

SECURITY FIRST APPROACH:
CAUSES OF SECURITY PRIORITIZATION AND
IMPLICATIONS OF THIS PRIORITIZATION ON DEMOCRACY IN
THE CASES OF SINGAPORE AND AZERBAIJAN

A Master's Thesis

by
NUR ALKIŞ

Department of
International Relations
Bilkent University
Ankara
December 2009

SECURITY FIRST APPROACH:
CAUSES OF SECURITY PRIORITIZATION AND
IMPLICATIONS OF THIS PRIORITIZATION ON DEMOCRACY IN
THE CASES OF SINGAPORE AND AZERBAIJAN

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

NUR ALKIŞ

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

December 2009

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersel Aydınlı
Supervisor

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar İpek
Examining Committee Member

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Güney
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

THE SECURITY FIRST APPROACH: CAUSES OF SECURITY PRIORITIZATION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THIS PRIORITIZATION ON DEMOCRACY IN THE CASES OF SINGAPORE AND AZERBAIJAN

Nur Alkış

M.A. Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersel Aydınlı

December 2009

The security-democracy relationship is an interesting issue that has drawn scholarly attention. The security first approach is a new input in the field. It looks the issue from the Western foreign policy perspective and discusses what should be done by Western powers in the failed and rogue states to build security and democracy. It claims that first security must be established, and then democracy would gradually consolidate, rather than democracy promotion. Such a shift in Western foreign policy would have significant impact for the developing world, facing the challenge of political-economic development and security-democracy building at the same time. This thesis aims to apply security first approach to developing world. It analyzes the causes of security prioritization and implications of this prioritization on democracy, in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan to verify the security first approach's claims. Both of these countries have applied a security first approach after they gained independence. They have also established some democratic institutional and legal structures. However, the worry of the ruling elites about losing security and power led them constantly delay democratization and restrict political arena. The governments of both cases have been successful in maintaining security and stability, yet this did not give way to the gradual triumph of democracy as argued by security first approach. Western cooperation with the governments of these countries, due to the formers' interest in the stability of both countries and regimes can be argued to have contributed to the security of the states and their ruling elites, but not to the democratization process and the security of the people. Hence, the thesis argues that the discussion in the Western foreign policy should not be about security versus democracy, but rather about striving for security and democracy concurrently in the developing world.

Keywords: Security, Stability, Democracy, Democratization, Security First, Singapore, Azerbaijan

ÖZET

ÖNCE GÜVENLİK YAKLAŞIMI: SİNGAPUR VE AZERBAYCAN ÖRNEKLERİNDE GÜVENLİĞİN ÖNCELİKLEŞTİRİLMESİNİN NEDENLERİ VE BU ÖNCELİKLEŞTİRMENİN DEMOKRASİYE ETKİSİ

Nur Alkış

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ersel Aydınlı

Aralık 2009

Güvenlik-demokrasi ilişkisi akademik dünyada ilgi çeken ve çalışılan bir konu olagelmıştır. Bu alana yeni bir katkı olan önce güvenlik yaklaşımı, güvenlik-demokrasi ilişkisini Batılı ülkelerin dış politika perspektifinden ele alarak, başarısız ve haydut devletlerde güvenlik ve demokrasinin tesisi için Batılı devletlerce ne yapılması gerektiğini tartışmakta ve önceliğin güvenliğin teminine verilmesi gerektiğini, demokrasinin zaman içerisinde gelişeceğini savunmaktadır. Batılı ülkelerin dış politikalarında bu türlü bir değişikliğe gidilmesi, siyasi ve ekonomik kalkınma ile güvenlik ve demokrasiyi aynı zamanda gerçekleştirmek durumunda kalan üçüncü dünyayı da etkileyecektir. Bu çalışma önce güvenlik yaklaşımını üçüncü dünyaya uyarlamayı amaçlamakta, bu doğrultuda Singapur ve Azerbaycan örneklerinde güvenliğin öncelikleştirilmesinin nedenlerini ve bu öncelikleştirmenin demokrasiye etkisini incelemektedir. Her iki ülke de bağımsızlığını kazandıktan sonra önce güvenlik anlayışını benimsemiştir. Aynı zamanda bazı demokratik kurumsal ve yasal düzenlemeleri kabul etmiştir. Ancak, yönetimlerin güvenliği ve iktidarı kaybetme endişesi, demokratikleşmenin sürekli ertelenmesine ve siyasi alanın kısıtlanmasına neden olmuştur. İki ülkede de iktidarlar, güvenlik ve istikrarı sağlamıştır, ancak bu önce güvenlik yaklaşımınca savunulduğu üzere demokrasinin zaferiyle sonuçlanmamıştır. Batılı güçlerin çıkarları doğrultusunda bu hükümetleri desteklemeleri, hem devletlerin hem de hükümetlerin güvenliğine katkı sağlamıştır, ancak ne demokratikleşme sürecine ne de insanların güvenliğine katkıda bulunmamıştır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma Batılı ülkelerin dış politikalarının güvenlik mi yoksa demokrasi mi argümanı yerine, gelişmekte olan ülkelerde güvenlik ve demokrasinin aynı zamanda temini için çabalanmasına odaklanması gerektiğini savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik, İstikrar, Demokrasi, Demokratikleşme, Önce Güvenlik, Singapur, Azerbaycan

ACNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersel Aydınlı for his guidance and support, not only throughout the thesis but also throughout my graduate study.

I am also thankful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar İpek and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Güney who examined my study, gave valuable comments and made recommendations on my thesis.

I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bedirhanoglu, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Tayfur, Assist. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bilgin for their valuable recommendations and guidance during my undergraduate and graduate study.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratefulness to my family for their irreplaceable support and understanding all the way through.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ...	11
2.1. Introduction	11
2.2. Definitions	12
2.2.1. Security	12
2.2.2. Political Stability	15
2.2.3. Democracy	16
2.2.4. Democratization	19
2.3. Literature Review on the Security-Democracy Relationship	19
2.3.1. Democratic Peace Theory	21
2.3.2. Democratization as Cause of Insecurity and Instability	25
2.3.3. Negative Impact of State and Military-Centric Security on Democracy.....	28
2.3.4. Security First Approach	31
2.3.5. Critics of Security First Approach	37
2.4. Conclusion	42
CHAPTER III: THE CASE OF SINGAPORE	47
3.1. Introduction	47
3.2. Political History and System	48
3.3. The Context that Gave Way to the Prioritization of Security	50
3.3.1. Legacy of Colonialism	50

3.3.2. Cold War Environment.....	51
3.3.3. Urgency of Survival	52
3.3.4. Multiethnic Society.....	53
3.3.5. Asian Values.....	53
3.3.6. Lack Of Opposition.....	54
3.3.7. Successful Economic Development	55
3.4. Prioritization of Security at the Expense of Democracy.....	56
3.5. Implications of Security First Understanding on Democracy.....	58
3.5.1. Political Restrictions in the Name of Survival.....	59
3.5.2. Restrictions on Ethnic Groups and Languages	60
3.5.3. Restrictions on Civil Society and Media.....	62
3.5.4. Incorporation of Working and Middle Classes into the System.....	64
3.5.5. Hindering Opposition.....	65
3.5.6. Use of Elections as the Base of Legitimacy	67
3.5.7. Economic Development as the Other Base of Legacy	69
3.5.8. Meritocracy Principle	70
3.6. Some Opening Up	71
3.7. Conclusion	72
CHAPTER IV: THE CASE OF AZERBAIJAN	77
4.1. Introduction	77
4.2. Political History and System	78
4.3. The Context that Gave Way to the Prioritization of Security	81
4.3.1. Historical Legacy.....	81
4.3.2. Karabakh Conflict.....	82
4.3.3. Need to Stability for economic Development.....	82
4.3.4. Foreign Interest.....	83
4.4. Prioritization of Security at the Expense of Democracy.....	85
4.5. Implications of Security First Understanding on Democracy	86
4.5.1. Use of Karabakh Conflict for Internal Politics.....	87
4.5.2. Rapid Increase in Military Expenditure	88
4.5.3. Distorted Elections	89
4.5.4. Restrictions on Civil Society and Media	93

4.5.5. West’s Support to Undemocratic Rule for Energy	
Interests.....	93
4.5.6. Clientelistic Relations	96
4.5.7. Fragmented Opposition	97
4.6. Conclusion	99
CHAPTER V: COMPARASION OF TWO CASES.....	106
5.1. Introduction	106
5.2. Manipulation of Vulnerabilities.....	107
5.3. Prioritization of Security and Stability by Western Powers.....	109
5.4 Security at the Expense of Democracy.....	110
5.5. Conclusion.....	114
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION	117
6.1. Application of Security First Approach’s Assumptions on Cases....	117
6.2. Main Findings of the Thesis	123
6.3. Application of the Main Findings to Policy Making	128
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the post Cold War era following the collapse or change of communist systems in Europe and Asia, many Western democracies have adopted strategies in their foreign policies that emphasize the promotion of democracy. Arguments for pushing democracy have developed around the hypothesis that more democracies mean fewer wars and therefore fewer problems of security for most states and regions.¹ The argument not only suggests that democracies do not fight each other but that democracy reduces the likelihood of political repression, hence the fostering of democracy and efforts to reduce the levels of political repression in less developed countries have been accepted as a grand strategy of the U.S. and the West.² Former President of the U.S. Bill Clinton adopted this understanding during his campaign in 1992 that the strategic interests and moral values of America are rooted in extension of democracy. He said “As we help democracy to expand, we make ourselves and our allies safer. Democracies rarely go war with each other or traffic in terrorism.”³ Later Former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice highlighted this understanding:

¹Ursula E. Daxecker, 2007, “Perilous Politics? An Assessment of the Democratization-Conflict Linkage”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 13 (4), pp. 527-528; Raju G. C. Thomas, 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, New York: St. Martin Press, p. 2

² Patrick M. Regan and Errol A. Henderson, 2002, “Democracy, Threats and Political Repression in Developing Countries: Are Democracies Internally Less Violent?”, *Third World Quarterly*, 23 (1), p. 119; The White House, 1996, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*

³ Bill Clinton is quoted in Piki Ish-Shalom, “For a Democratic Peace of Mind: Politicization of the Democratic Peace Theory”, *Harvard International Review: Web Perspectives*

President Bush outlined the vision for it in his second inaugural address: “It is the policy of the U.S. to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world”. ...Our experience of this new world leads us to conclude that the fundamental character of regimes matter more today than the international distribution of power. The phenomenon of weak and failing states is not new, but the danger they now pose is unparalleled. The goal of our statecraft is to help create a world of democratic, well-governed states that can meet the needs of their citizens and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. Stability without democracy will prove to be false stability.⁴

Democracy promotion, as a source of security and stability building, keeps its significance as one of foreign policy strategies of the U.S., yet due to the difficulties faced in Afghanistan and Iraq, its relevance is started to be questioned. “Strategic Leadership: Framework for a 21st Century National Security Strategy”⁵, a report outlining recommendations for a new national security strategy for the next U.S. president underlines:

Our core goals today are the same ones envisaged by our founding fathers: the resolute pursuit of security, liberty, and prosperity both for our own people and as the basis for a just and stable inter-national order. ...Operationally, strategic leadership has five principal requisites: exercising strong state-craft, ensuring 21st century military strength, enhancing prosperity and development, encouraging democracy and human rights, and energizing America at home. It also means setting priorities. ...While America remains the single most powerful country in the world today, it cannot take global leadership for granted, nor can it revert to what worked in previous eras. ...the U.S. must be pragmatic and flexible enough to work with a wide variety of states on different issues.

Correspondingly, Etzioni argues that no state has unlimited resources and leverage and accordingly, it should set clear priorities. He argues that the report centers on the promotion of “security, liberty and prosperity” and these key factors are not assembled in random order. Security is listed first because “the right to live is more basic than all others, as all other are contingent on security.” According to

⁴ Condoleezza Rice, 11.12.2005, “The Promise of Democratic Peace: Why Promoting Freedom is the Only Realistic Path to Security”, *The Washington Post*

⁵ Michael A. McFaul et al., 2008, “Strategic Leadership: Framework for a 21st Century National Security Strategy”, Centre for a New American Security

him people trade democracy for security. “Only once security is reasonably secured do people become keen to have their legal and political rights respected”.⁶ Most significantly, security must be promoted in failing states and in dealing with rogue states without first trying to build democracy in such unwelcoming terrains. Insistent support of the U.S. for democratization or regime change in these states undermines both security and democracy rather than contributes them. Offering security guarantees or other international rewards might work better. Democratization will happen at its own pace after security established.⁷ Moreover, security first understanding claims that the U.S. should not abstain to work with the illiberal religious, ethnic or tribal groups, while dealing with countries at transition from authoritarianism to democracy, given that they provide basic security⁸ and do not prevent democratization in the long run and cooperate with the U.S. in countering terrorism.⁹ Etzioni argues for a “principled realism” having both moral foundations and practicality. It is moral because it highlights the primacy of life and personal security, and it is practical because it determines the objectives in accordance with the available resources and sets clear priorities.¹⁰

Why one should pay attention to this issue? Because a shift in the U.S. foreign policy in the direction of prioritizing security over democracy would not only affect the so called failed and rogue states and the relationship of the U.S. with

⁶ Amitai Etzioni, 2008, “A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration”, *Military Review*, pp. 99-100

⁷ Amitai Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, *The National Interest*, p. 13

⁸ For Etzioni basic security refers to “conditions –both domestic and international- under which most people, most of the time, are able to go about their lives, venture onto the street, work, study and participate in public life (politics included) without acute fear of being killed or injured”. Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, p. 11

⁹ Amitai Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 151

¹⁰ Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, p. 11

these states, but have significant impact for the developing world¹¹, which encompasses the most of the countries and the population of the world. Developing countries face the challenge of political and economic development and security building at the same time with limited capacity and sources. These are the unavoidable needs of both states and their citizens. It is a fact that everyone wants to be secure and at the same time have liberty and political and civic rights. Security first approach presents security and democracy as two good deeds that one wants to have all together, but it also states that under circumstances that the two cannot be maintained simultaneously first security must be established, because security is the base where all other good deeds are built on. The situation that prevents security and democracy to be established concurrently is emerged due to the difficulty of the task and limited resources. Security first approach is developed as a kind of reaction to the American foreign policy based on democracy promotion with imperial sentiments and solution to the insufficiency of resources, a situation posing a choice among the needs. Etzioni primarily considers the situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, where U.S. has been trying to establish democracy. These countries have no familiarity with democracy and its institutions and each day there emerges serious security problems. Under these conditions it is not possible to promote democracy. Besides, U.S. does not have limited resources to spend for these countries. The solution for Etzioni is to set priorities in line with the available resources and

¹¹ It can be argued that the use of the concept of developing world (Third World may also be used), encompassing huge number of states, is problematic, since such thinking assumes the homogeneity of all those states. Developing world is composed of an array of states that are different in their economic, political and social conditions. Yet, in theoretical terms, analysts seem to agree that the central feature of the developing world is its being in the process of political and economic development, facing the pressures of state building and democratization. The colonial past, the artificial boundaries drawn by European powers and lack of social cohesion are other accepted common figures of developing countries. Barry Buzan, 1998, "Conclusions: System versus Units in Theorizing about the Third World", in S. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 217-218; Brian Job, 1992, "Insecurity Dilemma: National, Regime and State Securities in the Third World", in B. Job (ed.), *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, p. 19

priority is the security. Security first approach deals with the democracy-security relationship from the perspective of Western powers' foreign policy and argues what kind of foreign policy Western powers should follow in failed and rogue states that have no political, economic and security structures and launch a transition period without any experience of democracy. It advocates to the Western powers the proper allocation of resources and prioritization in foreign policy making, but it also advocates policies with regard to the domestic politics of so called failed and rogue states. When security first approach is applied to developing countries, as a concern of domestic politics, it becomes possible to argue that for the developing world, which faces the difficult task of responding to different needs concurrently and the pressure of the resource scarcity¹² much severer than the U.S., making a prioritization between the two needs: democracy and security is unavoidable. Since the right to physical security is more basic than the right to democracy according to security first understanding, first security must be established. By this way, the way for democracy to flourish gradually would be opened.

Security and democracy are two values that both are inevitably necessary for the human being in the modern world system, and have a complex interaction. Security first approach that emerged under certain circumstances is a current attempt to understand this relationship. Etzioni argues that democracy promotion as an American mission has been unsuccessful. Contrary to the democratic peace theory, he claims that maintenance of security provides the necessary conditions for democracy, not the other way around. He presents security as a precondition for democracy, while claiming that democratization is an unstable process. There are also studies emphasizing the unconstructive relationship between the two concepts.

¹² It is important to note that for the developing world, scarcity of resources includes not only economic power and means but also institutional and political capacity and qualified human sources.

Some scholars have associated democratization with rising political instability or violence.¹³ Others highlight the pressures of security that place stress on the maintenance of democratic process and political oppression used by states against their population in the name of security concerns.¹⁴ The security-democracy relationship is an interesting issue that has drawn scholarly attention. The theories on democracy-security relationship, including security first approach, will be explained in the following chapter. They all pay attention to the relationship between the two and the implication of one on the other both at interstate and intrastate levels. Many scholars also emphasize the issue with regard to developing world. Security first approach is a current contribution to the subject; therefore it is worth to pay attention. Yet, the significance of studying security first approach does not only stem from its being a new input in the field, but rather from the potential implications of its claims for the developing world, being in the process of political and economic development, facing the concurrent pressures of security and democracy building. Security first approach looks the issue from the American foreign policy perspective. However, it discusses what should be done by Western powers within the concerned countries, thus it also covers the intrastate level and becomes important for the domestic politics of the developing world. This is why security first approach is chosen in this study.

This thesis aims to apply security first approach to the developing countries. Drawing upon such an understanding, it will examine why security is a priority and what the impact of security prioritization is on democracy in the developing world.

¹³ Samuel Huntington, 2006, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven: Yale University Press; Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, 1995, "Democratization and War Dangers of Transition", *Foreign Affairs*, 79

¹⁴ Ken Booth, '1995, Human Wrongs and International Relations', *International Affairs* 71 (1); Robert H. Jackson, 1992, "The Security Dilemma in Africa" in Brian L. Job (ed.), *Security Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner

In order to understand and verify the security first approach's claims regarding the premium of security over democracy and inevitability of the democracy's gradual triumph once security is maintained, cases from the developing world must be studied. The cases of the study are Singapore and Azerbaijan. Hence, the research question is: What are the causes of security prioritization and implications of this prioritization on democracy in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan?

Singapore and Azerbaijan are interesting cases for analyzing the prioritization of security and impact of security first understanding on democracy. The governments of the both countries have adopted security first approach under different, but at the same time some common internal and external circumstances: Singapore in the years of Cold War, as a small city state, with a multiethnic society, trying to establish its independence, being dependent to external world for economic success, Azerbaijan in the post Cold War period, in a conflictual region, at war with its neighbour, trying to establish its independence, being dependent to foreign investment for economic development. In these countries, security is understood in the military and political framework, encompassing external security and internal stability, and to some extent synonymous with security from violence and survival. In both cases, the primacy of the need for security and stability has been kept on the public agenda by the ruling elite to be able to hold on to power and given way to rather undemocratic policies.

Singapore's vulnerability as a small territory lacking of natural resources compared to its relatively larger neighbors in Southeast Asia and its total dependency on the external world for its livelihood provided the politicians a good reason in convincing Singaporeans of the urgency of the survival issue.¹⁵ It is argued

¹⁵ Alan Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate, 1992-2000: Reflections on an Experiment in Soft Power", *The Pacific Review*, 17 (1), p. 98

that the political culture of Singapore became “a subject culture” because of the strong belief in the importance of stability for the sake of ensuring survival.¹⁶ Likewise, Azerbaijani political elite has used Karabakh conflict to justify harsh measures repressing protest at the conduct of the elections. The regime consistently appealed to the need for social stability, claiming that Azerbaijan’s defeat in the war had been due to domestic instability.¹⁷ Moreover, dependency on foreign investment in the case of Singapore and on oil revenues in the case of Azerbaijan has kept the significance of security and political stability. Singaporean politicians provide a safe home for locals and foreigners, without which Singapore would easily lose investors’ confidence. In the early 1980s outside observers ranked Singapore as “one of the safest and most profitable locations in the world”.¹⁸ By signing “the contract of the century” to explore three offshore fields with the BP-led oil consortium, Azerbaijan provided the West with huge energy resources, this in turn ensured Azerbaijani government of extensive Western capital and diplomatic backing and increased the interest of the West in the stability of the region.¹⁹ Hence U.S. and Western countries in general, have paid attention to the stability and security of the both countries due to their strategic considerations and cooperated with the governments of these countries despite their undemocratic polices. For the U.S, Singapore’s economic and political development was “a bastion against communism’s progress in Southeast Asia” and Azerbaijan’s cooperation with the

¹⁶ Seah Chee Meow, 1984, “Political Change and Continuity in Singapore” in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 240

¹⁷ Farid Guliyev, 2005, “Post-Soviet Azerbaijan: Transition to Sultanistic Semiauthoritarianism? An Attempt at Conceptualization”, *Demokratizatsiya*, 13 (3), pp. 421-423; Rasim Musabayov, 2005, “The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan”

¹⁸ Bilveer Singh, 2008, “Singapore Success at Home, Challenges from Abroad”, *Southeast Asian Affairs*, pp. 315-317; Eric C. Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, *Centre of Southeast Asian Studies*, Working Paper 78, pp. 4-7

¹⁹ Nasib Nassibli, 1999-2000, “Azerbaijan’s Geopolitics and Oil Pipeline Issue”, *Perceptions*, 4 (4); International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, “Azerbaijan: Turning over a New Leaf?”

U.S. and West in general, in security issues provided a significant contribution to the international counter-terrorism efforts.²⁰ Stability and security have also been the continuous concern of people, different societal groups and classes that are incorporated into the system and dependent on the existing rule to carry on their lives.

The structure of the thesis is divided into six chapters. Introductory chapter gives basic information about the thesis. It describes the significance of the topic and the purpose of the thesis. It also clears the disposition of the study. In chapter I, concepts of security, stability, democracy and democratization are discussed and the literature on the security-democracy linkage is reviewed. The studies on the relationship between democracy -democratization- and security -war and stability- can be grouped under four approaches: i. democratic peace theory, which perceives democracy as a precondition of security (democracies do not fight each other at interstate level, democracies do not employ repressive behavior at state level), ii. those seeing democratization as cause of insecurity-instability, iii. those emphasizing the negative impact of state and military-centric security understanding on democracy, iv. security first approach that presents security as the basic value on which other things can be founded and claim democracy's gradual triumph after the maintenance of security. Chapter II and III are the case studies. These chapters aim to provide a general outlook towards Singapore and Azerbaijan successively to understand the impact of the security first understanding on the process of democratization. Here the conditions that gave way to the prioritization of security and stability and the outcomes of this prioritization will be explored. In chapter IV, the two cases will be compared. In both cases it is significant that governments have

²⁰ Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 6; Leila Alieva, 2006, "Azerbaijan's Frustrating Elections", *Journal of Democracy*, 17 (2), pp. 152-158

employed the causes that gave way to the prioritization of security, as tools to stay in power and limit the consolidation of democracy, by the backing of the U.S. and Western countries that put security first in accordance with their strategic concerns, such as containing communism, investing in socially stable countries, securing energy resources and countering terror. Conclusion includes the main findings of the study and discusses how the theoretical findings of the study can be converted to policy implementation.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This chapter comprises three parts. In the first part, the different conceptualizations of the terms of security, stability, democracy and democratization and how they are defined in this study will be explained. In the second part, the literature on the security-democracy relationship will be reviewed. The studies on the linkage between democracy –democratization- and security -war and stability- can be grouped under four approaches: i. democratic peace theory, which perceives democracy as a precondition of security (democracies do not fight each other at interstate level, democracies do not employ repressive behavior at state level), ii. those seeing democratization as cause of insecurity and instability, iii. those emphasizing the negative impact of state and military-centric security understanding on democracy, iv. security first approach that presents security as the basic value on which other things can be founded and claim democracy's gradual triumph after the maintenance of security.

This study aims to verify the assumptions of security first approach regarding its impact on security-democracy challenge of developing countries in domestic politics. Yet, it is important to understand other theories on security-

democracy relationship to comprehend the contribution of the security first approach to the literature. Moreover, each theory has significant assumptions about the interaction between security and democracy, in general and particularly in the developing world, which are important to understand how security has been prioritized and how this process has affected democracy in the cases.

2.2. Definitions of Concepts

2.2.1. Security

Reaching a consensus on the concept of security has remained elusive. Predictably, security has been a term that tried to be defined as long as there have been human societies. However, as a subject of academic query it is a relatively new concept that came to prominence after the Second World War in the Anglo-American academic world.²¹ The first definition came from Walter Lippmann in 1943. He stated that “A nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war.”²² The tendency to define security as state and military-centric, pro-status quo and synonymous with national security²³ continued during the Cold War years. Buzan argues that security studies emerged as a precise answer to the problems of the bipolar world of the Cold War era, as an outcome of Western defense policy needs and dominated by neorealism.²⁴ Therefore, it focused on the

²¹ Paul Williams, 2008, “Security Studies: An Introduction” in P. Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, p. 2

²² Lippmann is quoted in Pinar Bilgin, Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jones, 1998, “Security Studies: The Next Stage”, *Nação e Defesa* 84 (2), p. 133

²³ National security refers to the security of the nation state and it is based on the assumption that there is an externally focused interest derived from a unified, self-identifying and ordered society within the state’s borders. Brian Job, “Insecurity Dilemma: National, Regime and State Securities in the Third World” in B. Job (ed.), *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992, pp. 16-17

²⁴ Barry Buzan, 1991, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, p. 10

promotion of the state/national security and maintenance of the status quo.²⁵ Neorealism assumes that states are the main actors in international relations, the domestic political structure is hierarchic, whereas the structure of the international system is anarchy.²⁶ This anarchic structure shapes the relations among states and as a result, security becomes the primary concern of the states²⁷, a concern to which any value can be sacrificed.²⁸ States see all other states as potential enemies and threats to their national security, since they all seek power, assessment of which begin with military capabilities.²⁹

Despite the dominancy of military and state-centric security understanding, there have been significant attempts to broaden and deepen the definition. It is argued that other issues, such as economic, environmental and social threats, endanger the lives of individuals rather than strictly the survival of states.³⁰ A number of scholars criticized neorealist definition due to its external orientation in threat perception and its emphasis on state and military dimension, especially with regard to the developing world. As Ayoob illustrates that the overwhelming frequency of military force since 1945 has been in intrastate and not interstate

²⁵ Stephanie G. Neuman, 1998, "International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron?" in S. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, p. 1

²⁶ Steven Walt, 1998, "International Relations: One World Many Theories", *Foreign Policy*, 110, p. 30

²⁷ Kenneth Waltz, 2003, "The Anarchic Structure of World Politics" in R. Art and R. Jervis (eds.), *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*, 6th ed., New York: Longman, pp. 47-67

²⁸ Arnold Wolfers, 1962, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*, Baltimore, The John Hopkins Press, pp. 156-157; Laura Neack, 2007, *Elusive Security: States First, People Last*, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 15-16

²⁹ Steve Lamy, 2001, "Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism" in J. Baylis and S. Smith (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, pp. 188-193

³⁰ Bilgin, Booth and Wyn Jones, 1998, "Security Studies: The Next Stage", pp. 133-135, 141; R. L. Ostergard, "Politics in the Hot Zone: AIDS and National Security in Africa", *Third World Quarterly*, 23, (2), 2002, pp. 334-5

conflicts.³¹ When the security of the developing countries is concerned, it is argued that the sense of threat that prevails is of internal threats rather than externally motivated threats to the existence of the state.³² From the point of Azar and Moon, understanding the security in the context of developing countries requires the consideration of not only the security environment and hardware but also the software side of security management that entails the political context and policy capacity through which threats are perceived, resources are distributed and policies are formulated. Political context, shaped by legitimacy and integration, and policy capacity are significant for the operationalization of security.³³ The emphasis on military dimension draws attention away from the non-military threats that have the potential to undermine the stability of many nations.³⁴ The studies of some scholars also draw attention to the impact of the international economic system on economic and political preferences of the developing countries, point the linkage between security and development in these countries, adds human dimension to the security by pointing to the need for secure food, health and trade systems and also stress the interaction of some of these areas.³⁵

Another significant attempt in defining security goes beyond broadening the dimensions of security (from military and political to social, economic and

³¹ Mohammad Ayoob, 1997, "Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective" in Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 121-123

³² Steven David, 1998, "The Primacy of Internal War" in Stephanie G. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 78-79; Kal J. Holsti, 1998, "International Relations Theory and Domestic War in the Third World: The Limits of Relevance" in Stephanie G. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998, pp. 104-105

³³ Edward Azar and Chung In Moon, 1988, "Legitimacy, Integration and Policy Capacity: The Software Side of Third World National Security" in E. Azar and C. I. Moon, *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats*, Cambridge: The University Press, pp.77-79

³⁴ Richard Ullman, 1983, "Redefining Security", *International Security*, 8 (1), p. 133

³⁵ Caroline Thomas, 1987, *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, p. 1; Marc Williams, 1989, "The Developing Countries and the International Economic Order: A View from the South" in C. Thomas and P. Saravanamuttu (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in South/North Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 53

environmental) to deepening the term by making the human being the referent of security and by accepting non-state actors as the agents of security.³⁶ A further result of accepting human being as the referent of the security is the prioritization of the justice over security. By this way it is claimed that search for power and order cannot produce real security because “absolute power implies no change and where there is no change, there is unlikely to be justice.”³⁷ Booth purports emancipation as a way to promote security and justice. Emancipation is defined as the “freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely chose to do”³⁸ and refers to the “promotion of world-order values such as economic justice, nonviolence, ecological sustainability and human rights”.³⁹ Those criticize the limited definition of security by neorealists, questions the origin and nature of the socially-constructed international order and the possibility of the transformation of this reality into one more conducive to human well-being.

In this study, security is defined in the military and political framework, encompassing external and internal security in line with the security understanding of the case studies. Significance of the internal security derives from Singapore and Azerbaijan that belong to developing world. Besides, economic, environmental, societal and individual dimensions of security are excluded in order to keep the study within a certain framework.

2.2.2. Political Stability

³⁶ Keith Krause and Michael Williams, 1996, “Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods”, *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40, pp. 229-233

³⁷ Ken Booth, 1991, “Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice”, *International Affairs*, 67 (3), p. 539

³⁸ Ken Booth, 1991, “Security and Emancipation”, *Review of International Studies*, 17, p. 319

³⁹ Ken Booth and Peter Vale, 1997, “Critical Security Studies and Regional Insecurity: The Case of Southern Africa” in K. Krause and M. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 337

The most common definition of the political stability is the absence of domestic conflict and violent behavior. There are also differing views equating the concept with: governmental longevity, the existence of a legitimate constitutional regime, the absence of structural change⁴⁰, the regularity of the flow of political exchanges (the more regular the flow of political exchanges, the more stability)⁴¹ and the ratio of institutionalization to participation (as political participation increases, the complexity, autonomy, adaptability and coherence of the society's political institutions must also increase if political stability is to be maintained).⁴²

The essence of stability according to common definition is equilibrium among different forces. This equilibrium should be reached peacefully, otherwise law and order (status quo) will be endangered. A stable polity is seen as a peaceful, law-abiding society where decision-making and politico-societal changes are the result of institutionalized and functional procedures.⁴³ Here, political stability is accepted with regard to the cases of the study, as the absence of internal conflict, management of clashes through state institutions and the maintenance of power equilibrium, while preserving the status quo. Both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, lack of domestic turmoil and maintenance of status quo has been highly appreciated, especially in the name of attracting foreign investors for the economic future and survival of the country.

2.2.3. Democracy

Democracy seems especially difficult to define because it is not a given or a thing in itself but rather a form of government and a process of governance that changes and adapts in response to circumstances. Any

⁴⁰ Leon Hurwitz, 1973, "Contemporary Approaches to Political Stability, *Comparative Politics*, 5 (3), p. 449

⁴¹ Claude Ake, 1975, "A Definition of Political Stability", *Comparative Politics*, 7 (2), pp. 273, 280

⁴² Huntington, 2006, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, pp. 78-80

⁴³ B. Kumar Sharma, 1989, *Political Instability in India*, New Delhi: Mittal Publications, pp. 7-11

‘universal’ definition is likely to ignore differences in detail or to need constant redefinition and adjustment. Moreover, since all democracies are more or less imperfect, finding a single definition that indicates precisely where “more or less” becomes “either/or” (a democracy or not a democracy) seems impossible.⁴⁴

As Rothstein points, democracy is elusive both as a concept and as a feasible objective. There are profound disagreements about the meaning of democracy. Aristotle defined democracy as rule by people, and this idea that in some way the people governs themselves is still the core meaning of democracy.⁴⁵ But around this idea several related themes have developed that are now thought integral what democracy means or must be present for democracy to exist. These are: 1. free, fair and frequent elections (where coercion is comparatively uncommon), 2. inclusive suffrage (all adults’ right to vote) 3. right to run for office (all adults’ right to run for elections). 4. elected officials (providing representation)⁴⁶, 5. freedom of expression (citizens’ right to express themselves without danger of severe punishment on political matters, including criticism of officials, the government etc.), 6. access to alternative sources of information, 7. associational autonomy (right to form relatively independent associations or organizations, including political parties), 8. inclusive citizenship (no representative of an ethnic, religious or other minority residing permanently in the country and subject to its laws can be denied the rights that are available to others).⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Robert L. Rothstein, 1995, “Democracy in the Third World: Definitional Dilemmas” in David Garnham and Mark A. Tessler (eds.), *Democracy, War and Peace in the Middle East*, Indiana: Indiana University Press, p. 65

⁴⁵ Robin Luckham, 1998, “Are There Alternatives to Liberal Democracy?” in Mark Robinson and Gordon White (eds.), *The Democratic Developmental State Politics and Institutional Design*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 308; Rummel, R. J., *Democratization*

⁴⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, 1993, *The Third Wave Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, pp. 5-7

⁴⁷ George Sorensen, 2008, *Democracy and Democratization Processes and Prospects in a Changing World*, Boulder: Westview Press, p. 13; Jeff Haynes, 1996, *Third World Politics a Concise Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 40

There is a tension between two different conceptions of democracy. While the minimalist tradition, labeled “electoral democracy” understands democracy as an electoral system and emphasize the first four themes, the broader perspective, labeled “liberal democracy” says that democracy requires not only a transparent electoral procedure, but also the respect for civic rights and political freedoms.⁴⁸ Given that democracy is the rule by the people and for the people and a system designed for peaceful resolution of differences, the liberal perspective stresses government accountability to the public and the need for the government’s powers to be limited by the rule of law.⁴⁹ The liberal definition has become dominant in the Western world and internationally, yet this definition excludes any connection to socio-economic conditions or respect for economic and social rights.⁵⁰

In this study, the liberal definition of democracy will be used although it lacks socio-economic rights, in order to keep the study in the political framework. Additionally, in both cases of the study, governments have used economic facilities, such as social housing and infrastructure projects, to gain a kind of performance legitimacy rather than seeing it as part of democratic rights. It is also important to keep in mind that elements of democracy are state and citizen; hence democracy is certain class of relations between state and citizens.⁵¹ Here the essence of democracy lies in its empowerment of ordinary citizens. Therefore, democracy is more than simply passing laws that formally establish political rights to give power

⁴⁸ Christian Welzel and Ronald Inglehart, 2008, “The Role of Ordinary People in Democratization”, *Journal of Democracy*, 19 (1), p. 126; Terry Lynn Karl, 1990, “Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America”, *Comparative Politics*, 23 (1), pp. 1-2

⁴⁹ Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset, 1995, “What Makes for Democracy?” in L. Diamond, J. J. Linz and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, p. 7

⁵⁰ Kenneth E. Bauzon, 1992, “Democratization in the Third World Myth or Reality” in Kenneth E. Bauzon (ed.), *Development and Democratization in the Third World: Myths, Hopes and Realities*, New York: Crane Russak, p. 8; Thomas Carothers, 2009, “Democracy Assistance: Political vs. Developmental?”, *Journal of Democracy*, 20 (1), p. 8

⁵¹ Charles Tilly, 2007, *Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-12

to people; it includes the implementation of those laws.⁵² Performance of the laws is crucial, because both Singapore and Azerbaijan have adopted democratic institutional and legal setups, yet political and civil liberties have been restrained through the incorporation of the formal procedures into informal power relations.

2.2.4. Democratization

The word democratization refers to political changes moving in a democratic direction. In accordance with the definition of the democracy, made in the previous part, the character of that movement over time is from less accountable to more accountable government, from less competitive (or non-existent) elections to freer and fairer competitive elections, from severely restricted to better protected civil and political rights, from weak (or non-existent) autonomous organizations in civil society to more autonomous and more numerous organizations.⁵³

Democratization can take many different forms and need not to proceed in a unidirectional or linear fashion. The significance is that there should be steady movement towards democracy. The legitimacy of political rule, institutionalized political parties, the strength of civil society are important factors for evaluating the chances for democratic consolidation.⁵⁴ Legitimacy of political rule, the strength of opposition parties and civil society, freedom of media and fairness of elections are discussed in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan, while the implications of security first understanding on democracy is analyzed.

2.3. Literature Review

⁵² Welzel and Inglehart, 2008, "The Role of Ordinary People in Democratization", p. 128

⁵³ David Potter, 1997, "Explaining Democratization" in David Potter, David Goldblatt, Margaret Kihol and Paul Lewis (eds.), *Democratization*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 3-6

⁵⁴ Sorensen, 2008, *Democracy and Democratization Processes ...*, p. 160

Although security and democracy are the two goods which are sought in every political community, they have conventionally been treated separately. One reason is the traditional gap between the study of domestic and external spheres of state behaviour which is reflected in a corresponding gap between students of comparative politics and political development on the one hand, and those of foreign policy and international relations on the other.⁵⁵

Yet, the quest for security and the quest for democracy have become interlinked in the present liberal world order on the presumption that global security is best assured through peaceful relations among democracies, having shared values. The assumption that democracies do not fight each other and that democracies are internally less violent, led democracy promotion to become the major strategy of the foreign policies' of Western countries, particularly the U.S. However, the impression that the relationship between security and democracy is linear or casual would not be correct, due to the fact that some scholars have associated democratization with rising political instability or violence. It is argued that there have often been tensions between democratization and the prevention and management of conflict. One reason is that democratization raises political expectations, but at the same time tends to be resisted by those whose power and privileges it threatens. The process of development and democratization is inherently destabilizing. It unleashes social forces in new directions with potential spillover to other countries. Democratic structures are more representative and consequently more conducive to stability and security. But in a fragmented society, political pluralism may lead to political paralysis and further fragmentation.⁵⁶ Just as the

⁵⁵ Ali E. Hillal Dessouki, 1993, "Dilemmas of Security and Development in the Arab World: Aspects of the Linkage" in B. Korany, P. Noble and R. Brynen (eds.), *Many Faces of National Security in the Arab World*, London: MacMillan, pp. 78, 82-83

⁵⁶ Luckham, 2003, "Democratic Strategies for Security in Transition and Conflict", pp. 3- 6

pressures of security may place stress on the maintenance of democratic process or may forestall democratic movements in democratizing countries.

The studies on the relationship between democracy/democratization and security/stability are grouped under four categories: i. democratic peace theory, which perceives democracy as a precondition of security (democracies do not fight each other at interstate level, democracies do not employ repressive behavior at state level), ii. those seeing democratization as cause of insecurity and instability, iii. those emphasizing the negative impact of state and military-centric security on democracy, iv. security first approach that presents security as the basic value on which other things can be founded and claim democracy's gradual triumph after the maintenance of security.

2.3.1. Democratic Peace Theory

Ever since the beginning of the 20th century, when real democracy started to take hold in many countries, violent military conflicts between democracies have been rare. And full scale wars between democracies have been virtually non-existent... The more democratic any two countries are, the less likely they are to get into disputes that kill people and the less violent any such conflicts are likely to be... The democratic peace makes a contribution to good policy, but it is not a panacea. It is not a valid excuse to make war in order to establish democracy.⁵⁷

One of the major tenets of U.S. foreign policy has been the encouragement and support of democratization in the world. At the core of this argument is a national security objective of a less war-prone world. The linkage between a more peaceful world and more states with democratic political system is the belief that democratic states are unlikely to fight wars against each other; the democratic peace

⁵⁷ Bruce Russett, 2009, "The Democratic Peace: What It Is, and What It Isn't?" Forthcoming in *Human Security Report*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

proposition.⁵⁸ Though it is not free of criticism, the consensus view is summed up in the remark that the “absence of war between democratic states comes as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations”.⁵⁹

The primary claim of democratic peace proponents is that democratic states do not wage war against each other, although a number of scholars have modified the claim to the proposition that “democracies are less likely to fight wars with each other” or “democracies are less violent than non-democracies.”⁶⁰

Explanations of the democratic peace typically fall into one or a combination of three main categories: i. democratic institutions place constraints on the ability of leaders to fight other democracies or simply make them reluctant to choose war; ii. norms shared by democratic states cause them to view each other as pacific and unthreatening; iii. democracy tends to foster economic interdependence, which reduces the likelihood of war.⁶¹

The arguments of this theory have mostly been applied to existing liberal democracies in prosperous regions of Western Europe and North America. Raju Thomas claims that “the absence of wars in these regions may be attributable to their cultures and affluence rather than their political systems”.⁶² Likewise Henderson, in this book *Democracy and War*, argues that factors such as bipolarity, alliance membership, nuclear deterrence and trade links, beyond regime type led to

⁵⁸ Arthur A. Goldsmith, 2008, “Making the World Safe for Partial Democracy? Questioning the Premises of Democracy Promotion”, *International Security*, 33 (2), pp. 120,131

⁵⁹ Mansfield and Snyder, 1995, “Democratization and War Dangers of Transition”, p. 79

⁶⁰ David A. Lake, 1992, “Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War”, *American Political Science Review*, 86 (1), p. 24; R. J. Rummel, 1995, “Democracies are Less Warlike than Other Regimes”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (4), p. 474

⁶¹ D. Michael Ward and Kristen S. Gleditsch, 1998, “Democratizing for Peace”, *American Political Science Review*, 92 (1), p. 52; Thomas Risse-Kappen, 1995, “Democratic Peace – Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (4), pp. 496-501

⁶² Thomas, 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, p. 3

the relative absence of interstate war between democracies.⁶³ Furthermore, he claims that the clearest implication of his study's findings is that "democratic enlargement, as a strategy, is not likely to be effective in reducing the likelihood of wars between or within states, and it is apt to increase the probability of war involvement for individual states."⁶⁴

Although the concept of a democratic peace is derived from the experience of relations between states, there is also the argument that democracy reduces intense violence within states and democracies experience less political repression⁶⁵ than non-democracies. Davenport's analysis reaches the conclusion that "whether a particular nation-state is fully democratic or merely becoming more so, government leaders in this situation are expected to be more tolerant of citizens' rights and relax previously imposed repressive activities."⁶⁶ Likewise, Poe and Tate's findings show that when states have higher levels of democracy, they tend to use political repression less frequently. Two factors account for the logic of this relationship. First, democratic leaders are more accountable to people and interest groups. Second, coercive agents within democracies are generally less inclined to go for repression.⁶⁷

Yet, Regan and Henderson link increased levels of repression with increased levels of threat, independent of the regime type. Here threat is conceptualized in terms of "the demands on a regime by opposition groups". The effective institutions

⁶³ Errol A. Henderson, 2002, *Democracy and War The End of an Illusion?*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 125-143

⁶⁴ Henderson, 2002, *Democracy and War The End of an Illusion?*, p. 19

⁶⁵ Political repression, in the broadest sense, refers to "the systemic violation of the civil liberties and human rights of groups and/or individuals". While civil liberties generally refer to particular types of expression, human rights refer to respect for people's personal integrity. Regan and Henderson, 2002, "Democracy, Threats and Political Repression in Developing Countries...", p. 120

⁶⁶ Christian Davenport, 1999, "Human Rights and the Democratic Proposition", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 43 (1), p. 92

⁶⁷ Steven C. Poe and Neal Tate, 1994, "Repression of Human Rights to Personal Integrity in the 1980s: A Global Analysis, *American Political Science Review*, 88 (4), pp. 865-866

of democracies are able to channel all forms of opposition into the formal political institutions of society. The result is that even the extreme demands of the opponents do not generate sufficient support to be considered threatening by the rulers in a democracy. On the other hand, the absence of legitimate channels for dissent in autocratic regimes ensures that regimes do not have to negotiate with opponents. The secure grip of elites on power and the police machinery frightens the public and makes domination more acceptable. With the opposition intimidated, the regime is not inclined to engage in violent forms of political repression.⁶⁸ However, intermediate regimes like semi-democracies face competing pressures that increase the extent and credibility of the threats they faced. In response to this higher level of threat, semi-democracies employ higher levels of repression. In semi-democracies, the institutional infrastructure is usually not developed well enough to channel the demands of the opposition into the political arena. Thus, the responses by the leaders are limited by the scarcity of legitimate institutions. Moreover, citizens in semi-democracies have opportunity to express dissent publicly (compared with the citizens of autocracies) and make demands on the state. Since political leaders in semi-democracies are likely to perceive demands as a challenge to their fragile legitimacy, they are more likely to repress opponents.⁶⁹ Thomas also argues that there are linkages between the degree of freedom of the individual and the degree of threats perceived by the state. In democracies as in authoritarian systems, the relative degree of freedom that the individual enjoys may increase or decrease depending on the level of threat perceived by the state. The greater the threat, the

⁶⁸ Regan and Henderson, 2002, *Democracy, Threats and Political Repression in Developing Countries...*, pp. 122-124

⁶⁹ Henderson, 2002, *Democracy and War The End of an Illusion?*, pp. 64; 105-106; Jan Henryk Pierskalla, 2009, "Protest, Deterrence and Escalation: The Strategic Calculus of Government Repression", *MPSA Conference: Panel on Game Theoretic Approaches on the Study of Civil War*, pp. 4-6

greater the sacrifice demanded and the fewer the freedoms that may be enjoyed by the individual, whether these restrictions are obtained by voluntary or imposed means.⁷⁰

The significance of these studies for the thesis is their emphasis on the linkage between the threat perception of the elites and the use of political repression against the dissidents. This linkage is crucial to understand the context and the procedure that resulted in the implementation of undemocratic policies by the governments of Singapore and Azerbaijan. The disputed legitimacy of the regimes led them to perceive many demands of the society and different groups as threat to their rule and resorted the ruling elites to restrain political arena through repression.

2.3.2. Democratization as cause of instability and insecurity

Some scholars argue that the instability of democratic transitions increases the likelihood that democratizing states will initiate international conflict. According to Mansfield and Snyder,

The idea that democracies never fight wars against each other has become an axiom for many scholars and also used by American statesmen to justify a foreign policy that encourages democratization abroad. It might be true that a world in which more countries were mature, stable democracies would be safer and preferable for the U.S. But countries do not become mature democracies overnight. They usually go through a rocky transition...in this transitional phase of democratization, countries become more aggressive and war-prone, not less and they do fight wars with democratic states.⁷¹

Democratization typically creates a syndrome of weak central authority, unstable democratic coalitions, and high-energy mass politics. It brings new social groups and classes onto the political stage. Political leaders, finding no way to reconcile incompatible interests, resort to shortsighted and risky policies in order to

⁷⁰ Thomas, 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, p. 27

⁷¹ Mansfield and Snyder, 1995, "Democratization and War Dangers of Transition", p. 79

maintain their governing coalitions. Elites need to gain mass allies to defend their weakened positions. Therefore threatened elites may appeal to nationalist sentiment and in turn use force abroad to divert the public's attention from the power contests in the domestic sphere. Another reason that democratization is likely to produce "belligerent nationalism" is that the threatened traditional power bases by the new political structure might hope to get a benefit from war.⁷²

Contrarily, Galbreath argues that democratizing states, as opposed to authoritarian states exhibiting a brief period of liberalization, are inherently less prone to periods of international conflict. The underlying causes of the democratic transition encourage elites and the masses to turn away from the coercive policies of the previous regime. In particular, the military, will have a reducing position within civil politics as democratic reforms progress. The democratic institutions created at the beginning of the collapse of the previous regime allow mass politics and elite politics to rearrange themselves upon each other in a way that prevents those lost power in the new regime from taking extra political actions. These characteristics of democratic transitions reduce the possibility of international war by democratizing states.⁷³

In a similar way, the results of Daxecker and Ward&Gleditsch's studies show that democratizing polities are substantially less war prone. By focusing on the characteristics of transition process, they find that rapid transitions or reversals are associated with a countervailing effect; they increase the risk of being involved in warfare. Both in the long term and while societies undergo democratic change, the

⁷² Mansfield and Snyder, 1995, "Democratization and War Dangers of Transition", pp. 83-90

⁷³ David J. Galbreath, 2004, "Democratization and Inter-State War: Why Reform does not Encourage Conflict?", *Political Studies Association*, 24 (3), pp. 206, 212-213

risk of involvement in war are reduced by democratization and exacerbated by reversals in the democratization process.⁷⁴

The argument on the peaceful nature of the process of democratization is supplied with dissent. Huntington points that political decay and instability occur when popular mobilization outpaces political institutionalization.⁷⁵ During the 1950s and 1960s the numerical incidence of political violence and disorder increased dramatically in most countries of the world. This violence and instability was in large part the product of rapid social change and rapid mobilization of new groups into politics coupled with slow development of political institutions. Political instability in modernizing countries is thus in large part a function of the gap between aspirations and expectations produced by escalation of aspirations which particularly occurs in the early phases of democratization.⁷⁶

Within a democratizing state, elite actors are striving for survival, while both political institutions and the economy are being reformed. Given this chaotic situation, there is great possibility of conflict between competing factions. Goldsmith argues that the successor regime to a dictatorship is frequently a partial democracy which can pose an even greater security threat. He points to the report of the Political Instability Task Force, according to which in the period of 1955 to 2001, mixed regimes by its total accounted for more than one-third of all major political instability events, such as adverse shifts in patterns of governance, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars and genocides. Democratic regime change is strongly

⁷⁴ D. Michael Ward and Kristen S. Gleditsch, 1998, "Democratizing for Peace", *American Political Science Review*, 92 (1), p. 51; Daxecker, 2007, "Perilous Polities? An Assessment of the Democratization-Conflict Linkage", pp. 527, 545

⁷⁵ He defines political development as the institutionalization of political institutions and procedures. Samuel Huntington, 1965, Political Development and Political Decay, *World Politics*, 17 (3), p. 393

⁷⁶ Huntington, 2006, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, pp. 3-5, 56

correlated with internal military conflict, though the prospects for civil peace improve with time if the country evolves into an established democratic system.⁷⁷

The significance of the discussions, regarding the impact of democratization process on security and likelihood of war, for this study stems from their emphasis on the difficulty of the transformation process and the pressure it puts on the rulers. With in a transforming state, both political institutions and the economy are being reformed, while new social groups and classes come onto the political stage with different concerns. This situation forces the ruling elite to deal many and probably conflictual issues at the same time, with insufficient political, economic and human sources. This argument is important to understand the context that gives way to the prioritization of security. Since Singapore and Azerbaijan experienced such transition processes, the ruling elite of the both countries faced the difficult task of dealing with confrontational issues with limited resources. Moreover, the social and political turmoil emerged in this process -ethnic protests in Singapore and military coup attempts in Azerbaijan- resort the governments to prioritize security and to use restrictive measures.

2.3.3. Negative Impact of State and Military-Centric Security on Democracy

State and military-centric security studies do not pay attention on the link between security and democracy. Since political development and democratization fall within the boundaries of the internal domain, they often separate or overlook the effects of various policy measures for pursuing one on the other.⁷⁸ Moreover it can be argued that in this understanding of security, practices regarding political development, democratization and human rights are relegated to secondary place, while order and

⁷⁷ Arthur A. Goldsmith, 2008, "Making the World Safe for Partial Democracy? Questioning the Premises of Democracy Promotion", *International Security*, 33 (2), pp. 132-133

⁷⁸ Thomas, 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, pp. 1-2

security of state are constantly essentialized. By whatever means security comes to be perceived as the core value, it gains priority over other policies. In other words, the choice between security and democracy would be biased toward security requirements. Al-Mahsat claims that security orientation has led to the development of institutions and the allocation of capabilities to tasks that offer little support for political development and democratization becomes secondary to “survival of the actor’s autonomy”.⁷⁹ In this understanding, people are called upon to give priority to state/national security and thus to consent to sacrifice of any value that will provide more security.⁸⁰

Scholars that are critical of state and military-centric security, in particular those studying the security of the developing world, made a significant contribution to the field by drawing attention to the impact of this understanding on democracy. They argue that sometimes the activities of state be the major source of insecurity for the individuals and groups especially in the developing countries. As discussed in the previous part, rulers of the developing countries are facing the pressures of state building, political and economic development, security and democratization at the same time, this led them to perceive different demands as a challenge to their fragile legitimacy and be more likely to repress their citizens.⁸¹ The preoccupation with security, particularly with internal threats to the regimes, might lead to certain decay in the democratization process. Moreover, it is claimed that existing power

⁷⁹ Abdul-Monem Al-Mahsat, 1985, *National Security in the Third World*, Boulder and London: Westview Press pp. 21-22

⁸⁰ Neack, 2007, *Elusive Security: States First, People Last*, pp. 15-16

⁸¹ Robert H. Jackson, 1992, “The Security Dilemma in Africa” in Brian L. Job (ed.), *Security Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, p. 86; Ken Booth, 1995, “Human Wrongs and International Relations”, *International Affairs* 71 (1), p. 107

structures – at global, regional or local levels – that determine who enjoys the entitlement to security and who does not is responsible for the insecurity of people.⁸²

The military and state-centric understanding of security, might result in undemocratic practices of states toward their population because of its prioritization of security over all other endeavors in general, and state security over security of citizens in particular. In this type of security, state/national security has priority because security of the state is seen as a precondition of the citizen's security. People's security is relegated to a secondary position due to the assumption that citizens feel safe and go on their daily lives without worry when the state is safe. If the concern regarding state/national security might gave way to downgrading of other endeavors including people's security and democracy, then how one can be sure that those deciding on security issues will not keep the security concerns prominent on public agenda in order to follow their own interests?⁸³ The most probable answer to this question is through democratization of the state, because in democracies those having the power to decide on and make policies are accountable. They are responsible for their decisions and have to explain to the public the rationale behind their decisions. Here emerges the dilemma between security and democracy or to put it otherwise, between being preoccupied with security, particularly the internal threats to the regime, and staying in power and taking necessary steps for consolidation of democracy and losing power. This is also related with the postulation of the security first approach, regarding the gradual consolidation of democracy internally, after security is established. Here it is assumed that the ruling elite will perform democratization including enacting

⁸² Caroline Thomas, 2000, *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge Of Poverty and Inequality*, London: Pluto Press, p. 4

⁸³ Pinar Bilgin, 2008, "The Security Sector in Theory and Practice: From 'State-Centered' Security to 'Citizen-Centered' Security? 'New Security'", *Security Sector Governance: Turkey and Europe*, İstanbul: TESEV, pp. 55-56

political reforms, holding free and fair elections, advancing rule of law and making themselves accountable, after they provided security. The practicality of this assumption will be analyzed in the following chapters on Singapore and Azerbaijan.

The significance of this approach for the thesis stems from its emphasis on the problem of prioritizing an endeavor over other things. When a value is chosen as a priority, unavoidably other values are put to secondary position and it becomes possible to delay or even sacrifice those for the core value. Actually, this happened in Singapore and Azerbaijan. Since security and stability have been kept on the agenda as the most important concern, democracy has constantly been delayed in the name of security. Moreover, this approach highlights that the decision between security and democracy is a political choice and if those making the choice are not accountable, how one can be sure about the rightness of this decision or whether the preferences will be reorganized in accordance with the changing needs of the country and the people rather than of the rulers. This paradox is also valid for Singapore and Azerbaijan.

2.3.4. Security First Approach

Democratization as the rallying cry of America's mission in the world has essentially failed. There are strong principled and pragmatic reasons to turn U.S. foreign policy 180 degrees: instead of assuming that democratizing nations such as Iraq and Afghanistan will turn them into guardians of the peace and reliable friends, we must aim first to ensure basic security -including freedom from deadly violence, maiming and torture-, both for its own sake and for the sake of the democracy that might gradually grow in these faraway places. Because security drives democracy, democracy does not beget security.⁸⁴

In his book "Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy", Amitai Etzioni lays out a set of policy changes to guide the American foreign policy,

⁸⁴ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. IX

especially with taking into account the failure of the democratization efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. He is critical of democratic peace theory and democracy promotion as grand strategy of American foreign policy. By pointing the limited power and resources of the U.S., he argues for a “principled realism” having both moral foundations and practicality. Its morality comes from emphasizing the primacy of life and personal security, and its practicality derives from determining objectives and setting priorities in line with the available resources.⁸⁵ The main points of the security first approach are explored in the following paragraphs.

Democratic peace theory does not apply to the democratizing world, especially when democracy is tried to be established externally. Etzioni argues that democratization that has become a major part of a long-established American foreign policy, has been pursued by the U.S. since Woodrow Wilson’s presidency and as late as 2004, it was still widely agreed that liberal democracy was on the march and that the U.S. should lead this historical trend. The trend was said to favor the West and world peace because democracies do not attack other democracies. By the end of 2005, however it became clear though not yet incorporated into the main American foreign policy that the world is not democratizing. Etzioni refers to Mansfield and Snyder’s point that democratic peace theory may hold for truly liberal democracies but not do so far societies which are democratizing- “often a violent and unstable process”.⁸⁶ Democratization creates a wider spectrum of politically significant groups with diverse interests. Those threatened by the change came with democratization, are often compelled to take an inflexible view of their interests. The political impasse is further deepened by the weakening of the central authority, unable to find way to reconcile incompatible interests. Drawing on the

⁸⁵ Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, p. 11

⁸⁶ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. 19

lessons taken in Afghanistan and Iraq, he argues that in those societies having no experience of democracy and mature civil society, there is not much the U.S. can do to rush for democracy. Those came to power in Iraq and Afghanistan have been seen as puppets of the U.S. and the West and had neither power nor legitimacy to act effectively. Moreover, by disbanding the political and military structures in these countries, U.S. generated a power vacuum that resulted in the increase in violence, created a new kind of authoritarianism and undermined the confidence in democracy building.⁸⁷ Then what should replace democracy promotion as a major strategy?

Although, the U.S. is still the most powerful country of the world, it has not limited resources and leverage, hence it has to set priorities. Security must be promoted in failing states and in dealing with rogue states without first democratizing the regimes involved. The priority must be security, because neither democracy nor economic development can be established or consolidated without basic security is provided. For Etzioni basic security refers to “conditions –both domestic and international- under which most people, most of the time, are able to go about their lives, venture onto the street, work, study and participate in public life (politics included) without acute fear of being killed or injured”.⁸⁸ Security is usually considered as a legal-political right, but Etzioni draws an additional distinction between security and all the other legal-political rights. He connotes that “this step is necessary to enable me to formulate the proposition that on both principled and pragmatic grounds, the right to security is of highest order and its successful provision is more urgent than advancing other rights”. In circumstances under which a full spectrum of rights cannot be advanced simultaneously, a common situation, basic security must lead. Security first principle does not favor

⁸⁷ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, pp. 22-25

⁸⁸ Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, p. 11

“curtailing well-established freedoms for marginal gains in security in London, New York or Paris. But it does command first priority in places where people cannot walk streets, work, study or worship without fear of being bombed or kidnapped, tortured or maimed.”⁸⁹ Moreover, Etzioni asserts that those people lacking basic security, are ready to make a deal between democracy and security. Under conflictual and insecure conditions people are not interested in the abstract concepts of democracy, such as voting power, right to assemble, freedom of speech. Only once security is established, and people became able to continue their daily lives, they start to look for their legal and political rights.

After security is provided democratization would be gradually phased. Democracy cannot be fostered by force of arms. Forcing the rogue and failing states for regime change or liberalization might be more counterproductive and create anti-American sentiments rather than to promote democracy and security. Etzioni connotes that “democracy cannot be imposed on gunpoint, most assuredly not on societies with little history that would prepare them for it, nations without a free press and civil liberties and without the institutions of a flourishing civil society”.⁹⁰ Therefore, policy makers should discard forceful democracy promotion as one of the strategic foreign policy tools for promoting security of the U.S. and the world. Etzioni asserts that the U.S. has highlighted issues regarding democratization and human rights rather than nuclear materials and arms in its dealings with Russia. However, Russian government might agree to much tighter controls on Russia’s nuclear materials and arms if the proper incentives are offered; such controls add to the security of the government and have only small political costs. In contrast, rulers are unlikely to reverse the numerous undemocratic measures that were introduced

⁸⁹ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, pp. 5-6

⁹⁰ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. 13

during their rule, because such moves might endanger their own power and regime. For Etzioni, “the leaders of Basra would be free to ban alcohol and fine those who do not obey, and even enact dress codes for women, but not to bomb liquor stores to assassinate Sunnis”.⁹¹ Further, he gives Libya as a small but effective example. After Libya gave up its support for terrorism and ceased its program for Weapons of Mass Destruction, the Bush Administration allowed Libya to emerge from isolation and sanctions, despite the fact that it has barely begun to reform its authoritarian regime. Such reforms can be promoted later as a second stage. Many elements of the existing regime should be kept in place, while considerable time should be allowed for new forces to grow. For Etzioni, if a rogue state deproliferates and stops supporting terrorism, its regime can be left intact in return and this would not mean that the West must engage in some kind of “Faustian bargain” and give up its “liberal soul to purchase security”. If the U.S. aims to democratize the world, most of the world would resist or not cooperate, if it aims to provide security for oneself and the entire world, the majority of the nations and citizens of the world will share this goal. Favoring democracy as public diplomacy might lead people across the world to question the support given by the U.S. to Saudi Arabia and Egypt.⁹²

Additionally, security first understanding claims that it is not immoral to work with the religious, ethnic or tribal groups even though they follow illiberal and undemocratic policies. While dealing with autocratic countries in transition to democracy, U.S. can work with these illiberal groups given that they provide basic security, do not avoid democratization in the long term and contribute to the international counter-terrorism efforts. Etzioni use the term “illiberal moderates” referring to “those who disavow violence but who do not necessarily favor a liberal-

⁹¹ Etzioni, 2007, “Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order’s”, p. 13

⁹² Etzioni, 2008, “A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration”, pp. 100-101, 105

democratic regime or full program of human rights.”⁹³ According to Etzioni, illiberal moderates that are in between their opposition to many Western values and their rejection of violence are the most important group for U.S. foreign policy and for world peace.

Another significant argument of the security first approach is that first basic security must be established, yet in the long run, security forces alone cannot maintain order; newly liberated societies require citizens with a strong set of shared ethics and moderate political opinions to legitimate the new order. For Etzioni, assuming that democratization and declarations of human rights will restore social order is a mistake. Law enforcement authority, backed by a moral culture, is the first step on the road to a stable and free social order. As security is established and democratization is pursued by peaceful means without external coercion, changes in the moral culture must also be pursued, because a society can function well as long as people do things with the belief that it is the right and just thing to do, not because of the fear from the power of the authorities. In Etzioni’s words:

Security is not self-sustaining. Either it is undergirded by a police state, albeit at great human costs and with ongoing instability, or by a firm social fabric, which entails a shared moral culture, supported largely by informal social controls, in which law enforcement authorities are used mainly as a backup and a last resort... No state can field the number of law enforcement personnel needed to provide even basic security if most of the billions of interactions within the population must be surveyed and policed. And the law enforcement agents are likely themselves to violate the law, if they are not imbued with a sound moral culture.⁹⁴

Hence security and order should rely largely on moral culture that is promoted informally. In addition, promotion of the moral culture “cannot be separated from the quest for truly democratic regimes, because without a strong

⁹³ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, pp. 85-87

⁹⁴ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, pp. XIII, 152-159

moral culture neither political stability nor democratic liberalism can be established.”⁹⁵

2.3.5. Critics to Security First Approach

Democracy is the answer. Not because democracy is perfect. It is precisely because it is imperfect. We are not looking for another utopia; we are looking for an optimal solution based on the systems available to us. By that standard, there is no contest... and there is no justification for further delay. For decades after independence, many of our populist regimes told us that democracy had to be suspended until “national liberation”; until Palestine had been liberated; until we have economic development; until we have true social justice; and so on. As it turns out now, after 50 years of depriving ourselves of democracy, we find ourselves with none of these things! And we’re no closer to democracy.

Saad Eddin Ibrahim⁹⁶

For Etzioni, security is the foundation on which all the other “good deeds” base on, hence first security should be provided. This does not mean that there should be a choice between good deeds, of course one naturally wants all good things together. Yet, if all of them cannot be provided at the same time, one of them must be prioritized. And it is the security. Etzioni is right in saying that if people cannot walk on the street safely, and all the time have the worry of being murdered than how can they think about their voting rights or freedom of expression. This is also valid in case of economic means. For an ordinary people having a job, earning enough money for perpetuating the conditions of a standard life, being able to send their children to school or hospital are more important than democracy and political rights which in daily life do not mean much to people. In a similar way Welzel and Inglehart state that everyone wants freedom and autonomy, but people’s priorities

⁹⁵ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. 162

⁹⁶ Egyptian democracy activist quoted in Morton H. Halperin, Joseph T. Siegle and Michael M. Weinstein, 2005, *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, New York: Routledge, p. 25

reflect their socio-economic conditions, and they therefore place the highest subjective value on their most pressing needs. Since material sustenance and physical security are the first requirements for survival, people assign them top priority under conditions of scarcity; with growing prosperity people become more likely to emphasize autonomy and self-expression values.⁹⁷

From this point of view democracy and human rights are seen as luxuries that can be delayed until security and order are provided. However, democracy, encompassing civil and political rights, democratic accountability and the rule of law, is not a luxury that can safely be postponed until order and security are restored; they are inseparable from the former. Thus one cannot really separate the need to rebuild structures of public security from the need to restore livelihoods and democracy. The latter in its turn requires the restoration of public order.⁹⁸ They are both needed and one cannot be maintained at the expense of the other. Although Etzioni advocates the priority of the security over democracy promotion, he explains the inseparability of and the interaction between the two terms through his argument on the need for a moral culture. For Etzioni, the new order, maintained by security forces, should be legitimated through a set of shared values. A stable and free social order cannot be maintained unless law enforcement is supported by a moral culture. Besides, endorsement of the moral culture “cannot be separated from the quest for truly democratic regimes, because without a strong moral culture neither political stability nor democratic liberalism can be established.”⁹⁹ Ish-Shalom touches upon this issue in his critic of security first approach:

One cannot promise security first, not even for the sake of morality second. Security and morality do not form a lexical order of priorities. Being mutually constitutive implies a nonlexical association where not

⁹⁷ Welzel and Inglehart, 2008, “The Role of Ordinary People in Democratization”, p. 130

⁹⁸ Luckham, 2003, “Democratic Strategies for Security in Transition and Conflict” pp. 21- 22

⁹⁹ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. 162

only does security produce the perquisites for morality, but morality produces the prerequisites for security. Consequently, one is obliged and ought to strive for them both.¹⁰⁰

Actually it is not possible to prioritize a thing without downgrading another. But, it is a fact that security and democracy are two values that both are inevitably necessary for the people in the modern world system, and neither of them is an indulgence to be delayed until first the other is maintained. Prioritizing security and then expecting democracy to develop gradually and internally on the basic value of security might not work well. Those having the political power, labeled as government, rulers, statesmen, regime whatever, might use the urgency of the establishment of security for the sake of peoples' life in the short run, as an excuse to further limit the political and civil rights so that their power cannot be challenged. Etzioni's assumption regarding the triumph of democracy in time, after security maintained is questionable. What is the motivation for the ruling elite, having the political and economic power, to take the risk of losing that power by enacting political reforms, holding free and fair elections, advancing rule of law and making themselves accountable? Additionally, claim of security first understanding with regard to cooperating with illiberal but moderate groups, despite their undemocratic tendencies, for the security of the world – West and U.S. in particular – might provide them with international backing and strengthen their position in domestic politics regarding the priority of security and stability, which might result in the delay of democratization due to the security needs. Mahler connotes:

Interestingly Etzioni seems as attentive of the basic security of foreign leaders as of the people they lead. As he sees it, there is ordinarily little to be gained by threatening foreign rulers with overthrow in an effort to change undesirable domestic or international behaviour... Respecting the security of repressive foreign leaders often can come at the expense of the basic security of individuals within their countries because the

¹⁰⁰ Piki Ish-Shalom, 2008, "Render Unto Caesar That Which is Caesar's On the Joint Pursuit of Morality and Security, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), p. 1286

most serious threat to a great many people's psychical security is from their own governments. Unfortunately, one cannot have it both ways: It is in many cases simply impossible to achieve basic security for individuals within a country without challenging the leaders who are oppressing them.¹⁰¹

Etzioni holds up Libya as a model for the security first approach to dealing with rogue states, arguing that "the U.S. should renounce regime change in return for their renouncing the pursuit of nuclear weapons and support for terrorists, irrespective of their human rights records at home".¹⁰² The fundamentality of the primacy of life gives Etzioni the rationale for morally and strategically tolerating those who reject political violence regardless of their political creed. The pragmatism of having relationship with illiberal moderates, despite their undemocratic policies at home, in the name of promoting international security, as a foreign policy strategy is obvious, yet its morality is dubious. As stated by Ish-Shalom:

Hypothetically the bar to being accepted into America's club, as it were, is a statist embrace of unconditional liberty. Etzioni argues for striving to mediate civilizational differences and foster alliances between moderates, namely those who settle disagreements by argumentation, rather than by resorting to violence. However in the moderate but illiberal states, dissidents and minorities, although respected, are not guaranteed political representation in decision making institutions.¹⁰³

Leaving the regime intact might mean that we are not concerned with the people living under that regime. Etzioni has right in arguing that dismantling the structures of the existing system creates a power vacuum, which might give way to further security and democracy problems. However, leaving the many elements of the old system intact in turn of some maneuvers of the regime to contribute to international security would not contribute the basic security of the citizens of the

¹⁰¹ Vincent A. Mahler, 2008, "On Providing and Enforcing Basic Security", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1370, 1372

¹⁰² James B. Steinberg, 2008, "A Sound Principle, but Not a Playbook", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), p. 1359

¹⁰³ Ish-Shalom, 2008, "Render Unto Caesar That Which is Caesar's ...", pp. 1288-1289

concerned country. What is the contribution of Libya's abandoning of the pursuit of WMDs programme on the basic security of Libyans? Etzioni does not deal with this issue. Moreover, U.S. and European powers took Libya out of the list of rogue states after stopping its pursuit of nuclear arms and reestablished their diplomatic relations with Libya. The regime could use this diplomatic backing for legitimizing its security policies at domestic level.¹⁰⁴ When Etzioni gives the Russian example, he says that government of Russia might agree to much tighter controls on Russia's nuclear materials and arms if the right incentives are offered because such controls add to the security of the government and have only small political costs.¹⁰⁵ However, repealing the undemocratic measures that were introduced during their rule would be costly, because such moves might jeopardize the power of the regime. Under these conditions, is it rationale to expect the ruling elites of the moderate but illiberal states to realize democratic reforms for guaranteeing political representation to opponents and making themselves accountable after they maintained security without any external pressure, since opposition groups, civil society and media do not have enough power to pressurize the government internally?

Another paradoxical point of Etzioni's approach is his use of Weber's definition of state, "an entity that has a legal monopoly on the use of force".¹⁰⁶ For him only state has this right. He argues for basic security, consisting internal and international conditions under which most people, most of the time, are able to go about their lives, venture onto the street, work, study and participate in public life, including politics, without acute fear of being killed or injured, yet he accepts the state as the only agent of security. Since state is the only entity that can maintain

¹⁰⁴ "Sorun Seçim Değil Rejim (The Problem is not the Election, but the Regime)", 27.07.2009, *Radikal*, (El Kudsul Arabi, 25.07.2009, Editorial)

¹⁰⁵ Etzioni, 2007, "Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order's", p. 13

¹⁰⁶ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, p. 24

security, the security of people become dependent on the security of the state. This understanding might result in the essentialization of the security of state over other endeavors, including the security of citizens and democracy, as emphasized by those studies criticizing the state-centric security understanding. In such a situation, maintenance of security would not generate the conditions for democracy to consolidate.

2.4. Conclusion

Democracy and security are both difficult concepts to define because they tend to mean different things to different people at different times. Although the relationship between security and democracy is studied from different angles, it is possible to say that there is not sufficient scholarly attention on the relationship between the two concepts, especially the impact of the former on the latter. Some scholars of comparative politics see democracy and democratization as a way to provide security, others emphasize the potential of democratization process to lead instability and conflict, whereas society-centric security studies pay attention to the negative impact of state and military-centric security understanding on democracy and security of citizens.

Democratic peace theory claims that there is a negative relationship between the level of democracy between two states and their likelihood of fighting each other. Several theorists have also extended the democratic peace thesis to argue that a democratic peace is evident within intrastate conflicts as well. It has been reasoned that democracy reduces the likelihood of discrimination and of political repression. However, Henderson points out, “the democratic peace proposition has not been explicitly tested with reference to third world post colonial states, where most civil

wars take place”.¹⁰⁷ He also shows that in democracies as in authoritarian systems, the relative degree of freedom that the individual enjoys may increase or decrease depending on the level of threat perceived by the state. There would appear to be an inverse relationship between security and democracy. Some scholars emphasize the instability impact of the democratization process. Huntington states as the rates of social mobilization and the expansion of political participation are high and the rates of political organization and institutionalization are low, the result is political instability and disorder. Mansfield and Synder argue that the instability of democratic transitions increases the likelihood that democratizing states will initiate international conflict. Meanwhile Daxecker, Galbreath, Ward&Gleditsch and Goldsmith’s works conclude that large change to democracy reduces the likelihood of conflict for the post World War II period, while uneven transitions or democratic reversals, increase conflict propensities. While scholars of comparative politics, discuss the impact of democratization on security or stability, scholars of society-centric security explore the effects of state and military-centric security understanding on democracy. Arguing that in state and military-centric security understanding, people are called upon to give priority to state/national security and thus to consent to sacrifice of any value that will provide more security, society-centered studies underline that sometimes the activities of state, especially in developing countries, become the major impediment for the consolidation of democracy and the main source of insecurity for citizens.

Security first approach as a current contribution to the literature, presents security as the precondition of democracy. Etzioni developed security first approach because of the need for a change in American foreign policy considering the

¹⁰⁷ Henderson, 2002, *Democracy and War The End of an Illusion?*, p. 103

unsuccessful attempts for forceful democratization in Afghanistan and Iraq. He mainly asserts that rather than trying to establish democracy or to change the regime in failed and rogue states, first attempt must be in the direction of the maintenance of basic security. He asserts priority to security by taking into account the inconvenient conditions in the concerned countries for democracy and insufficiency of resources. As the most powerful state of the world, U.S. does not have limited sources. Hence, building structures of security and democracy might not be possible simultaneously. Moreover, under conditions where people face the risk of being attacked or murdered any time and lacking the minimum standards of living, democracy promotion would not work. Therefore, first security must be established so that people can go on with their daily lives without worry and become able to think about their political and civil rights. However, this does not mean disregarding democracy at all. Democracy would evolve gradually in accordance with internal circumstances.

Security first approach assumes that inherent limits of resources and the difficulty of concurrent maintenance of security and democracy lead rulers, even the rulers of the most powerful state of the world, to make a prioritization between needs. Since the pressure of resource scarcity is higher in developing world, rulers of these countries have to set priorities in accordance with the available resources. In case of the need to security and democracy, priority is given to security because its maintenance provides the foundation for other rights to be developed. Drawing upon this understanding, security first approach postulates that after security is established democracy will gradually be consolidated. Here it is also assumed that the rulers, having political and economic power, will perform democratization at the expense of their power, once security is provided. Does resource scarcity really force rulers

to make prioritization, or urgency issue is a kind of mechanism that is used by those having power in order to keep the agenda as they incline, so that they do not lose power, and whether they enact political reforms for consolidating democracy at the expense of their power or will security concerns keep their urgency? The accuracy of these two assumptions will be analyzed in the following chapters on Singapore and Azerbaijan, as developing countries adopted security first approach.

As touched upon by many scholars, developing countries have to deal with political and economic development concurrently with maintenance of security and democracy as well. Most probably, they become independent having an authoritarian legacy, without having experience with democracy, political institutions and security structures of themselves. This difficulty is furthered by the different demands of the groups newly joined to the political arena after the independence and the launch of democratization process. Here the scarcity of available institutions and tools to meet these demands and the anxiety of the ruling elites about losing their power affects their perception of threat. In addition to the internal and external context and availability of sources, the policy capacity and legitimacy of the rule have effect on how challenges and threats are perceived and policies are formulated. Thus, not just the context and resources but perception of threats is significant for the prioritization of security. The perception of the different demands as a challenge to their rule by the elites might resort them to prioritize stability and security and to restrict the political arena -maybe through repression- in the name of maintaining stability and security, mainly the security of the state and their rule. Here, security is not only prioritized but its maintenance become possible through constraining democratization process. The result is the prioritization of

security at the expense of democracy. The accurateness of this argument will also be analyzed in the following parts.

CHAPTER III

THE CASE OF SINGAPORE

3.1. Introduction

I reject the notion that all men yearned for democratic freedoms, prizing free speech and the vote over other needs such as economic development... Notions of absolute rights to freedom for individuals would sometimes have to be compromised in order to help maintain public order and security.

Lee Kuan Yew¹⁰⁸

Singapore gained its independence from the British Empire in 1963 and joined the Malaysia Federation, and became totally independent in 1965 after its separation from the Federation. Established during the Cold War, Singaporean state was part of developing world that is in need of both political and economic development and security. As the rulers of a newly sovereign state, Singaporean elites have pursued security-centered policies. It is an interesting case, because it provides a chance to study security first approach on a developing country and answer the questions regarding the objective and subjective dimensions of the emergence and continuation of such an understanding, and influence of this understanding on the democratization process.

This chapter aims to understand the causes that gave way to the prioritization of security and impact of the security first understanding on the process of

¹⁰⁸ Singapore's first Prime Minister quoted in Lynn Kuok, 2008, "The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), p. 1407

democratization in Singapore, as a developing and modernizing country. Here the assumptions of security first approach -priorities should be clarified in line with available resources, U.S. should work with those not liberal but against use of violence and terror and democracy would develop after security is maintained- will be verified on the case of Singapore. The chapter composes three parts. In the first part political history and political system of the country are explained briefly to give general information about the country. In the second part the context and the causes –objective and subjective- that gave way to the prioritization of security are discussed to understand whether just the internal and external context and availability of sources are significant for the prioritization of security or the perception of challenges and threats by the ruling elites. In the third part, implications of security first understanding on democratization process are explored to understand whether maintenance of security and cooperation of Western powers with illiberal but moderate regimes provide the necessary conditions for democracy to develop gradually.

3.2. Political History and the Political System

Singapore passed into the control of the British Empire in the late nineteenth century and became a significant commercial harbour. In 1924 Straits Settlements (the Malayan Union), consisting of Singapore, Malacca and Penang, was formed under the government of Bengal. After the Second World War the Malayan Union proposal was ended and the Federation of Malaya and the Colony of Singapore were established in 1946. The British government allowed Singapore to hold its first general election, in 1955, which was won by the Labour Front under the leadership of David Marshall. Demanding complete self-rule, then Chief Minister Marshall led

a delegation to London, but was refused by the British government. He resigned upon return, and was replaced by Lim Yew Hock, whose policies then convinced the British Empire. Singapore was granted full internal self-government with its own prime minister and cabinet overseeing all matters of government except defence and foreign affairs.¹⁰⁹

Elections were then held on 30 May 1959 with the People's Action Party winning a landslide victory. Singapore eventually became a self-governing state within the British Empire on 3 June 1959 and Lee Kuan Yew was sworn in as the first prime minister of Singapore. In August 1963, Singapore declared independence from Britain unilaterally, and joined the Federation of Malaysia in September along with Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak as the result of the 1962 Merger Referendum of Singapore. Yet this merger did not last long. Singapore left the federation in 1965, following the heated ideological conflict between the state's PAP government and the federal Kuala Lumpur government, and became independent on August 9, 1965 by its separation from the Federation of Malaysia.¹¹⁰

PAP has held the overwhelming majority of seats in parliament since 1966, when the opposition Barisan Sosialis Party¹¹¹ refused to take part in 1968 elections. The decline of the Barisan was obvious following its boycott of Parliament. The competitive multi-party phase ended in 1968. The ineffectiveness of other political parties led to the basis for a de facto one party dominant system and left the PAP as

¹⁰⁹ Ow Chin Hock, 1984, "Singapore: Past, Present and Future" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 366-368

¹¹⁰ Lim Chong-Yah, 1984, "The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years: A Glimpse" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 8,

¹¹¹ Fearing that emergency regulations outlawed communists in Malaya would be applied to Singapore if these two ex-British colonies were to merge, the left faction of the PAP, being sympathetic to the communist cause, broke away in 1962 to form the Barisan Sosialis to campaign in a referendum against merger. Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 656

the sole representative party till 1981. Since 1981, opposition parties have been represented in the parliament, yet PAP continues to be the governing party.¹¹² PAP was headed by Lee Kuan Yew from independence through 1990s, currently his son Lee Hsien Loong leads the party.¹¹³

The political system of Singapore is parliamentary republic, whereby the Prime Minister of Singapore is the head of government, and of a single-party system. Executive power is exercised by the government. Legislative power is vested in both the government and the Parliament of Singapore. The legislature is the parliament, which consists of the president as its head and a single chamber whose members are elected by popular vote. The role of the president as the head of state has been ceremonial.

3.3. The Context that Gave way to Prioritization of Security

Singaporean government has adopted security first approach under certain internal and external circumstances that gave way to the prioritization of security and stability. Trying to establish independence with the experience of security-centered system of the colonial rule, Cold War environment in which Western powers have put premium on security and stability of the country and the regime due to their strategic and economic interests, concurrent need to political and economic development and security building and multiethnic structure of the society created a context that led rulers to perform security-centered policies. Moreover, successful economic development and lack of political opposition strengthened the ruling

¹¹² Seah Chee Meow, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 239

¹¹³ Marco Verweij and Riccardo Pelizzo, 2009, "Singapore: Does Authoritarianism Pay?", *Journal of Democracy*, 20 (2), p. 18

elite's position with regard to security first approach, while Asian values debate provided the moral base of this understanding.

3.3.1. Legacy of Colonialism

It is argued that the colonial system in Singapore, even its most benevolent phases, had been highly authoritarian and put security and stability to the centre.¹¹⁴ Singapore has retained and enhanced various illiberal laws, including provisions allowing detention without trial, a licensing system for press, discretionary registration of societies, from the colonial administration and nurtured a post-colonial culture that held stability and efficiency to be central, and many principles of democracy, peripheral.¹¹⁵

3.3.2. Cold War Environment

Singapore's authoritarian regime is argued to be largely the product of the Cold War. The island was an essential element of Western defence in the region and "a buttress against the fall of the dominoes". Both the U.S. and Britain supported rise of Singapore's state power and promoted the country as an ideal model of Third World economic and political development, where "a strong and enlightened government provided the necessary political stability for industrialization".¹¹⁶ From the perspective of the U.S. and West, establishment of security and order was important to provide a stable environment for foreign investments, which in turn

¹¹⁴ Gordon P. Means, 1996, "Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore", *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (4), p. 104

¹¹⁵ Cherian George, 2007, "Consolidating Authoritarian Rule: Calibrated Coercion in Singapore", *The Pacific Review*, 20 (2), p. 128; Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change The Democratization Process in Singapore" in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, p. 117

¹¹⁶ Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", pp. 6, 30

was significant for economic development. And economic development played a key role in avoiding the progress of communism in the region.

Yun-han claims that “the bipolar peace of East Asia reflects the ability of China and the U.S. to dominate local powers in their respective spheres”.¹¹⁷ The U.S. and West with their strategic interests in mind, were slow or even reluctant to exercise their political and economic power to promote democratic change among their security allies during the Cold War years and they tolerated authoritarian regimes to sustain key Cold War security partners.¹¹⁸

3.3.3. Urgency of Survival

Survival argument is largely used by the Singaporean government for persuading people in the need of security and political stability as the most important requirements of economic development, which is the only trajectory for survival. After its sudden expulsion from Malaysia, the survival of Singapore as an independent state became the dominating concern affecting almost all the government policies. The situation was particularly tense in the 1960s when Indonesia was pursuing its policy of confrontation against Malaysia and Singapore.¹¹⁹ This sense of vulnerability further heightened by geostrategic realities of the country: a tiny, predominantly Chinese island state with larger Malay neighbours and lacking natural resources. This situation increased the country’s dependency on external world for its livelihood.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Chu Yun-han, 2006, “Third-Wave Democratization in East Asia: Challenges and Prospect”, *ASIEN*, 100, p. 12

¹¹⁸ James B. Steinberg, 2008, “A Sound Principle, but Not a Playbook”, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), p. 1359

¹¹⁹ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, “Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion” in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Coercion and Governance: The Declining Political Role of the Military in Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, p. 280

¹²⁰ Alan Chong, 2004, “Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate, 1992-2000: Reflections on an Experiment in Soft Power”, *The Pacific Review*, 17 (1), p. 98

Singh states that for Singapore, a strong economy is more vital than military security for its survival. Yet, security and stability have underpinned Singapore's economic success.¹²¹ Given the dependency on foreign investment, political stability is the key to the country's economic future. Singapore has provided a secure environment for locals and foreigners and gained investors' confidence.¹²² Significance of the political stability in the continued economic growth of the island and its attraction as an investment and business centre also emphasized by Deputy Prime Minister Wong: "Every society needs order to prosper and that even though some foreigners and Singaporeans complained about lack of freedom in Singapore, the country's safety draws foreigners there".¹²³

3.3.4. Multiethnic Society

Modern Singapore has argued to be shaped by ethnic riots, which fostered a premium on order and strong government. Singapore has a multi-ethnic composition of the population, with ethnic Chinese (%75) predominating, followed by ethnic Malays (%14) and ethnic Indians (%8).¹²⁴ Singapore's expulsion from Malaysian federation in 1965, together with its ethnically diverse population divided by race, religion and language in addition to its tiny size, has given its leaders an acute sense of vulnerability, which they believe can be compensated for only through discipline and order.¹²⁵

3.3.5. Asian Values

¹²¹ Bilveer Singh, 2008, "Singapore Success at Home, Challenges from Abroad", *Southeast Asian Affairs*, pp. 315, 317

¹²² Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", pp. 4-7

¹²³ Quoted in Kuok, 2008, "The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?", p. 1412

¹²⁴ Means, 1996, "Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore", p. 103

¹²⁵ George, 2007, "Consolidating Authoritarian Rule: Calibrated Coercion in Singapore", p. 132

The state of Singapore uses the concept of Asian democracy that tend to place greater emphasis on common good rather than individual good.¹²⁶ Asian democracy, quite unlike liberal democracy, is argued to produce the good life and a wholesome society, economic and social progress and a political and social system that is consistent with the values and traditions of newly industrialized countries of East and Southeast Asia.¹²⁷ Individualism and more generally Western culture, is viewed as polluting, descendant and a threat to the island's economic feature. Confucian values instill the discipline necessary for people to work together towards the common good.¹²⁸ The positive concepts of collective interests and collective responsibility, basing on Asian values, against negative concepts of individualism and liberalism are used by elites to support the survival ideology which requires stability and hard working.

3.3.6. Lack of Opposition

It is also vital to note that the absence of a credible opposition party throughout much of Singapore's history has allowed the PAP to adopt a security first approach without worrying too much about having to balance this against political expediencies.¹²⁹

The major opposition Barisan Sosialis Party boycotted 1968 elections and became inactive then. The incompetence of other political parties led PAP to hold all the seats in parliament between 1968-1981 and the overwhelming majority of seats since 1981.¹³⁰ Absence of opposition enabled the PAP to establish its

¹²⁶ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change...", pp. 114-115

¹²⁷ Chang Heng Chee, 1994, "Democracy, Human Rights and Social Justice as Key Factors in Balanced Development", *Round Table*, 329 (1), p. 31

¹²⁸ Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 22

¹²⁹ Kuok, 2008, "The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?", p. 1407

¹³⁰ Seah Chee Meow, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore", p. 239

institutional and ideological hegemony which holds up to today. It was able to stimulate the population behind its ideology of economic pragmatism; that is “resolute drive for economic development as the only strategy for Singapore’s survival as a nation”¹³¹.

3.3.7. Successful Economic Development

With increasing attention paid to economic issues after independence and success on the economic front, the PAP leadership was able to mobilize the nation towards the stated goals of progress and prosperity. The economic transformation has been achieved mostly by the large-scale foreign investment, the inflow of which has become possible due to the safe and politically stable environment.¹³² It is argued that whereas security in Singapore has nurtured rapid increases in GDP, economic development has promoted social stability and further security in turn.¹³³ Increasing wealth and industrialization tend to raise the income of workers and to expand the size of the middle class, thereby giving more people a stake in the existing socioeconomic order.¹³⁴ The successful economic development of the island and rising living standards have helped strengthen the power of the state and support for its security centered policies.¹³⁵

Security first approach was adopted in Singapore within a certain framework shaped by external and internal factors. Experiencing a security-centered colonial rule and the Cold War, a system based on security of the state, maintenance of bipolarity and containment policies, led people to perceive security as the major

¹³¹ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, “Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore” pp. 657-658

¹³² Lim Chong-Yah, 1984, “The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years: A Glimpse” in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 6, 9

¹³³ Kuok, 2008, “The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?”, pp. 1409, 1412

¹³⁴ Chan, 1993, *East Asian Dynamism: Growth, Order and Security in the Pacific Region*, p. 84

¹³⁵ Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, p. 12

attribute and made it easier for rulers to pursue security first approach. Furthermore, the geographical realities of the island and economic difficulties increased the sense of vulnerability, a problem that was believed to be solved through rapid economic growth and development. Yet, it is interesting that the need to economic development was presented as a survival issue and took its place as the major security concern. In addition the solution for development was also based on security, because development was argued to be preceded by security. Former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew purported that “I believe what a country needs to develop is discipline more than democracy. The exuberance of democracy leads to indiscipline and disorderly conduct, which are inimical to development.”¹³⁶ Security is not only shown as a precondition for development, but a premium is put on security over democracy. In this process, not only the context, vulnerabilities of the country and difficulties but the threat perception of rulers have had significant effect. Rising openness and increasing political and social demands of different groups due to the democratization has been perceived as a threat to the stability and economic development of the country and the durability of the existing rule by the ruling elites. Since democratization has been perceived as a destabilizing process and thus a challenge for the security of the country and the regime by the ruling elites, they have rather preferred to retard democratization through use of some restraining measures in political and civil life.

3.4. Prioritization of Security at the Expense of Democracy

Leaders of Singapore portrayed the security world in “dark Hobbesian-like terms” and thus, the newly independent Singapore adopted the “pugnacious image of a

¹³⁶ Former President of Singapore in Halperin, Siegle and Weinstein, 2005, *The Democracy Advantage*, p. 25

poison shrimp, small not invulnerable but certainly no pushover”.¹³⁷ This led to a strong emphasis on building a credible military deterrent, which was evidenced by the introduction of national service for all young males, after Singapore’s separation from the Malaysian Federation. Within a short period of time, a full-fledged citizens’ army; Singaporean Armed Forces (SAF) have been formed.¹³⁸ Singapore has not faced an obvious territorial aggression from any of its neighbours since its confrontation with Indonesia in the late 1960s. However the concern of the PAP government over the security of the country has not been reduced. Government constantly reminded the public the fragility of order. Even in the national education programs, interconnectedness of security to survival and success of the country is consistently appealed.¹³⁹

Leaders saw the SAF strictly as a military or hard-security deterrent that complemented other soft-security deterrents. Other than the armed forces, the “Total Defence” strategy also emphasized the restructuring and empowering civil management and oversight agencies. Total defence strategy base on the belief that Singapore can survive a war only if the entire society, not just military, is prepared and ready for defence. It encompasses physiological (citizen's commitment to the nation and confidence in the future of the country), economic (economy’s resistance against crisis and war situations), civil (civil management in cases of emergency) and social (harmony in multiracial society) defence.¹⁴⁰ Therefore, total defence has shaped not only the security sector in the country but also other sectors as well. Moreover, self-reliance in defence is argued to be sought not only for self-esteem and

¹³⁷ See Seng Tan and Alvin Chew, 2008, “Governing Singapore’s Security Sector: Problems, Prospects and Paradox”, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 30 (2), pp. 248-249

¹³⁸ Lim Chong-Yah, 1984, “The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years...”, p. 9

¹³⁹ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, “Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion” in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Coercion and Governance: The Declining Political Role of the Military in Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University press, p. 280

¹⁴⁰ *Total Defence*, <http://www.ne.edu.sg/fiveaspects.htm>

prestige but also for the concern that unless the government was able to demonstrate its ability to defend itself against potential enemies, it would not be able to inspire the confidence of foreign investors.¹⁴¹

In the case of Singapore, security has been understood as state and military-centric, including country's capability in defending its values and the internal stability that enables the necessary environment for the realization of the core interests, foremost of which is survival. In this understanding, stability and order have been presented as more important than civil rights and citizens' security. Since the party integrated with the state, security of the state covers the security of the PAP. It can be argued that the PAP government's security concerns in the name of survival might conceivably influence the ways problems are perceived and policies are formulated. Nevertheless, to maintain a stable environment for foreign investment, not only the political opposition but also civil society was pressurized, ethnic groups and media were controlled and working and middle classes were reclaimed through the incorporation into the state. While elections and economic development were presented as bases of legitimacy of the PAP rule, Asian values and meritocracy arguments used to prioritize social order over individual rights.

3.5. Implications of Security First Understanding on Democracy

The leaders of PAP successfully convinced Singaporeans of the urgency of the survival issue. The argument about the total dependence of the island to foreign investment was emphasized by the rulers, basing on country's smallness and lack of natural resources. A safe and politically stable environment was the precondition of being attractive for foreign investors. According to this argument PAP would be a

¹⁴¹ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, "Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion", p. 281

good government, providing stability and security and promoting employment.¹⁴² However, security first understanding gave way to the formulation of undemocratic policies and degradation of political and civil rights. Alan Chong argues that Singapore's bureaucrats are driven by the survival ideology and public political culture became nationalized into this ideology through two measures:

First, the ordinary citizen civic groups, trade unions and other cultural associations were encouraged to identify with a para-political grassroots network both to provide feedback and ideas for government policies. Second, there was effective political communication on communitarian solidarity through the commercially consolidated pro-government local media.¹⁴³

3.5.1. Political Restrictions in the Name of Survival

To maintain a stable environment for trade and foreign investment, political opposition and social behaviour were coerced by the threat of anti-disorder legislation, as well as legal proceedings, to avoid activities such as strikes, riots, mass protest, street crime and excessive individualism.¹⁴⁴ This helped to maintain a stable polity within which development-friendly policies could be implemented which, in turn, won the party the popular mandate it needed to rule with a firm hand.¹⁴⁵ George purports that "Singapore's political stability belies important shifts in coercive strategy, which may help to account for the endurance of the PAP. Part of the PAP's success formula has been its ability to choose the right tools of repression for the right job".¹⁴⁶

Another example to the political restrictions in the name of survival is that due to the crisis with Malaysia on 1963-65, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew asked

¹⁴² Seah Chee Meow, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore", p. 240

¹⁴³ Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...", p. 99

¹⁴⁴ Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...", p. 99

¹⁴⁵ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change...", p. 118

¹⁴⁶ Cherian George, 2007, "Consolidating Authoritarian Rule: Calibrated Coercion in Singapore", *The Pacific Review*, 20 (2), p. 128

Singaporeans to give the PAP a sweeping mandate for strong and decisive rule unencumbered by a parliamentary opposition or public debate over contentious issues. Gordon Means claims that by this way parliamentary institutions provided the legitimatizing rituals for the exercise of the authoritarian rule. “Thus the PAP, which clamored for democracy and human rights when it was founded in 1954 had by the 1970s become the champion of authoritarian powers and institutions inherited from colonialism.”¹⁴⁷

3.5.2. Restrictions on Ethnic Groups and Languages

Faced with serious ethnic riots in July and September 1964 and ethnic clashes in 1969 following the outbreak of riots in Malaysia after its general election, the government of Singapore chose to place priority on achieving security over the rights and freedoms of ethnic groups. Every Singaporean or permanent resident is required to have an ethnicity. The government encourages community self-help organizations, in which community is drawn around the boundaries of the three official races and in dealing with sensitive, ethnically related matters, relies on ethnic leaders for feedback and advice, holding regular consultations with them. Every Singaporean or permanent resident is required to have an ethnicity. The state’s policy of using ethnicity as a primary label of social identification and as the main form of socio-cultural classification furthers the authoritarian culture and social character of the country.¹⁴⁸

According to Hiang Khng, the government’s sense of vulnerability against ideological threat of communism was enhanced by the emotional pull that a

¹⁴⁷ Gordon P. Means, 1996, “Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore”, *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (4), p. 106

¹⁴⁸ Eric C. Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, *Centre of Southeast Asian Studies*, Working Paper 78, p. 24; Lynn Kuok, 2008, “The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?”, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1407-1408

Marxist-ruled China had on Chinese Singaporeans, particularly students in the Chinese-language secondary schools. This problem was further complicated by “a resentful mood among this Chinese-educated community that they were being marginalized in a society which was run by English-speaking elite who were, at best, indifferent and at worst, hostile to the needs of Chinese education in Singapore”. In order to neutralize such an allegation of disruptive forces the PAP where necessary, made use of authoritarian methods, such as the discretionary detention of political opponents and imposing a strict censorship regime on the media and other means of public expression.¹⁴⁹ While in 1959, a small group of English-speaking Singaporeans were lectured upon, in 1984 nearly all schools have voluntarily become English-medium schools. The emphasis on the importance of the English language by the government together with the concern of economic interest by the parents has resulted in a drastic switch of student enrolment from the vernacular schools to English schools.¹⁵⁰

Laothamatas states that the PAP government succeeds in deterring opposition efforts from destabilizing its rule and interfering in the Singaporean political system because it has well demonstrated to the “ethnic Chinese that it, and only it could safeguard their interest in a sea of Malayness which is their neighbouring countries. On the other hand, it has shown to the ethnic Malays that it is always prepared to move resolutely to control the ethnic Chinese chauvinistic

¹⁴⁹ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, “Economic Development and Political Change The Democratization Process in Singapore” in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, p. 118

¹⁵⁰ Lim Chong-Yah, 1984, “The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years: A Glipmse” in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 7; S. J. Peter Chen, 1984, “Social Change and Planning in Singapore” in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 326-329

demands on language and culture at their cost”.¹⁵¹ To break the political power of Malays, the PAP government introduced ethnic quotas in public estates in 1989. By this way it ensured that Malays would not form a majority in any constituencies and could not affect the victory of PAP in elections.¹⁵²

3.5.3. Restrictions on Civil Society and Media

Singapore is characterized by a centralized power structure and a closed and elitist policy-making structure dominated by the PAP. The PAP regime permits no opposition from interest groups outside the parliament and presides over control of local media and the regulation of foreign news publications. Accountability administered through civil society organizations is something that the PAP is especially averse to. As the PAP sees it, it is through the institutions of parliament and elections that democratic accountability is enacted.¹⁵³ Political debate is channeled through government-control agencies or officially registered political parties, though these do not have the same opportunities as the ruling party. Seriously anti-democratic legislations which constraint the political sphere are in place. Singapore’s Internal Security Act upholds a series of constraints on civil activities while the Societies Act requires regularly meeting groups of more than ten people to register formally with the Registrar of Societies, moreover prohibits such registered organizations to engage in most forms of political activity.¹⁵⁴ Singapore’s civil society is further circumscribed by so-called out-of-bound markers on political

¹⁵¹ Anek Laothamatas, 1997, “Development and Democratization A Theoretical Introduction with Reference to the Southeast Asian And East Asian Cases” in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, p. 13

¹⁵² Eric C. Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, *Centre of Southeast Asian Studies*, Working Paper 78, p. 19

¹⁵³ Garry Rodan, 2009, “Accountability and Authoritarianism: Human Rights in Malaysia and Singapore”, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39 (2), pp. 192-193

¹⁵⁴ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, “Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore” *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 658

commentary and activity. Government steers civil movements into its own group of state-related organizations. This forms part of a wider trend of the PAP absorbing greater segments of domestic society to identify and associate with itself.¹⁵⁵

The PAP regime aims to extend political control beyond the institutional and non-institutional forms, through the positive concepts of collective interests and collective responsibility, basing on Asian values, against negative concepts of individualism and liberalism.¹⁵⁶ By this way civil society is reduced to one of which is defined and determined by the competition of rights between individuals and all state interventions are justified as preemptive actions for ensuring collective well-being and measures of good government rather than abuses of individual rights.¹⁵⁷ Strict laws, privileging societal over individual (or group) rights, such as the Internal Security Act (ISA) and Miscellaneous Offences Rules (MOR) strictly enforced. ISA, initially introduced to combat communism and then justified on the basis that Singapore does not have laws to deal with racial or religious extremism, allows for a person to be detained without trial. MOR require a permit to be taken out for any public assembly or procession of five or more persons in any public place on the basis that a large group of people who gather for a peaceful purpose can turn violent.¹⁵⁸

Singapore is also criticized for the suppression of media freedom, defamation suits to silence critics and curbs on public assembly. Newspapers are

¹⁵⁵ Christopher M. Dent, 2002, *The Foreign Economic Policies of Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 117-118; S. J. Peter Chen, "Social Change and Planning in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), 1984, *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 326-328

¹⁵⁶ Garry Rodan, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", *Asia Research Centre*, Working Paper 131, p. 17

¹⁵⁷ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 663; Seah Chee Meow, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, 1984, p. 245

¹⁵⁸ Lynn Kuok, 2008, "The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1407-1408

privately owned but the selection of editors, the sale of shares, and the appointment of boards of directors all require government approval.¹⁵⁹ The control of the media is less visible and therefore harder to pin down. Censorship in Singapore is exercised more by informal advice and such a law ensures that the advice is taken seriously.¹⁶⁰ Government uses financial penalties and restrictions rather than direct censorship, to control the foreign media, including journalists and political commentators. PAP leaders have used libel suits against critics in both the domestic opposition and the foreign press.¹⁶¹ According to Lee Kuan Yew, “[f]reedom of the press, freedom of the news media, must be subordinated to the overriding needs of Singapore and to the primacy of purpose of an elected government”. The Singapore government has allowed the press just enough autonomy to preserve a modicum of credibility, and through the regulatory restrictions and commercial constraints creates a self-censorship system.¹⁶²

3.5.4. Incorporation of Working and Middle Classes into the State

The domestic economy is controlled by government linked companies and statutory authorities, and this made many Singaporeans, directly or indirectly, dependent on the state for access to housing, employment, business contracts and personal savings. Given its structural power to either reward or punish citizens, the capacity

¹⁵⁹ Chee Soon Juan, “2001, Pressing For Openness in Singapore”, *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (2), pp. 160, 164

Garry Rodan, 2009, “Accountability and Authoritarianism: Human Rights in Malaysia and Singapore”, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39 (2), p. 198

¹⁶⁰ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, “Economic Development and Political Change The Democratization Process in Singapore” in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, p. 122

¹⁶¹ Gordon P. Means, 1996, “Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore”, *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (4), pp. 110-111

¹⁶² In Cherian George, 2007, “Consolidating Authoritarian Rule: Calibrated Coercion in Singapore”, *The Pacific Review*, 20 (2), pp. 133, 135

of the ruling party for political cooption has also been strengthened.¹⁶³ Government is the largest employer of labour. People think in terms of social obligations rather than just their individual rights when faced with issues of participation and decision making. Hence, fear plays an important role in both the working and middle classes' relationship with the state.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, potential personal costs are weighed against the relatively good material life that Singaporeans continue to enjoy under the PAP regime. Thus the middle class is cooperative with the regime than against it.¹⁶⁵

With independent labour having been controlled, this form of state capitalism has comprehensively undermined other alternative potential bases of power outside the state by either domestic business or middle classes. The outcome is not just weakened formal political opponents but also a near elimination of civil society. To the extent that civil society exists at all, its actors are extremely fragmented and lacking the capacity for collective action.¹⁶⁶ Incorporation of the working and middle classes into the state, through various forms of social and economic dependence on the state, created political vulnerability on domestic business and citizens and affected the nature of independent social bases from which political movements can draw.¹⁶⁷

3.5.5. Hindering Opposition

¹⁶³ Seah Chee Meow, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 244, 250

¹⁶⁴ Eric C. Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", *Centre of Southeast Asian Studies*, Working Paper 78, p. 25

¹⁶⁵ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), pp. 660-662

¹⁶⁶ Garry Rodan, 2009, "Accountability and Authoritarianism: Human Rights in Malaysia and Singapore", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39 (2), p. 192

¹⁶⁷ Garry Rodan and Kanishka Jayasuriya, 2009, "Capitalist Development, Regime Transition and New Forms of Authoritarianism in Asia", *The Pacific Review*, 22 (1), p. 24

The PAP, governing the country since independence, was supposed to be mass-based, multiracial and democratic political party, consisting of both nationalists and communists, with the sole objective of ending colonial rule. It was a marriage in 1954 of temporary political convenience, born out of the struggle for independence. On the one hand it compromised the well-organized leftist and nationalist grassroots organizations. On the other hand it involved English-educated middle class nationalists such as Lee Kuan Yew. The executive of the PAP was for the time being largely controlled by Lee Kuan Yew's faction that exploited this advantage to reform the party structure to further centralize power in their hands before the 1959 election for self-government and to intimidate their opponents.¹⁶⁸ The counter-democratic trends are argued to emerge soon after the initial flourish of post independence pluralism. The leaders of the PAP understood that some form of electoral mandate was needed for the legitimacy to govern. Yet for them good governance was defined more by its efficiency at solving problems rather than democratic requirements of checks and balances.¹⁶⁹ In its drive for absolute political dominance, PAP used many undemocratic policies to suppress opposition. Among these were detention without trial, deregistration and replacement of radical unions with compliant ones, withdrawal of license from newspapers deemed to be opposed to national interests, political re-education of civil servants to reduce the independence of the civil service and bind it to the government's agenda.¹⁷⁰ Choo purports that the need to control has been fundamental to PAP's political culture

¹⁶⁸ Ow Chin Hock, 1984, "Singapore: Past, Present and Future" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 367; Garry Rodan, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", *Asia Research Centre*, Working Paper 131, p. 6

¹⁶⁹ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change The Democratization Process in Singapore" in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, p. 119

¹⁷⁰ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 657

since independence, including regulating many aspects of social life, and naturally the government is reluctant to change the foundations of this system.¹⁷¹

According to Hiang Khng, for an individual, being a political opposition can be a risky activity in Singapore where the state is pervasive in every sphere of social life. It is possible to say that one's livelihood is directly or indirectly tied to the functions of some state agencies. Besides, in its determination to stay in power, the PAP keeps a close watch on the activities and words of members of opposition parties. Recent political history contains several instances of members of opposition parties being successfully prosecuted for violating tax laws or sued by PAP leaders for defamation.¹⁷² Under the PAP, Singapore's governance has been highly successful in terms of securing peace, security and economic success. However the PAP government is viewed as being rather intolerant of political criticism and with the exception of the period prior to and during elections, as restricting the space for the organized political opposition.¹⁷³ Although general elections have been held every four or five years, the PAP has continuously occupied nearly every parliamentary seat. Those who run or vote for parties other than the PAP are discouraged, disadvantaged and punished in variety of ways: the jailing and bankrupting of opposition leaders; the engineered sacking of critical commentators; the withholding of state funds from opposition wards and the redrawing of their boundaries; the manipulation of election schedules to deprive the opposition of time to campaign; the restriction of political debate of officially registered parties; the

¹⁷¹ Stephen Choo, 2005, "Developing an Entrepreneurial Culture in Singapore: Dream or Reality", *Asian Affairs*, 36 (3), p. 361

¹⁷² Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), pp. 660-662

¹⁷³ Bilveer Singh, 2008, "Singapore Success at Home, Challenges from Abroad", *Southeast Asian Affairs*, p. 319

placement of ambiguous limits on any form of public discourse; the curtailing of media coverage of opposition parties and so on.¹⁷⁴

3.5.6. Use of Elections as the Base of the Legitimacy

The fundamental basis of PAP's claim to be democratic is that it has always captured state power through elections not otherwise.¹⁷⁵ It won all of the seats in an expanding parliament in the general elections of 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1980 against a handful of inconsequential opposition parties and gave way to a de facto one-party parliamentary system. PAP's share of the popular vote in contested seats declined from 78% in 1980 to 65% in 1997. However, the elections of 2001 saw the party's share of the popular vote climb to 75%. Singapore general election, 2006 marked the first time since 1988 the PAP did not return to power on nomination day, with the opposition parties fielding candidates in over half of the constituencies.¹⁷⁶ Joshua B. Jeyaretnam of the Workers' Party became the first alternative party member of parliament in fifteen years (last time Barisan Sosialis Party represented in the parliament between 1966-1968) when he won a 1981 by-election. Despite getting an increasing percentage of the popular vote, 34% overall in 2006, alternative parties gained small numbers of seats in the general elections. The opposition parties attribute the disproportionate results to the nature of the group representation constituency (GRC) electoral system.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Marco Verweij and Riccardo Pelizzo, 2009, "Singapore: Does Authoritarianism Pay?", *Journal of Democracy*, 20 (2), p. 19

¹⁷⁵ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 656

¹⁷⁶ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change The Democratization Process in Singapore" in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, pp. 115-126

¹⁷⁷ Constituencies of Singapore are electoral divisions which may be represented by single or multiple seats in the Parliament of Singapore. Constituencies are classified as single member constituency (SMC) and GRC for single-seat constituency and multiple-seat constituency, respectively. In 1988, PAP amended the Parliamentary Elections Act to create GRCs and to move

Rodan depicts Singapore as a “façade electoral regime” where electoral institutions exist but yield no meaningful contestation for power. Elections are argued to be retained and viewed as functional for the purposes of political legitimacy.¹⁷⁸ Their retention also reflected the specific historical circumstances out of which the party came to power, a process in which the PAP championed the case for free elections. Although the PAP’s English-educated middle class leaders have weakened political pluralism, they have insisted, especially to international audiences, that electoral competition is free and fair.¹⁷⁹ The PAP has drawn upon the legitimating power of elections; however coercion remains one of the pillars of PAP dominance. George claims that “[t]he array of repressive tools at the government’s disposal remains large. What has changed in time is the manner in which those tools are used. There has been a shift from more spectacular punishments, such as imprisonment, towards more behind-the-scenes controls”.¹⁸⁰

3.5.7. Economic Development as the Other Base of Legitimacy

The successful economic development of the island and rising living standards have helped strengthen the power of the state and the legitimacy of the party.¹⁸¹ The case of Singapore according to Laothamatas, shows that economic success does not automatically or easily usher in a democratic era. On the contrary, a booming economy and happy workers probably created the most suitable condition for the PAP to intensify its strategy for depoliticizing society. Efficiency and effectiveness

away from the single member constituency system. Gordon P. Means, 1996, “Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore”, *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (4), p. 107

¹⁷⁸ Garry Rodan and Kanishka Jayasuriya, 2009, “Capitalist Development, Regime Transition and New Forms of Authoritarianism in Asia”, *The Pacific Review*, 22 (1), p. 25

¹⁷⁹ Garry Rodan, 2006, “Singapore ‘Exceptionalism’? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation”, *Asia Research Centre*, Working Paper 131, p. 9

¹⁸⁰ Cherian George, 2007, “Consolidating Authoritarian Rule...”, p. 133

¹⁸¹ Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, p. 12

were central values for PAP, not democratic principles.¹⁸² Singapore's case is employed by those defending the need to postpone the introduction of liberal democracy until sustained economic growth has been achieved and security prevails.¹⁸³

The PAP recognized early that without substantial improvements in the social and economic conditions of Singaporeans no amount of repression or ideological rhetoric could guarantee power. According to Deputy Prime Minister Tong, liberal democracy would result in the destabilization of the island's political system and therefore threaten the country's economic viability.¹⁸⁴ The PAP government had promoted the idea of a trade-off between political liberty and economic and social development. Expansive social and economic roles by the state included major public investments in education and public housing.¹⁸⁵ Increasing wealth and industrialization tend to raise the income of workers and to expand the size of the middle class, thereby giving more people a stake in the existing socioeconomic order.¹⁸⁶ The trade-off for the majority is improved material life for some losses in civil and political liberties.

3.5.8. Meritocracy Principle

Lee Kuan Yew's one of the statements in 1971, shows the importance of meritocracy in the PAP ideology:

Singapore is a meritocracy. And these men have risen to the top by their own merit, hard work, and high performance. Together they are a closely-knit and coordinated hard core. If all 300 were to crash in one jumbo jet,

¹⁸² Anek Laothamatas, 1997, "Development and Democratization A Theoretical Introduction with Reference to the Southeast Asian And East Asian Cases" in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, p. 17

¹⁸³ Verweij and Pelizzo, 2009, "Singapore: Does Authoritarianism Pay?", p. 19

¹⁸⁴ Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 23

¹⁸⁵ Garry Rodan, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", *Asia Research Centre*, Working Paper 131, p. 8

¹⁸⁶ Steve Chan, 1993, *East Asian Dynamism: Growth, Order and Security in the Pacific Region*, p. 84

then Singapore would disintegrate. That shows how small the base is for our leadership in politics, economic and security. We have to, and we will, enlarge this base, enlarging the number of key digits.¹⁸⁷

The PAP insists that the employment of cohesive and similarly endowed elites is what secures good governance and economic and social prosperity. For Paul, in Singapore there is a social contract wherein the “people put their trust in those who know better because they are better educated and have proven their competence; in return people gain good governance, protection, high living standards and political stability”.¹⁸⁸ The ideology of meritocracy bases on the idea that rewards are dealt out according to merit rather than ethnic membership, and this provides the general framework of equality.¹⁸⁹ However, it is argued that “political accountability reform agendas involving institutional check and balances on power are an anathema to a deeply held PAP ideological conviction central to its justification of one-party state: the myth of meritocracy.”¹⁹⁰

3.6. Some Opening Up

Due to the decrease in the PAP votes in 1984 and 1991 elections, the PAP government has become more responsive to popular demands. It introduced the “Nominated MP” scheme in which selected individuals are appointed rather than elected, to parliament as independent voices. A “Feedback Unit” has been instituted to organize regular closed-door policy discussions with invited individuals. Yet all these openings were limited. The government had responded to these civil society

¹⁸⁷ Lee Kuan Yew quoted in Garry Rodan, 2009, “Accountability and Authoritarianism: Human Rights in Malaysia and Singapore, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39 (2), pp. 192

¹⁸⁸ Paul, 1992, “Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore”, p. 23

¹⁸⁹ Kuok, 2008, “The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?”, p. 1408

¹⁹⁰ Rodan, 2009, “Accountability and Authoritarianism...”, pp. 191

activities in ways that it hopes will not jeopardize its continuing legitimacy.¹⁹¹ These new institutions are argued to be developed for promoting non-democratic notions of representation and permitting very selective types of conflict into the political process.¹⁹² According to Heng Khng, the regime's response to this political challenge has been a change of governing style which places more emphasis on consultation with and feedback from the electorate than it used to. However, another equally important component of this political renovation effort was the use of the party's considerable experience and power to pre-empt and control dissidence so that they do not undermine the fundamentals of a dominant party system.¹⁹³ The PAP government has regarded maintenance of this dominance as a condition for the good economic performance that is crucial for its legitimacy. This is parallel to an ideology that whatever features the system takes on by way of liberalization and concessions to opponents would have to be within its limiting framework.¹⁹⁴ Rodan claims that through such opening up it is not the political space of civil society but that of the PAP state that is expanding. "Ironically, even if political participation is on the increase, political pluralism is not. New forms of political participation exclude collective, independent attempts to challenge the PAP."¹⁹⁵

Hence, commitment to democracy has been in the minimalist procedural way of holding elections and giving concessions to dissidents in order to legitimize the regime. In addition, a kind of "custodial approach towards lifestyle and culture" (for

¹⁹¹ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), p. 659-660

¹⁹² Garry Rodan and Kanishka Jayasuriya, 2009, "Capitalist Development, Regime Transition and New Forms of Authoritarianism in Asia", *The Pacific Review*, 22 (1), pp. 30

¹⁹³ Heng Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change...", p. 135

¹⁹⁴ Verweij and Pelizzo, 2009, "Singapore: Does Authoritarianism Pay?", pp. 19-20

¹⁹⁵ Rodan, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", p. 4

example, banning of certain pop songs and long hair) also signaled a limited acceptance of democratic rights such as freedom of expression.¹⁹⁶

3.7. Conclusion

Singaporean government has adopted security first approach after it gained independence, during the Cold War, as a small island state, with a multiracial society and without natural resources. The primacy of the need for security and stability has kept a rather authoritarian government in place and although Singaporean society is opening up to accommodate more rights associated with liberal democracy, this has not been allowed to occur at the expense of security.¹⁹⁷ The political culture of Singapore is argued to become “a subject culture” because of the strong belief in the importance of stability for the sake of ensuring survival.¹⁹⁸

Singapore’s vulnerability as a small territory lacking of natural resources compared to its relatively larger neighbors in Southeast Asia and its total dependency on the external world for its livelihood provided the politicians a good reason in convincing Singaporeans of the urgency of the survival issue.¹⁹⁹ Through the sense of vulnerability and survival ideology the necessity for the country to an effective defence capability has been highlighted. From the point of the PAP government, in order “to survive in an unfriendly world, a small, weak and exposed Singapore must become robust, rugged and self-reliant, especially in its defence capability”.²⁰⁰ Dependency on foreign investment has kept the significance of security and social stability. Singaporean politicians provide a safe home for locals and foreigners,

¹⁹⁶ Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, “Economic Development and Political Change...”, p. 117

¹⁹⁷ Kuok, 2008, “The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?”, p. 1412

¹⁹⁸ Seah Chee Meow, 1984, “Political Change and Continuity in Singapore”, p. 240

¹⁹⁹ Alan Chong, 2004, “Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...”, p. 98

²⁰⁰ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, “Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion”, p. 280

without which Singapore would easily lose investors' confidence.²⁰¹ The survival ideology has also been heightened due to the security-centered conjecture of the Cold War system, which presents military security of the state as the most important value. Besides, for the U.S., Singapore's economic and political development was "a bastion against communism's progress in Southeast Asia".²⁰²

Therefore, it is possible to argue that both the domestic and international juncture supported the adoption of security first approach. The Singaporean elites evolved their survival ideology on economic prosperity assumption. Rapid economic development and growth, which were dependent upon foreign investment, were presented as the only way of surviving. And for attracting foreigners there was need to a socially and politically stable environment in addition to an effective defence capability. In Singapore, the survival mentality encompasses not only military and economic sectors but also all other sections of life, because the total defence strategy includes physiological, societal and civil defence in addition to economic and military defence. Furthermore, significance of the survival issue has been kept on the public agenda through the use of media and the education programs, although the country has not faced a real threat or aggression from its neighbours. Asian values, emphasizing common good and order rather than individual rights, was utilized as the moral base of survival ideology. Lack of effective opposition and the successful economic development have further strengthened the PAP government's position regarding prioritizing security and survival issues. The internal and external context that gave way to the prioritization of security have at the same time resulted in the increase of PAP's power and control over all sectors. Yong explains gradual

²⁰¹ Bilveer Singh, 2008, "Singapore Success at Home, Challenges from Abroad", pp. 315-317; Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", pp. 4-7

²⁰² Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 6

enhancement of the PAP dominance over Singaporean political, economic and social life:

With virtually no credible political opposition since the eclipse of the Barisan Socialis in the late 1960s, the PAP's grip on political power in Singapore has been total and absolute. This political dominance has been enabled the PAP government to consolidate its control over every aspect of state and society in Singapore. Over the years, with its emphasis on economic development the PAP government moved to depoliticize Singapore by moving political debate from political arena into the bureaucracy and systematically building an administrative state. Under these conditions, civil servants began playing an increasingly dominant role in managing state and society. Indeed, the integration between political leadership and civil service was such that the latter became the principal recruiting ground for political leadership.²⁰³

As argued by Heng Khng, a democratization exercise involves renegotiating a new contract of power between a governing regime and the governed. This renegotiating process requires changes to what constitutes legitimacy in the status quo. In the case of Singapore, "the requisite changes should be likened more to a renovation rather than a redefinition of the notion of legitimacy altogether". Economic performance continues to be the primary element of the PAP's legitimacy.²⁰⁴ With rapid economic growth and the expansion of high living standards, people from different segments of the society have stake in the status quo. They accord the government what Means calls "performance legitimacy", issues of the regime's commitment to democracy or to civil and human rights receive little attention from the citizens.²⁰⁵

The PAP born out of the struggle for independence as a pluralist party, consisting people from different segments of society, having different political views, with different races. However, the undemocratic policies emerged soon after the post independence pluralism. The section leaded by Lee Kuan Yew changed the party

²⁰³ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, "Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion", pp. 279-280

²⁰⁴ Heng Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change...", p. 135

²⁰⁵ Means, 1996, "Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore", p. 114

structure to centralize power in their hands just before the 1959 election and started to limit the power of their opponents.²⁰⁶ The leaders of the PAP was aware of the need for the legitimacy to govern, although for them good governance was defined more by its effectiveness at solving problems rather than checks and balances. It used regular elections as a way of providing legitimacy, but the most crucial factor to the success of PAP government is the rapid economic development and its positive impact on the peoples' life. PAP presented political stability as the pre-condition for future economic growth and development, which is the only way to survival. As suggested by the Asian values debate, it has put premium on common good and order over liberty and democracy, and through economic development, it has managed to incorporate the different segments of the society to the system. Moreover the strong-handed PAP government, enjoying to a certain extent legitimacy has controlled the political challenge with its effective measures designed to restrain its political opponents.²⁰⁷

The causes that gave way to the prioritization of security were utilized by the PAP government to set its dominance over all segments of life in Singapore and to prolong this dominance. PAP has developed a system in which rules and conventions constrained the growth of both the opposition parties and civil society. In this system, PAP's approach is to democratize to a level where it is not politically destabilizing. It is predictable that PAP will continue to set a political agenda that ensures its political dominance because no political party can be expected to let its own decline in power.

²⁰⁶ Ow Chin Hock, 1984, "Singapore: Past, Present and Future" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, p. 367; Rodan, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", p. 6

²⁰⁷ Laothamatas, 1997, "Development and Democratization...", p. 15

CHAPTER IV

THE CASE OF AZERBAIJAN

4.1. Introduction

Azerbaijan gained its independence in 1991 by the collapse of the Soviet Union. At the time, the arguments regarding the victory of the liberal democracy and democratization of the states in the post-Soviet arena rose high. The turmoil caused by the disintegration of the Soviet Union, heightened by the outbreak of military conflicts both between and within the states in the Soviet geography. The establishment of Azerbaijani independence was accompanied with the disastrous developments of the war between Azerbaijan and Armenia in Upper-Karabakh. Azerbaijani state faced the challenge of securing a place while trying to develop democracy. Facing the double challenges of security and democratization, ruling elites of Azerbaijan have pursued security-centered policies. It is an interesting case, because it provides a chance to study security first approach on a developing country and answer the questions regarding the objective and subjective dimensions of the emergence and continuation of such an understanding, and influence of this understanding on the democratization process.

This chapter aims to understand the causes that gave way to the prioritization of security and impact of the security first understanding on the process of democratization in Azerbaijan, as a developing and modernizing country. Here the

assumptions of security first approach -priorities should be clarified in line with available resources, U.S. should work with those not liberal but against use of violence and terror and democracy would develop after security is maintained- will be verified on the case of Azerbaijan. The chapter composes three parts. In the first part, political history and political system of the country are explained briefly to give general information about the case. In the second part, the context and the causes –objective and subjective- that gave way to the prioritization of security are discussed to understand whether just the internal and external context and availability of sources are significant for the prioritization of security or the perception of challenges and threats by the ruling elites. In the third part, implications of security first understanding on democratization process are explored to understand whether maintenance of security and cooperation of Western powers with illiberal but moderate regimes provide the necessary conditions for democracy to develop gradually.

4.2. Political History and the Political System

Azerbaijan, having a brief period of independence between 1918-1920, regained its independence from the former Soviet Union on August 30, 1991, with Ayaz Mutalibov, former First Secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party, becoming the country's first President. Becoming independent under less than ideal and orderly conditions, Azerbaijan was entangled in a devastating war with Armenia over Upper-Karabakh. With the onset of full-scale armed hostilities, “a pattern was established whereby governments in Baku rose or fell as a result of developments on the battlefield.”²⁰⁸ Following a massacre of Azerbaijanis at Khojali in Karabakh in

²⁰⁸ Musabayov, 2005, “The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan”

March 1992, Mutalibov resigned and the country experienced a period of political instability. The old guard returned Mutalibov to power in May 1992, but less than a week later his efforts to suspend scheduled presidential elections and ban all political activity prompted the opposition Popular Front Party (PFP) to organize a resistance movement and take power. Among its reforms, the PFP dissolved the predominantly Communist Supreme Soviet and transferred its functions to the fifty member upper house of the legislature, the National Council.²⁰⁹

Elections on June 7, 1992 resulted in the selection of PFP leader Ebulfez Elçibey as the country's second president. Elçibey's government is widely credited with having laid the basis for democracy in the country. However, his government was incapable of either credibly prosecuting the Upper-Karabakh conflict or managing the economy, moreover many PFP officials came to be perceived as incompetent. Growing discontent resulted in June 1993 in an armed insurrection, led by Colonel Surat Husseninov in Ganja. The rebels advanced on Baku facing any opposition. As a result, President Elçibey fled to his native province of Nakhchivan. The National Council gave presidential powers to its new Speaker, Heydar Aliyev, former First Secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party (1969-81) and later a member of the Soviet Union Politburo, and Soviet Union Deputy Prime Minister (until 1987). Elçibey was formally deposed by a national referendum in August 1993, and Aliyev was elected to a five year term as president in October with only symbolic opposition.²¹⁰ Aliyev preserved the state of emergency instituted under Elçibey, mass demonstrations, marches and meetings were prohibited, and the media were subject to strict censorship. The Karabakh conflict was becoming an

²⁰⁹ Svante E. Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falters in Azerbaijan", *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (2), pp. 118-119

²¹⁰ Thomas Goltz, 1998, *Azerbaijan Diary a Rogue Reporter's Adventures in an Oil-Rich, War-Torn, Post-Soviet Republic*, New York: M. E. Sharpe, pp. 37-73

obstacle to stable development in Azerbaijan. Yet by early 1993 events on the battlefield were pointing to stalemate. Attempts to advance brought devastating losses to both sides. Azerbaijan and Armenia signed a ceasefire agreement in May 1994. The freezing of armed hostilities allowed Azerbaijan to return to a semblance of political normality. The state of emergency was abolished and political activity resumed.²¹¹

In 1994, Surat Huseynov, by that time the prime minister, attempted a military coup against Heydar Aliyev, Huseynov was arrested and charged with treason. In 1995, another coup attempt against Aliyev, by the commander of the military police, Rovshan Javadov, was averted, resulting in the killing of Javadov and dispersing of Azerbaijan's military police. By 1997, Heydar Aliyev was credited both domestically and internationally, with having restored order, succeeded in attracting numerous foreign oil companies to the country, improved Azerbaijan's standing in world affairs and created the foundation of a modern army with Turkey's help.²¹² He won re-election to another five year term in 1998. His power has consolidated over the country and his New Azerbaijan Party (NAP), has enjoyed a comfortable majority in the parliament. In the October 2003 presidential elections, İlham Aliyev, son of Heydar Aliyev and the premier, was elected as the president.²¹³ He was reelected for a second term in 2008 presidential elections.

The political system of Azerbaijan is presidential republic. Executive power is exercised by the president, the government and the national council, whose members are appointed by the president and confirmed by the national assembly.

²¹¹ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

²¹² Pınar Ipek, 2009, "Azerbaijan's Foreign Policy and Challenges for Energy Security", *Middle East Journal*, 63(2), pp. 229-233; Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falter in Azerbaijan", p.121

²¹³ Tadeusz Swietochowski, 1999, "Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads", *Central Asian Survey*, 18 (4), p. 419; DaanVan Der Schriek, 02.02.2003, "Little to Lose: Opposition in Azerbaijan", *Euroasianet*

President is the chief of the state and elected by popular vote to a five year term (eligible for continues terms). Prime minister is the head of the government. Legislative power is vested in the national assembly (Milli Mejlis) whose members are elected by popular vote to serve five year terms.

4.3. The Context that Gave way to Prioritization of Security

Whereas the collapse of the Soviet Union brought about the emergence of many independent states, it also caused chaos in the post-Soviet sphere, especially in Caucasus, that was experienced through military conflict between states, civil wars and changes of governments through military coups. Azerbaijan became independent, while it was dealing with the military conflict with Armenia, as a result the security concerns and military issues became the top priority of the rulers and the society.²¹⁴ Azerbaijani government has adopted security first approach under certain internal and external circumstances that gave way to the prioritization of security and stability. Karabakh conflict has been the major factor of the adoption of security first approach in Azerbaijan. In addition, the seventy years of Soviet rule, the need to stability for economic development and the international actors interests in the region – trying to take the country under their own sphere of influence, reaching the energy resources and securing the energy routes - created a context that led rulers to keep the security and stability concerns on the agenda and perform security-centered policies.

4.3.1. Historical Legacy

²¹⁴ Hikmet Hadjy-Zadeh, 2002, “Civil Control on Armed Forces in Young Nations: The Case of Azerbaijan”, paper presented at *DCAF Conference on Civilians in National Security Policy*

While the Soviet legacy left behind an ethnicized bureaucracy in the South Caucasus, it did not help to develop an institutional framework for popular political participation, because there was no legacy of pluralistic party politics, competitive elections, meaningful parliamentary representations or professional journalism.²¹⁵ Importance of the security of the state and the maintenance of the system and order was the top priority. Besides mentality of the society, which was largely determined by seventy years of Soviet regime, was not used to the new conditions. The notions of democracy such as freedom of speech, human rights, distribution of powers and the system of checks and balances were foreign to the society.²¹⁶

4.3.2. Karabakh Conflict

The “no peace no war” condition between Azerbaijan and Armenia had a devastating impact on all aspects of life. The conflict became an all encompassing, overwhelming issue. Society’s interest in the war was enormous and a greater part of national newspapers was dedicated to the military theme. National security concerns and responding to the immediate needs of a million refugees and the internally displaced population absorbed most available resources.²¹⁷

Azerbaijan had not its own army or military specialists during the Soviet rule, and the military infrastructure developed during Soviet times was rapidly destroyed, following the collapse of the Union. The significance of the military capability was realized by the outbreak of the military conflict with Armenia. Moreover, the patriotic feelings that came to fore by the independence after the long

²¹⁵ Tigran Mkrtchyan, “Democratization and the Conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh”, p. 4

²¹⁶ Levan Alapishvili, “The Civil-Military Relations and Democratic Control on Armed Forces in Caucasus Region: A Comparative Study”

²¹⁷ Nayereh Tohidi, “Women, Democratization and Islam in Post-Soviet Azerbaijan”

period of Soviet dominance, further rose because of the war, and society became ready to make many sacrifices in the name of liberating the invaded territories.²¹⁸

4.3.3. Need to Stability for Economic Development

Azerbaijan, like all the other ex-Soviet republics, faced economic difficulties just after gaining independence. Since its whole economy dependent upon the command economy of the Soviet system, the collapse of the Union disbanded the Azerbaijani economy. The continuous military conflict with Armenia and flow of refugees from the invaded lands to other cities of Azerbaijan further complicated the economic difficulties. The major source of Azerbaijani economy has been energy resources, however it did not its own infrastructure to extract and export the oil and the natural gas. This made Azerbaijani economy dependent upon the foreign investment, which required a stable environment and predictability.²¹⁹ The flow of foreign investment was presented as the only way of economic prosperity and Kuwait's success was used as a remarkable example. Between 1994 and 1998, the Aliyev regime was rightly associated with political and economic stability, which was Azerbaijan's clear priority at the time.²²⁰

4.3.4. Foreign Interest

Oil means large investments which require stability. In September 1994, Azerbaijan signed "the contract of the century" to explore three offshore fields with the BP-led oil consortium, and it made Western countries, led by the U.S., interested in the

²¹⁸ Hadjy-Zadeh, 2002, "Civil Control on Armed Forces in Young Nations: The Case of Azerbaijan"

²¹⁹ Ipek, 2009, "Azerbaijan's Foreign Policy and Challenges for Energy Security", p. 228; Farid Guliyev, 2009, "Oil Wealth, Patrimonialism and the Failure of Democracy in Azerbaijan, *Caucasus Analytical Digest*, pp. 3-4

²²⁰ Alec Rasizade, 2002, "Azerbaijan After a Decade of Independence: Less Oil, More Graft and Poverty", *Central Asian Survey*, 21 (4), p. 363

stability of the region.²²¹ They had increasing economic interests in the Caucasian region, a potentially lucrative and attractive place for foreign direct investment, especially for multinational oil companies. Therefore, conflict resolution should be regarded as a prerequisite for securing energy export routes. Internal political stability is another precondition for the development of energy and infrastructure projects, both of which are vital for the region.²²² As with oil, geopolitical and strategic considerations give outside powers an incentive to place stability and security first in their dealings with Azerbaijan.²²³

Security first approach was adopted in Azerbaijan within a certain framework shaped by external and internal factors. Experiencing a security-centered Soviet rule and trying to establish independence during a war with its neighbour led people to perceive security as the major attribute and made it easier for rulers to pursue security first approach. Furthermore, the situation of the refugees and the displaced persons and economic difficulties increased the sense of vulnerability, a problem that was believed to be solved through economic development, dependent on foreign investment that requires stability. The need to economic development, hence to foreign investment has been linked to security concerns. Security and stability are not only shown as necessary conditions for political and economic development, but a premium is put on security over democracy. In this process, not only the context, vulnerabilities of the country and difficulties faced by people, but the threat perception of rulers have had significant effect. Rising openness and increasing political and social demands of different groups due to the democratization has been perceived as a threat to the success in the battlefield, stability and economic

²²¹ Nassibli, 1999-2000, "Azerbaijan's Geopolitics and Oil Pipeline Issue"

²²² Elkhan Nuriyev, 2007, "EU Policy in the South Caucasus: A View From Azerbaijan", *Centre for European Policy Studies*, Working Paper, No. 272, pp. 3, 7

²²³ Alieva, 2006, "Azerbaijan's Frustrating Elections", pp. 152, 157, 158

development of the country by the rulers. Moreover, the frequent change of governments in subsequent two years challenged the durability of the rule and led a critical worry at the side of ruling elites. Democratization has been perceived as a destabilizing process. Instability on the other hand has been seen as a contributor to the failure at Karabakh conflict and delay in the economic development, in addition to the being a challenge to the longevity of the regime by the ruling elites. This led rulers to retard democratization through use of some restraining measures in political and civil life.

4.4. Prioritization of Security at the Expense of Democracy

The influx of one million refugees from the invaded cities and infrastructural damage caused by the war had a very harsh impact on the society and the economy of Azerbaijan. The region's chronic instability discouraged foreign investors from doing business there and made the task of building pipelines to carry Caspian Sea oil and gas to markets much more difficult. The nationalist upsurge accompanying the conflicts prevented the development of an ideologically defined political system. The conflicts complicated the democratization process and the building of civil society and served as excuses for undemocratic rule. The ceasefire with Armenia provided order and stability to the country. This stability, however came "at the expense of halting the ambitious process of democratization initiated in 1992. For a overwhelming majority of the population, stability was a more urgent concern than democracy".²²⁴

In the case of Azerbaijan, security has been understood as state and military-centric, mainly the country's ability to defend and rescue its invaded territories.

²²⁴ Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falter in Azerbaijan", p. 121

Here internal stability has been the enabling factor, both for military success and political and economic development. In this understanding, stability and security of the state have been presented as more important than peoples' security and democracy. Since stability contributes to the durability of the existing rule, it also adds to the security of the regime.

4.5. Implications of Security First Understanding on Democracy

The 1992 elections, resulted in the selection of Elçibey as the country's second president, is argued to be the one of the freest elections in the post-Soviet sphere. Despite the war, Azerbaijan under PFP developed in a clearly democratic direction. Elçibey's government is widely credited with having laid the basis for democracy in the country.²²⁵ At the beginning of the Aliyev regime, a significant progress was made not only in political and economic stability, but also in democratization process. Significant legislative reform prepared the ground for elections, press censorship was abolished and opposition media functioned, although with difficulty. However, in time the hopes regarding democratization come to an end. As Cornell puts it, “[w]hile Aliyev’s advent to power has brought stability to Azerbaijan, it also put an end to the country’s first democratic experiment.”²²⁶

Heydar Aliyev came to power, after the fled of Elçibey because of an armed insurrection, and faced two military coup attempts in 1994 and 1995. Feeling threatened, the Aliyev regime responded by intensifying its drive toward the centralization of power. “With power at the center unrestrained by internal checks and balances, Azerbaijan all too readily became a ‘superpresidential regime’ in which the ruler and a tiny elite around him monopolized political power and

²²⁵ Goltz, 1998, *Azerbaijan Diary a Rogue Reporter’s Adventures...*, p. 43

²²⁶ Cornell, 2001, “Democratization Falts in Azerbaijan”, pp. 120, 126

national resources.”²²⁷ While Karabakh Conflict has been used for domestic politics to criticize the opponents and keep stability and security concerns on the agenda, military expenditure has been raised rapidly at the expense of social projects, civil society and media has been restricted in the name of survival, elections have been controlled and even rigged by the authorities. In addition, the premium on stability and security over democracy has been consolidated because of the U.S. and other Western countries interest in the security of energy sources and routes. Moreover, the inherent clientelistic relations within the Azerbaijani society and fragmented opposition have made it easier to follow security-centered policies.

4.5.1. Use of Karabakh Conflict for Internal Politics

The continuous military conflict had an immense impact on peoples’ life and the need to stability for both political and economic requirements overshadowed concerns for democratization and political rights. The Karabakh issue, however, has remained on both the regime’s and opposition’s agenda, after the signature of the ceasefire agreement in 1994. It has been mostly used for internal political problems. The conflict was exploited by the authorities to justify harsh measures repressing protest at the conduct of the elections. The regime consistently invoked the need for social stability, claiming that Azerbaijan’s defeat in the war had been due to domestic turmoil.²²⁸ Aliyev regimes used the defeat at war to discredit the former government, now the opposition. It is also used to distract attention from rule of law, human rights and democracy issues the state of which are under international observance and criticism. The conflict has been, and still is, used by political elites

²²⁷ Alieva, 2006, “Azerbaijan’s Frustrating Elections”, p. 148, 153

²²⁸ Musabayov, 2005, “The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan”

as a pretext to limit the rights and freedoms of citizens and delay much needed political and economic reform.²²⁹

The opposition, on the other hand, has presented the Karabakh Conflict as a failure of Aliyev regime. The opposition in Azerbaijan has been less compromise oriented on this issue than the government and has pushed for increased military and political pressure on Armenia.²³⁰ İlham Aliyev's lower levels of legitimacy compared to his father forced him to adopt a more hard-line position in this issue. Aggressive statements about a readiness to resort to force to liberate the occupied territories have been accompanied by a rise in the number of ceasefire violations along the line of contact. Since the current leadership owes its rise to power to "skilful manipulation of popular protest over the handling of the Karabakh issue, and to loud pledges to resolve the conflict quickly and without losses to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Azerbaijan, a retreat from this position would be dangerous and potentially threatening to government's legitimacy."²³¹

Political parties and elites²³² have sought to use the consistent preoccupation of public opinion with the Karabakh issue to their own advantage. Opinion polls focusing on the factors behind continued Azeri-Armenian enmity show the consciousness of public about this exploitation. 34.1 per cent of respondents cited that the deployment of the Karabakh issue by internal political forces in their

²²⁹ International Crisis Group, 14.11.2007, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War", *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187, p. 14

²³⁰ Mkrtchyan, "Democratization and the Conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh", p. 5

²³¹ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

²³² Azerbaijan's political system is characterized by clan struggles and competition between regional elites. As a result an important impact of Karabakh Conflict on the Azerbaijani political arena has been the ascendance in government and business of Azeris displaced from Armenia (Yerazi) and Azeris from the Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan. These Azeris had more contact and direct experience of conflict with Armenians. Although Azeris from Karabakh were and still are well-represented in business and government, the Armenian occupation of Karabakh and the surrounding regions has significantly reduced their economic and political potential. Other regional elites, such as the Baku-Shirvan, Ganja-Kazakh and Mugan-Lankaran groups, have been completely marginalized by the conflict. International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"

struggle for power, while 35.4 per cent cited that the interest of competing world and regional powers have in prolonging the conflict, a factor consistently emphasized in the media.²³³

4.5.2. Rapid Increase in Military Expenditure

When the war was outbreak with Armenia, Azerbaijan had not its own army or military specialists. Therefore the military sector was dealt by volunteers. Yet, by 1997 a modern army was founded by the support of Turkey.²³⁴ However, the unresolved Karabakh Conflict and the priority of security concerns led tremendous militarization and substantial increase in military expenditure in the last few years. This factor has diverted the government from investing more in institutional capacity, education and social issues, infrastructure and renovation.²³⁵ Military expenditure in Azerbaijan has increased by 554 percent in real terms between 1998-2007. The increase was particularly high in 2006, when spending more than doubled.²³⁶ In December 2005 a presidential decree created a ministry for the defence industry responsible for military production and in 2007 the military budget rose to 1.1 billion Dollars as President İlham Aliyev pledged to make it equal to Armenia's entire budget.²³⁷ Azerbaijan's first National Security Concept, signed by Aliyev on May 24, 2008, emphasizes the need to improve the country's defensive capabilities in order to better respond to separatism and regional conflicts.²³⁸

²³³ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

²³⁴ Mehmet Fatih Öztarsu, 17.04.2009, "Azerbaycan ve Türkiye Askeri İlişkileri"(The Military Relations between Azerbaijan and Turkey), *Azerbaycan Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi(Azerbaijan StrategicResearch Center)*

²³⁵ Mkrtchyan, "Democratization and the Conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh", p. 7

²³⁶ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2008, *SIPRI Yearbook 2008: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 185-188

²³⁷ International Crisis Group, 14.11.2007, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War", *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187, p. 12

²³⁸ H. Kaan Nazlı, 2007, *Freedom House: Nations in Transit 2007-Azerbaijan*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers

Azerbaijan staged a major military line in late June 2008, at which Aliyev stated that “we should ready to liberate our territories by military force at any moment.”²³⁹

4.5.3. Distorted Elections

It is argued that the consolidation of Heydar Aliyev’s power over the country and majority of NAP in the parliament became possible in a series of disputed elections, marred by serious irregularities, including ballot-rigging.²⁴⁰ Leila Alieva claims that most of the members of Azerbaijan's 1995 parliament, the first parliament, was selected rather than elected, and thus it enjoyed little confidence among the people.²⁴¹

Just before the 2003 presidential elections, the constitution was changed through thirty nine amendments, and endorsed at a referendum at the end of 2002. The most important amendment is the one that made the premier next in line to the president. Previously the speaker of parliament stood next in line. Local politicians construed that this was done to make it possible for the son of the 80-year old Heydar Aliyev, İlham Aliyev to succeed his father, who was admitted to a Turkish hospital on July 8, 2003 because of heart problems.²⁴² In August, 2003, İlham Aliyev was appointed as premier by the president. Though Artur Rasizade, who had been prime minister since 1996, continued to fulfill the duties of that office so that İlham Aliyev could concentrate on his presidential election bid. In the October 2003 presidential elections, İlham Aliyev was announced winner while international

²³⁹ Jim Nichol, 09.04.2009, “Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia: Political Developments and Implications for US Interests”, *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, p. 12; Justin Burke, 10.07.2001, *Azerbaijan Daily Digest*

²⁴⁰ Swietochowski, 1999, “Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads”, p. 419; Van Der Schriek, 02.02.2003, “Little to Lose: Opposition in Azerbaijan”

²⁴¹ Alieva, 2006, “Azerbaijan’s Frustrating Elections”, p. 147

²⁴² Rasizade, 2003, “Azerbaijan in Transition to the New Age of Democracy”, p. 352

observers reported several electoral irregularities.²⁴³ He was sworn in as president at the end of the month, and Rasizade became premier again.

The 125-member unicameral parliament was elected in November 2005 in an election that showed significant improvements in democratic processes, but did not meet international requirements of free and fair election. Electoral irregularities, regarding the organization of public debate, the conduct of polling and the counting of votes, reported by International Election Observation Mission.²⁴⁴ Changes to the election law, some in line with proposals of Venice Commission (an advisory body of the Council of Europe), were approved by the legislature in June 2005, including those making it easier for people to become candidates for the November 6, 2005, parliamentary election. However, the deputies rejected some of the most significant proposals, including a more equitable representation of political interests on electoral commissions. During the run-up to the 2005 parliamentary election, authorities, those opposed President İlham Aliyev's policies, arrested several prominent officials on charges of coup-plotting. One sensational trial involved Ferhad Aliyev (no relationship to İlham Aliyev), former minister of economic development, his brother Refik Aliyev, president of state energy company, and Ali İnsanov, former Health Minister. They were convicted on charges of fraud to ten years in prison. Opposition journalist Elmar Huseinov was murdered on March 2, 2005, and criminals have not been apprehended yet.²⁴⁵

Some other changes were made to electoral code in June 2008 before the presidential election on October. However the mostly criticized regulations were not

²⁴³ Hüsni Mahalli, 19.10.2003, "Azerbaycan ve Demokratik Seçim (Azerbaijan and Democratic Election), *Yeni Şafak*

²⁴⁴ Report of International Election Observation Mission for the Parliamentary Elections of Republic of Azerbaijan, 07.11.2005

²⁴⁵ Pınar Ipek ,2007, "Challenges for Democratization in Central Asia: What Can the U.S. Do?", *Middle East Policy*, 14 (1), p. 99; Freedom House, 2006, "Nations in Transit 2006-Azerbaijan"

changed, such as the dominance of government representatives on election commissions and the four week campaign period.²⁴⁶ The mainstream opposition parties, such as Musavat, the Popular Front, and the Azerbaijan Democratic Party, have boycotted the elections. They have motivated this with the absence of adequate campaigning opportunities for them, the domination of the election commissions by representatives of the authorities, an absence of reforms in the election code, and unfavorable conditions in the local media. This is not the first time that the opposition parties are boycotting either the election process, or elections results. In the 1998 presidential elections, most opposition parties, stayed out of the election process for similar reasons. Similarly, some opposition parties boycotted the results of the Parliamentary elections in 2000 and 2005 and preferred staying outside Parliament to using their seats to voice the problems of their voters.²⁴⁷

On March 2009, Azerbaijani people voted in a referendum by which more than forty amendments to the constitution were approved. One of the amendments removed some of the restraints on the presidency to confiscate constitutional ban on one person serving more than two consecutive presidential terms. By this way, it became possible for İlham Aliyev, elected president in 2003 and 2008 presidential elections, to run for a third term in 2013.²⁴⁸

4.5.4. Restrictions on Civil Society and Media

In Azerbaijan, freedom of association is recognized and protected by the Constitution and the European Convention on Human Rights. While grassroots

²⁴⁶ Jim Nichol, 09.04.2009, "Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia: Political Developments and Implications for US Interests", *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, p. 23-24

²⁴⁷ Alman Mir İsmail, 10.01.2008, "Presidential Elections in Azerbaijan Present a New Set of Opportunities, Central Asia Caucasus Institute

²⁴⁸ Farid Guliyev, 22.04.2009, "Azerbaijan Continues to Eschew Genuine Democracy", *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty*

activity continues to flourish, the Aliyev administration exerts a dominating influence on civil society organizations, especially those critical of government's democratic shortcomings. NGOs face registration, tax and funding problems. Local financial support to NGOs is limited. Similarly freedom of speech, support for media, access to information and protection of journalists' rights are recognized by law, yet media sector encounters numerous obstacles conducting its work and maintaining independence. Azerbaijan was ranked in 2007 among the top five countries in the world in terms of the number of imprisoned journalists.²⁴⁹ Charges are generally for defamation or inciting ethnic and religious hatred and promoting terrorism. President Aliyev amnestied five journalists in December 2007, yet several others remained imprisoned. The breakup of public protests by use of force is common.²⁵⁰ Excessive use of force against peaceful demonstrators remains as a serious problem. Large anti-Aliyev rallies in Baku and other cities, just after 2003 presidential election, were met by physical brutality and arrest.²⁵¹ The ministry of interior has often been used to undermine political opposition by discrediting, intimidating or prosecuting political parties and journalists. Newspapers linked to opposition parties have been persecuted and face considerable financial pressure.²⁵² The government consistently harasses independent civil society groups, especially through lawsuits, such as the punitive libel cases against Leyla Yunus, a leading human rights activist, and Intigam Aliyev, president of the Legal Education Society.²⁵³ There are opposition parties, civil society organizations and semi-free press outlets in Azerbaijan. However, "these loci of democracy, pluralism and

²⁴⁹ Nazli, 2007, *Freedom House: Nations in Transit 2007-Azerbaijan*

²⁵⁰ David J. Kramer, 29.07.2008, *Statement Before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe*; Swietochowski, 1999, "Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads", p. 419

²⁵¹ Barak A. Salmoni, 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt? Azerbaijan, Georgia and American Regional Goals", Center for Contemporary Conflict

²⁵² International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"

²⁵³ Michael Allen, "Azerbaijan's Robust Authoritarianism a Challenge to Democracy Assistance Groups"

openness are allowed to the extent that they do not threaten the regime's existence". To make their systems live longer, political elites do not hesitate to manipulate the election process, manage media flows, and impede the strengthening of political institutions.²⁵⁴

4.5.5. West's Support to Undemocratic Rule for Energy Interests

By signing the oil contract in 1994, Heydar Aliyev gave the West a huge stake in the development of hydrocarbon resources and increased Western countries', led by the U.S., interest in the stability of the country. By this way, Aliyev ensured his government of extensive Western capital and diplomatic backing.²⁵⁵ Major Western oil companies have invested billions of Dollars in developing Azerbaijani oil and natural gas fields and export pipelines. In order to receive the recompense of these investments, there is need to stability. As Guliyev states, "Western governments' interest in Caspian oil meant they would support whoever ensures that precious stability. Moreover, since all oil contracts had to be negotiated with the president, foreign companies and Western governments courted the chief executive, giving him a great deal of external and domestic legitimacy."²⁵⁶ So the greater the oil reserves the more tolerant are Western governments in overlooking undemocratic policies of Azerbaijani regime.²⁵⁷

Upon the critics of some human rights and other observers about the undue support of the U.S. to nondemocratic leader of Azerbaijan, Deputy Assistant Secretary Bryza stated in June 2006 that "just because Azerbaijan has not gone as

²⁵⁴ Farid Guliyev, 2005, "Post-Soviet Azerbaijan: Transition to Sultanistic Semiauthoritarianism? An Attempt at Conceptualization", *Demokratizatsiya*, 13 (3), pp. 395, 407

²⁵⁵ International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"

²⁵⁶ Farid Guliyev, 2009, "Oil Wealth, Patrimonialism and the Failure of Democracy in Azerbaijan, *Caucasus Analytical Digest*, pp. 3-4

²⁵⁷ Alec Rasizade, 2002, "Azerbaijan After a Decade of Independence: Less Oil, More Graft and Poverty", *Central Asian Survey*, 21 (4), p. 362

far as we would like on democracy does not mean we are going to ignore our energy, counter terrorism and military interests.”²⁵⁸

Foreign criticism was decidedly muted and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that this was largely due to commercial energy interests and looking for strategic advantage in the region.²⁵⁹ 2003 presidential election fell far short of international norms. The international community, eager for stability and continuity in the oil-rich state, offered only soft criticism until it was too late to affect anything. The international response to the events surrounding the election and widespread evidence of fraud and human rights abuses made clear that many in the West place a premium on political stability and energy investment.²⁶⁰ The stability of the Caucasus, necessary to keep the transport of Caspian oil and gas uninterrupted, is even more essential to world markets and strategic interests. In addition to energy needs, the Caucasus region is the crucial link between Central Asia and Europe; therefore its political stability and economic development is important to U.S. national security interests. The Caucasus countries are becoming more important security allies in the U.S. led campaign against terrorism.²⁶¹ David Holly asks, “How hard should Washington push for democratic change at the risk of alienating a government it sees as a geopolitical partner, an ally in fighting terrorism and a force promoting key Western oil interest?”²⁶²

With İlham Aliyev cooperating with the U.S. and Europe in areas such as security, counterterrorism and energy, Western policy makers felt little desire to see power change hands in Baku. “Azerbaijan showed that if the democratic world

²⁵⁸ Quoted in Nichol, 09.04.2009, “Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia...”, p. 24

²⁵⁹ Nassibli, 1999-2000, “Azerbaijan’s Geopolitics and Oil Pipeline Issue”

²⁶⁰ International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, “Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?”

²⁶¹ Zeyno Baran, 2002, “The Caucasus: Ten Years After Independence”, *The Washington Quarterly*, 25 (1), pp. 221, 233

²⁶² David Holley, 09.07.2003, “Dynasty and Democracy Azerbaijan at a Crossroads”, *Los Angeles Times*

allows other interests to divert it from taking a firm stand on behalf of democratic principles in a transitional state where resolute authoritarians remain players, beleaguered prodemocratic locals cannot be expected to take up the slack.”²⁶³ It is claimed that the oil industry is profit-motivated above all else and that this goes a long way to explaining the fact that work for democracy and human rights is set aside when Western oil companies get involved in Azerbaijan. Western investors are, moreover, convinced that they need to stay on good terms with Aliyev to do business. It seems that with this end in view “the dictatorship is unhesitatingly accepted, and even supported.”²⁶⁴

It also important to note that Aliyev regimes’ dominance and undemocratic policies have been possible due to the structure of the society and the political system in Azerbaijan. Personal, family and clan relations and struggles and competition between these families and clans are an inherent part of Azerbaijani society.²⁶⁵

4.5.6. Clientelistic Relations

Azerbaijan’s ruling elite is argued to be increasingly divided with several clans, largely organized around regional (Nakhichevanis and Yerazi) and patronage relationships, competing for control of a pyramidal distribution structure. Political institutions are closely linked to clan structures and the ruling elite.²⁶⁶ A substantial number of people depend on patronage from İlham Aliyev for their privileged

²⁶³ Alieva, 2006, “Azerbaijan’s Frustrating Elections”, p. 152, 157, 158

²⁶⁴ Daniel Heradstveit, 2001, “Democratic Development in Azerbaijan and the Role of the Western Oil Industry”, *Central Asian Survey*, 20 (3), p. 264

²⁶⁵ Swietochowski, 1999, “Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads”, p. 421

²⁶⁶ Charles H. Fairbanks, 2001, “Disillusionment in the Caucasus and Central Asia”, *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (4), p. 52

position and have a vested interest in retaining the regime in power.²⁶⁷ That is the main reason for Aliyev's and his New Azerbaijan Party's strong support among the new Azerbaijani's. Another social group with entrenched interest in preserving the Aliyev regime is "the clientelistic network of favoritism that is tangling the country at all levels of government, as well as business and educational establishments, and even in many non-governmental organizations."²⁶⁸ The ruling New Azerbaijan Party was established in Nakhichevan by Heydar Aliyev in 1991. It is argued to be managed much like a Soviet communist party; membership is a precondition for state employment. Many high ranking NAP officials, served under Heydar Aliyev during his duty as communist party chief in the 1970s, are close Aliyev relatives. Around Aliyev family, power is tightly held by a small group that exploits its administrative positions.²⁶⁹

Furthermore, oil and gas exports have provided the governments' with significant economic convenience and contributed to regime stability, allowing the government, through patronage, public spending and rent-seeking, to get public support and to keep the society unorganized.²⁷⁰ Examples vary from spending petro dollars on expanding the public sector to wasteful spending on popular and highly visible projects to financing mega-infrastructural projects across the country.²⁷¹

4.5.7. Fragmented Opposition

²⁶⁷ Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falter in Azerbaijan", p. 124

²⁶⁸ Rasizade, 2003, "Azerbaijan in Transition to the New Age of Democracy", p. 353

²⁶⁹ International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"

²⁷⁰ Ipek, 2007, "Challenges for Democratization in Central Asia: What Can the U.S. Do?", pp. 97-99

²⁷¹ Farid Guliyev, 28.02.2009, "End of Limits Monarchical Presidencies on the Rise", *Harvard International Review*

The opposition in Azerbaijan is divided. Its largest parties are heirs to the nationalists who briefly held power between 1918-1920.²⁷² A special feature of Azerbaijani politics became the formation of parties around the personalities of leaders, rather than programs or ideologies. For example, in the run-up to the October 2003 elections, three chief opposition leaders emerged. In addition, loyalty to the ruler is motivated not because of his representing an ideology, or any charismatic qualities, but due to a mixture of fear and rewards to his collaborators.

273

The ceasefire with Armenia allowed Heydar Aliyev to tighten his control of the state administration. He dispensed with prime minister and Ganja coup leader Suret Huseynov. An uprising of the special police force, led by Karabakh veteran and Deputy Minister of the Interior Colonel Rovshan Javadov, was put down, and Aliyev ensured that opposition forces in the Ministry of the Interior, army, government and regional authorities were duly quelled.²⁷⁴ Since 1993, allegation and Aliyev regime's repression have produced a fragmented opposition.²⁷⁵ Voters get disoriented by the practice of Azerbaijani authorities to establish alternative parties, by using traitor members of political forces against whom these countervailing parties are being established.²⁷⁶

Opposition leaders criticize the regime openly and harshly, organize demonstrations and rallies demanding president's resignation. They attack any plans to create a dynastic state, but they have not the leverage of public support. Opposition parties lack a comprehensive political platform that could attract large number of supporters. Political indifference of Azerbaijani citizenry stems from the

²⁷² International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"

²⁷³ Swietochowski, 1999, "Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads", p. 421

²⁷⁴ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

²⁷⁵ Salmoni, 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt..."

²⁷⁶ Rasizade, 2003, "Azerbaijan in Transition to the New Age of Democracy", p. 353

general conviction that the opposition's real aim is to gain access to the nation's oil revenue by replacing the regime which is currently benefiting it.²⁷⁷ Like the government opposition politicians understand the problems of society, like unemployment, uneven development, yet do not better than the government at proposing constructive means to solve them. Instead, many opposition leaders give the impression of pursuing individual agendas. This struggle leaves the majority of the population politically alienated.²⁷⁸ Besides, for an overwhelming majority, stability and survival are more urgent than the abstract concepts of democracy. As connoted by an Azerbaijani citizen,

When a man cannot afford to feed his children, cannot afford to send them school, the democracy is the last thing he thinks about, if he thinks about it at all. When the Iraqi people were asked "Whether they were better off during Saddam rule" almost %80 said yes, they were. If this is the democracy, which USA trying to bring to people of Iraq, which Farid Bey also wants for Azerbaijan, then I would rather live under dictatorship, but have a job, security and able to send my children to school. People needs job, security, economic and financial stability and peace so that they can get on with their lives, but not empty words of democracy.²⁷⁹

4.6. Conclusion

After the seventy year of security-centered rule of the Soviet Union, Azerbaijan gained its sovereignty in 1991, in a period of the collapse of the communist system and triumph of liberal democracy. Restoration of Azerbaijani independence would go together with the establishment of democracy and its institutions that are to some extent foreign to Azerbaijani population because of the Soviet dominance and powerful family and clan relations within the Azerbaijani society. On the other hand, the process of independence and democracy establishment had to be realized

²⁷⁷ Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falts in Azerbaijan", p. 129

²⁷⁸ Van Der Schriek, 02.02.2003, "Little to Lose: Opposition in Azerbaijan"

²⁷⁹ Command by Nuriddin Mammedly on Farid Guliyev, "Azerbaijan Continues to Eschew Genuine Democracy"

at the same time with Azerbaijan's war with Armenia in Upper-Karabakh. Like all other newly independent states, Azerbaijan was facing the problems of political and economic development and security maintenance simultaneously. The continuing military conflict further complicated the situation for both the Azerbaijani citizens and rulers. The conflict became an all encompassing issue for every Azerbaijani. National newspapers paid enormous attention to the military theme. National security concern and liberation of the invaded territories became the utmost issues.²⁸⁰

The developments in the battlefield directly affected the political arena and stability in Azerbaijan. Failures in the war led power to change hands many times in a very short period of time.²⁸¹ Meanwhile, the economy of the country and the living conditions were in a continuous decay. The influx of one million refugees and displaced persons from the invaded cities made the situation worse. Heydar Aliyev, came to power after the deposition of Elçibey -first elected president of Azerbaijan- by a military overthrow, and faced two military coup attempts in two years, adopted security fist approach in order to maintain stability for the political and economic development of the country. Becoming president, Heydar Aliyev kept the state of emergency introduced by Elçibey -mass demonstrations and meetings were not allowed, the media were subject to censorship- to provide stability and prevent a state failure. To overcome the stalemate in military conflict, which was also the main reason of instability and economic hardship, he signed ceasefire agreement with Armenia in 1994. The stability came with the ceasefire, provided the necessary environment for Western companies to invest in Azerbaijani oil. Foreign investment was very important, because Azerbaijan lacked the necessary infrastructure to

²⁸⁰ Tohidi, "Women, Democratization and Islam in Post-Soviet Azerbaijan"

²⁸¹ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

extract and export the major energy resources it has.²⁸² In addition to providing political stability through ceasefire agreement and attracting foreign investment by signing oil contracts with Western oil companies, Heydar Aliyev took necessary steps for the foundation of an Azerbaijani army. Since Azerbaijan had not its own army, during the war with Armenia volunteers did the necessary job. This heightened the significance of the military capability.²⁸³

Therefore, it can be argued that both the internal and external factors supported the adoption of security first approach in Azerbaijan. Becoming independent during a continuous military conflict with its neighbour escalated Azerbaijan's security and democracy challenge. Disastrous impact of war on every aspect of life, led Azerbaijani rulers to evolve an assumption that without the maintenance of security and stability political and economic prosperity is not possible. However, it is interesting that the priority of security and stability has been kept after the ceasefire with Armenia and some economic growth, which became possible by the revenue gained through oil export. Security and stability have constantly been kept on the public agenda due to the unresolved conflict between Armenia. Both the ruling elite and the opposition have used Karabakh problem as a tool of internal politics and a way to gain public support. While opposition has presented the unresolved conflict as a failure of Aliyev regimes and argued for more aggressive attitude for solution, rulers accused the previous regime -now the opposition- and the internal turmoil for the defeat in the war and chose to limit the political arena and restrain media and civil society in the name of providing stability.²⁸⁴ The internal and external context that gave way to the prioritization of

²⁸² Guliyev, 2009, "Oil Wealth, Patrimonialism and the Failure of Democracy in Azerbaijan", pp. 3-4

²⁸³ Hadjy-Zadeh, 2002, "Civil Control on Armed Forces in Young Nations: The Case of Azerbaijan"

²⁸⁴ International Crisis Group, 14.11.2007, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War", *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187, pp. 14-15

security have at the same time resulted in the increase of Aliyev regime's power and control over Azerbaijani politics and economy. Especially the backing of Western countries to Aliyev regimes, for their energy and strategic interests, add to regimes' power.

Both Heydar and İlham Aliyev cooperated with the U.S. and other Western countries, regarding the integration of Azerbaijan to the Western structures, security of energy sources and routes, international counter terrorism efforts.²⁸⁵ Heydar Aliyev's main political message has always been stability and Western-oriented policy. Aliyev regimes paid attention to the opinion of the West, with which they negotiated oil investment contracts. Therefore, the democracy demand of the West has tried to be realized by the rulers, although limited in the form of the semi-free press, opposition and civil society.²⁸⁶ On the other hand, foreign criticism was not harsh. The commercial energy interests and search for strategic advantage in the region led Western powers to have good relations with the regime and make soft criticism on the irregularities with regard to elections, government pressure on media, civil society and opposition.²⁸⁷ The cooperation between the Azerbaijani governments and Western powers, and their prioritization of security and stability over democracy promotion, has provided the regimes with diplomatic backing and strengthened their position in internal politics.

Lack of effective opposition and the successful economic growth have further strengthened the Aliyev regimes' position regarding prioritizing stability and security issues, with the aim of holding on power. This actually stems from a special feature of Azerbaijani politics: the significance of kinship ties and loyalties with

²⁸⁵ Ipek, 2009, "Azerbaijan's Foreign Policy and Challenges for Energy Security", pp. 227-228

²⁸⁶ Guliyev, 2005, "Post-Soviet Azerbaijan...", pp. 421-423

²⁸⁷ Nassibli, 1999-2000, "Azerbaijan's Geopolitics and Oil Pipeline Issue"

regional-based clans functioning as effective pressure groups.²⁸⁸ In Azerbaijan, political parties and other political formations evolve around persons rather than on ideas or perceptions. The power of the person on the other hand does not come from its personal qualities or ideas, but rather from the potential gains and losses that will be resulted from being a supporter of him/her. As a result a significant amount of the state officials, bureaucrats from all sectors including military, economy, education and health sectors, and the members of the NAP, are either relatives of Aliyev or those reliant on Aliyev regime for personal gain. Even the most of the media and civil society organizations are dependent upon the regime.²⁸⁹ This dependency has furthered by government's significant investment on public projects with the money earned from oil export. When it is thought that ordinary citizens first of all think about the opportunities they have in their daily lives, such as having a job, a good education and health system rather than right to vote, to assemble and to free speech, the money spent on public projects provide performance legitimacy to the regime.

Farid Guliyev explains Azerbaijani experience as “a reverse trajectory of transition: not from authoritarianism to democracy but from a democracy oriented rule to semiauthoritarianism”.²⁹⁰ This reverse trajectory can argued to become possible through the adoption of security first understanding that has found life by the utilization of Karabakh conflict and West's support to Aliyev regimes in line with their strategic and energy security concerns. Azerbaijan's first democracy experiment started with Elçibey's election as the first president. During Elçibey's presidency and PFP's government many steps taken on the way to democracy and this attempt was continued during the first years of Heydar Aliyev's presidency and NAP government. However, military coup attempts and the political instability led

²⁸⁸ Swietochowski, 1999, “Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads”, p. 421

²⁸⁹ Rasizade, 2003, “Azerbaijan in Transition to the New Age of Democracy”, p. 353

²⁹⁰ Guliyev, 2005, “Post-Soviet Azerbaijan...”, p. 395

Heydar Aliyev to feel threatened and put restraints on opposition and civil society, which slowed down the democratization process. This process has further been damaged by the amendments to the constitution just before 2003 presidential elections, with the aim of opening İlham Aliyev's way for presidency. Since Azerbaijani society and politics base on family and clan relations, the only way to be successful and powerful for a family or clan is to be holding on power. Since İlham Aliyev's public support is not strong as of his father, who is accepted as the founder of Azerbaijan and provider of peace, stability and economic development to the country, he continues to restrict political arena as much as possible without being much criticized by the West. It would not be right to say that the political system in Azerbaijan is authoritarianism, because it has adopted democratic institutional and legal setups, and the opposition and media can criticize the regime and its policies openly. However, the way the institutions work and the way the rules are implemented are not in line with democracy. However, through the use of Karabakh conflict; policies prioritizing stability and security at the expense of democracy are legitimized, while the support of Western powers and the economic growth due to oil revenues provide the regime with certain performance legitimacy.

According to Carathers, Azerbaijan is characterized by the “domination of a single political actor”, and since this provides a certain degree of stability it is difficult for the country to move out of it.²⁹¹ Hence it is not reasonable to expect the regime, having both political and economic power, to implement democratic rules and remove political restrictions with taking the risk of losing power. And it is also not reasonable to expect Western states, as the highest per capita consumers of

²⁹¹ Carathers is quoted in Guliyev, 2005, “Post-Soviet Azerbaijan...”, p. 399

energy, to alienate the Aliyev regime by criticizing it for undemocratic policies with taking the risk of losing energy supplier.²⁹²

²⁹² Daniel Kimmage, "Toward a New Paradigm For the Post-Soviet Petrostates" and Nichol, 09.04.2009, "Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia...", p. 2

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON OF THE TWO CASES

5.1. Introduction

As argued in the previous chapters, Singapore and Azerbaijan are interesting cases for studying security first approach on developing world and explaining the impact of security first understanding on democracy. The governments of the both countries have adopted security first approach while trying to establish their independence and continued this understanding till now. The context and circumstances that gave way to the adoption of security first understanding have both similarities and dissimilarities in two countries. Both were ruled by security-centered political systems before the independence and by the time they became sovereign states they faced challenges of political development, economic growth and security simultaneously with weak institutional and political capability and limited human and economic sources. While Singapore gained its independence in the years of Cold War, as a small city state, with a multiethnic society, Azerbaijan became independent by the collapse of the Soviet Union, in a conflictual region, at war with its neighbour. In both cases, the primacy of the need for security and stability has been kept on the public agenda by the ruling elite, led the implication of undemocratic rules, and restrictions on opposition, civil society and media. Although in Singapore and Azerbaijan democratic institutional and legal setups were adopted and societies are opening up to accommodate more rights associated

with liberal democracy, this has not been allowed to occur at the expense of security and stability, which contribute to the power of the rulers.

This chapter aims to make a comparative analysis of the manipulation of the vulnerabilities, the objective dimension giving way to premium of security, of Singapore and Azerbaijan by rulers in order to emphasize the need to security and stability during the restoration of independence and further continuance of this attitude at the expense of democracy to be able to hold on to power. It composes three parts. In the first part utilization of the weakness and difficulties faced by the countries to prioritize security and to keep security concerns on public agenda is explained. In the second part the support of Western countries to security first understanding of these regimes in line with their economic, political and security interests and affect of this position on democratization of Singapore and Azerbaijan are explored. In the third part, prioritization of security at the expense of democracy is highlighted.

5.2. Manipulation of Vulnerabilities

Singapore was a British colony, while Azerbaijan was under Soviet dominance before the independence, and they both inherited security-centered rules of the previous governance. When they became independent, societies were not familiar with democracy, they did not have democratic institutions, their own army and effective economic structures to improve on. Like the all developing countries, both Singapore and Azerbaijan faced the challenges of political development, security and economic growth simultaneously. Singapore's vulnerability as a multiethnic small country lacking of natural resources compared to its Malay populated larger neighbors in Southeast Asia and its total dependency on the external world for its

economy provided the politicians with effective rationale in convincing Singaporeans of the urgency of the survival issue.²⁹³ Azerbaijan became independent, while it was in a military conflict with Armenia. Society's and media's interest in the war was enormous. National security concerns became the top priority and responding to the immediate needs of a million refugees and the internally displaced population absorbed the most of the resources. Moreover, war led the rise of patriotic feelings and society became ready to make any sacrifices to release the invaded cities.²⁹⁴ The continuous war had a disturbing impact on all aspects of life. The incompetence of the governments with regard to the war, created a great instability in Azerbaijani politics. The country faced resistance movements, rebels and military coups and various governments in a very short term. To maintain stability, rulers adopted state of emergency, mass movements and demonstrations were banned and a censorship was put on media. Political turmoil and instability was shown as the cause of failure at the battlefield.²⁹⁵

Azerbaijan was facing a real military conflict, whereas Singapore not. It felt threatened because of its smallness, large neighbours, multiethnic society and economy's reliance on foreign investment. The ruling elite of Singapore presented these vulnerabilities as a real issue of endurance of the country and society. According to PAP, to overcome this problem there was need to an effective defence capability and stability. Defence capability does not only encompass a strong army and armament but also physiological, economic, civil and social defence that covers and shapes all sectors. The rationale behind this understanding was the need to foreign investment. Economic growth was presented as the only way of surviving

²⁹³ Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...", p. 98

²⁹⁴ Hadjy-Zadeh, 2002, "Civil Control on Armed Forces in Young Nations: The Case of Azerbaijan"; Tohidi, "Women, Democratization and Islam in Post-Soviet Azerbaijan"

²⁹⁵ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

and it was possible by attracting foreign direct investment, which requires stability and predictability.²⁹⁶ In order to maintain a stable environment for foreign investment, the political opposition and civil society was pressurized, ethnic groups and media were controlled. Thus, in Singapore, the vulnerabilities have been manipulated to stress the importance of security and stability. The objective dimensions of the need to security has been kept on the agenda and fragility of stability and order continuously reminded, due to the perception of challenges by elites, in which democratization is seen as a destabilizing process and instability causing political, economic and military failure. The need to economic development was presented as a survival issue and took its place as the major security concern. In addition the way to development was also based on security, because development was argued to be preceded by security. Azerbaijan had a real security concern, yet rulers have used it to restrain the political and civil rights and get public support, while the opposition has been utilized from the conflict as a way to criticize the government. Karabakh Conflict has been kept on public agenda by Aliyev regimes, after the ceasefire agreed between Azerbaijan and Armenia, through the use of national media and especially in rationalizing the measures suppressing protests at the conduct of the elections.²⁹⁷ Thus, in both countries the ruling elite has stressed the significance of security concerns, tried to keep the stability issue on the agenda through use of media or education programs, and reminded the fragility of order to keep opposition under control.

5.3. Prioritization of Security and Stability by Western Powers

²⁹⁶ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, "Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion" p. 281

²⁹⁷ International Crisis Group, 14.11.2007, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War", *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187, p. 14

Singapore's independence came during Cold War, so rather than the promotion of democracy, security of the West and of strategic allies was important. State security, military capabilities, maintenance of bipolar structure and advancement of capitalism were among the top priorities. Rapid economic growth of Singapore, based on capitalist market economy was a model against communist China. Therefore, the so called First World of the Cold War era, supported the economic development of Singapore. In addition the stability of the country has provided a safe and lucrative place for Western investors.²⁹⁸ The necessity to stability for drawing foreign investment to the country was not only highlighted by PAP governments but also Azerbaijani rulers. Azerbaijani independence came at the collapse of Soviet Union and triumph of democracy arguments, hence democracy promotion became more important. Yet energy and strategic interests of West led the continuation of the premium on security and stability. The stability of Azerbaijan as a supplier of oil and contributor of international counterterrorism efforts turned out to be the concern of the U.S. and European powers. This concern in turn provided external backing to Aliyev regimes, and strengthened regimes' hand in domestic politics.²⁹⁹ In both cases, the attitude of the Western powers supported the prioritization of security. Moreover, this support encouraged ruling elites of Singapore and Azerbaijan in pursuing security first understanding at the expense of democracy.

5.4. Security at the Expense of Democracy

Both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, the internal and external context has been used and even manipulated to prioritize security, yet what is more important is that

²⁹⁸ Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 30

²⁹⁹ Alieva, 2006, "Azerbaijan's Frustrating Elections", pp. 152-158

security and stability have been prioritized at the expense of democracy and vulnerabilities presented as justification for limiting political and civil rights. In Singapore, anti-disorder legislation was adopted, by which political opposition and social behaviour were coerced and strikes, riots and mass protest were avoided, in order to maintain a stable environment for foreign investment.³⁰⁰ In Azerbaijan, Heydar Aliyev, coming to power after the deposition of Elçibey by a military overthrow, and dealing with two military coup attempts in consequent years, kept the state of emergency introduced by Elçibey, to maintain stability and avoid a king of government and state failure. However, the challenges faced by Heydar Aliyev influenced his threat perception and resorted him to restrict any attempt that might lead instability. Mass demonstrations and meetings were not allowed, the media were subject to censorship in order to maintain stability for the political and economic development of the country.³⁰¹

The counter-democratic trends came forward in both countries, following the post independence pluralism. The PAP was established as a mass-based democratic political party, consisting of people with different political views and races, with the aim of gaining independence. However, Lee Kuan Yew's faction that controlled the executive of the PAP used this advantage to reform the party structure to centralize power in their hands before the 1959 election and coerced their opponents.³⁰² The PAP governments have pursued various undemocratic strategies -detention without trial, deregistration and replacement of radical unions with compliant ones, withdrawal of license from newspapers deemed to be opposed to national interests, political re-education of civil servants to reduce the independence of the civil

³⁰⁰ Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...", p. 99

³⁰¹ Musabayov, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan"

³⁰² Ow Chin Hock, 1984, "Singapore: Past, Present and Future", p. 367

service and bind it to the government's agenda- to suppress opposition.³⁰³ 1992 Azerbaijani presidential election is accepted as one of the freest elections among the post-Soviet geography. The PFP government laid the basis for democracy in the country, in spite of the continuing military conflict with Armenia. On the verge of Heydar Aliyev's presidency, a legislative reform prepared the ground for elections, press censorship was abolished and opposition media started to function, despite the difficulties.³⁰⁴ Yet, the ceasefire with Armenia led Heydar Aliyev to tighten his control of the state administration. After dispensing coup leaders Suret Huseynov and Rovshan Javadov, Aliyev ensured that opposition forces in the Ministry of the Interior, army, government and regional authorities were put down, and the regime's repression have produced a fragmented opposition.³⁰⁵ Several prominent officials, those opposed to President İlham Aliyev's policies were arrested on charges of coup-plotting.³⁰⁶

Both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, series of constraints on civil activities have been uphold, while the regularly meeting groups have to be registered formally and a permit has to be taken out for any public assembly or procession in any public place. Media sector encounters numerous obstacles conducting its work and maintaining independence, including informal censorship, charges for defamation or inciting ethnic and religious hatred and financial penalties. Election codes and constitution have been amended in order to keep the PAP government and Aliyev regimes in power.³⁰⁷

³⁰³ Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore", p. 657

³⁰⁴ Goltz, 1998, *Azerbaijan Diary*, p. 43

³⁰⁵ Salmoni, 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt? Azerbaijan, Georgia and American Regional Goals"

³⁰⁶ Freedom House, 2006, "Nations in Transit 2006-Azerbaijan"

³⁰⁷ Nazlı, 2007, *Freedom House: Nations in Transit 2007-Azerbaijan*; Chua Beng-Huat, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore", p. 658

With their worry to lose security and stability and their drive for political supremacy the PAP governments in Singapore and Aliyev regimes in Azerbaijan, have manipulated the vulnerabilities of the country with regard to security and economy, to highlight the need to security and order, which has made it easier for governors to limit the political and social opposition in the name of stability. The dominance of PAP and Aliyevs became possible by the virtual merging of state and party in Singapore and clientelistic relationships in Azerbaijan. Due to the party structure in Singapore, policy formation became the total preserve of the PAP executive in conjunction with senior civil servants. New civil service appointments then extended PAP control over the state apparatus and as a result, the upper levels of the civil service became the standard route to political leadership.³⁰⁸ The division of Azerbaijani ruling elite among several clans, mainly structured around regional and patronage relationships, has also linked the political institutions to these clan structures and the ruling elite. Many NAP members and bureaucrats are from the Aliyev family or their relatives.³⁰⁹

In addition, both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, the political economy relations are also used as the base of the regime's power. The form of state capitalism rendered many Singaporeans dependent on the state for economic and social resources, including housing, employment and business contracts. Increasing wealth and industrialization tend to raise the income of workers and to expand the size of the middle class, thereby giving more people a stake in the existing socioeconomic order.³¹⁰ In a similar way, the money gained through oil exports have strengthened Azerbaijani governments' economic facility and led governments, through public spending, to get public support. An important number of people have

³⁰⁸ Rodan and Jayasuriya, 2009, "Capitalist Development, Regime Transition...", p. 29

³⁰⁹ Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falter in Azerbaijan", p. 124

³¹⁰ Steve Chan, 1993, *East Asian Dynamism: Growth, Order and Security in the Pacific Region*, p. 84

a vested interest in maintaining the current regime in power because of their dependency on patronage from İlham Aliyev for their political or economic position.³¹¹

5.5. Conclusion

Singapore and Azerbaijan, gaining their independence in different international conjunctures with some similar internal and external circumstances and facing political development, economic growth and security challenges simultaneously, have adopted security first approach. While the need to security was obvious in the case of Azerbaijan, being a military conflict with its neighbour and having a million displaced people, in Singapore the situation with regard to security was not that problematic, yet potential threats especially economic difficulties have been presented as a survival issue that requires ultimate stability and effective defence capability. In two cases, stability was shown as the main requirement of gaining the confidence of foreign investors, without which economic development would not be realized and the future of the country would be blurred. What is more significant is that in both countries, vulnerabilities have been utilized to keep the security concerns on public agenda and restrain the political opposition and civil society. So not only a premium was put on security, but it was also prioritized at the expense of democracy. Democratization is considered problematic for the political stability and economic development of the country. The openness came with democratization gave way to the emergence of new demands of different groups. The ethnic riots in July and September 1964 and ethnic clashes in 1969 in Singapore, following the outbreak of riots in Malaysia after its general election, and the influence of

³¹¹ Guliyev, 28.02.2009, "End of Limits Monarchical Presidencies on the Rise"

communist China on Chinese Singaporeans enhanced the sense of vulnerability of the PAP government, whereas in Azerbaijan the oppositionary movements and rebels due to the developments in the battlefield heightened the sense of vulnerability.³¹² Political instability is a challenge not only for the state, but also for the longevity of the regime and for the economic development. Therefore, the governments of the both countries have continuously highlighted the need to stability and its importance for the countries' future. Democratization has also been a challenge for the ruling elites due to its requirement of governance by rule of law and accountability of rules. Democratization is argued to be initiated

[W]hen multiparty system exists and the first set of free and fair elections for national level office take place. This first set of elections must be accompanied in short order by the granting of civil liberties and political rights and the establishment of both state institutions that operate according to the rule of law and intermediate organizations that mediate between the citizen and the state. If these events do not take place, then it is likely that the process of democratization will not be fully consolidated.³¹³

Both countries have adopted democratic institutional and legal setups, however it is not possible to say that they are democracies. The possibility of losing security and government created a constant delay in democratization. While regular elections constitute the legitimacy of the regimes, the location of formal institutions within wider power relationships -the combination of state and PAP in Singapore and patronage and clan relations of ruling elites in Azerbaijan- in addition to prioritization of security, led the implementation of various undemocratic strategies and policies by governors. Considering the interest of the Western countries in the stability of these countries, and obviously the regimes, and the stake that many

³¹² Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 24; Heng Hiang Khng, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change...", p. 118, Cornell, 2001, "Democratization Falter in Azerbaijan", pp. 118-119

³¹³ Karen Dawisha, 1997, "Democratization and Political Participation: Research Concepts and Methodologies" in Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrott (eds.), *The Consolidation of Democracy in East-Central Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 42

citizens have in the existing political and socio-economic system, it is difficult to expect a real democratic reform to take place in these countries. In both countries, regimes have been successful in maintaining security and stability, yet this did not give way to the gradual triumph of democracy as argued by security first approach. The cooperation of the Western powers with the governments of these countries can be argued to contribute to the security of the states and the regimes, but neither the democratization process nor the security of the people.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Explaining the relationship between security and democracy is as difficult as conceptualizing the two terms since they are likely to mean different things to different people. While some scholars see a positive relationship between security and democracy, others emphasize the negative impact of one on the other. Alternatively, a group of studies accept democratization as a way to provide security, whereas others argue for the need to security as a foundation on which democracy can be instituted. Security first approach supports the latter view. In the previous chapters, security first approach and its assumptions are explained and two countries, Singapore and Azerbaijan that adopted security first understanding are analyzed. Here the three assumptions of security first approach will be disused on these two cases, the main findings of the study will be stated and the ways to convert these findings to policy implementation will be discussed.

6.1. Application of Security First Approach's Assumptions on Cases

The assumptions are: 1. the need to set clear priorities due to the resource scarcity - institutional capacity, qualified personnel, economic means, time- 2. first security must be established, then democracy would develop internally and gradually, 3. U.S.

should work with illiberal moderates, those not liberal but against the use of violence and terror, for both its own security and the international security.

Security first approach derives from the postulation that the scarcity of resources forces people to make a choice among the needs or sought values. Even the U.S., as the most powerful state of the world, does not have unlimited resources. Therefore it has to set the priorities of its foreign policy in accordance with its available resources. When it comes to the establishment of security and democracy, which are the two good deeds people want to have all together, in failed or rogue states, priority should be given to the establishment of security. According to Etzioni, security is first, because it is the basic value on which the other values are founded. If basic security is not provided and people face the possibility of being attacked or murdered any time, than it is not possible to consolidate democracy or economic development. Once security is maintained, the necessary environment would be created for democracy to internally and gradually develop.³¹⁴ Drawing from this assumption, it is possible to argue that for the developing world, facing the severe pressure of building security, democracy and development with limited political and institutional capacity, economic and human sources and time, making a prioritization between democracy and security is unavoidable. Since democracy cannot be consolidated without security, they have to put the premium on security. By arguing that democracy would phase after security is established, this approach also assumes that the ruling elites that make and imply security-centered policies, would at a certain point decide that security is maintained at sufficient level and now it is time to take necessary steps for democratization. Though the context, circumstances, needs and available resources shape how polices are made and

³¹⁴ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*

operationalized, the perceptions and choices of the ruling elites also influence the policies. At last, it is a political choice to prioritize a thing over others and shift priorities in line with changes in the context, capabilities etc.

Did the scarcity of resources force the rulers of Singapore and Azerbaijan to adopt security first approach? As newly independent states, both of them faced concurrent challenges of political and economic development and security. They were not familiar with democracy and its institutions, their economies were in decay and did not have their own militaries. Not only the internal context but also external one provided the rationale for prioritizing security and stability issues. The situation in Azerbaijan was really severe. It was in a military conflict with its neighbour and one eighth of its population became either refugees or displaced persons. War and security became the utmost concern for the whole society. In the case of Singapore, there was not a real military conflict or a foreign attack. Yet ruling elites have presented the smallness of the country, its containment with Malay populated big neighbours and its dependency to the foreign direct investment for the economic growth as a survival issue. The establishment of an effective defence capability, which has been necessary to persuade foreign investors that the country is able to protect itself and avoid instability, has become a part of development strategy. The need to attract foreign investment to extract and export the hydrocarbon resources has also been used as the rationale for the need to stability in Azerbaijan.

So both countries faced the problematic of resource scarcity and challenge of doing many things at the same time with little sources, Azerbaijan even more. Not only the rulers but citizens feel the same pressure on themselves, and most probably they prefer, as stated by one of the Azerbaijani, to be safe and able to get on with

their lives under an autocracy, rather than abstract concepts of democracy.³¹⁵ As Etzioni argues people might trade democracy for security, because “[o]nly once security is reasonably secured do people become keen to have their legal and political rights respected”.³¹⁶ Is the establishment of security really followed by consolidation of democracy and the rise of demand for democratic rights?

In the cases of this study, maintenance of security did not lead the consolidation of democracy. In Azerbaijan, the priority of security and stability has been reserved after the ceasefire agreement with Armenia and economic growth, which became possible by the revenue gained through oil export. Security and stability have constantly been kept on the public agenda due to the unresolved conflict with Armenia. Both the ruling elite and the opposition have used Karabakh problem as a tool of internal politics and a way to gain public support. While opposition has presented the unresolved conflict as a failure of Aliyev regimes and argued for more aggressive attitude for solution, rulers accused the previous regime -now the opposition- and the internal turmoil for the defeat in the war and chose to limit the political arena and restrain media and civil society in the name of providing stability.³¹⁷ The Singaporean elites evolved their survival ideology on economic prosperity, politically stable environment and effective defence capability assumptions. The survival mentality encompasses not only military and economic sectors but also all other sections of life, because the total defence strategy includes physiological, societal, civil and economic defence in addition to military defence. Furthermore, significance of the survival issue has been kept on the public agenda through the use of media and the education programs, although the country has not

³¹⁵ Command by Nuriddin Mammedly on Guliyev, “Azerbaijan Continues to Eschew Genuine Democracy”

³¹⁶ Etzioni, 2008, “A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration”, pp. 99-100

³¹⁷ International Crisis Group, 14.11.2007, “Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War”, *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187, pp. 14-15

faced a real threat or aggression from its neighbours. Asian values, emphasizing common good and order rather than individual rights, has been utilized as the moral base of survival ideology.³¹⁸ In both cases, the internal and external context that gave way to the prioritization of security have further utilized by the ruling elite to increase the regimes' power and control over all sectors.³¹⁹ Hence it is possible to argue that the ruling elite, who decide to put premium on security due to scarcity and time pressure and various challenges and build up security-centered policies, have not been persuaded that security is maintained at sufficient level and therefore they have not decided to take necessary steps for democratization. Another supposition would be that since the prioritization of security provides the ruling elite with the rationale to limit political and social opposition and to increase their power and control, in the name of stability and security, they would like to continue this system.

Moreover, citizens and social groups, incorporated into the system through economic growth, social projects, public spending, having a stake in the existing regime, and fearing to lose their privileged positions, would not want a dramatic change at the current system. As with geopolitical, economic and security considerations have given the Western countries an incentive to put a premium on stability in their relations with Singapore and Azerbaijan, and the existing regimes providing stability and security, West is neither expected to demand a change. So, when we consider the third assumption of security first approach- U.S. should work with illiberal moderates, those not liberal but against the use of violence and terror, for both its own security and the international security- in our cases, it can be argued

³¹⁸ Tan Tai Yong, 2001, "Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion" p. 281; Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 22

³¹⁹ It is also important to note that lack of effective opposition, the successful economic development and public projects, merge of state and party in Singapore and clientelistic relations in Azerbaijan have vital impact on the increase of regimes' power and implementation of non-democratic policies.

that the impact of West's cooperation with the "illiberal moderates", for the maintenance of West's and international security, does not contribute to the democratization of the concerned countries.

Security first understanding argues that while dealing with autocratic countries in transition to democracy, U.S. can work with "illiberal moderates" referring to "those who disavow violence but who do not necessarily favor a liberal-democratic regime or full program of human rights", given that they provide basic security, do not avoid democratization in the long run and contribute to the international counter-terrorism efforts.³²⁰ Libya is given as a small but effective example. After Libya gave up its support for terrorism and ceased its program for Weapons of Mass Destruction, the U.S. government allowed Libya to emerge from isolation and sanctions, despite the fact that it has barely begun to reform its authoritarian regime. For Etzioni, such reforms can be promoted later as a second stage. Many elements of the existing regime should be kept in place, while considerable time should be allowed for new forces to grow.³²¹ However, having relationship with illiberal moderates for the security of the world, West and U.S. in particular, might provide those illiberal moderates with international backing and increase their power internally as a result, cause a delay in the democratization process due to presented security needs. Actually this happened in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan.

For the U.S. and West, establishment of security and order in Singapore, was important to provide a stable environment for foreign investments, which would trigger economic development and in turn avoid the progress of communism in the region. They supported rise of Singapore's state power and promoted the country as

³²⁰ Etzioni, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, pp. 85-87

³²¹ Etzioni, 2008, "A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration", pp. 100-101, 105

an ideal model for economic and political development. The U.S. and West with their strategic interests in mind, were slow or even reluctant to exercise their political and economic power to promote democratic change among their security allies during the Cold War years and they tolerated authoritarian regimes to sustain key Cold War security partners.³²² In a similar way, the U.S. favored present leaders in Azerbaijan throughout the last decade as more coherent points of contact able to manipulate state and economy to its strategic interests.³²³ The stability of the Caucasus, necessary to keep the transport of Caspian oil and gas uninterrupted, is very important for the investing companies and strategic interests of Western countries. In addition to energy needs, the Caucasus region is the crucial link between Central Asia and Europe; therefore its political stability and economic development is important to U.S. national security interests. The Caucasus countries are becoming more important security allies in the U.S. led campaign against terrorism.³²⁴ Hence Western powers are not eager for a democratic change at the expense of distancing a regime they see as a partner in fighting terrorism and a force promoting key Western oil interest.³²⁵

6.2. Main Findings of the Thesis

Much discussed stability versus democracy dilemma in Western foreign policy, and many argued that security, terrorism concerns and interests in the energy resources should not be led to overwhelm democratization, civil society building and human rights. Moreover it is highlighted that working with non-democratic leaders for the sake of regional strategic and security considerations can have negative implications

³²² James B. Steinberg, 2008, "A Sound Principle, but Not a Playbook", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), p. 1359

³²³ Salmoni, 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt..."

³²⁴ Baran, 2002, "The Caucasus: Ten Years After Independence", pp. 221, 233

³²⁵ Holley, 09.07.2003, "Dynasty and Democracy Azerbaijan at a Crossroads"

for American prestige and ability to develop relationships with today's opposition and probably tomorrow's rulers.³²⁶ Whereas Etzioni advocates the cooperation with illiberal moderates and the prioritization of security over democracy in foreign policy formulation. He states that if the U.S. aims to democratize the world, most of the countries would resist or not cooperate, if it aims to provide security for itself and the world, the majority of the states and people will share this goal. Favoring democracy as public diplomacy might lead people across the world to question the support given by the U.S. to Saudi Arabia and Egypt.³²⁷ The orientation of the foreign policy of the U.S. and West is important due to its reflections on developing world and on the democratization process of these countries. As discussed in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan, prioritization of security has been eventuated at the expense of democracy. The regimes accept some democracy in the form of the semi-free elections, press, opposition and civil society, to provide legitimacy for their rule in the eyes of the domestic and international community. Yet, democratization has not allowed occurring at the expense of security and political stability. Actually it is not possible to prioritize a thing without downgrading another. But, it is a fact that security and democracy are two values that both are inevitably necessary for the people in the modern world system, and they are not luxuries to be delayed until first the other is maintained. Prioritizing security and then expecting democracy to develop gradually and internally on the basic value of security might not work well. As shown in the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan, the interests of the ruling elite, Western powers and those people and groups having vested interests in the existing system gave way to continued utilization of the need

³²⁶ Nichol, 09.04.2009, "Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia...", p. 3; Tohidi, "Women, Democratization and Islam in Post-Soviet Azerbaijan"; Salmoni, 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt..."

³²⁷ Etzioni, 2008, "A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration", pp. 100-101, 105

to security and stability at the expense of democracy. Accordingly, especially in the developing world, the purpose should be striving for security and democracy concurrently, rather than prioritizing security and presenting it as the precondition of democracy, because prioritization of security and implementation of security-centered policies increase the power and control of the regime over society and all the sectors, which in turn lets the ruling elites to utilize the need to stability and security for the continuation of security-centered policies and their control over country.

Nevertheless the fact that democracy and security are both needed without any prioritization, the relationship between the two is not linear or affirmative at all times. There are many researches, on the one hand showing the pacifying impact of democracy both at intra-state and interstate levels, on the other hand criticizing democratic peace approach, explaining that there is not a definite positive linkage between democracy and peace or security.³²⁸ There are also studies emphasizing the instability impact of democratization causing civil or international conflict, as well as the pressures of security, preventing the maintenance of democratic process or forestalling democratic movements in democratizing countries and use of political repression by rulers against people for the sake of stability.³²⁹ Etzioni develops security first approach due to the inability of democratic peace approach, on which democracy promotion became a key strategy of U.S. foreign policy in the last decades. While democratic peace presents democracy as precondition of security, Etzioni does the other way around by his security first argument. However, the cases of this study show that putting the premium on security and expecting democracy to

³²⁸ Lake, 1992, "Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War"; Mansfield and Snyder, 1995, "Democratization and War Dangers of Transition"

³²⁹ Huntington, 2006, *Political Order in Changing Societies*; Jackson, 1992, "The Security Dilemma in Africa"

phase internally did not work. Hence the discussion in the Western foreign policy should not be security versus democracy or presenting one of them as the precondition of the other, but rather how to maintain security and democracy in the developing world without making any prioritization. Hence, security first approach might also be revised in this direction. While Etzioni argues first for security and claiming to propose a pragmatic and moral foreign policy, he considers the interests of the U.S. and tries to offer a foreign policy that is justifiable and acceptable for both U.S. citizens and citizens of the other states. Here, morality argument is not for the maintenance of justice or the well-being of the citizens of the concerned country. In foreign policy, a state would follow its own interests, this is inevitable. Yet, arguing for a moral foreign policy, which first of all considers the basic security of the citizens and then the promotion of democracy, on the other hand advocating cooperation with ruling elites that follow undemocratic policies for security, investment, energy or terrorism concerns is paradoxical. A more coherent and plausible foreign policy, with regard to developing world, should take into account the concurrent need of these countries to security and democracy and accordingly, aim to maintain security and democracy without relegating democracy to secondary position.

The case countries of this study faced the problematic of resource scarcity and challenge of doing many things at the same time and both of the governments have adopted security first approach. What is more critical is that the vulnerabilities of the countries have been utilized by governors to continue the security-centered policies that increase regimes' power. The objective dimensions of the need to security and stability have been manipulated by rulers. While Singapore's vulnerability as a small territory lacking of natural resources compared to its

relatively larger and Malay dominated neighbors in Southeast Asia and its total dependency on the external world for its livelihood provided the politicians the rationale in convincing Singaporeans of the urgency of the survival issue, Azerbaijani political elite has used Karabakh conflict to justify measures repressing the civil society and opposition. The regimes also consistently appealed to the need for social stability, due to the need to foreign investment for economic development.³³⁰ For both Singapore and Azerbaijan there were many, some of which common, factors that gave way to the adoption of security first approach, such as historical legacy, need to stability for economic development and interest of the Western powers. However, the main reason of constant keep of security and stability concerns on the public agenda and use of undemocratic and repressive measures in the name of security and stability was ruling elites' concern with regard to losing everything that they have when they lose security and governance. Singapore is a multiethnic country having 14% Malay population neighbored by mostly Malay populated big neighbours. It is economically and geographically dependent to external world. These realities have put pressure on English speaking Chinese rulers, who supports liberalism in economy. This is why Lee Kuan Yew as an English speaking Chinese, increased the power of the executive branch of PAP against the other branches consisting of other ethnicities and communists. The democratic trend that emerged just after the independence came to an end by undemocratic measures applied in order to maintain stability and security. A similar process has been experienced in Azerbaijan. Being in war and facing a real military threat made it easier for Azerbaijani rulers to limit political and social freedoms. Personal, family and clan relations and struggles and competition between these

³³⁰ Chong, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate...", p. 98; Guliyev, 2005, "Post-Soviet Azerbaijan: Transition to Sultanistic...", pp. 421-423

families and clans are an inherent part of Azerbaijani society. Hence holding the political power at hand is the safest way of being successful in any sector. With their fear of losing political stability and power and their drive for political ascendancy the PAP governments in Singapore and Aliyev regimes in Azerbaijan, have manipulated the vulnerabilities of the country with regard to security and economy, to highlight the need to security and order, which has made it easier for governors to limit the political and social opposition in the name of stability. The continuance supremacy of security issues and depending on this the control of PAP and Aliyev regimes became possible by mainly three common factors: i. interests of Western powers, ii. weakness of the opposition parties and civil societies, iii. dependency of economic development to stability and economic dependency of the people to the state – to PAP in Singapore and to Aliyev family in Azerbaijan. To avoid the prioritization of security and practice of undemocratic strategies in the developing countries, it might be useful to raise these issues.

6.3. Application of the Main Findings to Policy Making

What kind of a foreign policy might U.S. or other Western powers develop to deal with these matters? First of all, as previously mentioned security, terrorism concerns and interests in the economy and energy resources should not be led to subjugate the need to democracy. It is a fact that, no country gives up its own interests. Yet, U.S. and other Western states should not base their foreign policy strategy only on realizing their interests in short term. They should consider the many-sided implications of pursuing their own interests on the concerned country's security, democracy and citizen's lives in the long-term. This would be a more acceptable foreign policy especially with regard to both international and domestic public. In

the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan, Western powers have acted in accordance with their interests and cooperated with the governments without paying attention to the undemocratic policies that restricted political and civil life in these countries. This attitude further supported the prioritization of security in these countries.

Democratization cannot be imposed by external powers, it should be developed by internal dynamics. Nevertheless, in a country where rulers utilize the weaknesses of the country to hold on to power and use undemocratic and repressive measures to suppress opposition and civil society, it would not be rationale to expect rulers to take necessary steps for democratization, which requires accountability of the governors and limitation of their power, without any pressure. Since the opposition and civil society do not have enough power to pressurize the rulers for democratization, efforts of external powers for the empowerment of opposition and civil society would contribute to the democratization process in these countries. The basic component of empowerment process might be education. Cross-country student ex-change programs and university linkages are important to train opinion makers that would lead the civil society and give shape to opponent's arguments. For example, education of the journalist is significant in the case of Azerbaijan. Many journalist and newspapers are sued by ruling elites for defamation.³³¹ Generally, they are sentenced to very high criminal penalties, but in some cases newspapers are closed and journalists are sentenced to imprisonment. Since a free media is part of democratic right of free speech, it is important to empower journalist through training so that they to do their job without overriding others rights. It is also important that external powers should reach the different segments of society -people with different ideologies, having different ethnicities or religions,

³³¹ International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?"; Nazlı, 2007, *Freedom House: Nations in Transit 2007-Azerbaijan*

belonging to different classes- and pay attention to their concerns. People with different needs should learn to raise their demands in a democratic tradition and to find agreeable solutions to conflictual demands. They should learn how to lobbying and creating a pressure on government. While trying to empower the opposition and civil society, it should be clarified that the aim is not to change the government. Actually, a change in the power does not guarantee reforms toward democratization. This is also essential for preventing the existing regime to practice harsher strategies against the opponents and civil society. Rulers might feel threatened from the cooperation between the external powers and opponents, think about the clandestine attempts for toppling the rule and as a result resort to suppressing opponents and civil society. External powers should try to understand the concerns of the rulers as well as the concerns of citizens and opponents. Additionally they should show that they understand and also regard these concerns. For example, in Singapore's case the Malaysia and communist China are seen as a potential threat by the PAP governments and led rulers to impose restrictions on Malay and Chinese-speaking communities.³³² To avoid such suppression on these communities, and provide them with their political and civil rights on the one hand and to lessen the security concerns of the PAP government on the other hand, external powers might work to improve the good neighbourly relationships in the Southeast Asia.

A final issue that should be dealt is the dependency of economic development to political stability and economic dependency of people to the existing regime and socio-economic order. Both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, foreign investment has been the only way to economic growth and stability became the precondition for gaining foreign companies' confidence. Both countries have

³³² Lim Chong-Yah, 1984, "The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years: A Glimpse", p. 7; Paul, 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", p. 24

provided a secure environment for investors' through legal proceedings avoiding riots and protests. Economic considerations have given external powers an incentive to place stability and security first in their dealings with these countries. On the other hand, increasing wealth led governments, through public spending, to get public support and has given more people a stake in the existing system. The political economy relations are used as the base of the regime's power. People became dependent on the state for economic and social resources, including housing, employment and business contracts.³³³ As discussed previously, the external powers should consider the implications of their acts for the concerned countries. Their only criteria should not be safety and predictability for investing in developing countries. The government of the invested countries might be pressured to make reforms both at political and economic system to lessen the restrictions on political freedoms and the control of ruling elite on the economy. The investment projects might target to develop directly the region that the investment is done and the people living in that region with the aim of providing an equitable distribution of income. The investment contracts might directly be signed with local people from different communities of the society, having no linkage with the ruling elites or the government.

What kind of policies might these countries develop to overcome the delay of democratization in the name of stability and security? The problem is not security versus democracy. They are both needed and the challenge is to build security and democracy concurrently, with limited sources and institutional capacity. As discussed previously, the relationship between security and democracy might not be constructive. The problem in the developing countries is that democratization is seen

³³³ Steve Chan, 1993, *East Asian Dynamism: Growth, Order and Security in the Pacific Region*, p. 84; Guliyev, 28.02.2009, "End of Limits Monarchical Presidencies on the Rise"

as a threat to security and political stability due to its potential to cause instability and security problems, which might give way power to change hand. The possibility of losing political stability and power resorts the ruling elites to further centralize power and restrict opposition. This results in constant delay of democratization and liberalization. However, the curtailment or suppression of freedoms might aggravate the security problems of the state, regime and obviously people. When rulers repress the different demands of ethnic or religious groups or political opponents rather than trying to find ways of compromising these demands in policy making, regarding political, economic and security sectors, the legitimacy of the regime and the state becomes questionable. The weak legitimacy and lack of accountability in turn leads further restrictions and even aggressive policies because of the failure to establish fair democratic institutions and procedures to deal with different demands.³³⁴ Even, the understanding that security of state is necessary for the security of the citizens can not legitimize the restrictive and forceful strategies against the citizens, by this way, governments that are responsible to maintain peoples' security act in the direction to harm peoples' security in the name of avoiding state failure. Here the operationalization is paradoxical with the understanding. This paradoxical situation generally emerges, as it happened in the cases of this study, because power is hold by a group or class. The way that power is created and the relations between the groups within the state and the relations between the state and groups are organized is not legitimate and fair. In such a situation, the demands of other groups or classes are seen as a threat to the rule, as a result demands are oppressed and democratization is delayed. This vicious circle not only restricts the political and

³³⁴ Thomas, 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, p. 28

civil rights of people but also keeps the ruling elites in a constant worry of losing security and power.

To overcome this problem, the first step of the rulers might to gain legitimacy for their governance and continue to act in line with legitimacy. In the cases of Azerbaijan and Singapore, first governments came to power through elections, not distorted ones. But in time, they resort to undemocratic strategies and have used semi-free elections and social and economic projects as bases of their legitimacy. However, instead of implying restrictive measures against the demands of different groups and opponents, they might try to reconcile different demands in accordance with the unavoidable needs of the people and the country and available sources and capacity. Inclusion of different groups into the policy making procedure is important for the legitimacy and accountability of the rule and rulers. This might complicate the procedure and take more time to reach a decision, but on the other hand might increase the effectiveness of the policies and make the implementation part easier since they are made by the inclusion of different views and needs. Although it is difficult, strengthening the institutional capacity in order to respond fairly to different demands and include different views to policy making might be the most effective way to gain legitimacy and overcome the constant worry of losing security and power. This might also provide a chance to make policies that considers the different aspects of the issue. For example, for the ruling elites of the PAP, Malay populated neighbours and communist China have been a threat due to their concern of the potential impact of these countries on Malay and Chinese-speaking groups in the society. However, inclusion of these groups in policy making might provide the consideration of the issue from different perspectives and result in the formulation of good relations with these countries, establishment of economic or

security pacts within the region rather than restraining those groups among the society. In Azerbaijan, the rivalry between clans and families might become moderate if one of do not dominates the others and others also have a say in political, economic, societal life. If all are included in decision making, through smooth institutional and legal procedures, they would not aspire for governing as much as they do when they are excluded from the process.

Another important aspect is the situation of the opposition. Both in Singapore and Azerbaijan, opposition is weak and do not have much influence. In Singapore, the most effective opposition party, Barisan Socialis boycotted 1968 elections. The ineffectiveness of other political parties led to the dominance of the PAP. Similarly, in Azerbaijan opposition parties are not effective and they also boycotted some elections. People do not have trust in the opposition parties and think that if one of the opposition parties came to power than they will benefit form being the governor for their own interests rather than serving for the country and the citizens. It is vital to note that the weakness of the opposition and civil society is to some extend the outcome of the specific strategies of the regimes with the aim of restraining and dividing opposition parties and civil society. Refusing to take part in elections is a way of reacting and protesting, yet, the only aim of the opposition should not become the government. Opposition parties might act more responsibly and try to pressurize the government for democratization and openness through their effective alternative projects that acknowledge people about the shortages of the existing rule with regard to all sectors and necessary steps that should be taken to deal with these shortages. Here ordinary citizens have liability, too. Neither security building, nor democratization is easy and these processes create a pressure on people and affect every aspect of their life. Yet, people have responsibilities as they

have rights. Preferring to live under an autocracy and being able to go on with daily lives or to keep their vested interests and privileges in the existing system instead of abstract concepts of democracy would contribute to the postponement of democratization.

There might emerge a question with regard to the applicability of these suggestions, since Western powers and ruling elites of the concerned countries have interest in the continuation of the status quo and do not want a change that would challenge their interests, likewise those people and groups having vested interests in the existing system. It is a fact that foreign policies and relationships with other countries are determined in accordance with interests of the state, although there might be some groups paying honest attention to morality of the policies. In the current system, it is important to develop foreign policies that are justifiable both for domestic and international public. A foreign policy, developed by considering the long-term implications of it on security, democracy, economy etc. of the concerned country could be more justifiable. Pressuring the governments of those countries for democratization is also important not because democracy is perfect as stated by İbrahim, but rather its being “an optimal solution based on the systems available” for the moment.³³⁵ From the perspective of the ruling elites, taking a step for democratization and including different people and ideas to decision making process would increase their legitimacy and thus decrease their anxiety about losing power and security. Although, the restrictive measures make it possible to control the opposition and maintain stability, the fragility of the power due to lack of legitimacy create a constant fear on the side of the ruling elites. Therefore, democratization

³³⁵ Egyptian democracy activist quoted in Morton H. Halperin, Joseph T. Siegle and Michael M. Weinstein, 2005, *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, New York: Routledge, p. 25

might contribute to the longevity of the government, despite the limitation it poses on power of the government through checks and balances.

Security first approach looks at the relationship with security and democracy from the perspective of the U.S. foreign policy in failed and rogue states, however its assumptions are important due to their influence in domestic politics of developing countries. The issues raised about the foreign policies of Western powers and domestic policies of developing countries, basing on the cases of Singapore and Azerbaijan, might provide a tiny contribution to how security first approach be revised with regard to developing world, with also attention paid to internal dimensions.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ake, Claude, 1975, "A Definition of Political Stability", *Comparative Politics*, 7 (2), pp. 271-283
- Alapishvili, Levan, "The Civil-Military Relations and Democratic Control on Armed Forces in Caucasus Region: A Comparative Study", <http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/97-99/alapshvili.pdf> (Accessed on 08.09.2009)
- Al-Mahsat, Abdul-Monem M., 1985, *National Security in the Third World*, Boulder and London: Westview Press,
- Allen, Michael, 15.04.2009, "Azerbaijan's Robust Authoritarianism a Challenge to Democracy Assistance Groups", <http://www.demdigest.net/blog/2149/azerbajans-robust-authoritarianism-a-challenge-to-democracy-groups> (Accessed on 20.04.2009)
- Alieva, Leila, 2006, "Azerbaijan's Frustrating Elections", *Journal of Democracy*, 17 (2), pp. 147-160
- Aydınlı, Ersel, 2005, "Anarchy Meets Globalization: A New Security Dilemma for the Modernizing State" in E. Aydınllı and J. N. Rosenau (eds.), *Paradigms in Transition: Globalization, Security and the Nation State*, New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 99-113
- Ayoob, Mohammad, 1997, "Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective" in Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 121-146
- Azar, Edward E. and Chung-in Moon, 1988, "Rethinking Third World National Security" in Azar and Moon (eds.), *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats*, Cambridge: The University Press, pp. 1-13
- Baran, Zeyno, 2002, "The Caucasus: Ten Years After Independence", *The Washington Quarterly*, 25 (1), pp. 221-234
- Bauzon, Kenneth E., 1992, "Democratization in the Third World Myth or Reality" in Kenneth E. Bauzon (ed.), *Development and Democratization in the Third World: Myths, Hopes and Realities*, New York: Crane Russak, pp. 1-31

- Beng-Huat, Chua, 1994, "Arrested Development: Democratization in Singapore" *Third World Quarterly*, 15 (4), pp. 655-668
- Bilgin, Pinar, 2008, "The Security Sector in Theory and Practice: From 'State-Centered' Security to 'Citizen-Centered' Security? 'New Security'", *Security Sector Governance: Turkey and Europe*, İstanbul: TESEV, pp. 43-61
- _____, Ken Booth and Richard W. Jones, 1998, "Security Studies: The Next Stage?", *Naçoe e Defesa*, 84 (2), pp. 131-157
- Booth, Ken, 1991, "Security and Emancipation", *Review of International Studies*, 17, pp. 313-326
- _____, 1991, "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice", *International Affairs*, 67 (3), pp. 527-545
- _____, 1995, "Human Wrongs and International Relations", *International Affairs*, 71 (1), pp. 103-126
- _____, and Peter Vale, 1997, "Critical Security Studies and Regional Insecurity: The Case of Southern Africa" in K. Krause and M. C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 329-357
- Bruneau, Thomas C. and Scott D. Tollefson (eds.), 2006, *Who Guards the Guardians and How? Democratic Civil-Military Relations*, Austin: University of Texas Press
- Burke, Justin, 10.07.2001, *Azerbaijan Daily Digest*, <http://www.eurasianet.org/resource/azerbaijan/hypermail/200107/0009.html> (Accessed on 11.09.2009)
- Buzan, Barry, 1991, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Carothers, Thomas, 2009, "Democracy Assistance: Political vs. Developmental?", *Journal of Democracy*, 20 (1), pp. 5-19
- Cawthra, Gawin and Robin Luckham, 2003, "Democratic Control and the Security Sector The Scope for Transformation and its Limits" in Gavin Cawthra and Robin Luckham (eds.), *Governing Insecurity Democratic Control of Military and Security Establishments in Transitional Democracies*, London & New York: Zed Books, pp. 305-327
- Chan, Steve, 1993, *East Asian Dynamism: Growth, Order and Security in the Pacific Region*, Boulder: Westview Press
- Chee, Chang Heng, 1994, "Democracy, Human Rights and Social Justice as Key Factors in Balanced Development", *Round Table*, 329 (1), pp. 27-32

- Chen, S. J. Peter, 1984 "Social Change and Planning in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 315-336
- Chong, Alan, 2004, "Singaporean Foreign Policy and The Asian Values Debate, 1992-2000: Reflections on an Experiment in Soft Power", *The Pacific Review*, 17 (1), pp. 95-133
- Chong-Yah, Lim, 1984, "The Transformation of Singapore in Twenty-Five Years: A Glimpse" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 1-10
- Choo, Stephen, 2005, "Developing an Entrepreneurial Culture in Singapore: Dream or Reality", *Asian Affairs*, 36 (3), pp. 361-372
- Crouch, Harold, *Civil-Military Relations in Southeast Asia Today*, <http://www.pdgs.org.ar/partners/crouch.htm> (Accessed on 08.09.2009)
- Cohen, Ariel, 2003, "Aliiev Dynasty or Azerbaijani Democracy? Securing a Democratic Transition", Heritage Foundation, No. 324, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/wm324.cfm?renderforprint> (Accessed on 03.05.2009)
- Cornell, Svante E., 2001, "Democratization Falters in Azerbaijan", *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (2), pp. 118-131
- Davenport, Christian, 1999, "Human Rights and the Democratic Proposition", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 43 (1), pp. 92-116
- David, Steven, 1998, "The Primacy of Internal War" in Stephanie G. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 77- 102
- Dawisha, Karen, 1997, "Democratization and Political Participation: Research Concepts and Methodologies" in Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrott (eds.), *The Consolidation of Democracy in East-Central Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 40-65
- Daxecker, Ursula E., 2007, "Perilous Polities? An Assessment of the Democratization-Conflict Linkage", *European Journal of International Relations*, 13 (4), pp. 527-553
- Dent, Christopher M., 2002, *The Foreign Economic Policies of Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar
- Dessouki, Ali E. Hillal, 1993, "Dilemmas of Security and Development in the Arab World: Aspects of the Linkage" in B. Korany, P. Noble and R. Brynen (eds.), *Many Faces of National Security in the Arab World*, London: MacMillan, pp. 76-90

- Diamond, Larry and Leonardo Morlino, 2004, "Quality of Democracy: An Overview", *Journal of Democracy*, 15 (4), pp. 20-31
- _____, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset, 1995, "What Makes for Democracy?" in L. Diamond, J. J. Linz and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Donald K. Emmerson, 1995, "Singapore and Asian Values Debate", *Journal of Democracy*, 6 (4), pp. 95-105
- Etzioni, Amitai, 2007, "Security First Ours, Theirs and the Global Order's", *The National Interest*, pp. 11-15
- _____, 2007, *Security First for a Muscular, Moral Foreign Policy*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press
- _____, 2008, "A National Security Strategy for the Next Administration", *Military Review*, pp. 99-105
- Fairbanks, Charles H., 2001, "Disillusionment in the Caucasus and Central Asia", *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (4), pp. 49-56
- Freedom House, 2006, *Nations in Transit 2006-Azerbaijan*, www.freedomhouse.org/pdfdocs/azerbaijan/2006.pdf
- Galbreath, David J., 2004, "Democratization and Inter-State War: Why Reform does not Encourage Conflict?", *Political Studies Association*, 24 (3), pp. 206-214
- George, Cherian, 2007, "Consolidating Authoritarian Rule: Calibrated Coercion in Singapore", *The Pacific Review*, 20 (2), pp. 127-145
- Goldsmith, Arthur A., 2008, "Making the World Safe for Partial Democracy? Questioning the Premises of Democracy Promotion", *International Security*, 33 (2), pp. 120-147
- Goltz, Thomas, 1998, *Azerbaijan Diary a Rogue Reporter's Adventures in an Oil-Rich, War-Torn, Post-Soviet Republic*, New York: M. E. Sharpe
- Guliyev, Farid, 2005, "Post-Soviet Azerbaijan: Transition to Sultanistic Semiauthoritarianism? An Attempt at Conceptualization", *Demokratizatsiya*, 13 (3), pp. 393-435
- _____, 22.04.2009, "Azerbaijan Continues to Eschew Genuine Democracy", *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty*, <http://www.rferl.org/content/AzerbaijanContinues-to-Eschew-Genuine-Democracy/1613850.html> (Accessed on 30.04.2009)

- _____, 28.02.2009, “End of Limits Monarchical Presidencies on the Rise”, *Harvard International Review*, <http://www.harvardir.org/articles/1823> (Accessed on 30.04.2009)
- _____, 16.04.2009, “Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely: Azerbaijan Lifts Term Limits”, *ResetDoc*, <http://www.resetdoc.org/EN/Azerbaijan-democracy-referendum.php> (Accessed on 30.04.2009)
- _____, 2009, “Oil Wealth, Patrimonialism and the Failure of Democracy in Azerbaijan”, *Caucasus Analytical Digest*, pp. 2-5
- Güven, Erdal, 15.08.2003, “Azerbaycan mı Demokratik? (Is Azerbaijan Democratic?)”, *Radikal*, (Accessed on 03.05.2009)
- Hadjy-Zadeh, Hikmet, 2002, “Civil Control on Armed Forces in Young Nations: The Case of Azerbaijan”, paper presented at *DCAF Conference on Civilians in National Security Policy*, www.dcaf.ch/cersp/ev_geneva_papers_hadjy.pdf (Accessed on 12.09.2009)
- Halperin, Morton H., Joseph T. Siegle and Michael M. Weinstein, 2005, *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, New York: Routledge
- Haynes, Jeff, 1996, *Third World Politics a Concise Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Henderson, A. Errol, 2002, *Democracy and War The End of an Illusion?*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Heradstveit, Daniel, 2001, “Democratic Development in Azerbaijan and the Role of the Western Oil Industry”, *Central Asian Survey*, 20 (3), pp. 261-288
- Hock, Ow Chin, 1984, “Singapore: Past, Present and Future” in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 366-380
- Holley, David, 09.07.2003, “Dynasty and Democracy Azerbaijan at a Crossroads”, *Los Angeles Times*, http://www.ncsj.org/AuxPages/090703LATimes_Azr.shtml (Accessed on 03.05.2009)
- Holsti, Kal J., 1998, “International Relations Theory and Domestic War in the Third World: The Limits of Relevance” in Stephanie G. Neumann (ed.), *International Relations and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, pp. 103-132
- Huntington, Samuel P., 2006, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven: Yale University Press,
- _____, 1993, *The Third Wave Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press

- _____, 1965, Political Development and Political Decay, *World Politics*, 17 (3), pp. 386-430
- Hurwitz, Leon, 1973, "Contemporary Approaches to Political Stability, *Comparative Politics*, 5 (3), pp. 449-463
- International Crisis Group, 13.05.2004, "Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?" *ICG Europe Report*, No. 156
- _____, 14.11.2007, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Risking War", *ICG Europe Report*, No. 187
- Ipek, Pinar, 2009, "Azerbaijan's Foreign Policy and Challenges for Energy Security", *Middle East Journal*, 63(2), pp. 227-239
- _____, 2007, "Challenges for Democratization in Central Asia: What Can the U.S. Do?", *Middle East Policy*, 14 (1), pp. 95-106
- Ish-Shalom, Piki, 2008, "Render Unto Caesar That Which is Caesar's On the Joint Pursuit of Morality and Security, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1285-1302
- _____, "For a Democratic Peace of Mind: Politicization of the Democratic Peace Theory", *Harvard International Review*, Web Perspectives, <http://hir.harvard.edu/articles/1503/> (Accessed on 19.11.09)
- İsmail, Alman Mir, 10.01.2008, "Presidential Elections in Azerbaijan Present a New Set of Opportunities, Central Asia Caucasus Institute, <http://www.cacianalyst.org/?q=node/4950> (Accessed on 04.05.2009)
- Jackson, Robert H., 1992, "The Security Dilemma in Africa" in Brian L. Job (ed.), *Security Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, pp. 81-94
- Job, Brian, 1992, "Insecurity Dilemma: National, Regime and State Securities in the Third World" in B. Job (ed.), *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp. 11-35
- Juan, Chee Soon, 2001, "Pressing For Openness in Singapore", *Journal of Democracy*, 12 (2), pp. 157-167
- Kapstein, Ethan B., 2008, Nathan Converse, "Why Democracies Fail", *Journal of Democracy*, 19 (4), pp. 57-68
- Karl, Terry Lynn, 1990, "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America", *Comparative Politics*, 23 (1), pp. 1-21
- Khng, Heng Hiang, 1997, "Economic Development and Political Change the Democratization Process in Singapore" in A. Laothamatas (ed.),

- Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Thailand: Trasvin Publications, pp. 113-140
- Kimmagine, Daniel, *Toward a New Paradigm for the Post-Soviet Petrostates*, http://www.rferl.org/content/Toward_A_New_Paradigm_For_The_Post_Soviet_Petrostates (Accessed on 21.05.2009)
- Kramer, David J., 29.07.2008, "Remarks on Democracy, Human Rights in Azerbaijan", Statement before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, <http://www.america.gov/st/texttrans-english/2008/July/20080730165746eaifas0.212063.html&distid=ucs> (Accessed on 29.05.2009)
- Krause, Keith, 1998, "Theorizing Security, State Formation and the Third World in the Post-Cold War World", *Review of International Studies*, 24, pp. 125-136
- _____, and Michael C. Williams, 1996, "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods", *Mershon International Studies Review* 40, pp. 229-254
- Kuok, Lynn, 2008, "The Lodestar for US Foreign Policy In Southeast Asia?", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1405-1450
- Lake, David A., 1992, "Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War", *American Political Science Review*, 86 (1), pp. 24-37
- Lamy, Steven, 2001, "Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism" in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, pp. 182-199
- Laothamatas, Anek, 1997, "Development and Democratization A Theoretical Introduction with Reference to the southeast Asian And East Asian Cases" in A. Laothamatas (ed.), *Democratization in Southeast and East Asia*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp. 1-20
- Luckham, Robin, 2003, "Democratic Strategies for Security in Transition and Conflict" in Gavin Cawthra and Robin Luckham (eds.), *Governing Insecurity Democratic Control of Military and Security Establishments in Transitional Democracies*, London & New York: Zed Books, pp. 3-28
- _____, 1998, "Are There Alternatives to Liberal Democracy?" in Mark Robinson and Gordon White (eds.), *The Democratic Developmental State Politics and Institutional Design*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 306-342
- Mahalli, Hüsni, 19.10.2003, "Azerbaycan ve Demokratik Seçim" (Azerbaijan and Democratic Election), *Yeni Şafak* (Accessed on 04.05.2009)
- Mahler, Vincent A., 2008, "On Providing and Enforcing Basic Security", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp.1370-1373

- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder, 1995, "Democratization and War Dangers of Transition", *Foreign Affairs*, 79, pp. 79-97
- Mares, R. David (ed.), 1998, *Civil Military Relations, Building Democracy and Regional Security in Latin America, Southern Asia and Central Europe*, Boulder: Westview Press
- McFaul, Michael A. et al., 2008, "Strategic Leadership: Framework for a 21st Century National Security Strategy", Centre for a New American Security, http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/07_national_security_brainard.aspx (Accessed on 08.09.2009)
- McDonald, Matt, 2008, "Securitization and the Construction of Security", *European Journal of International Relations*, 14 (4), pp. 563-587
- Means, Gordon P., 1996, "Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore", *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (4), pp. 103-117
- Meow, Seah Chee, 1984, "Political Change and Continuity in Singapore" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 235-252
- Mkrtchyan, Tigran, "Democratization and the Conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh" www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_turkey_tpq_id_111.pdf (Accessed on 21.05.2009)
- Musabayov, Rasim, 2005, "The Karabakh Conflict and Democratization in Azerbaijan", <http://www.c-r.org/our-work/accord/nagorny-karabakh/conflict-democratizaiton-azerbaijan>
- Neack, Laura, 2007, *Elusive Security: States First, People Last*, MD: Rowman & Littlefield,
- Nassibli, Nasib, 1999-2000, "Azerbaijan's Geopolitics and Oil Pipeline Issue", *Perceptions*, 4 (4)
- Nazlı, H. Kaan, 2007, *Freedom House: Nations in Transit 2007-Azerbaijan*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers
- Neuman, Stephanie G., 1998, "International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron?" in S. Neuman (ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*, New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 1-27
- Nichol, Jim, 30.11.2005, "Azerbaijan's 2005 Legislative Election: Outcome and Implications for U.S. Interests", *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*
- _____, 09.04.2009, "Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia: Political Developments and Implications for US Interests", *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*

- Nuriyev, Elkhan, 2007, "EU Policy in the South Caucasus: A View from Azerbaijan", *Centre for European Policy Studies*, Working Paper, No. 272
- Öztarsu, Mehmet Fatih, 17.04.2009, "Azerbaycan ve Türkiye Askeri İlişkileri", *Azerbaycan Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi* <http://www.azsam.org/modules.php?name=News&file=print&sid=428> (Accessed on 11.09.2009)
- Ostergard, R. L., 2002, "Politics in the Hot Zone: AIDS and National Security in Africa", *Third World Quarterly*, 23 (2), pp. 333-350
- Paul, Eric. C., 1992, "Obstacles to Democratization in Singapore", *Centre of Southeast Asian Studies*, Working Paper 78
- Pierskalla, Jan Henryk, 2009, "Protest, Deterrence and Escalation: The Strategic Calculus of Government Repression", *MPSA Conference: Panel on Game Theoretic Approaches on the Study of Civil War*, www.poli.duke.edu/gsc/files/pierskalla09.pdf (Accessed on 22.10.2009)
- Pinkley, Robert, 2003, *Democracy in the Third World*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Poe, Steven C. and Neal Tate, 1994, "Repression of Human Rights to Personal Integrity in the 1980s: A Global Analysis", *American Political Science Review*, 88 (4), pp. 853-872
- Potter, David, David Goldblatt, Margaret Kihol and Paul Lewis (eds.), 1997, *Democratization*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, Jose A. Cheibub, Fernando Limongi, 1996, "What Makes Democracies Endure?", *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (1), pp. 39-55
- Quah, Jon S. T., 1984, "The Public Bureaucracy in Singapore, 1959-1984" in Y. P. Seng and L. C. Yah (eds.), *Singapore: Twenty-Five Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zaobao, pp. 288-310
- Rajagopalan, Swarna, *Security and Democracy*, http://infochangeindia.org/index2.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=7577 (Accessed on 31.07.2009)
- Rasizade, Alec, 2002, "Azerbaijan After a Decade of Independence: Less Oil, More Graft and Poverty", *Central Asian Survey*, 21 (4), pp. 349-370
- _____, 2003, "Azerbaijan in Transition to the New Age of Democracy", *Communist and Post Communist Studies*, 36, pp. 345-372
- Regan, Patrick M. and Errol A. Henderson, 2002, "Democracy, Threats and Political Repression in Developing Countries: Are Democracies Internally Less Violent?", *Third World Quarterly*, 23 (1), pp. 119-136

- Report of International Election Observation Mission for the Parliamentary Elections of Republic of Azerbaijan, 7 November 2005, <http://www.osce.org/item/16887.html> (Accessed on 12.09.2009)
- Rice, Condoleezza, 11.12.2005, "The Promise of Democratic Peace: Why Promoting Freedom is the Only Realistic Path to Security", *The Washington Post* (Accessed on 16.06.2009)
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas, 1995, "Democratic Peace – Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument", *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (4), pp. 491-517
- Rodan, Garry, 2009, "Accountability and Authoritarianism: Human Rights in Malaysia and Singapore", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 39 (2), pp. 180-203
- _____, and Kanishka Jayasuriya, 2009, "Capitalist Development, Regime Transition and New Forms of Authoritarianism in Asia", *The Pacific Review*, 22 (1), pp. 23-47
- _____, 2006, "Singapore 'Exceptionalism'? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation", *Asia Research Centre*, Working Paper 131
- Rothstein, Robert L., 1995, "Democracy in the Third World: Definitional Dilemmas" in David Garnham and Mark A. Tessler (eds.), *Democracy, War and Peace in the Middle East*, Indiana: Indiana University Press, pp. 65-81
- Rummel, R. J., *Democratization*, <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/DEMOC.HTM> (Accessed on 27.02.2009)
- _____, 1995, "Democracies are Less Warlike than Other Regimes", *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (4), pp. 457-479
- Russett, Bruce, 2009, "The Democratic Peace: What It Is, and What It Isn't?", Forthcoming in *Human Security Report*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <http://pantheon.yale.edu/~brusset/> (Accessed on 19.09.2009)
- Salmoni, Barak A., 02.12.2003, "Electoral Survival of the Most Corrupt? Azerbaijan, Georgia and American Regional Goals", Center for Contemporary Conflict, <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/people/salmoni.asp> (Accessed on 03.05.2009)
- Sanchez, Peter, 2008, "Is Security First Simply a Repackaged Realism?", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1374-1376
- Sharma, B. Kumar, 1989, *Political Instability in India*, New Delhi: Mittal Publications
- Singh, Bilveer, 2008, "Singapore Success at Home, Challenges from Abroad", *Southeast Asian Affairs*, pp. 315-330

- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2008, *SIPRI Yearbook 2008: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Smith, Steve, 1990, "The Increasing Insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing Security in the Last Twenty Years", *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20 (3), pp. 72-101
- Sorensen, George, 2008, *Democracy and Democratization Processes and Prospects in a Changing World*, Boulder: Westview Press
- "Sorun Seçim Değil Rejim (The Problem is not the Election, but the Regime)", 27.07.2009, *Radikal*, (El Kudsul Arabi, 25.07.2009, Editorial)
- Steinberg, James B., 2008, "A Sound Principle, but Not a Playbook", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (9), pp. 1357-1361
- Swietochowski, Tadeusz, 1999, "Azerbaijan: Perspectives from the Crossroads", *Central Asian Survey*, 18 (4), pp. 419-434
- Tan, See Seng, Alvin Chew, 2008, "Governing Singapore's Security Sector: Problems, Prospects and Paradox", *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 30 (2), pp. 241-263
- Terchek, Ronald J. and Thomas C. Conte, 2001, *Theories of Democracy a Reader*, Boulder: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers
- Thomas, Caroline, 2000, *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge Of Poverty and Inequality*, London: Pluto Press
- _____, 1987, *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner
- The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, 1996, <http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/national/1996stra.htm> (Accessed on 05.08.2009)
- Thomas, Raju G. C., 1996, *Democracy, Security and Development in India*, New York: St. Martin Press
- Tilly, Charles, 2007, *Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Tohidi, Nayereh, *Women, Democratization and Islam in Post-Soviet Azerbaijan*, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?doc_id=8659&fuseaction=topics.publications (Accessed on 21.05.2009)
- Total Defence*, <http://www.ne.edu.sg/fiveaspects.htm> (Accessed on 08.09.2009)
- Ullman, Richard, 1983, "Redefining Security", *International Security*, 8 (1), pp. 129-153

- Yong, Tan Tai, 2001, "Singapore: Civil-Military Fusion" in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), *Coercion and Governance: The Declining Political Role of the Military in Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 276-293
- Yun-han, Chu, 2006, "Third-Wave Democratization in East Asia: Challenges and Prospect", *ASIEN*, 100, pp. 11-17
- Van Der Schriek, Daan, 02.02.2003, "Little to Lose: Opposition in Azerbaijan", *Euroasianet*, <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/rights/articles/eav020303> (Accessed on 03.05.2009)
- Verweij, Marco, Riccardo Pelizzo, 2009, "Singapore: Does Authoritarianism Pay?", *Journal of Democracy*, 20 (2), pp. 18-32
- Walt, Stephen M., 1998, "International Relations: One World Many Theories", *Foreign Policy*, 110, pp. 29-46
- Waltz, Kenneth, 2003, "The Anarchic Structure of World Politics" in Robert Art and Robert Jervis (eds.), *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*, 6th ed., New York: Longman, pp. 47-67
- Ward, D. Michael and Kristen S. Gleditsch, 1998, "Democratizing for Peace", *American Political Science Review*, 92 (1), pp. 51-61
- Welzel, Christian and Ronald Inglehart, 2008, "The Role of Ordinary People in Democratization", *Journal of Democracy*, 19 (1), pp. 126-140
- Williams, Marc, 1989, "The Developing Countries and the International Economic Order: A View from the South" in C. Thomas and P. Saravanamuttu (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in South/North Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-58
- Williams, Paul, 2008, "Security Studies: An Introduction" in P. Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, pp. 1-12
- Wolfers, Arnold, 1962, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press