MEDITERRANEAN PAPER SERIES 2011

TURKEY AND THE ARAB SPRING
IMPLICATIONS FOR TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY FROM A TRANSATLANTIC PERSPECTIVE

Nathalie Tocci
Ömer Taşpınar
Henri J. Barkey
Eduard Soler i Lecha
Hassan Nafaa

G | M | F The German Marshall Fund of the United States
STRENGTHENING TRANSATLANTIC COOPERATION

IAI Istituto Affari Internazionali

The German Marshall Fund of the United States
1744 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
T 1 202 683 2650
F 1 202 265 1662
E info@gmfus.org

This publication can be downloaded for free at www.gmfus.org/publications. Limited print copies are also available. To request a copy, send an e-mail to info@gmfus.org.

GMF Paper Series
The GMF Paper Series presents research on a variety of transatlantic topics by staff, fellows, and partners of the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of GMF. Comments from readers are welcome; reply to the mailing address above or by e-mail to info@gmfus.org.

About GMF
The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) is a non-partisan American public policy and grantmaking institution dedicated to promoting better understanding and cooperation between North America and Europe on transatlantic and global issues. GMF does this by supporting individuals and institutions working in the transatlantic sphere, by convening leaders and members of the policy and business communities, by contributing research and analysis on transatlantic topics, and by providing exchange opportunities to foster renewed commitment to the transatlantic relationship. In addition, GMF supports a number of initiatives to strengthen democracies. Founded in 1972 through a gift from Germany as a permanent memorial to Marshall Plan assistance, GMF maintains a strong presence on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to its headquarters in Washington, DC, GMF has seven offices in Europe: Berlin, Paris, Brussels, Belgrade, Ankara, Bucharest, and Warsaw. GMF also has smaller representations in Bratislava, Turin, and Stockholm.

About the Mediterranean Policy Program
The Mediterranean Policy Program promotes transatlantic analysis and dialogue on issues affecting Southern Europe, North Africa, the Levant, and the Mediterranean basin. Priority areas include: understanding trends in Mediterranean societies; exploring opportunities for south-south cooperation and integration; research on key functional issues affecting Mediterranean security and development; and strengthening the North American policy debate on the region and transatlantic cooperation on Mediterranean strategy.

About Istituto Affari Internazionali
The Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), founded by Altiero Spinelli in 1965, does research in the fields of foreign policy, political economics, and international security. A non-profit organization, the IAI aims to disseminate knowledge through research studies, conferences, and publications. To that end, it cooperates with other research institutes, universities, and foundations in Italy and abroad and is a member of various international networks. More specifically, the main research sectors are European institutions and policies, Italian foreign policy, trends in the global economy and internationalization processes in Italy, the Mediterranean and the Middle East, defense economy and policy, and transatlantic relations. The IAI puts out an English-language quarterly (*The International Spectator*), an online webzine (*AffarInternazionali*), a series of research papers (Quaderni IAI) and an Italian foreign policy yearbook (*La Politica Estera dell'Italia*).

Cover photo: Palestinian students hold the pictures of Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan and the Turkish and Palestinian flags during rally beckoning him to visit the Gaza Strip at the port in Gaza City on Sep. 13, 2011.
© Ashraf Amra/ZUMA Press/Corbis

Turkey and the Arab Spring: Implications for Turkish Foreign Policy From a Transatlantic Perspective

Mediterranean Paper Series

october 2011

Nathalie Tocci,[1] Ömer Taşpınar,[2] Henri J. Barkey,[3]
Eduard Soler i Lecha,[4] and Hassan Nafaa[5]

[1] Deputy director, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), Rome.

[2] Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

[3] Bernard and Bertha Cohen Professor of International Relations, Lehigh University.

[4] Research Fellow, CIDOB (Barcelona Center for International Affairs).

[5] Professor of Political Science, Cairo University.

Foreword
Nathalie Tocci

In 2011 a tide of change has swept across North Africa and the Middle East. Before the eyes of the world, the so-called Arab street, often derided for its apathy and acquiescence, succeeded there where no one else did (or perhaps tried). Through mass protests (and tacit military support), decade-old dictatorships of the likes of Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali and Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak melted away like giants with feet of clay. As their house of cards came tumbling down, the region shook from Morocco and Algeria through to Bahrain and Yemen, making regimes tremble and empowered populations rise in jubilation and despair.

The Arab Spring reveals a number of contradictions, constraints as well as opportunities for Turkish foreign policy, all of which are of key relevance both to Turkey and to its transatlantic partners.

In the short-term, the Arab Spring has revealed a number of inconsistencies in and weaknesses of Turkish foreign policy, particularly when mapped against the stances of the European Union (EU) and the United States. These weaknesses and inconsistencies may be viewed as by-products of a more proactive Turkish role in its southern neighborhood. Over the last decade, Turkish foreign policy has become more open to engagement with its neighbors, more eager to resolve regional problems and less securitized in nature. Improved relations with Syria, Iraq, and Iran (as well as Russia, Armenia, and Greece) are evidence of this. But this does not mean that Turkish foreign policy has been purely idealistic and norm driven. The Arab Spring has revealed the inherent tension between the normative and *realpolitik* dimensions of Turkish foreign policy. When norms have dovetailed with interests, Turkey was forthright in its support for democracy. Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan was the first Western leader to call for Hosni Mubarak's resignation in a televised speech on al-Jazeera in February 2011, and President Abdullah Gül was the first head of state to meet with the Egyptian Supreme Council in Egypt soon thereafter. In Egypt and Tunisia, Turkey was unambiguously on the side of democracy. As the Arab Spring progressed, *realpolitik* came to the fore. In Libya, Turkey was initially opposed to NATO's intervention to enforce a no-fly zone, has participated exclusively in the humanitarian dimension of the intervention since then, and has pursed diplomatic efforts to propose a negotiated ceasefire between Muammar Gaddafi and the rebels. Only on May 3, 2011, Turkey officially called for Gaddafi's resignation. Likewise in Syria, whereas Turkish diplomacy was initially active in spurring President Bashar al-Assad to reform, as violence escalated, Turkey took a backseat.

What explains these differences? In Egypt, the implicit strategic rivalry between Turkey and the Egyptian regime and the absence of large Turkish investments all pushed Turkey into supporting the Tahrir revolution. By contrast, in Libya, the $15 billion worth of Turkish investments and the 25,000 Turkish citizens to be repatriated contributed to Turkey's caution. In Syria, the fear of instability along the 877 kilometer Turkish-Syrian border and of the sectarian ramifications of the Syrian uprising (particularly as regards the Kurdish question) led Turkey to adopt a pro-status quo wait-and-see approach.

The Arab Spring has also revealed that Turkey's "zero problems with neighbors" has rested largely on improved ties with specific leaders. To some extent this is inevitable. Strengthening relations with countries governed by authoritarian regimes — be this Syria, Iran, or Libya — necessarily means improving ties with their leaders. The personal rapport between Prime Minister Erdoğan and President Assad testifies to this. Yet the contradictions (and embarrassment) inherent in this approach has emerged in full force in 2011.

Much like Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, Erdoğan has also been shamed for his warm ties to Gaddafi, having accepted (and not returned) the Gaddafi international human rights prize.

Finally, the Arab Spring has revealed that Turkey's activism in the Middle East, and in particular its prolific mediation activities, have been as much contextual as actor driven. Turkey's efforts in mediating the manifold conflicts in the region can be credited partly to Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu's personal inclination, but mainly to the lack of effective mediation in the region. With the United States deeply enmeshed in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the Egyptian regime discredited for its excessively compliant pro-U.S. stance, Turkey stepped into a vacuum. Its mediation efforts between Israel and Syrian in 2008 and between Israel and Hamas in 2006 and 2008 should be read in this light. In fact, no sooner had Mubarak stepped down from office than Cairo successfully brokered a reconciliation agreement between Hamas and Fateh in April 2011. When it comes to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the potential for Turkish mediation is limited. Turkey's role had been artificially inflated by the absence of effective mediation by those regional (Egypt, Saudi Arabia) and international (United States) actors with effective leverage on the conflict. This is not to say that Turkey has no mediating role to play in the conflict-ridden Middle East, but rather that its potential is limited (e.g., within Iraq, Syria, or between the West and Iran) and does not extend clearly to the protracted Israeli-Arab quagmire.

In the short-term, the Arab Spring has highlighted the contradictions and limits of Turkish foreign policy. In the medium and long-term, a changing Middle East may present Turkey with important opportunities, to be seized alongside its transatlantic partners. At least since the end of the Cold War, Turkey has been heralded by the West as a model for the Muslim world. In the early 1990s, the model metaphor was applied to the Turkic world in the former Soviet space. In the 2000s, the Bush (and then Obama) administrations have referred to Turkey as a model, an example, or a source of inspiration for the Muslim Middle East. The idea of the Turkish model has not been voiced by the United States alone. It has also been echoed by the European Union, by Turkey, as well as by public opinion in the Middle East itself.

The Arab Spring has not (and is unlikely to) lead to homogenous results. Some countries (e.g., Tunisia) are more likely to move toward democracy, some may see forms of authoritarian restructuring (e.g., Egypt), others may timidly move toward reform (e.g., Morocco), while the future of others still (e.g., Libya, Syria, Yemen, and Bahrain) remains highly uncertain. What may be cautiously suggested however, is that the Middle East is unlikely to return to the status quo ante. The days of authoritarian stasis seem gone. As the region moves toward an uncertain future, current and future leaders may embrace the need for change more genuinely. As they do, the idea of the Turkish model may acquire new relevance and, therefore, it may no longer be simply a U.S.-driven and Turkish/European-embraced discourse and a slogan with some appeal amongst Arab public opinion. It may become a more complex and articulate notion that old and new Arab leaders may explore (alongside other models and examples) as they grapple with domestic change. It is to this thorny question that the contributions to this report turn.

If and as the Turkish model acquires relevance in the region, its actual meaning/s may differ from how it was originally conceived. Rather than a black-and-white model of a pro-Western Muslim secular democracy, Turkey may offer a number of different models and ideas to inspire change in its southern neighborhood. Some of these ideas may complement and enrich, others may contrast with, the Western concept of the Turkish model.

Different countries (and different actors within them) may find different aspects of Turkey of interest, as noted by Hassan Nafaa. In particular, Ömer Taşpınar reflects on how two seemingly contrasting aspects of the Turkish model might strike chords across democratizing or reforming countries in the southern Mediterranean: Turkish political Islam and the Turkish military. On one hand, southern Mediterranean countries may turn to the trajectory of Turkish political Islam and, specifically, the evolution of the Justice and Development Party. On the other hand, these countries may take an interest in the development of the Turkish military and civil-military relations in Turkey. Yet as pointed out by Barkey, Taşpınar, and Nafaa, Turkey inevitably has its peculiarities that defy any clear-cut emulation. Equally relevant, as Henri Barkey notes, rather than the Turkish model as such, what may be of interest is studying Turkey's evolution, learning from its steps forward, and, perhaps, even more critically, from its mistakes.

The Arab Spring has revealed both weaknesses in and opportunities for Turkish foreign policy. In order to minimize the former while maximizing the latter, Turkey, the EU, and the United States could explore ways of institutionalizing a strategic foreign policy dialogue between themselves. The best way to proceed would be for transatlantic dialogue to take place between the EU and the United States, whereby Turkey, as a candidate for EU membership, would be englobed within the EU camp. Today, and as noted by Eduard Soler i Lecha, this is not the case. In fact, the scope for foreign policy dialogue between the EU and Turkey has reduced. Until the Lisbon Treaty, Turkish officials met regularly with the EU Troika (i.e., the Common Foreign and Security Policy High Representative, the current, and the future presidencies). When Turkey's accession negotiations proceeded (albeit slowly), Turkey also used to meet representatives of the 27 member states at the intergovernmental conferences opening and closing accession negotiation chapters. Finally, when optimism prevailed in EU-Turkey relations, Turkey enthusiastically aligned its foreign policy positions with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) consensus. Today, the opportunities for the EU and Turkey to discuss foreign policy have reduced and Turkey, snubbed by the EU, tends to align its positions with the CFSP only as and when it sees fit. The stalled accession negotiations also generate Turkish skepticism that any proposal for foreign policy dialogue is merely a ploy to trap Turkey into a "privileged partnership" with the EU.

This impasse is detrimental to Turkey, the EU, and the United States, particularly in view of the Arab Spring. As the EU shapes its External Action Service (EAS), it should establish means to institutionalize, operationalize, and deepen foreign policy cooperation with Turkey in a manner that is complementary to the accession process. Soler i Lecha identifies a number of steps through which this could be done. While such measures would not, in and of themselves, unblock the impasse in EU-Turkey ties and re-establish healthy relations in the EU-Turkey-U.S. triangle, they may represent the much-needed first steps and triggers to reignite a virtuous dynamic between the three.

The Turkish Model and its Applicability

Ömer Taşpınar

1 Turkish Foreign Policy in Light of the Arab Spring

The Arab Spring came at a time when Turkey's relations with the United States, Israel, and the European Union were going through significant turbulence. 2010 proved to be a particularly difficult year for Turkey's place in the transatlantic community. The Gaza flotilla crisis in June 2010 — ending with Israeli forces killing eight Turkish citizens (and one Turkish-American citizen) — and Turkey's "no" vote to a new round of sanctions against Iran at the United Nations (UN) Security Council that same month triggered a heated debate, which led popular American columnists such as Tom Friedman to go as far as arguing that Ankara was now joining the "Hamas-Hezbollah-Iran resistance front against Israel." [1]

The Arab Spring, which shook the core of the Arab world and led to the emergence of new regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya dramatically changed the Western discourse about Turkey. Instead of asking "who lost Turkey" or complaining about the Islamization of Turkish foreign policy, analysts began discussing whether the new regimes in the Arab world would follow the "Turkish model." As the most democratic and secular Muslim country in the region, Turkey did not hesitate to call for democratic change in Egypt and — after initial reluctance — gave its blessing for the NATO military effort in Libya. Even in Syria, where Turkey had invested significant strategic and diplomatic capital in rebuilding its tattered relations with the Assad regime, Ankara ultimately aligned with the West.

Turkey's image is even more positive in the Middle East. To be sure, part of Ankara's popularity comes from its determination to diplomatically confront Israel. Yet, this is not the whole story. When one looks at the Arab media, one of the most discussed questions is whether Islamic movements in Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, Libya, Syria, and other Arab states will evolve along the lines of Turkey's reformed and moderate Islamic movement, today represented by the governing Justice and Development Party (AKP).

In the past, Turkey's image in the Arab world was characterized by its militant secularism, obsessive Westernization, and rejection of its Islamic-Ottoman heritage under the heavy weight of Kemalism. Since the AKP came to power in late 2002, Turkey began moving in a different direction. A process that had already started under Turgut Özal in the 1980s gained further momentum. Turkey was slowly coming to terms with its Muslim identity. It was also modifying its foreign policy along a more strategic and multidimensional line. The AKP's foreign policy has been based on what Prime Minister Erdoğan's top foreign policy advisor and now foreign minister, Ahmet Davutoğlu, calls "strategic depth" and "zero-problems" with neighbors. Davutoğlu's main argument is that Turkey is a great power that has neglected its historic ties and diplomatic, economic, and political relations with the Middle East, North Africa, the Balkans, and Eurasia, dating back to the Ottoman era. Since Turkey's new-found self-confidence and activism is mostly visible in formerly Ottoman territories, the AKP's foreign policy is sometimes referred to as "neo-Ottomanism."

Today, neo-Ottomanism is a concept that defines not only the foreign policy but also the domestic trends of the new Turkey. One can also argue that it is this paradigm change that transformed Turkey into an attractive model for Arab reformers. Three factors help define the neo-Ottoman tendencies of the AKP.

The first is the willingness to come to terms with Turkey's Ottoman and Muslim heritage. Neo-Ottomanism does not call for Turkish imperialism. Similarly, it does not seek to institute an Islamic legal system to supplant secularism. Instead, it

[1] Tom Friedman, "Letter from Istanbul," *New York Times*, June 15, 2010.

favours a more moderate version of secularism. Neo-Ottomanism is also very relevant for Turkey's principal domestic problem: the Kurdish question. Since it is at peace with the imperial and multinational legacy of Turkey, neo-Ottomanism opens the door for a less ethnic and more civic and multicultural conceptualization of citizenship. As a result, compared to the Kemalist principles of the nationalist Turkish Republic, it is much more tolerant of Kurdish cultural rights and expressions of Kurdish identity, as long as loyalty to the Republic of Turkey is not put in question.

The second characteristic of neo-Ottomanism is a sense of *grandeur* and self-confidence in Turkey's role in the world. This calls for a more activist foreign policy, particularly in terms of willingness to mediate in regional conflicts. In this neo-Ottoman paradigm, Ankara exerts more "soft power"— political, economic, diplomatic, and cultural influence — in formerly Ottoman territories as well as in other regions where Turkey has strategic interests. Neo-Ottomanism sees Turkey as a regional superpower. Its strategic vision and culture reflects the geographic reach of the Ottoman and Byzantine Empires. According to this neo-Ottoman vision, Turkey, as a pivotal state, should play an active diplomatic, political, and economic role in a wide region of which it is the "center." Such grand ambitions, in turn, require a nation-state in peace with and which values its multiple identities, including its Muslim and multinational past.

The third aspect of neo-Ottomanism is its goal of embracing the West as much as the Muslim world. Like the imperial city of Istanbul, which straddles Europe and Asia, neo-Ottomanism is Janus-faced. Both Özal and leaders such as Abdullah Gül and Erdoğan displayed strong awareness that Turkey's comparative advantage in the Islamic world comes in part from its Western identity and European vocation. In that sense, European Union membership matters a great deal for the strategic outlook of neo-Ottomanism.

Since its rise to power, the AKP government has followed its neo-Ottoman instincts and has taken a more active approach toward the greater Middle East, the Balkans, and the European Union. Turkey has also often taken uncharacteristically strong positions in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict; has sent troops to the NATO mission in Afghanistan; has contributed to UN forces in Lebanon; has assumed a leadership position in the Organization of Islamic Conference; has attended several Arab League conferences; has established closer ties with Iran, Iraq, and Syria; has improved its economic, political, and diplomatic relations with most Arab and Muslim states, but it has also engaged in accession negotiations with the European Union and has accepted to host NATO's most recent missile defense system. In other words, the AKP's neo-Ottoman instincts have indeed given rise to a multifaceted and singularly activist foreign policy.

2 The Turkish Model and the Arab Spring

Today, when one looks at the big picture, the Arab Spring presents a mixed blessing for the neo-Ottoman ambitions of Turkey. To be sure, most Turks feel a sense of pride that their country is referred to as a model for democratizing Arab states. Yet, the dizzying pace of events is rapidly changing the balance of power in the Middle East and causing problems for Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu's "zero-problems with neighbors" policy, particularly as far as relations with Syria are concerned. The re-emergence of Egypt as a regional leader is also a potentially complicating factor for Turkey, whose leadership in Middle East has been due as much to the merits of its foreign policy as to the absence of credible Arab leadership in the region.

Until recently, the AKP's neo-Ottomanism used to fill a vacuum of strategic leadership in the Arab world. It was the dismal failure of Egyptian leadership in the region that was at the heart of the Arab predicament and the deep admiration of Turkey's growing soft power. With the Arab Spring and Egypt's revolution, Cairo is now slowly re-emerging as the most likely candidate to fill the vacuum of strategic leadership in the Arab world. Given the international media focus on Turkey as a potential model for the region, the lessons Turkey's political evolution offer for the Arab world require special attention.

How relevant is the Turkish model for the Arab world? The answer to this question depends on what we mean by the Turkish model. There seems to be two different Turkish models. As far U.S. policy-makers and analysts are concerned, the most familiar aspect of the debate is the focus on political Islam, with the underlying question of whether the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and other Arab states will consider Turkey's AKP as a model. In that sense, as it is often repeated, Turkey is a model of "moderate" or "reformist" Islam. Yet, there is a second dimension of the Turkish model that is equally relevant: the role of the Turkish military in shaping the political system.

In both Egypt and Tunisia, the army has played a crucial role in the ongoing transition to post-authoritarianism. It should not come as a surprise that whenever the military becomes the most important factor shaping the domestic political environment, people think of Turkey. After all, the Turkish military played a crucial role in the formation of the Republic and became the self-declared guardian of the Kemalist regime in Turkey after 1923. There seems to be an interesting paradox in this duality of the Turkish model. How can Turkey be a model for an activist military as well as for a moderate Islamic movement? The answer to this question requires a deeper look at some historical characteristics of the Turkish political system and the more recent dynamics of democratization in Turkey. Deciphering this paradox may also help us analyze whether the European Union and the United States can help the democratic evolution of the Arab world.

Let us start with the historic characteristic of the Turkish model. The Turkish state has a tradition of political supremacy over Islam that goes back to Ottoman times. In many ways, the Ottoman state was based on political supremacy over Islam. A body of law, known as "kanuns," promulgated by the sultan were enacted outside the realm of Shariah and had no direct Islamic justification. The sultan made these laws based on rational rather than religious principles. These laws applied to the spheres of public, administrative, and criminal law as well as state finance. Whenever there was a clash between a "*raison d'état*" and Islamic law, the former emerged victorious. In other words, politics had primacy over religion.

After the emergence of the modern Turkish Republic under Atatürk, the staunchly secularist military continued this tradition of political

supremacy over Islam. Political Islam, in its Turkish form, had to respect the red lines of Turkish secularism or suffer the consequences. In that sense, the moderation of Turkish political Islam was partly dictated by the presence of a strong secular state and an interventionist military. Today, the AKP is the fourth reincarnation of political Islam in Turkey. Its predecessors have been shut down either by military interventions or by the Constitutional Court. Interestingly, this pattern has not caused radicalization within the Islamic movement. On the contrary, the trend has been one of moderation. The AKP, for instance, has followed a very pragmatic and moderately conservative agenda instead of pushing for militant Islamism. Similarly the Welfare Party was much more moderate during the 1990s than its predecessor, the National Salvation Party, which was banned after the 1980 coup. Compared to their Arab counterparts, who dream about a Caliphate under Sharia law, Turkish Islamists have much less ambitious agendas, such as ending the ban on headscarves in public universities.

Yet, all credit should not go to the military and the red lines of militant secularism in terms of moderating Turkish political Islam. After all, similar dynamics could have easily radicalized Islamists by pushing them underground, as has often happened in the Arab world. This is why in analyzing the pragmatism and moderation of Turkish political Islam, an equally important part of the story is the presence of a democratic system in the country. Turkey's transition to multi-party democracy with free and fair elections in 1950 was a crucial turning point. Similar dynamics are finally at play today in the Arab world, 60 years after they took place in Turkey.

Democracy is often the best antidote against radical political Islam. In the absence of freedom of expression, freedom of the press, free political parties, and free elections, the mosques and Islam are the only outlets for political dissent. Islam, in such authoritarian contexts, becomes a powerful symbol of resistance against tyranny. The emergence of the myth that somehow an Islamic political system would solve all problems is rooted in such authoritarian contexts. Unsurprisingly, "Islam is the solution" is the motto of the Muslim Brotherhood, the most powerful Islamic movement in the Arab world. Turkey has managed to avoid this vicious cycle with the transition to multi-party democracy in the 1950s and the participation of conservative Muslims in the political system. As Islamists entered the political competition, they developed a more pragmatic and realistic outlook.

Another advantage of Turkey has been its capitalist economic system and the emergence of a conservative entrepreneurial middle class that has benefited from globalization and export-led development. Turkey is blessed by the absence of vast oil and gas resources. Energy abundance in the Arab world has been a curse that has paralyzed the growth of democracy and capitalism. Instead of oil and gas, the Turkish economic growth is fueled by highly productive small and medium-sized companies known as "Anatolian tigers." This upwardly mobile, devout Anatolian bourgeoisie regularly votes for conservative political parties and has a vested interest in political stability. As a result, Turkey's Muslim entrepreneurs dream about maximizing their sales and profits in the global marketplace instead of an Islamic revolution that will bring about Shariah.

Two more factors, one domestic and the other external, have played an important role in the emergence of a Turkish model of moderate Islam.

At the domestic level, it certainly helps that Turkish Islam has a strong Sufi dimension. This brings a social, cultural, and mystical dimension to Turkish Islam at the expense of a radical political agenda. The fact that Turkey's most powerful religious

movement under the leadership of Fetullah Gülen is led by a brotherhood more interested in education, media, and interfaith dialogue is a case in point. At the external level, it is crucial to remember that without EU membership prospects, Turkey would have been deprived from a very significant driver both of modernization and of democratization. From civil-military relations, to the Kurdish question, and from judicial independence to gender rights, the drive for EU membership has been a great incentive for structural reforms in Turkey. There would be no Turkish model to emulate without this external anchor of Turkish foreign policy.

As this section illustrates, none of the political, economic, and cultural elements that define the Turkish model are easily "transferable" to the Arab world. To be sure, the Arab world is not a monolith. Arab states have different histories, class structures, political regimes, and economic systems. Given the *sui generis* nature of Turkey and the diversity of the Arab world, the concept of a country serving as a model is an intellectual exercise in abstraction with a great level of uncertainty. In any case, it is important to keep in mind that Turkey is not an Arab country and that its political evolution and history is unique. Yet, there are clearly some aspects of the Turkish model that are relevant for the Arab world and show how the West can help the Arab Spring flourish. The key for the EU and the United States is to offer strong financial, strategic, and political incentives for better governance and democratization in countries such as Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Jordan, and Yemen.

Unlike in Turkey's case, EU membership is not on the cards for these countries. Yet, the EU and the United States can use the prospect of increased aid or membership in international clubs such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), NATO's Partnership for Peace, and a revamped Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) as levers to encourage Arab progress toward the establishment of multi-party elections, the rule of law, property rights, and free markets. The decision in May 2011 of the G8 to mobilize $20 billion from multilateral development banks to support the Arab Spring nations is a major step in the right direction. The challenge will be twofold: first, to assure that these funds actually become available despite recessionary global economic dynamics. Second, eligibility for these incentive-based policies needs clear conditions and criteria, similar to the Copenhagen conditions for EU membership. The EU-Turkey pattern may indeed be the most relevant lesson the Turkish model can offer to the Arab Spring.

Coordinating Responses to the 2011 Arab Revolt: Turkey and the Transatlantic Alliance

Henri J. Barkey

Introduction

The 2011 Arab citizens' revolt has generated much interest in the potential for Turkey, as a democratic, prosperous, and dynamic country at peace with Islamic politics, to serve as a model for the new emerging polities in the Arab world. Turkey had already become the talk of the town in the Middle East with its new policy of regional engagement in the wake of the Justice and Development Party's (AKP) 2002 ascent to power. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and his foreign minister Ahmet Davutoğlu, have increasingly assumed visible roles in the tumult that has gripped the Arab world.

Indeed, Turkey represents an enviable achievement in a region that has only known autocratic politics, where sons expect to succeed their fathers even in republican regimes, and when marginal improvements in standards of living are punctuated by extremely unequal wealth distributions amidst the vast riches accruing to oil exporters. This comparison notwithstanding, it is not immediately evident how Turkey can be any more than what Erdoğan himself expressed as some point, "a source of inspiration." Turkey's development path to its current status contains two important lessons. First, it has taken a long time and has, on the democracy side, still a long way to go. Second, this trajectory has certainly not been linear. It has been marked by numerous ups and downs, miscalculations, and external constraints that are neither easy (nor desirable) to replicate.

The 2011 revolt has also challenged the Turks and their much-heralded "zero-problems with neighbors" policy. The Libyan and Syrian revolts have served to undermine, if not completely question, the tenets of a policy whose practical effect led to the establishment of "good relations with ruling regimes" at the expense of the populations. Ankara was forced to beat the retreat in both Libya and Syria when its support for their respective leaders became untenable.

Nevertheless, Turkey is well positioned to play an important role in the future Middle East. Constructing the new Middle East will take time and will require a brand new domestic, regional, and international political and economic infrastructure. Ankara can — and should — certainly help shape this new infrastructure. It will, however, require much help from the West and ultimately a buy in from newly constituted governments in the region. Here too, not everything is straightforward, insofar as Turkey's role can be hindered by its increasingly acrimonious relationship with Israel.

This essay explores the impact of the 2011 events on Turkey's regional position, the applicability of the Turkish model to the emerging Middle East, and the role that Ankara can play in a new transatlantic approach to the region.

1 Turkey as a Model

Following its 2002 rise to power, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) focused on solidifying its relations with a skeptical West that was wary of the party's Islamist origins. It sped up the process of EU-related reforms, ensuring the opening of accession negotiations with that body in 2004. It aggressively moved to increase its international presence in a variety of world organizations, successfully lobbying for nonpermanent UN Security Council membership; it improved relations with its neighbors; and, taking advantage of the vacuum created by the 2003 U.S. war on Iraq, it launched a series of high-profile regional diplomatic initiatives. The AKP also had to carefully manage its domestic opponents, especially the powerful military establishment, that viewed the party as the nemesis of the Kemalist tradition, which had dominated Turkey since 1923.

By 2007, when the AKP had consolidated its domestic position, Turkey had emerged as a country of significant regional consequence. The AKP transformed Turkey's traditional passive international posture by shepherding the Israeli-Syrian negotiations, engaging in Lebanon following the Hariri Rafik assassination and the Israeli-Hezbollah war and, most importantly, by making use of its growing economic prowess. In the end, it was the AKP's confrontation with Israel that catapulted Turkey and especially Erdoğan at the heights of Middle Eastern public opinion.

At the root of this transformation lies the changed political-economic character of Turkey. Having abandoned its inward-oriented economic policies in favor of an export-oriented one in the early 1980s under the leadership of Turgut Özal, Turkey slowly emerged as an economic powerhouse. Today it is the world's 16th largest economy and a member of the G20. As exports became the main economic driver, a new middle class emerged away from the traditional economic centers of Istanbul and Izmir. The new economic class, which is pious and conservative, did not owe its wellbeing to government largesse and support. On the contrary, labeled as Anatolian Tigers, it is free-market oriented and willing to take risks and explore markets in previously unthinkable destinations. The AKP derives much of its strength from this new economic class. This also means that the need to search for new export markets has become a critical driver of Turkish foreign policy.

Turkey's opening to the Middle East has to be seen in this context. The initiation of visa-free travel, the signing of multiple commercial agreements including some free trade agreements, and the improvement in relations with countries, such as Syria, previously seen as hostile to Ankara, are all driven by this economic imperative. Ironically, the most important change occurred in Iraq, where the AKP abandoned the decades-long policy of undermining the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG), and established cordial and lucrative trade relations with the Kurds and, with their help, assumed an important role in Iraqi politics.

The emergence of an alternative middle class as the AKP's power base has helped usher in another important change: a break in the military-civilian elite's stranglehold on Turkish politics and society. The Turkish military, which overthrew governments at will and imposed its views and prescriptions on a variety of societal and national security issues, has been forced to retreat back into the barracks. To be sure, with their misreading of the public mood and their arrogance, the officers contributed handily to their own demise.

If Turkey's transformation appeals to the wider Middle East public it is also because it is perceived to be authentic and self-generated. The new Turkey has shed its animus toward all things Islamic and, as such, the AKP government has constructed a Turkey that is closer to the region's cultural sensitivities and its participation in institutions

such as NATO or the EU no longer symbolize an abandonment of its Islamic character.

2 The Path and the Model

All of these accomplishments have made Turkey the envy of many in the region. References to the Turkish model abound in the newly emerging countries. In some Middle Eastern countries, new political parties explicitly emulating the AKP have either been created or are being contemplated. It is easy to see why Turkey is seen as a model: it is increasingly prosperous, democratic — albeit with a number of serious problems waiting to be resolved — and straddles the East-West divide with relative ease. Can Turkey serve as a model in view of the Arab revolts?

This perhaps is the wrong question to ask because it assumes that the Turkish development process can be replicated or that there is a singular path to follow. Clearly this is not the case. This is not because the Turkish case is *sui generis*. Turkey's current success is not the product of a conscious evolution but rather the by-product of good and bad decision-making, unintended consequences, dialectical processes, external developments, influences, and constraints many of which do not exist in the Arab world. Moreover, as will be suggested below, the Turkish development path is the product of a process that started at the very least in the early 1980s. Nevertheless, understanding the Turkish case is important to learn from the mistakes that slowed the process in order not to repeat them.

What are then the critical turning points, institutions, and mistakes that shaped Turkey's current ascent? It could be argued that three sets of events were determining factors. The first is the end of World War II and the advent of the Cold War. Second is the collapse of the Turkish economy in 1979 and the subsequent 1980-coup d'état and Turgut Özal's leadership. Third is the 1997 "post-modern" military intervention. Each of these events were embedded in an ideological framework and belief system, Kemalism, that was inherently self-contradicting, inconsistent, and restraining.

Kemalism as an ideology was simultaneously modernizing and authoritarian. The determination with which it sought to reshape traditional society was simply breathtaking and yet dismissive of the very people it tried to thrust into the modern world. Especially after the death of its founder, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1938, the Kemalist system reproduced itself in the form of veneration of the leader. It is, however, the defeat of Fascism and Nazism in World War II and the threat that the Soviet Union symbolized that forced Turkey to introduce multi-party politics in its domestic system. Turkey would not and could not have aspired to join the democratic West and thus get the protection it needed against Moscow as an authoritarian state. Reluctantly, the ruling party at the time allowed for contested elections — first in 1946, which it rigged in its own favor, and then in 1950 when it allowed for truly free ones — which catapulted the opposition to power and opened the way for NATO membership.

The authoritarian impulses never faded though. The military intervened in 1960, executed the civilian leaders and enshrined itself as the ultimate guarantor of "democracy." The 1960 coup opened a Pandora's box in so far as military involvement in civilian politics was concerned. It institutionalized a role for an organization that accepted little opposition when it came to its broad societal goals and that demonstrated its willingness to use force to achieve them. In fact, it did precisely that. From then on, the military (and its civilian supporters) believed it could do no wrong. The 1960 coup weakened civilian politics and, in effect, severely delayed the evolution of democracy and the rule of law in Turkey.

At about the same time, Turkey began the process of joining the European Community, the precursor to the European Union, a unique body brought together by shared values. This is where the inconsistency of the Kemalist ideology was most

apparent: it pushed Turkey toward Europe, while it simultaneously rejected much of the values that the EU represented. In the imagination of the Turkish elite, Europe, through its democracy and human rights discourse, stood for everything it tried to rid Turkey of: Islamism, religious orders, Kurdish nationalism, and the obscurantism of the Middle East.

The collapse of the import-substitution model in 1979 forced Turkey to undertake drastic reforms. The 1980 coup provided the institutional wherewithal for change, but it also unintentionally enabled the rise of Özal first as prime minister and then as president. The Turkish political system as constituted would never have allowed someone like Özal, who dominated Turkish political economy throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, to emerge. Yet, perhaps more than any other modern Turkish politician, Özal singlehandedly transformed Turkey into what it is today: a dynamic private sector centered economic powerhouse. The new Turkish private sector is no longer narrowly based or dependent on state support and largesse, but is distributed throughout the territory and is very diverse. It includes a whole new elite that is Anatolian-based, conservative, pious, and market-oriented. This new elite has emerged as the AKP's most important backers. This said, it is important to note that the fruits of Özal's reforms were long in coming and the AKP today is their primary political beneficiary.

Özal's reforms together with the military's miscalculations, which simultaneously victimized the Turkish Islamist movement and weakened the political center, paved the way for the rise of the AKP. The 1997 military ouster of the Islamist Welfare Party-led coalition government with the center-right True Path Party unintentionally set forth a process of rejuvenation among the Islamist ranks and the elevation of Erdoğan as a leader. The AKP slowly moved to claim Turkey's political center, consolidate its gains and, once sure of its power, challenge the military's domination of politics. Again, had the military hierarchy not miscalculated in 2007 first through its ill-conceived memorandum aimed to block Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül's election to the presidency and, failing that, colluding with the judiciary to ban the AKP, Erdoğan would not have achieved the dominant position he currently occupies in Turkey. As a result, the military, as evidenced by the resignations of the chief of staff and three service chiefs in August 2011, finds itself decisively defeated.

One cannot argue that Turkey is out of the woods as yet though. The 1980 military junta imposed a constitution on Turkey that continues to constrain the consolidation of democracy and the rule of law. The constitution privileges the state over the individual and imposes severe restrictions on freedom of speech and minority rights and has given rise to a judicial system that is arbitrary and capricious.

3 The Lessons

This peculiarly Turkish trajectory to democratic consolidation and prosperity is a complex one that defies replication. However, there are lessons to be drawn from the Turkish experience and its mistakes. The first is the need for patience. This is an evolutionary process; institutions are not created overnight and economic policies take time to implement. More importantly, in the search for temporary stability, it would be a mistake to emulate the "guardianship" role performed by the Turkish military in the pre-AKP era. This is a temptation that is particularly strong in Egypt today. The Egyptian military has been in power in effect since 1952 and, in the process, has accumulated privileges and developed vested interests, ranging from the economic to simple creature comforts for its personnel, that will continue to shape its corporate interests at the expense of societal ones.

In Egypt, years of economic mismanagement, support for nepotistic business arrangements, and stagnant and unequal economic growth has encouraged nostalgia for Gamal Abdel Nasser's days of rapid, albeit inward, inefficient, and not equal economic growth. What Egypt managed to do then was the product of a very specific historical circumstance. Just like Egypt in those days, many other countries, including Turkey, Argentina, and South Korea had experimented with import substitution. Given the power of globalization, a repeat is neither possible nor desirable. Still, the opening of these economies to the vagaries of international markets is likely to produce immediate adverse effects. Turkey's experience in this respect is illustrative: exchange rate policies were designed to encourage exports, competition at home was fostered through the lifting of trade barriers, and every effort possible was expended to help businesses to look for markets abroad.

In their own respective ways, Tunisia and Egypt have certain advantages they can fall back upon during this transition period. Both countries have robust tourism sectors that once back in action can earn sizable foreign exchange to cushion the blow. Turkey in 1980 had very little in the form of foreign exchange earnings, $2 billion form direct exports and a similar amount from worker remittances. Its tourism sector, now buoyant, was non-existent.

The Turks experienced their worst crisis in 2001 when poor macroeconomic regulatory management led to a banking crisis, in many ways, presaging the 2008 global one. As a result they had to restructure the banking system and establish tight regulatory controls that have served them well since.

The one advantage Turkey has with respect to Tunisia and Egypt is the influence of external actors, the United States, NATO, and especially the EU. Europe has served as a magnet, an idea, a regulator, an initiator of policies, an excuse for introducing unpopular reforms, and sometimes even as an opposition to Turkish governments. Europe's influence on Turkey cannot be underestimated. The United States, through its alliance relationship, has edged Turkey toward reforms. This is what the Arab world lacks.

4 What Can be Done? Contemplating a Regional Development Bank

Turkey is not the EU. It has neither the resources nor the wherewithal to replicate Europe's overall influence. It is not the embodiment of a powerful idea either. Nonetheless, it has a built-in economic and commercial know-how, extensive relations in many of these countries, especially at the level of medium-sized businesses, and a natural affinity for and eagerness to expand its own enterprises there.

Most importantly, where Turkey can be of help is in fashioning regional institutions that will help the transition in the region. These can take the form of a Regional Development Bank. Among the important criteria to consider in fashioning regional institutions is local input. Economic policy formulation and other decisions critical to the development of these economies, while generally conforming to the global marketplace, must also not appear to be imposed from the United States or Europe. The challenge will be to generate ideas that are regional and authentic if there is to be a buy-in from the populations. There is a great pool of *émigré* talent who has made its name and fortune in international institutions that can be lured back to help with the transitions.

In the uncertainty that reigns in many regional capitals, Turkey has many advantages that can be deployed to host such an institution and attract back this talent. Istanbul is a desirable location with excellent international connections, its workforce is among the best educated in the region, which can easily staff many of the mid-level positions and would also provide a respite from inter-Arab rivalries.

The devil is always in the details: there would be much work to do before such an organization was to be established. There are those who will surely object to locating such an institution in Turkey. The tendency for (irrational) exuberance on the part of Turkish foreign policy leaders can put off some, but in the long run Turkey's intrinsic benefits outweigh the downsides.

The EU, Turkey, and the Arab Spring: From Parallel Approaches to a Joint Strategy?

Eduard Soler i Lecha

Introduction

A political earthquake referred to as the "Arab Spring" has been shaking North Africa and the Middle East in 2011. This seismic movement has reached the European Union (EU) and Turkey, forcing both to revise their traditional policies toward this region. Any attempt to return to the *statusquo ante* is unfeasible as political dynamics in the Arab world have reached a point of no return. Consequently, European and Turkish policies have to be modified in their form and substance, in order to adequately respond to the specific needs of the new context and prepare for a new political landscape in this region.

While both Turkey and the EU have publicly acknowledged the need to respond to this rapidly changing environment, neither contemplates the possibility of profiting from this opportunity by developing, jointly, a more effective, value-based, and forward-looking strategy for the region. In Ankara, Brussels, and the main European capitals, policymakers scramble to analyze this new landscape, seek new interlocutors, define and fund democratization programs, and explore how to contain regimes that are using brutal force against demonstrators. However, almost none of the proposals that have emerged so far stem from the realization that Turkey and the EU, working together, could multiply the effects of actions aimed at promoting a more secure, prosperous, and democratic future across the Arab world.

In contrast, several analysts have been advocating for further EU-Turkey cooperation in this field.[1] As a contribution to this debate, this paper indicates why the current context has been detrimental to EU-Turkish cooperation in foreign and security policy issues and proposes several ideas for EU-Turkish cooperation in response to the democratic openings in the region. These proposals cannot, alone, revamp EU-Turkish relations in general, but could bypass the negative dynamics underpinning these relations, materializing in specific cooperative actions that could address more effectively the challenges faced by the EU and Turkey in their common neighborhood.

[1] See, for instance, Diba Nigar Göksel, "Europe's Neighborhood: Can Turkey Inspire?," *On Turkey series*, GMFUS, May 8, 2011; Charles Grant, "A new neighbourhood policy for the EU," *Center for European Reform Policy Brief*, March 2011; Katynka Barysch, "Why the EU and Turkey Need to Coordinate Their Foreign Policies," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Commentary, August 31, 2011; and Heather Grabbe and Sinan Ülgen, "The high price of strategic rivalry," *European Voice*, April 20, 2011.

1 A Common Neighborhood, Parallel Approaches

Both the EU and Turkey have a long experience and substantial leverage in the southern Mediterranean. For decades, the Mediterranean has been a top priority for the EU and some of its most powerful member states. The EU has played a leading role in promoting regional cooperation in the Mediterranean, trade liberalization through bilateral association agreements, and has insisted that converging dynamics of southern Mediterranean countries with European norms and practices is key to reducing the enormous economic and political gap between the two shores of the Mediterranean. More recently, Turkey has also upgraded its Middle Eastern policy, both in terms of economic and trade links as well as in terms of diplomatic activism. Its visa diplomacy and the so-called "zero-problem policy with neighbors" stand out as two visible facets of Turkey's rediscovery of its southern neighbors.

European and Turkish approaches toward the region have differed in aspects such as visa policy, where Turkey's liberal stance has contrasted with the Union's fortress-Europe tendencies. However, there have also been shared elements in Turkish and EU policies. Among them, the vital importance of security concerns, the attempt to bolster relations through trade, and the need to cooperate with ruling authoritarian regimes in the region, hoping that reforms could be promoted by reformist sectors within the regimes.

The Arab Spring caught Turkey, the EU, and its member states off guard and embarrassingly exposed their cooperation with authoritarian and corrupt dynasties. The persistent inability of several Arab regimes to meet the political, economic, and social demands of their citizens, together with the brutal repression exerted against demonstrators, have triggered an unprecedented wave of revolts, political changes, promises of reforms, and, in some cases, even harsher repression against any sort of protest movement. Turkey, the EU, and its member states have been forced to react to the brutality of the regimes' repression. Traditional alliances with authoritarian regimes are no longer sustainable, at least not at any price.

Some examples of how several actors have started to shift or adapt their policies toward this region are the EU's ongoing review of its European Neighbourhood Policy, France's democratic conversion (from being one of Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali's key advocates to becoming Libya's democratic champion), or the radical turn of Turkey's policies toward Syria. While there are differences in terms of form, rhythm, and scope, both Turkey and the EU share common features in their respective policy-review processes. First, both are driven by a need to recover some of the credibility lost due to the shady deals and the support provided to authoritarian regimes. Second, both aspire to remain influential players in shaping the future of the region. Third, both have mostly ignored each other when formulating new policies toward this region. Finally, their responses have projected their respective strengths and weaknesses.

2 Filling the EU's Credibility Gap

The EU, and, even more, some of its member states, have been fiercely criticized for their stance regarding the Tunisian and Egyptian uprisings. Initial European reactions were dubbed as slow and weak. Later on, the EU was unable to project a cohesive position toward the Libyan crisis, as exemplified by the voting pattern on UN Security Council resolution 1973, which largely contributed to the image of a "divided Europe."[2] The alarmist reaction of several governments, particularly France and Italy, regarding refugees flows and the lack of internal and external solidarity on this issue were further detrimental to the image of the EU and in particular of southern European countries. [3]

Aware of a growing credibility deficit, several European governments have multiplied their political gestures in support for new democratic forces, whilst European institutions have promised a "new response" to a rapidly changing environment, through a revamped European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). The Commission and the External Action Service have issued several communications promising additional funding (€1.2 billion), better access to EU markets, new mechanisms to promote civil society and democratization, some openings in the field of human mobility, and a general revision of conditionality mechanisms.[4] In typical EU fashion, most of these proposals are supposed to materialize through new institutional mechanisms: a Civil Society Facility, a European Endowment for Democracy, Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements, and Dialogues on Migration, Mobility, and Security between the EU and specific countries leading to the implementation of Mobility Partnerships, etc.

All in all, the ambition and scope of the EU's proposals have fallen short not only of the demands of some of the partner countries that have been asking for some sort of "Marshall Plan" but also of the expectations of most analysts.[5] The Commission's responses have demonstrated technical competence regarding the exploitation of existing instruments at the EU's disposal. However, these virtues have been overshadowed by the structural problems of a Union, which is self-absorbed in trying to cope with its dire internal problems.

Such self-absorption was exemplified by the conclusions of the European Council of June 23-24, 2011, which should have given a political response to the Arab Spring. Instead, it focused on internal EU problems such as the Greek bailout, the persisting threats to the Union's economic and financial foundations, and the potential collapse of the Schengen system. In such circumstances, EU leaders mechanically backed the Commission's proposals, which are more technical than political in nature, without adding any significant political impulse to the EU's response to the Arab Spring, with the exception of the establishment of the post of a special envoy for the southern Mediterranean.

[2] Timo Behr (2011), "Arab Spring, European Split," *BEPA Monthly Brief*, Issue 46, April 2011.

[3] Daniel Korski (2011), "Club Med and the migrants: Europe's response to the Arab Spring," *European Council on Foreign Relations*, May 10, 2011.

[4] The two most important documents being: European Commission (2011), *Joint Communication to the European Council, the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Region: A Partnership for Democracy and Shared Prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean*, COM (2011) 200 final, and European Commission (2011), *Joint Communication to the European Council, the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A new response to a changing Neighbourhood, Brussels*, May 25, 2011, COM (2011) 303.

[5] See, among others, Nathalie Tocci (2011) "The European Union and the Arab Spring: A (Missed?) Opportunity to Revamp the European Neighbourhood Policy," *EuroMeSCo Brief*, n. 2; Rosa Balfour (2011) "The Arab Spring, the changing Mediterranean, and the EU: tools as a substitute for strategy?," *European Policy Center brief*, June 2011, and Eduard Soler i Lecha and Elina Viilup (2011), "Reviewing the European Neighbourhood Policy: a weak response to fast changing realities," *Notes Internacionals CIDOB*, 36; Barcelona: CIDOB.

3 Updating Turkey's Zero-Problem Approach

In contrast to the EU, Turkey's reaction to the Egyptian and Tunisian uprisings was robust and appreciated by pro-democracy movements. Turkish authorities stood firm in their support for Egyptian demonstrators and were among the first to demand for Mubarak's resignation. This confirmed Turkey's popularity among the Arab public, who view Turkey's political and economic transformation as a success story, as a source of inspiration, or even as a model.[6] In contrast with its pro-democracy stance on Egypt, however, Turkish authorities were far more cautious regarding the first protests in Libya and Syria, and the AKP government took longer to position itself against the Gaddafi and Assad regimes. This gave way to criticisms of Turkish double-standards, driven by the pre-eminence of Turkish economic interests over normative concerns.[7]

Indeed, a combination of economic and purely security interests lay behind Ankara's initial prudence when the first clashes erupted in Libya and Syria. Such interests also underpinned Turkey's diplomatic attempts to find political compromises to both situations. In the case of Libya, the huge lucrative construction contracts but, above all, the need to repatriate 25,000 Turkish workers living in Libya were Ankara's top priorities. Alongside these interests, Turkey also questioned how a NATO intervention would be perceived in Muslim countries. Finally, French-Turkish tensions and Paris' role as a prime supporter of the Libyan National Transitional Council initially dissuaded Turkey from openly supporting the Libyan revolution.

The case of Syria was even more sensitive, due to both geographical proximity and to the importance of Syria in Turkey's renovated Middle Eastern policy. Over the last decade, Turkey and Syria have turned the page on their longstanding dispute, signing multiple bilateral agreements, approving visa liberalization, and upgrading their political, economic, and social contacts. However, as in the case of Libya, Turkey's initially cautious response to the Assad regime was revised as the latter's brutality intensified, thousands of Syrians sought refuge in Turkey's bordering regions, and the reforms promised by Assad were unanimously perceived in Turkey as cosmetic and void. Turkey became the host country of several meetings of Syrian opposition leaders. Simultaneously, Turkish leaders such as Erdoğan and Gül stated that they had lost confidence in the regime. Turkish leaders ultimately appreciated that for Turkey to make full use of its soft-power in the region in future, Ankara could no longer side with authoritarian regimes. A serious revision of the "zero-problem policy with neighbors," one of the flagships of the AKP's foreign policy, was proposed by experts and analysts.[8] Indeed, Erdoğan's victory speech in June 2011, in which he announced a greater Turkish focus on supporting democratic movements, was interpreted by Turkish and international observers as a shift in Turkey's regional strategy.[9]

[6] On the image of Turkey in the Arab world, see Meliha Altunışık (2010), "Turkey: Arab Perspectives," *Foreign Policy Series*, n. 11, Istanbul: TESEV. Altunışık points out that Arab opinion on Turkey has become increasingly positive but not monolithic. As emphasized by the author of this report "the debate in the Arab world on Turkey is in fact a debate on the Arab world in itself." More than ever, current Arab debates on the Turkish model confirm this hypothesis.

[7] See, among others, Pelin Turgut, "How Syria and Libya Got to Be Turkey's Headaches," *TIME*, April 30, 2011,

[8] See, for instance, Ömer Taşpınar, "Zero Problems With This Syria?," *Today's Zaman*, April 25, 2011.

[9] See, for instance, Susanne Güsten, "Mandate for a new era," *The New York Times*, June 16, 2011.

4 The Need for Cooperation Despite a Difficult Relationship

There is wide consensus that the EU has financial and institutional resources that Turkey cannot dream of and that Turkey enjoys a level of popularity among the Arab public that the EU has lost over the last decades. Viewed from this angle, there are many complementarities between EU and Turkish policies in the region. But for the time being, there has been no significant gesture by EU or Turkish leaders indicating that joint action is considered as a strategic need. This reflects the dire state of EU-Turkish relations.

EU-Turkish relations have been on the verge of paralysis for several years. Accession negotiations have progressed very slowly and several chapters are frozen due to the Cyprus conflict and French opposition to opening negotiations on chapters that, according to Paris, could reaffirm Turkey's membership prospects. There are new clouds on the horizon, particularly regarding Turkey's warning that relations with the EU would be frozen during the Cypriot EU-Presidency in the second half of 2012 and the possibility of an escalation of tension over gas exploitation rights in the eastern Mediterranean waters between Cyprus, Lebanon, and Israel. In such conditions, Turkey is not willing to establish unconditional foreign policy cooperation with the EU unless there is a boost to accession negotiations or, at the very least, EU movement toward visa-liberalization with Turkey.[10]

Finding a way out of this vicious circle could immediately translate into genuine and forward-looking cooperation between Turkey and the EU in the international arena and particularly in the Middle East. By contrast, without an EU-Turkish *rapprochement*, blockages will persist in EU-NATO relations, which are particularly vital to launching new EU Common Security and Defence Policy missions in the Mediterranean region and beyond.[11] Notwithstanding, as important as developments in the Middle East might be for both the EU and Turkey, it seems unlikely that a shared acknowledgment of the need to join forces in order to respond effectively to the challenges stemming from the region will suffice to restore trust between Ankara and Brussels (and Paris and Berlin) and create momentum for a re-launch of accession negotiations.

[10] The Commission call to launch a visa dialogue with Turkey in the spring of 2011 received a cool response from Ankara. Turkish authorities insist that instead of a visa dialogue they expect an EU move toward visa liberalization, as in the case of EU-Western Balkan relations.

[11] Under the "Berlin plus" agreements, Turkey can block the use of NATO military capacities in EU Common Security and Defence Policy missions. Turkey's objection to Cyprus presence in EU-NATO meetings has become the most important obstacle to EU-NATO cooperation.

5 Pushing for Specific Joint-Actions

While reigniting a virtuous circle in EU-Turkey relations seems not to be on the cards, it is still realistic to envisage some politically meaningful decisions drawing together the EU and Turkey in the southern Mediterranean. Rather than creating new institutional mechanisms, which could be perceived by Turkey as the materialization of a "privileged partnership," that is, a consolation prize for the EU's rejection of Turkey's full membership, EU actors (particularly the External Action Service) could approach Turkey not as an ordinary candidate country but as a quasi-member state, which in many respects, Turkey already is since its entry into the EU Custom Union.

Engaging and consulting rather than informing should be the motto of a renewed EU approach toward Turkey, at least when dealing with foreign and security policy issues and particularly in areas of Turkey's vital interest. This implies moving toward Turkey's involvement in EU decision making and shaping mechanisms in these areas. The list of possibilities includes:

- *ad hoc* participation at the highest level in decision-making in areas that are vital to Turkey's interests (e.g., Syria);
- de-blocking Turkey's membership to the European Defence Agency. This would give a strong political signal that the EU is genuinely willing to consider Turkey as a key partner in security issues and could have a positive spill-over effect on EU-NATO cooperation;
- structured cooperation between the office of the recently appointed Special Envoy of the EU for the southern Mediterranean and those units in Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs dealing with the region. For instance, a Turkish diplomat could be invited to join the team led by Bernardino León, while an EU diplomat could reciprocate in Ankara;
- regular dialogue between DEVCO-EuropeAid and TIKA (Turkish Cooperation Agency), both at the level of Policy Planning Units and in specific countries where TIKA and the European Commission pursue or are planning to develop actions; and
- involve Turkey in the design of new instruments that are already on the table, such as the Civil Society Facility or the European Endowment for Democracy. Turkey's contribution is critical insofar as Turkey's political parties and civil society organizations have different and complementary contacts in Arab countries.[12] This is particularly obvious if the EU acknowledges that there is a need to engage with Islamist movements.

Furthermore, and in response to ongoing or forthcoming political crises in the region, the EU and Turkey could envisage, among others, a number of specific actions:

- prepare joint visits to the region by the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Turkish Foreign Affairs Minister, or even at heads of state level. By the same token, it is of paramount importance to avoid images such as the competition on who was visiting Libya first, as Cameron and Sarkozy's visit to Tripoli and Bengazi in September 2011 was perceived as an attempt to overshadow Erdoğan's regional tour;

[12] Ibahim Kalin, Turkish Prime Minister chief adviser, in his article "Turkey and the Arab Spring" (*Today's Zaman*, May 23, 2011), points out Turkey's policies of engagement with Arab governments and publics, and affirms that "the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, *al-Nahda* Movement in Tunisia, and Hamas in Palestine will all play important and legitimate roles in the political future of their respective countries," and that "Americans and Europeans will need to engage these groups publicly and directly, as Turkey has done."

- coordinated actions in multilateral fora to support ongoing democratic transitions and, simultaneously, joint measures to put further pressure on regimes using brutal repression against peaceful demonstrators (this is particularly urgent in the case of Syria);
- in the case of Libya, and building on Turkey's expertise in Iraq, Turkey and the EU could jointly propose a meeting of Libya's neighbors. Regional cooperation could play a positive role to support Libya's transition and, at the same time, the neighbors would benefit from joining forces among each other and with the new Libyan authorities to prevent threats such as arms trafficking and terrorist activities; and
- joint actions to support Security Sector Reform in post-authoritarian contexts, an area where both Turkey and several EU member states have a solid expertise.

6 Conclusion

The EU and Turkey need to grasp the window of opportunity to join forces, find complementarities, and define common actions when responding to the ongoing seismic transformations in the southern Mediterranean. Thinking together, sharing information, working in a coordinated manner, exploring areas where one could support the other and vice-versa are probably the most effective ways to deal with current challenges in the region and avoid suspicions of neo-colonial meddling.

Cooperation in this field cannot be expected to immediately result in a revitalization of EU-Turkish relations, despite the fact that no better signal could be sent regarding how to build a common Euro-Mediterranean future of peace, democracy, and prosperity. The blockage of EU-Turkey accession negotiations is likely to remain a major obstacle for substantive cooperation in international affairs and in the Middle East in particular. Reversing this situation requires political will and a change of mentality that will not happen from one day to the next. However, some of the proposals presented here could be implemented fairly rapidly and could lay the ground for more ambitious forms of cooperation between the EU and Turkey in the years to come.

The "Turkish Model" in the Mirror of the Arab Spring[1]

Hassan Nafaa

[1] Translated from Arabic to English by Ghada Diab.

Introduction

The winds of freedom blowing across the Arab world have thus far swept away the regimes of Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali in Tunisia, Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, and Muammar Gaddafi in Libya. They are expected to bring down other regimes and figures, at the forefront of which is that of Ali Saleh in Yemen. While a number of Arab regimes, such as those in the Gulf, seem to be holding out longer, they will be unable to escape the tidal wave of change entirely and will ultimately be affected one way or another. Thus, it can be said without exaggeration that the winds of change sweeping across the Arab region these days will not die down before they reshape the political map of the region.

Yet, the successive fall of corrupt and authoritarian regimes in the Arab world does not necessarily mean that the Arab peoples are now in a position to build alternative democratic regimes capable of surviving and thriving in a region packed with highly complex political, economic, and social contrasts. Since the region's Islamic political forces and parties seem to be more organized and capable of mobilizing masses, several questions naturally arise about the type of political, social, and economic systems that can be built on the ruins of the regimes brought down by the Arab Spring and the kind of Islamic model that will be chosen: the Taliban in Afghanistan, the clerical rule in Iran or the Justice and Development Party (AKP) in Turkey?

Given that most western intellectuals and political analysts, particularly in the United States and EU countries, prefer the Turkish model, regarded as the Islamic model most easily reconciled with the values of Western democracy, many questions arise as to how the Turkish model can inspire and spread throughout the Arab world and what role Western countries can play in this regard.

Before seeking to answer these questions, we should consider the meaning of the term "model". It suggests, in theory at least, a ready-made formula to be used when needed. In practice, however, I believe there is no such thing as a ready-made formula. When it comes to political and social systems, it is difficult to find a model regime that can be replicated and applied elsewhere in the world. Every political or social system emerges from the historical experience of specific human communities that have their own cultural characteristics.

Since the cultural characteristics of communities are a by-product of interactions between subjective and local components, on one hand, and a regional and international setting, on the other, the "systems" produced by specific communities may have an inspirational effect on other communities, but it may not necessarily be possible to plant them in a different sociopolitical soil. In this sense, the social and political experiences that have been success stories do not necessarily constitute models.

In this context, I think it would be most proper to view the AKP's experience in Turkey as a 'success story' that may be inspiring to the Arab peoples at this important and critical stage in their history, but not necessarily as a model that can be transferred and replicated. Undoubtedly, there are numerous factors that make the AKP's experience both an inspiration and an influence, especially after the party managed to resolve many of the chronic problems that had plagued Turkey for many decades, such as identity, democracy, stability, and dependency. Naturally, other societies facing similar problems should be able to benefit from this rich experience, but only to the extent to which their own characteristics permit, and without borrowing a 'model' and 'replanting' it in another soil that may not be suitable for its growth.

In order to identify the magnitude and kind of impact that the AKP's experience can have on the masses in revolt in the Arab world, the following three aspects must be taken into account: a) the factors that have made the AKP's experience a success story that inspires others; b) how the Arab revolutions can benefit from the AKP's experience; and c) how the other countries, particularly the United States and EU countries, perceive the Turkish experience and its potential impact on the Arab world.

1 The Appeal of the "Turkish model"

Since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and the subsequent establishment of a modern, Western-style secular state with an anti-Islamic bent, Turkey has suffered a series of political, economic, and social crises. However, the rise of the AKP to power in Turkey in 2002 and its formation of a single-party majority government has reshaped the political map of Turkey and dramatically altered Turkey's status, especially after the AKP managed to create effective solutions for a number of major problems, most notably:

- **Stability and democracy**. Political life in Turkey was marked by a great deal of instability for many decades, which was a pretext for the military's direct intervention in political life. So it came as no surprise that the Turkish army carried out a military coup approximately every 10 years: the first direct coup was staged in 1960, the second in 1971, and the third in 1980, while an indirect coup was carried out in 1997, overthrowing the government of Necmettin Erbakan. Single-handedly winning the majority of parliamentary seats in three consecutive elections, the AKP has managed to change the political scene completely and lay down new rules for the political game. These rules have helped to preserve and consolidate democracy and reduce the military's role in political life and immobilize its ability to act alone. Thus, it can be said that Turkey's political system has never been closer to the long-standing democracies of Europe than it is now, thanks to the successful policies adopted by the Islamic-oriented ruling party. Turkey's enjoyment of democratic stability has indisputably opened the door for major achievements in many other areas, such as economics and foreign policy.

- **Identity and alienation**. For many decades, Turkey suffered a serious identity crisis caused by the inconsistency between historical, cultural, and geographical facts and the political, cultural, and legal reality that was imposed upon the country for decades. This resulted in an ever-widening rift between its natural identity, which was more of an Eastern and Islamic-oriented one, and an imposed identity that was anti-Islamic and alienating. The AKP was able to resolve this problem through a set of realistic and moderate policies that laid the foundation for a different political system that has allowed Turkey's Islamic identity and values to be expressed in line with the values of freedom, the rule of law, justice, and transparency.

- **Development and modernization**. Turkey's economy long suffered from structural problems, hindering its progress on the road to development and modernization. However, the economic policies adopted by the AKP increased the Gross National Product from $300 billion in 2002 to $750 billion in 2008 and the average annual per capita income from $3,300 to more than $10,000 in the same period. As a result, the Turkish economy, for the first time since the founding of modern Turkey, is ranked 16th in the world and 6th in Europe.

- **Dependency and a non autonomous role**. Turkey long maintained close strategic relations with the West and Israel, under which it was deemed more a dependent than an autonomous country. Turkey's long-standing inability to play an active role regionally and internationally was dramatically reversed with the AKP's rise to power. The party has managed to develop an independent foreign policy enabling Turkey to move effectively in all directions while maintaining its relations and strategic interests with the West and even with Israel.

2 The Arab Spring and the Prospects for Democratization

Until recently, the Arab world appeared impermeable to democracy. Then suddenly a revolution broke out in Tunisia, toppling one of the most corrupt and authoritarian Arab regimes, that of Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali. It was only a few weeks later that the revolutionary spark spread to Egypt. Given Egypt's regional leverage, the success of that country's revolution in toppling Hosni Mubarak's regime, and thus ending his plans to transfer power to his son Gamal, caused the revolutionary wave to spread across most of the Arab world. This has opened the way to democratizing the Arab regional system as a whole, especially after the outbreak of revolutions in Libya, Yemen, Bahrain, and Syria.

Despite the many difficulties faced by some of the ongoing revolutions, it seems clear that there will be no turning back for the Arab region. With the road to democratization long and rocky, any talk about the future of democracy in this critical region will have to take into account the diversity of political and socioeconomic conditions from one Arab country to another. With such diversity, each Arab country is likely to tread a different path to democratization. Since the success of Egypt's transition to democracy in particular is likely to have enormous implications for the rest of the Arab world, this paper will focus on the prospects for democratization in Egypt after the January 25 Revolution.

The Egyptian Revolution as a Model

In order to understand the reality of the recent and ongoing events in Egypt, a number of facts should be taken into account, most notably:

- The Egyptian revolution was sparked by educated, tech-savvy, upper middle-class youth, but would never have succeeded if it were not for the subsequent support of all groups and sectors of the population. Therefore, it would be a mistake to classify Egypt's revolution as a "youth revolution". It should be seen as a massive popular revolution in every sense of the word.
- Although it came as a surprise to many, the revolution did not break out suddenly but was the natural outcome of a long and cumulative process of political mobility that demanded change. During the ten-year long process, various protest movements were formed: the Kefaya movement, founded in 2004 (comprising veteran activists who had turned against their official political parties for their failure to bring about the desired change) with the slogan "No to extension, no to succession"; the April 6 movement (made up of young activists not affiliated to any official parties), launched in support of the Mahalla workers' strike of April 6, 2008; and the Egyptian Campaign Against Succession, formed in 2009 out of a number of political parties and movements that rejected the "inheritance-of-power" plan, and later developed into another more dynamic and appealing movement named the National Association for Change, founded in February 2010 following El-Baradei's return to Egypt and his direct involvement in political action. The call for a protest on January 25, 2011 sent out by the "We are All Khaled Said" Facebook group, which sparked the remarkable Egyptian Revolution, was but one manifestation of this political mobility.
- The revolution was of more a political than a social nature, despite the fact that social justice was one of its main objectives and one of the most important reasons for the involvement of the lower classes. The Egyptian Revolution broke out in order to bring down Mubarak's regime and establish a new democratic system, after Egyptians had lost all hope of reforming the system from within. This was based on

the conviction that tyranny is the root of corruption, which in turn has resulted in the loss of human dignity for all Egyptians and social injustice for the poor and working classes.

- It was a leaderless revolution. It lacked a unified political leadership, despite the participation of most opposition figures; lacked an organizational structure, despite the involvement of the majority of political forces and parties at one stage or another; and lacked a unified ideological vision, despite the participation of the various intellectual currents, from the far right to the far left.

- The revolution remains unfinished, as the elements that triggered it have failed to seize power, hindering the achievement of their remaining objectives. The military seized power upon forcing the former president to step down from office. Since then, it has practically acted as a living barrier between the revolutionary forces seeking to create a new system and the remnants of an old regime whose head has been cut off while the body remains alive and has been able to operate and lead the counter-revolution. Nevertheless, the forces that shaped the revolution are still active enough to sustain and renew themselves and apply various forms of pressure to achieve all their objectives and demands.

From the foregoing, it is evident that the future of democracy in Egypt will depend largely on how the transition period is managed; a period that is likely to see a bitter conflict among three groups of forces with disparate interests and objectives:

- the revolutionary groups interested in effecting change, who were brought together by their hatred of the former regime and torn apart by their conflicting ideologies and different views on how to build a new system to replace an old regime, decapitated but with roots still firmly sunk into the country's sociopolitical soil;

- the remnants of the old regime, represented by the former regime's security services and their associated network of interests, members of the dissolved National Democratic Party (NDP), and business groups who benefited from the old regime, all of whom share a burning desire to abort the revolution, or at least to minimize the current and projected losses; and

- the currently ruling military junta, which is trying to find a middle ground between the forces of the revolution and those of the counter-revolution, in order to be able to manage the transition period in line with its vision for Egypt's national security requirements, on one hand, and with the size and strength of the pressure from the forces at home and abroad, on the other.

Since there is no room here for a detailed analysis of patterns of interaction within and among these three groups of forces competing to maximize their gains during the remainder of the transition period, the situation can be briefly outlined as follows. The forces that sparked or supported the revolution failed to maintain their cohesion after toppling the head of the regime, and the various factions have been competing ever since for the largest possible piece of the "unfinished revolution" cake. Despite the fluid positions of the various factions on numerous issues, the outcome of their interactions has ultimately led to a state of polarization and division, with the various factions of political Islam at the opposite end of the spectrum from all the other political currents.

This state of polarization was most evident during and after the referendum on proposed changes to a number of articles of the previous constitution. While the various Islamic factions stood behind

the idea of making limited amendments to the old constitution, the other currents demanded that the process of drafting a new constitution be initiated immediately. A few of the proposed amendments required that parliamentary elections precede the drafting of a new constitution, which would later be the task of a founding committee to be chosen by the new parliament. This caused secular forces to fear Islamist domination of the committee, and their subsequent control over the drafting of the new constitution — in the event that Islamists were to win a majority of seats in the upcoming parliamentary elections.

While secularists raised the "Constitution First" slogan, Islamists rallied behind the "Elections First" demand, explaining that the results of the referendum on constitutional amendments had to be respected. This heated disagreement between the two camps has taken its toll on the revolutionary forces' ability to pressure the junta into meeting all the demands of the revolution, most importantly: a) the complete removal of the remnants of the old regime and b) the construction of a new, more democratic system. Nevertheless, there has been continuous pressure on the junta, particularly by secular and liberal forces, and it is thanks to this that Mubarak and his family were put on trial, many prominent central and local government officials changed, and the Interior Ministry largely purged of corrupt officers.

The forces opposed to change, which serve as a natural vehicle for the counter-revolution, are almost all somehow connected to the former ruling party, the NDP. Despite the dissolution of the NDP, along with the security services it specifically set up to protect the regime, many of its members and supporters remained in sensitive state positions for months after the revolution, mainly in local government, universities, banks, and others. As a result, they were able to stir up unrest and turmoil in order to deepen the average citizen's perception that the revolution was the reason for the breakdown of security, the standstill of production, the aggravation of the economic crisis, and the rise of unemployment.

The months following the revolution saw a series of alarming events in different areas of the country, including the burning of a number of churches, attacks on protesters by thugs, and the staging of demonstrations and protests in support of the ousted president and his regime. Despite their failure to abort the revolution or undermine the revolutionary spirit in the country, the forces opposed to change remain steadfast, thus posing a danger that should not be underestimated.

Finally, the military establishment, represented by the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), is managing state affairs at present. The SCAF derives its legitimacy from its dual role in protecting the revolution, namely: a) refusing to carry out the former regime's orders to open fire on protestors and b) forcing the former president to step down from office after his steadfast refusal to do so. While the SCAF did have reservations about the policies of the former regime, particularly those relating to plans to transfer power to Gamal Mubarak and aspects of the 'privatization' program that led to rampant corruption, they were not among the forces that shaped the revolution, nor did they carry out a coup against the regime, of which they were an essential part.

Therefore, the only explanation for the role played by the SCAF during the revolution would be that they had no desire to see the fall of the regime cause a collapse of the state itself. Thus, it can be said that the SCAF protected the revolution as much as it did the regime, after their decision to sacrifice its head and some of its key figures. This is why some have stressed that the SCAF's current actions imply that they are more inclined toward the old regime than they are toward the revolution and the forces seeking to establish a democracy.

3 The Turkish model between the West's Interest and the Concerns of the Egyptian Revolution

The West's interest in the Turkish model seems to be particularly driven by satisfaction with the fact that Turkey has been able to achieve a true and lasting reconciliation between Islam and democracy, on one hand, and between Islam and the West, on the other. It has also managed to realistically address the problems of minorities and religious freedom. The West seems enthusiastic about this model and hopes it can be seen as a model by the Arab revolutionaries seeking to establish democracy. However, this view fails to take into account the individuality of the Turkish historical experience. It fails to consider the huge differences between that unique experience and the present reality of the Arab peoples. While Egypt's Islamic political forces and parties, especially the Muslim Brotherhood, welcome the development achieved by the Justice and Development Party (AKP) in Turkey, they do not see the party or its ideology as a model for the kind of Islamic party or society they wish to create.

The Turkish model has not only been of interest to Egypt's Islamic forces, but to all the other political forces. We can even say that it has been of more interest to non-Islamic forces than to others. This interest has increased since the revolution for two reasons: a) the public emergence of all Islamic political forces and their formation of formal political parties, as well as their inherent tendency to unite and coordinate with each other in the face of other forces and b) the weakness of secular and liberal parties in Egypt, those that were formed both before and after the revolution. These two factors are likely to maximize the chances of Islamic parties winning a majority in the upcoming parliamentary elections.

These developments have created a new situation in Egypt, and it would not be unlikely to see the rise of Islamists to power in Egypt, or at least to see them in a position to control the formation of future governments. Since it would in all cases be difficult to ignore the Islamic current in Egypt, irrespective of the upcoming election results, many naturally speculate about the kind of domestic and foreign policies that would be adopted by representatives of this current. There is, as yet, no indication that Egypt's Islamic forces may choose to develop their ideologies based on the Turkish model. These forces, mainly comprising the Muslim Brotherhood, Salafis, and Sufis, do not see the Turkish AKP as a role model, not even as a real Islamic party — a view strongly held by Salafis in particular. Although it would not be unlikely to see a future change in this trend, especially among the Muslim Brotherhood's Justice and Freedom Party, it is likely to take some time before such a change were to become a reality in Egypt.

In fact, the admiration felt by Egypt's various political forces, including Islamists, for the Turkish model is primarily based on Turkey's achievements in foreign policy, particularly with regard to the shift in Turkey's stance on the Arab-Israeli conflict. An extremely intelligent and vigorous foreign policy developed by the AKP has successfully managed to change the Turkish stereotype in the minds of the Arab people and redefine Turkey's role in the international arena in a manner that has earned it the respect of all countries, even those with different leanings and stances. Based on new, clear foundations that seek to fully minimize Turkey's differences with its neighbors, the purpose of the policy is for Turkey to be completely free and able to move effectively in all directions.

It is indeed rare to find a foreign policy that matches that of Turkey in its ability to reconcile so many contradictions. While Turkey's application to join the European Community was once met with disdain, Turkey today appears to be in a position to oblige the EU to treat it with respect and agree to negotiate the conditions for accession and the deadlines by which they should be met. It could even be said that the EU no longer has the luxury

of bargaining with Turkey over its right to apply for accession, but at the same time does not have the courage to explicitly reject the application.

Despite its membership in NATO and its long-standing alliance with the United States, Turkey did not hesitate to reject a U.S. request to use its territory and air bases as a launch pad for the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Its position on the crisis was even much more favorable than that of many Arab countries that now grieve over what has happened to Iraq and over Iran's growing role in the region. Also, its close ties with the West and the United States have not prevented Turkey from developing relations with Russia, which was considered an enemy during the Cold War, as well as with Central Asian countries. Turkey even seems to be in a position today to reach out to Armenia and work toward resolving the historical crisis between the two countries without jeopardizing relations with Azerbaijan.

Turkey's foreign policy performance regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict has been, from the Arab viewpoint, almost ideal in terms of its ability to move freely and flexibly. The maintenance of close strategic ties with Israel has not stopped Turkey from directing the harshest of criticism against Israeli policy on numerous occasions. While Turkey tried at some point to utilize its close ties with Israel to act as a mediator to help reach a political settlement with Syria, it did not hesitate to expose and condemn Israel's position upon discovering how elusive and unserious it was about reaching a settlement, and that it merely sought to use Turkey to put pressure on Syria.

So, it was not unusual for Arabs to heartily applaud Erdogan's angry walkout from the Davos World Economic Forum after being prevented from responding to what Shimon Peres said during the conference. They also began to follow with admiration Turkey's gradual drift away from the orbit of Israeli policy, especially after Israel's raid on the Turkish flotilla, the *Mavi Marmara*, while on its way to take part in a campaign to break the Gaza blockade.

Europe's admiration for the 'Turkish model' stems from the fact that the latter has managed to resolve many long-standing problems, such as Islam's relationship with democracy and the West and Turkey's stance on minorities. However, this does not extend to all aspects of Turkish foreign policy, particularly those pertaining to the relationship with Israel. The Arab world's admiration for the model, however, is mainly due to the change in Turkey's traditional policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict, and hence the possibility of using Turkey's new position to pressure Israel into reaching a just settlement of the Middle East conflict. This is where the Western dilemma becomes patently clear. The West seeks to promote the Turkish model to Arabs so as to motivate them to adopt a more moderate form of Islam, but shows no eagerness for a just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly when such a settlement would require stronger pressure on Israel.

Whatever the case, Turkey's foreign policy obviously provides Egypt with a model of how a country can, despite being allied with the West, adopt an independent policy consistent with its national interests. This has been one of the most important lessons learned in the Arab world thus far from the Turkish model. If the West is genuinely keen on seeing democracy and the Turkish model spread across the Arab region, it needs to give serious thought to achieving a just settlement of the Palestinian question. Without such a settlement, the Arab world will be driven to more extremism, and thus further away from the Turkish model.

G|M|F OFFICES

Washington • Berlin • Paris • Brussels
Belgrade • Ankara • Bucharest • Warsaw

www.gmfus.org