internal affairs of states are closely related to each other. The international community defines the greatest threats to international security and stability as those threats that stem from polities where domestic instability and

economic underdevelopment prevail. In case of any domestic turbulence, the dangers would spill over to other places because in today's world, security concerns are transregionalised in nature (Oğuzlu, 2003:51-83).

Today, important considerations are: whether a state is governed by democracy or not, whether leaders are held publically accountable in terms of their promises to help improve the social and economic quality of life and whether helping promote democracy and helping failed states should be seen as a security strategy. Turkey's participation in the ISAF suggests that it sides with the western international community on all of these questions. Moreover, Turkey's leading role in the ISAF also implies that the West can successfully deal with the security challenges of the post-September 11 era only in close collaboration with the Muslim world. Turkey, a secular and western oriented state with an overwhelming Muslim population, would certainly add to the legitimacy of the western-led international peace operations in the eyes of the Muslim communities all around the globe. Turkey, as a Muslim country, could become a model for Afghanistan, for example.

If the ideational boundaries of western civilization, of which the EU constitutes an important part, were defined by the struggle against global terrorism, then Turkey's case for EU membership would likely gain strength. This is because Turkey has been in struggle with separatist and fundamentalist terrorism for decades (Oğuzlu, 2002:75). Turkey's participation in peace operations in Afghanistan against global terrorism would bolster the claims of those who argue that the war on terrorism should not be continued on the basis of a clash of civilizations between the developed Christian North and the undeveloped Muslim South. The participation of Islamic countries such as Turkey especially, will prevent the Afghanistan war from being seen as a clash between Christians and Muslims. Since Turkey is NATO's only

majority Muslim member, it is assured of a “very strong role” in postwar Afghanistan. Turkey’s position in the region and close ties with Central Asian nations will make it an important player in the process of building a new government in Afghanistan that represents all of its ethnic groups.¹⁴⁵

A similar ideational logic can be observed in Ankara’s approach to nuclear weapons in Turkey. Despite many counter arguments, Turkey’s security elites appear to be content with the deployment of approximately 90 nuclear warheads in Incirlik and Murted. They see their presence as a guarantee of American commitment to Turkey’s security as well as, Turkey’s western identity in the eyes of Washington (Kibaroglu, 2005: 443-457).

¹⁴⁵ Turkey Warms Up for peacekeeping, Military Training Missions in Afghanistan by Selcan Hacaoglu *Associated Press* October 18, 2001

CHAPTER IV

THE IMPACT OF PARTICIPATION IN PEACE OPERATIONS ON TURKEY

The main goal of this chapter is to examine the impact of participation in peace operations on Turkey. In doing so, we will examine the ideational, security and domestic impact, in that order. This chapter will also shed light on the compatibility between the theoretical expectations of different motivating factors, as described in the previous chapter, and achievements on the ground. The goal is to help single out which theoretical explanation better explains Turkey's participation in peace operations.

4.1. Security-related Impact

Turkey's participation in peace operations has had a significant security-related impact on Turkey. These impact may be mentioned under the subheadings: Political-Strategic; Organizational and Educational (Training); Tactical; Operational and Planning; Logistic and CIMIC.

4.1.1. Political-Strategic

Turkey's national security and defense policy has been affected by participation in peace operations. Ankara now holds that defense starts outside territorial borders and

what happens in other countries impacts Turkey's security interests. It is without a doubt that Turkey's experiences in peace operations abroad have helped transform its security understanding in this way. This can best be seen in Turkey's new military doctrine, which has moved from 'territorial defense' to 'forward defense.' One of the most important components of the doctrine is the 'forward deployment of Turkish troops in a pre-emptive manner'(Hickok, 2000:105-120).¹⁴⁶

The Turkish Army has proved its success internationally and has gained higher responsibilities. As revealed by the Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan cases, Turkey has improved the capabilities of its armed forces through carrying out operations in different geographical areas and climatic conditions by participating actively in peace operations in these regions. Because peace operations demand special expertise, Turkey's involvement in peace operations in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan has increased the professionalization of the Turkish Armed Forces. It helped legitimize Turkey's efforts to modernize its army, not to eliminate possible sources of insecurity.

One of the most important problems of Turkey faces is terrorism. Participating in the peace operations has created opportunities for cooperation in terms of terrorism. The TAF has also gained the operational capability of dealing with the PKK- KONGRA GEL terrorism through the experiences it gained abroad. This is important because PKK- KONGRA GEL offers a non-traditional security threat and coping with it requires expertise in low intensity conflicts and operations other than war (OOTW). The Turkish military has gained such expertise through joining peace operations.

¹⁴⁶ Turkey's military incursions into northern Iraq in pursuit of PKK terrorists and Turkish readiness to use force if Syrian and Greek Cypriot governments did bow to Turkish demands are two examples of the changing nature of Turkey's military doctrine.

Turkey has shared its capability and experience with terrorism with other countries and benefited from the experiences of other countries as well by contributing to peace operations in Afghanistan. As Turkey is a country located in the middle of current and potential conflicts, the Turkish Army has been familiar with many kinds of these threats, especially in the context of terrorism, for many years. The Turkish Army is one which has gained the most training, experience and success in the struggle against terrorism in the world to date. Turkey succeeded in defeating the terrorists inside and ensured peace at home. The success has boosted respect for Turkey in the international arena, particularly in its region, and as a result Turkey may play bigger roles in the future. The Turkish Armed Forces have had the opportunity to share the expertise gained against terror with the armed forces of other countries, to transfer its experiences to them and at the same time, to benefit from the experiences of other armed forces.

In weak states that have failed, or are on the verge of failing, Turkey's presence in peace operations discouraged some countries from aggressive activities. This served as deterrence for other countries that might have hostile plans towards Turkey in the future. The deterrence of the TAF and the level it has reached in low, medium and high density conflicts has been displayed. Turkey has displayed what it is capable of doing in the international arena to the western community. Participating in peace operations contributed to Turkey's growing presence in key nations and regions. Turkey's opportunities and abilities have been shown to the world in the peace operations that it has participated in under the umbrella of the UN or NATO. Turkey, having a constructive role in the region, has proved to the international community that it has the ability to be helpful in the establishment of peace and stability

in the Balkans, within the international framework of the support and efforts in terms of finding a fair and permanent solution to the problems of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Turkey's participation in peace operations has also contributed to good public relations and to the promotion of the dignity of Turkey. Participating in peace operations has made its Armed Forces known (Kocatepe, 2001:619). The training level, discipline, effectiveness, equipment and materials and command structure have been shown to the international community. Turkish soldiers have taken the opportunity to show their traditional characteristics such as discipline, sense of duty and humanitarian characteristics to the international community and other countries contributing troops.

The success of the Turkish brigade that participated in the Korean War and the bravery that was presented are praised by all countries, especially South Korea and the USA. The sympathy, objective approach and activities of the 300 Turkish troops who served in "Operation Restore Hope" organized in Somalia by UN were admired by citizens of Somalia, and its modern equipment and tools were admired by other countries. Hamid Karzai, Afghan Head of State, in his speech in the ceremony held for transfer of the ISAF command, said that Turkey and Afghanistan had lived as friends for years and now Turkey would continue its help by taking over the command and that he was very happy because of this fact. The dignity of the Turkish Armed Forces among other armed forces has increased even more. The Afghanistan operation showed that Turkey is not only important for its region but also is an indispensable part for the world security environment.

In today's world, participating in peace operations has helped Turkey respond effectively to the risks and challenges of globalization. The more Turkey contributed to peace operations, the more secure it felt, in regard to both hard (conventional) and

soft (non-conventional) threats. The post-Cold War era security understanding prioritizes ‘human security,’ ‘the global, interdependent and trans-regionalized nature of security’ and the ‘closer linkage between internal and external developments.’ The number of inter-state wars has decreased significantly since the end of the Cold War, but intra-state threats to human security have gained prominence. Turkey’s participation in peace operations has demonstrated that it has paid attention to human security and has become increasingly concerned about the human rights situation and its potential to spread instability to neighbouring countries in the region. By contributing to peace operations, Turkey has tried to persuade the international community that Serbian aggression was a direct threat to the sovereignty of Kosovo and violation of human rights of its citizens. Ankara, which had been accused of violating human rights by European states for years, has shown its sensitivity for human rights by contributing to these peace operations.

Turkey’s participation in peace operations has demonstrated that the Turkish Army has accumulated experience, knowledge and ability to make plans at operative and strategic levels and carry out these plans in the multinational environment as a leading country. Contributing to ISAF as a leading country has elevated Turkey to the position of “planning country” from “supporting country.” Ankara has found the chance to prove that it is successful as a regional power and ready to assume more responsibilities.

Wearing a blue helmet has also promoted Turkey’s reputation as a concerned, responsible regional power. Taking into consideration the contribution of Georgian and Azerbaijan platoons to SFOR and KFOR on the one hand, and the contribution of Albanian and Azerbaijan platoons to ISAF on the other hand (as subunits of Turkish Battalion Task Force), Turkey’s participation in peace operations has

demonstrated that Turkey is a ‘power producer’ country rather than a ‘security consumer’ (Bağcı and Kardaş: 2004). By contributing to peace operations, Turkey has increased the respect of its armed forces much more among the other countries’ armed forces.

The importance of lobbying is undeniable as a strategy for having a voice in the international arena. Nowadays, Ankara has gained more effectiveness in lobbying by contributing to peace operations. Participating in peace operations gave Turkey the opportunity to send many civil technical staff both to UN decision-making bodies and to the establishment of civil headquarters in the force headquarters of the operation and this might influence the decisions that will be made to be in line with the interests of Turkey.

Its participation in peace operations in the Balkans, Caucasus and the Middle East has made Turkey effective in preventing the adverse effects that occur in its neighborhood by participating in peace operations. Participation in peace operations in the Balkans and Caucasus has helped Ankara preserve regional and global peace and stability, reduce tensions and contain conflicts, resolve disputes through peaceful means, encourage the propagation of democracy and the rule of law, prevent ethnic conflicts from spilling over into its territory, create a peaceful and stable environment around it, and finally, improve relations with the countries in these regions.

Another political-strategic related set of impacts of Turkey’s participation in peace operations is that it has provided Turkey with some important lessons learned.¹⁴⁷ The TAF has learned that in contributing to a peace operation, it is necessary to study and analyse the background to the conflict carefully before

¹⁴⁷ Mission reports of personnel deploying in peace operations are used as primary source. The only official source about lessons learned from peace operations is Subconcept of Peace Support Operation, Education and Doctrine Commandership, 1997.

sending any troops to such a mission. Turkey's contribution to peace operations based on unambiguous resolutions will likely enhance its success. Weighing conditions carefully will enable operations more successful. Lack of consent on the part of the various factions could prolong peace operations, leading to a stalemate in certain cases. A lead nation with adequate resources and political will, as well as the capacity to deploy well-equipped and prepared military forces quickly and convincingly, can be crucial for the credibility of a peace process.

Evaluation of the political environment after the conflict will highly probably prevent that Ankara stays outside the table in the new political environment. The TAF has gained beneficial experiences for the reshaping of its force structure by participating in peace operations. Peace operations defined new criteria in the determination of priorities and precautions to be taken in the modernization of the armed forces. If it is established that it will be nearly impossible to win future wars by land occupation, the need for reshaping the force structure in this direction has been seen clearly. It has been understood that the execution of a more active foreign policy is required in order to protect Turkey's far and near benefits. It has been witnessed that it is necessary to participate effectively in political and military formations that can intervene in crises and conflicts.

Making some political and economic arrangements will likely prevent the migration of Turks from regions with current peace operations to Turkey. Therefore, the acquisition of Turkish nationality can be made difficult and staying in regions with peace operations can be made attractive. Especially students going to Turkey for their education have the desire to stay in Turkey after their education is finished. They do not want to return to their country. They try to fulfill these desires through different means (marriage and acquisition of Turkish nationality, etc.). Prevention of

these kinds of things and making them return to their country in any case will benefit Turkey. It would be useful for both public and private sectors to invest heavily in regions with current peace operations. Renting and operating of the factories, which were operating before the war, by Turkish businessmen for a certain period of time will likely guarantee the future of Turkish society living in regions with current peace operations.

4.1.2. Organizational and Educational (Training)

Turkey has gained several important military benefits from participating in peace operations. The Turkish Armed Forces have gained beneficial experiences for reshaping its force structure by participating in peace operations. The TAF has been compared with the armed forces of other countries and its superior and defective points have been determined. In parallel with the concept of forward defense, Turkish security policy makers have found it necessary to transform the TAF from a conscript based conventional army into a professional army consisting of highly mobile and technologically equipped military units (Hickok, 2000:105-120).

Turkey has transformed its army and gained a new structure and role. In light of the critical developments in the post-Cold War era, Turkey adapted and transformed its army in order to cope with new security challenges. Participation in peace operations and the skills and experiences acquired by the Turkish peacekeepers abroad have also contributed to the modernization of the Army in line with the changing security understandings during the post-Cold War era. Therefore, in response to Turkey's growing exposure to a constellation of hard and soft security threats, security policy makers should have increasingly found it necessary to improve the operational capabilities of the TAF. Turkey's attainment of soft and hard

military security capabilities would make it a more credible and influential power in the region.

The General Staff now has a particular branch responsible for participation in peace operations.¹⁴⁸ A brigade, the 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade, has been assigned for peace operations as the result of Turkey's participation in previous peace operations. The Brigade is under the command of the 4th Corps. This unit was established on 19 April 1976 as the 28th Motorized Infantry Brigade in Mamak, Ankara in place of the 28th Motorized Infantry Division which was deployed to Cyprus because of Turkish Military Intervention in 1974 (Kutluhan, 2002:52-57). It was organized as the Mechanized Infantry Brigade by restructuring on 1 July 1992 and was renamed the Peace Force Brigade in 2001.

The 28th Mechanized Infantry (Peace Force) Brigade, is located within the same barracks as the 4th Corps in Mamak, Ankara, and is a unique brigade in Turkey as it is assigned for peace operation missions. The brigade carries out all activities and training related to peace operations. The brigade consists of one Headquarter Company, four mechanized infantry battalions, one tank battalion, one artillery battalion, supporting units and units connected to it. One mechanized infantry battalion of the brigade serves in Bosnia-Herzegovina, another battalion serves in Kosovo, and the other battalion serves in Afghanistan.

Since 1992, the 28th Mechanized Infantry (Peace Force) Brigade has been preparing and training Turkish soldiers who will serve in peace operations. To this end, conscripts in particular have been trained for 10 weeks on peace operation subjects after completing basic military training, which lasts 3 months. In addition to training fields and peace operation classrooms, the 28th Mechanized Infantry (Peace

¹⁴⁸ Detailed Information about this branch of the Turkish General Staff can be reached at <http://www.tsk.mil.tr/uluslararasi/barisidestekharekatkatki/index.htm>

Force) Brigade has a standing Peace Support Operation Center. It controls and follows up Turkish contingent activities, follows their daily activities, takes their reports, rapidly examines them and combines their daily actions and exercises to convey to Land Forces Headquarter and other related units if needed and transmits the commands, directives and instructions to the Turkish contingents. The military tasks and the task of suppressing a social disturbance in particular, require sufficient training about these issues. The Turkish Armed Forces has established a training unit as a subunit of the 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade and all of the military personnel assigned to the TBTF are being trained by this unit.

In parallel with Turkey's increasing participation in peace operations, the TAF has also been faced with the need to operate in coordination by rearranging its functions related with NATO and to cooperate in crisis areas by using both its own and civil sectors' capabilities. Within this context, the TAF Logistics and Humanitarian Aid Brigade was established on July 20th, 2001. The Logistics and Humanitarian Aid Brigade is the unique logistics unit for peace operations and carries out logistics and humanitarian activities and training related to both peace operations and natural disasters. The Brigade Command is composed of Headquarter and Headquarter Support Company, CIMIC Unit, Functional Expert Teams, Special Engineer Battalion and three Logistics Support Battalion which will serve in three different mission region simultaneously. The mission of the Brigade is to provide logistics support and humanitarian aid and/or to minimize the negative effects of the conditions after natural disasters and to contribute to the efforts in returning to normal life conditions.

The Turkish Armed Forces, which gained a certain experience by participating in the activities of peace forces, will train the armed forces of other

countries in case of such a demand. In this way, Turkey has both been publicized and foreign exchange has entered the country. Participation in peace operations has given this force the opportunity to receive realistic information on the sufficiency of arms, equipment, training levels, technologies and communication service support belonging to other troop contributing countries, and to compare this information with Turkish troops, and to make up the deficiencies.

The staff participating in the activities of peace forces have developed a broader vision and have taken the opportunity to know the citizens and armed forces of other countries. The TAF has gained useful experiences for forming the power structure in the future by participating in peace operations. These operations put some new criteria forward for the determination of precautions and priorities for the modernization of arms systems. When we take into consideration that it will be nearly impossible to win fights by occupation of lands, it can be clearly seen that the power structure could be formed in this direction. The necessity of forming an armed force that aims to have a constant potential to cause great harm to the aggressor came into being in order to deter and to obtain national objectives.

Through participating actively in the peace operation in Somalia, the Turkish Army has gained international experience in peace operations, which it could not gain during the Cold War era. A significant portion of the military staff has taken specialized training, including intensive English language courses, communications and driver training. Because of the short deployment cycles in the peace operations, experienced personnel regularly returned to their units with greater skills and experience, which they helped disseminate to their colleagues. Turkish military personnel have also gained the experience of cooperating and working closely with the armed forces of allied countries. Forming a friendship between the staff of the

TAF and staff of other troop contributing countries has resulted in positive effects for the mutual assistance of armed forces. It has given the TAF the opportunity to cooperate and work with the armed forces of other countries that participate in the peace operations. As evidence, John Mccoll, English Major General, who transferred the command of ISAF in Afghanistan on June, 20 2002 said that everybody worked in a cooperative manner during the term of Office for the provisional government and declared his trust in Turkish Troops.¹⁴⁹

Turkish soldiers have gained considerable experience by contributing to peace operations. The added skills and experience acquired by peacekeepers have contributed to the overall modernization of the Turkish Army. Turkey's participation in peace operations has benefited the capabilities of individual soldiers and entire units. Formal training, field and command post exercises, and operations on the ground in peace operations have given hundreds of officers and troops direct experience in dealing with devious local political factions, crowds of displaced civilians, fiercely independent providers of humanitarian relief, and randomly planted landmines.

The TAF has also shared its capabilities with other troop contributing countries and benefited from their experiences in peace operations. Turkish soldiers have also helped Turkish politicians and bureaucrats who worked with them in gaining experience. The information and skills that have been gained by participating in peace operations has developed and it has contributed to the expansion of this information to the Turkish Armed Forces. In the field, officers observed and adapted to one another's tactics, techniques, and procedures. Peace operations highlighted the

¹⁴⁹ Turkish Press Review, Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister, Summary of the political and economic news in the Turkish press , 21.06.2002 , "Turkey Takes Over Command of ISAF" at <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2002/06/02X06X21.HTM#%201>

need for much better language capabilities, bilingual capabilities being especially important for unit and subunit commanders. Moreover, interpreters were found to need more than language facility; they also needed to understand the concept being translated, implying a need to be familiar with the other country's military doctrine, methods, and terminology.

Turkey contributed to this attitude towards the TAF by having special troops with high levels of training required in order to be a candidate for peace operations. Participating in multinational forces has provided the TAF with the opportunity of effective training in real war conditions and has increased its experience. No training can replace war experiences for the Armed Forces. War is not a desirable phenomenon; however participating in an operation of Multinational Forces in order to see what troops are capable of when obligated to fight together, and to detect and make up for the deficiencies in this undertaking is important.

That rules of engagement be well understood by all personnel of Turkish contingents and interpretation of the rules be consistent across contingents will likely enhance its reliability. The contingent commanders may ensure that all personnel are fully aware of the rules of engagement through extensive briefings both before deployment and following deployment. It has been understood that all personnel know thoroughly the UN legislation, and taking a counselor who knows this legislation to the region will probably enhance success.

Upon arrival in a mission area, receiving a proper induction and orientation briefings including familiarization with mission standard operating procedures developed and issued at the start of the mission will likely prepare all staff members for their tasks. The induction course could cover all relevant subjects, including background information on the mission, its mandate, the history of the conflict,

information on local cultural and religious practices, the obligations and responsibilities of UN personnel in the host country, standards of personal conduct, etc. Creating specific induction packages for their new staff members, explaining tasks and functions will probably make each component more effective. Establishing a staff welfare committee to organize staff activities to promote informal interaction between staff in different areas of the mission will encourage greater cohesiveness within a mission, hence, improve working relations. In a multinational operation, there would be need for effective communications between national contingents as well, and the further need to interact and communicate effectively and consistently with the local population.

Having the trained personnel and equipment needed to fulfill the tasks of the mandate will likely make Turkish contingents contributing to a peace operation more effective. It is the responsibility of Turkish Army to ensure that its contingents are adequately equipped, trained, led and motivated for service with a peace operation. Developing mission standard operating procedures will likely enhance effectiveness of the operation. Other countries' contingents such as Azerbaijan, Georgia and Macedonia which will serve under the command of Turkish units in a peace operation have different military cultures and standards of training. These diverse backgrounds need to be harmonised for smooth co-ordination during peace operations. In this regard, it is gratifying to note that many efforts are being made by Turkish Army. Turkey's efforts in creating joint training institutions, and running workshops, seminars, conferences and map exercises will probably ensure some common denominators are established.

Conducting mission-specific pre-deployment training will prepare all contingents for peacekeeping duty. This training could include the following topics:

mandate of the mission, background to the conflict and the security environment in general, mission rules of engagement and other standard operating procedures, Code of Conduct and personal behaviour, health and hygiene, drivers' education, mission's working language, weapons and equipment, and crowd control techniques. Meaningful and realistic training will likely build confidence, improves cohesion, and prevents boredom. Tasks that have been well-learned and repeatedly practiced are less disrupted by stress. Continuation of their own training programmes will probably ensure Contingents' preparedness.

Preparation of the Turkish Contingents contributing to peace operations to undertake the full range of tasks expected in these operations, including robust deterrence will likely enhance effectiveness of the operation. Mission training cells needs to be encouraged to conduct refresher training courses in addition to the induction training/briefings they already conduct for contingents and staff officers. In multidimensional missions they can also be used for conducting specialized training or integrated training with other mission components.

Communications means are essential for all units to fulfill their operational tasks. Providing properly trained communications personnel and communications equipment that is workable upon deployment will likely enhance success of a peace operation. Well established Communication and Information Systems was an important role and this assisted the success of the peace operations that Turkey contributed to. Secure voice, data and video teleconferencing facilities functioned well especially in ISAF. Establishing communication teams equipped with high-technology devices and whose educational levels are high enough are important for the success of a peace operation.

An important experience has been obtained with the active participation of the Air Forces' components in the peace operation in the Balkans. Establishing a modular structured Corps consisting of two brigades that will execute OOTW and a Logistics Brigade that can provide Logistics support in these peace operations will probably enhance Turkey's success. Training of the modular structured corps to be organized according to the purpose and teaching the required languages to the personnel will enhance its effectiveness.

The Peace Force Training unit could take place in the establishment of that Corps and the assignment of modulation personnel after taking enough training on operations other than war may improve its accomplishments. Creation of a stable environment will likely enhance its success in the task, and CIMIC may be constituted so as to have dominance in terms of morale and tactical. A unit that will carry out psychological operation activities may be established. Assignment of a Special Forces team to the units that will participate in Peace Operations will assist them in Special Forces Operation. The presence of at least one NBC (Nuclear, Biologic, and Chemical) team in the forces will likely protect the forces against the threat of using chemical arms against the parties. The individuals who will direct Turkish policy may officiate in the peace force units. For this purpose, it will be suitable to assign a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs so that he/she will act jointly with Peace Force units. Forming a team of mine detection dogs under the Corps will help the mines, especially the plastic ones, to be found while executing the mine clearance mission. A Commando battalion may be established under the Corps. A corps that can execute operations other than war operations may be self-sufficient and may take advantage of personnel, materials and resources from other units, public institutions and organizations.

4.1.3. Tactical

Participating in peace operations has contributed to the testing and made up for the deficiencies in command-control and communication systems. For example, US troops in Somalia communicated with their country with the help of small portable radar and satellites. For the TAF, a need for including such a system to the inventory was added to the agenda. Levels of experience were improved through working within and being exposed to the multinational environment. Turkey's participation in peace operations has given the Turkish Armed Forces the opportunity to eliminate deficiencies in terms of the intervention of events in civil society, media and public relations, and management of psychological operations. It will facilitate the harmony of Armed Forces with the Combined Joint Operations and will make up for the deficiencies.

Participating in peace operations under the command of the UN and NATO has given the TAF an important experience. The tactics needed in using modern arms systems in an armed forces' repertoire were observed. Especially, the extent of effectively using guided weapons, called intelligent ammunition, and to what extent force saving can be assured were determined. Turkey's participation in peace operations has given the Turkish Armed Forces the ability to serve in different lands (desert, dense forests, and residential areas) and climate conditions (very hot, very cold) and the TAF has become able to serve in every climate and land. The mobility of the TAF over long distances via highways, railways, naval ways and airways has developed.

The participation of the Turkish Air Force in peace operations of NATO brought it the ability and opportunity to perform operations in an international environment, including logistics support. The Turkish Air Force is a power that is

acquainted with NATO doctrine procedures and training along with national doctrines. The national operations or joint or independent operations in NATO, with controls and assessments, constantly developed this ability. However, the Bosnia peace operation was the first confrontation with a real operation for most NATO administrators and forces that participated in the operation. For this reason, available concepts and methods were constantly developed and the Turkish Air Force immediately benefited from this development. As a result, the TAF did not lag behind in the implementation of more developed air forces.

Along with the acquisitions of the Turkish Air Force as a result of its participation in peace operations, the TAF also observed and compared the implementations, opportunities and abilities of other air forces with its own opportunities and abilities, and that it drew lessons in order to know what should be developed and obtained to become a more effective military power. In the Kosovo operation, the protection that advanced technology arms and arms systems provided the Turkish Air Force and the damage given to the enemy were observed by the TAF on hand.

The Kosovo Operation provided the reinforcement of new air operation concepts that were implemented in the Gulf Operation. This is an approach that deals not only with the Air Forces of the enemy but also with the administration, economy, transportation system, energy resources of the Armed Forces of the enemy as a whole and that makes the systems of the target country inoperable and defines targets to create a strategic paralysis effect. Political, economic and military targets are considered together. Simultaneous attacks are realized at the strategic, operative and tactical levels. Thus, taking this new concept into account both in attack and defense

of power structuring will probably make the Air Forces a more effective military power.

Regular contacts and consultations with the other troop contributing countries (TCCs) are vital for the success of peace operations. The frank and open consultations including an honest assessment of the situation on the ground and what conditions troops are likely to face will probably increase the success of peace operations. Forming a common understanding on what has to be achieved and how will improve the efficiency of the force. It may even be essential to establish a robust, well-resourced public information component from the initial phase of a peace mission. The presence of the force component on the ground as early as possible will highly likely explain the mandate of the mission to the parties to the conflict, the local population, and the local and international media. This is essential to establish the credibility of the mission early on and shape realistic expectations among the local population. The other important issue is to avoid any interference with the internal affairs of the country politics.

There had been problems with the administrative and operational control of UNOSOM II operation. Owing to the complex, multinational nature of UNOSOM operations, Lieutenant General Çevik Bir, the force commander of UNOSOM II, had been constrained by the need for extensive consultation before ordering troops from different countries to execute tasks which are crucial to the success of their missions. Consultations tended to waste vital hours and days, eventually resulting in the loss of lives.¹⁵⁰ General Bir explained that, as commander of UNOSOM II, he had faced some problems since he had almost no authority to charge the contingents under his command and control. Contributing countries had been assigning their forces to the

¹⁵⁰ Interview with General Çevik Bir on 10 February 1994

UN with the condition that they could determine their area of responsibility by themselves. He had been trying to command these forces according to the preference of their countries. This understanding had been one of the difficulties faced by General Bir throughout his service (Bir, 1999:79). Respecting to the related authority by all of the other units and organizations in the area of responsibility of the Peace Force will enhance success. Reacting to incidents and sending timely reports are essential for command and control. Force protection of all the units is also an important issue in a Peace Operation.

Security equipment, such as detectors, x-ray devices, armored vehicles and narcotic sniffing dogs are essential equipment to ensure the security and force protection of the units. In these peace missions, it will be suitable to be focused on and give priority to small scale units/facilities having an asymmetrical impact and giving support to regional populations and the other country squads taking place in the international environment instead of combat squads being superior in numbers. Giving priority to helicopter squads in some peace operations will probably improve their effectiveness. It has been evaluated that undertaking the responsibility of running facilities having a strategic characteristic like airports will probably benefit Turkish contingents. It has been observed that charging special squads that are small but have operational efficiency and have received alpinism and/ or ski training according to the characteristics of the region in which the operation will be carried out is important.

Establishing psychological operation teams which are equipped with technological possibilities and with highly educated personnel is important in order to ensure that Turkish contingents can become self-sufficient in these matters. The national limitations that Turkey puts on the usage of its squads may be compatible

with the national limitations of other countries. Some authorities on this subject may be given to the commanders, who are operating at the rank of generals in the region. Some flexibility may be given to the Commander in the region for the implementation of national limitations declared by NATO. It has been demonstrated that issues like Special Operations and Psychological Operations are important.

From past operations, it has been understood that it is necessary to give the charged personnel the authority of opening fire in the face of situations like skirmishes with ethnic groups, mine dangers, or ambush fires. It has been appreciated that team unity in Common and Joint Operations carries a great deal of significance. It has been realized that the mines which are not marked can create great dangers. It has been revealed that the squads that will participate in these types of operations may be trained for various kinds of tasks ranging from the control of an air space to the control of a city, and they may be prepared for these issues. It has been realized that the fact that far-reaching activities like the foundation of a government and the establishment of a State's functions may be necessary and may be taken into consideration, and this is necessary to train personnel on these subjects.

Unmarked mines had been a danger for the TBTF. Due to lack of personnel in the Explosive and Ordnance Disposal (EOD) team, the TBTF was faced with some problems during collecting arms. Patrol teams had to wait for EOD personnel when they found some materials in some certain places since only EOD personnel were authorized to touch them. Utilizing EOD teams in every TBTF during a peace operation will likely enhance its success.

4.1.4. Operational and Planning

A geographic information system cell may be established as early as the mission planning stage to ensure such coverage from the very beginning. Turkish Contingents could be encouraged to conduct pre-deployment visits by assessment teams to their future areas of operation, when possible. Teams may include experts on logistics and operations. In later peace operations, the Turkish Army carried out pre-deployment reconnaissance visits to their future areas of responsibility to understand the situation on the ground and better prepare their troops. This initiative led to very good results in terms of the preparation of contingents prior to deployment.

Pre-deployment reconnaissance, which is essential to achieving a rapid and structured military deployment schedule, can be a prerequisite for all new missions. Perfect coordination with the specialists before coming to the theatre is of crucial importance to clarify the requirements of personnel, logistics, communications and all of the other equipment. Careful determination of the structure of troops to be deployed will likely increase the effectiveness of Turkish Army in peace operations. For instance, while ISAF II had roughly 4,800 personnel, only 850 were infantry troops assigned for patrolling and check-point duties. The rest were staff and support personnel. This is because many countries preferred not to provide combat troops. In order to be effective, it may be necessary to remove bottlenecks in the organizational structure of Turkish units in peace operations. Having special tables of organization and equipment (TOE) for units including upgraded communications, observation, and mine clearance capabilities, as well as psychological warfare (PSYOPS), and civil affairs capacity will likely enhance the success of Turkish Units sent into peace operations.

It has been understood that the Planning Group, which will be formed after the UN's decision, could prepare all sorts of plans before the components come to the region. This group could also define clearly the functions and responsibilities of the units when they arrive in the region. The probability plans may even be prepared 4 or 5 months beforehand, and the detailed handbooks of strategically important regions that can enter in the sphere of interest may be prepared by coordinating related ministries in order to be prepared for future peace operations. The characteristics of local people and of the forces that will participate in the operation may also be specified in these books.

It would be beneficial to contact with people having the knowledge of the region beforehand, such as journalists and traders, and to attain knowledge about the region. Having learned from past operations, contributing to peace operations at the right time will likely be more favorable for Turkey. When it is decided that the Turkish Armed Forces will participate in a peace operation, the time should be determined in the best way. For instance, avoiding creating an unrealistic environment, such as stating "Look, Turkish soldiers are turning back after long years" will benefit Turkey. A wrong evaluation that will be made on this subject can both decrease the respectability of Turkey in the public opinion of the world and make Turkey a military target.

Rumors are common before deployment. Providing accurate information to soldiers and their families will get them have appropriate expectations and will prepare them psychologically. Transmission of information from the chain of command may be scheduled on a routine basis so that soldiers will learn to rely on official sources, rather than rumor. Information about the mission's background, the rules of engagement, the length of deployment, the culture of the country of

deployment, the threat of disease, etc. will give soldiers a concrete focus for plans and actions.

Selecting well trained personnel for the peace operation is another key issue for the operation's success. It has been noted that some of the personnel serving in early peace operations do not have the enough skills and competencies to represent the Turkish Armed Forces and Turkish Republic abroad and do not know how to behave. The success of a peace operation relies heavily on the individual and collective skills of its personnel, particularly its leadership. For instance, the appointment of a Turkish Commander to Afghanistan was cited by many as a critical element in winning the confidence of the local people.

Selection and appointment of staff with the necessary professional skills and experience for key positions from the start of a mission will highly likely increase operation's success. Senior military leaders, such as the Force Commander, Deputy Force Commander, Chief Military Observer, may be selected not only for their extensive military experience, but also their ability to work in a multinational and multicultural environment. They may have excellent political and diplomatic skills and demonstrate the ability to build a team. They may be able to command the respect of both their own forces as well as those of the parties to the conflict. As far as possible, they may be involved in the initial planning of the mission and the development of the concept of operations.

Being represented effectively inside all of the headquarters at an operative level in the operation area will probably increase the influence of the Turkish Army. Giving priority to be represented in the command groups of the headquarters or in the sections of G-2 (Intelligence Officer), G-3 (Operation Officer), and CIMIC is of crucial importance. To be represented in the headquarters at the rank of general and

if not possible, at the rank of colonel is also important factor. The permanent representation of especially critical offices in these headquarters, rather than the cyclical change in the participation of these offices, may be taken into consideration. It has been observed that selecting the cadres and units that can create maximum representation through minimum usage of forces and resources, with the maximum influence on the local people and on the personnel of other countries who can provide the possibility of obtaining the maximum amount of information about the developments and orienting the events are important.

Some of the problems experienced by the Turkish contingent are directly related to linguistic diversity. The contributing countries have different languages as well as their different military cultures and standards of training. These diverse backgrounds have sometimes created problems. Peacekeepers were not talking about the same thing as happened in NATO. There was no plan, standard procedures etc.¹⁵¹ Since the common language within the UN or NATO peace operations has long been English, assignment of personnel who have proficiency in English to the cadres will likely increase the success of Turkish contingents. It has been evaluated that the language level of the personnel who will take charge in the International headquarters should be 'very good/good, the language level of those who will take charge in the other cadres should be 'intermediate'.

It has been demonstrated that intelligence is important in peace operations. Problems of control in peace operations have been exacerbated by a lack of meaningful intelligence. It is common knowledge that for any operation to succeed there is the need for adequate intelligence which will enable cohesive planning. Dispatching troops to the mission area with very little information about the people,

¹⁵¹ Interview with General Çevik Bir on 10 February 1994

their culture, their beliefs, traditions and customs will likely decrease the efficiency of Turkish contingents. Many of the troops were inadequately briefed on Somali culture, leading to inappropriate behavior on their part. There was not Somalia handbook on Somali culture. In UNOSOM II, some personnel of the Turkish contingent had some problems since they were not made fully aware of the mission's rules of engagement.¹⁵²

Intelligence gathering is a serious business and needs to be carried out by trained and competent staff in order to achieve coherent planning. Coordinated training for peacekeeping troops and civilian staff alike in intelligence and counter intelligence is necessary for success in future operations. It will be suitable to support the activities of Turkish contingents with information support elements and the teams of HUMINT (Human Intelligence). In order to ensure that Turkish contingents can become self-sufficient, establishing intelligence teams which are equipped with technological possibilities and with highly educated personnel is important. It has been revealed that the number of arms declared by the clashing groups is different from the real numbers and taking special measures for arms control will likely increase the success of the operation. It has been seen that the best way of collecting combat intelligence is to meet regional people and speak with them. It has been understood that the confirmation of reconnaissance information obtained from the air is important. It has been realized that it is essential to know the local languages (in addition to English) of the regional people along with their social and cultural characteristics. Currently, the possibilities and competences of the menacing countries must be known in order for the modern airplanes can perform their functions in the most efficient ways. In order to have a better situational

¹⁵² Interview with General Çevik Bir on 10 February 1994

awareness, the Turkish Air Forces could have the possibility of real-time intelligence and employ unmanned aerial vehicles.

The system of liaison officership had been well organized by the US Army in Somalia. Every unit which arrived to Somalia had been provided with an American liaison officer and this officer had been staying with his vehicle, driver and radio. Most of them held in the rank of Captain or Major and had been serving voluntarily. If Turkey assumes the leadership of a peace operation in the future, using this method will be useful.

4.1.5. Logistic

Deployment has provided the opportunity to field-test equipment and methods, to gain first-hand experience in the field and to assess the capabilities of other nations deploying or supporting the peace operation. Additionally, deployed units have been provided with the newest equipment. For instance, medical units bring the latest in field ambulances and mobile operating theaters, while other units utilize communications equipment and light arms which they are able to test and refine under field conditions. Turkey's participation in peace operations gave the Armed Forces the opportunity and ability to try and implement the planning, transportation and control of operations that will be held thousands of kilometers away from Turkey and to ensure logistics support. Overseas deployments tested Turkish logistics systems, and provided opportunities to experience and learn from other nation's systems.

The Turkish contingent in Somalia experienced some operational setbacks initially because there were no updated maps of the area of operations for accurate operational planning or orders. Locations of hostile incidents were difficult to report,

deployments of troops and patrols were hard to plan and operational tasks were made much more difficult because of the lack of good maps.

For the soldiers to better orient themselves in a new environment, the best cartographic information of the mission area can be made available before deployment. Updated maps of the area of operations are essential tools for soldiers to conduct their operational activities on the ground.

There was also a lack of water, food, medicine, oil etc. in Somalia which could not meet the requirements of the Turkish contingent as well as the other troop contributing countries (Bir, 1999:30). The Turkish contingent thus faced significant difficulties in the beginning of its deployment. Adequate logistic support is a necessity for Turkish contingent to be successful in peace operations. Basic items such as tents, flak jackets, ballistic helmets and ambulances to carry their sick and wounded to the field hospital will enhance its success. Without effective logistics support, an essential element of peace operations, contingents will always feel abandoned and unable to operate at their optimum. In this regard, the pre-positioning of essential logistical items in the peace operation regions is of vital importance. The logistical capability of the military makes it well suited to perform certain kinds of assistance interventions, such as road repair and other reconstruction activities. Turkish contingents undertook many humanitarian projects, which benefited the local population immensely. These projects were all funded from the contingents' own resources.

Somalia was an alien and formidable environment for the Turkish contingent. Deployed soldiers confronted a very harsh climate and risked exposure to diseases. Many more serious infectious diseases existed in Somalia than in Turkey. Not only were many infectious diseases present, but the insects and other means of

transmitting them were also present.¹⁵³ Large numbers of displaced, malnourished, sick and dying people living in crowded unsanitary conditions increased the risk of epidemics. The Turkish soldiers were particularly vulnerable because they had not been exposed to many of these diseases and had no immunity to them. Decreasing health problems through pre-deployment ‘Preventive Medicine Measures’ and vaccinations according to the regional characteristics of the area of operation will probably improve operational effectiveness. Peace missions’ effectivity requires the adoption of a multi-pronged preventive and treatment strategy for serious health hazards, such as malaria and HIV/AIDS.

Logistics is the main problem area and need to be carefully planned and executed. Availability of planes (transportation or tactic) and various construction equipment (in particular military engineering construction equipment) to Turkish contingents will improve their efficiency. It has been realized that the materials and the equipment that are given to both preliminary delegation and the real force could be portable and arranged in such a way enabling them to be carried by containers. Although many troop contributing countries had troubles with their clothing and equipment because their uniforms were not suitable for the characteristics of the operation and operation region, the Turkish personnel seemed not to be troubled by this (Bir, 1999:44). It has been noted that the performance of the force will be likely affected by the suitability of their clothes to the regional weather conditions.

It has been further observed that satellite communication capability will improve personnell’s morale. Today, the need for Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) planes in addition to warning systems deployed on land for the

¹⁵³ See, *Sustaining Soldier Health and Performance in Somalia: Guidance for Small Unit Leaders*, Prepared by the Staff of the U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine Natick, MA 01760-5007 and Walter Reed Army Institute of Research Washington, DC 20307-5100 December 1992, p.24

expedition and direction of the operation is obligatory if the Turkish Air Forces participate in a probable operation inland or abroad. For this reason, accelerating the procurement of airborne early warning planes will increase the efficiency of the air force.

A modular structure of the logistics unit will be more appropriate; it will be suitable to transform the unit rapidly according to the structure of the peace operation and to train and organize this unit in such way that it will support at least four peace operations that may be executed at the same time. Following a very brief warning, establishing the logistics units suitable to the operation type to be implemented in the peace operation will be appropriate. Organizing a flexible and modular structure that can fit to the establishment and to the structure arising from the differences of function in the peace keeping and peace enforcement operations will probably enhance logistical support.

The Turkish soldiers experienced some stressors related to dangerous situations and separation from their family. The environment in Somalia was also highly stressful for all staff. They had to adapt to this new situation. Yet, none of the staff had access to a stress counselor. The Turkish contingent did not have a psychologist in Somalia. There is a need for qualified stress management personnel to counsel staff in peacekeeping operations. Regular counseling session may improve personnell's psychological health.

4.1.6. Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC)

The Turkish Armed Forces has gained experience especially in CIMIC activities. After all, the ultimate aim of peace operations is to restore peace and stability which will enable people to return to a normal way of life. It has been

demonstrated that issues like Press and Public relations and civil- military cooperation activities are important. In order to defuse the negative effects of the intimidation people feel in a peace operation region because of the economic, military, and manpower strength displayed by the international community, it is essential to show to the people respect. Showing respect is also the key to gaining the trust of the people living in peace operation region.

Projects undertaken by military contingents to improve the life of the local population where they are deployed are essential for building a positive relationship with the local population. These projects serve also as an important confidence building and peace-building measure that has important political benefits. A civil-military coordination cell could be established to coordinate such activities. Many CIMIC projects also paid political and security dividends beyond the initial humanitarian purpose. Resurfaced and rebuilt roads improved security and access, encouraging refugee returns and increased commerce. Rehabilitated market facilities and schools provided opportunities for ex-combatants to return to civilian life. Soccer fields and balls donated by Turkish contingents occupied young people who otherwise had nothing to do. Most projects were undertaken in consultation with the local communities.

Since CIMIC personnel officiates in the peace operation for six months is disadvantageous, the period in office can be lengthened. While the personnel are trying to become acquainted with the public and vice-versa, the period comes to an end. It will take the personnel approximately three months to establish an understanding of the people connected in the operational region, and to learn the environment. The fact that the personnel may be sent to the region in an overlapping way will probably remove a weakness in this subject. The task of

securing and maintaining mutual trust and respect is the most crucial aspect of any peace support operation. The main principle in a peace operation should be “to show polite behavior to local people.” For this reason, it is essential for countries to provide prior training to their personnel on the delicate nature of peace operations, which requires courteous behavior towards the local population. Being seen to act impartially, being of mature age and/or having experience in your field, taking the time to listen to representatives of the population, and never losing your temper all contribute to gaining the population’s trust and respect, which in turn enables a more effective discharge of the mission’s mandate.

In a peace operation, it is a necessity that all personnel respect the country’s customs, cultural values and religious beliefs, in other words, they pay attention to the sensitivities of the people. At the same time, in a peace operation all personnel should take great care to set an equal approach to all ethnic groups of the country. Otherwise, people can easily see peacekeepers as invaders. On the CIMIC issues, working in very close consultation and coordination with the local authorities, the UN and other Non-Governmental Organizations are another important aspect of peace operations. A common CIMIC fund for peace operations’ assistance activities towards the local community would be useful.

Ignoring the role of the media will likely decrease the operations’ success. Media plays an important role in achieving goals by informing local and international community about the activities of peace operations and incidents that have taken place in the area of operations. The media is also of crucial importance in reporting on time and accurately, and preventing incorrect news production. For this reason, holding press briefing will inform the public through one source and correct information. Some UN agencies, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees

(UNHCR), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the World Food Programme (WFP), as well as a number of NGOs may indeed be considered valuable partners to the military in the saving of lives. These organisations have financial and material resources that peacekeeping forces do not have. In many peace operations, however, friction has developed between the peacekeeping troops and the NGOs. With adequate and coordinated training, the differences in culture and modus operandi can perhaps be sorted out and the gap between these groups bridged for the benefit of those who are affected by conflicts.

There has also been friction between the military components of peace missions and the media. The duty of the media is to inform and educate. If accurate information is concealed from them, they will find some information from inadequate sources any way. On the other hand, when handled properly, the media can be a very powerful tool for commanders in a stressful and desperate situation. It will also be suitable to support the activities of these components with information support elements, and the teams of CIMIC. Of further note is that the team commanders who have local translators speaking the local language and knowing how to approach local people are more successful in the peace operations. Considering the characteristics of the region and the ethnic structure, planning of at least one translator among the local or military personnel for each team doing CIMIC activities will likely enhance communications with local people.

Peace operations personnel will benefit from being educated in public relations and civil-military co-operation at the orientation program before taking responsibility. In addition, CIMIC standard operating procedures will highly probably improve standardization of activities. It has been revealed that CIMIC,

Press and Public relations carry a great deal of importance in the operation of peace enforcement and protection. Of note is that, the US has the trained units and personnel on the subject of CIMIC and this area has been left to the US completely.

Increased number of Turkish NGOs in addition to assistance organizations could be directed to the region. Officer and non-commissioned officer selection process for CIMIC units in peace operations will determine how effective those units will be. Instead of selecting the persons who cannot realize the spirit of the mission; selection of those having the competence to carry the notion of Special Force will be more appropriate. Particularly those who will be charged with the duty of local institutions Communication officer and Humanitarian Aid officer may be experienced, strong in bilateral relations, know themselves, have a few weaknesses, and have a strong character. Assignment of inexperienced people will likely decrease effectiveness of the mission.

A hospital that will be built in the region and the supplies and the doctors who will be assigned to the region by Turkish financial assistance will be a great factor for gaining public trust. Turkish units may operate health facilities having a characteristic of serving both local people on the wide plain and the other military units in the region

It is to be noted that VHF/FM radios cannot be used efficiently in the mountainous regions without transmitters. It has been experienced that the initiative can be held easily by applying C4ISR (Command, Control, Communication, Computer, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance) activities completely. An efficient command control system can be implemented without any faults and the desired result can be taken with the least loss, in the most efficient way and in the

shortest time. Therefore, the needs for including the systems that will maintain an efficient C4ISR environment in the inventory have been revealed.

Most of the F-16 and F-4 planes in the inventory of the Turkish Air Force have Self Protection systems. However, nowadays electronic combination has obtained a great deal of importance in order to paralyze the land and air command-control systems and other arms systems of the enemy. For this reason, the Turkish Air Force need the obtaining programs of electronic combination systems (Stand off jamming and Escort jamming). The needs for including the systems that will maintain an efficient Command-Control and Correspondence environment in the inventory have been revealed. Providing short-range portable radio equipment to the units will likely increase the efficiency. Efficient and effective official lines of communication with the home-base rear detachment may even be established promptly. Soldiers may be encouraged to write home. Unofficial communication, such as a unit newsletter written by deployed soldiers, can be effective in reducing rumors back home and families' fears about their loved one's living and working conditions.

4.2. Domestic Impact

This impact may be mentioned under the subheadings: Public Opinion Impact; Historical and Cultural Impact; Religious Impact; and Economic Impact.

4.2.1. Public Opinion Impact

Another set of impacts on Turkey's participation in peace operations in the post-Cold War era has been the role of public opinion in Turkey. Due to the presence of large numbers of Turks who had migrated from the neighbouring places, particularly the

Balkans, to Turkey over the years, the impact of its participation in peace operations on public opinion that have relatives in these regions is noteworthy. Turkey's participation in peace operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan has helped Ankara develop its policies concerning the peoples living in these regions. Everyday events and achievements of the Turkish Battalion Task Force in the Balkans were noted in the Turkish press and played a role in public opinion (Lesser, 2000: 183-199) for they involved parties with strong cultural, ethnic or religious ties to Turkey. Therefore, Turkish people have welcomed the sending of Turkish troops to the Balkans since this has possibly increased the welfare of their relatives. Ankara has contributed to the happiness and well-being of its citizens by participating in peace operations in the Balkans since many Turks have relatives in the Balkans. This has helped prevent any domestic disturbance in Turkey.

4.2.2. Historical and Cultural Impact

Turkey's contribution to peace operations in the Balkans has protected the historical cultural heritage of the Ottomans. It has contributed to the restructuring of the country socially and economically and has restored and rebuilt the traces reflecting the historical heritage of the Ottoman era (Bosna-Hersek Gerçeği, 1995:47). Turkey's participation in Multinational forces has enabled it to protect the works of art which were in the operation area and had impacts from Turkish history and also helped it to prevent the annihilation of the people with whom Turkey has historical ties. It has promoted Turkish culture and traditions in different parts of the world with the help of the Turkish Armed Forces. Important historical and cultural ties exist between the peoples of Turkey and the Balkan countries, which in effect mirror

Turkey's close ties with the region.¹⁵⁴ Turkey, which had been active in the Balkans since the 14th century, kept historical ties and relative relationships with Kosovo up to date. By participating in peace operations, Turkey has embarked upon relations which will bear fruit in 50-100 years in the country where this operation is held. It is obvious that the establishment of the feelings of friendship and mutual understanding between nations requires many decades. Its relation with the Republic of Korea is a good example for this. Turkey has sown seeds of friendship in Afghanistan, similar to those which it had sown and reaped concrete results from it in Korea in 1950, and led to a consolidated Turkish friendship with Korea.

Turkey's participation in peace operations has given the opportunity to establish close and deep-rooted relations with the host country as in the example of Korea. This friendship has enabled them to become closer and have close relations between them. This friendship and good relations is reflected in the political platforms and also solidarity in other different fields. For example, the Korean people supported the Turkish team and made advertisements with Turkish flags during the 2002 FIFA World Cup. The match to determine the third and fourth place between Korea and Turkey was a display of friendship rather than a harsh competition.

4.2.3. Religious Impact

Its contribution to peace operation in Somalia has had significant impact on Turkey regarding religion, for Turkey's population is overwhelmingly Muslim. Turkey, which was unable to prevent ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, much of it directed at

¹⁵⁴ See, Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Balkans, Last Updated: 29.11.2005 at <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Synopsis/SYNOPSIS.htm>

Muslims, has helped other Muslims in Somalia. Seen in this way, the participation of Turkey in peace operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo has also helped ease tensions in Turkey since the Muslim populations of Bosnia and Kosova are 43 % and 87 %, respectively. Turkey established a refugee camp in Kırklareli and hosted 18,000 Kosovar deportees. In addition, Ankara established two refugee camps in the Republic of Macedonia and Albania and provided shelter for more than 10,000 refugees (Turkish General Staff, 2001: 3).

4.2.4. Economic Impact

There is a rising trend of governments making financial gains from peace operations. The poorer nations may attempt to improve their financial positions by extracting as much money from UN peace operations as possible. Unlike these examples, Ankara is motivated by a boost in international stature. For Turkey, motivation for participation in peace operations is altruism and national prestige. Participation in peace operations is not supposed to generate financial benefits for Turkey. However, Ankara has gained several economic benefits from participating in UN or NATO peace operations. Its participation has made a contribution to the revival of the Turkish economy as the equipment for UN logistic support is provided from Turkey. Even though participating in peace operations for humanistic reasons is more important, its material contribution to Turkey cannot be undervalued. Some of the countries that participate in peace operations make economic contributions by leasing transportation means (plane, ship, etc.). Turkey has also gained in economic terms by leasing its available transportation means to the UN.

The presence of a Turkish contingent in a peace operation has encouraged Turkish businessmen to make business contracts. Deploying in Bosnia, Kosova and

Afghanistan has brought investment to those countries. Its participation in peace operations has given Ankara the opportunity to increase its export and to realize technology transfer by obtaining new economic markets and having close relations with other contributing countries. The use of war weaponry and equipment (F-16, Aselsan, etc.) that are produced in Turkey has given the opportunity to find a market for these products and might contribute to the growth of the defense industry. An opportunity to find new markets for the home produced armored combat vehicle (ACV), F-16, light arms, radio, equipment and training uniforms that are used in the peace operations by Turkish contingents has arisen. Participation in peace operations has also enabled Ankara to take its place in the peace talks to be held after the conflict. In this way, the private sector has taken the opportunity to find new markets. In the conflict areas, the restructuring and development after the end of conflict and conclusion of final peace agreement create a big market.

Participation in the peace operation has also made an important material contribution to Turkey. This has increased the economic wealth of the staff working there and it has also become a contribution to the Turkish economy. For example, the soldiers of the countries that participate in the UN peace operation receive a certain wage. Turkish soldiers in Bosnia-Herzegovina were paid 25 US Dollars and officers and non commissioned officers were paid 25 to 70 US Dollars per day. Turkey's participation in peace operations has helped an important amount of the material contribution that Turkey annually pays to the UN to come back to Turkey. By participating in peace operations, Turkey has established close relations with other participant countries, has obtained new economic market opportunities, and ensured the future transfer of technology. Provision of supply materials and equipment that

are part of the logistics support needs of the UN from Turkey has indirectly ensured revival of the Turkish economy.

4.3. Ideational Impact

Turkey's participation in peace operations has had a significant ideational impact on Turkey. This impact may be mentioned under the subheadings: Security Understanding of the West; Western Values; Relations with the US; Turkey's Image as a Security Producer Country; Turkey's Western/European Image; and EU Membership.

4.3.1. Security Understanding of the West

Turkey's increasing participation in peace operations during the post-Cold War era has demonstrated that it has successfully been adapting its security conceptualization/identity/culture/understanding to that of the West. Turkey's participation in peace operations has also accelerated the process of its successful socialization into the idea that 'during the Cold War era the armies of the western states were deployed on the ground to simply prevent the armies of the weak and totalitarian states from doing bad things outside their border whereas during the post-Cold War era the armies of the western states are now deployed to urge them to do good things inside their borders.'

The European continent and its surrounding regions have been passing through a critical period from the end of the Cold War towards a new system in which security, politics, economy, and society are becoming increasingly interrelated. The concept of security, which is one of the most basic issues for human beings, has gained new definitions, understandings and applications (Sperling and

Kishner, 1997; Buzan, 1991). The international community defines the greatest threats to international security and stability as those that stem from weak/failed/rogue states where domestic instability and economic underdevelopment prevail. In case of any domestic turbulence, the dangers would spill over to other places because in today's world, security concerns are transregionalised in nature (Oğuzlu, 2003:51-83).

Turkey now holds that defense starts outside territorial borders and what happens in other countries closely impacts its security interests. What happens outside of states did gain a priority for the western security interests. Thus, peace operations of the post-Cold War era became about the aspect of identity. It is without a doubt that Turkey's experiences in peace operations abroad have helped transform its security understanding in this way. The TAF has begun to define Turkey's security identity and interests in a way consistent with EU norms and principles.

In the post-Cold War era, Turkey's security concerns increased, its security burden became overloaded, and the new security issues influenced its security understanding. Ankara's increasing emphasis on socio-economic and cultural-political aspects of security (soft security) by contributing to peace operations provided positive implications for Turkey's being recognized as Western/European in the post-Cold War era. The ISAF experience demonstrates that in the post 9/11 world, Ankara has signed onto the logic that international security and internal affairs of states are closely related to each other.

4.3.2. Western Values

Turkey's participation in peace operations has demonstrated that it has been considering legitimate western countries' attempts to extend western values to non-

western areas. In particular, the PfP Training Center is of great importance in this vein. In addition to providing the Alliance with hard military power in risky locations on the world map, Turkey has also tried to adapt to the new changing identity of the Alliance by taking part in many of the NATO-led peacekeeping and peacemaking operations in and around Europe and by redesigning its defense policy in line with the defense reforms in NATO. Turkey has proved to be an ardent participant of the Partnership for Peace Program and to this end hosted a PfP Training Center in Ankara (Karaosmanoğlu and Kibaroglu, 2002: 131-164).

Turkey, as a NATO member, has actively participated in the deliberations aimed at establishing and enhancing the PfP and launching the Euro Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), and has wholeheartedly supported regional co-operation within the PfP (White Paper, 2000:14). Ankara pays great importance to the PfP programme, and considers the PfP programme an important mechanism to enlarge the peaceful environment by improving friendly relations further with all PfP countries. Turkey is very eager to contribute to international peace and stability within the framework of the PfP (Turkish General Staff, 2001:15). Within this context, Turkey decided to establish a ‘PfP Training Center’ in light of NATO’s Partnership for Peace initiative and the 5th paragraph of Point 25 of the Washington Summit Communique and declared that decision at the ministerial meeting of the NACC/EAPC in Sintra/Portugal, on 30 May 1997. Then Under-secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Onur Öymen stated in the opening of this Ministerial Meeting:

“... we attach particular importance to the more operational role of the enhanced PfP. We have already decided in principle to create a multinational unit, which will be used for possible peace support operations. Our military authorities will develop the modalities of this project in consultation with the partners concerned. Furthermore, Turkey is planning to establish a PfP training center,

which will contribute to achieving peace and stability in our region.”¹⁵⁵

The Turkish PfP Training Center was inaugurated with an international opening ceremony on 29 June 1998 in Ankara along with the first PfP Orientation Course held between 29 June-03 July 1998.¹⁵⁶ In accordance with the ‘Concept of PfP Centers,’ all requirements were completed and the center was recognized and accredited by NATO on 12 February 1999 (Turkish General Staff, 2001:16). It is worth mentioning that it is the first recognized PfP training center by NATO of the nine PfP training centers.¹⁵⁷

The principal objective of the PfP Training center is to provide qualitative education and training support to military and civilian personnel of partners in accordance with NATO and PfP general principles and interoperability objectives and to organize courses in various fields ‘in the spirit of’ the PfP, bringing together officers from PfP member countries (Von Moltke, 1994:3-7). The mission of the PfP Training Center is to plan and coordinate all PfP and peace operation training and education activities (except for exercises) at strategic (military-political), operational, tactical-technical level and language courses. Military-political, operational and tactical courses have been carried out directly in the PfP Training Center while

¹⁵⁵ Statement by Ambassador Onur Öymen, Under-secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs-Turkey in the Opening of the Ministerial Meeting of the NACC/Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), Sintra, Portugal 30 May 1997 at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1997/s970530n.htm>.

¹⁵⁶ For further information, see the official PfP Training Center site at <http://www.bioem.tsk.mil.tr>.

¹⁵⁷ They are in Greece (Multinational Peace Support Operations Training Center, 19 May 2000), Ukraine (Yavoriv PfP Training Center, 22 March 1999), Romania (Bucharest PfP Training Center, 25 March 1999), Switzerland (Geneva Center for Security Policy, 6 April 1999), Austria (Austrian International Peace Support Command, 19 April 1999), Sweden (Almnas Training Center, 21 April 1999), Slovenia (Slovenian Language Training Center, 31 July 2000) and Finland (Finnish PfP Training Center, 24 July 2001) Akçapar, Burak.1999. “PfP Training Centers: Improving training and education in PfP,” *NATO Review*, Web Edition, 47(3):31-32

technical courses and courses requiring field/sea training have been conducted in academies, military schools and training centers throughout Turkey under the command of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Gendarmerie Training and Doctrine Commands (TRADOC) and Joint Staff Colleges within the coordination of the PfP Training Center (Turkish General Staff, 2001:16).

In addition to the PfP countries, Turkey provides training opportunities to personnel from non-PfP countries like the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Bangladesh, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Gambia, Egypt, Jordan, Malaysia, Pakistan and South Korea. The course's subjects given in this center related to peace operations are such as: Legal Aspects of Peacekeeping, Peace Support Operations, Land, Air, and Navy Forces in Peace Operations, Logistics in Peace Support Operations; CIMIC in Peace Operations and International Decision Mechanism (Sezgin, 1998).

One of the main focuses of the PfP is the development of greater co-operation in the field of peace operations. NATO and partner countries are increasingly likely to find themselves side by side in responding to, and implementing, UN and OSCE mandates in peace operations (Von Moltke, 1994:3-7). The Ankara PfP Training Center makes great contributions to the efforts of PfP countries to meet their requirements to reach NATO standards. The purpose of the support given by Turkey to the personnel of these PfP countries is to assist them for adaptation to NATO's doctrine, principles, tactics, procedures and standards. It's obvious that Turkey, by means of the PfP Training Center, has contributed to peace and stability by developing a common understanding and methodology and will continue to play its key role in supporting peace operations (İnan and Yusuf, 1999: 68-84).

4.3.3. Relations with the US

Turkey's participation in peace operations has demonstrated that Ankara has been able to co-operate with the United States on the basis of its well-established strategic-security understanding. The overlapping of American interests with those of Turkey in peace operation areas has made it possible for Turkey to follow such a course. Turkey's contribution to peace operations has fostered bilateral cooperation with the United States in economic, social and military areas. Bilateral co-operation with the United States, particularly in the aftermath of 11 September 2001, through participating in peace operations in the fight against global terrorism has offered the state elite in Turkey a valuable opportunity to underline once again Turkey's western identity and its indispensable place within the western international community (Turan, 2002: 10-18). The security culture of the Turkish Republic made it possible to cooperate with the United States in the above-mentioned regions. Both Turkey and the United States are used to operating in the international arena in accordance with the principles of *realpolitik* (Oğuzlu, 2003:294).

With Turkey's increasing participation in peace operations, US administrations have expressed support for Turkey's membership in the EU. They have played the role of consoling Turkey when it has been rebuked by the Europeans. Washington had the most influence in promoting the significance of Turkey and its support for Turkey's membership in the EU has gained further significance not only for Turkey's aspirations to join the EU but also for Turkey's increasing contribution to peace operations.

Participation in peace operations has become an effective strategy to help re-establish Turkey's western and pro-American identity. That is why Turkey led the peace force in Somalia, sent substantial numbers of military troops to Bosnia and

Kosova, and recently joined the International Assistance Force in Afghanistan. For example, by assuming command of NATO forces in Afghanistan, Turkey has demonstrated the solidarity of the US-Turkey strategic partnership and Turkey's resolve to combat terrorism. Turkey's participation in ISAF was also a well thought out strategic calculation on the part of Ankara to help mend fences with the Americans following the deterioration of the bilateral relations in the wake of the latest Iraqi War (Kapsis, 2005: 380-389).

When the Turks claim that Turkey is a 'security producing' country because it has participated in many of the NATO and UN international peace operations, as well as in NATO's Partnership for Peace activities, they have found a receptive ear in Washington (Oğuzlu, 2002: 74). Washington has often praised Turkey's participation in peace operations and has stated that Turkey is a security producing country. The words of Mark Parris, the former US Ambassador to Turkey are important in illustrating the effect of Turkey's participation in peace operations to US-Turkish relations in the post-Cold War era; "From a security perspective, the military dimension of the relationship proved as important as during the Cold War. Turkish participation in peacekeeping actions in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia demonstrated to Pentagon and White House planners Ankara's capabilities and readiness to shoulder responsibility as a 'security producing' nation" (Parris, 2003:7).

On 1 November.2001, President Bush remarked that Turkey's decision to deploy special troops for the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan refuted allegations that the US-led war was one against Islam. Recalling that Turkish-American cooperation had been initiated during the Korean War and had continued with the Gulf War and Kosovo conflict, Bush said, "Today, Turkey and the US are

growing closer than ever before as part of our efforts to establish a world order based upon peace.” Meanwhile, the former US Ambassador to Turkey Robert Pearson said that the US was highly appreciative of Turkey’s decision to send troops to Afghanistan.¹⁵⁸

Another impact of Turkey’s participation in peace operations is that the US wants to see Turkey as a stability factor in the Balkans. The fact that Turkey is the only Muslim country that is considered as the representative of the Muslim World by western civilization has given Turkey the opportunity to take its own place in the peace talks. Turkey’s contribution to peace operations across the globe and its adoption of western security understanding appear to be among the most important reasons why the United States invited Turkey to send its troops to Iraq in the summer of 2003.

4.3.4. Turkey’s Image as a Security Producing Country

Turkey’s contribution to peace operations helped the members of the western community understand that Turkey is a security producing country in the region and is always a part of the solutions, rather than the problems. Turkey’s image as a security producing country has been enhanced. Turkey was seen as a “security burden or consumer” country.¹⁵⁹ Since the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, it has become rather commonplace among EU policymakers to present Turkey as a consumer and not a producer of security in Europe. The EU’s move to transform itself from a purely civilian power to a military power and its

¹⁵⁸ Turkish Press Review, Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister, Summary of the political and economic news in the Turkish press , 02.11.2001, “US President Bush praises Turkey” at <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2001/11/01x11x02.HTM>

¹⁵⁹ See Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, *Europe’s Security Parameters*, paper delivered at the Conference on Turkey and Central and Eastern European Countries in Transition: A Comparative Study with a View to Future Membership to EU, Bilkent University, Ankara, 9 March 1996.

growing interest in the constitution of a European military crisis management capability has created an opportunity for Turkey to prove itself useful as a producer of security in Europe. Investment in the military sector, which inevitably resulted in identifying Turkey as a “security consumer” at the beginning of the 1990s, shifted to investment in the civilian sector in peacekeeping and peacemaking operations by visualizing the country as a “security provider” towards the end of the 1990s (Hürsoy, 2005: 419)

The decision to initiate BLACKSEAFOR and the Southeast European Brigade should be interpreted in this vein. These initiatives have nothing to do with Turkey’s efforts to increase its security against regional threats. All of these initiatives were undertaken among others with the prime motivation of helping the members understand that Turkey was a security producing country in the region and always a part of the solutions, rather than the problems (Karaosmanoğlu, 2000:199-216).

Turkey’s participation in such operations has also helped dispel fears of a rising-hegemon Turkey. Scandinavian countries and countries such as Canada and Austria regularly participate to the activities of peace operations. These countries are known and respected as pacifist countries. Turkey’s participation in the UN Charter and in the activities of the peace keeping in line with the spirit of this Charter has increased its dignity in the international arena and contributed to its pacifist image. Its pacifist image as a country has changed the widely held negative view of Turkey. It has caused the negative propaganda against Turkey to fail.

4.3.5. Turkey's Western/European Image

Turkey's contribution to western security interests had in the past constituted the most important link tying it to the West, and therefore making it easy for Turkey to be recognized as western. Turkey's relationship with Europe and the West had been questioned deeply with regard to identity concerns especially after the collapse of the bipolar world system in the beginning of the nineties. The difference between the Turkish way of modernization and European civilization were clearly exposed. In such a negative atmosphere participation in peace operations appears to have offered Ankara a window of opportunity to help register its diminishing Western/European identity. Appearing to contribute to western security interests was hoped to re-establish the most important link tying Turkey to the West, viz. the security. The more useful Turkey became for western security, the more western it would be recognized by the West.

Turkey's contribution to peace operations solidified its European/Western identity and provided effective functioning for Turkey's relations with the western international community. Participation in peace operations provided Ankara with a western identity in international politics. Turkey's Western/European image in Washington and European capitals has improved through its active involvement and successful performance in peace operations. The roles Turkey played in peace operations have served as occasions on which Turkish policy makers articulated and defined its Western/European identity as well as maintaining its security needs and interests.

Turkey proved that it is successful as a regional power¹⁶⁰ and ready to assume higher responsibilities by participating in peace operations. Both sides of the western world now consider Turkey as a regional power contributing to peace and stability. Turkey has been regarded as an island of stability in the midst of regional instabilities. In this sense, Turkey's concern of being recognized as Western/European country has been met by its participation in peace operations and close cooperation with the West against new challenges.¹⁶¹ Given that many locations where Turkey sent peacekeeping units did not directly affect its security in the realist or neo-realist sense, its participation has become a policy instrument to help bolster Turkey's Western/European identity.

Ankara pays close attention to every international organisation in the region, including NATO, OSCE, WEU, and the EU. By participating in peace operations within these organizations, Turkey did not stay out of their activities which may have had implications for Turkish foreign and security policy if they had. Ankara's stronger links with the UN, NATO, the EU and OSCE within the framework of

¹⁶⁰ The "major regional powers" refer to the four to seven most militarily powerful states in each of the five regions of the world in terms of level of military expenditures and number of military personnel, including external states with substantial military forces based or deployed in each of the regions. The following countries are considered major "regional powers" during part or all of the period from 1945 to 2002: (1) Asia/Pacific Region: Australia (1958–2002); China (1945–2002), France (1945–1954), India (1947–2002), Japan (1952–2002), South Korea (1958–2002), Russia/Soviet Union (1945–2002), United Kingdom (1945–1958), United States (1945–2002); (2) Europe/Russia/Former Soviet Union Region: France (1945–2002), Italy (1945–2002), Russia/Soviet Union (1945–2002), United Kingdom (1945–2002), United States (1945–2002), West Germany/Germany (1949–2002); (3) Middle East/North Africa/Persian Gulf Region: Egypt (1945–2002), France (1945–1962), Iran (1945–2002), Israel (1962–2002), Saudi Arabia (1945–2002), Turkey (1945–2002), United Kingdom (1945–1970), United States (1970–2002); (4) Sub-Saharan Africa Region: Ethiopia (1945–2002), France (1945–2002), Nigeria (1960–2002), Portugal (1945–1975), South Africa (1945–2002), United Kingdom (1945–1980); and (5) Western Hemisphere Region: Argentina (1945–2002), Brazil (1945–2002), Canada (1945–2002), Mexico (1945–2002), United States (1945–2002) (Sources: *National Material Capabilities Data, Version 2.1*, Correlates of War (COW) Project, University of Michigan; World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency/U.S. Department of State).

¹⁶¹ Uğur Ziyal, 'Re-Conceptualization of Soft Security and Turkey's Contribution to International Security,' *Turkish Political Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 2004). The text can be reached at http://www.turkishpolicy.com/default.asp?show=sum2004_Ugur_Ziyal

peace operations has strengthened its western orientation and bolstered its European identity. With its participation in peace operations, Turkey has been seen much more in the activities of the UN and has played a much more active role in the international arena after the end of the Cold War. Turkey has shown its respect for the new values of the United Nations in the post-Cold War. Although it has not been elected as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council as of writing this dissertation, Turkey has gained international respect on the world stage. Turkey's increased activity in international organizations provided it with new additional fora to express its views about security issues in Europe and other regions.

States participate in peace operations to acquire a desired position in the hierarchy of states. Peacekeeping is a high profile international activity and participation can result in the elevation of status. Status and influence in international affairs is what states strive for, and therefore, participation in peace operations may be motivated by national interest. By contributing to peace operations, Turkey has rose to a favourable position in the international hierarchy of states. A realist perspective of state participation in peace operations recognises that, if a state's interest is linked to the continuation of the international status quo, it will use whatever means at its disposal, including peacekeeping, to preserve that favourable status quo. By contributing to peace operations, Ankara preserved the continuation of the international status quo. The fact that Turkey is a prestigious member of the UN has a certain effect on the neighbor countries and on the countries in the region. This is a worldwide advertisement and publicity for Turkey. One of the most important methods of protecting peace is deterrence. For this aim, there should be armed forces that are strong enough to protect peace. In this way, the threats and aggressions of the neighbors and other countries can be prevented. The fact that Turkey participates in

peace operations under the umbrella of the UN or NATO and that it has strong armed forces has reinforced the importance of Turkey's force and has increased the importance and bargaining power of Turkey in the political platforms.

It is widely known that the media directs the international public in the information and communication era. In the framework of UN resolutions, the whole world watched live, the operation made in Iraq by Coalition Forces for 15 days. Live broadcasting of humanitarian aid given to the hungry people in Somalia had an important role in the publicity of the countries and their armed forces that participated in this operation. Participation in the activities of peacekeeping forces has introduced Turkey and the Turkish Armed Forces to the world.

4.3.6. EU Membership

It is also worth mentioning in this regard that Turkey's participation in ISAF and signing on to the security logic in the post-9/11 era has contributed to the EU's more constructive attitude towards Turkey's demands to join the EU. EU membership was viewed as evidence of Ankara's claim to belong to the western civilisation. Turkey's chances of EU membership are strongly bound to its performance in successfully adopting distinctive EU values and norms, which are less about security than they are about democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and transparent and impartial procedures. Although the EU required Ankara to meet very complex and detailed accession criteria if it wanted to join the EU, Turkey's participation in peace operations has increased its chances of becoming a member of the EU from a strategic-security perspective. During its Laeken Summit in December 2001 the European Union invited Turkey to take part in the European Convention scheduled for April 2002. This was a remarkable development given that the EU prior to 11

September had refused to issue an invitation to Turkey, even though it had invited all of the other candidate countries.

The EU has started to see Turkey's participation in peace operations as strengthening Ankara's international profile. Statements by many senior generals indicate that the Turkish Armed Forces has begun to define Turkey's security identity and interests in a way consistent with EU norms and principles.¹⁶² The new emphasis on economic development and political liberalization at home, and participation in multilateral peacekeeping operations and the use of economic diplomacy abroad, attest to this changing rationale.¹⁶³

The European Union has been eager to develop its own autonomous military capability not because of a desire to prevent unconventional security risks and challenges from disrupting the stability and prosperity of the continent. The major goal of the European Army has been to enable EU members to respond to any former Yugoslavia type crises that may occur within the European continent in the future (Rasmussen, 2002: 54). It seems that the EU's approach towards the European Army is in accordance with its security understanding and threat perceptions in the post-Cold War era (Oğuzlu, 2002:65). For any country to join the EU, the first requirement is adoption of the conceptual basis and dynamics of the EU's security modelling. It is only through this that the EU can feel secure against possible sources of threat that may originate from the EU's periphery.

Turkey has proved its commitment to European security both during the Cold War era and in its aftermath. It has also decided to allocate a significant number of

¹⁶² Speech by Deputy Chief of Staff, General Yasar Buyukanit, conference on globalization and security, Turkish War Academy, 29-30 May 2003

¹⁶³ Speech by Deputy Chief of Staff, General Yasar Buyukanit, conference on globalization and security, Turkish War Academy, 29-30 May 2003

troops and other more sophisticated military capabilities to the emerging European Army.¹⁶⁴ Turkey's participation in peace operations has demonstrated that the EU needs Turkey to function in the European theatre to intervene in possible crises that might erupt on the peripheries of the continent (Petersberg tasks) until such time as the European Union is able to mount its own army in the field. Turkey is a NATO member with geopolitical and sophisticated military assets (Baç, 2000: 489-502) and can help the EU establish an autonomous European Army and help the EU with tasks of humanitarian intervention, peacekeeping and conflict management.

The important point here is that Turkey's development of peacekeeping capabilities and potential contribution to the European military force in peace operations would not only enhance its bargaining power vis-à-vis the EU, in the sense that the EU would benefit from Turkey's military capabilities in an instrumental manner, but also suggests that Ankara is transforming its security identity into that of the European Union around the principles of crises management and human security (Oğuzlu, 2005:83-104).

Its close strategic relationship with the United States in Eurasia, Central Asia and the Greater Middle East inhibited Turkey's internalization of the EU's security identity in the past (Oğuzlu, 2003:294). However, Turkey's participation in peace operations has helped this process. Closer co-operation between the EU and Ankara within peace operations has had the added benefit for Turkey of bolstering its hopes that the credentials of its European identity (and the security this identity would bring) are more solid. Turkey's membership from a security perspective seems to have become more likely as the post-11 September era has presented the parties with

¹⁶⁴ 'Turkish General Staff's View on ESDI', *Insight Turkey*, Vol.3, No.2 (April-June 2001), pp.87-95.

new rationales for bridging their security differences and as Turkey's participation has increased in this new era.

With its participation in the ISAF, Turkey sided with the western international community on the new security strategy. In addition, Turkey's leading role in the ISAF also implies that the West can successfully deal with the security challenges of the post-September 11 era only in close collaboration with the Muslim world. Turkey, a secular and western oriented state with an overwhelming Muslim population, would certainly add to the legitimacy of the western-led international peace operations in the eyes of the Muslim communities around the globe.

Turkey's participation in EU-led operation, such as Operation *Althea* (EUFOR) has an important impact in this regard. This would send the strongest signal, it can be argued, to the Muslim world that the EU does not define its security identity and its interests in opposition to the Muslim world (Oğuzlu, 2005:99). This is an important reason why the EU asked if Turkey would join the EU mission in Congo. Turkey's eagerness to join the EU-led peacekeeping force in Congo should be seen as a strategic action on the part of Ankara that this would help bolster Turkey's its European identity.¹⁶⁵ Turkey does not have any strategic interest in Congo. Participation would suggest that Turkey helps the West project its constitutive values onto problem areas.

It would be difficult to prove that Turkey's transformation of its security understanding in a peacekeeping friendly manner on the one hand and active Turkish participation in peace operations on the other have increased the prospects of Turkey's accession to the Union and prompted the EU leaders to officially start the

¹⁶⁵ Stament By Ambassador Baki İlkin, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations at the General Debate of the Special Committee on Peacemaking Operations NewYork, 1 February 2005. The text can be reached at <http://www.un.int/turkey/page35.html>

accession talks with Ankara. However, it would also be wrong to underestimate such an impact. Now, an increasing number of westerners underline Turkey's contribution to western security and try to justify their arguments by pointing to Turkey's participation in peace operation across the world (Calleya, 2006:40-47; Barysch, and et al., 2005).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This dissertation aimed at understanding Turkey's motivations behind its policies and attitudes toward peace operations mostly organized under the leadership of the UN and NATO in the post-Cold War era. First of all, this dissertation described the changing nature of the UN peace operations which have evolved out of the collective security's failure since the beginning of the Cold War era. Peace operations are not, and never were, intended to be an alternative to a system of collective security. But as a result of the failure of the collective security system of Chapter VII of the Charter, peace operations were considered as a second best option as a useful instrument for the management of conflict. Peace operation evolved out of necessity as a pragmatic solution to a practical problem.

Peace operations evolved in size, complexity, legitimacy and effectiveness and went through periods of innovation, development and expansion. One of the main incentives behind the development of the UN peace operation was the Cold War political climate in which it evolved. The main concern was to localize conflicts and tensions and prevent them from escalating to a superpower confrontation. In this sense, the peace operations undertaken during the Cold War era were conflict-management activities.

However, peace operations were not been applied to all violent conflicts during the Cold War. The attitude of the two superpowers had a crucial impact on the performance of peace operations. The rivalry between the two superpowers often prevented the UN Security Council from taking effective action to contain and control conflicts. The UN was excluded from playing any peace operation role within the super powers' own "spheres of influence." More often than not, peace operations dealt with regional violent conflicts which had a wider potential for threatening international peace and security, in which the superpowers were likely to become involved. In almost every case, peace operations were applied to areas beyond the dominance of superpowers.

As written in the UN Charter, the UN has two main purposes. The first is to establish and maintain international peace and security. The second is to improve the political, economic, and social justice of the world's peoples. During the Cold War era, the first purpose meant the principle of non-involvement in states' internal affairs. The link between regional and international security on the one hand and the domestic orders of states on the other, was not fully established. External sovereignty used to be more important than internal sovereignty. As the second principle started to gain more legitimacy in the 1990s, observers have increasingly noted dramatic increases in UN-led peace operations.

The demand for, and the scope of, peace operations have steadily increased in the post-Cold War era. The UN has authorized or deployed a series of new missions. In order to understand the reasons for the expansion and the change in the nature of peace operations, this dissertation examined the international climate in this new era. The main reason for this expansion in the number of peace operations and observer

missions has been the increased capacity of the UN Security Council to agree on action in particular crises.

The second reason for the expansion of peace operations has been the large number of minor armed conflicts. The end of strategic competition between the US and the Soviet Union created an environment much more amenable to minor armed conflicts breaking out between small states. These minor armed conflicts transformed the global context of peace operations and significantly broadened peace operations' potential as a technique of peaceful settlement. The third reason behind the expansion has been the settlements of conflicts. The end of the Cold War allowed peaceful initiatives in the old conflicts caused by the spheres of influence inherent in the East-West rivalry and facilitated settlements of conflicts. The fourth reason has been the breaking up of states. Since the super power support, which suppressed internal divisions, withdrew, the number of states falling victim to domestic violence, often ethnically based, has increased. Further reasons have been a widespread mood of optimism, the process of globalization and the importance given to the multilateralism in international relations in the post- Cold War era.

There have been dramatic changes in the nature, as well as in the volume, of the UN activities in the field of peace and security. In addition to the increase in the application of peace operations, the types of missions, which have been mandated, have also altered. The objectives of peace operations have in fact, changed considerably: from helping in maintaining cease-fires during the Cold War, to becoming increasingly involved in peace-building missions during the 1990s. The peace operations undertaken during the Cold War era were conflict-management activities, whereas the ones undertaken during the post-Cold War era could be better classified as conflict-resolution activities. This dramatic increase in the number of

peace operations can be attributed to the changing nature of security challenges and threats. Today's conflicts are more likely to be intra-state rather than international conflicts, triggered by a range of factors, including social, ethnic or religious strife, the violation of human rights, poverty, the inequitable distribution of resources, environmental degradation, large-scale migration, drug trafficking, organized crime and terrorism.

Peacekeepers have now been given more challenging mandates such as organizing and supervising free and fair elections, monitoring arms flows and demobilizing troops, supervising government functions, the rehabilitation of refugees, disarmament, monitoring human rights obligations, assisting in the delivery of humanitarian relief and most importantly, nation-building. The development of post-Cold War peace operations have taken place in the integrated operational environment (conditions, circumstances of deployment) and in the multilateral or multifaceted nature of peace operations with various organizations taking into account supportive roles for either military objectives or preventative mediation objectives. The increased peace operation activity has strained the UN's resources and capacity because of both quantitative and qualitative changes in the operations themselves. The task of peace operations, which once seemed to belong exclusively to the UN, has become the growing area of interest for regional security organizations in the 1990s.

Just as the enlargement of the EU and NATO to Central and Eastern European countries has helped stabilize these regions and has improved European security, growing peace operations in the Balkans and other geographies have served similar functions (Smith and Timmins, 2000:80-90). Developing NATO's crises management capabilities on the one hand and endowing the EU with

peacekeeping/peacebuilding capabilities with crises-management and human security dimensions on the other, should be interpreted in line with this changing security understanding (Cornish and Edwards, 2001:587-603). These efforts are not only security oriented but also cover an ideational dimension in the sense that peace operations have enabled westerners to maintain the legitimacy of the core western values in the volatile international system. Peace operations have proved effective tools through which the West could project its constitutive values to non-western areas.

Even though Turkey's involvement in UN-led peace operations has increased in the post-Cold War era, Ankara shied away from such missions during the Cold War years. This was so despite the fact that 7 out of 13 peace operations were deployed in the Middle East. Turkey did not contribute to peace operations established during the Cold War era for several reasons. The international systemic change from a 'balance of power' to a 'bipolar' system with the onset of the Cold War era dramatically curtailed the maneuvering capability of small and medium sized countries, Turkey being no exception. Although Ankara did not remain completely isolated from these developments it did not contribute actively to the United Nations peace operations undertaken in the Cold War.

Turkey's attitude towards peace operations in the Cold War era was determined by its membership in NATO. Turkey had to streamline its peacekeeping policy with that of the alliance in general and the United States in particular. Given that the US/NATO was lukewarm to the idea of setting up peace operations for troubled conflicts, lest such contingencies might lead to dangerous confrontations between the US and the Soviet Union, Turkey had also hesitated to develop a strong interest in such operations. Another factor that appears to explain Turkey's

reluctance to join peace operations during the Cold War era concerns the fact that Ankara focused its energy on internal development and sought to avoid foreign tensions that could divert it from that goal. Instead of projecting power and contributing to peace operations, Turkey focused strictly on protecting borders and maintaining internal security.

Most of the regions where peace operations had been established were not a priority area in Turkish security calculations. Turkey did not want to provoke the Soviet Union by contributing to peace operations in the Caucasus and Central Asia, which were under the control of Moscow. Turkey's regional environment displayed far more stability than it does in the post-Cold War era. Turkey was not exposed to spillover risks since these conflicts did not involve Turkic and other Muslim peoples with whom Turkey had historic ties.

With the advent of the post-Cold War era, Turkey's contribution to peace operations increased. Several factors caused such a development. First, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the subsequent transformation of the political and strategic landscape of Eastern Europe and Central Asia and the eruption of violent ethno-national conflicts in the Balkans and the Caucasus affected Turkey. Ankara found itself at the very center of crises areas, where ultra-nationalist, aggressive and irredentist tendencies were vibrant. Unlike the Cold War era, Turkey geopolitically has become a unique country bordering several regions very different from each other. In parallel to such tectonic changes in Turkey's neighborhood, Turkey has become increasingly exposed to the side effects of intra and inter-state conflicts in all of these regions.

During the Cold War years, Turkey was mainly concerned with the existence of a direct military attack by a pre-determined enemy, the Soviet Union. In the post-

Cold War era, this hard-security threat disappeared, but new soft-security issues have come to occupy Ankara's agenda. Ethnic nationalism, religious fundamentalism, ethnic or religious terrorism, social and economic instabilities, illicit trafficking of arms and drugs, refugees and illegal migration became issues of concern. For the first time since the Second World War, Turkey has also faced sudden mass movements of refugees into the country.

Therefore, in response to Turkey's growing exposure to a constellation of hard and soft security threats, Turkey's security policy makers have increasingly found it necessary to improve the operational capabilities of the Turkish Armed Forces. In parallel to the concept of forward defense, Turkish security policy makers have found it necessary to transform the Turkish Armed Forces from a conscript based conventional army into a professionalizing army consisting of highly mobile and technologically equipped military units. Transformation of the Turkish Armed Forces with a view to dealing with a new type of security threats would be seen more legitimate were this transformation process carried out as part of Turkey's efforts to join peace operations organized under the leadership of the western international community.

Second, Turkey had to develop its military capabilities, particularly the ones in relation to peace operations, for it was no longer guaranteed that Turkey's membership in NATO would imply a full western commitment to its security. Turkey's defense against new type of threats would be possible through the transformation of the Turkish Armed Forces in such a way as to meet peacekeeping demands.

Third, the dynamics of Turkey's security relations with the western international community constitute the most important reason explaining its

decisions to join international peace operations, particularly in the post-Cold War era. Turkey's relations with the United States on the one hand and the European Union on the other, can help readers understand the rationale behind Ankara's decision to be part of such operations in troubled parts of the globe. Absent the western dimension, one cannot grasp the logic driving Turkey's policies. In addition to the western dimension, this dissertation also argued that the changing security dynamics in Turkey's neighborhood in the 1990s have contributed to the shaping of Turkey's peacekeeping policies. Turkey's decisions to improve its peacekeeping capabilities and growing aspirations to join such operations cannot be fully understood without taking into account the changing nature of Turkey's relations with the European Union in the post-Cold War era. Given that the end of the Cold War era had somehow decreased Turkey's European character regarding the European security architecture, it was hoped in Ankara that Turkey's successful performance in peace operations might reinforce Turkey's European image and then increase the prospects of its possible entry to the Union.

The important point here is that Turkey's development of peacekeeping capabilities would not only enhance its bargaining power vis-à-vis the EU, in the sense that the EU would benefit from Turkey's military capabilities in an instrumental manner, but also suggest that Turkey is transforming its security identity into that of the European Union around the principles of crises management and human security. Sending peacekeeping units abroad would at the same time imply that security is understood as effective governance at home.

Turkey wants to show the Europeans that its military capabilities, particularly in the field of peacekeeping, could help the EU deal with the emerging security threats in Europe's peripheries. Therefore, Turkey's decision to join many peace

operations in the Balkans and other places in Europe's peripheries can be attributed to the purpose of registering Turkey's security producing image with the Europeans. Participating in peace operations would also imply that the Turkish Armed Forces were becoming professionalized. Because peace operations demand special expertise, Turkey's involvement in such operations was hoped to increase the professionalism of the Turkish Armed Forces.

Theoretically speaking, we may define professionalism in two different ways. First, professionalization may mean the transformation of the Turkish Army from a conscript based structure into a professional soldier based army. I think there is not a clear connection between Turkey's participation in peace operations and transformation of the Turkish Army in this way. Second, professionalization may also mean the transformation of the Turkish military in line with emerging security conceptualizations of current military strategies across the world. In other words, professionalization in this regard can be defined as Turkey's efforts to modernize its army in a peacekeeping friendly manner. Above all, the second case suits the definition/idea of professionalization in the Turkish Army. The Turkish Armed Forces are already highly professional (its officer cadres). I think the problem rather, is its soft power aspects need to further improvement. In general, peace operations are man power intensive operations and in some respects they are low-tech. They require soft power experience and capability. Turkey's participation in peace operations contribute to the improvement of soft power aspects of the Turkish Armed Forces.

This dissertation argued that even though Turkey's security has come under serious challenges from regional developments, this can not convincingly explain Turkey's participation in peace operations. Stated somewhat differently, such

regional security threats are not compelling enough of a factor for Turkey to seek its security through peace operations. Neither the crises in the Balkans nor Caucasus seriously threatened Ankara's vital security interests. Besides, Turkey's own conventional military capabilities would likely deter possible aggressors. Moreover, how the neo-realist logic would explain Turkey's active involvement in the US led peace operations in Somalia and Afghanistan where Turkey did not have clear security interests, remains a puzzle.

Fourth, ethnic conflicts in Turkey's region generated extensive interest and concern in Turkey due to the presence of large numbers of Turks who had migrated from neighboring places, particularly the Balkans, to Turkey. The impact of pressure groups living in Turkey on Ankara's decisions to send troops to peace operations in the Balkans and Caucasus was noteworthy. Finally, the cooperation and understanding between the US and Turkey in their approach to regional security issues proved to be instrumental in facilitating greater Turkish activism to peace operations. Turkey contributed several peace operations as a consequence of the United States' insistence. It was partly under the urging of the United States that Turkey took part in the UN operation in Somalia, where the forces were actually led by a Turkish general. This logic, the need to ally with the United States against new threats, also played a significant role in Turkey's decision to contribute to the International Security Assistance Force in 2002. Turkey not only sent troops to this force but also commanded the international units there when NATO took over the lead of the operation in Afghanistan.

In sum, the reasons for Turkey's participation in peace operations are to show its respect for the values of the United Nations; to help improve the soft power experience and capability of Turkish Armed Forces; to show its western identity and

continue the cooperation with its strategic partner, the United States; to increase the prospects of its admission to the Union; to maintain its geo-strategic importance in global politics; to preserve regional and global peace and stability; to help reduce tensions and contain conflicts; to resolve disputes through peaceful means; to encourage the propagation of democracy and the rule of law; to prevent ethnic conflicts from spilling over into its territory; to create a peaceful and stable environment around it; to meet the public's expectations; to improve relations with the Balkan countries; to avoid behavior that may isolate Turkey in the international community; to keep close relations with international organizations carrying out peace operations; and to meet the requirements of the new concept of war.

Of all, two factors seem critical in understanding the rationale behind Ankara's peacekeeping policies. One is to improve Turkey's military capabilities to deal with new types of security threats, mainly emanating from its near abroad. Conventional military planning was designed with the sole goal of eliminating hard-core security threats, viz. territorial attacks from other states, mainly the Soviet Union. The 1990s, however, have gradually made it clear that security is structural and more about effective governance. The process of globalization has further increased security-interdependence. Seen in this way, the transformation of Turkey's military capabilities in a peace operation friendly manner would enable the country to deal with new type of security threats. Contributing to the good-governance of neighboring weak-states through the deployment of peace operation units abroad would certainly improve the security feeling at home.

Changing security conceptualizations in the West has undoubtedly led Turkey to attach an increasing value to peace operations. Participation in such operations did not merely imply Turkey's material presence in western initiatives but also suggest

the ongoing transformation of Turkey's security mentality in line with the West's changing security norms emphasizing crisis-management and the human dimension of security. Ankara's decisions to join peace operations have been mainly motivated by the ideational concern of being included in the western international community. While Europe sees peace operations as a constructivist effort to reshape the principles of international politics around the goals of crisis management and human security, Turkey has tried to register its western identity in the eyes of its western partners through its participation in such operations.

This dissertation argued that Turkey's involvement in peace operations during the post-Cold War era can better be explained by the dynamics of its relations with the West. Turkey's contribution to western security interests had in the past constituted the most important link tying Turkey to the West, and therefore making it easy for Turkey to be recognized as western. Turkey's concern with being recognized as western was met by its membership in NATO and close cooperation with the West against the common Soviet threat. In addition, Turkey's security identity and interests were in accordance with those of the western international community. While the West itself defined its security identity/interest in opposition to the Soviet Union and prioritized the preservation of western style of living as the most important security goal, Turkey did not find it difficult to become socialized to this understanding (Aybet and Müftüler Baç, 2000:567-582). What happened inside states did not gain a priority for the western security interests. Thus peace operations of the Cold War era fell short of having an identity-constructing aspect.

This situation has completely changed in the post-Cold War era. When the West started to see peace operations from a new perspective, Turkey's interest in such operations also developed. Turkey would not have remained outside such a

western project, while the credentials of its western identity have come under strong challenges following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and growing criticisms regarding its contributions to western security. While NATO has gradually lost its European and western character following the transformation of the Alliance from being a western collective defense organization into a semi military-semi political collective security organization, the EU increasingly emphasized liberal-democratic transformation of state-society relations as the most important criterion for membership (Cornish, 2004:63-74; Kurth, 2001:5-16; Webber, and et al., 2004:3-26).

Without denying the significance of political, social, cultural and economic factors, this dissertation shares the view that the more Turkey and the EU cooperate within peace operations framework, the greater Turkey's chance of being admitted to the EU. Developing peacekeeping capabilities would not only increase Turkey's leverage vis-à-vis the European Union and the United States in an instrumental manner, but also imply that Turkey has been adapting its security understanding to the security norms of the western international community, namely the significance of effective governance around the principles of liberal democracy, and the emphasis on crises-management and human security. Such a transformation would likely increase Turkey's chances of being admitted to the European Union in the long-term.

Turkey's most important security interest is to be seen as a modern and western country and to be included in western institutions. Given that security has traditionally constituted the most important link tying Turkey to the West, it would be critical for Turkey to adapt its security identity to that of the western international community, particularly that of the European Union, in order to be still regarded as western in the post-Cold War era. If Turkey were not to be seen as western in the

field of security, it would be much harder for it to be regarded as such in other realms. Given that many locations where Turkey sent peace operation units did not directly affect Turkey's security in the traditional sense, one can eventually claim that decision-makers in Ankara have tended to consider participation in peace operations as a policy instrument to help bolster its western identity, first and foremost in the realm of security.

Such an ideational concern has come to the forefront as western aspects of Turkey's international/security identity have been exposed to serious challenges in the 1990s. When the prospects of Turkey's accession to the EU remained low and the European character of NATO had gradually eroded, Turkey has increasingly turned to peace operations as an important instrument to help re-establish its weakened western identity. Turkey simply wanted to be seen that it was aiding the leading western powers in their efforts to project the constitutive norms of the West onto non-western places through peace operations. Such a stance has also been in conformity with the changing meaning of security in the post-Cold War years.

Even though security-related factors and the presence of pressure groups inside the country might have motivated Turkey's decision makers to actively take part in peace operations, their impact proved to be limited. Turkey did not have to join such operations in order to deal with the emerging security threats in its environment. Its own military capabilities would have proved to be too deterrent a factor in this regard. Moreover, Turkey did not have clear cut security interest in such regions as Somalia and Afghanistan. However, participation in peace operations in the Balkans and Caucasus has helped Turkey preserve regional and global peace and stability, reduce tensions and contain conflicts, resolve disputes through peaceful means, encourage the propagation of democracy and the rule of law, prevent ethnic

conflicts from spilling over into its territory, create a peaceful and stable environment around it, and finally, improve relations with the countries in these regions.

On the other hand, gauging the impact of pressure groups on Turkey's approach to peace operations has been a daunting task due to the problems of measurement. We know that a significant portion of Turkey's population have come to Turkey from the Balkans and Caucasus and they still have family connections with their relatives there. We also know that these people helped organize public meetings against the inhuman treatment to which their relatives were exposed in these geographies. They wanted the Turkish government to take a more active role by urging the international community to immediately stop the bloodshed. However we cannot be sure that decision makers agreed to send Turkish troops abroad due to the activities of these circles.

That said, participation in peace operations has had significant impact on Turkey. First, wearing a blue helmet has promoted Turkey's reputation as a concerned, responsible regional power. Turkey's image as a security producing country has been enhanced. Its participation in such operations has also helped dispel fears of a rising-hegemon Turkey. Turkey's image in Washington and European capitals has also improved through Turkey's active involvement in peace operations. Both sides of the western world now consider Turkey as a regional power contributing to peace and stability. Turkey has been regarded as an island of stability in the midst of regional unstabilities. In this sense Turkey's concern with being recognized as western and as a security producing country has been met by participation in peace operations.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁶ Uğur Ziyal, 'Re-Conceptualization of Soft Security and Turkey's Contribution to International Security,' *Turkish Political Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 2004). The text can be reached at http://www.turkishpolicy.com/default.asp?show=sum2004_Ugur_Ziyal

It would be difficult to prove that Turkey's transformation of its security understanding in a peacekeeping friendly manner on the one hand and active Turkish participation in peace operations on the other, have increased the prospects of Turkey's accession to the Union and prompted the EU leaders to officially start the accession talks with Turkey. However, it would also be wrong to underestimate such an impact. Now, an increasing number of westerners underline Turkey's contribution to western security and try to justify their arguments by pointing out to Turkey's participation in peace operation across the world (Calleja, 2006:40-47; Barysch, and et al., 2005).

Participation in peace operations has also contributed to the modernization of the Turkish military in line with the changing security understandings in the post-Cold War era. The skills and experiences acquired by the Turkish peacekeepers abroad have contributed to the overall modernization of the Turkish army. A significant portion of the military staff have taken specialized training, including intensive English language courses, communications and driver training. Because of the short deployment cycles in the peace operations, experienced personnel regularly returned to their units with greater skills and experience, which they helped disseminate to their colleagues. Turkish military personnel have also gained the experience of cooperating and working closely with the armed forces of allied countries.

Turkey has also gained the operational capability of dealing with the PKK-KONGRA GEL terrorism through the experiences it gained abroad. This is important because PKK- KONGRA GEL offers a non-traditional security threat and coping with it requires expertise on low intensity conflicts and OOTW. The Turkish military has gained such expertise through joining peace operations. Turkey's national

security and defense policy has also been affected by participation in peace operations. Ankara now holds that defense starts outside territorial borders and what happens in other countries does impact Turkey's security interests. It is without a doubt that Turkey's experiences in peace operations abroad have helped transform its security understanding in this way.

For example, Turkey is now more eager to take part in peace operations in troubled parts of the globe, particularly the Middle East. Three recent examples from the recent past are worth mentioning in this regard. In the first case, the US government asked Turkey to send a substantial number of troops to Iraq in the summer of 2003. The Turkish government reciprocated positively for the internal instability and chaos in Iraq could potentially threaten Turkey's domestic security. Even though the prime reason behind Turkey's acquiescence to such an American proposal was to help improve Turkey's tarnished image in the eyes of the Americans in the aftermath of the March 1 crisis, Ankara's eagerness to comply with this American demand can also be explained with reference to Turkey's changing security understanding. Internal chaos in neighboring countries closely affects Turkey's internal peace and the best defense starts outside the territorial borders. Ankara also positively responded to European claims that Turkish troops should be deployed in Congo as part of the EU mission there.

As of writing this dissertation, there have been speculations that Turkey might participate in the proposed UN peace operation in southern Lebanon to oversee a permanent ceasefire between Israel and Hizbullah forces. The decision of the Turkish Parliament in September 2006 to support the governmental decree regulating deployment of Turkish troops in Lebanon as part of the multinational

peace operation after the Israel–Hezbollah war underpins the ideational motivations behind Turkey’s approach to peace operations.

The national interest argument appears to drop out here. Turkey does not have a vital strategic interest in sending troops to the already fragile and unstable southern Lebanon where the possibility of Hezbollah and Israeli forces exchanging bullets and rockets still remains extremely high. It is probable that Turkish troops will find themselves in the middle of skirmishes. In such a case the Turkish government would find it difficult to persuade Turkish public opinion to tolerate casualties in Lebanon, especially as Turkey’s own struggle with the PKK terrorist cells continues to worsen. During the deliberations by the parliament prior to the approval of the government’s decree, it became clear that both the main opposition party and the majority of the Turkish people were against the idea of sending Turkish troops abroad while Turkey itself has been enmeshed in more serious security challenges.¹⁶⁷

The impact of domestic ethnic interests on Turkey’s decision has also been very limited. Turkey is not home to active pro-Israeli or pro-Arab ethnic lobbies. Besides, the majority of Turkish public opinion has embraced a sympathetic view of Hezbollah during the latest war in Lebanon. Turkish people overwhelmingly believe that the deployment of the UN-led mission in southern Lebanon will serve more Israeli than Lebanese interests. The goal of the mission has been understood as being to help demilitarise Hezbollah and protect Israel from the possibility of assaults that might originate from southern Lebanon.

The ideational factors behind Turkey’s decision to send troops to Lebanon can be noticed in several respects. First, the US and the EU countries have supported

¹⁶⁷ For a critical review on Turkey’s probable participation in the UN mission in Lebanon see Zeynep Damla Gürel, ‘Lubnan Macerasına Hayır Demeli’ [Better to Say ‘No’ to the Adventure in Lebanon], *Radikal*, 9 Sept. 2005. Gürel is a member of the main opposition party in the parliament, CHP.

the idea of sending such a force. Turkey hopes to improve its tarnished relations with the US by sending troops to Lebanon. Turkey is a secular and westernising country with a predominantly Muslim population. Turkey's presence in such a force would make it clear that Turkey shares the security interests of the US in the region. Another consideration on the part of Ankara appears to be the hope that the US will revise its approach to the PKK and northern Iraq in line with Turkey's priorities in return for Turkey's support for the UN mission to Lebanon.

Second, the majority of troops will come from the member countries of the EU. As a candidate country, Turkey's contribution to the UN mission in Lebanon, signals support for EU foreign and security policies and readiness to help bolster EU's military capabilities. Third, the legitimacy of the force has already been secured as the United Nations Security Council authorised the mission.¹⁶⁸

This dissertation has also demonstrated that participating in peace operations positively improves the international status and legitimacy of Turkey and probably has similar effects for other middle power states.¹⁶⁹ Turkey's participation in peace operations has earned it a good reputation and added to its soft power. None of the contingencies in which Turkish troops served as part of multinational peace operations directly concerned Turkey's security. This point is important because it shows that major powers and middle powers approach peace operations from different angles. The ideational concerns are much more visible in the second case.

This dissertation offers a novel understanding of the reasons why a particular country participates in peace operations. In this regard the dissertation underlines the

¹⁶⁸ For a sympathetic view on Turkey's participation in the UN mission in Lebanon, see Gunduz Aktan, 'Neden Gonderelim' [Why We Should Send], *Radikal*, 2 Sept. 2006. See also Cengiz Candar, 'Lubnan'a asker: Avrupalilik Zorunlulugu' [Soldiers to Lebanon: The Requirement of being European], *Bugun*, 6 Sept. 2006. Both Mr Aktan and Mr Candar were foreign policy aides of the late president Turgut Ozal.

¹⁶⁹ For information on middle power states, see William Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*, Frank Cass, London

differences between motivations that guide behaviours of major and medium power states. In the absence of the common Soviet threat and in the presence of the changing geopolitical priorities of the US, NATO and the EU, Turkey's participation in peace operations showed a different and transformed side of the country previously missing from foreign perceptions. As a deliberate goal, this ideational policy cannot be examined from a pure neo-realist security perspective.

The meaning that Turkey has attached to participation in peace operations differs from that understood by the EU and the US. For the emerging European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), peace operations would be important and much-needed assets. While peace operations have become the basic justification for the existence of European armed services and have become an instrument for their expenditures, they have been of relatively minor importance for the US and Russia. Although the major powers like US, Russia and China have retained their focus on war-fighting and have war-making armies, European countries without existential security threats have embraced policing duties and have police-like armies. They define national security in terms of combating terrorism, disrupting drug trade, and participating in peace operations to provide stability to troubled regions (Ripsman and Paul, 2005:208-213)

As a committed peacekeeper, Canada views peace operations from a different perspective. The first and foremost Canadian national interest, both during and after the Cold War, was to support the Western allies, especially the US and NATO members. Canada contributed a substantial number of troops to the peacekeeping force in Cyprus for almost three decades (1964-1993) in order to prevent two NATO allies (Greece and Turkey) from going to war over Cyprus and splitting the alliance. Similarly, Canada's participation in the UN's first peacekeeping force during the

Suez crisis in 1956, was done to help the UK and France out of a predicament from which they could not withdraw their forces without great embarrassment. Canada's large contributions to the UN's successive missions in Haiti are also explained in part by a desire to assist the US in the continental backyard.

Whether the motive is idealistic or pragmatic, Canada seeks a place and some recognition in the wider world. Canada seeks to find a special role that great powers like the US have difficulty filling. These powers did not participate in peace operations during the Cold War because they were deemed unable to act impartially, given their global involvement, ideological struggles, and intelligence activities. A middle power country like Canada was seen as a better choice for the peacekeeper role.

Are Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, Ethiopia, and Nepal altruistic or mercenarial because in a period spanning the end of 2004 and the beginning of 2005 they provided over forty percent of all UN military and civilian police contributions? These states are disengaged from the horrors the peace operations are preventing or cleaning up by their own needs, similar to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. So why do they participate with soldiers without first-world professional training, without a first-world professional officer corps, and typically without proper equipment and training to carry out the mission effectively. These countries view peace operations from a financial perspective. Given their economic realities they are highly likely to be motivated by financial gains to participate in UN peace operations. They usually profit financially from UN service depending on the arrangements made with UN Headquarters.¹⁷⁰

¹⁷⁰ For discussion see Kabilan Krishnasamy, Autumn 2002, "Pakistan's Peacekeeping Experiences," *International Peacekeeping*, 9(3): 111-113

From a national perspective, participation in UN peace operations tends to elevate the profile and prestige of the country. For a military institution like Argentina's, still laden with the baggage of years of military dictatorship, and the fiasco of the *Falklands/Malvinas* defeat, involvement in UN peace operations offers the opportunity to recover some of the prestige and self-respect lost after many years of negative image in the world and in their own country.

In contrast to these approaches, Turkey has placed great ideational importance on its participation in peace operations. They have been important for the re-construction of Turkey's Western identity as well as the maintenance of Turkey's number one security interest, being a part of the West. Participation in peace operations is an integral and important part of Turkish security and defense policy. Through its involvement Turkey makes a contribution towards peace while at the same time demonstrates its solidarity with the international community. Taking these kinds of roles in the future may result in Ankara's more active involvement in world affairs. It may boost its influence not only in regions where Turkish personnel serve, but also on the UN Security Council and among other voting members of the UN, as well. By contributing to peace operations, Turkey will rise to a more favorable position in the international hierarchy of states.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abiew, Francis Kofi and Keating, Tom. 1999. "NGOs and UN Peacekeeping Operations: Strange Bedfellows", *International Peacekeeping* 6(2):89-111

Adebajo, Adekeye and Landsberg, Chris. 2000. "Back to the Future: UN Peacekeeping in Africa", *International Peacekeeping* 7(4):161-188

Adekanye, J. Bayo. 1997. "Review Essay: Arms and Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Societies", *Journal of Peace Research* 34(3):359-366

Akçapar, Burak. 1999. "PfP Training Centers: Improving training and education in PfP", *NATO Review* 47(3):31-32

Akgönenç, Oya. July 1997. "Türk Tugayı Bosna-Hersek'te (Turkish Brigade in Bosnia Herzegovina)", *Silahlı Kuvvetler Dergisi* 353: 39-51

Annan, Kofi. 1993. "UN Peacekeeping Operations and Cooperation with NATO", *NATO Review* 41(5):3-7

Annan, Kofi. 1997. *Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform*. Report of the Secretary-General, New York. UN, paras 206-214 UN doc., A/51/950, 14 July 1997, para 107

Arı, Tayyar. 2001. "2000'li Yıllarda Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu Politikası." In İdris Bal eds, *21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Dış Politikası*, İstanbul: Alfa, 409-439

Arıyörük, Arca. November 27, 2002. "Turkey Has Been Successful As the Leader of the International Force in Afghanistan Featuring Hilmi Akin Zorlu" *Policy Watch*, 682 Special Forum Report. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Aybet, Gülnur and Baç, Meltem Müftüler. 2000. "Transformations in security and identity after the Cold War: Turkey's Problematic relationship with Europe", *International Journal* 55(4): 567-582

Aydın, Mustafa. 2003a. "Securitization of history and geography: Understanding of security in Turkey", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 3(2): 163-84

Aydın, Mustafa. 2003b. "The determinants of Turkish foreign policy and Turkey's European connection", *The Review of International Affairs* 3: 306-31

Baç, Meltem Müftüler. 2000. "Turkey's role in the EU's security and foreign policies", *Security Dialogue* 31: 489-502

Bağcı, Hüseyin. 1998. "Changing Security Perspective of Turkey." In Mustafa Aydın, eds., *Turkey at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Global Encounters and/vs Regional Alternatives*, Ankara: International Relations Foundation

Bağcı, Hüseyin. 2001. "Afganistan Politikamızı Ulusal Çıkarlarımız ve Tercihlerimiz Belirliyor", 2023 7: 22-27

Bağcı, Hüseyin. 2001. "Türkiye ve AGSK: Beklentiler, Endişeler." In İdris Bal, eds., *21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Dış Politikası*, İstanbul: Alfa, 593-615

Bağcı, Hüseyin and Kardaş, Şaban. May 2003. "Post-September 11 Impact: The Strategic Importance of Turkey Revisited", Turkey's Strategic Future, ESF Working Paper No:13, CEPS/IISS European Security Forum, Brussels, pp.19-48.

Bağcı, Hüseyin and Kardaş, Şaban. 2004. "Türkiye'nin Barış Operasyonlarındaki Rolüne Bakış", *Asya Avrupa Dergisi* 1(1)

Baykan, Mahmut Ali. 2005. "Turkey and European Security and Defence Identity/Policy (ESDI/P): A Turkish View", *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 13(3):335-359

Bellamy, Alex J. 2004. "The 'Next Stage' in Peace Operations Theory?", *International Peacekeeping* 11(1):17-38

Berdal, Mats. 1995. "United Nations Peacekeeping in the Former Yugoslavia." In D.F. Daniel and B.C. Hayes, eds., *Beyond Traditional Peacekeeping*, New York: St. Martin's Press

Berdal, Mats. 1996. "Disarmament and Demobilization after Civil Wars: Arms, Soldiers and the Termination of Armed Conflict", *Adelphi Paper* 303, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bilgin, Pınar. 2001. "Turkey and the EU: Yesterday's Answers to Tomorrow's Security Problems?" In G.P. Herd and J. Huru, eds., *EU Civilian Crisis Management*, (Survey: Conflict Studies Research Centre, Royal Military Academy Sandhurst), 34-51

Bilgin, Pınar. 2003. "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security", *International Studies Review* 5: 203-222

Bilgin, Pınar. 2004. "A Return to 'Civilisational Geopolitics' in the Mediterranean? Changing Geopolitical Images of the European Union and Turkey in the Post-Cold War Era", *Geopolitics* 9(2):269-291

Bir, Çevik. 1998. "Turkey's Role in the New World Order", *Strategic Forum* No. 135, National Defense University

Bir, Çevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut*. Sabah Kitapları 105. Olaylar-İnsanlar Dizisi 105. İstanbul

Bjorkdahl, Annika. 2006. "Promoting norms through peacekeeping: UNPREDEP and conflict prevention", *International Peacekeeping* 13(2): 214-228

Bratt, Duane. 1997. "Explaining Peacekeeping Performance: the United Nations in Internal Conflicts", *International Peacekeeping* 4(3): 45-70

Butfoy, Andy. 1994. "Themes Within The Collective Security Idea", *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 16 (4): 490-510

Buzan, Bary and Diez, Thomas. 1999. "The European Union and Turkey", *Survival* 41(1): 41-57

Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda For International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 2nd ed.)

Call, Chuck and Barnett, Michael. 1999. "Looking for a Few Good Cops: Peacekeeping, Peacebuilding and CIVPOL", *International Peacekeeping* 6(4): 43-68

Calleya, Stephen C. 2006. "EU-Turkish Relations: Prospects and Problems", *Mediterranean Quarterly* 17(2): 40-47

Cervanek, Christine. 1995. "Lessons of the Past: Experiences in Peace Operations." In Chayes, Antonia Handler and Raach, George T. eds., *Peace Operations: Developing An American Strategy*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press

Claude, Inis. L. 1962. *Power and International Relations*, New York: Random House

Claude, Inis. L. 1964. *Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. New York: Random House

Clément, Sophia. 1997. *Conflict Prevention in the Balkans: Case Studies of the Fyr Macedonia*, Alencon: Institute for Security Studies of WEU

Cornish, Paul. 2004. "NATO: the practice and politics of transformation", *International Affairs* 80(1): 63-74

Cornish, Paul and Edwards, Geoffrey. 2001. "Beyond the EU/NATO dichotomy: The Beginnings of a European Strategic Culture", *International Affairs* 77(3):587-603

Crawford, John. 1995. *The field for peace: New Zealand's contribution to international peace-support operations: 1950-1995*. New Zealand Defense Force

Çalış, Şaban. 2001. "Turkey's Balkan Policy in the Early 1990s", *Turkish Studies* 2(1): 135-146

Çelikpala, Mithat. 2006. "From Immigrants to Diaspora: Influence of the North Caucasian Diaspora in Turkey", *Middle Eastern Studies* 42(3):423-446

Çeviköz, Ünal. 1998. "The Balkan Connection." In Mustafa Aydın, eds., *Turkey at the Threshold of the 21st Century: Global Encounters and/vs Regional Alternatives*, Istanbul: International Relations Foundation, pp.173-181

Dewar, Michael. 1993. "Intervention in Bosnia- the case against", *The World Today* 49(2): 32-34

Deringil, Selim. 1992. "Turkish Foreign Policy Since Ataturk." In Clement H. Dodd, eds., *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects* Modern Turkish Studies Program SOAS, Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press

Erim, Hüseyin. April 1993. "Somali". *Silahlı Kuvvetler Dergisi* 336:35-42

Diez, Thomas and Richard Whitman. 2002. "Analysing European Integration: Reflecting on the English School Scenarios for an Encounter", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(1): 43-67

Dobbie, Charles. 1994. "A Concept for Post Cold War Peacekeeping", *Survival* 36 (3):21-48

Duke, Simon. 1994. "The United Nations and Intra-state Conflict", *International Peacekeeping* 1(4):375-393

Egeli, Sıtkı. 1993. *Taktik Balistik Füzesler ve Türkiye(Tactical Ballistic Missiles and Turkey)* . Ankara: T.C.M.S.B., Savunma Sanayi Müşteşarlığı

Elekdağ, Şükrü. 2000. "Balkanlardaki son gelişmeler ve Türkiye'ye olan etkileri (Recent Developments in the Balkans and its Effect on Turkey)", Harp Akademileri Basımevi

Erim, Hüseyin. January 1994. "Somalide II. Safha", *Silahlı Kuvvetler Dergisi* 339:59-72

Erol, Mehmet Seyfettin. 2002. "Fırsatlar ve Zorluklar İkileminde Türkiye-Afganistan İlişkilerinde Yeni Dönem", *Stratejik Analiz* 2(23): 77-85

Ergüvenç, Şadi. 1995. "Turkish Security and the Middle East", *Foreign Policy* 19(3-4): 1-10

Etzioni, Amitai. Winter 2006. "Soverignty as Responsibility", *Orbis* 50(1):363-379

Evans, Gareth. 1993. *Cooperating For Peace: The Global Agenda for the 1990s and Beyond*. Australia: Australian Print Group

- Fetherston, A. Betts. 1995. *Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping*, London: St. Martin's Press
- Parr, Fukuda- Sakiko. July 2003. "New Threats to Human Security in the Era of Globalization", *Journal of Human Development* 4(2):167-179
- Galtung, John. 1975. "Peace, War and Defence", *Peace Research* 2:282-304
- Ghali, Boutros. 1992. *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*. New York: United Nations
- Ghali, Boutros. 1995. *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace: Position Paper of the Secretary-General on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations*, UN doc., A/50/60-S/1995/1
- Goldman, Emily O. June 2001. "New Threats, New Identities and New Ways of War: The Sources of Change in National Security Doctrine", *Journal of Strategic Studies* 24(2):43-76
- Gordon, Philip and Taspinar, Ömer. 2006. "Turkey on the Brink", *Washington Quarterly* 29(3):57-70
- Goulding, Marrack. 1993. The Evolution of United Nations Peace keeping. *International Affairs* 69(3): 451-464
- Greenwood, Christopher. 1993. "Is there a right of Humanitarian Intervention?", *The World Today* 49(2): 34-40
- Greig, J. Michael and Diehl, Paul F. 2005. "The Peacekeeping-Peacemaking Dilemma", *International Studies Quarterly* 49: 621-645
- Griffin, Michele. 1999. "Retrenchment, Reform and Regionalization: Trends in UN Peace Support Operations", *International Peacekeeping* 6(9):1-31
- Griffin, Michele and Jones, Bruce. 2001. "Building Peace Through Transitional Authority: New Directions, Major Challenges." In Adedekeye Abajao and Chandrac Lekha Sriam, eds., *Managing Armed Conflict in the 21st Century*. London: Frank Cass, 75-90
- Hale, William. 1992. "Turkey, the Middle East and the Gulf Crisis", *International Affairs* 68(4):679-692
- Hale, William. 1999. "Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics." In *The Turkish Republic at Seventy-Five Years*, 90-106
- Hastings, Lynn. 2001. "Implementation of the Property Legislation in Bosnia-Herzegovina", *Stanford Journal of International Law* 37(2)

Hickok, Michael Robert. 2000. "Hegemon Rising: The Gap between Turkish Strategy and Military Modernization", *Parameters: US Army War College* 30(2):105-120

Higgins, Rosalyn. 1981. *United Nations Peacekeeping: Documents and Commentary*, 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hilf, Meinhard. 1994. "On Article 22" in Bruno Simma eds., *The Charter of the United Nations, A Commentary*, 386-387

Hilf, Meinhard. 1994. "On Article 29." In Bruno Sima, eds., *The Charter of the United Nations, A Commentary*, 485

Hill, Stephen M. And Malik, Shahin P. 1996. "Peacekeeping and the United Nations", *Issues in International Security*, Series Editor: Stuart Croft, Dartmouth Publishing Company

Hirsch, John L. and Oakley, Robert B. 1995. *Somalia and Operation Restore Hope: Reflections on Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press

Holmes, John W. 1964. "The political and philosophical aspects of UN security forces," In Per Frydenberg, eds, *Peace-keeping: Experience and Evaluation*, Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Holmes, Kim R. 1993. "New World Disorder: A Critique of the United Nations", *Journal of International Affairs* 46 (2): 323-340

Huntington, Samuel. 1998. *The Clash of Civilizations and Remaking of World Order*. London: Touchstone Books

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs* 72(3):433-435

Hurd, Ian. 1999. "Legitimacy and Authority in International Relations", *International Organisation* 53(2):379-409

Hürsoy, Siret. 2005. "A Regional Dimension to Peace Operations: European Contributions to the UN and Implications for Turkish Co-operation and Co-ordination", *Defense and Security Analysis* 21(4): 415-428

İnan, Yüksel, and Yusuf, İslam. 1999. "Partnership for Peace", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 4(2):68-84

James, Alan. 1990. *Peacekeeping in International Politics*. London: Macmillan for International Institute for Strategic Studies

Jockel, Joseph T. 1994. *Canada and International Peacekeeping*. Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, Significant Issues Series, 16 (3)

Joffe, Joseph. 1992. "Collective Security and the Future of Europe: Failed Dreams and Dead Ends", *Survival* 34(1): 36-50

Krishnasamy, Kabilan. 2002. "Pakistan's Peacekeeping Experiences," *International Peacekeeping*, 9(3): 103-120

Kapsis, James E. 2005. "From Desert Storm to Metal Storm: How Iraq Has Spoiled US-Turkish Relations", *Current History* 104(685): 380-389

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 1972. "The United Nations Force in Cyprus: A Functional Analysis in Terms of the Conflict Theory." In *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*, 38-57

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 1988. "Turkey's Security Policy: Continuity and Change", in Douglas T. Stuart, *Politics and Security in the Southern Region of the Alliance*, London: Macmillan Press, 157-180

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2000. "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey", *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1):199-216

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2001. "Türkiye Açısından Avrupa Güvenlik Kimliği: Jeopolitik ve Demokratik Ufuk." In Şabah Çalış, et.al., *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi*, Ankara: Liberte

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. 2002. "Turkey's Security Policy in Connection with the USA and the EU." In Hasan Celal Güzel et.al., *The Turks*, Vol.5, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Publications

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. and Kibaroglu, Mustafa. 2002. "Defense Reform in Turkey." In Istvan Gyarmán et al., *Post-Cold War Defense Reform: Lessons Learned in Europe and the United States* (New York: Brassey's.), pp. 131-64

Kibaroglu, Mustafa. 1998. "Turkey." In Harald Müller, *Europe and Nuclear Disarmament*, eds., Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF), European University Press, Brussels, 161-193

Kibaroglu, Mustafa. 2002. "Turkey's Triple-Trouble: ESDP, Cyprus and Northern Iraq", *Insight Turkey* 4(1): 49-57

Kibaroglu, Mustafa. 2004. "Turkey's Threat Perception From The East: A Roadblock In Its March Toward The West?" In Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu and Seyfi Taşhan, eds., *The Europeanization of Turkey's Security Policy: Prospects and Pitfalls*, Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute Press, 53-78

Kibaroglu, Mustafa. 2005. "Isn't It Time to Say Farewell to Nukes in Turkey", *European Security* 14(4):443-457

Kirişçi, Kemal. 1994. "The end of the Cold War and Changes in Turkish Foreign Policy Behaviour", *Foreign Policy* 18(3-4): 1-43

Kirişçi, Kemal. 1997. "Post-Cold War Turkish Security and the Middle East", *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 1(2)

Kirişçi, Kemal. 1998. "Turkey and the United States: Ambivalent Allies", *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 2(4):18-27

Kirişçi, Kemal. 2002. "ABD-Türkiye İlişkileri: Yenilenen Ortaklıkta Yeni Belirsizlikler." In Rubin, Barry and Kirişçi, Kemal. *Günümüzde Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Bosphorus University Press, 200-228

Kirişçi, Kemal. 2004. "Reconciling Refugee Protection with Combatting Irregular Migration: Turkey and the EU", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 9(2)

Kelsen, Hans. 2000. *The Law of the United Nations: A Critical Analysis of its Fundamental Problems*, The Lawbook Exchange Ltd

Kohen, Sami. May 2002. "Keeping the Peace in Afghanistan, On Turkey's Shoulders", *World Press Review* 49(5)

Koloğlu, Orhan. 1993. *Balkanlar-Osmanlı Döneminde Balkanlar(Balkans-Balkans at Ottoman Era)* , İstanbul

Kramer, Heinz. 2000. *A Changing Turkey: Challenge to Europe and the United States*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, Inter-American Development Bank

Kramer, Heinz. 2001. *A Changing Turkey: Challenge to Europe and the United States*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press

Kurth, James. 2001. "The Next NATO Building an American Commonwealth of Nations", *The National Interest*, 5-16

Kut, Şule. 2000. "Turks of Kosovo: What to Expect?", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 5(3): 49-60

Kutluhan, Bora. 2002. "28nci Mekanize Piyade (Barış Gücü) Tugayı (28th Mechanized Infantry (Peace Force) Brigade)", *Savunma ve Havacılık* 16(90): 52-57

Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs. 1997. "Göçmen ve Sığınmacı Gruplardan Bir Kesit; Bulgaristan Göçmenleri ve Bosnalı Sığınmacılar." In Kemali Saybaşılı and Gencer Özcan, ed., *Yeni Balkanlar, Eski Sorunlar*

Lesser, Ian O. 2000. "Turkey in a Changing Security Environment", *Journal of International Affairs* 54(1):183-199

Lewis, Jonathan Eric. 2006. "Replace Turkey as a Strategic Partner?", *Middle East Quarterly* 13(2): 1-8

- Linklater, Andrew and Macmillan, John. 1995. *Boundaries in Question*, London: Frances Pinter
- Lund, Michael. 1996. *Preventing Violent Conflicts*, Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press
- Niklas, L.P. Swanström, 2002. *Regional Cooperation and Conflict Management: Lessons from the Pacific Rim*, Uppsala: Department of Peace and Conflict Research
- Mace, Catriona. 2004. "Operation Concordia: Developing a European Approach to Crisis Management", *International Peacekeeping* 11(3):474-490
- Mackinlay, John and Chopra, Jarat. "Second Generation Multinational Operations", *The Washington Quarterly* 15(3): 113-131
- Makovski, Alan. 1999. "The New Activism in Turkish Foreign Policy", *SAIS Review*, USA: The John Hopkins University Press, 19(1): 92-113
- Makovsky, Alan. 2002. "Turkey's Unfinished Role in the War on Terrorism", *Insight Turkey* 4(1): 41-48
- Malone, David M and Karin Wermester. 2000. "Boom and Bust? The Changing Nature of United Nations Peacekeeping", *International Peacekeeping* 7(4): 38-54
- Mawlawi, Farouk. 1993. "New Conflicts, New Challenges: The Evolving Role for Non Governmental Actors", *Journal of International Affairs* 46(2): 391-413
- McInees, Colin. 1993. "The military security agenda." In G.Wyn Rees, eds., *International Politics in Europe: The New Agenda*, London: Routledge
- McCoubrey and Nigel, White. 1996. *The Blue Helmets: Legal Regulation of United Nations Military Operations*
- Miall Hugh, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse. 1999. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution* (Cambridge: Polity)
- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1973. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf
- Nopens, P. 1995. *Peace Operations as an Instrument of Conflict Prevention*. (Defensie Studiecentrum, 46)
- Oakley, Robert B., Dziedzic, Michael J. and Goldberg Eliot M. 1998. *Policing the New World Disorder, Peace Operations and Public Security*, National Defense University Publications
- Oğuzlu, H. Tanık. 2002. "Turkey and the European Union: The Security Dimension", *Contemporary Security Policy* 23(3):61-82

Oğuzlu, H. Tarık. 2003. "An analysis of Turkey's prospective membership in the European Union from a security perspective", *Security Dialogue* 34(3): 285-99

Oğuzlu, H. Tarık. 2003. "Is the latest Turkish-Greek détente promising for the future", *European Security* 12(2): 45-62

Oğuzlu, H. Tarık. 2003. "How To Interpret Turkey's Accession Process With The European Union? A Clash of Discourses", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 7(4):51-83

Oğuzlu, H. Tarık. 2004. "Changing Dynamics of Turkey's U.S. and EU Relations", *Middle East Policy* 11(1): 98-105

Oğuzlu, H. Tarık. 2005. "The Changing Turkish Approach towards the European Union after 9/11", *International Journal* 61(1):83-104

Oran, Baskın. 2001. *Türk Dış Politikası I ed*, İstanbul: İletişim Press

Öymen, Onur. 2001. "Turkey and its role in European Security and Defence", *Insight Turkey* 3(1):53-57

Özdil, Ersin. 1993. *Bosna-Hersek Krizinde Uluslararası Kuruluşlar ve NATO*, İzmir

Özerdem, Alpaslan. 2003. "From a 'Terrorist' Group to a 'Civil Defence' Corps: The Transformation of the Kosovo Liberation Army", *International Peacekeeping* 10(3): 79-101

Parris, Mark R. 2003. "Starting Over: US-Turkish Relations in the Post-Iraq War Era", *Turkish Policy Quarterly* 2(1):7

Rasmussen, Mikkel Verdy. 2002. "Turbulent Neighbourhoods: How To Deploy the EU's Rapid Reaction Force", *Contemporary Security Policy* 23(2): 39-69

Ratner, Steven R. 1995. *The New UN Peacekeeping: Building Peace in Lands of Conflict after the Cold War*. New York: St. Martin's Press

Richmond, Oliver. 2001. "A Genealogy of Pecaemaking: The Creation and Re-Creation of Order", *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 26(3):317-348

Richmond, Oliver. 2004. "UN Peca Operations and the Dilemmas of the Pecaebuilding Consensus", *International Peacekeeping* 11(1): 83-101

Richmond, Oliver and Woodhouse, Tom. 2005. "Cosmopolitan Pecakeeping and the Globalization of Security", *International Peacekeeping* 12(2): 139-156

Rikhye, Indar J. 1984. *The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping*, London: Hurst

- Rikhye, Indar J. 1990. *The United Nations and Peacekeeping*. New York: International Peace Academy
- Ripsman, Norrin M. and Paul, T.V. 2005. "Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis", *International Studies Review* 7: 199-227
- Roberts, Adam. 1993. "The United Nations and International Security", *Survival* 35(2): 3-30
- Roberts, Adam. Autumn 1994. "A Crisis in Peacekeeping", *Survival* 36(3): 93-120
- Roberts, Adam and Kingsburry, Benedict (Eds.). 1993. *United Nations, Divided World: The UN's Roles in International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Robins, Philip. 1991. *Turkey and the Middle East*. London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs
- Robins, Philip. 2003. *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy since the Cold War*, Hurst and Co: London
- Russett, Bruce. 1998. "Preventing Violent Conflict Through the Kantian Peace." In *Preventing Violent Conflicts: Past Record and Future Challenges*, eds., Peter Wallensteen, Report No 48 (Uppsala: Department of Peace and Conflict Research)
- Sayarı, Sabri. 1992. "Turkey: The Changing European Security Environment and the Gulf Crisis", *Middle East Journal* 46(1): 9-21
- Sayarı, Sabri. 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism", *The Journal of International Affairs* 54(1):169-182
- Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu. 1992. "Threat Perceptions in Southern Europe. The Case of Turkey." In Laszlo Valki, eds., *Changing Threat Perceptions and Military Doctrines*, London: Macmillan, 227-237
- Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu. 1993. "Turkey and the European Idea", *NATO's Sixteen Nations* 4, 82-87
- Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu. 1995. "Turkey's New Security Environment, Nuclear Weapons and Proliferation", *Comparative Strategy* 14(2):149-172
- Sharp, J.M.O. 1993. "Intervention in Bosnia- the case for", *The World Today* 49(2):29-32
- Simma, Bruno, et al., 1995. *The Charter of the United Nations: A Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Simonsen, Sven Gunnar. Summer 2004. "Nationbuilding as Peacebuilding: Racing to Define the Kosovar", *International Peacekeeping* 289-311

Smith, Edwin M. 1994. "Collective Security and Collective Defence: Changing Conceptions and Institutions." In Smith, Edwin M. and Schechter, Michael G., eds., *The United Nations in a New World Order*, California: The Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies

Smith, Martin and Timmins, Grahame. 2000. "The EU, NATO and the Extension of Institutional Order in Europe", *World Affairs* 163(2): 80-90

Sperling, James and Kishner, Emil. 1997. *Recasting the European Order: Security architectures and economic cooperation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Niklas L.P. Swanström, 2002. *Regional Cooperation and Conflict Management: Lessons from the Pacific Rim* (Uppsala: Department of Peace and Conflict Research)

Niklas L.P. Swanström 2003. "Conflict Management in Northeast Asia", *Korean Journal of International Studies* 3(1)

Tanner, Fred. 2000. "Conflict Prevention and Conflict Resolution: Limits of Multilateralism", *International Review of the Red Cross*

Turan, İlter. 2002. "Short Term Pains for Long Term Pleasures", *Private View* 10-18

Türkmen, Füsun. 2002. "Turkey and the Korean War", *Turkish Studies* 3(2): 161-180

Udum, Şebnem. 2002. "Turkey and the Emerging European Security Framework", *Turkish Studies* 3(2):69-103

Ulriksen, Stale, Catriona, Gourlay and Catriona, Mace. 2004. "Operation Artemis: The Shape of Things to Come?", *International Peacekeeping* 11(3):508-525

Ulusoy, Hasan. 2002. "A New Formation in the Black Sea: BLACKSEAFOR", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 6(4):91-106

Urquhart, Brian. 1987. *UN Peacekeeping Operations and How Their Role Might Be Enhanced*. In UNITAR

Urquhart, Brian. 1993. "The UN and International Security After the Cold War." In Roberts, A. and Kingsbury, B., eds., *United Nations, Divided World: The UN's Roles in International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Von Moltke, Gebhardt. 1994. "Building a Partnership for Peace", *NATO Review* 42(3):3-7

Wallensteen, Peter ed., 1998. *Preventing Violent Conflicts: Past Record and Future Challenges*, Report No.48 (Uppsala: Department of Peace and Conflict Research)

Wallensteen, Peter. 2002. *Understanding Conflict Resolution War, Peace and The Global System* (London: Sage Publishing)

Wallensteen, Peter and Axell, Karin. 1993. "Armed Conflict at the End of the Cold War, 1989-92", *Journal of Peace Research* 30(3):330-337

Webber Mark, Croft Stuart Jolyon Howorth and Terry Terriff. 2004. "The Governance of European Security", *Review of International Studies* 30(1):3-26

Weiss, Thomas G., Forsythe, David P. and Coate, Roger A. 1997. *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press

White, Nigel D. 1993. *Keeping The Peace: The UN and the Maintenance of International Peace and Security*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

White, Nigel D. 1994. "UN Peacekeeping- Development or Destruction?", *International Relations* 12(1): 129-158

White, Nigel D. 1996. "The UN Charter and Peacekeeping Forces: Constitutional Issues", *International Peacekeeping* 3(4):43-63

Williams, Michael C. 1998. "Civil-Military Relationships and Peacekeeping", *Adelphi Paper* 321

Wiseman, Henry. 1983. *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals*. New York: Pergamon Press

Yeğenoğlu, Düden. 18 November, 2005. "The ISAF Mission and Turkey's Role in Rebuilding the Afghan State Featuring Lt. Gen. Ethem Erdağı" *Policy Watch*, 1052 Special Forum Report. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy

Zartman, William I. 1997. "Towards the Resolution of International Conflicts." In William I. Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen, eds., *Peacemaking in international conflict: methods and techniques*, Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press

Ziyal, Uğur. 2004. "Re-Conceptualization of Soft Security and Turkey's Contribution to International Security", *Turkish Political Quarterly* 3(2)

Zorlu, Hilmi Akin. December 2003- February 2004. "A First in NATO: Peace Operations in Afghanistan", *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs* 8(4): 35-38

Newspapers

Ecevit, Bülent. "We Regard Kosovo Incident As Our Debt We Owe To Our Own History – I'm Worried About Influence Of The Crisis On Bosnia-Herzegovina," 06 April 1999, *Anadolu News Agency*

Pope, Hugh "Turkey's Role in Afghanistan Presents Opportunity," *Wall Street Journal*, June 6, 2002, p.A16

Sabah Newspaper, 4 February 1994

Sabah Newspaper, 13 February 2005

Turkey Warms Up for peacekeeping, Military Training Missions in Afghanistan by Selcan Hacaoglu *Associated Press*, October 18, 2001

Turkey had already provided the U.S. with overflight rights in September shortly after attacks: "Turkey opens airspace to US", *BBC News Online*, 22 September, 2001

"Turkey opens airspace to US," *BBC News Online*, 22 September, 2001

Interviews

- Interview with General Çevik BİR on 10 February 1994

- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish Military Academy on 5 May 2004, who had participated in ISAF II, in June 2002- February 2003

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in 28th Mechanized Brigade in Mamak/Ankara on 8 May 2004, who had participated in ISAF II, in June 2002- February 2003

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in Turkish General Staff, Support Units on 6 September 2004, who had participated in ISAF, in 2003- 2004

- Interview with a Captain serving in Tunceli Brigade on 25 March 2005, who had participated in KFOR, in November 2001- May 2002

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in Tunceli Brigade on 25 March 2005, who had participated in KFOR, in November 2001- May 2002

- Interview with a Master Sergeant serving in 17th Regiment, Bingöl on 2 June 2005, who had participated in KFOR, in November 2001- May 2002

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in Turkish Military Academy on 2 April 2004, who had participated in KFOR, in November 2001- May 2002

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in 66th Armoured Brigade, İstanbul on 2 April 2004, who had participated in KFOR, January 2002- June 2002

- Interview with a First Lietunant serving in Turkish Military Academy on 2 April 2004, who had participated in KFOR, in May 2002- September 2002

- Interview with a First Lieutenant serving in Turkish Military Academy on 2 April 2004, who had participated in KFOR, in January 2003- June 2003
- Interview with a Captain serving in 17th Motorized Regiment, Bingöl on 10 October 2005, who had participated in KFOR, in Nov. 2001- May 2002
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish Military Academy on 2 April 2004, who had participated in KFOR, in November 2001- May 2002
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 3 May 2005, who had participated in UNMISET, in 2003-2004
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 5 December 2004, who had participated in UNOMIG, in 2000-2001
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish Military Academy on 20 February 2004, who had participated in UNOMIG, in 2003-2004
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 5 December 2004, who had participated in ISAF II, in 2002-2003
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish Military Academy on 5 December 2004, who had participated in TIPH, in 2001
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 20 February 2004, who had participated in UNOMIG, in 2000
- Interview with a Captain serving in 25th Brigade in Ardahan, on 15 June 2005, OSCE Mission to Georgia, in January 2000- December 2000
- Interview with a First Lieutenant serving in Turkish Military Academy on 5 January 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in November 2002- May 2003
- Interview with a Captain serving in 8th Corp in Elazığ on 2 May 2006, who had participated in IFOR/SFOR, in May 1996- June 1997
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish Military Academy on 15 January 2004, who had participated in IFOR/SFOR, in May 1996- June 1997
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 15 January 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in 1998
- Interview with a Major serving in Turkish Military Academy on 15 January 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in 1998
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish General Staff on 6 November 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in December 2003- June 2004
- Interview with a First Lieutenant serving in Turkish General Staff on 6 November 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in November 2002- May 2003

- Interview with a Master Sergeant serving in Turkish Military Academy on 6 November 2004, who had participated in SFOR, in November 2002- May 2003
- Interview with a Captain serving in Turkish General Staff on 17 April 2004, who had participated in IFOR/SFOR, in May 1996- June 1997
- Interview with a Captain serving in Tunceli Brigade on 25 March 2005, who had participated in IFOR/SFOR, in May 1998- June 1999
- Interview with a Major serving in Armoured Brigade in Şanlıurfa on 20 November 2006, who had participated in UNIKOM, in May 1999- May 2000

Conferences

Ambassador Baki İlkin, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations at the General Debate of the Special Committee on Peacemaking Operations NewYork, 1 February 2005

Balanzino, Sergio. "The State of the Alliance- A Good News Story," speech delivered at the 11th International Antalya Conference on Security and Co-operation, Antalya, Turkey, 29 March-2 April 2001, (Ankara: TBBM, 2001)

"Balkanlar ve Türkiye'nin Bölgeye Yönelik Politikaları Sempozyumu," 5-16 December 1998, Harp Akademileri Basımevi, Yeni Levent, İstanbul, 1999

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. "Europe's Security Parameters," paper delivered at the Conference on Turkey and Central and Eastern European Countries in Transition: A Comparative Study with a View to Future Membership to EU, Bilkent University, Ankara, 9 March 1996

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. "Turkey's security policy: a cultural perspective," paper presented to second international conference, Eurasian Strategic Studies Centre, Ankara, 15-16, June 2002

Sami Türk, Hikmet. "Turkish Defense Policy", speech delivered at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 3 March 1999

Sezgin, İsmet. "PfP Training Centers and PfP Training Activities", Briefing in Ministerial Meeting, 26 Sept. 1998, Skopje, Macedonian Defence Ministry

Solmaztürk, Haldun. 11 February 1994. "Lessons Learned from Somali Operation" in Turkish War Academy

Speech by Deputy Chief of Staff, General Yaşar Büyükanıt, conference on globalization and security, Turkish War Academy, 29-30 May 2003

Briefings

“Turkish General Staff, Peace Support Operation Briefing”, 22 May 2002

“Barış Gücü Brifingi-Peace Force Briefing”, unpublished, given at 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade Headquarter in Mamak/Ankara

“Bosnia and Herzegovina Peace Force Briefing”, unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina

“Subay Astsubay Oryantasyon Brifingi - Officer and Non-Commissioned Officer Orientation Briefing”, unpublished, given by the Chief of Tactical Operational Center of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Bosnia Herzegovina in January 2001

“Kosovo Peace Force Briefing”, unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Kosovo

“ISAF Peace Force Briefing”, unpublished, given by the headquarter of Turkish Battalion Task Force in Afghanistan

Materials published by an organization

Army Field Manual, *Wider Peacekeeping*, fourth draft. 1994. Wiltshire: Headquarters Doctrine and Training

Balkanlar ve Türkiye'nin Bölgeye Yönelik Politikaları Sempozyumu (Symposium on Balkans and Turkey's Politics Toward Region), Harp Akademileri Yayınları, İstanbul, 1999

Basic Facts about the United Nations, 1995, November, New York: UNDPI

Basic Facts about the United Nations, 1998, New York: UNDPI

Basic Fact Sheet: 1996, January. *NATO's Role in Peace Keeping in the Former Yugoslavia*. (N.4) Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press

Basic Fact Sheet: 1996, *NATO's Role in the Implementation of the Bosnian Peace Agreement*. (N.11). Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press

Basic Fact Sheet: *Nato's Role in the Implementation of the Bosnian Peace Agreement*. (1996, January) (N.11). Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press

Bosna - Hersek Gerçeği (Bosnia Herzegovina Reality), Harp Akademileri Basım Evi, Yenilevent-İstanbul Nisan 1995

Bosna-Hersek Dün-Bugün-Yarın (Bosnia Herzegovina, Yesterday-Today-Tomorrow) Harp Akademileri Basım Evi, Yenilevent-İstanbul January 1997

Bosna-Hersek (Bosnia Herzegovina), Harp Akademileri Basım Evi, Yenilevent-İstanbul 1992

European Union Factsheet, *EU Military Operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Operation EUFOR - Althea) February 2005

Bosna-Hersek ve Kosova Harekâtı Uygulaması ve Stratejisinin Değerlendirilmesi Ders Notu (Evaluation of the strategy of Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo Operation), December 2004. Hava Harp Akademisi Komutanlığı, Komutanlık ve Karargah Subaylığı Eğitim ve Öğretimi

Istanbul Summit Communique, Press Release (2004), Brussels, NATO, 2004

Journal of Turkish Naval Forces, Special Edition, Nov. 2001, BLACKSEAFOR

KFOR Chronicle, 2002. “The Turkish Battalion, Brothers in arms”, No.3

KFOR Chronicle, 29-Apr-2003. “Task Force Dragas”, No.4

Kosovo One Year On, Achievement and Challenge by Lord Robertson of Port Ellen, Secretary General of NATO 21 March 2000

NATO Handbook, Brussels: Information and Press Office Publication, 2001

NATO Handbook, Brussels: Information and Press Office Publication, 2002

NATO Release, 2 November 2001, *Operation Active Endeavour*, NATO’s *Naval Presence in the Eastern Mediterranean*

OSCE Helsinki Document, 1 July 1992

Peacekeeper’s Handbook. International Peace Academy, 1984. New York: Pergamon Press

RAND Project Memorandum, May 1995

Savunma ve Havacılık. 1998. “KKK ve Kuvvet 2000, Söyleşi”, Mönch Publishing Group, 12(3):10-18

Savunma ve Havacılık. 2002. “Bülent Alpkaya ile söyleşi”, Mönch Publishing Group, 16(20613):8-30

Subconcept of Peace Support Operation, Education and Doctrine Commandership, 1997

Sustaining Soldier Health and Performance in Somalia: Guidance For Small Unit Leaders, Prepared by the Staff of the U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine Natick, MA 01760-5007 and Walter Reed Army Institute of Research Washington, DC 20307-5100 December 1992

The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peacekeeping. 1996. New York: UNDPI

The UN and the situation in the former Yugoslavia, Reference Paper Revision 4, New York: UNDPI

The UN and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia, Reference Paper, 7 May 1993, New York: UNDPI

The United Nations and the situation in the Former Yugoslavia, (March 15, 1994) New York: UNDPI

The United Nations and the situation in Somalia, (April, 1993), New York: UNDPI

The United Nations and the situation in Somalia, (March, 1994), New York: UNDPI

The United Nations and the situation in Somalia, (March, 1994), New York: UNDPI

United Nations Peace-keeping, (August, 1996), New York: UNDPI

Turkish Armed Forces Contribution to World Peace. The Press of Turkish General Staff, Ankara, 2001

“Turkish General Staff’s View on ESDI,” 2001, *Insight Turkey*, 3(2): 87-95

Turkish General Staff, April 2001, *Turkish Armed Forces Contribution to World Peace*, Genelkurmay Basımevi no. 2001/39

Ulusal Strateji, March-April 1999, 68-73

UN Report of the Secretary. *General on the situation in Somalia*, UN Doc. S/24343. New York: UN. 22 July 1992

United Nations, *Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia*, UN.Doc. S/24343. New York: UN, 22 July 1992

United Nations Peace Keeping Information Notes, 1993. New York: UNDPI

United Nations Peacekeeping Information Notes, 1996, New York: UNDPI

White Paper, 2000, Turkish Defence Ministry, 2000:36

Yearbook of the UN, DPI, UN, New York, 1992, V.46

Yearbook of the UN, Special Edition, UN Fiftieth Anniversary 1945-1995, DPI, UN, New York, 1995

Yearbook of the UN, DPI, UN, New York, 1995, V.49

Yearbook of the UN, DPI, UN, New York, 1996, V.50

Yearbook of the UN, DPI, UN, New York, 1997, V.51

Yearbook of the UN, DPI, UN, New York, 1999, V.53

Web sites

Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe, Updated: 18-Aug-2003, AFSOUTH Fact sheets, Operation Sharp Guard at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/SharpGuard/SharpGuardFactSheet.htm>

Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe, Updated: 19-Feb-2004, AFSOUTH Fact sheets, Peace Implementation Force - IFOR at <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/IFOR/IFORFactSheet.htm>

DOCUMENT A/1804, 3 December 2002, Multinational European forces REPORT submitted on behalf of the Defence Committee by Mr Wilkinson, Rapporteur at http://www.assembly-weu.org/en/documents/sessions_ordinaires/rpt/2002/1804.php#P91_4429

Partnership for Peace Training Center at <http://www.bioem.tsk.mil.tr>

BLACKSEAFOR, Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group at <http://www.blackseafor.org>

Turkish Press Review, Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister, Summary of the political and economic news in the Turkish press, 02.11.2001, “US President Bush praises Turkey” at <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2001/11/01x11x02.HTM>

Turkish Press Review, Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister, Summary of the political and economic news in the Turkish press, 21.06.2002, “Turkey Takes Over Command of ISAF” at <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/CHR/ING2002/06/02X06X21.HTM#%201>

Istanbul Summit Communique, Press Release (2004), Brussels, NATO, 2004. Updated: 28-Jun-2004 NATO Press Releases (2004)096 at <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>

EU military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Operation EUFOR-Althea) at <http://www.euforbih.org/sheets/fs050103a.htm>

Center for Balkan Development, History of the war in Kosovo Written April, 1999 at http://www.friendsofbosnia.org/edu_kos.html

White Paper, 2000, at
<http://www.msb.gov.tr/Birimler/GnPPD/GnPPDBeyazKitap.htm#WHITE%20PAPER>

Synopsis of the Turkish Foreign Policy, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Balkans, Last Updated: 29.11.2005 at
<http://www.mfa.gov.tr/MFA/ForeignPolicy/Synopsis/SYNOPSIS.htm>

KFOR Contingent: Turkey, as of 29 May 2006, Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/nations/turkey.htm>

My country and NATO, Turkey, NATO : the way to the future Last update:29 June. 1999, Ismail Cem, Foreign Minister of Turkey at <http://www.nato.int/turkey/turkey3.htm>.

SFOR Stabilisation Force, History of the NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina at <http://www.nato.int/sfor/docu/d981116a.htm>

NATO's role in Kosovo, A historical overview, Updated: 28-Aug-2006 at <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/kosovo.htm>

NATO's role in Kosovo, NATO's role in relation to the conflict in Kosovo Updated: 15 July 1999, Historical Overview , Background to the conflict at <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/history.htm>

Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, Multinational Brigade Southwest at http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/mnb_southwest.htm

Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, Background to the conflict at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/intro.htm>

Official Web Site of the Kosovo Force, KFOR Objectives/ Mission at <http://www.nato.int/kfor/kfor/objectives.htm>

OSCE Mission in Kosovo at <http://www.osce.org/kosovo/13194.html>

Statement by Ambassador Onur Öymen, Under-secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs-Turkey in the Opening of the Ministerial Meeting of the NACC/Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), Sintra, Portugal 30 May 1997 at <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1997/s970530n.htm>.

Swanström, Niklas L.P., Ed, *Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management in Northeast Asia*, Uppsala & Washington: CACI & SRSP, 2005. Central Asia - Caucasus Institute and Silk Road Studies Program, a Joint Transatlantic Research and Policy Center affiliated with Johns Hopkins University-SAIS and Uppsala University at http://silkroadstudies.org/new/inside/staff/staff_web/niklas_swanstrom.htm

The Henry L. Stimson Center, Rebuilding Afghanistan: The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), PEACE OPERATIONS BACKGROUNDER, June 2002 at <http://www.stimson.org/fopo/pdf/ISAFbackgrounder.pdf>

‘Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı, Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinin Barışı Destekleme Harekatına Katkıları’ at <http://www.tsk.mil.tr/uluslararası/barisidestekharekatkatki/barisdestekkatki.htm>

Uğur Ziyal, ‘Re-Conceptualization of Soft Security and Turkey’s Contribution to International Security,’ *Turkish Political Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer 2004) at http://www.turkishpolicy.com/default.asp?show=sum2004_Ugur_Ziyal

Stament By Ambassador Baki İlkin, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations at the General Debate of the Special Committee on Peacemaking Operations NewYork, 1 February 2005 at <http://www.un.int/turkey/page35.html>

Present and Past UN Peace Operations at <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/bnote.htm>

Somalia, United Nations Operation In Somalia I, UNOSOM I, April 1992 - March 1993 at http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosomi.htm

Somalia, United Nations Operation In Somalia II, UNOSOM II, March 1993 - March 1995 at http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosom2.htm

Former Yugoslavia, United Nations Protection Force, UNPROFOR at http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unprofor.htm

“United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo,” UNMIK Police at <http://www.unmikonline.org/civpol/mandate.htm>

Hikmet Sami Türk, ‘Turkish Defense Policy,’ speech delivered at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 3 March 1999 at <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/media/samiturk.htm>

TABLE I**PRESENT PEACE OPERATIONS (1948-2006)**

1.	UNTSO	UN Truce Supervision Organization	May 1948
2.	UNMOGIP	UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan	January 1949
3.	UNFICYP	UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus	March 1964
4.	UNDOF	United Nations Disengagement Force	June 1974
5.	UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon	March 1978
6.	MINURSO	UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara	April 1991
7.	UNOMIG	UN Observer Mission in Georgia	August 1993
8.	UNMIK	UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo	June 1999
9.	MONUC	UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Nov. 1999
10.	UNMEE	UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea	July 2000
11.	UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia	Sept. 2003
12.	UNOCI	United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire	April 2004
13.	MINUSTAH	UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti	June 2004
14.	ONUB	United Nations Operation in Burundi	June 2004
15.	UNMIS	United Nations Mission in the Sudan	March 2005

TABLE II**PAST PEACE OPERATIONS (1948-2006)**

1.	UNEF I	First United Nations Emergency Force	Nov. 1956-June 1967
2.	UNOGIL	UN Observation Group in Lebanon	June 1958 Dec. 1958
3.	ONUC	United Nations Operation in the Congo	July 1960- June 1964
4.	UNSF	UN Security Force in West New Guinea	Oct. 1962- Apr. 1963
5.	UNYOM	UN Yemen Observation Mission	July 1963- Sep. 1964
6.	DOMREP	Mission of the Representative of the SG in the Dominican Republic	May 1965- Oct. 1966
7.	UNIPOM	UN India-Pakistan Observation Mission	September 1965- March 1966
8.	UNEF II	Second UN Emergency Force	Oct. 1973- July 1979
9.	UNGOMAP	UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan	May 1988- Mar. 1990
10.	UNIIMOG	UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group	Aug. 1988- Feb. 1991
11.	UNAVEM I	UN Angola Verification Mission I	Jan. 1989- June 1991
12.	UNTAG	UN Transition Assistance Group	Apr. 1989- Mar. 1990
13.	ONUCA	UN Observer Group in Central America	Nov. 1989-Jan. 1992
14.	UNIKOM	UN Iraq - Kuwait Observation Mission	Apr. 1991- Oct. 2003
15.	UNAVEM II	UN Angola Verification Mission II	June 1991- Feb. 1995
16.	ONUSAL	UN Observer Mission in El Salvador	July 1991- Apr. 1995
17.	UNAMIC	UN Advance Mission in Cambodia	Oct. 1991-Mar. 1992
18.	UNPROFOR	UN Protection Force	Feb. 1992 –Dec.1995
19.	UNTAC	UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia	Mar. 1992 –Sep. 1993
20.	UNOSOM I	United Nations Operation in Somalia I	Apr. 1992- Mar. 1993
21.	ONUMOZ	UN Operation in Mozambique	Dec. 1992- Dec. 1994
21.	UNOSOM II	UN Operation in Somalia II	Mar. 1993- Mar. 1995
23.	UNOMUR	UN Observer Mission Uganda-Rwanda	June 1993- Sep. 1994

24.	UNOMIL	UN Observer Mission in Liberia	Sep.1993- Sep. 1997
25.	UNMIH	United Nations Mission in Haiti	Sep. 1993 -June 1996
26.	UNAMIR	UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda	Oct. 1993 Mar. 1996
27.	UNASOG	UN Aouzou Strip Observer Group	May 1994- June 1994
28.	UNMOT	UN Mission of Observers in Tajikistan	Dec. 1994-May 2000
29.	UNAVEM III	UN Angola Verification Mission III	Feb. 1995- June 1997
30.	UNCRO	UN Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia	May 1995- Jan. 1996
31.	UNPREDEP	UN Preventive Deployment Force	Mar. 1995- Feb. 1999
32.	UNMIBH	UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dec.1995- Dec. 2002
33.	UNTAES	UN Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium	Jan. 1996- Jan. 1998
34.	UNMOP	UN Mission of Observers in Prevlaka	Jan. 1996- Dec. 2002
35.	UNSMIH	UN Support Mission in Haiti	July 1996- July 1997
36.	MINUGUA	UN Verification Mission in Guatemala	Jan. 1997- May 1997
37.	MONUA	UN Observer Mission in Angola	June 1997- Feb. 1999
38.	UNTMIH	UN Transition Mission in Haiti	Aug. 1997- Nov. 1997
39.	MINOPUH	UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti	Dec. 1997- Mar. 2000
40.		UN Civilian Police Support Group	Jan. 1998-Oct. 1998
41.	MINURCA	UN Mission in the Central African Rep.	Apr. 1998- Feb. 2000
42.	UNOMSIL	UN Observer Mission in Sierra Leone	July 1998- Oct. 1999
43.	UNAMSIL	UN Mission in Sierra Leone	Oct. 1999-Dec. 2005
44.	UNTAET	UN Transitional Administration in East Timor	Oct. 1999- May 2002
45	UNMISSET	UN Mission of Support in East Timor	May 2002- May 2005

TABLE III**THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PEACE OPERATIONS BY REGIONS AND PERIODS**

REGIONS	COLD WAR 1946-1985		TRANSITION PERIOD 1985-1989		POST-COLD WAR 1989-TO PRESENT		TOTAL	
	P.O.	%	P.O.	%	P.O.	%	P.O.	%
MIDDLE EAST	7	53,8	1	20	1	2,7	9	16,2
AFRICA	1	7,7	2	40	20	54	23	42,6
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC	3	23,1	1	20	5	13,5	9	16,2
EUROPE	1	7,7	-	-	9	24,3	10	18
AMERICAS	1	7,7	1	20	7	18,9	9	16,2
TOTAL	13	21,5	5	7	42	71,5	60	100

TABLE IV
VETOES CAST IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

YEAR	CHINA	FRANCE	UK	USA	USSR/ RUSSIA	TOTAL
1946-55	(1*)	2	-	-	80	83
1956-65	-	2	3	-	26	31
1966-1975	2	2	10	12	7	33
1976-1985	-	9	11	34	6	60
1986-1995	-	3	8	24	2	37
1996	-	-	-	-	-	0
1997	1	-	-	2	-	3
1998	-	-	-	-	-	0
1999	1	-	-	-	-	1
2000	-	-	-	-	-	0
2001	-	-	-	2	-	2
2002	-	-	-	2	-	2
2003	-	-	-	2	-	2
2004	-	-	-	2	1	3
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006	-	-	-	1	-	1
TOTAL	4-5	18	32	81	122	258

*Between 1946 and 1971, the Chinese seat on the Security Council was occupied by the Republic of China (Taiwan), which used the veto only once (to block Mongolia's application for membership in 1955). The first veto exercised by the present occupant, the People's Republic of China, was therefore not until 25 August 1972.

Table compiled by Global Policy Forum from UN information