# THE MOTIVATIONS OF TURKEY AND SOUTH KOREA FOR SENDING TROOPS TO PEACE OPERATIONS: UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, AND ISAF

**A Master's Thesis**

**by**

**JIN WOO KIM**

**Department of**
**International Relations**
**Bilkent University**
**Ankara**

**June 2010**

# THE MOTIVATIONS OF TURKEY AND SOUTH KOREA FOR SENDING TROOPS TO PEACE OPERATIONS: UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, AND ISAF

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

JIN WOO KIM

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

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

June 2010

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 Masters of Arts in International Relations.

------------------------------
Assistant Professor H. Tarık Oğuzlu
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 Masters of Arts in International Relations.

------------------------------
Professor Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu
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 Masters of Arts in International Relations.

------------------------------
Assistant Professor Aylin Güney
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

------------------------------
Professor Erdal Erel
Director

# ABSTRACT

# THE MOTIVATIONS OF TURKEY AND SOUTH KOREA
# FOR SENDING TROOPS TO PEACE OPERATIONS:
# UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, AND ISAF

**Kim, Jin Woo**

M.A., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. H. Tarık Oğuzlu

June 2010

Since the end of the Cold War, Turkey and South Korea have been actively participating in peace operations. Both states have many commonalities, such as substantial economic and military capabilities, considerable regional political influence, and strong relationships with the United States. Another similarity they share is in terms of their decisions to send troops to relatively risky operations in which they have no direct economic or strategic interests. The aim of this thesis is to find out the decisive motivations of Turkey and South Korea, which could both be identified as "allied new middle powers," for sending troops to the post-Cold War peace operations. Through analyzing the processes that led up to Turkey's and South Korea's decisions to participate in UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, and ISAF, I have reached a conclusion that both states are highly motivated by future-oriented ideational considerations, namely, their intentions to become multi-regional or global actors in the new era. I have also discovered that indirect security concerns, the domestic factors, and potential economic benefits are less influential motivating factors for both Turkey and South Korea.

**Keywords**: Peace Operations, Motivation, Turkey, South Korea, UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, ISAF, Ideational Consideration

# ÖZET

## TÜRKİYE VE GÜNEY KORE'NİN BARIŞ OPERASYONLARINA ASKER GÖNDERMELERİNİN MOTIVASYONLARI: UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, VE ISAF

**Kim, Jin Woo**

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. H. Tarık Oğuzlu

June 2010

Soğuk Savaş bitiminden itibaren, Türkiye ve Güney Kore, çeşitli barış operasyonlarına aktif bir şekilde katılmaktadır. İki ülke, oldukça büyük ekonomik ve askeri güç, önemli derecedeki bölgesel politika üzerinde etkileri, ve Amerika ile olan güçlü ilişkiler gibi benzerliklere sahiptir. Ayrıca, iki ülke, hem tehlike ihtimali yüksek olan, hem de direkt ekonomik veya stratejik çıkar sağlamayan operasyonlara asker gönderme bakımından birbirine benzemektedir. Bu tez "müttefikli yeni orta güçler" olarak tanımlanabilen Türkiye ve Güney Kore'nin Soğuk Savaş sonrası barış operasyonlarına asker göndermelerinde etkili olan motivasyonları bulmayı hedeflemektedir. Türkiye ve Güney Kore'nin UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, ve ISAF operasyonlarına katılma kararlarını almalarına kadar olan süreçlerin incelenme sonucu, iki ülkenin geleceğe yönelik düşüncel fikirler, yani, yeni çağda birden fazla bölgeye uzanan veya küresel aktör haline gelme niyetleri ile motive edildiği öğrenilmiştir. Ayrıca, dolaylı güvenlik kuşkuları, yurtiçi faktörler, ve olası ekonomik kazançların Türkiye ve Güney Kore'yi fazla motive etmediği kanıtlanmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler**: Barış Operasyonları, Motivasyon, Türkiye, Güney Kore, UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, ISAF, Düşüncel Fikirler

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

**AIA**            Afghan Interim Authority

**AKP**            *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*

           (Justice and Development Party)

**ANA**            Afghan National Army

**ANAP**           *Anavatan Partisi* (Motherland Party)

**ANP**            Afghan National Police

**ANSF**           Afghan National Security Force

**AOR**            Area of Responsibility

**ATA**            Afghan Transitional Authority

**APEC**           Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation

**ASEAN**          Association of Southeast Asian Nations

**BSEC**           Black Sea Economic Cooperation

**DAC**            Development Assistance Committee

**ECOMOG**         Economic Community of West African States Military

           Observer Group

**EU**             European Union

**EUROMARFOR**     European Maritime Force

**GDP**            Gross Domestic Product

| | |
|---|---|
| **GNP** | Gross National Product |
| **ICRC** | International Committee of the Red Cross |
| **IMF** | International Monetary Fund |
| **ISAF** | International Security Assistance Force |
| **MNF** | Multinational Force |
| **MTF** | Maritime Task Force |
| **NATO** | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| **NPT** | Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty |
| **NRDC-T** | NATO Rapid Deployable Corps-Turkey |
| **ODA** | Official Development Assistance |
| **OECD** | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| **OEF** | Operation Enduring Freedom |
| **ONUMOZ** | United Nations Operation in Mozambique |
| **OSCE** | Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe |
| **PfP** | Partnership for Peace |
| **PLO** | Palestine Liberation Organization |
| **PKK** | *Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan* (Kurdistan Workers Party) |
| **PKO** | Peacekeeping Operation |
| **PRT** | Provincial Reconstruction Team |
| **PSI** | Proliferation Security Initiative |
| **QRF** | Quick Reaction Force |
| **SC** | Security Council |
| **SCM** | Security Consultative Meeting |

| | |
|---|---|
| **SNA** | Somali National Alliance |
| **TAF** | Turkish Armed Forces |
| **TGNA** | Turkish Grand National Assembly |
| **UN** | United Nations |
| **UNIFIL** | United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon |
| **UNITAF** | Unified Task Force |
| **UNMIH** | United Nations Mission in Haiti |
| **UNOSOM** | United Nations Operation in Somalia |
| **UNPROFOR** | United Nations Protection Force |
| **UNTAC** | United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia |
| **UNTAG** | United Nations Transitional Assistance Group |
| **WMDs** | Weapons of Mass Destruction |

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

Starting from the supervision of truce between Israel and its neighboring Arab states in 1948, peace operations became one of the most effective tools of the United Nations (UN) for maintaining international peace and security. During the Cold War, the major purpose of peace operations was to prevent struggles between the United States and the Soviet Union from intruding into peripheral areas.[1] Due to the frequent paralysis of the UN Security Council (SC), which originated from rivalry between the two superpowers, the scope of peace operations was limited, and only a small number of states participated in the peace operations of early years.[2] As the Cold War came to an end, the range of peace operations rapidly extended to include a variety of missions, such as assistance to build sustainable institutions of governance, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants. The nature of peace operations also changed as the international community started to get involved in intra-state conflicts and civil wars by sending peacekeepers. In

---

[1]The second UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold labeled this as 'preventive diplomacy.' See, Claude, Inis Lothair Jr. 1967. *Swords into Plowshares* (New York: Random House): 312-313

[2] Only 26 states participated in the UN peace operations until 1988. These states were medium-sized developed states (e.g. Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden), larger developing states (e.g. India and Pakistan), and smaller developing states (e.g. Fiji, Ghana, Nepal and Senegal). See, The United Nations. 1995.*UN Press Release*, SG/SM/95/52: 2

addition, states that had not been involved in any peace operations during the Cold War started to send their troops to peace operations. Currently, more than 110,000 UN personnel from nearly 120 countries are being deployed in conflict zones around the world.[3]

To a great extent, the participation of more states in peace operations following the demise of the Soviet Union can be explained by structural change, from a bipolar world to a unipolar world, since it unleashed many new conflicts and consequently necessitated more UN engagements for the resolution of those conflicts. However, increased need of UN involvement brought by the emergence of a unipolar world has limitation in thoroughly explaining states' participation in peace operations. Especially, given the fact that UN member states have no obligation to provide their troops for any new peace operations, states' decisions to send their troops to peace operations are not necessarily natural consequences of the post-Cold War era. Although the direct impact of change in the global order is hardly deniable, it is thought that states' decisions to take part in peace operations have much to do with states' own considerations, similar to the way they make other foreign policy decisions. In other words, some motivating factors are at work in states' decisions to send their troops to peace operations in the post-Cold War era.

Among the states that started appearing in the field of peace operations after the Cold War, a group including Spain, Turkey, Argentina, and South Korea made huge progress by contributing sizable troops to various peace operations. What makes these states' contributions distinct from the other newcomers is their active participation in relatively risky operations in which they have minor economic or strategic interests. These states are similar to one another in terms of substantial

---

[3] The message of the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, in 'Honoring 60 Years of United Nations Peacekeeping,' available at: http://www.un.org/events/peacekeeping60/sgmessage.shtml

economic and military capabilities, considerable regional political influence, and strong relationships with the United States. To represent these states, the term "allied new middle powers" will be used throughout my research in order to differentiate them from traditional middle powers, such as Australia, Canada, Norway, and Sweden. Although an "allied new middle power" has some characteristics of a traditional middle power, the former lacked the "international behavior" in the Cold War period that was pursued by the latter.[4] In addition, with the arrival of the post-Cold War period, "allied new middle powers" tend to go beyond their Cold-War geographical restrictions, whereas traditional middle powers tend to relocate their focus of diplomacy from multinational activities to regional activities.[5]

How can we explain the appearance of "allied new middle powers" as active contributors in the field of peace operations in the post-Cold War era, especially their active participation in relatively risky operations in which they have minor economic or strategic interests? Given the new international order that emerged in the 1990s, which gave the majority of states little geopolitical incentive to getting involved in conflicts outside their own sphere of influence, the active participation of the "allied new middle powers" in such operations seems to be extraordinary. It is generally accepted that economic profit from the UN reimbursements for the costs of troop contributions is the main motivating factor for less-developed or under-developing states, which clearly explains why states like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Ghana, and Nepal are in the top 10 list of troop contributors

---

[4] 'International behavior' or 'middle power diplomacy' is the most often used criterion in identifying 'middle powers' during the Cold War. It means the tendency to pursue multilateral solutions to international problems, to embrace compromise positions in international disputes, and to embrace notions of 'good international citizenship' to guide diplomacy. See, Cooper, Andrew F. and Higgott, Richard A. and Nossal, Kim R. 1993. *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order* (Great Britain: Macmillan Press): 19

[5] In the post-Cold War period, Australia turned to making relationship with its neighbors in the Asia-Pacific and the activity of Sweden centered on the Baltic/Hansa region. See, Cooper, Andrew F.1997. "Niche Diplomacy: A Conceptual Overview," in *Niche Diplomacy*, eds., Cooper, Andrew F. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers): 18-19

published by the UN.[6] However, this factor is not necessarily relevant for "allied new middle powers," because they already have sizable economic capabilities. On the other hand, it is unlikely that "allied new middle powers" send their troops to those peace operations with purely altruistic intentions because even seemingly the most altruistic Nordic states' participation in the Cold War peace operations was in fact shaped by their common interests.[7] This unsolved puzzle, namely, what motivates the "allied new middle powers" to dispatch their troops to relatively risky peace operations in which they have no direct economic or strategic interests is the main focus of my research. Is there one dominating motivation? If not, which motivations are at work when the "allied new middle powers" decide to participate in risky and irrelevant peace operations in the post-Cold War era?

The main reason why I choose to analyze the motivations of "allied new middle powers" is the scarcity of studies on the subject, despite those states' considerable contribution to peace operations after the end of the Cold War. The majority of the existing literature examining motivations for participating in peace operations generally focuses on developed Western states, such as France, Canada, and Nordic states. Furthermore, in spite of many states' emergences as new contributors to peace operations in the post-Cold War era, little attention has been paid to studying the motivations of the new peacekeepers, except some states that can be categorized as great powers, such as the United States, Germany, and Japan. Since developed Western states or great powers account for just a small part of the world in terms of national characteristics, it is difficult for us to get a broader understanding of the other states' motivations for sending troops to peace operations

---

[6] The United Nations. 2008. *United Nations Peace Operations Year in Review: 2008* (New York: UN Department of Public Information): 51, available at:
http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/yir/yir2008.pdf
[7] Jakobsen, Peter V. 2006. *Nordic Approaches to Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge): 19

by merely depending on the existing literature. By analyzing the decisive motivations of the "allied new middle powers," which not only have been playing a leading role in the post-Cold War peace operations, but also have been in a state of transition from developing country status to newly developed country status, a wider range of nations' motivations for participating in peace operations can be understood.

For the purpose of analyzing the motivations of the "allied new middle powers," my research will be carried out by taking two representative case states, Turkey and South Korea. Turkey and South Korea have substantial economic and military capabilities as illustrated in Table 1. Furthermore, both states have significant political influence in their own regions. Turkey has been playing an active role in regional organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC), and its regional influence will further

**Table 1. Facts of Turkey and South Korea (2008)**[8]

|  | **Turkey** | **South Korea** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Population | 76.8 million (17th) | 48.5 million (25th) |
| GDP | 903 billion $ (17th) | 1,338 billion $ (14th) |
| Military Expenditure | 2.1% of GDP | 2.6% of GDP |
| Active Military Personnel | 514,000 | 655,000 |

---

[8] The information used in Table 1. are in reference to *CIA World Fact Book* (Population and GDP), available at: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/ ; *SIPRI Military Expenditure Database* (Military Expenditure), available at: http://milexdata.sipri.org/ ; and the official websites of South Korean Ministry of National Defense and Turkish General Staff (Active Military Personnel), available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/mndReform/problem/problem_1/index.jsp#03 and http://www.tsk.tr/eng/genel_konular/kuvvetyapisi.htm

increase once the full membership negotiations with the European Union (EU), which began in 2005, are completed. Similarly, South Korea has been projecting its regional leverage in regional organizations, like the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Plus Three, and its rapid transformation into a wealthy and industrialized economy is being lauded and emulated by other regional states. When it comes to these two states' relations with the United States, Turkey has retained a military alliance with the United States through NATO since its membership in 1952 and has upgraded bilateral economic relations with the United States through the Economic Partnership Commission that was established in 2002. South Korea has also held a bilateral military alliance with the United States following the Korean War (1950 – 1953) and is currently the seventh-largest trading partner of the United States. Turkey's and South Korea's strong relationships with the superpower in the post-Cold War era have remained unchanged, although both states have experienced discord over some issues.[9] Other than the aforementioned characteristics of an "allied new middle power," Turkey and South Korea also have many other commonalities. The two states have similar democratic political systems and maintain a conscription system for their militaries. Both states also have some unsolved problems with neighboring states[10], and thus need constant international and US support. Furthermore, both Turkey and South Korea share the view that a stable global and regional order is essential for their further development in the political, economic, and security fields. These commonalities between Turkey and South Korea will help me obtain more

---

[9] For instance, the Turkish – US relations suffered a rupture in 2003 following the failure of adopting the resolution allowing US troops to use Turkish territories in attacking Iraq. There was also huge anti-American sentiment in South Korea due to the military vehicle accident, which killed two South Korean girls in 2002.
[10] Turkey has problems with Greece, Syria, and Iraq (Kurdish Regional Government) and South Korea has problems with North Korea and Japan.

objective and reliable results.

There is no doubt that both Turkey and South Korea have been actively participating in peace operations since the end of the Cold War. Turkey, which had distanced itself from peace operations during the Cold War except for the UN-led multinational force in the Korean War, started contributing to various peace operations in 1988. Turkey's increased commitments to peace operations can be easily seen from its taking over the $2^{nd}$ and $7^{th}$ command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. South Korea had not participated in any peace operation during the Cold War. However, South Korea has been increasing its commitments to various peace operations, starting from its first peace operation in 1993. South Korea's current plan to establish a national peace operation center and to create a standby high readiness force for overseas operations in 2010 clearly reveals its willingness to participate in peace operations.[11]

When it comes to the selection of peace operations to be analyzed, three post-Cold War peace operations will be chosen. These three chosen cases are in accordance with the two criteria, "risk" and "minor nature of direct economic or strategic attractiveness." These three operations in question are the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II), the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL II), and ISAF in Afghanistan. Turkey and South Korea participated (or are participating) in these three peace operations with quite sizable troops (more than a company-sized unit), not a merely symbolic number of troops. All the three peace operations are relatively dangerous, carried out under Chapter VI plus (UNIFIL II) or Chapter VII (UNOSOM II and ISAF) of the UN Charter, and hence Turkey and

---

[11] Joong-Ang Daily News. 2009. '군, 내년초 해외파병 상비부대 창설 (South Korean Armed Forces, planning to establish a standby high readiness force for oversea operations in the next year),' 04 October, available at: http://article.joins.com/article/article.asp?total_id=3805680

South Korea risked potential casualties when deciding to join the operations.[12] The high risk of these three peace operations implies that there might be more strong motivations of Turkey and South Korea for sending troops. In addition, all the three operations have little to do with both Turkey and South Korea in terms of direct economic or strategic attractiveness. It is difficult to say that Turkey has no interest in the peace operations carried out in Europe (the Balkans) and South Korea has no interest in the peace operations carried out in Asia (East Asia), because each region constitutes a political, economic, and security priority for each state. However, Somalia in Africa and Afghanistan in Central Asia do not necessarily constitute any significance to either Turkey or South Korea due to their geographical remoteness. Lebanon's little relevance to South Korea is also easily explainable by taking into consideration the long distance between the two. In addition, we can derive Lebanon's little relevance to Turkey from the fact that Turkey has kept distancing itself from Lebanon even after the end of the Cold War, when the former gradually started turning its attention to the Middle East, due to the existence of Arab nationalism, power of the Greek Orthodox population, and Armenian populations in the latter.[13] Furthermore, there are other reasons why these three post-Cold War operations have been chosen for my research.

UNOSOM II is one of the largest, most expensive, and most ambitious UN peace operations to date. For both Turkey and South Korea, UNOSOM II was the first peace operation with quite large contingents (Turkey: a 300-person mechanized infantry contingent / South Korea: a 250-person engineering construction contingent)

---

[12] UNOSOM ended with total 160 fatalities and UNIFIL has total 282 fatalities by 2009. It is also reported that coalition casualties in Afghanistan except the United States and the United Kingdom are 383 by 2009. See, United Nations Peacekeeping. 2009. *(3) Fatalities by Mission and Appointment Type*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/fatalities/ and iCasualites: Operation Enduring Freedom. 2009. *Fatalities by Country*, available at: http://icasualties.org/OEF/Index.aspx

[13] Altunisik, Meliha B. 2007. *Lübnan Krizi: Nedenleri ve Sonuçları (The Labanese Crisis: Reasons and Results)* (Istanbul: Tesev Yayinlari): 26

in the post-Cold War era. Since UNOSOM II was carried out right after the end of the Cold War, and the two states had little or no experience with peace operations until then, it is thought that the initial motivations of Turkey and South Korea in the post-Cold War era can be found out through examining UNOSOM II.

UNIFIL II started when the UN SC adopted Resolution 1701 on 11 August 2006, which enhanced the original mandate of UNIFIL, following the July/August 2006 Israeli-Hezbollah war. UNIFIL II is one of the three large-scale UN peace operations still actively ongoing.[14] In addition, it is the newest peace operation for Turkey, which has provided an engineering construction contingent as well as four naval ships, and the most remote peace operation involving combat units for South Korea. Through examining UNIFIL II, the current motivations of Turkey and South Korea can be discovered.

ISAF is a UN-mandated and NATO-administered peace operation. ISAF was established with UN SC Resolution 1386 on 20 December 2001, following the September 11 terrorist attacks. Until August 2003 when NATO assumed command of ISAF, its missions had been carried out by volunteer individual nations with a 6-month rotation system. ISAF is no doubt at the center of international concerns nowadays. Since ISAF is somewhat different from other UN-controlled peace operations in terms of formation, scope of missions, budget, and actors involved, we can find out whether Turkey and South Korea are motivated by some different kinds of factors that are unseen in their decisions to participate in the UN-controlled peace operations. What makes ISAF more suitable for my research is Turkey's huge

---

[14] The other two large UN peace operations are African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) and United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). See, United Nations Peacekeeping. 2009. *Peacekeeping Chart: 1991-present*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/chart.pdf

commitments and South Korea's decision to become part of ISAF despite its troop withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2007.

All the three selected peace operations involve the United States either directly or indirectly. In Somalia, the United States led the Unified Task Force (UNITAF) and provided huge military and economic supports for the activities of UNOSOM II. In Afghanistan, the United States has contributed more than half of ISAF troops and is leading all the missions carried out there. The United States did not join UNIFIL II, but it not only played a key role in designing the force at the initial phase, but also supported the performance of UNIFIL II through its European partners. As mentioned before, one of the main characteristics of the "allied new middle powers" is their strong relations with the United States. In order for us to examine any impact of the US factor on both Turkey's and South Korea's decisions to send troops to peace operations, a case operation should include the involvement of the United States. In this regard, these three case operations are more appropriate for my research than any other peace operations.

In my research, the descriptive approach will be applied. Secondary research sources, such as academic journals, books, newspapers, and TV programs, will be used as supporting data. Since my research focuses on analyzing the motivations of Turkey and South Korea, official records and documents of the two states, which include statements by key political figures, such as the President, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of National Defense, will constitute the major part of the research sources. In order to examine the economic aspects of the two states' motivations, there will be primarily the usage of annual reports published by Turkish and South Korean embassies in Somalia, Lebanon, and Afghanistan respectively.

This thesis is systemically designed to analyze main motivations of the two states representing the "allied new middle powers," Turkey and South Korea, in the course of their decisions to participate in UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, and ISAF. In the first chapter, states' general motivations for participating in peace operations will be examined. Based on the main assumptions and arguments of the three theoretical perspectives in the IR discipline (realism, liberalism, and constructivism), states' general motivations will be drawn, and specific examples representing each motivation will be provided. Preliminary assumption of which motivations are more decisive for the "allied new middle powers" will be made, and four probable motivations that are in concordance with common characteristics of the "allied new middle powers," that is, (1) alliance with the US ↔ indirect security concerns (or US pressure); (2) democratic political system ↔ the domestic factor (public opinion); (3) rising economic power ↔ potential economic benefit; and (4) willingness and activeness in the field of peace operations ↔ ideational considerations, will be determined for empirical analysis.

In the second chapter, general information on the three selected peace operations (UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, and ISAF), such as the origin, mandate, conduct, and development will be provided. In addition, Turkey's and South Korea's contributions to each case operation will be discussed as a preparatory step for analyzing the two states' decisive motivations for participating in the three peace operations.

In the third chapter, an empirical analysis of Turkey's and South Korea's motivations for sending troops to the three peace operations selected as cases, will be carried out. Special attention will be given to examining the actual impact of the four probable motivations of the "allied new middle powers" -- indirect security concerns

(or US pressure); the domestic factor (public opinion); potential economic benefit; and ideational considerations -- on the two states' decisions to send troops to Somalia, Lebanon, and Afghanistan, respectively. After analyzing the motivations of Turkey and South Korea on a case-by-case basis, combined results of the whole analyses will be suggested.

In the conclusion, the main findings of my research will be summarized and its scholarly contribution will also be emphasized. In addition, some suggestions for a future research will be made.

# CHAPTER II

# STATES' GENERAL MOTIVATIONS FOR

# SENDING TROOPS TO PEACE OPERATIONS

# & ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE RESEARCH

Before analyzing Turkey's and South Korea's motivations for sending troops to the three selected peace operations, it is necessary to examine states' general motivations for participating in peace operations. Although there are many studies on peace operations, the majority of those studies do not sufficiently deal with what leads states to send troops to peace operations. Instead, they mostly focus on other areas of the topic, such as the development, principles, functions and effectiveness of peace operations.[15] Even a small number of studies looking at states' motivations do not provide the motivations in a theoretically categorized way, since they are generally written based on just one state's motivations in a particular peace operation. Thus, I will examine the three theoretical perspectives in the IR discipline -- realism, liberalism, and constructivism -- and draw these perspectives' comments on states' motivations for sending troops to peace operations. Based on each theoretical perspective's main assumptions and arguments, states' motivations will

---

[15] Johnstone, Ian. 2005. "Peace Operations Literature Review," *Center on International Cooperation*, August: 11

be drawn and specific examples representing each motivation will be provided. In addition, which motivations can be more decisive for the "allied new middle powers" will be considered, taking into account their characteristics, that is, the substantial economic and military capabilities, the considerable regional political influence, and the strong relationship with the United States. What are to be suggested as decisive motivations of the "allied new middle powers" will constitute the main focus of the case analyses.

## 2.1. Realism and States' Motivations

Realism assumes that states, main actors in world politics, seek power in an anarchic system, where no centralized authority exists over all the states. In seeking power, states endeavor not only to increase their own military and economic capabilities, but also to prevent any other state from changing the balance of power in its favor. Classical realism, which is represented by Hans J. Morgenthau, attributes the reason of states' seeking power to the "human lust for power," while structural realism, which is represented by Kenneth N. Waltz, finds the reason in the structure of the international system that forces states to pursue power.[16] From realist scholars' point of view, power is the core of defining national interests, which is pursued in the form of a state's foreign policies. Among various national interests defined in political, military, and economic terms, national survival and security are given priority. Morgenthau argues, "in a world where a number of sovereign nations compete with and oppose each other for power, the foreign policies of all nations

---

[16] Mearsheimer, John J. 2006. "Structural Realism," in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, eds. Dunne, Tim and Kurki, Milja and Smith, Steve (New York: Oxford University Press): 72

must necessarily refer to their survival as their minimum requirements."[17] This implies that since other national interests are by no means achievable without the maintenance of territorial integrity or the autonomy of political order of a state, national survival and security should be considered primarily. It is generally suggested by realist scholars that forming alliance with other states and gaining material capabilities are proper means to assure national survival and security.[18] By taking realism into consideration, states' motivations for taking part in peace operations can be categorized as follows.

First of all, states which face direct security concerns originating from a conflict situation where a peace operation is envisaged will be motivated to send their troops to the operation. Since security is one of the most important national interests of a state, according to realism, damage to it will not be tolerable. If direct security challenges can be abated or totally solved by sending a small number of troops to peace operations, that will be a desirable option for states confronting those challenges. We can more easily discern this motivation from states' participations in proximate peace operations. For instance, it is well known that the members of ASEAN participated in the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) with the consideration that their involvement in the operation would contribute to their national security interests.[19] In addition, Nigeria actively contributed to the two peace operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone as part of the Economic Community of West African States Military Observer Group (ECOMOG)

---

[17] Morgenthau, Hans J. 1952. "Another "Great Debate": The National Interest of the United States," *American Political Science Review 46(4)*: 972
[18] Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics* (New York: Random House): 103-104
[19] Findlay, Trevor. 1996. "The new peacekeepers and the new peacekeeping," *Australian National University IR Department Working Paper* No. 1996/2: 5

due to the fear that conflicts in those countries could jump their arbitrary boundaries and destabilize the neighboring states.[20]

Although it is true that conflicts in a certain area are more likely to threaten the security of neighboring or nearby states, this does not mean that those conflicts have no possibility to directly harm the security of remote states. Especially in a globalized world, conflicts in a certain area are no longer entirely irrelevant to the security of remote states. As Georg Sorenson argues, the insecurity dilemma, which is the existence of weak or failed states who are major threats to the security of their own populations, has emerged as a new core security concern of the whole international community in the post-Cold War era.[21] In order to make the world order more liberal and peaceful, states are required not to turn a blind eye to the situation of failed states, as long as humanitarian intervention in the form of peacekeeping or peacemaking is not transformed into the extreme liberal imperialism.[22] States also become increasingly concerned about globalized security issues, such as terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), and piracy. Currently, more than 90 countries around the world voluntarily support the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), which was launched by the US President Bush in 2003 and endorsed by UN SC Resolution 1540, with the aims of stopping the trafficking of WMDs, delivery systems, and related materials to and from states and non-state actors of proliferation concern.[23] Furthermore, in response to the recent upsurge of piracy off the Somali coast, a coordinated naval peace operation with more than 30 warships, either from individual states or from NATO and the EU, is being conducted around

---

[20] Howe, Herbert M. 2005. "Nigeria," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 181

[21] Sorenson, Georg. 2007. "After the Security Dilemma: The Challenges of Insecurity in Weak States and the Dilemma of Liberal Values," *Security Dialogue* Vol.38 (3): 358
[22] Ibid. : 369
[23] U.S. Department of State. 2010. *Proliferation Security Initiative,* available at: http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c10390.htm

the area in order to achieve what was called upon in UN SC Resolution 1838, the repression of acts of piracy.[24]

Secondly, states can be motivated by indirect security concerns. Indirect security concerns mostly originate from the relational situation of states, such as alliance dependence. Forming an alliance against an emerging power or a perceived threat is regarded as a proper way of seeking national security by realist scholars. For smaller states, especially, alliance is one of the most significant power elements.[25] Small states (and sometimes middle states), which are asymmetrically dependent on great powers in general, face two anxieties in alliances: abandonment and entrapment.[26] Abandonment is a situation in which great powers fail to help their allied states in time of need, while entrapment is a situation in which allied states become entangled in a conflict central to great powers' interests, but relatively peripheral to their own. In the face of the alliance security dilemma between abandonment and entrapment, small allied states support great powers, if their dependence on the great powers outweighs their fear of entrapment. In other words, if great powers' assistance is essential for handling small allied states' own security challenges, either internal or external, the small allied states are likely to behave in the direction the great powers desire.

The concern over being abandoned by allied great powers can also be at work, when states decide whether to send troops to a peace operation. If allied great powers are in favor of engaging in a certain peace operation and expect dependent states to participate in the operation, there will remain few options for those states except meeting the allied great powers' expectation, that is, troop commitments to

---

[24] Kotlyar, V. 2009. "Piracy in the 21st Century," *International Affairs* No. 3: 62
[25] Goldstein, Joshua S. 1996. *International Relations.* 2nd Edition (New York: HarperCollins): 83
[26] Bennett, Andrew and Lepgold, Joseph and Unger, Danny. 1994. "Burden-sharing in the Persian Gulf War," *International Organization* Vol. 48(1): 44

the peace operation. In short, states can be motivated to take part in a far off or seemingly irrelevant peace operation along with their core security-providers in order to prevent any decrease in the reliability of their alliances, which are essential for coping with security challenges within and around them. This motivating factor is seen more in the US-led peace operations. For instance, many of Caribbean states and Israel were pressured to participate in the Multinational Force (MNF) in Haiti and thereafter in the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), since the United States wanted to lend to the US-dominated operation a multilateral character.[27] The same factor can be easily found in the United Arab Emirates' (UAE) and Kuwait's participations in UNITAF in Somalia, since these two states' security dependence on the United States increased rapidly following the Persian Gulf War (1990 – 1991).[28] Georgia's recent participation in peace operations can be similarly regarded. Faced with internal security concerns emanating from the two de facto autonomous provinces, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and external security concerns coming from Russia, Georgia highly depends on Western allies, especially on the United States, for its security. For the purpose of consolidating its reliance on the allies, Georgia has participated in both NATO-led peace operations and MNF in Iraq along with the United States since 1999. It is also highly likely that many Central and East European countries sent troops to Iraq and Afghanistan with the hope that the United States would come to their aid if they were attacked by Russia, their giant neighbor.

Thirdly, participation in peace operations can be regarded by states as a good opportunity to increase their power. Realists generally regard military force as the most important element of state power along with economic strength, which is

---

[27] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 1996. *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers* (New York: Oxford University Press): 7
[28] Ibid.

easily fungible into military force.[29] The changing nature of international politics following the end of the Cold War, however, has made co-optive or soft power of states as important as tangible hard power.[30] Troops in peace operations not only get actual combat experience that is invaluable in peacetime, but also acquire military skills, such as planning, communicating, and coordinating with multinational forces. They can also share experience with other states' troops and learn how to carry out operations in different geographical areas and different climate conditions. Operational skills that can be acquired through participating in peace operations are particularly valuable for states experiencing similar conflicts. For instance, through participating in various peace operations, India got valuable experience that could be utilized for domestic conflict resolution in divided areas such as Assam, the Punjab, and Kashmir.[31]

Along with qualitative improvements in the capability of military force, military equipments and foreign aid in the form of military assistance can also be gained. States in peace operations can receive weapons and vehicles from better-equipped troop contributors. For example, the Pakistani contingent received protective vehicles from Germany when it participated in the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the Former Yugoslavia.[32] Jordan's participation in peace operations has also much to do with this motivating factor. It is widely known that the Jordanian contingent received US assistance in UNPROFOR.[33] Jordan's recent participation in ISAF is also thought to be in part driven by the

---

[29] Goldstein, Joshua S. 1996. *International Relations*. 2nd Edition (New York: HarperCollins): 58

[30] Co-optive or soft power means a state's ability to get other countries to want what it wants. Soft power arises from such resources as cultural and ideological attractions as well as rules and institutions of international regimes. See, Nye, Joseph S. Jr. 1990. "Soft Power," *Foreign Policy* No. 80, Twentieth Anniversary (Autumn): 166, 168

[31] Bullion, Alan James. 2005. "India," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 199

[32] Findlay, Trevor. 1996. "The new peacekeepers and the new peacekeeping," *Australian National University IR Department Working Paper* No. 1996/2: 6

[33] Ibid.

increased US military assistance following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, since it was mainly allocated for nations supporting the United States in the war on global terrorism. In fact, Jordan received 460 million US dollars from the United States in 2005 as a reward for its active involvement in the war on terrorism.[34]

In addition, states participating in peace operations can increase their soft power potential by gaining prestige and making their images in the eyes of other states cooperative and credible. The more a state proves itself as a responsible member of the international community, the more it will gain the power of attractiveness in the eyes of others. Since legitimacy is an indispensable condition for soft power, and one way to increase legitimacy is showing multilateralism[35], states desiring to increase their soft power will be motivated to be part of peace operations. This is predominantly because peace operations became the main tools of the UN, the most exemplary multilateral institution in the world, for maintaining international peace and security. For states hoping to assume key positions in the UN, such as permanent membership of the SC, to increase soft power potential can be a crucial motivating factor in deciding whether to send troops to peace operations. For instance, India has been lobbying to become a permanent member of the SC and is competing with other Third World states for the position. Although the time of revision in the current UN system has not been decided yet, India believes that its huge contribution to UN peace operations will make other member states perceive it as a suitable candidate for a future permanent member seat.[36]

---

[34] Tarnoff, Curt and Nowels, Larry. 2005. "Foreign Aid: An Introductory Overview of U.S. Programs and Policy," *CRS Report for Congress*, January 19: 14

[35] Oguzlu, H. Tarik. 2007. "Soft power in Turkish foreign policy," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* Vol. 61 (1): 83-84

[36] Bullion, Alan James. 2005. "India," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 200

## 2.2. Liberalism and States' Motivations

Although there are several strands of liberalism, such as republican liberalism, commercial liberalism, sociological liberalism, interdependence liberalism, and neoliberalism, all the liberal scholars generally take a positive view of human nature and agree that cooperation among states based on mutual interests will prevail.[37] According to classical liberalists, domestic actors and structures have a great impact on the foreign policy of states. Andrew Moravcsik argues, "States represent some subset of domestic society, on the basis of whose interests state officials define state preferences and act purposively in world politics."[38] This implies that the foreign policy of a state is affected by the preferences of some domestic individuals and groups who effectively pressure the central government officials to carry out policies in the intended direction. When it comes to neoliberalism, the role of international institutions in facilitating multilateral cooperation among states in an interdependent world is highly valued. Neoliberalism relies on the core assumption that, even in collective actions, states calculate the costs and benefits of different courses of action and choose the one that gives them the highest net pay-off.[39] It is also generally accepted that for states, economic benefits and other "low political" issues are as important as security issues in considering the pay-off.[40] We can infer from liberalism two broad motivations of states for sending troops to peace operations, as suggested below.

Firstly, domestic impact on states' decisions to send troops can be considered. According to liberalism, the foreign policy of a state is not independent

---

[37] Jackson, Robert and Sorensen, Georg. 2003. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and approaches* (New York: Oxford University Press): 107

[38] Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. "Taking Preference Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* Vol. 51(4): 518

[39] Martin, Lisa L. 2006. "Neoliberalism," in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, eds. Dunne, Tim and Kurki, Milja and Smith, Steve (New York: Oxford University Press): 112

[40] Ibid.

of its domestic politics, which incorporates a variety of actors. Rather, the two are somehow entangled and influence one another. Robert D. Putnam shows this entanglement in a simple way by adopting "two-level games," and argues that domestic groups seek their interests by pressuring their government to make favorable decisions at the national level, while national governments try to satisfy domestic demands at the international level.[41] Given the fact that dispatching troops to peace operations is also one of the foreign policy decisions of a state, we can think that certain domestic pressure groups play a role in making the government to take such actions. One good example showing the role of domestic pressure groups is the United States' participation in UNMIH. The US government was initially reluctant to be involved in the Haitian problem despite the increasing number of illegal refugees flooding into it. However, the reluctance was overcome as the Clinton administration was pressured not only from civil right groups who demanded equal treatment for Haitian refugees, but also from the Congressional Black Caucus that requested a fundamental solution to the Haitian problem through handling the Haitian political system.[42] At times, specific individuals are as influential as pressure groups in steering a government towards participation in peace operations. For instance, Hans Hekkerup, the former Defense Minister of Denmark, played a pivotal role in sending the Danish troops equipped with heavy weapons to Bosnia despite the absence of political consensus and public support.[43]

In addition, the role of public opinion in states' decisions to send troops to peace operations can be considered under the same category. Public opinion, which is generally formed as a result of media coverage, can prompt states to do something

---

[41] Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games," *International Organization* Vol. 42(3): 434

[42] Sorenson, David S. 2005. "The United States," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 118-119

[43] Jakobsen, Peter V. 2006. *Nordic Approaches to Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge): 93

about conflicts in other regions. For instance, it is well known that "CNN effect" created popular pressure on the political leaders of the United States to take necessary measures for stopping the starvation in Somalia and the ethnic cleansing in the Former Yugoslavia.[44] In addition, Swedish participation in the peace operations conducted in the Former Yugoslavia stood on the basis of strong public support. Almost 78 % of the Swedish population showed their support for the decisions to deploy troops and to make troops available for UN peace operations involving a risk of enforcement actions.[45]

Secondly, states can be motivated by visible or latent economic gains that would be achievable as a result of participating in peace operations. In an interdependent world, political, military, economic, and social issues are, to a great extent, interrelated and this linkage makes the separation of one issue from another issue difficult. Peace operations are no exception to this phenomenon. Peace operations no longer remain just within the boundary of issues mainly delegated to the military. Peace operations in recent years have had close relations with other issues. They are especially increasingly related with economic issues, as new missions are given to the operations, and new actors are involved in these multifaceted operations. One of the economic benefits that can be earned from participating in peace operations is the UN financial reimbursement for the costs of troop contributions. The UN compensates states volunteering troops to peace operations at a flat rate of a little over $1,000 per soldier per month with some supplementary payments.[46] Since the UN money given to participating states is quite sizable, this can be a motive appealing especially to less-developed or under-

---

[44] Farrell, Theo. 2003. "Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Operations," in *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, eds., Baylis, John and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 296
[45] Jakobsen, Peter V. 2006. *Nordic Approaches to Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge): 181
[46] The United Nations. 2003. *Today's Peacekeepers: Questions and Answers on United Nations Peacekeeping*, available at: http://www.un.org/events/peacekeepers/2003/docs/qanda.htm

developing states. For instance, Fiji's participation in peace operations since 1978 arises mainly from its understanding that the UN reimbursement is a significant source of foreign exchange.[47]

Furthermore, some potential economic benefits could also be considered. By contributing to the peaceful resolution of a conflict and maintaining troop presence, states can provide their own private sectors with opportunities to benefit, not only from post-conflict reconstruction (short-term profit), but also from post-conflict investment (long-term profit).[48] For instance, it is argued that many Western contributors in the peace operations carried out in the Balkans were motivated, in part, by a desire to integrate "south-east Europe into the sphere of Western capitalism."[49] If a peace operation is envisaged in areas having economic attractions, states hoping to take advantage of those attractions are more likely to participate in such an operation. The United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) is a good example. Mozambique possesses abundant reserves of mineral resources, natural gas, and coal. With the start of ONUMOZ, 900 out of the 1,250 government-controlled firms were privatized in Mozambique, and the majority of foreign investments flew from the United States, Canada, and Japan, which were all participants in the operation.[50] It is also known that Italy's key role during the peace process allowed its businesses to begin making profits in a broad range of sectors in Mozambique, such as energy, construction, and transportation.[51]

---

[47] Scobell, Andrew. 1994. "Politics, Professionalism, and Peacekeeping: An Analysis of the 1987 Military Coup in Fiji," *Comparative Politics* Vol. 26(2): 190

[48] Felgenhauer, Katharina. 2007. "Peace Economics: Private Sector Business Involvement in Conflict Prevention," *New School Economic Review*, Vol. 2(1): 41

[49] Pugh, Michael. 2000. "Protectorate Democracy in South-East Europe," *Colombia International Affairs Online Working Papers*, available at: http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/pum01/

[50] Gerson, Allan. 2001. "Peace Building: The Private Sector's Role," *The American Journal of International Law* Vol. 95(1): 108-109

[51] U.S. Department of State. 2009. *Background Note: Mozambique*, available at http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/7035.htm#relations

## 2.3. Constructivism and States' Motivations

Different from realism and liberalism, constructivism emphasizes the social dimensions of international relations and demonstrates the significance of norms, rules and language in continuous processes of interaction among actors. The identity of a state, which is the source of its preferences and consequent actions, is regarded intersubjective, that is, dependent on historical, cultural, political and social context.[52] For constructivists, national interests are variable in accordance with identities which are constructed in the social interplay of elites, populations, and state institutions. Alexander Wendt supports this idea by arguing, "Identities are the basis of interests. Actors do not have 'portfolio' of interests… they define their interests in the process of defining situation."[53] National interests are not merely observable objects as realists generally accept; rather, they are the result of social constructions in which meanings are produced and their legitimacy is conferred through a process of representation.[54] In other words, what states value or what states believe to be good or appropriate can also be national interests, which are pursued by them in the international arena.

The main assumptions and arguments of constructivism give us a hint that states can participate in peace operations with ideational motivations, which have been internalized and legitimized through states' own formative processes. One pure ideational motivation is altruism or humanitarianism. Starting from the end of twentieth century, states have become more concerned with the crises of other states and remote regions, especially when those crises caused human suffering and human

---

[52] Hopf, Ted. 1998. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," *International Security* Vol. 23(1): 174-175

[53] Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics," *International Organization* Vol. 46(2): 398

[54] Weldes, Jutta. 1996. "Constructing National Interests," *European Journal of International Relations* Vol. 2(3): 283

rights abuses.[55] This means that states felt responsible for the conflicts of other peoples, regardless of the amount of their own material interest at stake. Since international cooperation in solving international problems of any kind and in promoting fundamental human rights is one of the purposes of the UN[56], participation in peace operations corresponding to this purpose is regarded as an obligation of a member of the international community. The fact that states in peace operations should be ready to sacrifice their own soldiers' and citizens' lives, which are no doubt the most important values to be protected by states, also reveals states' humanitarian considerations to a certain extent.

It is generally accepted that traditional middle powers, such as Australia, Canada, and the Nordic states were in part motivated to participate in the peace operations of the Cold War era by this altruistic or humanitarian thinking. During the Cold War, these states regarded participation in peace operations as the quintessence of good international citizenship.[57] Strengthening the international rule of law and promoting peaceful settlement of all disputes was domestically legitimized in the egalitarian and humanist societies of traditional middle powers without any huge controversy and pursued in the international arena through active participation in peace operations. Among traditional middle powers, Sweden was the most salient actor motivated by altruistic thinking. For instance, anti-apartheid was the source of Sweden's active participation in the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia and its enthusiastic involvement in other South African peace

---

[55] Martha Finnemore argued that some changes in humanitarian norms in the 21st century had created new patterns of humanitarian intervention behavior of states. Those changes are 'Who is human,' 'How we intervene,' and 'The definition of success.' See, Finnemore, Martha. 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention* (London: Cornell University Press): 53
[56] See, *Charter of the United Nations*, Chapter 1. Purpose and Principles
[57] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 1996. *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers* (New York: Oxford University Press): 7

processes of the 1980s.[58]

There are also other ideational motivations that originate from states' internally embedded or constituted norms and ideas. These kinds of ideational motivations are more influential for states that incrementally began to participate in peace operations in the post-Cold War era. One exemplary state is Germany. The foreign policy of Germany during the Cold War was based on its culture of reticence, which was represented by slogans like "never again war" and "never again Auschwitz." West Germany was reluctant to take part in any kind of military intervention due to what it learned from World War II and the Holocaust. After unification, however, Germany gradually moved away from the traditional culture, as the request for normalization of German foreign policy emerged from political parties and the German Constitutional Court found room for German military deployment outside national borders, the pursuit of "safeguarding peace."[59] Although Germany initially wanted to play a role as a pure "civilian power" committed to further international peace and cooperation without being involved in "out of area" operations, it became apparent that Germany would hardly eschew its international obligation to send the German troops to a wider range of military operations in the post-Cold War era.[60] Germany followed cautious steps designed to gradually soothe public concern about participation in "out of area" operations and started to commit troops to peace operations that aimed at defending humanitarian and democratic values, while firmly adhering to the condition of "never on our own." The use of military force on the basis of multilateralism became acceptable for Germany, as

[58] Black, David R. 1997. "Addressing Apartheid: Lessons from Australian, Canadian, and Swedish Policies in Southern Africa" in *Niche Diplomacy*, eds., Cooper, Andrew F. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers): 114

[59] Hampton, Mary N. 2005. "Germany," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 31

[60] Hyde-Price, Adrian. 2001. "Germany and the Kosovo war: still a civilian power?," *German Politics* Vol. 10(1): 20

long as all the other political and economic means of the state were consumed beforehand.[61] The most crucial motivating factor for Germany in considering its participation was projecting its soft power capabilities. Germany, which has been competing for the leadership of the EU, wanted its soft power security approach to become the basic European model for security policy, which employs firstly non-military means and then military means only as a last resort.[62] Through participating in peace operations, Germany aimed to make its status in Europe firm and highly valued, while at the same time make itself seen as a non-threatening state.

Similar to Germany, Japan also approached peace operations with its own ideational motivations. Japan, which had strict constitutional restraints on the use of military force, became a target of international criticism after its apathy towards the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. Following the Gulf War, opinion among the Japanese public and the major political parties rapidly shifted to favoring Japan's contribution to peace operations and, as a consequence, the "PKO Law" was established in 1992.[63] The five principles of the initial "PKO Law" had limited the role of Japan to simply providing logistical support. However, an amendment passed in 2001 expanded the scope of the Japanese participation in peace operations by allowing Japanese peacekeepers to carry out missions like monitoring ceasefires, disarming local forces, patrolling demilitarized zones, inspecting the transport of weapons, and collecting and disposing of abandoned weapons.[64] By gradually participating in peace operations, Japan aimed to develop a distinctive international policy as a new political power. It wanted to adopt a UN-centered policy so as to

---

[61]Ibid.: 32
[62] Hampton, Mary N. 2005. "Germany," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 36
[63] Ishizuka, Katsumi. 2005. "Japan's Policy towards UN Peacekeeping Operations," *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.12(1): 69-70
[64] Ibid.: 75

broaden its diplomatic options internationally, while overcoming its tradition of siding with the United States. In addition, Japan intended to project a positive or cooperative image to regional states that had anti-militarism attitudes towards it. Japan's active participation in peace operations would lead many states that once experienced Japanese colonial rule to have a perception that Japan finally became a "normal" state, shaking its previous aggressive and colonial behavior off. In short, Japan's contribution to regional peace operations was a way of building regional confidence for the purpose of enhancing its political status in Asia and the Pacific.[65]

## 2.4. Preliminary Assumption: Decisive Motivations of the "Allied New Middle Powers"

Henceforth, attention will be paid to reasoning which motivations out of what have been listed in the previous sub-sections are more decisive for the two representative "allied new middle powers," Turkey and South Korea, in their decisions to send troops to the selected three post-Cold War peace operations. Given the substantial economic capabilities of Turkey and South Korea, it is thought that economic profit from the UN reimbursements, which is the main motivating factor for less-developed or under-developing states, hardly motivates them. In addition, since Turkey and South Korea already maintain relatively huge and advanced military forces, quantitative and qualitative improvement in the power position through participating in peace operations is less likely to appeal to them. Furthermore, charitable thinking seems to be less relevant for either Turkey or South Korea, because both states do not have a long-established tradition of giving priority to humanist values at home. What makes this motivating factor less likely for Turkey

---

[65] Ibid.: 80

**Table 2. Concordance between Characteristics and Motivations**

| Characteristic | Motivation |
|---|---|
| Alliance with the US | Indirect security concerns |
| Democratic political system | Pressure group & Public opinion |
| Rising economic power | Potential economic benefit |
| Willingness & Activeness | Ideational considerations |

and South Korea is the fact that even traditional middle powers, which had participated in the peace operations of the Cold War era with altruistic thinking, showed a tendency to move away from such thinking in the post-Cold War era.[66] Direct security concerns can also be ruled out as one of the decisive motivations. Unlike the United States and other great powers, the two representative "allied new middle powers" have limited global influence. Turkey and South Korea can be concerned about what happens in Somalia, Lebanon, and Afghanistan in a globalized world. However, the remoteness and irrelevance of the three areas still make the two states less exposed to the security risks coming from those areas. The fact that Turkey and South Korea confront their own security challenges from domestic separatist organizations or from neighboring states also makes the factor of direct security concerns in these peace operations less crucial for them. Thus, the degree of perceived immediate threat from a conflict situation in irrelevant parts of the world is thought to be insufficient to fully drive Turkey and South Korea to engage in such conflicts.

---

[66] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 1996. *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers* (New York: Oxford University Press): 8

Having excluding the aforementioned motivations, there remain four motivations. The remaining motivations are considered as more decisive for the "allied new middle powers," since they are in concordance with their common characteristics as illustrated in Table 2. Therefore, in Chapter IV, I will focus on analyzing to what extent these four motivations actually functioned in Turkey's and South Korea's decisions to participate in the selected three peace operations.

# CHAPTER III

# THE CASE PEACE OPERATIONS

In this chapter, general information on the three selected peace operations (UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, and ISAF), such as the origin, mandate, conduct, and development will be provided. Although Turkey and South Korea did not participate in UNOSOM I (July 1992 – May 1993) and UNIFIL I (March 1978 – August 2006), these periods are also briefly touched upon for the purpose of understanding the nature of the conflicts. In addition, Turkey's and South Korea's contributions to each operation will be discussed as a preparatory step for analyzing the decisive motivations of Turkey and South Korea for participating in the three peace operations.

## 3.1. United Nations Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II)

### 3.1.1. General Information on UNOSOM II

Following President Barre's defeat in 1991, a civil war broke out between ethnically homogenous but genealogically different factions in Somalia -- those in favor of Interim President Ali Mahdi Mohamed and those in favor of General Mohamed Farah Aidid --, especially in the capital Mogadishu. The civil war combined with a disastrous famine not only resulted in the deaths of more than

300,000 Somalis, but also caused a huge refugee problem and severe malnutrition of the majority of Somali population.[67] In order to solve the conflict, UNOSOM I was established in April 1992 by UN SC Resolution 751.[68] However, the UN mission had neither assumed any direct responsibility for finalizing the political impasse in Somalia, nor had enough capability to monitor ceasefire and to provide security for humanitarian works. The small number of initially assigned troops that were responsible for both monitoring the ceasefire and escorting deliveries of humanitarian supplies -- 50 military observers and just 500 infantry soldiers -- demonstrates the incapability of UNOSOM I.[69] As the initial effort to relieve the deteriorated situation of Somalia deadlocked due to the continued fighting and insecurity, the UN SC adopted Resolution 794, which authorized UN member states to form the UNITAF.[70] UNITAF was comprised of contingents from 24 countries led by the United States with 37,000 troops at its full strength and authorized to use all necessary means to establish a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.[71] UNITAF, which was in coordination with UNOSOM I, succeeded in opening up supply routes and made the flow of humanitarian aids possible.

Although UNITAF had a positive impact on the security situation in Somalia and on the effective delivery of humanitarian assistance, it covered only 40 percent of the entire territory and thus the insecure environment in Somalia had not yet disappeared completely. UN Security-General Boutros-Ghali kept insisting that UNITAF should have dealt with disarmament of the various factions in and around Mogadishu while adhering to a wider interpretation of "secure environment" for the

---

[67] United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Operation in Somalia II, Background*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unosom2backgr2.html
[68] See, Security Council Resolution 751 (April 24, 1992)
[69] O'Neill, John Terence and Rees, Nicholas. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: RoutRedge): 111-112
[70] See, Security Council Resolution 794 (December 3, 1992)
[71] O'Neill, John Terence and Rees, Nicholas. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: RoutRedge): 113

delivery of humanitarian assistance. Boutros-Ghali subsequently recommended the new UN-controlled operation in Somalia, UNOSOM II, be endowed with enforcement powers under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, in order to establish a secure environment across Somalia.[72] The transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II was completed on 26 March 1993 with the adoption of UN SC Resolution 814. As the Secretary-General intended, UNOSOM II was mandated to disarm Somali militias by using force beyond self-defense if necessary. The main duties of UNOSOM II were: (1) monitoring that all factions continued to respect the cessation of hostilities and other agreements to which they had consented; (2) preventing any resumption of violence and, if necessary, taking appropriate action; (3) maintaining control of the heavy weapons of the organized factions which would have been brought under international control; (4) seizing the small arms of all unauthorized armed elements; (5) securing all ports, airports, and lines of communications required for the delivery of humanitarian assistance; (6) protecting the personnel, installations and equipment of the UN and its agencies, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) as well as NGOs; and (7) continuing mine-clearing, and to assist in repatriation of refugees and displaced persons in Somalia.[73] Furthermore, unlike UNITAF, UNOSOM II was placed under the direct control of the UN through the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative to Somalia and had 28,000 UN troops with reduced American presence.[74]

The broadened mandate of UNOSOM II was considered a threat to the authority of the Somali factions, and consequently confrontation between UNOSOM

---

[72] Ibid.: 114-115
[73] See, Security Council Resolution 814 (March 26, 1993)
[74] The United States directly participated in UNOSOM II with only logistics troops. The most of its remaining UNITAF troops were held in reserve as the Quick Reaction Force (QRF), which was not formally part of UNOSOM II. See, Bellamy, Alex J. and Williams, Paul and Griffin, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Cambridge: Polity): 159; Weiss, Tomas G. and Forsythe, David P. and Coate, Roger A. 1997. *The United Nations and Changing World Politics* (Boulder, Co.: Westview): 80

II and the warlords, especially General Aidid's Somali National Alliance (SNA), became inevitable. A conspicuous example of the growing tension between the UN forces and the SNA was 24 Pakistani peacekeepers' deaths in an attack in June 1993. Following the incident, the UN SC adopted Resolution 837, which blamed the SNA for inciting the attacks on Pakistani soldiers and authorized UNOSOM II to take all necessary measures against those responsible for the armed attack.[75] From the day Resolution 837 was adopted, the situation in Somalia turned into a virtual war between UNOSOM II and the SNA as the two sides started attacking each other. Since the capture of General Aidid or his senior officials was beyond the capabilities of UNOSOM II forces, the Quick Reaction Force (QRF) of the United States, which was deployed in support of UNOSOM II, also began taking actions with the reinforcement of a strong 400-person Ranger task force.[76] Despite the huge effort to eradicate the SNA, it remained unharmed and increased its retaliatory attacks on UN forces. On 3 October 1993, the SNA succeeded in inflicting serious casualties on US and UN personnel. In total, 1 Malaysian, 18 US soldiers were killed and 9 Malaysian, 3 Pakistani, and 78 US soldiers were injured in an operation in Mogadishu.[77] Forced by public outcry, President Clinton announced on 7 October that all US forces would be withdrawn from Somalia by 31 March 1994. Within a few days, the US decision to withdraw its troops was followed by other troop contributing states, such as Belgium, France and Sweden.[78] UNOSOM II's ability to provide security had been reduced by troop withdrawals and the UN's effort to form an interim administration in Somalia ended with achieving no progress. Once the UN understood its inability

---

[75] O'Neill, John Terence and Rees, Nicholas. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: RoutRedge): 117
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.
[78] United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Operation in Somalia II, Background*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unosom2backgr2.html

to urge factions to enact a ceasefire and form a unified government, the mission of UNOSOM II expired in March 1995, leaving behind a possibility of further famine in Somalia.[79]

### 3.1.2. Turkey in UNOSOM II

Following the UN SC decision to establish UNITAF in December 1992, Turkey received an invitation letter from the UN, in which it was requested to participate in the new US-led peace operation in Somalia. The invitation was examined by various governmental organizations and a decision allowing the dispatch of a mechanized company-sized contingent to Somalia was made after obtaining approval from the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) on 8 December 1992.[80] A small committee comprised of 9 personnel from the Chief of General Staff and Minister of Foreign Affairs was first sent to Somalia on 15 December. The mission given to the committee was to assess the situation in Somalia and to carry out preliminary work related to the site and area of responsibility (AOR) of the Turkish contingent.[81] On 19 December, two Turkish naval ships carrying the Turkish contingent departed from Mersin harbor and reached Mogadishu harbor after a 15-day trip. The Turkish contingent contributed to the operation in Somalia from 2 January 1993 to 22 February 1994 (as part of UNITAF and then UNOSOM II) with a 300-person mechanized company.[82] The main task assigned to the Turkish contingent was the protection of Mogadishu airport, which possessed the vital importance of connecting Somalia with the outside world.[83] The other tasks the

---

[79] Ibid.

[80] Bir, Çevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut ( A Hope for Somalia)* (Istanbul: Sabah Kitaplari): 14

[81] Ibid.

[82] Turkish General Staff. 2010. *Contribution of Turkish Armed Forces to Peace Support Operations*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/barisdestekkatki.htm

[83] Bir, Cevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut ( A Hope for Somalia)* (Istanbul: Sabah Kitaplari): 46

Turkish troops carried out were to coordinate relief supplies, to protect UNOSOM II headquarters, to provide escorts for convoys, to facilitate security, and to ensure delivery of food to the Somali people.

As the end of the one-year period allowed to the Turkish contingent in Somalia by the decision of TGNA approached and many contributing states (including the United States) declared their intentions to leave Somalia, Turkey also decided to withdraw its troops from Somalia in February 1994. The Turkish mission in Somalia was completed on 22 February 1994 with the return of its entire personnel and equipment to Turkey. What makes the operation in Somalia much more meaningful for Turkey is the fact that the command of UNOSOM II was assumed by a Turkish Lieutenant General. Following the transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II, General Çevik Bir became the first commander of UNOSOM II and performed his duty successfully from April 1993 to January 1994.

### 3.1.3. South Korea in UNOSOM II

South Korea did not send troops to UNITAF, but it provided financial support amounting to 2 million US dollars for the operation. When the transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II was ongoing in the late January 1993, South Korea was asked by the Secretariat of the UN whether it could participate in UNOSOM II. After conducting an on-site inspection in Somalia and discussing the issue 3 times within the government, on 7 April 1993 South Korea informed the UN of its intention to participate in UNOSOM II with a 250-person engineering construction contingent.[84] The bill on the dispatch of a South Korean engineering construction

---

[84] National Assembly of South Korea. 1993.
한국공병부대의 「소말리아유엔평화유지단」 참여동의안 부록 *(The Appendix of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Construction Contingent to UNOSOM II)*, 18 May, available at http://likms.assembly.go.kr/kms_data/record/data1/161/161za0010a.PDF#page=428

contingent to Somalia was approved by the Cabinet on 15 April, and then by the National Assembly of South Korea on 18 May. The South Korean contingent, which was dubbed "Sangroksu Unit," started its mission in Somalia on 31 July 1993. It contributed to UNOSOM II for 8 months with 516 troops in total.[85]

The South Korean contingent was deployed in Bal-ad district which is located 40 Km northeast of the capital city of Mogadishu. The main tasks assigned to it were to repair the road between Bal-ad and Jowhar, to set up a detour linking Bal-ad to Afgooye in cooperation with the US contingent, and to re-open the "General Daud" irrigation canal.[86] The South Korean contingent also conducted additional missions. These included missions such as developing clean water sources, repairing the airport, supporting other foreign contingents' construction of barracks, and delivering drinking water to the Somali people. It also provided elementary school education to the Somali children who were left hopeless in the disastrous civil war and famine. In a school established by the South Korean troops, 18 teachers (14 South Korean officers and 4 local teachers) taught Somali children Somali, English, mathematics, and music.[87] UNOSOM II was the first peace operation in which the South Korean Armed forces ever participated. South Korea gained valuable experience and achieved self-confidence in conducting military tasks abroad through participation in UNOSOM II.

---

[85] Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 소말리아 상록수 부대(The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Sangnoksu Unit in Somalia)*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_3/index.jsp#02
[86] Ibid.
[87] Kang, Yo-Sik. 1994. *신마저 버린 땅 소말리아(An Abandoned Soil: Somalia)* (Seoul: Hanwon): 189

### 3.2. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon II (UNIFIL II)

#### 3.2.1. General Information on UNIFIL II

As Palestinian armed elements relocated themselves from Jordan to Lebanon in the early 1970s, tension along the Israel-Lebanon border increased. In response to a commando attack on Israel by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Israeli forces invaded Lebanon on 14 March 1978 and took control of the entire southern part of the state in a few days.[88] Following the invasion, the UN called upon Israel's immediate cessation of military action and withdrawal of its troops from Lebanese territories by adopting SC Resolutions 425 and 426 on 19 March 1978. The creation of UNIFIL was also agreed on and it was mandated to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, to restore international peace and security, and to assist the government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.[89] When the Israeli-Lebanese war occurred in 1982, Israeli forces invaded Lebanon again and functions of UNIFIL were limited primarily to humanitarian assistance. Despite the UN's continuous efforts of persuasion, Israel retained control of some territories in southern Lebanon until early 2000. On 17 April 2000, Israel informed UN Secretary-General of its intention to withdraw all Israeli troops from the occupied zone by July 2000. Following the Israeli withdrawal, the situation in the area of the UNIFIL operation remained relatively tranquil and UN troops resumed their military functions in cooperation with Lebanese authorities.[90]

However, new hostilities on the Israeli-Lebanese border, which started with Hezbollah's rocket launching towards the Israeli forces on 12 July 2006, turned the calm situation into an armed conflict. A heavy exchange of fire ensued across the

---

[88] United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Background*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/background.shtml
[89] See, Security Council Resolutions 425 and 426 (March 19, 1978)
[90] United Nations Security Council. 2000. *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (for the period from 17 January to 17 July 2000)*: 3

UN-drawn Blue Line[91] as Hezbollah targeted Israeli troop positions and towns, while Israel retaliated by ground, air, and sea attacks on Hezbollah positions within and around the UNIFIL area of operations. To end the conflict, which had caused the deaths of more than 1,300 people and the displacement of 300,000 residents[92], the UN SC adopted Resolution 1701 on 11 August 2006 and called for a full cessation of hostilities based on the immediate cessation by Hezbollah of all attacks and the immediate cessation by Israel of all offensive military operations.[93] The adoption of Resolution 1701 also made UNIFIL enter a totally different phase. An entirely new mission was created within the structure of the existing UNIFIL operation as its mandate, troop strength, troop configuration, and rules of engagement were radically revised.

UNIFIL II was given six new tasks: (1) monitoring the cessation of hostilities; (2) accompanying Lebanese troops as they deploy throughout the South; (3) coordinating its activities with the Governments of Lebanon and Israel; (4) ensuring humanitarian access to civilians and the safe return of displaced persons; (5) assisting the Lebanese armed forces in undertaking their extensive responsibilities; and (6) assisting the Government of Lebanon in securing its borders.[94] Although the new mandate given to UNIFIL II was positioned between Chapter VI and Chapter VII due to the intense resistance of the Lebanese, UNIFIL II was also allowed "to take all the necessary actions in areas of deployment of its force, and as it deems with its capabilities, to ensure that its area of operations is not utilized for hostile activities

---

[91] The UN-drawn Blue Line is a border demarcation between Lebanon and Israel agreed on 7 June 2000 for the purposes of determining whether Israel had fully withdrawn from Lebanon. It is based on the deployment of the Israel Defense Force (IDF) prior to March 14, 1978.
[92] Center on International Cooperation. 2007. *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2007 (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers)*: 84
[93] See, Security Council Resolution 1701 (August 11, 2006)
[94] Ibid.

of any kind."[95] In addition, operative paragraphs 11 and 12 of the new mandate, which left ample room for interpretation, made UNIFIL II's indirect engagement with disarming Hezbollah possible through supporting and training the Lebanese forces.[96]

UNIFIL II's authorized troop strength was raised from 2,000 to 15,000 with the adoption of Resolution 1701. Currently, 12,133 uniformed personnel from 29 states (both European and non-European states) are working for UNIFIL II, along with international and local civilian staffs.[97] For the first time in the history of UN peace operations, the Maritime Task Force (MTF) was also included as part of UNIFIL II in October 2006. The role of MTF is to assist the Lebanese Naval Forces in preventing the smuggling of illegal and armament shipments. The MTF has been led by the European Maritime Force (EUROMARFOR) since February 2008.[98]

### 3.2.2. Turkey in UNIFIL II

Since UN SC Resolution 1701 was adopted, Turkey has shown its willingness to contribute to UNIFIL II. On 28 August 2006, the Board of Ministers took a decision which not only allowed foreign troops headed for Lebanon to use Turkish airports and seaports, but also made Turkey's contribution to UNIFIL II possible. On 5 September 2006, TGNA ratified Decision 880 and Turkey officially took a step forward to participate in UNIFIL II with troop commitment.[99] As part of UNIFIL II ground operation, a Turkish engineering construction unit, which is

---

[95] Ibid.

[96] Elron, Efrat. 2007. "Israel, UNIFIL II, the UN and the International Community," *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture* Vol. 13(4): 35

[97] United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Facts and Figures*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/facts.shtml

[98] UN News Center. 2008. 'Lebanon: European mariners take the wheel of UN coastal fleet,' 29 February, available at: http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=25803&Cr=UNIFIL&Cr1=

[99] Turkish General Staff. 2010. *UN Interim Force in Lebanon(UNIFIL)*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/BM_UNIFIL.htm

located in Eş Şaatiye (about 8 km east of Sur city), has been conducting its mission in Lebanon since 20 October 2006. So far, a total of 237 military personnel and 24 civilian officials have been working in the Turkish unit.[100] In addition, within the framework of UNIFIL II MTF, 4 Turkish naval ships -- 1 frigate (since 15 October 2007), 1 underway replenishment vessel (since 17 March 2008), and 2 corvettes (since 25 April 2008) -- have been carrying out their missions.

Turkey contributes to UNIFIL II in four ways: (1) patrolling the coast of the East Mediterranean Sea; (2) supporting other contributing countries in air and sea transportation with a condition of pre-examination; (3) providing military trainings to the Lebanese Armed Forces; and (4) conducting humanitarian activities.[101] TGNA has extended the one-year period for the deployment of Turkish troops in Lebanon 3 times since its first approval.[102] As one of a few Muslim countries participating in UNIFIL II, Turkey is currently playing an active role in bringing a peaceful solution to the crisis in Lebanon.

### 3.2.3. South Korea in UNIFIL II

When the UN signaled the start of UNIFIL II by adopting SC Resolution 1701 and officially requested the international community's shared role and contribution, the South Korean government decided to send troops to the new operation. A bill on the dispatch of 350 infantry troops to UNIFIL II was drawn up and then passed by the Cabinet on 28 November 2006. On 22 December, the bill entered into effect with the approval of the National Assembly. The South Korean

---

[100] Ibid.
[101] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2006. *Birleşmiş Milletler Geçici Gücü bünyesinde faaliyette bulunmak amacıyla Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerin Lübnan'a gönderilmesine izin verilmesine ilişkin Başbakanlık tezkeresi(The Prime Ministry's Bill on the Dispatch of the Turkish Armed Forces to Lebanon)*, 5 September
[102] Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Lübnan'da Türk askerinin görev süresi 3 kez uzatılıyor (The Mission Period for the Turkish Forces in Lebanon is being Extended for the 3rd Time)', 22 June, available at: http://www.sabah.com.tr/Siyaset/2009/06/22/lubnanda_turk_askerinin_gorev_suresi_3_kez_uzatiliyor

contingent, which was dubbed "Dongmyung Unit," started its first mission in Lebanon on 19 July 2007.[103] It was deployed in Tyre, which is one of Lebanon's largest cities and serves as the core supply port to UNIFIL II, as a sub-battalion of the Western Brigade. So far, a total of 1,681 South Korean personnel have contributed to UNIFIL II with a 6-month rotation system.[104]

The South Korean contingent has been carrying out various missions in Lebanon. It successfully conducted the surveillance-reconnaissance mission over 5,000 times and prevented armed militants' infiltration into its own AOR. In addition, it executed the collaborated mission with Lebanese troops over 2,700 times and contributed to the improvement of Lebanese troops' operational abilities.[105] Under the code name "Peace Wave," the South Korean contingent is also conducting its own civil operation for Lebanese people. The "Peace Wave" is composed of two main parts, medical service and project for local inhabitants.[106] More than 14,000 patients have received medical service from the South Korean traveling clinic. In addition, as part of project for local inhabitants, a gymnasium was built and two educational schools were opened. As the extension bill for the South Korean contingent in Lebanon was passed in the National Assembly on 15 July 2009, the South Korean contingent is expected to carry out its mission in Lebanon until late 2010.[107] UNIFIL II is South Korea's fifth UN mission (except observing missions) and second mission involving combat units.

---

[103] Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 레바논 평화유지군 동명부대*(The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Dongmyung Unit in Lebanon), available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_2/index.jsp#
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Lee, Jang-Ho. 2007 "한국군 평화유지단 '동명부대' 레바논에 평화를 심다 (Dongmyung Unit's contribution to the peace in Lebanon," *The South Korean Army Journal,* Vol.289 (September/October): 76-77
[107] The Korea Herald. 2009. 'S. Korea to extend troop stay in Lebanon,' 15 July, available at: http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives/result_contents.asp

### 3.3. International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)

### 3.3.1. General Information on ISAF

In response to the unprecedented terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda upon the United States on 11 September 2001, the US-led military operation or Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) was launched on the basis of self-defense of the UN Charter to eliminate Al-Qaeda, to oust the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, and to prevent the emergence of other terrorist organizations. In parallel with OEF, the UN condemned the terrorist attacks and recognized the need to establish a transitional administration in Afghanistan after the overthrow of the Taliban regime. As a result, the Afghan Interim Authority (AIA) was created following the Bonn Treaty on 5 December 2001.[108] In addition, as requested in the treaty, ISAF was established with UN SC Resolution 1386 on 20 December 2001 to maintain the security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, so that the AIA as well as the personnel of the UN could operate in a secure environment.[109] ISAF was given a peace-enforcement mandate under Chapter VII of the UN Charter and was not a UN mission, but a UN-authorized mission funded by the troop contributors.[110]

From ISAF I to ISAF III (1 December 2001 – 3 August 2003), its mission had been carried out by volunteer individual nations with a 6-month rotation system.[111] On 11 August 2003, NATO took over the command and coordination of ISAF and brought the rotation system to an end by overcoming the problem of a continual search to find new leading nations and the difficulties of setting up a new

---

[108] For the detail of the Bonn Treaty, see Afghan Government. 2001. *The Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions*, available at http://www.afghangovernment.com/AfghanAgreementBonn.htm

[109] See, Security Council Resolution 1386 (December 20, 2001)

[110] Bellamy, Alex J. and Williams, Paul and Griffin, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Cambridge: Polity): 181-182

[111] ISAF I from the United Kingdom, ISAF II from Turkey, and ISAF III from Germany and the Netherlands

headquarters every six months.[112] Although the initial mandate of ISAF was limited to the region of Kabul, the adoption of UN SC Resolution 1510 on 13 October 2003 paved the way for an expansion of the ISAF mission. The resolution requested ISAF to help the Afghan Transitional Authority (ATA) in maintaining security of the entire Afghanistan beyond Kabul and to provide a secure environment for other international civilian personnel engaged in reconstruction and humanitarian efforts.[113] Following the adoption of UN SC Resolution 1510, the troop deployment of ISAF evolved. ISAF gradually took command over other regions from OEF. Stage 1 of the scheduled expansion, which was initiated on 31 December 2003, expanded ISAF's area of operations to cover the North of Afghanistan. Stage 2 and 3 allowed ISAF to provide security assistance in the West and the South, respectively. After Stage 4, which was completed on 5 October 2006 by expanding ISAF's AOR towards the East, ISAF finally covered the whole of Afghanistan. [114]

In the UN SC Resolution 1776 of 2007, ISAF was given a new additional mission, which was to sustain its efforts to train, mentor, and empower the Afghan National Security Force (ANSF), in particular the Afghan National Police (ANP).[115] Currently, ISAF is carrying out four general missions for the purpose of assisting the Afghan authorities in providing security and stability and creating the conditions for reconstruction and development. These are: (1) security-related missions: (a) conducting security and stability operations, (b) supporting the Afghan National Army (ANA) and ANP, (c) disarming illegally armed groups, (d) facilitating ammunition depots managements, and (e) providing post-operation assistance; (2)

---

[112] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO's Role in Afghanistan*, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_8189.htm
[113] See, Security Council Resolution 1501 (October 13, 2003)
[114] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO's Role in Afghanistan*, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_8189.htm
[115] See, Security Council Resolution 1776 (September 19, 2007)

reconstruction and development-related missions through the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs): (a) providing security to permit reconstruction, and (b) humanitarian assistance; (3) governance through PRTs; and (4) counter-narcotics.[116]

ISAF structure is composed of Regional Command Capital (HQ ISAF and HQ RC), Regional Command South (4 PRTs), Regional Command West (4 PRTs), Regional Command North (5 PRTs), and Regional Command East (13 PRTs).[117] As of December 2009, ISAF had 84,150 troops from 43 nations.[118] Its troop numbers are to be increased, as US President Obama pledged the deployment of an additional 30,000 US troops to Afghanistan to reverse the Taliban's momentum and stabilize the government of Afghanistan.[119] The ultimate goal of ISAF is to hand over lead responsibility for security to ANSF as reaffirmed by the NATO Secretary-General Rasmussen in the London Conference on Afghanistan in January 2010.[120]

### 3.3.2. Turkey in ISAF

In the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks, Turkey quickly gave its full support to the US military campaign against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and agreed to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty along with the other NATO members. A bill authorizing the Turkish government to contribute troops to the US military campaign was passed in TGNA in October 2001. The bill

---

[116] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO's Role in Afghanistan*, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_8189.htm

[117] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2009. *ISAF "placemat" (Contributing nations and troop numbers) – 22Dec. 2009*, available at http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf

[118] Ibid.

[119] CNN News. 2009. 'Obama Afghanistan strategy: More troops in quickly, drawdown in 2011,' 1 December, available at:
http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/12/01/obama.afghanistan/index.html?iref=allsearch

[120] NATO News. 2010. 'NATO Secretary General welcomes results of London Conference,' 28 January, available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-26A12DA1-F8A536E3/natolive/news_61099.htm?

also permitted the stationing of foreign troops on Turkish territories and the use of Turkish airspace and airbases. Initially, Turkey sent a unit of Special Forces to Afghanistan in order to help American troops conduct humanitarian operations and train Northern Alliance fighters.[121] When ISAF started in December 2001, Turkey decided to take part in the operation. Turkey contributed to ISAF I by sending an infantry company composed of 267 soldiers. The Turkish company, which was deployed in Kabul, carried out security patrols and humanitarian aid.

When the British leadership of ISAF I came to an end, Turkey decided to play a leading role in ISAF II on 29 April 2002. Following the decision, Turkey increased its contribution to the battalion-level task force with approximately 1,300 troops.[122] During the period of ISAF II (20 June 2002 – 10 February 2003), Turkish Major General Hilmi Akin Zorlu commanded the international force, which was composed of 4,800 personnel from 22 countries, and Turkish troops took charge of the Kabul International Airport and the Multinational Headquarters.[123] On 10 February 2003, Turkey handed over its 8-month ISAF II leadership to the joint command of Germany and the Netherlands. Turkey's participation continued after the end of ISAF II with a decreased number of troops. Between ISAF III and ISAF V (February 2003 – August 2004), Turkey participated in the operation with 300 troops and provided 3 helicopters for medical evacuation and reconnaissance purposes.

When the command and coordination of ISAF was placed under NATO, Turkey showed its leadership in ISAF again. NATO Rapid Deployable Corps-Turkey (NRDC-T) assumed the leadership of ISAF VII, and Turkish troop presence in Afghanistan was increased from 240 (including 23 Azerbaijani and 23 Albanian

---

[121] Kibaroglu, Mustafa and Kibaroglu, Aysegul. 2009. *Global Security Watch TURKEY* (London: Praeger Security International): 105
[122] Turkish General Staff. 2010. *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) Operation*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/isaf.htm
[123] Ibid.

troops) to 1,500 personnel.[124] During the period of ISAF VII (13 February 2005 – 4 August 2005), the Turkish 28th Mechanized Infantry Brigade served as the Kabul Multinational Brigade and a Turkish unit ran the Kabul International Airport. Turkey also established a PRT in Wardak province, which is located approximately 40 km west of Kabul, in November 2006. In the Wardak PRT, Turkish civilian and military personnel have worked together to achieve 3 main goals: (1) developing administrative and judiciary systems; (2) training the Afghan Police Force; and (3) conducting activities aimed to improve and support infrastructure, public works, and social support to raise the life quality of the local population.[125]

Currently, Turkey is responsible for administering the Headquarters of Regional Command Capital Kabul with a 1,755 troop presence in Afghanistan.[126] In addition, Turkey is planning to establish another PRT in Jawzjan province and to rebuild the Kabul Military High School.[127] Turkey conducts its mission in Afghanistan, keeping itself from engaging in any combat operations. Even when the reduction of national caveats was requested by several key NATO members in the Riga summit in October 2006, Turkey refused to change its restriction on the use of force in combat.[128] Turkey's firm stance of distancing itself from any combat operation in Afghanistan is well revealed in a statement by Ahmet Davutoglu,

---

[124] Sabah Newspaper. 2005. 'Afganistan'da Komuta Yeniden Türkiyenin (The Command in Afghanistan is assumed by Turkey again),' available at:
http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/muderrisoglu/2004/05/21/Afganistan_da_komuta_yeniden_Turkiye_nin

[125] Turkish General Staff. 2010. *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) Operation*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/isaf.htm

[126] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *International Security Assistance Force and Afghan National Army Strength & Laydown*, 1 February, available at http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf

[127] Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Kabil'de Komutanlık Türkiye'ye geçiyor (The Command in Kabul is transferred to Turkey' 1 November, available at:
http://www.sabah.com.tr/Dunya/2009/11/01/kbilde_komutanlik_turkiyeye_geciyor

[128] In response to the request, France changed its national caveat and agreed to allow its forces in Kabul and elsewhere to come to the assistance of other NATO forces in an emergency. Italy and Spain left the decision of sending forces to assist in an urgent situation to their force commanders in the field. See, Gallis, Paul. 2007. "NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance," *CRS Report for Congress,* Code RL33627: 13

current Minister of Foreign Affairs. In the meeting of NATO foreign ministers in December 2009, he said, "There is no plan to send Turkish combat troops to Afghanistan. However, it is possible to consider sending military instructors for training the Afghan Armed Forces."[129]

### 3.3.3. South Korea in ISAF

Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the South Korean government decided to join the international campaign of solidarity for supporting the US attempt to eradicate terrorism. The bill on sending troops to Afghanistan was submitted to the National Assembly for approval and adopted on 6 December 2001.[130] Initially, 1 naval vessel and 4 C-130 aircrafts were sent to assist the American troops in transporting personnel and supplies. In late 2002, South Korea additionally sent one medical unit (called "Dongui") and one engineering construction unit (called "Dasan") to Afghanistan for humanitarian purposes. The medical unit opened a hospital in the Bagram base, which is located 40 km north of Kabul, and provided surgical treatments for local Afghans and foreign troops. For five years, the South Korean medical unit treated more than 260,000 personnel, gave 63 health training, and conducted 36 relief activities with 780 troops in total.[131] The engineering construction unit conducted various missions, such as the restoration of local infrastructure, the construction of military bases for foreign troops, and job training

---

[129] Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Afganistan'a Takviye Türk Askeri Yok (There is no Turkish Reinforcement to Afghanistan)' 5 December, available at:
http://www.sabah.com.tr/Dunya/2009/12/05/afganistana_takviye_turk_askeri_yok

[130] National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. 제16대 국회  제225회  제20차 국회본회의 회의록 (The Record of the 16th National Assembly 225-20th Plenary Session), available at:
http://likms.assembly.go.kr/kms-dt/record/data2/225/pdf/225za0020b.PDF#xml=/xml/126653399218236.xml

[131] Ministry of National Defense. 2010. 세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 아프가니스탄 동의·다산 부대 (The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Dongui and Dasan Unit in Afghanistan), available at:
http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_2/index.jsp#

for the Afghan people, with 1,360 troops in total.[132] In addition, South Korea led the Parwan PRT in cooperation with the United States.[133]

In December 2007, South Korea withdrew its troops from Afghanistan following the Taliban's kidnapping of 21 South Koreans on 19 July.[134] However, it did not stop its contribution to the reconstruction process in Afghanistan. A South Korean reconstruction team comprised of 30 personnel from government officials, civilian medical personnel, and civilian experts on job training, remained in Afghanistan and continued to support the rehabilitation effort of the Afghan people. [135] Recently, the South Korean government has decided to expand its contribution to Afghanistan so as to meet the Afghan government's constant requests. On 8 December 2009, the Cabinet finalized the bill on dispatching troops to Afghanistan. The bill includes the establishment of a PRT, which is comprised of 100 civilians and 40 police officers, in Parwan province and the dispatch of 350 troops for the protection of the PRT personnel.[136] With the final approval of the National Assembly on 25 February 2010, South Korea got down to the preparation for troop commitments to ISAF, with the aim of fully starting its missions in Afghanistan by July 2010 at the latest. The prospective South Korean contingent will assume the tasks for improving the ability of provincial administration, providing medical service, developing agricultural infrastructure, and training the Afghan police. The prospective South Korean contingent will be placed under ISAF

---

[132] Ibid.

[133] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO – Republic of Korea cooperation*, available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50098.htm?selectedLocale=en

[134] Korea Herald. 2007. 'Korean troops return from mission in Afghanistan' 15 December, available at: http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives/result_contents.asp

[135] Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2007. *Press Release No.07-746,* 21 December

[136] Yonhap News. 2009. '정부 아프간 파병안 확정배경과 전망 *(The Government's Confirmation of the Bill on Dispatching Troops to Afghanistan)*,' 8 December, available at: http://news.naver.com/main/read.nhn?mode=LSD&mid=sec&sid1=100&oid=001&aid=0003014684

Regional Command East for a two-and-a-half-year period.[137] Tae-Young Kim, Minister of National Defense, clearly revealed the purpose of the new mission by saying, "This dispatch is not for conducting combat operations, but for ensuring a secure environment in which our PRT can play its reconstructing role without any risk."[138]

---

[137] Ibid.

[138] Yonhap News. 2010. '국방위 아프간 파병동의안 처리 *(The Committee of National Defense Approved the Bill on Dispatching Troops to Afghanistan)*' 19 February, available at: http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/politics/2010/02/19/0502000000AKR20100219181700001.HTML?template=2087

# CHAPTER IV

# ANALYSIS OF TURKEY'S AND SOUTH KOREA'S MOTIVATIONS

In this chapter, the motivations of Turkey and South Korea will be analyzed. Special attention will be given to examining the actual impact of the four probable motivations of the "allied new middle powers" -- indirect security concerns (or US pressure); the domestic factor (public opinion); potential economic benefit; and ideational considerations -- on the two states' decisions to send troops to Somalia, Lebanon, and Afghanistan, respectively. Since it is not possible to analyze a state's motivations without knowing the state's internal and external situations, Turkey's and South Korea's political, economic, and security situations, especially those relevant to the analysis, will be briefly touched upon at the beginning of every sub-section. After analyzing the motivations of Turkey and South Korea on a case-by-case basis, combined results of the whole analyses will be suggested at the end of this chapter.

## 4.1. Motivations for Sending Troops to UNOSOM II

### 4.1.1. Turkey's Motivations

Turkey's decision to send troops to Somalia occurred not long after the end

of the Cold War. During the Cold War, Turkey enjoyed the privileged status of being a NATO member by directly containing the Soviet Union in the immediate proximity. Turkey's place in the West was not a topic of controversy, since its geo-strategic importance was highly valued by the United States and other NATO members. When the Cold War came to an end, however, Turkey became seized with the possibility that its geo-strategic importance would be marginalized in the new era. Turkish authorities were concerned that a decrease in Turkey's geo-strategic importance would likely cause a reduction in Western economic and military assistance and an increase in Western pressure concerning Cyprus and human right issues.[139] Losing geo-strategic importance, which conveyed the same meaning of staying outside the Western structure, was by no means acceptable for Turkey. The outbreak of the Gulf War in August 1990 provided Turkey with a good opportunity to alleviate this concern. By playing a significant role in the US-led international coalition against Iraq, Turkey proved that it was still a reliable ally of the West and an indispensable partner for protecting Western interests in the Middle East.[140]

At the same time, the collapse of the Soviet Union in late 1991 and the fragmentation of Yugoslavia in early 1992 caused Turkey to turn its attention to much broader regions. During the Cold War, Turkey had almost no relation with Central Asia and the Caucasus despite common ethnic and cultural ties.[141] Turkey's approach to the Balkans was also limited in some specific issues, such as the security challenge posed by the Warsaw Pact, and the treatment of the ethnic Turkish minorities in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Romania. [142] However, the emergence of the new Turkic republics (Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan,

---

[139] Uslu, Nasuh. 2004. *Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Period* (New York: Nova): 4
[140] Ibid.: 7
[141] Sayari, Sabri. 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism," *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 54(1): 173
[142] Ibid.: 176

Kyrgyzstan, and Kazakhstan) in Central Asia and the Caucasus, and the independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia (where Turkish minorities and Muslim populations were living) in the Balkans created a hope that Turkey could expand its role and influence in these territories. In the early 1990s, Turkey was aiming to increase its political and economic influence in multiple regions through the newly adopted activist and assertive foreign policy.[143]

It is not possible to explain Turkey's participation in UNOSOM II separately from the consecutive developments of Turkish foreign policy orientation in the initial stage of the post-Cold War era. This is mainly because other motivating factors like public opinion and economic gains were less influential. Although Somalia had been a region of the Habesh province of the Ottoman Empire, and the majority of its population were Muslims, the crisis in Somalia did not attract much Turkish public attention in late 1992. The primary issue in which the Turkish people were interested was rather the crisis in Bosnia, where the Serbian ethnic cleansing policy towards the Bosnian Muslims was ongoing. The Turkish people's little attention to the crisis in Somalia at that time is well revealed in the statement by Engin Güner who was a member of TGNA from the Motherland Party (*Anavatan Partisi*-ANAP):

> For a couple of months, we have mentioned about the tragedy, ethnic cleansing, deaths of hundreds of thousands of people, and displacement in Bosnia-Herzegovina. These are the main topics of TV, radio, and other publications in these days. Now, we received a governmental bill on Somalia. It is very difficult to explain this bill to the public…How many people in Turkey know Somalia and follow the conflict there? But, if you ask anyone in the streets where a massacre is occurring, where a crime against humanity is happening, and where an ethnic cleansing is being implemented, the answer will be clear, Bosnia-Herzegovina.[144]

As there was no public opinion which could sufficiently prompt the Turkish

---

[143] Ibid.: 182
[144] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 1992. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 19/ Cilt: 12 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 19/ Version: 12)*: 263-264

government to take action concerning the crisis in Somalia, receiving economic benefits from participation in UNOSOM II was not a predominant consideration either. Somalia was one of the world's poorest and least developed countries in 1992. For Turkey, not just Somalia, but all African countries, were out of economic consideration. Indeed, Turkey's economic relations with Africa between 1923 and 1998 were at their lowest level, which cannot be said to exist at all.[145] General Çevik Bir also explained the unreadiness of the Turkish government to create economic profits by taking advantage of his assignment to the post of UNOSOM II commander. He said, "It might be possible to get some economic advantages from my commander position …Turkish food and pharmaceutical industries were capable of providing the necessities in Somalia…However, to put forward this topic was not a responsibility of military, but a responsibility of related ministry."[146]

One crucial motivating factor for Turkey's decision to dispatch troops to Somalia was to show its willingness to contribute to any international humanitarian movement so as to facilitate its participation in the UN activities in the Balkans, especially in Bosnia-Herzegovina. From the beginning of the crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Turkey was eager to bring a peaceful solution to the crisis due in part to the likelihood that the crisis could undermine regional stability and spill over into Turkey, and mostly to the presence of a large number of Turks of Balkan origin in Turkey.[147] As the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina further deteriorated and the public demand for the fulfillment of moral responsibilities towards the Bosnian Muslims increased in late 1992, the Turkish government was seeking a strengthened multilateral response to end Serbian atrocities. Turkey did not intend to take any

---

[145] Ozkan, Mehmet. 2008. "Turkey Discovers Africa: Implications and Prospects," *SETA Policy Brief*, No. 22: 2
[146] Bir, Çevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut ( A Hope for Somalia)* (Istanbul: Sabah Kitaplari): 34
[147] Sayari, Sabri. 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism," *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 54(1): 177

unilateral action, since such action might be perceived as the pursuance of irredentism towards former Ottoman territories and would damage its relations with Western allies.[148] At such a moment, Turkey's contribution to the UN humanitarian intervention in Somalia could help not only change the pessimistic attitude of the United States and the European states towards using military force against the Serbs, but also justify its active action towards the Balkans within the international context. This motivation is expressed in the statement by Hikmet Çetin, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, during the parliamentary discussion on the dispatch bill on 8 December 1992:

> From the beginning, the Republic of Turkey has been saying that the UN should intervene in the crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina and trying to get it done. In every international conference and bilateral meeting, the primary issue has been Bosnia-Herzegovina and Karabağ for the President, the Prime Minister, and the whole government officials including myself…The only thing required is for the UN and the world not to use double standards. We believe that as there was intervention in Iraq and as there is now intervention in Somalia, there should be intervention in Sarajevo in the same way despite difficulties…This (the UN intervention in Somalia) gives a strong justification for Bosnia-Herzegovina. The decision for Somalia can be a powerful justification against those who keep saying "The crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina is an intra-state problem, it is necessary to keep away from such domestic problems." It is probable that, even if with humanitarian purpose, the UN Security Council will intervene by sending forces.[149]

The other crucial motivating factor for Turkey was to demonstrate itself as a model state in the new era. In the early 1990s, Turkey was regarded by various Turkish elites, and by foreign scholars as a model of a democratic, secular, free-market society, which would be suitable for the newly independent states in Central Europe and Central Asia.[150] The ultimate foreign policy goal of Turkey during the

---

[148] Hunter, Shireen. 1999. "Bridge or frontier? Turkey's Post-Cold War geopolitical posture," *The International Spectator*, Vol. 34(1): 73
[149] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 1992. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 19/ Cilt: 12 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 19/ Version: 12)*: 251-252
[150] Kut, Sule. 2001. "The Contours of Turkish Foreign Policy in the 1990s," in *Turkey in the World Politics: An Emerging Multiregional Power*, eds. Rubin, Barry and Kirisci, Kemal (London: Lynne Rienner Publisher): 8

tenure of President Özal (1989 – 1993) was to project the Turkish model with the support of the United States so as to step forward as the leading actor in a Turkic world stretching from the Adriatic to the great Chinese wall.[151] Somalia constituted a good arena for Turkey to show its ability to play an international role. Turkey's successful performance in Somalia would increase its national prestige and consequently enhance the acceptability of the Turkish model. General Çevik Bir revealed this perspective in his book *A Hope for Somalia*:

> My assignment to the UN commander would add prestige to our country in the international arena. At that time, Turkish Republics that shared common ties in terms of history, culture, religion, and language were newly emerging as independent states. The positive situation that had been made through the strong ties with them would continue to develop in our favor with Turkey's UNOSOM II commander position.[152]

Turkish authorities' intentions to augment Turkey's international role through sending troops to Somalia can also be found in the answer that Süleyman Demirel, then Prime Minister, gave during a press interview on 7 December 1992. When asked about Turkey's decision to send troops to Somalia, he said, "If you want Turkey to become a world state, you should not say, 'What are our interests at stake there?'."[153]

To summarize Turkey's motivations for sending troops to Somalia, facilitating Turkey's participation in the UN activities in the Balkans and demonstrating the Turkish model in the new era can be counted as the actual decisive motivations. In addition, public opinion and economic considerations had little impact on the decision. Indirect security concerns had also little to do with Turkey's decision to participate in UNOSOM II, because it was Turkey that needed the United

---

[151] Aral, Berdal. 2001. "Dispensing with Tradition? Turkish Politics and International Society during the Ozal Decade, 1983-93," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.37(1): 76
[152] Bir, Çevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut ( A Hope for Somalia)* (Istanbul: Sabah Kitaplari): 57
[153] Hürriyet Newspaper. 1992. 'Somali'ye Asker Göndermenin Perde Arkası (The back stage of sending troops to Somalia)' Politika, written by Özkök, Erturuğul, 8 December

States by its side for pursuing the activist and assertive foreign policy in the post-Cold War era.

### 4.1.2. South Korea's Motivations

The advent of the post-Cold War era brought a reconciliatory mood to the Korean peninsula that had invariably been a hot spot of ideological and military confrontation for four decades. South Korea's ambitious "Northern Policy," which was launched in the late 1980s with the aim of normalizing its relations with socialist regimes, produced good results, such as the start of diplomatic relations with Moscow (1990) and Beijing (1992).[154] South Korea also intended to ease the hostile rivalry with North Korea through increased trade and inter-Korean communication. South Korea's efforts to alleviate the tension resulted in immediate positive outcomes. The first high-level talk between South and North Korean prime ministers took place in September 1990. South Korea and North Korea finally entered the UN as two separate but equal member states on 17 September 1991.[155] The two Koreas also successfully negotiated the agreement on reconciliation, non-aggression, and exchanges and cooperation on 13 December 1991 and consequently adopted the joint declaration on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula on 31 December 1991.[156] The atmosphere of the inter-Korean rapprochement went on until 19 March 1993, when North Korea announced its withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The event radically changed the expectation for peace in the Korean peninsula from optimism to pessimism. The two Koreas were pushed to the brink of war as North Korea played a brinkmanship policy by resisting international pressure

---

[154] Grutov, Mel. 1996. "South Korea's Foreign Policy and Future Security: Implications of the Nuclear-Standoff," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 69(1): 9

[155] The UN membership applications of the two Koreas had been rejected in the Cold War era due to the exercise of the veto power either by the United States or by the Soviet Union.

[156] Kihl, Young-Whan. 1994. "The Politics of Inter-Korean Relations: Coexistence or Reunification," in *Korea and the World: Beyond the Cold War*, eds., Kihl, Young-Whan (Oxford: Westview Press): 135-136

for nuclear inspection.

The South Korean government's final decision to participate in UNOSOM II (April 1993) chronologically follows the beginning of the nuclear standoff on the Korean peninsula (March 1993). However, the security concern emanating from the North Korean nuclear program had no impact on South Korea's decision to send troops to Somalia. A few days after South Korea became an official member of the UN in September 1991, it received the UN questionnaire asking to what extent South Korea can send troops to UN peace operations. After a one-year discussion, the South Korean government informed the UN on 18 September 1992 that it could contribute to UN peace operations within the purview of 540 infantry troops, 36 military observers, and 174 military medical personnel.[157] In October 1992, the UN requested that the South Korean government send a medical unit comprised of 70 personnel to UNOSOM I through an unofficial route, but the South Korean government rejected the request. The decision to reject was because it thought its preparation for peace operations was not sufficient and, more importantly, it had long been hoping for Cambodia to become its first UN peace operation area.[158] In December 1992, the UN once again requested South Korea's troop contribution and financial support for UNITAF. In response to the request, the South Korean government decided not to send troops, but to provide 2 million US dollars for the operation. In January 1993, when the transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II was ongoing in Somalia, the UN requested South Korea's troop commitment for the third time. This time, the South Korean government took a positive attitude towards the

---

[157] Chosun Newspaper. 1992. 'PKO 780 명 파병-정부 UN 에 회신(PKO 780 personnel-The government replied to the UN),' 18 September, available at:
https://srchdb1.chosun.com/pdf/i_service/read_body.jsp?Y=1992&M=09&D=19&ID=9209190407
[158] Dong-A Newspaper. 1992. '유엔, 한국에 소말리아 파병요청 / 정부, 거부의사 밝혀 (The UN requested South Korea's troop contribution to Somalia / The government revealed its reluctance)' 30 November, available at: http://www.donga.com/fbin/dfsrchview?n=9211300000201147

request and made a provisional decision in February 1993 to send troops to UNOSOM II.[159] As revealed above, all the consecutive processes paving the way for the South Korean government's final decision to send troops to Somalia had happened before the inter-Korean relations started moving in a negative direction. This fact implies that indirect security concerns or potential weakening of its military alliance with the United States were not crucial motivating factors for South Korea's participation in UNOSOM II. The South Korean government's refusal to send troops to UNITAF despite the request of President Bush and its turning down the request of President Clinton to send combat troops to UNOSOM II also confirm that indirect security concerns were not a powerful motivation.[160]

In addition, the impact of public opinion and economic consideration on South Korea's decision was very marginal. When the South Korean government set up the basic principles of sending troops to peace operations in 1992, South Koreans generally had negative attitudes towards the participation in any peace operation due mostly to the experience of severe casualties in the Vietnam War. In the course of considering the participation in UNOSOM II, South Korean public opinion did not shift. The South Korean diplomats working in the UN headquarters said, "PKO has a low level of risk because its missions are limited to monitoring elections and delivering humanitarian aids. However, we have difficulties with respect to the topic of sending troops to Somalia, since there is a widespread public perception in South Korea of regarding PKO in the same light as the Vietnam War."[161] When it comes to

---

[159] National Assembly of South Korea. 1993.
한국공병부대의 「소말리아유엔평화유지단」 참여동의안 심사보고서 (*The Evaluation Report of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Construction Contingent to UNOSOM II*)
[160] Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '전투병 파병 거부 / 김대통령, 클린턴에 친서 보내(Refusal to send combat troops / A letter sent to Clinton by President Kim),' 20 October, available at: http://news.chosun.com/svc/content_view/content_view.html?contid=1993102070104
[161] Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '한국의 국제 수준(The international level of South Korea),' 5 January, available at: http://news.chosun.com/svc/content_view/content_view.html?contid=1993010570211

economic considerations, the South Korean government did not aim to get economic benefits from participating in UNOSOM II. Although South Korea established diplomatic relations with Somalia in 1987, South Korean companies did not show any enthusiasm to invest in Somalia. When the security situation of Somalia further deteriorated in early 1992, South Korea closed down its embassy in Mogadishu. From 1993 to 2003, South Korea had no diplomatic relations with Somalia at all.[162] Furthermore, South Korea's annual trade volume with Somalia stayed around $ 1.5 million, a very small amount of money, even after the completion of UNOSOM II.[163] This fact confirms that South Korea did not have any design to make use of its contribution to Somalia for creating potential economic profits.

One of the most decisive motivations of South Korea was to quickly elevate its position in the UN. South Korea's attempt to gain UN membership started in 1949. However, the superpower rivalry in the Cold War era and North Korea's constant objection to the parallel membership for the two Koreas delayed its admission for 42 years.[164] Since South Korea placed 30th in terms of per-capita income and 13th in terms of gross national product (GNP) by the end of 1980s, it targeted the very first day of its UN membership to make its position in the UN commensurate with its already reached high economic level. The participation in UNOSOM II constituted a good opportunity for South Korea to reach its goal more quickly. When the South Korean government started to take active steps towards its troop commitment to Somalia, the spokesman of Ministry of Foreign Affairs said, "The basic stance of the

---

[162] Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Republic of Kenya. 2009. *The General Information on Somali Republic*, available at: http://ken.mofat.go.kr/kor/af/ken/legation/add/somalia/index.jsp
[163] The highest volume was $ 2.2 million in 2001, which was still very small amount of money in comparison to South Korea's total annual export volume of $ 170 billion in 2001. See, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2005. *The Guide for Abroad Business: Somali Republic/East Africa*: 540
[164] From the early 1970s, North Korea kept arguing that it was the sole legitimate entity representing the whole Korean peninsula, whereas South Korea claimed for relative legitimation (separate but equal UN membership) See, Kim, Samuel S. 1994. "The Two Koreas and World Order," in *Korea and the World: Beyond the Cold War*, eds., Kihl, Young-Whan (Oxford: Westview Press): 33

government is that South Korea should actively take part in the UN effort to keep international peace and security, so as to enhance its status in the UN and to strengthen its cooperation with other member states."[165] South Korea's intention to exalt its position in the UN through sending troops to Somalia is also expressed in the *Evaluation Report of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Contingent to UNOSOM II*:

> This bill is for participating in UN peacekeeping activities within the limits of possibility as a member of the UN. The participation in UNOSOM II is thought to be a good opportunity, since it is consistent with the spirit of our constitution claiming to advocate pacifism; it will make our people feel a sense of pride and self-confidence; and it will be a way to accumulate our records of contributing to constructive activities and to the international community, which is essential for securing a position befitting our international status in the UN…By sending an engineering contingent to Somalia, we expect to make our international status enhanced and to create a likely circumstance for getting international assistance in case of emergency.[166]

South Korea's decision to send troops to Somalia had also much to do with the "New Diplomacy." With the election of Young-Sam Kim as President in December 1992, a new civilian government was formed in South Korea that ended 32 years of military regimes. The new government laid out a blueprint South Korea should follow in the new era under the title of the "New Diplomacy." The "New Diplomacy" was a diplomacy emphasizing universal values of democracy, liberty, welfare, and human rights. It also had five fundamental principles, namely, globalism, diversification, multidimensionalism, regional cooperation, and future orientation.[167] Through pursuing the "New Diplomacy," the new government aimed not only to raise South Korea's international competitiveness, but also to take a step forward in

---

[165] Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '정부, 소말리아 파병 적극 검토 / 유엔 요청 대비 준비작업 (The government, active examination on the dispatch to Somalia / A preparation for the UN request),' 28 January, available at: http://www.donga.com/fbin/dfsrchview?n=9301280000014899
[166] National Assembly of South Korea. 1993. 한국공병부대의「소말리아유엔평화유지단」참여동의안 심사보고서 (*The Evaluation Report of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Construction Contingent to UNOSOM II*)
[167] Kim, Samuel S. 2000. "Korea's *Segyehwa* Drive: Promise versus Performance," in *Korea's Globalization*, eds., Kim, Samuel S. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press): 244

playing a central role in the international arena. The decision to participate in UNOSOM II was an outcome of the new South Korean government's early drive towards globalization in the post-Cold War era. Sung-Joo Han, the first Foreign Minister of President Young-Sam Kim's administration and one of the key architectures of the "New Diplomacy," said, "We will take an active part in international efforts to tackle global issues…We will contribute to UN peacekeeping operations and international peace and security, thereby also securing our place in the international community." [168] In addition, Deputy Foreign Minister Soon-Young Hong's answer with respect to the participation in UNOSOM II at the Committee of Foreign Affairs and Unification on 13 May 1993 clearly shows the new South Korean government's aspirations for a more active role in the international arena:

> Many members of the National Assembly have asked why we should send troops to Somalia and why we should engage in every conflict whenever it occurs. In fact, one of the most noteworthy changes in the aftermath of the Cold War is the strengthened role of the UN in the international arena, and then comes the strengthened function of PKO activities. It is necessary for us to actively participate in PKO activities as a responsible member of the international community. We should assume a key role in maintaining the new international order and contribute to further strengthening of PKO activities.[169]

To summarize South Korea's motivations for sending troops to Somalia, quickly exalting its position in the UN and playing a central role in the international arena through pursuing the "New Diplomacy" can be counted as the actual decisive motivations. In addition, it is hard to regard indirect security concerns as a decisive motivation, since all the consecutive processes leading to the South Koran government's final decision to participate in UNOSOM II occurred at the time of reconciliation between the two Koreas. Public opinion and economic consideration had also little impact on the decision.

---

[168] Quoted in Koh, B.C. 2000. "*Segyehwa*, Korea, and the United Nations," in *Korea's Globalization*, eds., Kim, Samuel S. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press): 198-199
[169] The National Assembly of South Korea. 1993. 제161회 제4차 외무통일위원회 회의록 (The Record of 161-4th Discussion at the Committee of Foreign Affairs and Unification): 42

### 4.2. Motivations for Sending Troops to UNIFIL II

#### 4.2.1. Turkey's Motivations

From the outbreak of the armed conflict between Israel and Hezbollah in July 2006, Turkey attentively followed the evolution of events in Lebanon. On 15 July, Turkey called for an immediate ceasefire in the region. Abdullah Gül, then Foreign Minister, said, "We invite everyone to ceasefire quickly. If a ceasefire is delayed, we will see the risk of escalation and the complete destruction of the opportunity for co-existence."[170] Turkey also devoted itself to end the tension that could negatively affect the entire world through all of its bilateral and multilateral diplomatic channels. When the deployment of a stabilization force in southern Lebanon began to be discussed among UN diplomats, many news reports and experts mentioned Turkey as one of the possible leading nations for the force. Turkey approached the issue with discretion as it set certain terms for its final decision. The terms were: (1) the adoption of a UN resolution; (2) non-involvement in any combat mission (including the disarmament of Hezbollah) by the international force; and (3) the announcement by all the parties to the conflict welcoming Turkey's participation.[171] In an interview with CNN on 27 July, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan said, "Turkey may take part in a Lebanon peace force only after the realization of a ceasefire."[172] Even after the UN SC unanimously adopted Resolution 1701 on 11 August, Turkey remained cautious about its troop commitments. On 14 August, the Turkish government signaled that it would suspend its formal decision until the UN SC approved a new decision clarifying the mandate of the planned troop

---

[170] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Turkey urges ceasefire as Israel expands offensive,' 15 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-urges-ceasefire-as-israel-expands-offensive-2006-07-15

[171] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2006. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 22/ Cilt: 127-1 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 12/ Version: 127-1)*

[172] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Turkey may send troops to Lebanon, PM announces' 29 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-may-send-troops-to-lebanon-pm-announces-2006-07-29

deployment. It was only after the Foreign Minister Gül's fact-finding mission for gathering opinions from Lebanon, Israel, Palestine, and Syria that the Turkish government finally completed its long pondering on whether to send troops to Lebanon. On 28 August, government spokesperson and Justice Minister Cemil Çiçek said, "The UN peace force issue was discussed and it was decided in principle that we would participate in the mission."[173]

The issue of sending troops to Lebanon created a huge wave of opposition in Turkey's domestic arena. The majority of the Turkish people did not favor the government's decision to participate in UNIFIL II. More than 100,000 Turks who were outraged by Israeli strikes on Lebanon joined the anti-war demonstration in Istanbul.[174] Furthermore, the results of an internet poll conducted by major Turkish newspapers right before the parliamentary vote showed that public opinion in Turkey was strongly against the decision (Hürriyet: 76.8% / Milliyet: 84% / Sabah: 69.66%).[175] Ahmet Necdet Sezer, President of the time, was also among those who opposed the idea of sending troops. He took a strong stance against the decision by saying, "I keep saying everywhere. We do not have to protect other states' national interests. It is not our duty to solve other states' security problems. Under the circumstance that we have our own problem, it is not our responsibility to deal with that of others."[176] Even many deputies of the ruling Justice and Development Party

---

[173] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Gov't agrees to send troops to Lebanon,' 29 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=govt-agrees-to-send-troops-to-lebanon-2006-08-29

[174] Gruen, George E. 2006. "Turkey's Role in Peacekeeping Missions," *American Foreign Policy Interests*, Vol. 28: 436

[175] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Internet polls show resounding "no!" on troops to Lebanon question' 4 September, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=internet-polls-show-resounding-no-on-troops-to-lebanon-question-2006-09-04

[176] Hürriyet Newspaper. 2006. 'Sezer: Türkiye'nin Lübnan'a asker göndermesine karşıyım (Sezer: I'm against Turkey's sending troops to Lebanon),' 25 August, available at: http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=4980763

(*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*-AKP) disagreed with sending troops to Lebanon.[177] Hence, it can be said that the Turkish government's decision to participate in UNIFIL II was not a result of any domestic pressure.

The Turkish government's decision was not affected by US pressure, in other words, indirect security concerns were not a decisive motivating factor for Turkey. From the beginning, Turkey unchangingly argued that a ceasefire should be maintained before the deployment of a possible stabilization force in Lebanon and favored the force under the UN flag, whereas the United States resisted calling for an immediate ceasefire and wanted NATO to assume the leadership of the force. To the disappointment of many US officials, Turkey declined to take a critical stand on Hezbollah and officially blamed Israel for indiscriminate and disproportionate retaliation. In addition, Turkey was staunchly opposed to the idea proposed by the United States that UNIFIL II should have the authority to fight Hezbollah if needed. The Turkish government publicly declared that it would participate only in humanitarian missions at a time when the United States was seeking a new UN decision to give UNIFIL II the clear task of disarming Hezbollah.[178] Turkey's dissatisfaction with the US stance on the terrorist Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) in the same period simply drops US pressure as one of the main motivations. When the PKK terrorist campaign in the southeastern region of Turkey mounted in mid-July, the Turkish government issued a strong call on the United States to do something about the PKK presence in northern Iraq and warned that it could otherwise engage

---

[177] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'AKP divided over sending troops to Lebanon' 29 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=akp-divided-over-sending-troops-to-lebanon-2006-08-29

[178] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Ankara sharpens red lines for Lebanon troops' 24 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ankara-sharpens-red-lines-for-lebanon-troops-2006-08-24

in cross-border military action unilaterally.[179] Several Turkish officials also criticized the United States for tolerating Israel's attacks on its enemies in Lebanon while refusing to allow Turkey to crush the PKK terrorists hiding inside northern Iraq. Although the Bush administration pledged better cooperation in the fight against the PKK following the Turkish government's firm signal of intervening in northern Iraq, Turkish leaders continued to demand more concrete US actions against the PKK.[180] In short, it can be said that the Turkish government followed a separate track independent of the United States with respect to UNIFIL II.

It is true that Turkey's participation in UNIFIL II helped to improve its economic relations with Lebanon. As shown in Table 3, Turkey's exports to Lebanon have rapidly increased since 2006. In addition, Turkey placed 8th in the list of Lebanon's 10 largest trading partners for the first time in 2007. According to Veysel Ayhan, Turkey's willingness to participate in UNIFIL II and its humanitarian aid in Lebanon were the two important elements in the upgraded relations between Turkey

**Table 3. Economic Relation between Turkey and Lebanon (2005–2008)**[181]

| Turkey–Lebanon Annual Trade (1000 $) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** |
| Turkey's Exports to Lebanon | 199,641 | 257,826 | 405,096 | 698,529 |
| Turkey's Imports from Lebanon | 121,600 | 102,345 | 109,577 | 206,863 |
| Total Trade Volume | 321,241 | 360,171 | 514,673 | 905,392 |

---

[179] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Gül insists Turkey reserves right to hit PKK in Iraq' 21 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=gul-insists-turkey-reserves-right-to-hit-pkk-in-iraq-2006-07-21

[180] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Ankara displeased with US statement addressed to PKK' 18 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ankara-displeased-with-us-statement-addressed-to-pkk-2006-08-18

[181] Turkish Embassy in Beirut, Office of the Commercial Counselor. 2008. *The Annual Report on the General Economic Situation in Lebanon and the Economic Relation between Turkey and Lebanon*, available at: http://www.musavirlikler.gov.tr/altdetay.cfm?AltAlanID=368&dil=TR&ulke=RL

and Lebanon in the fields of economy, politics, and security.[182] The economic indices imply that the Turkish government might have been motivated by potential economic benefits achievable from participation in UNIFIL II. However, it is somewhat unclear since there was not any comment on the economic dimension by any Turkish officials during the decision-making process. Thus, it is more correct to say that economic benefits gained from Lebanon since 2006 was rather a natural consequence of Turkey's increased role as a third party in the Middle East. This fact leads us to one of the crucial motivations behind Turkey's decision to participate in UNIFIL II.

One crucial motivation of Turkey, as hinted above, was to increase its ability as a credible mediator in the Middle East, that is, to show itself as a core soft power in the region. Turkey has been regarded as a state possessing the potential to become a soft power, thanks to its uniqueness that combines Muslim, secular, and democratic characteristics in harmony. Turkey's considerable achievement in socioeconomic and political fields also helped it to be perceived as a soft power by many Muslim states. The AKP party's coming to power in 2002 further increased Turkey's appeal as a soft power, as it revealed the possibility of moderate Islam and its compatibility with democracy.[183] Turkey, which hoped to assume a leadership role in the promotion of democratization in the Islamic world by taking advantage of its invaluable assets, needed to prove its will to act in order to consolidate its position as a soft power. The Turkish government's decision to participate in UNIFIL II was an extension of its endeavor to get recognition not only from its Western allies, but also from its Muslim neighbors as a legitimate soft power.[184] Since Turkey

---

[182] Ayhan, Veysel. 2009. "Turkish Foreign Minister Davutoğlu's Visit to Lebanon and Turkey's Relations with Lebanon," *ORSAM (Center For Middle Eastern Strategic Studies)* 19 August, available at: http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/showArticle.aspx?ID=66
[183] Altunisik, Meliha B. 2008. "The Possibilities and Limits of Turkey's Soft Power in the Middle East," *Insight Turkey* Vol. 10(2): 44
[184] Ibid.: 52

maintained cordial ties with Israel, Lebanon, and other Muslim states including Syria and Iran, it could demonstrate its indispensable value as a neutral third party actor through active participation in UNIFIL II, which was part of the international efforts to resolve conflicts in the Middle East. An article published in *Financial Times* explains the Turkish government's intention to consolidate its soft power role through participating in UNIFIL II:

> Turkey's decision sends out an important message about Turkey's strategic intentions…Turkey ruled much of the Middle East, including Lebanon, until the Ottoman Empire collapsed in the World War I. Since then its clout in the region has appeared to diminish despite its huge military capability and modern economy. Erdoğan has been more willing than his predecessors to insist on Turkey's credentials both as a regional power and in the wider attempt to avoid a chasm between Islam and the West…Turkish diplomats say he has been seeking opportunities to display and project the country in those roles. The chance to participate in the Lebanon force is an ideal one. The deployment of Turkish troops in Lebanon would give Ankara a say in the resolution of an increasingly diffuse Middle Eastern question, fitting Erdoğan's vision of Turkey as a mediator in the conflict.[185]

The Turkish government's consistent emphasis on the humanitarian dimension of the operation and its justification of Turkey's involvement on the basis of historical and cultural ties with Lebanon were also closely related to its intention to be firmly recognized as a soft power. Prime Minister Erdoğan's statement in a joint news conference with UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan right after the TGNA's endorsement implicitly indicates this intention. The Prime Minister said, "Acts of violence have come to an end and hopes have risen again for a lasting political settlement after approval of resolution by the UN SC. Now, we should consolidate the ceasefire, and make peace and stability permanent in the region. Turkey will fulfill its historical and humanitarian commitments in this process. That's why we

---

[185] Boland, Vincent. 2006. "Turkey lays claim to the role of peacemaker in Lebanon," *Financial Times*, 7 September

have decided to contribute troops to UNIFIL."[186]

Another strong motivation of Turkey in deciding to participate in UNIFIL II was to facilitate its full EU membership. Turkey's European orientation dates back to the early 1920s when the founders of the Turkish Republic saw it as the sole way to modernize the country. To solidify its position in Europe, Turkey has long been hoping to be integrated into the EU. With the coming of the 21st century, Turkey's desire to become a member of the EU has further increased, since evolving into a liberal-pluralistic society as part of the integration process with the EU was considered the best strategy for Turkey to prevent itself from being isolated in the globalizing world.[187] Turkey's long journey towards full EU membership gained momentum following the EU's decision to start accession talks with Turkey on 3 October 2005. For Turkey to complete its Europeanization process with success, its support for the EU's foreign and security policies was no less necessary than its undertaking of domestic reform to internalize European norms. UNIFIL II, which was formed with huge troop commitments by EU members, constituted a good chance for Turkey to show its willingness to cooperate with the EU in maintaining peace and stability in the Middle East. Turkey's solidarity with EU members in Lebanon was also a good way of accentuating its European identity, which would help bring to fruition its bid for EU member status. A statement by Foreign Minister Gül at the parliamentary discussion on 5 September 2006 indicates Turkey's commitment to UNIFIL II had much to do with promoting the attractiveness of Turkey in the eyes of Europeans:

> We should bear in mind that more than half of the authorized 15,000 troops will be sent by NATO and EU members, and the leadership role in the first period

---

[186] Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Erdoğan- Annan joint news conference' 6 September, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=erdogan--annan-joint-news-conference-2006-09-06
[187] Oguzlu, H. Tarik. 2004. "Changing Dynamics of Turkey's U.S. and EU Relations," *Middle East Policy*, Vol. 11(1): 99

will be assumed by our allies. Even Italy and Spain, which once withdrew their troops from Iraq, and both of which are currently ruled by left-wing parties, will take part in the new UNIFIL with a considerable number of troops… This behavior (Turkey's decision to participate in UNIFIL II) is consistent with our legitimate claim that the EU can be transformed into a world power with Turkey, a reputable state having the unique characteristic of linking civilizations.[188]

Through actively participating in UNIFIL II, Turkey could make itself more appealing as an essential part of the European community to many EU states that had already lauded Turkey's troop commitment to Lebanon. Furthermore, as Olli Rehn, Enlargement Commissioner of the EU, said, Turkey's strategic importance to Europe was once again highlighted with the outbreak of the military conflict in Lebanon.[189] In such a desirable situation, there was no reason for Turkey not to assume the peacekeeper role, which would have a positive impact on its bid for full EU membership.

To summarize Turkey's motivations for sending troops to Lebanon, showing itself as a core soft power in the Middle East and facilitating full EU membership by accentuating its European identity can be counted as the actual decisive motivating factors. It is true that Turkey has emerged as a state making net benefits from the economic relations with Lebanon since its troop commitments to UNIFIL II. However, economy-related motivation was not given a great prominence in the decision-making process. Economic benefits gained from Lebanon since 2006 seem to be a natural consequence of Turkey's increased role as a soft power in the region. In addition, both public opinion and indirect security concerns are far from having influenced the decision to become part of UNIFIL II.

---

[188] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2006. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 22/ Cilt: 127-1 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 22/ Version: 127-1)*
[189] Olli Rehn said "The importance of negotiations with Turkey has increased in light of the military conflict in Lebanon because Turkey is a moderate Islamic society and secular democratic state" See, Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Rehn: EU-member Turkey would be 'bridge' with Islam' 6 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=rehn-eu-member-turkey-would-be-bridge-with-islam-2006-08-06

### 4.2.2. South Korea's Motivations

Unlike in Europe, where dispatch of troops to Lebanon started to be discussed in mid-July, the same issue surfaced in South Korea after the UN SC adopted Resolution 1701 on 11 August 2006, in which shared roles of the international community in reinforcing the peacekeeping force in Lebanon were officially requested. South Korea was concerned about the armed conflict in Lebanon, despite its remoteness, on the understanding that world peace cannot be sustained without peace in the Middle East, the region replete with chronic and intractable conflicts. However, a more serious concern for South Korea than what was going on in Lebanon around that time was North Korea's nuclear weapons program. North Korea launched seven ballistic missiles over the East Sea on 5 July 2006. The UN condemned North Korea's resumption of missile tests and imposed sanctions on North Korea by adopting SC Resolution 1695 on 15 July 2006. North Korea's missile tests made the six-party talks fruitless, which started in 2003 with the purpose of finding a peaceful resolution to the security concerns coming from North Korea.[190] The South Korean government was very much shocked by the event, because it was pursuing the "Peace and Prosperity Policy" towards North Korea, which aimed to reduce tensions between the two Koreas through increased reciprocity.[191] North Korea's nuclear denotation in October 2006 led the UN to adopt a stronger resolution, SC Resolution 1718, which clearly described the North Korean action as a threat to international peace and security. It also gave rise to the emergence of widespread skepticism in South Korea about the government's lenient attitude towards the North.[192]

---

[190] The six-party talks were a result of North Korea's withdrawing from the NPT in 2003.
Participating nations were China, South Korea, North Korea, the United States, Russia, and Japan.
[191] Bluth, Christoph. 2008. *Hot Spots in Global Politics: Korea* (Cambridge: Polity Press): 133
[192] Ibid.: 135

The South Korean government's decision to participate in UNIFIL II was made around the time when the new nuclear crisis emerged on the Korean peninsula. However, the two events bore little relation to each other; in other words, the South Korean government did not take into great consideration the North Korean factor in the course of its decision about UNIFIL II. Indeed, there was no statement related to the North Korean situation in various official announcements on UNIFIL II, let alone in the record of various parliamentary discussions on the issue.[193] In addition, UNIFIL II was not even one of the major topics discussed in the September 2006 summit talk between President Roh and President Bush. Christopher Hill, the US Assistant Secretary of State, said, "The South Korean government signaled its intention to participate in UNIFIL II during the summit…but there was no discussion on the issue between the two governments."[194] During the November 2006 summit talk, the same issue again remained outside the list of major topics, since it was considered a topic between the UN and South Korea.[195] Given the aforementioned facts, it is hard to say that the South Korean government was motivated to take part in UNIFIL II by its security concerns, either direct or indirect. The fact that President Roh consistently sought to achieve the self-reliance of national defense throughout his tenure (2003 – 2008) makes the latter concern, or US pressure, simply dropped as one of the main motivations.[196]

---

[193] Dispatch of a South Korean unit to Lebanon were discussed twice in the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce (5 December/15 December), once in the Committee of National Defense (12 December). Neither governmental officials, nor parliamentary members made any statement related to the North Korean situation during those parliamentary discussions.

[194] Chosun News. 2006. '힐 "노대통령, 레바논 파병 밝혀" (Hill "President Roh signaled dispatch to Lebanon"),' 29 September, available at:
http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/09/29/2006092960001.html

[195] Chosun News. 2006. '송민순 '한미정상회담' 일문입답 (Min-Soon Song, Q&A about the U.S.-Korea summit talk),' 18 November, available at:
http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/11/18/2006111860121.html

[196] President Roh's administration set to work on the transition of wartime operational control from the U.S. to South Korea as part of self-reliance of national defense. See, Kim, Chang-Hoon. 2008. 한국외교: 어제와 오늘 (South Korean Foreign Policy: Past and Present) (Kyung-Gi: KSI): 459

Public opinion and economic gain were not decisive motivations of the South Korean government, either. Prior to the government's final decision, many South Koreans were apprehensive that the safety of their troops might not be guaranteed in a dangerous place like Lebanon. A public survey conducted by the Korean Broadcast System, the biggest television network in South Korea, showed that 54.5% of South Koreans had a negative opinion of sending troops to Lebanon.[197] When it comes to economic considerations, it is true that South Korea's exports to Lebanon have increased since 2007 as shown in Table 4. However, it accounted for a very small portion of the total export volume of South Korea ($228 million out of $422 billion in 2008). In addition, Lebanon remained a minor market for South

**Table 4. South Korea's Exports to Lebanon and Other Four Countries**

**in the Middle East (2005–2008)[198]**

|  | 2005 | | 2006 | | 2007 | | 2008 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Syria** | 400 | 12.4% | 484 | 21.0% | 607 | 25.6% | 787 | 29.5% |
| **Jordan** | 467 | -11.1% | 359 | -23.2% | 386 | 7.6% | 734 | 89.9% |
| **Iraq** | 68 | -45.7% | 108 | 59.8% | 209 | 92.7% | 368 | 75.5% |
| **Israel** | 849 | -0.2% | 746 | -12.2% | 969 | 30% | 1,010 | 4.2% |
| **Lebanon** | 92 | 3.8% | 90 | -2.4% | 142 | 58% | 288 | 60% |

**Exports volume (million $) / Comparison with the volume of previous year (%)**

---

[197] Chosun News. 2006. 'KBS 여론조사, 레바논 PKO 파병은 54.5%가 반대 (KBS public survey, 54.5% against PKO dispatch to Lebanon),' 28 November, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/11/28/2006112860455.html

[198] Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Republic of Lebanon. 2009. 한·레바논 관계 (The Relation between South Korea and Lebanon), available at: http://lbn.mofat.go.kr/kor/af/lbn/affair/relation/index.jsp

Korea even after 2007 as compared with the other four countries in the Middle East. Thus, it can be said that South Korea's participation in UNIFIL II was not driven by either domestic pressure or profit-seeking.

One crucial motivation of South Korea was the necessity to make its participation in the UN PKO activities commensurate with its international status. As the 11th largest economy in the world and one of the top 10 financial donor states to the UN peacekeeping budget, South Korea had an obligation to contribute to international peace and prosperity to a certain extent. South Korea's personnel commitment, however, was far below the expectations of the international community. As of November 2006, South Korea had only 30 personnel who were serving as UN peacekeepers in six regions, as shown in Table 5. South Korea's 84th place in a ranking of personnel contribution to the UN PKO activities was thought problematic and incommensurate with its position in the international society. Both top governmental officials and parliamentary members belonging to the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce had a common opinion that expanding participation in the UN PKO activities to such an extent equivalent to South Korea's international standing is a way of promoting national interests.[199]

**Table 5. South Korea's Participation in the UN PKO Activities (Nov. 2006)**[200]

|  | **UNMOGIP** | **UNOMIG** | **UNMIL** | **UNAMA** | **ONUB** | **UNMIS** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Region** | India/Pakistan | Georgia | Liberia | Afghanistan | Burundi | Sudan |
| **Personnel** | 10 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |

[199] National Assembly of South Korea. 2006. 제263회 통일외교통상위원회회의록 제1차 (*The record of 263-1st Discussion at the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce*): 2
[200] Ministry of National Defense. 2006. *Defense White Paper* (Seoul:MND): 219

Furthermore, former Foreign Minister Ban Ki-Moon's election as UN Secretary-General on 13 October 2006 acted as the catalyst for making the South Korean government awakened to the need for enhanced international roles.[201] During a pre-evaluation session for the bill on the dispatch of troops to Lebanon, Hee-Kwon Gu, the senior professional member representing the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce, said:

> As a member of the international community, South Korea has a responsibility to support the decision of the UN to keep international peace and stability. Especially, as the home country of the UN Secretary-General, South Korea has an obligation to play a leading role in humanitarian efforts to end conflicts and reconstructing. Therefore, it will be desirable if the National Assembly positively considers the bill on dispatching troops to UNIFIL II.[202]

South Korea's decision to participate in UNIFIL II had also much to do with the "National Defense Reform 2020." Since 2006, South Korea has sought to transform its military structure into an information and technology intensive one and to raise the efficiency of national defense organization and management, so as to match the standards of the changing security environment and future warfare requirements.[203] Establishment of a standby arrangement system for overseas dispatch, which aims to facilitate active participation in the PKO activities, was selected as one of the twenty primary tasks of the reform.[204] In an initial phase of the reform, participation in UNIFIL II was a good way of showing South Korea's willingness and readiness to fulfill its plan. The *Defense White Paper 2006* clearly demonstrates that South Korea will further increase its participation in the international peacekeeping activities by preparing an institutional framework as part

---

[201] In, Nam-Sik. 2007. "Dispatch of Peacekeeping Forces to Lebanon: Implication and Tasks," *Institute of Foreign Affairs & National Security, Policy Brief*, No.2007-5: 8

[202] National Assembly of South Korea. 2006. 제262회 통일외교통상위원회회의록 제17차 (*The record of 262-17ˢᵗ Discussion at the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce*): 13

[203] Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *Defense Policy: Defense Reform*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndEng_2009/DefensePolicy/Policy12/Policy12_10/index.jsp

[204] Ministry of National Defense. 2009. *The Defense Reform Basic Plan* (Seoul:MND): 26

of the "National Defense Reform 2020." Expanding participation in the PKO activities is described in the paper as a way to contribute to enhancing the peace-loving image; securing international support for the problem on the Korean peninsula; and consolidating South Korea's diplomatic influence in the international arena.[205] It is thought that the South Korean government's decision to send troops to Lebanon was an early reflection of the defense reform aiming to increase South Korean armed forces' international role in the 21$^{st}$ century.

To summarize South Korea's motivations for sending troops to Lebanon, making its participation in the UN PKO activities commensurate with its international status and fulfilling the "National Defense Reform 2020" can be counted as the actual decisive motivations. US pressure had little to do with the South Korean government's decision to send troops to Lebanon despite North Korea's resumption of missile tests. Similarly, the impact of public opinion and economic consideration on the decision was absent.

## 4.3. Motivations for Sending Troops to ISAF

### 4.3.1. Turkey's Motivations

In the early 2000s, the political and security situation of Turkey was relatively stable thanks to a number of positive developments. The mutual assistance between Turkey and Greece after the devastating earthquakes in the summer of 1999 brought about a new period of reconciliation in the two countries' relations. Both countries' positive approaches towards each other created a new hope for the peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem. The capture of Abdullah Öcalan, the PKK leader, in February 1999 also led to a sharp decrease in the number of the PKK

---

[205] Ministry of National Defense. 2006. *Defense White Paper*: 102

insurgencies in the southeastern region of Turkey. Furthermore, the EU, which had rejected Turkey's bid for candidacy in the 1997 Luxembourg summit, reversed its stance and formally declared Turkey a candidate at Helsinki in December 1999. Turkey also felt relieved to a great extent from the international criticism on the human rights and democratization issues, as its strong relationship with Israel helped lessen pressure on it in the US Congress, and, moreover, the new Bush administration did not necessarily emphasize such issues. In contrast to the political and security situation, the economic situation of Turkey in the same period was quite problematic. The 1999 economic reform program supported by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) ended up with no success. In February 2001, Turkey was hit by the worst economic crisis in its modern history. Due to the crisis, its GNP fell by around 10 percent, the rate of inflation reached 92 percent, and domestic debt reached over 80 percent of GNP.[206] As a result, Turkey was in dire need of a continued and increased international economic support to get out of the financial crisis as soon as possible.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States occurred when Turkey was placed in a mixed circumstance, politically hopeful but economically problematic. Less than a month after the tragic event, the Turkish government was endowed with full authority for troop commitments to Afghanistan by TGNA, which had no limitation on duration and scope.[207] In the course of the government's decision and then parliamentary approval, public opinion was left out. According to the results of an opinion poll conducted by the Ankara Social Research Center, approximately 80 percent of the Turkish people were opposed to the government's decision to send

---

[206] Kumcu, Ercan. 2003. "The Unfinished Struggle for Economic Stability," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 52
[207] Bill of Prime Ministry No.3/892, See, The Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2001. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 21/ Cilt: 71-4 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 21/ Version: 71-4),* 10 October

troops to Afghanistan.[208] Abdullah Gül, then a member of TGNA from the AKP party, also argued during the parliamentary discussion on 10 October 2001 that the government decision was made without considering the Turkish people's general opinion. He said:

> ...one of our responsibilities is reflecting public opinion. When we look at the results of an opinion poll conducted by KONDA, one of the two independent organizations, 71 % of Turks are now against the decision. The results of an opinion poll conducted by the other independent organization, ANAR, show that 86 % of Turks think the decision wrong. We have this responsibility and thus find dispatch of the Turkish Armed Forces to foreign countries inappropriate under the current situation full of uncertainties about the scope, restriction, and duration of the dispatch.[209]

Thus, it can be said that public opinion was not a main motivating factor in Turkey's decision to dispatch troops to Afghanistan.

When it comes to economic consideration, it is true that Turkey sought some economic compensation for its military support in ISAF. Participation in ISAF was burdensome for Turkey, which was in severe financial crisis, because it was agreed in UN SC Resolution 1386 that the expenses of ISAF would be borne by the participating states, not by the UN. Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit said in an interview that Turkey's taking over the command of ISAF II would certainly be an added burden on the Turkish economy.[210] Although Turkey was willing to actively participate in the international force, its economic situation was an impeding factor. Financial support was one of the conditions of Turkey's accepting the ISAF II leadership. In response to Turkey's request, the United States, which wanted Turkey to assume the leadership, pledged $228 million financial aid ($28 million in Foreign

---

[208] Hürriyet Daily News. 2001. 'Turks opposed to sending troops' 3 November, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turks-opposed-to-sending-troops-2001-11-03

[209] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2001. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 21/ Cilt: 71-4 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 21/ Version: 71-4),* 10 October: 18

[210] Hürriyet Daily News. 2002. 'Ecevit leaves for the United States to discuss crucial topics,' 14 January, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ecevit-leaves-for-the-united-states-to-discuss-crucial-topics-2002-01-14

**Table 6. Turkey's Exports to Afghanistan (2001–2007)**[211]

| Year | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| **Exports** | 6,983 | 20,232 | 36,489 | 69,311 | 113,232 | 91,106 | 109,008 |

Unit (Thousand $)

Military Financing and $200 million in Economic Support Funds) in March 2002.[212] Along with financial aid, the United States also promised that it would cooperate with Turkey on the plans for reconstructing Afghanistan.[213] Since it was initially expected that a market of $50 billion would appear in Afghanistan during the reconstruction process[214], the Turkish business sector could get a considerable share, which would consequently be helpful for the improvement of the Turkish economy to a certain extent. Indeed, as shown in Table 6, Turkey's exports to Afghanistan have gradually increased since 2002, especially in construction-related materials. Although the financial pledges were not guaranteed ahead of TGNA's granting unlimited authority to the Turkish government in October 2001, it is hard to say that Turkey's decision to send troops to Afghanistan was made entirely free from economic considerations. However, Turkey's economic considerations were closely linked to a more crucial motivating factor, friendship with the United States.

One of the decisive motivations of Turkey was no doubt to solidify its cordial relationship with the United States. Not only political decision-makers, but also top-ranking generals in Turkey were aware that US cooperation was the

---

[211] Turkish Embassy in Kabul, Office of the Commercial Counselor. 2009. *The Annual Report on Afghanistan*, available at:
http://www.musavirlikler.gov.tr/altdetay.cfm?AltAlanID=368&dil=TR&ulke=AFG
[212] Henry L. Stimson Center. 2002. *Security in Afghanistan: The International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)*: 2
[213] Hürriyet Daily News. 2002. 'Turkey wins U.S. support for expanded Afghanistan mission,' 18 January, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-wins-u.s.-support-for-expanded-afghanistan-mission-2002-01-18
[214] A statement of Guven Sazak, Chairman of the Turkish-Afghan Business Council

essential element for promoting Turkey's interests in political, economic, and security issues. US support had already been proven very crucial in the capture of Abdullah Öcalan and in the EU's Helsinki decision.[215] Turkey needed continuous US support for making favorable a stack of critical issues, such as the Cyprus problem, the PKK problem, and developments regarding the European security and defense initiative. Especially, in order for Turkey to secure constant financial support from the World Bank and the IMF, US leverage in the global economy was indispensable. Participation in ISAF was seen as a good opportunity to enhance Turkey's importance in the eyes of American decision-makers. Through showing solidarity in Afghanistan with the ally that had suffered great pain from the unprecedented terrorist attacks, Turkey could consolidate its strategic relations with the United States, and even improve the scope and intensity of the relations. Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit revealed this motivation in a speech given to the parliamentary group of his party. He said, "The United States showed it was a true friend in our decades of fighting against separatist terrorism. Therefore, our contribution to the operation started in Afghanistan against terrorism is a debt of friendship and humanity."[216] Solidarity with the United States was also highly emphasized in the bill of Prime Ministry submitted to TGNA for the approval to send troops to Afghanistan. Words like "our friend" and "our ally" were clearly used and the continuous US support for Turkey in the previous years was highlighted.[217] In short, it can be said that Turkey was highly motivated to participate in the peace operation in Afghanistan by the intention to make itself a more valuable friend to the United States.

---

[215] Barkey, Henri J. 2003. "The Endless Pursuit: Improving U.S.-Turkish Relations," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 230

[216] Hürriyet Daily News. 2001. 'Ecevit: Ataturk tasked us to help Afghanistan,' 9 November, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ecevit-ataturk-tasked-us-to-help-afghanistan-2001-11-09

[217] Bill of Prime Ministry No.3/892 (10 October 2001)

To highlight the counter-terrorism efforts was also a crucial motivating factor for Turkey. For decades, Turkey has been a target of PKK terrorist attacks, which have incurred severe domestic insecurity. Despite Turkey's constant calls for a joint action against terrorism, the world, especially Europeans, had been soft on the issue prior to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. For instance, many European states had formerly declined to include the PKK on the EU's list of illegal terrorist organizations. When international terrorism came to the forefront as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States by Al-Qaeda, Turkey got a chance to more easily form a united front against the PKK terrorist attacks. Through actively participating in ISAF, an important part of the global effort to fight terrorism, Turkey could prove its belief that terrorism is a common challenge requiring a common response. Turkey's commitments to ISAF would also have a positive impact on drawing further international attention to its endeavor to cope with PKK terrorism. Indeed, the Turkish government strongly believed that participation in the operation in Afghanistan along with the United States would be helpful for solving its own terrorism problems. In the parliamentary discussion on the troop commitments to Afghanistan, Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit said:

> It was natural for Turkey to stand next to the United States. However, that was not just a result of consideration on debts or fidelity. That, at the same time, was a result of evaluation on the huge chance to relieve Turkey from the disaster of terrorism. When the United States, which is the world's most powerful state, starts the fight against terrorism, Turkey, which has been suffering from acts of terrorism for 15 – 20 years, should act alongside with the United States.[218]

It is also true that the Turkish military had a view that the commitment of the US, the sole superpower to fight terrorism globally, was in Turkey's interest in terms of struggling against the PKK and thus was in favor of cooperating with the United

---

[218] Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2001. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 21/ Cilt: 71-4 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 21/ Version: 71-4),* 10 October: 32

States.[219] Given the fact that the Turkish military's influence in the decision making process was relatively strong, the military position might be highly reflected in Turkey's decision to send troops to Afghanistan. Thus, it can be said that Turkey sought increased international action against all terrorist activities through its determination to contribute to combating global terrorism in Afghanistan.

Turkey's decision to send troops to Afghanistan had also much to do with the transformation of the Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) in the 21st century. In the face of the swiftly changing security environment of the 21st century, Turkey embarked on a modernization program enabling the TAF to have strategic mobility for joint operations. The military strategy also started to emphasize "forward defense," "military contribution to crisis management," and "intervention in crisis," along with traditional concepts like "deterrence" and "collective security." [220] Hüseyin Kıvırıkoğlu, the former Chief of the General Staff, reaffirmed this change by saying that the rapid deployment of the TAF in distant places is of vital importance in the new era.[221] Turkey's participation in ISAF clearly corresponded to the new reform of the TAF. ISAF was a conspicuous example of international "crisis management," and thus Turkey's military contribution was an expected behavior based on the new strategic concept. The establishment of PfP Training Center in 1998 and many other organizational settings like the creation of a "Peacekeeping Department" in all the services (army, navy, and air) were also related to the TAF's emphasis on peace operations in the 21st century.[222]

To summarize Turkey's motivations for sending troops to Afghanistan,

[219] Candar, Cengiz. 2003. "The Post-September 11 United States Through Turkish Lenses," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 161
[220] Ministry of National Defense. 2000. *Beyaz Kitap (White Book)*
[221] Oğuzlu, H. Tarık and Güngör, Uğur. 2006. "Peace Operations and the Transformation of Turkey's Security Policy," *Contemporary Security Policy* Vol.27(3): 483
[222] Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. and Kibaroğlu, Mustafa. 2003. "Defense Reform in Turkey," *East West Institute*: 11-12

solidifying its friendly relationship with the United States, highlighting the counter-terrorism efforts, and carrying out the transformation of the TAF in the 21st century can be counted as the actual decisive motivations. In addition, the deterioration of the Turkish economy in the early 2000s caused Turkey to seek some economic benefits from the military support in ISAF. Turkey was not under US pressure during the decision-making process; rather, it was willing to participate in ISAF to help its key ally. Furthermore, there was no public opinion in Turkey which could direct the government towards the troop commitments to Afghanistan.

### 4.3.2. South Korea's Motivations

South Korea entered the 21st century with the desire to promote reconciliation and cooperation between the two Koreas through improved dialogue. In June 2000, South Korean President Dae-Jung Kim and North Korean leader Jong-Il Kim met in Pyongyang and released a joint declaration on enhancing mutual trust by cooperating on economic projects along with other efforts in the civic and cultural fields. This historic event brought a significant change to the South Korean people's perception of North Korea and resulted in the development of inter-Korean relations.[223] South Korea's policy of engagement had been compatible with the US attitude towards North Korea until the election of the Bush administration. The Bush administration was critical of the former Clinton administration's policies involving North Korea and conducted a policy review on the US-North Korean relations in February 2001. The 9/11 terrorist attacks made the Bush administration take a tougher stance towards North Korea, and even to designate it as a member of the "axis of evil." South Korea faced a dilemma following the 9/11 terrorist attacks,

---

[223] Berry, William E. 2008. *Global Security Watch: Korea* (U.S.A.: Praeger Security International): 38

because it did not want any change in the policy of engagement with North Korea, whereas the United States was getting more and more unhappy with the North Korean regime.

South Korea's decision to send troops to Afghanistan is hard to explain without considering the motivation to assist its key ally that experienced formidable terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001. Just two days after the crisis, the National Assembly of South Korea adopted a resolution condemning the terrorist attacks on the United States. It was clearly stated in the resolution that South Korea would provide all possible assistance to help the United States and cooperate in the international efforts to eradicate terrorism.[224] In the 33rd South Korea-US Security Consultative Meeting (SCM) held on 15 November 2001, Dong-Shin Kim, then Minister of National Defense, reiterated the South Korean government's determination to offer all necessary support for the US effort to root out terrorism and reaffirmed the importance of close South Korea-US cooperation across the spectrum of counter-terrorism activities.[225] In addition, the South Korean government's aim of enhancing its friendship and cooperation with the United States through dispatching troops to Afghanistan was clearly revealed in a statement by the Minister of National Defense at the Committee of National Defense. He said, "As a member of the UN, the government is going to dispatch troops with the aim of contributing to the peace and stability of the world through participating in the international solidarity movement supporting the US efforts to eliminate terrorism, as well as promoting sustainable development of the South Korean-US alliance in the

---

[224] The Resolution on Condemnation of the Terrorist Attacks on the United States (13 September 2001) See, the National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. *제 225 회 4 차 국회 본회의 회의록 (The Record of the 225-4th Assembly Plenary Session)*: 9

[225] Joint Communiqué of 33rd Annual US-ROK Security Consultative Meeting, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/hanmiSecurity/hanmiSecurityScm/index.jsp?topMenuNo=2&leftNum=15

future."[226] In the meantime, it is worth noting that South Korea's decision to send troops to Afghanistan was not a result of US pressure. The South Korean government put forward a proposal concerning the dispatch even before the United States made a request.[227] The main reason to take such action in advance was the South Korean government's circumspect calculation that early dispatch would be more beneficial for development of the South Korean-US relations in the years to come. The fact that South Korea was maintaining the most amicable relations with North Korea in its modern history since the end of the Korean War also indicates that the decision had little relevance to US pressure.

It appears that South Korea did not gain economic benefits from its troop commitments to Afghanistan during the first period of dispatch (Late 2002 – 2007).[228] As shown in Table 7, there is little difference between South Korea's exports to Afghanistan before 2003 and those after 2003. Furthermore, South Korea was much more inclined to provide financial aid in grants for the Afghan people. For instance, the South Korean government announced at the International Conference on Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan held in Tokyo in January 2002 an

**Table 7. South Korea's Exports to Afghanistan (2000–2006)[229]**

| Year | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Exports** | 84,098 | 95,013 | 127,909 | 124,597 | 165,315 | 97,060 | 79,000 |

**Unit (Thousand $)**

---

[226] National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. 제225회 9차 국방위원회 회의록 (The Record of 225-9th Discussion at the Committee of National Defense): 7

[227] According to Minister of National Defense, Dong-Shin Kim, the United States officially requested troop commitments from South Korea on 24 November 2001. At that time, the South Korean military already completed the preparation for a potential dispatch to Afghanistan. See, Ibid.: 10

[228] The first period is between 2002 (The initial dispatch) and 2007 (Troop withdrawal due to the kidnapping). The second period starts from 2010 (Re-dispatch).

[229] Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. 2008. 한국과의 관계 (The Relations with South Korea), available at:
http://afg.mofat.go.kr/kor/as/afg/affair/relation/index.jsp

assistance plan worth over 45 million US dollars to help rebuild Afghanistan.[230] Therefore, it is hard to regard economic considerations as a strong motivating factor influencing South Korea's decision to send troops to Afghanistan.

South Korea withdrew all of its military personnel from Afghanistan in December 2007, leaving a small civilian reconstruction team there. Two years after the withdrawal, South Korea made a decision on troop commitments to Afghanistan again. Since many South Koreans still had vivid memories of the death of sergeant Jang-Ho Yoon in a terrorist bombing in February 2007 and 21 hostages held by the Taliban in July 2007, overcoming opposition from the public was difficult. Indeed, almost half of the South Korean people were opposed to the idea of sending troops to Afghanistan, and even the Democratic Party, the main opposition party, adopted an official party line against the dispatch and did not attend the National Assembly vote as a way of protesting the government's decision.[231] In the course of making the new decision, the South Korean government took into consideration the development of the bilateral relationship with Unites States as it had done before. Since the launch of the Myung-Bak Lee administration (2008 – current), strengthening the South Korea-US strategic alliance, which was agreed on as the substitute for the traditional allied partnership at the Camp David summit meeting in April 2008, has been one of the three primary foreign policy objectives of South Korea. The new administration has endeavored to develop the alliance not only in the realm of security, but also in the political, social, cultural and economic fields by sharing democratic and economic

[230] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. 2002. *The Outline and Evaluation Document on the International Conference on Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan* (24 January)
[231] Chosun Newspaper. 2009. '민주 "아프간 재파병 반대" 당론 확정 (Democrats adopted a party line "Opposition to the Re-dispatch to Afghanistan"),' 25 November, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2009/11/25/2009112500098.html

values and broadening mutual trust. [232] Participation in ISAF was clearly in accordance with South Korea's foreign policy objectives. Furthermore, it was much more desirable for South Korea, because the United States was just turning its attention from Iraq to Afghanistan with the election of Barack Obama as president and making an appeal to the international community for troop contributions. As Ki-Yul Kwon, the senior professional member representing the Committee of National Defense, reported after evaluating the dispatch bill, the necessity to consolidate the South Korea-US alliance seemed to highly motivate the South Korean government to make a decision on participation in ISAF.[233]

There was a more decisive motivation, however, than the motivation to consolidate the South Korea-US alliance. That motivation was to realize the national vision of becoming a true "Global Korea." The Myung-Bak Lee administration aspires to make South Korea a more prestigious country and to find its place among the ranks of advanced nations through not only actively cooperating, but also offering solutions to common issues facing the international community. [234] The administration also has a view that South Korea should leave behind the habit of diplomacy narrowly geared to the Korean peninsula and adopt a more open and enterprising posture seeing the world stage as the appropriate platform for its foreign policy and national interest.[235] One of the four strategic objectives that South Korea should follow in order to achieve its ultimate goal of becoming a "Global Korea" is to pursue a comprehensive and pragmatic foreign policy, and one key agenda for the objective is to expand South Korea's international responsibilities and overseas

---

[232] Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2010. *Key Diplomatic Tasks*, available at: http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/political/tasks/index.jsp
[233] Committee of National Defense. 2010. *The Evaluation Report: The Bill on Dispatch of the South Korean Armed Forces to Afghanistan*: 6
[234] Cheong Wa Dae, Office of the President. 2009. *Global Korea: The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Korea*: 12
[235] Ibid.

contributions.[236] South Korea has actually fulfilled that agenda to a great extent. For instance, South Korea increased its Official Development Assistance (ODA) volume from $699.1 million (2007) to $803.8 million (2008).[237] It also became a member of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on 25 November 2009 and pledged to increase its international aid up to the level of 0.15 percent of its GDP by 2012 and 0.25 percent by 2015.[238] The South Korean government's decision to participate in ISAF was also part of fulfilling the agenda to expand South Korea's global contributions. By contributing to the reconstruction of Afghan society, South Korea could take a step forward to becoming a respected global partner for building peace and promoting economic prosperity of the world. South Korea's motivation can be drawn from a statement by President Myung-Bak Lee in the TV program called the *Conversation with President* on 27 November 2009:

> We are now in a position to help others. We are going to chair the G20 next year. South Korea is the first and only country after the World War II that becomes a member of DAC, and moving from receiver status to provider status. There are only two DAC members in Asia, South Korea and Japan. International contribution is our responsibility. Paying no attention to others' problems is inappropriate for South Korea. The time is ripe for South Korea to willingly take part in the international activities of countering terrorism and keeping peace. I strongly believe that this is a way of sincerely fulfilling our international duty. I know that Afghanistan is a somewhat dangerous area. Despite the danger, approximately 150 civilian personnel are going to carry out peaceful services like medical treatment, agricultural training, and job training. Our troops will not join any combat operations, but merely provide protection for those who serve in Afghanistan.[239]

---

[236] The other strategic objectives set by the Myung-Bak Lee administration are: To build inter-Korean relations that advance mutual benefits and common prosperity; To expand cooperative network diplomacy; To build a future-oriented and advanced security system. The other key agendas for a comprehensive and pragmatic foreign policy are: To strengthen energy cooperation diplomacy; Diversification of FTAs; To Protect overseas nationals and supporting overseas Koreans' activities.
[237] Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2009. *Korea's Development Cooperation*: 5, available at: http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/political/hotissues/economy/index.jsp
[238] ODA Korea news. 2009. 'OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) welcomes Korean membership,' 8 December, available at: http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng/news/News/View.php
[239] Munhwa Broadcasting Cooperation (MBC). 2009. *The Conversation with President*

To summarize South Korea's motivations for sending troops to Afghanistan, enhancing its friendship and cooperation with the United States was no doubt a decisive motivation in the decision-making process of the first dispatch. In the decision-making process of the second dispatch, as well as consolidating the South Korea-US alliance, realizing the national vision of becoming a true "Global Korea" was very crucial. There is no evidence that South Korea was motivated to send troops to Afghanistan by indirect security concerns (or US pressure). It is much more correct to say that South Korea's decision to contribute troops to Afghanistan was of its own free will. Public opinion and economic considerations are hard to count as decisive motivating factors in the decision.

## 4.4. Combined Results: Commonalities in the Motivations of Turkey and South Korea for Sending Troops to Peace Operations

The findings from the case-by-case analyses allow us to list several commonalities between Turkey and South Korea, two states representing the "allied new middle powers," in terms of what leads them to make a decision on troop commitments to peace operations.

Firstly, the two liberalism-related motivations, that is, domestic pressure (public opinion) and economic consideration (profit-seeking) have little impact on the decisions of either Turkey or South Korea to send troops to peace operations. In the decision-making process of all the three peace operations, public opinion in the two states was generally formed against participation. In some cases, both governments also had to overcome the widespread objections of opposition parties (Turkey: ISAF and UNIFIL II / South Korea: ISAF - the second dispatch).[240] In

---

[240] Turkey: 192 against votes (out of total 533 valid votes) in the parliamentary vote on dispatch of troops to Lebanon, 100 against votes (out of total 422 valid votes) in the parliamentary vote on

addition, Turkey's and South Korea's troop commitments to the three operations did not necessarily produce positive changes in their economic relations with Somalia, Lebanon, and Afghanistan. The two states were even willing to provide financial aid in grants for the people of the three countries who had suffered from conflicts. Although it is true that Turkey sought some economic benefits from its initial participation in ISAF, that was an exception to Turkey's general behavior with respect to peace operations. The crucial evidence proving the temporary impact of economic consideration on Turkey's participation in ISAF is the fact that Turkey assumed the leadership of ISAF VII (13 February 2005 – 4 August 2005) and sent 1,500 troops without seeking any financial compensation from the United States or NATO.[241]

Secondly, both Turkey and South Korea are relatively free from US pressure (or fear of abandonment) when deciding to participate in peace operations. Although the United States was involved in the three case peace operations either directly (UNOSOM II and ISAF) or indirectly (UNIFIL II), Turkey and South Korea made decisions on troop commitments of their own free will. For instance, Turkey was in stark opposition to the US position favoring UNIFIL II's engagement with disarming Hezbollah, and South Korea rejected constant US requests to send combat troops to UNOSOM II. The two states also did not connect their own security concerns, namely the PKK problem of Turkey and North Korea-related issues of South Korea, to the decision to commit troops to the three peace operations. This fact implies that security-related motivations, especially indirect security concerns, are not necessarily decisive in driving the two states towards troop contributions to peace

---

dispatch of troops to Afghanistan / South Korea: around 80 parliamentary members from the Democratic Party didn't attend the parliamentary vote on ISAF as a way of protesting

[241] In 2005, Turkey received no financial aid from the United States (neither Economic Support Fund, nor Wartime Supplemental). See, USAID. 2006. *Turkey: Budget Summary*, available at: http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/ee/pdf/tr_progsum05.pdf

operations. At the same time, it is worth noting that both Turkey and South Korea were willing to take action in advance, if their key ally, the United States, took a stance compatible with theirs. The two states' willingness to send troops prior to any US request was most clearly seen in the ISAF case. Both Turkey and South Korea pledged their troops just a few days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, thinking that an early decision would further consolidate their relations with the United States in the years to come. To sum up, it can be said that, unlike small powers, both Turkey and South Korea follow their own agenda on peace operations and are not highly disturbed by direct and relational security concerns at home.

Thirdly, future-oriented ideational considerations, that is, intentions to increase their international clout through active participation in peace operations are the most decisive motivations of both Turkey and South Korea. In the course of deciding to participate in the three case peace operations, the two states were not necessarily motivated by short-term interests, such as immediate improvement of their security situations and obvious economic benefits. Rather, they were highly motivated by the forward-looking intentions to become multi-regional or global actors in the 21$^{st}$ century. The aim of both Turkey and South Korea to expand national influence beyond their traditional regions by participating in peace operations was well observed throughout the analysis. Turkey intended to prove its credibility as a proper model for the newly independent states in Central Europe and Central Asia (UNOSOM II), and to play a mediator role in the Middle East (UNIFIL II). Similarly, South Korea intended to raise South Korea's international competitiveness by pursuing the "New Diplomacy" (UNOSOM II), and to realize the national vision of becoming a true "Global Korea" (ISAF). It can be said that Turkey and South Korea see participation in peace operations as a good way to obtain an

increased role in the international arena, which will consequently bring long-term national interests to them in the political, economic, and security fields. In other words, the internally constructed idea of becoming a leading player in a globalized world is a more crucial motivation than any other for Turkey and South Korea when deciding to participate in peace operations.

Fourthly, both Turkey and South Korea paid due regard to the dynamics of their bilateral relations with the United States in their decisions to send troops to Afghanistan. In the course of deciding to participate in UNOSOM II and UNIFIL II, ideational considerations of the two states clearly took priority over any other motivations. In the ISAF case, however, consolidating the Turkish-US relations and the South Korean-US relations turned up as a crucial motivating factor for the two states, which was comparable to the ideational considerations. The United States had a vital security interest in Afghanistan, since it was attacked by the al-Qaeda terrorist organization using the area as a safe haven. For Turkey and South Korea, to help the United States, which was endeavoring to defend its essential security interests in Afghanistan, was the correct thing to do.  It can be said that when a peace operation directly concerns the core security interest of the United States, Turkey and South Korea are more likely to be motivated by their bilateral alliances, while when a peace operation is important but not necessarily vital for the United States, the two "allied new middle powers" are more likely to be motivated by their own ideational intentions to become a leading player in the 21$^{st}$ century world.

Lastly, both Turkey and South Korea set to work on a reforming process to make their armed forces more suitable and swiftly ready for participation in peace operations. Early examples reflecting such reform were Turkey's commitment to ISAF in 2001 and South Korea's commitment to UNIFIL II in 2006. In the face of

the rapidly changing security situations of the 21$^{st}$ century, both states understood they could no longer remain indifferent to not only global threats such as proliferation of WMDs, terrorism, and piracy, but also other states' conflicts and crises, and thus took the initiative in making their troops more available to help preserve the international order whenever they are requested. It can be said that Turkey and South Korea became determined to live up to their obligation as a credible member of the international community through contributing to maintaining peace and stability in the world. It is also expected that both Turkey and South Korea will continue contributing to international peace operations with enthusiasm in the future.

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION

Peace operations are unique and indispensable instruments of the 21$^{st}$ century to maintain international peace and security. The nature, scope, and function of peace operations have evolved over the past 60 years and are continuing to develop in the face of a rapidly changing security environment. Turkey and South Korea, two representative "allied new middle powers," have been participating in peace operations with great interest, despite their relatively short history in the field. These two states' attitudes towards peace operations are far from grudging, but clearly willing and enthusiastic. Both Turkey and South Korea refrained from being present with merely symbolic numbers of troops whenever they decided to make troop contributions to peace operations. They participated in peace operations with more than company-sized troops possessing high professional skills. In addition, Turkey and South Korea set to work on bringing institutional and legal modifications to their armed forces in order for them to be easily and swiftly ready for overseas dispatch. For both states, commitment to peace operations is not just a temporary action, which is different from the way many other nations that started participating in peace operations after the Cold War generally think. Turkey and South Korea make continuous efforts to be well prepared for participation in peace operations and

attach great importance to it. Furthermore, whether a peace operation carries a high degree of risk or whether a peace operation has a low level of economic and strategic attractiveness is not that important for Turkey and South Korea. Regardless of the danger and relevance a peace operation bears, these two "allied new middle powers" show their willingness to contribute to making the world a better place to live.

Throughout my thesis, I have tried to find out the main source of Turkey's and South Korea's willingness to participate in the post-Cold War peace operations that are relatively risky and seemingly devoid of direct economic or strategic attractiveness to the two states. I have drawn states' general motivations for sending troops to peace operations from realism, liberalism, and constructivism, and then determined four probable motivations of the "allied new middle powers" -- (1) indirect security concerns; (2) the domestic factor (public opinion); (3) potential economic benefit; and (4) ideational considerations -- for analyzing their actual impact on Turkey's and South Korea's decisions to participate in UNOSOM II, UNIFIL II, and ISAF, respectively. The consecutive case-by-case analyses have led to the conclusion that Turkey and South Korea were highly motivated by future-oriented ideational considerations, that is, intentions to increase their international clout through active participation in peace operations. Both Turkey and South Korea endeavored to become multi-regional or global actors in the world of the 21$^{st}$ century, and the field of peace operations was accepted as the best platform on which they can prove their ability and capability to become such leading players. The empirical analyses also shed light on the fact that although Turkey and South Korea confronted different internal and external situations around the time of their final decisions to participate in the three case post-Cold War peace operations, one realism-related motivation (US pressure) and two liberalism-related motivations (public opinion and

potential economic benefit) were commonly less decisive for the two states. In addition, through taking a close look at the ISAF case, it was discovered that when a peace operation is of vital security interest to the United States, the dynamics of Turkey's and South Korea's bilateral relations with this key ally can have a decisive impact, tantamount to the impact caused by their own ideational considerations, on their decisions to send troops.

The forward-looking ideas of Turkey and South Korea to achieve a multi-regional or global status in the post-Cold War era through active participation in peace operations are by no means outcomes of simple momentary thinking. Rather, the ideas are results of the formative processes Turkey and South Korea have undergone since the early 1990s with the insight into how their long-term national interests can be best served in the new era. The two states commonly understood that incremental increase in their international reach would help them to enjoy lasting stability, security, and prosperity in the new era, and thus to seek a broader international role became the intrinsic part of their foreign policy tendencies. Since Turkey and South Korea will unchangingly strive to become important actors in the 21$^{st}$ century world, their commitments to the field of peace operations will accordingly continue. As Turkey and South Korea have played key roles in keeping international peace and security thus far, the two states will remain credible and major contributors to peace operations in the future. It is clearly thought that the field of peace operations will constitute a foothold from which the two "allied new middle powers" will make a big leap towards becoming advanced and prominent players of the 21$^{st}$ century.

My thesis contributes to the international relations literature, especially the peace operations literature, by providing the analytic perspective for understanding

the motivations of the "allied new middle powers" for sending troops to peace operations. This subject has thus far remained outside scholarly works, despite the emergence of those states as active peacekeepers in the post-Cold War era. I admit that motivations of all the states can never be completely explained, even if motivations of a group of states are known. However, it will be possible to better understand the motivations of more states on the basis of the motivations of the "allied new middle powers," who are in the intermediate position between states that already possess accumulated knowledge about peace operations as well as enough capacity to assume an international role, and states that lag behind in both experience and capability. Besides, since it is highly likely that many newcomers in the field will follow the path the "allied new middle powers" have trod, what has been discovered in my work can be the starting point for future research.

The topic of my thesis constitutes just a small part of the entire picture. Many issues related to peace operations and states' motivations still remain unsolved. Here, I bring some issues, which are to some extent connected to what I have done and seem to be worth studying, to the attention of prospective researchers:

- Priorities of Turkey and South Korea in the process of preparing for participation in peace operations and conducting field missions
- Materialization of Turkey's and South Korea's decisive motivations for sending troops to peace operations and its impact on their future decision-making
- Analogous patterns of the "allied new middle powers" in other international missions

- Similarities and differences in states' institutional and legal bases for participation in peace operations

- The degree of public acceptance of UN peacekeeping and non-UN peacekeeping in various states

- The correlation between states' former experience with peace operations and their next decision to send troops abroad

- Rivalries among neighboring states for participation in peace operations

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Books**

Altunisik, Meliha B. 2007. *Lübnan Krizi: Nedenleri ve Sonuçları (The Labanese Crisis: Reasons and Results)* (Istanbul: Tesev Yayinlari)

Bellamy, Alex J. and Williams, Paul and Griffin, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Cambridge: Polity)

Berry, William E. 2008. *Global Security Watch: Korea* (U.S.A.: Praeger Security International)

Bir, Çevik. 1999. *Somali'ye Bir Umut (A Hope for Somalia)* (Istanbul: Sabah Kitaplari)

Bluth, Christoph. 2008. *Hot Spots in Global Politics: Korea* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Claude, Inis Lothair Jr. 1967. *Swords into Plowshares* (New York: Random House)

Cooper, Andrew F. and Higgott, Richard A. and Nossal, Kim R. 1993. *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order* (Great Britain: Macmillan Press)

Finnemore, Martha. 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention* (London: Cornell University Press)

Goldstein, Joshua S. 1996. *International Relations*. 2nd Edition (New York: HarperCollins)

Jackson, Robert and Sorensen, Georg. 2003. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and approaches* (New York: Oxford University Press)

Jakobsen, Peter V. 2006. *Nordic Approaches to Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge)

Kang, Yo-Sik. 1994. 신마저 버린 땅 소말리아 *(An Abandoned Soil: Somalia)* (Seoul: Hanwon)

Kibaroglu, Mustafa and Kibaroglu, Aysegul. 2009. *Global Security Watch TURKEY* (London: Praeger Security International)

Kim, Chang-Hoon. 2008. 한국외교: 어제와 오늘 *(South Korean Foreign Policy: Past and Present)* (Kyung-Gi: KSI)

O'Neill, John Terence and Rees, Nicholas. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: RoutRedge)

Uslu, Nasuh. 2004. *Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Period* (New York: Nova)

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics* (New York: Random House)

Weiss, Tomas G. and Forsythe, David P. and Coate, Roger A. 1997. *The United Nations and Changing World Politics* (Boulder, Co.: Westview)


**Journal and Book Articles**

Altunisik, Meliha B. 2008. "The Possibilities and Limits of Turkey's Soft Power in the Middle East," *Insight Turkey* Vol. 10(2): 41-54

Aral, Berdal. 2001. "Dispensing with Tradition? Turkish Politics and International Society during the Ozal Decade, 1983-93," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 37(1): 72-88

Ayhan, Veysel. 2009. "Turkish Foreign Minister Davutoğlu's Visit to Lebanon and Turkey's Relations with Lebanon," *ORSAM (Center for Middle Eastern Strategic Studies)* (19 August)

Barkey, Henri J. 2003. "The Endless Pursuit: Improving U.S.-Turkish Relations," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 207-250

Bennett, Andrew and Lepgold, Joseph and Unger, Danny. 1994. "Burden-sharing in the Persian Gulf War," *International Organization* Vol. 48(1): 39-75

Black, David R. 1997. "Addressing Apartheid: Lessons from Australian, Canadian, and Swedish Policies in Southern Africa," in *Niche Diplomacy*, eds., Cooper, Andrew F. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers): 100-128

Bullion, Alan James. 2005. "India," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 196-212

Candar, Cengiz. 2003. "The Post-September 11 United States through Turkish Lenses," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 145-172

Cooper, Andrew F.1997. "Niche Diplomacy: A Conceptual Overview," in *Niche Diplomacy*, eds., Cooper, Andrew F. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers): 1-24

Elron, Efrat. 2007. "Israel, UNIFIL II, the UN and the International Community," *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture* Vol. 13(4): 32-39

Farrell, Theo. 2003. "Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Operations," in *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, eds., Baylis, John and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 287-304

Felgenhauer, Katharina. 2007. "Peace Economics: Private Sector Business Involvement in Conflict Prevention," *New School Economic Review*, Vol. 2(1): 38-48

Gallis, Paul. 2007. "NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance," *CRS Report for Congress,* Code RL33627: 1-37

Gerson, Allan. 2001. "Peace Building: The Private Sector's Role," *The American Journal of International Law* Vol. 95(1): 102-119

Gruen, George E. 2006. "Turkey's Role in Peacekeeping Missions," *American Foreign Policy Interests*, Vol. 28: 435-449

Grutov, Mel. 1996. "South Korea's Foreign Policy and Future Security: Implications of the Nuclear-Standoff," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 69(1): 8-31

Hampton, Mary N. 2005. "Germany," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 29-51

Hyde-Price, Adrian. 2001. "Germany and the Kosovo war: still a civilian power?," *German Politics* Vol. 10(1): 19-34

Hopf, Ted. 1998. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," *International Security* Vol. 23(1): 171-200

Howe, Herbert M. 2005. "Nigeria," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 176-195

Hunter, Shireen. 1999. "Bridge or frontier? Turkey's Post-Cold War geopolitical posture," *The International Spectator*, Vol. 34(1): 63-78

In, Nam-Sik. 2007. "Dispatch of Peacekeeping Forces to Lebanon: Implication and Tasks," *Institute of Foreign Affairs & National Security, Policy Brief*, No.2007-5: 1-19

Ishizuka, Katsumi. 2005. "Japan's Policy towards UN Peacekeeping Operations," *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.12(1): 67-86

Johnstone, Ian. 2005. "Peace Operations Literature Review," *Center on International Cooperation*, August: 1-33

Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. and Kibaroğlu, Mustafa. 2003. "Defense Reform in Turkey," *East West Institute*: 1-30

Kihl, Young-Whan. 1994. "The Politics of Inter-Korean Relations: Coexistence or Reunification," in *Korea and the World: Beyond the Cold War*, eds., Kihl, Young-Whan (Oxford: Westview Press): 133-152

Kim, Samuel S. 1994. "The Two Koreas and World Order," in *Korea and the World: Beyond the Cold War*, eds., Kihl, Young-Whan (Oxford: Westview Press): 29-68

Kim, Samuel S. 2000. "Korea's *Segyehwa* Drive: Promise versus Performance," in *Korea's Globalization*, eds., Kim, Samuel S. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press): 242-281

Koh, B.C. 2000. "*Segyehwa*, Korea, and the United Nations," in *Korea's Globalization*, eds., Kim, Samuel S. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press): 196-216

Kotlyar, V. 2009. "Piracy in the 21st Century," *International Affairs* No. 3: 59-67

Kumcu, Ercan. 2003. "The Unfinished Struggle for Economic Stability," in *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need*, eds. Abramowitz, Morton (U.S.A.: The Century Foundation): 31-60

Kut, Sule. 2001. "The Contours of Turkish Foreign Policy in the 1990s," in *Turkey in the World Politics: An Emerging Multiregional Power*, eds. Rubin, Barry and Kirisci, Kemal (London: Lynne Rienner Publisher): 5-12

Lee, Jang-Ho. 2007 "한국군 평화유지단 '동명부대' 레바논에 평화를 심다 (Dongmyung Unit's Contribution to the Peace in Lebanon," *The South Korean Army Journal,* Vol. 289 (September/October): 74-77

Martin, Lisa L. 2006. "Neoliberalism," in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, eds. Dunne, Tim and Kurki, Milja and Smith, Steve (New York: Oxford University Press): 109-126

Mearsheimer, John J. 2006. "Structural Realism," in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, eds. Dunne, Tim and Kurki, Milja and Smith, Steve (New York: Oxford University Press): 71-88

Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. "Taking Preference Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* Vol. 51(4): 513-553

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1952. "Another "Great Debate": The National Interest of the United States," *American Political Science Review 46(4)*: 961-988

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. 1990. "Soft Power," *Foreign Policy* No. 80, Twentieth Anniversary (Autumn): 153-171

Oguzlu, H. Tarik. 2004. "Changing Dynamics of Turkey's U.S. and EU Relations," *Middle East Policy*, Vol. 11(1): 98-105

Oguzlu, H. Tarik and Gungor, Ugur. 2006. "Peace Operations and the Transformation of Turkey's Security Policy," *Contemporary Security Policy* Vol.27(3): 472 - 488

Oguzlu, H. Tarik. 2007. "Soft power in Turkish foreign policy," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* Vol. 61 (1): 81-97

Ozkan, Mehmet. 2008. "Turkey Discovers Africa: Implications and Prospects," *SETA Policy Brief*, No. 22: 1-8

Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games," *International Organization* Vol. 42(3): 427-460

Sayari, Sabri. 2000. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism," *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 54(1): 169-182

Scobell, Andrew. 1994. "Politics, Professionalism, and Peacekeeping: An Analysis of the 1987 Military Coup in Fiji," *Comparative Politics* Vol. 26(2): 187-201

Sorenson, David S. 2005. "The United States," in *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*, eds., Sorenson, David S. and Wood, Pia Christina (New York: Frank Cass): 114-139

Sorenson, Georg. 2007. "After the Security Dilemma: The Challenges of Insecurity in Weak States and the Dilemma of Liberal Values," *Security Dialogue* Vol.38 (3): 357-378

Tarnoff, Curt and Nowels, Larry. 2005. "Foreign Aid: An Introductory Overview of U.S. Programs and Policy," *CRS Report for Congress*, January 19: 1-33

Weldes, Jutta. 1996. "Constructing National Interests," *European Journal of International Relations* Vol. 2(3): 275-318

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics," *International Organization* Vol. 46(2): 391-425

**Newspaper Articles**

Chosun Newspaper. 1992. 'PKO 780 명 파병-정부 UN 에 회신(PKO 780 personnel-The government replied to the UN),' 18 September, available at: https://srchdb1.chosu n.com/pdf/i_service/read_body.jsp?Y=1992&M=09&D=19&ID=92091904 07

Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '한국의 국제 수준 (The international level of South Korea),' 5 January, available at: http://news.chosun.com/svc/content_view/content_view.html?contid=1993 010570211

Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '정부, 소말리아 파병 적극 검토 / 유엔 요청 대비 준비작업 (The government, active examination on the dispatch to Somalia / A preparation for the UN request),' 28 January, available at: http://www.donga.com/fbin/dfsrchview?n=9301280000014899

Chosun Newspaper. 1993. '전투병 파병 거부 / 김대통령, 클린턴에 친서 보내(Refusal to send combat troops / A letter sent to Clinton by President Kim),' 20 October, available at: http://news.chosun.com/svc/content_view/content_view.html?contid=1993 102070104

Chosun Newspaper. 2006. '힐 "노대통령, 레바논 파병 밝혀" (Hill "President Roh signaled dispatch to Lebanon"),' 29 September, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/09/29/2006092960001.htm l

Chosun Newspaper. 2006. '송민순 '한미정상회담' 일문입답 (Min-Soon Song, Q&A about the U.S.-Korea summit talk),' 18 November, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/11/18/2006111860121.htm l

Chosun Newspaper. 2006. 'KBS 여론조사, 레바논 PKO 파병은 54.5%가 반대 (KBS public survey, 54.5% against PKO dispatch to Lebanon),' 28 November, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2006/11/28/2006112860455.htm l

Chosun Newspaper. 2009. '민주 "아프간 재파병 반대" 당론 확정 (Democrats adopted a party line "Opposition to the Re-dispatch to Afghanistan"),' 25 November, available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2009/11/25/2009112500098.htm l

CNN News. 2009. 'Obama Afghanistan strategy: More troops in quickly, drawdown in 2011,' 1 December, available at:

http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/12/01/obama.afghanistan/index.html?iref=allsearch

Dong-A Newspaper. 1992. '유엔, 한국에 소말리아 파병요청 / 정부, 거부의사 밝혀 (The UN requested South Korea's troop contribution to Somalia / The government revealed its reluctance)' 30 November, available at: http://www.donga.com/fbin/dfsrchview?n=9211300000201147

Financial Times. 2006. 'Turkey lays claim to the role of peacemaker in Lebanon,' written by Boland, Vincent, 7 September

Hürriyet Daily News. 2001. 'Turks opposed to sending troops' 3 November, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turks-opposed-to-sending-troops-2001-11-03

Hürriyet Daily News. 2001. 'Ecevit: Ataturk tasked us to help Afghanistan,' 9 November, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ecevit-ataturk-tasked-us-to-help-afghanistan-2001-11-09

Hürriyet Daily News. 2002. 'Ecevit leaves for the United States to discuss crucial topics,' 14 January, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ecevit-leaves-for-the-united-states-to-discuss-crucial-topics-2002-01-14

Hürriyet Daily News. 2002. 'Turkey wins U.S. support for expanded Afghanistan mission,' 18 January, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-wins-u.s.-support-for-expanded-afghanistan-mission-2002-01-18

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Turkey urges ceasefire as Israel expands offensive,' 15 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-urges-ceasefire-as-israel-expands-offensive-2006-07-15

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Gül insists Turkey reserves right to hit PKK in Iraq,' 21 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=gul-insists-turkey-reserves-right-to-hit-pkk-in-iraq-2006-07-21

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Turkey may send troops to Lebanon, PM announces,' 29 July, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=turkey-may-send-troops-to-lebanon-pm-announces-2006-07-29

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Rehn: EU-member Turkey would be 'bridge' with Islam,' 6 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=rehn-eu-member-turkey-would-be-bridge-with-islam-2006-08-06

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Ankara displeased with US statement addressed to PKK,' 18 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ankara-displeased-with-us-statement-addressed-to-pkk-2006-08-18

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Ankara sharpens red lines for Lebanon troops,' 24 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=ankara-sharpens-red-lines-for-lebanon-troops-2006-08-24

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'AKP divided over sending troops to Lebanon,' 29 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=akp-divided-over-sending-troops-to-lebanon-2006-08-29

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Gov't agrees to send troops to Lebanon,' 29 August, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=govt-agrees-to-send-troops-to-lebanon-2006-08-29

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Internet polls show resounding "no!" on troops to Lebanon question,' 4 September, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=internet-polls-show-resounding-no-on-troops-to-lebanon-question-2006-09-04

Hürriyet Daily News. 2006. 'Erdoğan- Annan joint news conference,' 6 September, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/h.php?news=erdogan--annan-joint-news-conference-2006-09-06

Hürriyet Newspaper. 1992. 'Somali'ye Asker Göndermenin Perde Arkası (The back stage of sending troops to Somalia),' Politika, written by Özkök, Erturuğul, 8 December

Hürriyet Newspaper. 2006. 'Sezer: Türkiye'nin Lübnan'a asker göndermesine karşıyım (Sezer: I'm against Turkey's sending troops to Lebanon),' 25 August, available at: http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=4980763

Joong-Ang Daily News. 2009. '군, 내년 초 해외파병 상비부대 창설 (South Korean Armed Forces, planning to establish a standby high readiness force for overseas operations in the next year),' 04 October, at: http://article.joins.com/article/article.asp?total_id=3805680

Korea Herald. 2007. 'Korean troops return from mission in Afghanistan,' 15 December, available at: http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives/result_contents.asp

Korea Herald. 2009. 'S. Korea to extend troop stay in Lebanon,' 15 July, available at: http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives/result_contents.asp

NATO News. 2010. 'NATO Secretary General welcomes results of London Conference,' 28 January, available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-26A12DA1-F8A536E3/natolive/news_61099.htm?

ODA Korea news. 2009. 'OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) welcomes Korean membership,' 8 December, available at: http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng/news/News/View.php

Sabah Newspaper. 2005. 'Afganistan'da Komuta Yeniden Türkiyenin (The Command in Afghanistan is assumed by Turkey again),' available at: http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/muderrisoglu/2004/05/21/Afganistan_da_komuta_yeniden_Turkiye_nin

Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Kabil'de Komutanlık Türkiye'ye geçiyor (The Command in Kabul is transferred to Turkey,' 1 November, available at: http://www.sabah.com.tr/Dunya/2009/11/01/kbilde_komutanlik_turkiyeye_geciyor

Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Lübnan'da Türk askerinin görev süresi 3 kez uzatılıyor (The Mission Period for the Turkish Forces in Lebanon is being Extended for the 3rd Time),' 22 June, available at: http://www.sabah.com.tr/Siyaset/2009/06/22/lubnanda_turk_askerinin_gorev_suresi_3_kez_uzatiliyor

Sabah Newspaper. 2009. 'Afganistan'a Takviye Türk Askeri Yok (There is no Turkish Reinforcement to Afghanistan),' 5 December, available at: http://www.sabah.com.tr/Dunya/2009/12/05/afganistana_takviye_turk_askeri_yok

UN News Center. 2008. 'Lebanon: European mariners take the wheel of UN coastal fleet,' 29 February, available at: http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=25803&Cr=UNIFIL&Cr1≡

Yonhap News. 2009. '정부 아프간 파병안 확정배경과 전망 (The Government's Confirmation of the Bill on Dispatching Troops to Afghanistan),' 8 December, available at: http://news.naver.com/main/read.nhn?mode=LSD&mid=sec&sid1=100&oid=001&aid=0003014684

Yonhap News. 2010. '국방위 아프간 파병동의안 처리 (The Committee of National Defense Approved the Bill on Dispatching Troops to Afghanistan),' 19 February, available at: http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/politics/2010/02/19/0502000000AKR20100219181700001.HTML?template=2087

**Materials Published by an Organization**

Afghan Government. 2001. *The Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions*, available at http://www.afghangovernment.com/AfghanAgreementBonn.htm

Center on International Cooperation. 2007. *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2007 (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers)*

Central Intelligence Agency. 2008. *CIA World Fact Book*, available at: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/

Committee of National Defense. 2010. *The Evaluation Report: The Bill on Dispatch of the South Korean Armed Forces to Afghanistan*

Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. 2008. 한국과의 관계 *(The Relations with South Korea)*, available at: http://afg.mofat.go.kr/kor/as/afg/affair/relation/index.jsp

Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Republic of Lebanon. 2009. 한·레바논 관계 *(The Relation between South Korea and Lebanon)*, available at: http://lbn.mofat.go.kr/kor/af/lbn/affair/relation/index.jsp

Embassy of the Republic of Korea to the Republic of Kenya. 2009. *The General Information on Somali Republic*, available at: http://ken.mofat.go.kr/kor/af/ken/legation/add/somalia/index.jsp

Henry L. Stimson Center. 2002. *Security in Afghanistan: The International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)*

iCasualites: Operation Enduring Freedom. 2009. *Fatalities by Country*, available at: http://icasualties.org/OEF/Index.aspx

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2005. *The Guide for Abroad Business: Somali Republic/East Africa*

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2007. *Press Release No.07-746,* 21 December

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2009. *Korea's Development Cooperation*, available at: http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/political/hotissues/economy/index.jsp

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2010. *Key Diplomatic Tasks*, available at: http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/political/tasks/index.jsp

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. 2002. *The Outline and Evaluation Document on the International Conference on Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan* (24 January)

Ministry of National Defense. 2000. *Beyaz Kitap (White Book)*

Ministry of National Defense. 2001. *Joint Communiqué of 33<sup>rd</sup> Annual US-ROK Security Consultative Meeting*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/hanmiSecurity/hanmiSecurityScm/index. jsp?topMenuNo=2&leftNum=15

Ministry of National Defense. 2006. *Defense White Paper* (Seoul:MND)

Ministry of National Defense. 2009. *The Defense Reform Basic Plan* (Seoul:MND)

Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *Defense Policy: Defense Reform*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndEng_2009/DefensePolicy/Policy12/Policy12_10 /index.jsp

Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 소말리아 상록수 부대 (The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Sangnoksu Unit in Somalia)*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_3/inde x.jsp#02

Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 레바논 평화유지군 동명부대 (The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Dongmyung Unit in Lebanon)*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_2/inde x.jsp#

Ministry of National Defense. 2010. *세계속의 한국군, 부대단위 평화유지 활동, 아프가니스탄 동의·다산 부대 (The South Korean Armed Forces in the World, Participation in Peace-Keeping, Dongui and Dasan Unit in Afghanistan)*, available at: http://www.mnd.go.kr/mndPolicy/globalArmy/unitPeace/unitPeace_2/inde x.jsp#

National Assembly of South Korea. 1993. *한국공병부대의 소말리아 유엔 평화 유지단 참여동의안 심사보고서 (The Evaluation Report of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Construction Contingent to UNOSOM II)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 1993. *한국공병부대의 소말리아 유엔 평화 유지단 참여동의안 부록 (The Appendix of the Bill on the Dispatch of a South Korean Engineering Construction Contingent to UNOSOM II)*, 18 May

National Assembly of South Korea. 1993. *제 161 회 제 4 차 외무통일위원회 회의록 (The Record of the 161-4<sup>th</sup> Discussion at the Committee of Foreign Affairs and Unification)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. 제 225 회 4 차 국회 본회의 회의록 *(The Record of the 225-4<sup>th</sup> Assembly Plenary Session)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. 제 225 회 9 차 국방위원회 회의록 *(The Record of the 225-9<sup>th</sup> Discussion at the Committee of National Defense)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 2001. 제 16 대 국회 제 225 회 제 20 차 국회본회의 회의록 *(The Record of the 16<sup>th</sup> National Assembly 225-20<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 2006. 제 262 회 통일외교통상위원회회의록 제 17 차 *(The record of the 262-17<sup>st</sup> Discussion at the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce)*

National Assembly of South Korea. 2006. 제 263 회 통일외교통상 위원회 회의록 제 1 차 *(The record of the 263-1<sup>st</sup> Discussion at the Committee of Unification, Foreign Affairs, and Commerce)*

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2009. *ISAF "placemat" (Contributing nations and troop numbers) – 22 Dec. 2009*, available at http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO – Republic of Korea cooperation*, available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50098.htm?selectedLocale=en

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *NATO's Role in Afghanistan*, available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_8189.htm

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2010. *International Security Assistance Force and Afghan National Army Strength & Laydown*, 1 February, available at http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf

Office of the President (*Cheong Wa Dae*). 2009. *Global Korea: The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Korea*

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 1996. *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers* (New York: Oxford University Press)

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 2008. *SIPRI Military Expenditure Database*, available at: http://milexdata.sipri.org/

Turkish Embassy in Beirut, Office of the Commercial Counselor. 2008. *The Annual Report on the General Economic Situation in Lebanon and the Economic Relation between Turkey and Lebanon*, available at: http://www.musavirlikler.gov.tr/altdetay.cfm?AltAlanID=368&dil=TR&ulke=RL

Turkish Embassy in Kabul, Office of the Commercial Counselor. 2009. *The Annual Report on Afghanistan*, available at: http://www.musavirlikler.gov.tr/altdetay.cfm?AltAlanID=368&dil=TR&ul ke=AFG

Turkish General Staff. 2010. *Contribution of Turkish Armed Forces to Peace Support Operations*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/barisdestekkatki.htm

Turkish General Staff. 2010. *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) Operation*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/isaf.htm

Turkish General Staff. 2010. *UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)*, available at: http://www.tsk.tr/eng/uluslararasi/BM_UNIFIL.htm

Turkish Grand National Assembly. 1992. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 19/ Cilt: 12 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 19/ Version: 12)*

Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2001. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 21/ Cilt: 71-4 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 21/ Version: 71-4)*

Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2006. *T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 22/ Cilt: 127-1 (TGNA Record Book, Period: 22/ Version: 127-1)*

Turkish Grand National Assembly. 2006. *Birleşmiş Milletler Geçici Gücü bünyesinde faaliyette bulunmak amacıyla Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerin Lübnan'a gönderilmesine izin verilmesine ilişkin Başbakanlık tezkeresi (The Prime Ministry's Bill on the Dispatch of the Turkish Armed Forces to Lebanon)*, 5 September

United Nations. 1995. *UN Press Release*, SG/SM/95/52

United Nations. 2003. *Today's Peacekeepers: Questions and Answers on United Nations Peacekeeping*, available at: http://www.un.org/events/peacekeepers/2003/docs/qanda.htm

United Nations. 2008. *United Nations Peace Operations Year in Review: 2008* (New York: UN Department of Public Information), available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/yir/yir2008.pdf

United Nations Peacekeeping. 2009. *(3) Fatalities by Mission and Appointment Type*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/fatalities/

United Nations Peacekeeping. 2009. *Peacekeeping Chart: 1991-present*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/chart.pdf

United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Background*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/background.shtml

United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Facts and Figures*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/facts.shtml

United Nations Peacekeeping. 2010. *United Nations Operation in Somalia II, Background*, available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unosom2backgr2.html

United Nations Security Council. 2000. *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (for the period from 17 January to 17 July 2000)*

USAID. 2006. *Turkey: Budget Summary*, available at: http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/ee/pdf/tr_progsum05.pdf

U.S. Department of State. 2009. *Background Note: Mozambique*, available at http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/7035.htm#relations

U.S. Department of State. 2010. *Proliferation Security Initiative,* available at: http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c10390.htm


**Audio-Visual Materials**

Munhwa Broadcasting Cooperation (MBC). 2009. *대통령과의 대화* (*The Conversation with President)*


**Working Papers**

Findlay, Trevor. 1996. "The new peacekeepers and the new peacekeeping," *Australian National University IR Department Working Paper* No. 1996/2

Pugh, Michael. 2000. "Protectorate Democracy in South-East Europe," *Colombia International Affairs Online Working Papers*, available at: http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/pum01/

# APPENDIX A

## TURKEY'S PARTICIPATION IN PEACE OPERATIONS

| Location | | Unit | Duration | Troop Size |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Somalia (**UNITAF / UNOSOM II**) | | Mechanized Company | January 1993 - February 1994 | 300 personnel |
| **B o s n i a** | (**UNPROFOR**) | Regiment-level Task Force | August 1993 - December 1995 | 1,400 personnel |
| | (**IFOR / SFOR**) | Brigade-level Unit (Later Battalion-level Unit) | December 1995 - December 2004 | |
| | (**EUFOR Althea**) | Infantry Unit | December 2004 - Current | 255 personnel |
| Albania (**Operation ALBA**) | | Marine Battalion Task Force | April 1997 - August 1997 | 759 personnel |
| Kosovo (**KFOR**) | | Battalion-level Task Force | July 1999 - Current | 987 personnel |
| Macedonia (**NATO-led Operations**) | | Company-level Unit | August 2001 - March 2003 | |
| Afghanistan (**OEF / ISAF**) | | Special Forces (OEF) / Company-level Unit ~ Brigade-level Unit (ISAF) / 2$^{nd}$ & 7$^{th}$ Commander of ISAF | December 2001 - Current | 300~1,500 personnel |
| Sudan (**NATO's Assistance to AU in Darfur**) | | Air Force Unit | June 2005 - Current | 1 C-130 aircraft |
| Congo (**MONUC**) | | Transportation Support Unit | July 2006 - November 2006 | 1 C-130 aircraft / 15 personnel |
| Lebanon (**UNIFIL II / MTF**) | | Engineering Company / | August 2006 - Current | 237 personnel |
| | | Naval Unit | October 2007 - Current | 4 naval ships |

# APPENDIX B

## SOUTH KOREA'S PARTICIPATION IN PEACE OPERATIONS

| Location | Unit | Duration | Troop Size |
|---|---|---|---|
| Somalia (**UNOSOM II**) | Engineering Construction Unit | July 1993 - March 1994 | 250 personnel (516 personnel in total) |
| Western Sahara (**MINURSO**) | Medical Team | September 1994 - May 2006 | 20~40 personnel (502 personnel in total) |
| Angola (**UNAVEM III**) | Engineering Construction Battalion | October 1995 - February 1997 | 200 personnel (600 personnel in total) |
| East Timor (**UNTAET**) | Infantry Battalion | October 1999 - October 2003 | 420 personnel (3,328 personnel in total) |
| Afghanistan (**OEF/ISAF**) | Transportation Support Group (Navy & Air Force) | December 2001 - December 2003 | 1 LST ship / 4 C-130 aircrafts |
| | Medical Team | February 2002 - December 2007 | 60~100 personnel (750 personnel in total) |
| | Engineering Construction Unit | February 2003 - December 2007 | 150 personnel (1,360 personnel in total) |
| | PRT | July 2010 - | 100 civilians 40 police officers 350 military troops |
| Lebanon (**UNIFIL II**) | Infantry Battalion | July 2007 - Current | 359 personnel (1,681 personnel in total) |
| The Somali Coast | Naval Unit | March 2009 - Current | 1 destroyer / 298 personnel |
| Haiti (**MINUSTAH**) | Engineering Construction Unit | February 2010 - Current | 240 personnel |