CHAPTER EIGHT

Defense Reform in Turkey

Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu and Mustafa Kibaroğlu

Turkey has been a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) since 1952. During the Cold War, its armed forces were geared to play a significant role in defense of the Western alliance according to NATO's military doctrine and strategy. As a long-standing NATO ally, Turkey is not facing any serious problems today regarding standardization, interoperability, or military infrastructure. Apart from its NATO obligations, Ankara has maintained its regional perspective on security problems.

In the post-Cold War era, NATO assumed new responsibilities such as peace support operations in addition to its original collective defense function. The strategic environment around Turkey has changed completely: The Soviet threat has faded away, and new security challenges such as separatism, irredentism, terrorism, threats to energy security, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction have emerged. While its firm commitment to collective defense continues, Turkey has had to adapt its security and defense policy and its armed forces to the changing regional strategic setting as well as to the Atlantic Alliance's new functions. Because of its regional geopolitics, Turkey has somewhat a distinctive position within the Alliance. The Turkish Armed Forces (TAF), therefore, planned and carried out reforms with a view to maintaining the capability to operate either in tandem with the allied countries or alone.

The TAF's reform and modernization program has been successful to a considerable extent, despite economic difficulties, poor research and development (R&D), and continuation of the conscription system. One intractable problem, however, has been the military's paradoxical role in politics. This issue has come to the forefront recently as a result of

Turkey's European Union (EU) candidacy. Turkey also needs more transparency in its defense budgeting. The unsatisfactory level of democratic control over the military, however, is a result, not only of the assertiveness of the military, but also, and probably more important, from the general circumstances of Turkish politics. Nevertheless, some progress has been recorded recently in this field, too.

Changing Security Environment

During the Cold War, NATO doctrine focused on the central front as the main area of the Soviet-Warsaw Pact threat. The contingency of a massive attack through Germany into Western Europe was the fundamental assumption. Turkey's potential contribution in the event of such a contingency was important. The Turkish army, the largest in NATO after that of the United States, tied down approximately thirty Warsaw Pact divisions. Without Turkish alignment, the Soviets would have been able to concentrate more massively against the central front. Second, Turkish membership in NATO exposed vast areas in the Soviet Union to Western monitoring. Third, Turkey and the Alliance controlled the Straits and the Aegean passages. Turkey's neutralization (followed by that of Greece) would shift NATO's defensive line in the Mediterranean back to Italy and to the line from Sicily to Cape Bon, further complicating the Western defense posture in Europe.

In time of war, Turkey would have to engage the Soviet-Warsaw Pact forces in two theaters, the Thrace-Straits area and eastern Turkey, where it shared a 610-kilometer common border with the Soviet Union. Only in the Finnmark area of northern Norway did another NATO ally share a frontier with the Soviet Union. Turkey was the only NATO member facing the Warsaw Pact threat from two opposing directions. In return for these risks and its contribution to the European balance of military forces, Ankara enjoyed NATO's collective defense commitment and received military and economic assistance, primarily from the United States and, to a much lesser extent, Germany. Moreover, NATO greatly contributed to modernization of Turkey's military infrastructure.[1]

After the Cold War, this strategic arrangement ceased to satisfy the requirements of the new era. As a result of the disappearance of the Soviet Union, the center of gravity of security challenges shifted from the central front to NATO's southern region. The collapse of the communist system reopened the Pandora's box of old and relatively new conflicts.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), terrorist activities, and proliferation of substate entities and paramilitary groups within states added to the feeling of insecurity and uncertainty in the region. Regional instabilities and opportunities led to a new perspective in Ankara's foreign and security policy, encouraging it to assume a relatively active role in the Balkans, the Black Sea basin, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Middle East.

The most drastic change, however, has been the demise of the Soviet threat. The most striking outcome of this development was that, for the first time in the four-century-old history of Turco-Russian rivalry, the two nations were geographically separated by the emergence of new independent states. Dissolution of common borders with the Russian power contributed greatly to Turkish security. Moreover, conventional force reductions that were achieved with the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty improved the disproportionate situation between the two states in the area. The radical change in the strategic environment encouraged both states to exploit the vast opportunities that exist for mutual economic relations. The most recent development in Turkish-Russian rapprochement is the "Action Plan" on cooperation in Eurasian affairs that was signed by the two states on 16 November 2001 in New York. The document, entitled "From Bilateral Cooperation to Multidimensional Partnership," stresses that the two countries are determined to move their existing relations into an enhanced partnership in every area from the Balkans to the Middle East.

Similarly, Ankara also has developed close cooperative relationships with Bulgaria, Romania, Moldova, Ukraine, Georgia, and Azerbaijan. Turkey, in pursuance of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) objectives, has carried out special military training and educational programs and contributed to the improvement of military infrastructure in Azerbaijan and Georgia. Through initiation of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation scheme in 1992, Turkey added a regional multilateral dimension to its efforts at bilateral cooperation. However, while the Karabagh dispute remains unsettled, and 20 percent of Azerbaijan's territory is under Armenia's occupation, a Turkish-Armenian rapprochement does not seem possible in the near future.

Despite the recent dissipation of tension between Greece and Turkey, the Aegean and Cyprus disputes continue to spoil relations between these two NATO allies. Nevertheless, thanks to their NATO membership and the crisis-management skills they have developed over their years of

rivalry, tensions and occasional crises in the Aegean and Cyprus have been prevented from escalating to war. Under the present conditions, a war between Turkey and Greece seems unlikely.

Turkey's joining the coalition against Saddam Hussein's regime has underlined its importance in maintaining regional security and stability. In the aftermath of the Gulf War, however, the demise of the Iraqi central authority north of the thirty-sixth parallel complicated Turkey's security considerations. The region became a sanctuary for the *Partiya Karkaren Kurdistan* (Kurdistan Workers Party [PKK]) terrorists, who began to operate from northern Iraq against military and civilian targets inside Turkey. On the other hand, during the first days of the Gulf War, Turkey was confronted with the threat of mass migration of more than five hundred thousand Iraqi Kurds, who crossed the Turkish border to escape from Saddam Hussein's regime. Ankara averted this major problem with the help of the allied humanitarian operation, "Provide Comfort," which ensured the fleeing Kurdish population's safe return to their homes in northern Iraq. Furthermore, Syria's active support of the PKK also constituted a serious security challenge for Turkey until 1998, when Syria gave up its support under Turkish military pressure.

As a consequence of these developments and the PKK terrorism in the region, military planners in Ankara shifted their attention from Turkey's northern borders to the southern and eastern borders with Syria, Iraq, and Iran, and redeployed the military units accordingly. In less than a decade, Turkey's troop deployments in the region increased almost fivefold, from about sixty thousand infantry and *gendarmerie* troops in the early 1990s. In addition to the numerical increase, the quality of the troops, including special forces, also improved. Moreover, new equipment, such as light and heavy artillery, armored vehicles, and attack helicopters, was sent to the region, enabling the military to wage cross-border operations in northern Iraq. These deployments have been possible due to the fact that the CFE Treaty does not cover southeastern Turkey, an exceptional arrangement that has increased Ankara's freedom of action in the area (see Figure 1 and Table 1).

Defense Policy and Strategy

Currently, Turkey's defense policy objectives can be summarized as (1) protection of political independence and territorial integrity of the country, including the secular regime of the Republic, and (2) contribut-

Figure 1

TABLE 1
Turkey's Conventional Weapons Arsenal in Five Categories as Limited by the CFE Treaty

	Main Battle Tank	*Armored Personnel Carrier*	*Artillery*	*Attack Helicopter*	*Combat Aircraft*	*Personnel*
1993	3,234	1,862	3,210	11	355	575,045
1996	2,608	2,450	3,102	20	383	525,000
1999	2,690	2,552	3,101	26	354	525,000
2001	2,478	2,996	2,953	28	352	515,380
CFE Ceiling	2,795	3,120	3,523	150	750	530,000
Total[1]	4,591[2]	4,558[3]	10,257[4]	37	470[5]	551,000[6]

[1] The total number of weapons categories includes those weapons deployed abroad, mainly in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). See *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, London: Oxford University Press, , 2001, pp. 73–75.

[2] Out of this total number of main battle tanks, including 386 of Mustafa Kemal-48A5 type deployed in the TRNC, thirteen hundred of Mustafa Kemal-48 A5T1/T2 types reportedly are stored; *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, p. 73.

[3] Including 265 armored personnel carriers of Mustafa Kemal-113, 211 types that are deployed in the TRNC; *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, p. 75.

[4]Including 612 artillery of different types (plus eighty-one mm) deployed in the TRNC; *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, p. 75.

[5]Including 4 F-16 C type aircraft that are in Yugoslavia; *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, p. 75.

[6] Including thirty-six thousand troops deployed in the TRNC; *The Military Balance: 2001–2002*, p. 75.

ing to the creation of a favorable international and regional milieu of security and stability. It should be stressed that these two objectives comprise not only international tasks, but also a fairly broad internal mission that is examined briefly in a separate section of this paper. Moreover, the defense policy does not confine itself to a narrow mission of protecting frontier and territorial integrity. It also assumes the responsibility of contributing to regional security and stability, which became a clear policy objective after the Cold War.

In terms of the *White Book 2000* of the Ministry of National Defense, defense policy objectives are pursued through a military strategy that consists of deterrence, forward defense, military contribution to crisis management and intervention in crises, and collective security/defense.

DETERRENCE AND FORWARD DEFENSE

The *White Book 2000* states, "maintaining a military force that will provide a deterrent influence on the centers of risk and threat in the environment of instability and uncertainty surrounding Turkey constitutes the foundation of the national military strategy."[2] For deterrence, Turkey relies not only on NATO, but also on its own capabilities to balance other powers in the region.

Turkey's defense strategy no longer is confined to mere deterrence, however; it also consists of eliminating imminent threats stemming from the region in general. This forward defense strategy requires preparation to preempt threats before they cross into Turkish territory. The modernization program and reform are geared to provide the Turkish Armed Forces with such capability. For this purpose, the recent procurement of seven KC-135 tanker aircraft has extended the range of the 223 F-16 fighters considerably, enabling the air force to carry out missions abroad. The air force also has increased its lift capability by establishing five transport squadrons with C-130, C-160, CN-235, and CN 235 aircraft. Current plans for the purchase of airborne early warning and control (AEW-C) aircraft will enhance the effectiveness of Turkish air power further.[3]

The Turkish navy also is being modernized in conformity with its new missions, necessitated by the changing circumstances of the post-Cold War era. Modernization efforts are transforming the Turkish navy from a coastal one to a blue water navy that can operate effectively in the Mediterranean and Black Seas with comparatively enhanced capabilities of mobility and power projection. Apart from its wartime missions, such

as strategic deterrence, sea control, and participation in allied or coalition operations, the navy's peacetime missions can be summarized as follows: maintaining deterrence through its presence and exercises in the adjacent seas; control and protection of the sea lanes of communication (SLOCs) refugee control; humanitarian aid; search and rescue; environmental protection; and operations against terrorism and organized crime.

Due to its high degree of maneuverability and advanced communication and other electronic capabilities, the navy is regarded as a very useful instrument of crisis management, in that it allows sufficient time and flexibility to political and military decision makers. The Turkish and, indeed the Greek, navy's crisis-management capabilities were conspicuously observable during the Kardak/Imia crisis in the Aegean Sea in 1996. Both governments wisely kept their respective air forces standing by, and relied on their navies instead. This provided them with a high degree of flexibility and the possibility of communication facilitating de-escalation of the crisis.

The blue water component of the Turkish navy has become more and more visible through the gradual procurement of modern frigates, patrol craft, submarines, auxiliaries, and naval air assets. This process has gained momentum during the last decade.

The navy, which initially had defensive littoral warfare capabilities, acquired, after 1950, some antisubmarine warfare (ASW) capabilities and submarines. After 1970, it added guided missile patrol boats and more submarines to its inventory. During the same period, the navy's strength increased by procuring naval aviation, landing craft, and ships. The aim of the ongoing modernization program is to renew existing forces, strike a balance between forces and force multipliers, and improve integrated surveillance and reconnaissance capability with modern command, control, communication, and intelligence (C3I) links.[4]

In the words of the commander of the Turkish Land Forces, "The land forces have emerged as the highest priority power."[5] Although a number of changes are being made in the force structure of the land forces, the main organizational structure that depends on numerous combat brigades and corps is being maintained. However, the Land Forces Command is taking steps to decrease operating and maintenance costs without reducing the effectiveness of the military power. To use resources more efficiently and, at the same time, to keep the effectiveness of the military force, it is deemed necessary to increase intratheater mobility by having "centrally deployed troops which will be used in

every region" and "equipped with high-tech weapons and systems." Another change considered indispensable for reducing the size of the forces is improving command and control, reconnaissance, surveillance, and communications through introduction of more information-age technologies.[6]

These reforms, however, would require a new personnel policy aimed at creating a more professional army. Although, at present, the Turkish armed forces have a mixed system, with professional officers, noncommissioned officers (NCOs), and civilian employees combined with a conscription system applied to reserve officers and enlisted soldiers, the General Staff (TGS) is conducting studies for a transition to a more professional army. The personnel reform will begin with professionalization of all the officer cadres by filling them completely with professional contract personnel and abolishing the reserve officer system based on conscription.[7]

The Land Forces Personnel Directorate recently established a Human Resources Selection and Evaluation Center Command to recruit high-quality personnel by using modern scientific testing and evaluation methods. Another step taken by the Land Forces to improve the skills of young officers has been to send them to civilian universities for graduate studies in such fields as management, engineering, international relations, and finance. This has been considered to be an additional method useful to meet the requirements not easily met through a military school education. This practice is an initial step taken to reduce the military's monopoly on military education.

Nevertheless, the Land Forces Command is in favor of a phased and slow transition to a fully professional army. They argue that the economic and demographic conditions of the country, as well as the multiplicity of threats and the country's strategic location, do not allow a rapid abolition of the conscription system (see Figure 1). They also emphasize that the country's manpower sources provide the armed forces with a great advantage by enabling them to recruit sufficient numbers of soldiers in line with changing military circumstances. These views seem to be approved by the TGS.[8]

COUNTERING THE THREAT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Whereas the end of the Cold War created a sense of relief from the danger of nuclear catastrophe, the threat of worldwide proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) weapons, and ballistic missiles

as their delivery vehicles, soon eradicated hope for a more stable and peaceful world order. Unlike the bipolar international system, where the threat of nuclear annihilation was menacing, but stability could be maintained thanks to nuclear deterrence, the post-Cold War era is characterized by highly destabilizing factors, such as the emergence of state and nonstate actors (that is, terrorist and militia groups, cults, etc.) with strong ambitions to acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Turkey neighbors a number of such states (and other entities) , namely Iran, Iraq, and Syria, that are believed to have chemical and biological weapons stockpiles and are doing serious work on nuclear weapons. Turkey is also within range of delivery vehicles (ballistic missiles) deployed in these neighboring countries. One might expect that, in the face of such a threat, Turkey would embark on a crash program to develop its own WMD capability. Nevertheless, relying on NBC weapons development as an effective deterrent or countermeasure is, as has always been the case, out of the question for Turkey. Rather, Turkey has pursued a policy of becoming a state party to international nonproliferation agreements seeking to curb the spread of mass destruction weapons and their delivery vehicles.[9] Turkey fulfills with great care its liabilities stemming from such international documents as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).[10] One particular reason for Turkey to give its utmost support to international efforts to strengthen existing international nonproliferation regimes is the widespread belief among the Turkish security elite that effective verification mechanisms of NBC nonproliferation treaties might create serious impediments to aspiring states in their engagements with WMD development and, thus, might provide strong assurances to Turkey in its relations with its neighbors. This expectation has not been fulfilled, however.

Thus, to counter the threat posed by its Middle Eastern neighbors, Turkey believes it has a number of advantages. First, it has long relied on the positive security assurances provided by the Atlantic Alliance. NATO's deterrent is still considered by Turkey to be effective with respect to the threat posed by neighboring NBC-capable states. Second, Turkey relies on a forward defense strategy (the land-air doctrine) that is believed to provide enough credibility to deter even unconventional armed attacks from its neighbors.

As such, during the second half of 1990s, the Turkish military became

capable of launching overnight a comprehensive land operation with the involvement of around fifty thousand fully equipped troops. Added to this, its air power capability can provide troops on the ground with close air support. Early warning and refueling aircraft that are being added to the Turkish air force increase both the range and operational capability of combat aircraft involved in operations. Hence, the overall operational capability of ground forces, combined with the air units, is considered to give Turkey the capability to invade parts of the territory of the enemy, if need be, in a very short time. What needs to be done at this stage is quantitative and qualitative improvement of the technical passive defense equipment and protective gear needed to counter a possible chemical and biological attack. Necessary measures are being taken in this respect. Thus, the invasion capability of Turkey in retaliation is believed to constitute a credible deterrent against any of its southern neighbors that may contemplate attacking it with WMD.

Furthermore, its comprehensive cooperation in the field of military relations with Israel and the United States provides Turkey with the opportunity to create a missile shield in its territory. Relations between Turkey and Israel are improving, especially since the upgrading of diplomatic relations on both sides that followed Israel's peace initiatives with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and Jordan in late 1995 and beyond.[11] Furthermore, Turkish-Israeli relations entered a new phase with the military cooperation agreement signed in 1996 and have improved much since then. The text of the agreement apparently includes clauses for improving bilateral military cooperation. For instance, Israeli military aircraft are allowed to overfly Turkish territory for training. And Israel, on the other hand, agreed to upgrade fifty-four Turkish F-4 class military aircraft and to provide the Turkish air force with electronic warfare equipment. The significance of the military cooperation agreement between Turkey and Israel goes beyond these usual transactions and reflects a new element of power politics in the Middle East.

The U.S. proposal to establish a "missile shield" in the eastern districts of Turkey at the bilateral level or in the NATO framework, or at trilateral level with the inclusion of Israel, may be seen as an indicator of an emerging defense bloc among the three countries. Although too early to identify their arrangement as a formal pact, Turkey, Israel, and the United States may join forces to counter the threat of ballistic missiles that may be tipped with WMD warheads. The military exercise, "Ana-

tolian Eagle," that took place in central Anatolia in early July 2001 with the participation of air force units of Turkey, Israel, and the United States and the air defense systems of these countries, simulated defense and combat operations against a comprehensive attack from the air.[12] Furthermore, the Council of Ministers recently decided to purchase Israeli cruise missiles (Popeye II) with a range of two hundred kilometers.[13]

This advanced military cooperation among Turkey, the United States, and Israel seems to be contrary to what Turkey pursued during the Cold War: not to get involved in U.S. plans designed specifically to back up Israel. However, the threat of WMD and ballistic missiles is becoming an issue of common concern, and it is quite normal for the Turkish security elite to seek a reliable defense posture and a credible deterrent beyond merely the NATO context.[14]

The U.S. National Missile Defense (NMD) and NATO's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) projects could offer another option for a joint missile defense. Deploying ground-, sea-, and air-based boost phase intercept systems in the country could develop a missile defense architecture for Turkey. Turkey's participation in such a defensive system would satisfy, to a great extent, Ankara's security needs stemming from the proliferation of WMDs and missiles. The boost phase systems should be less threatening to Russia, because their range would not be sufficient to intercept Russian missile launches in their boost phase.[15] Although neither Washington nor Ankara has made a decision about this issue, Turkish defense experts have begun to consider this option seriously, which would be practicable if the U.S. (and NATO's) conception of ballistic missile defense and Turkey's missile defense architecture should complement each other.[16]

PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS

After the Cold War, Turkish Armed Forces began to pay particular attention to regional cooperative security and peace support operations, including diverse missions, ranging from peacekeeping to peace enforcement, depending on the consent of the parties concerned. Turkey actively participated in peace support operations in Somalia and the Balkans and has contributed to various peace observation missions. The Turkish Land Forces (TLF) were assigned to the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia at the brigade level. In December 1995, the TLF were assigned to Stabilization Force (SFOR). The navy participated

in "Operation Sharp Guard" in the Adriatic, whose mission was to monitor and impose an arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia. In April 1993, the air force joined NATO's "Operation Deny Flight" with an F-16squadron operating from Italy's Ghedi air base to enforce the no-flight zone over Bosnia and protect "safe areas." During the Kosovo crisis, Ankara contributed a mechanized infantry battalion as well as headquarters personnel to Kosovo Force (KFOR). Moreover, three Special Operations teams were sent to Kosovo to join the Hostage Rescue Force. An F-16 squadron also was assigned to NATO's "Operation Allied Force" in Kosovo.[17]

Although Turkey, as a non-EU NATO ally, cannot participate fully in the decision-making process of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), it has informed the EU of its readiness to contribute to the Headline Goal, a unit at the level of a brigade supported by a sufficient number of air force and navy units.

Turkey's interest in cooperative security extends from participation in peace support operations to initiation of regional security arrangements. It assumed a leading role in the formation of the Southeastern Europe Multinational Peace Force (SEEBRIG) and the Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group (BLACKSEAFOR). Turkey also contributes to NATO's PfP programs enthusiastically, participates in PfP's military and naval exercises in the region, and has established a PfP Training Center in Ankara.

Peace support operations are usually manpower-intensive and require diverse skills and special military training for units and individual soldiers. Since TAF are composed primarily of conscripts who serve for only eighteen months, troops assigned to peace support operations are trained specifically for that purpose. Training programs aim to improve not only their combat skills but also their abilities in public relations and to contribute to public order and security.[18] Peace operation troops are selected mainly from among the candidates who can speak foreign languages.

For the purpose of facilitating its adaptation and contribution to peace support operations, the TAF created new institutions in its own organization. Peace missions were assigned to the Third Corps and the Twenty-Eighth Mechanized Brigade, and the TGS and each of the three services (land, navy, and air) established "Peacekeeping Departments."

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Civil-military relations have been one of the most intractable issues in Turkey's process of democratization. Turkey's candidacy for the EU has focused European attention on the political role of the military. Another contradiction arises from NATO's new orientation and mission in the post-Cold War era. There is a widely accepted view among NATO members that the function of the PfP is to orient its participants toward the core democratic values of the Atlantic Alliance. Turkey is active in PfP programs and opened a PfP Training Center in Ankara. Moreover, Turkey's membership in NATO and other Western alliances, together with its intercultural characteristics, put it in a unique position to project Western values to the newly independent states. Its democratic deficits, however, complicate its role and ambitions. Therefore, the issue of civil-military relations deserves attention while the limits of military interference with politics require elucidation.

Since the eighteenth century, the military has been the prime Westernizer. Today, it considers itself to be the guardian of the state, established and maintained according to Atatürk's republican and secularist principles. In other words, the task of the TAF is to protect the political and territorial integrity of the state as well as its secular character, not only against external threats but also against its internal enemies. In the military's eyes, there are two main internal enemies: the militant Islamic movements that threaten the secular character of the state and the separatist movement, represented by the PKK, which constitutes a threat to the territorial integrity. The military, however, carefully distinguishes the majority of Turkey's Kurdish citizens from the PKK, which is regarded as a terrorist organization.[19]

Since the 1980s, when the separatist PKK launched its terrorist attacks primarily in the southeastern districts of Turkey, which soon coupled with deeply rooted militant Islamic movements, the military assigned top priority to these threats from within. Motivated by a determination to protect territorial integrity and the republican regime, the military launched a campaign that also incorporated elements of psychological warfare aimed to secure as much popular support as possible. These included the indoctrination of the public, using in particular, the elements of media communication. This has resulted in the involvement of the military in almost all aspects of life in Turkey. During this period, which lasted about a decade until the mid-1990s, there was not much

room to discuss, let alone to criticize, the role of the "saviors" of the country. Nor was there a pressing demand for such criticism from large segments of society who have displayed an equal sensitivity to protecting the territorial integrity and the regime.

Toward the late 1980s, and especially the early 1990s, when the PKK benefited from the geopolitical developments in northern Iraq, which turned out to be a sanctuary for them and, thus, enabled them to intensify their attacks, morale was considerably low among most Turkish citizens because the military was not perceived as being adequately prepared to fight guerilla warfare with its classical force deployment, war tactics, and classical weapons arsenal. In the mid-1990s, the military made a radical decision to reorganize its force structure and procure adequate weaponry with higher mobility and greater firepower, such as attack helicopters, light artillery, and armored personnel carriers, as well as high-tech equipment of all sorts, from thermal cameras to global surveillance and intelligence systems, all of which have proved to be highly effective in tracking down and destroying terrorist groups. The struggle against the PKK has provided the TAF with valuable training in low-intensity conflicts. These events, together with the successful military pressure that forced the Syrian regime in 1998 to expel PKK leader Öcalan from Syria, underlined, in the eyes of the Turkish public, the utility of military power in fighting against terrorism. This perception must have been strengthened even further by the recent war in Afghanistan.

Winning the war against the separatists, in the second half of the 1990s, permitted the military to shift its focus to religious extremists on all fronts, from small cells of Hizbullah militants in the countryside to politicians who were claimed to be their masterminds. Only after eliminating the danger of widespread terrorism, external threats, such as proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles capabilities in neighboring countries, entered the agenda of the National Security Council as high-priority items of immediate concern. More serious consideration of such threats started to pull the military, albeit slowly, toward its principal role of defending the regime and territorial integrity against outside threats.

Having put its house in order, and having acquired such state-of-the-art military assets as Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) and refueling aircraft, which empowered the already agile air force, the military showed an unprecedented interest in developments on its periphery, namely the Balkans, the Caucasus, and the Middle East, and

contributed significantly to peace-making and peacekeeping operations in these and other regions. Hence, undergoing a modernization process in its weaponry and reorganizing its command and control structure and force deployment to meet challenges from inside and outside the country made the Turkish military less dependent on old-fashioned psychological warfare against the "internal enemy," which in the past had augmented its role and thus its weight in domestic politics.

The Turkish military, contrary to most of the armed forces in the Third World, has a "refined concept of autonomy," by which it controls politicians through constitutional mechanisms.[20] This reflects a certain intention not to undermine the democratic regime by usurping civilian authority. The military also has considerable public prestige; it enjoys the support of the vast majority of the population, including the media, particularly in its struggle against terrorism, separatism, and Islamic extremism.

The Turkish legal system specifically charged the armed forces with responsibility for defending not only the country but also the political regime as defined in the Constitution. The first three articles of Turkey's Constitution define the characteristics of the Turkish state. They are irrevocable, and amendments to them cannot even be proposed. Article 1 stipulates that the Turkish state is a "republic." Article 2 provides that "The Republic of Turkey is a democratic, secular and social state governed by the rule of law. . . ." Article 3 declares that the Turkish state, with its territory and nation, is an indivisible entity. Its language is Turkish. The Turkish Armed Forces Internal Service Law requires the military to assume the duty of protecting and preserving . . . the Turkish republic as defined in the constitution. The Turkish Armed Forces Internal Service Directive, more explicitly, refers to the protection of "the republic, by arms when necessary, against internal and external threats."[21] Another constitutional mechanism through which the military exercises its influence on political decisions is the National Security Council.

In terms of the Constitution, the Turkish General Staff (TGS) is subordinated unequivocally to the Grand National Assembly (Parliament), the President, and the Prime Minister. The Constitution stipulates that "The Chief of the General Staff shall be appointed by the President of the Republic on the proposal of the Council of Ministers; his duties and powers shall be regulated by law. The Chief of the General Staff shall be responsible to the Prime Minister in the exercise of his duties and pow-

ers." The Ministry of National Defense, however, has equal status with the TGS. The Minister of National Defense is usually a civilian, a political figure from the political party in power. Both are subordinated to the Prime Minister; they only coordinate and divide labor between them, without any hierarchical order. The Ministry of National Defense is responsible for carrying out the legal, social, financial, and budget services of the national defense functions as well as the conscription system. This arrangement diverges from the practice of the allied countries, where the chiefs of the general staff usually are subordinate to the ministers of defense.

Although the military usually is encouraged by the public and existing constitutional and other legal arrangements to maintain its guardianship over the republican order, there is a widespread desire for further democratization on the part of the public. Turkey is facing considerable pressure from its Western allies for greater democratization as well. In this context, European leverage has increased since Turkey's acceptance as a candidate for EU membership at the Helsinki Summit of December 1999. Traditionally the leading promoter of Turkey's Western admiration, the armed forces cannot remain insensitive to Western democratization views.

Important developments have taken place recently in this regard. A prominent improvement was constituted by the exclusion of military judges and prosecutors from the State Security Courts. Former President Süleyman Demirel approved the revision by declaring that Parliament had rid the country of one of its greatest burdens.[22] Another improvement had to do with the composition and powers of the National Security Council (NSC). In September 2001, the Parliament modified thirty-four articles of the Constitution to adapt them to the Copenhagen Criteria of the EU. Under these amendments, Parliament changed the composition of the NSC by increasing the number of civilian members and reduced the NSC's recommendation powers. At present, the NSC has eight civilian and five military members. As for its powers, the word, "decision," in the old text was replaced with "recommendation," and the sentence, "The Council of Ministers shall give priority consideration to the decisions of the NSC . . .," in the previous text was replaced with "the Council of Ministers shall evaluate the recommendations of the NSC. . . ."

Although the military still plays a significant role in political decisions concerning maintenance of territorial integrity and the secular character of the republican regime, its influence on politics has certain boundaries. Furthermore, limitations imposed on the military's political role tend to

be gradually more effective. The present trend reflects the military's slow withdrawal from the political scene. As a student of the Turkish military pertinently points out, "the role of the military in Turkey is the result of a combination of context and circumstance, a symptom rather than a cause of the failure of parliamentary democracy in Turkey to provide stability, prosperity or good governance."[23] It would not be wrong to argue that, under strong and stable single-party governments, the military's political influence will be curtailed considerably.

It is worthy to note that there are deeper reasons for the military's ongoing gradual disengagement from politics. First, in the contemporary era, democratization cannot be disintegrated from Westernization. As the prime agent of Westernization, the military has been increasingly mindful of this historical development since the end of World War II. Second, the military knows, from experience, that its involvement in politics leads to an erosion of its officer core's professionalism as well as a loss of their prestige, particularly among their colleagues abroad. Third, there is growing pressure for further democratization from public opinion and the liberal media, despite the fact that, according to public opinion surveys, the TAF are viewed by an overwhelming majority of the population (more than 80 percent) as the most reliable institution in the country. Finally, Turkey's institutional integration with the West, which began after World War II, has gained a new dimension as a result of the country's EU candidacy. EU membership is promoting further democratization, which is expected to reduce the role of the military in politics gradually.[24]

Budget and Defense Expenditure

Defense expenditures and resources are determined within the framework of the planning, programming, and budgeting system, which generally functions quite effectively. The government assumes responsibility not only for preparing the military budget, but also for controlling payments and contracts by means of the Ministry of Finance. In addition to government control, the auditors of the Court of Public Accounts audit on behalf of Parliament the proper use of all of the items of the central government's consolidated budget to ensure that they are used in accordance with the Budget Law. This political and bureaucratic supervision over preparation and implementation of the military budget, however, does not necessarily mean that parliamentary oversight functions adequately.

The resources of defense expenses are composed of the following items (see Table 2):

- allocated resources of the National Defense Budget;
- resources from the Defense Industry Support Fund (DISF);
- resources from the Turkish Armed Forces Strengthening Foundation (TAFSF);
- budgets of the *Gendarmerie* General Command and the Coast Guard Command;
- foreign state and company loans repaid from the budget of the Undersecretariat of the Treasury (U.S. Foreign Military Sales [FMS] credits were reduced gradually in the 1990s and finally halted in 1999; NATO infrastructure funding continues); and
- revenues based on the special laws of the Ministry of National Defense.

The budget of the Ministry of National Defense (MND) constitutes the most important portion of the resources allocated to defense. The MND budget is distributed to the forces and organizations as follows:[25]

Land Forces	49.3 percent
Air Forces	21.9 percent
Naval Forces	14.4 percent
MND (organization)	7.2 percent
TGS (organization)	7.1 percent

TABLE 2
Resources Allocated to the Turkish Armed Forces (US$ million)

	National Resources					*Other Resources*			
Years	*MND Budget*	*TAF DF Budget*	*DIS Fund*	*Special Allocations*	*Total (TL)*	*FMS Loans*	*NATO ENF Fund*	*State Company Loans*	*Total*
1995	3,341.8	10.7	826.8	76.5	4,225.7	328.5	184.3	186.0	698.8
1996	3,997.9	9.5	887.3	101.7	4,996.4	320.0	161.2	498.4	979.6
1997	4,407.4	11.8	772.4	111.9	5,303.5	175.0	140.3	400.0	715.3
1998	5,327.2	11.4	1,056.9	107.7	6,503.3	150.0	100.0	400.0	650.0
1999	5,968.2	11.2	1,008.7	53.6	7,041.7	—	165.0	400.0	565.0
2000	7,218.0	11.0	1,466.9	65.0	8,760.9	—	180.0	300.0	480.0

Average foreign currency exchange rates of the Turkish Central Bank for the related years were used.

According to *White Paper 2000*, an average of 30 percent of the MND budget is allocated for personnel expenses, 68.9 percent for other current expenses, and the balance for investment and transfer expenses (see Table 3).

According to *White Paper 2000*, the share of the MND budget in the gross national product (GNP) is an average of 2.5 percent and around 9.7 percent of the consolidated budget (see Table 4).

Defense expenditures in Turkey present a number of measurement problems. Within the context of Turkey's highly inflationary financial environment and ongoing revisions introduced into the government's budgetary accounts, measurement of the relative as well as the absolute size of national defense expenditures (and their sources of financing) pose a number of difficult statistical issues, some of which are discussed below.

Overall national defense spending is financed by three major sources : (a) the Central Government Consolidated Budget; (b) various off-budget funds, the most significant of which is the Defense Industry Support Fund; and (c) foreign official and nonofficial resource inflows. In particular, the resource balances of the relevant off-budget funds are not sufficiently transparent.

The initial and end-year budget appropriations may exhibit large differences, because supplementary budgets are introduced in the course of a given year's budget implementation. To the extent possible, actual expenditures should be used for intertemporal assessments.

TABLE 3
Distribution of the Ministry of National Defense 2000 Budget (billion TL)

Main Service Groups	*Share of the 2000 Budget*	*Percentage (percent) Share of the 2000 Budget*
Personnel Expenses	1,270,000	30.70
Other Currrent Expenses	2,850,000	68.90
Special Defense Investments	1,523,011	36.82
Consumption Expenses	1,099,046	26.57
Others	227,941	5.51
Investments	3,050	0.07
Transfers	13,450	0.33
Total	4,136,500	100.00

White Paper 2000, p. 109.

TABLE 4
Comparison of the Budget of the Ministry of National Defense with the Gross National Product and the Consolidated Budget (percent million)

Years	*Gross National Product*	*Consolidated Budget*	*MND Budget*	*Share of MND Budget in GNP (percent)*	*Share of Consolidated Budget in GNP (percent)*	*Share of MND Budget in Consolidated Budget (percent)*
1994	130,519.1	27,742.6	2,607.4	2.0	21.3	9.4
1995	171,736.6	29,340.5	3,341.8	1.9	17.1	11.4
1996	184,037.4	43,846.7	3,997.9	2.2	23.8	9.1
1997	190,836.4	41,785.0	4,407.4	2.3	21.9	10.5
1998	188,060.1	56,683.8	5,327.2	2.8	30.1	9.4
1999	186,264.2	64,910.9	5,968.2	3.2	34.8	9.2
2000	205,273.4	81,719.0	7,218.0	3.5	39.8	8.8

The average foreign currency exchange rate of the Turkish Central bank for the related year was taken as the basis.

White Paper 2000, p. 108. In the general budget of 2001, due to the economic crisis, the Ministry of National Defense's share was reduced to US$5.4 billion.

The real and nominal dollar exchange rates do not behave systematically over time. Thus, dollar-based expenditure estimates are not always meaningful for annual comparisons.

In recent years, the share of interest payments in total budget expenditures has been very high, increasing from 28 percent in 1997 to 43 percent in 2001. In this context, it should be noted that the bulk of nominal interest payments accounts for the inflationary erosion of the domestic debt stock, given the very high rates of domestic inflation. Hence, it might be more meaningful to measure and evaluate the fiscal burden of defense expenditure in relation to the non-interest budget expenditure and/or tax revenue collected in the budget implementation.

In the context of the stabilization program supported by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), coverage of the Consolidated Budget broadened significantly from 1999 on, by incorporating highly fragmented off-budget funds that traditionally have operated outside the budget. This process is likely to continue in the coming years to ensure a more realistic consolidation of government accounts for improved financial management and enhanced parliamentary scrutiny. Thus, one may expect a somewhat declining share of defense

in the Central Government's budget in the medium term, barring unexpected international events that may trigger much higher spending for national security.

Finally, one should note that for proper cross-country comparisons, defense expenditures should include budgetary spending by *Gendarmerie*, coast guard, and the Ministry of National Defense. In fact, this is taken into account in the administrative classification of data given in the official budget documents.

Tables 5 and 6 represent an effort to get over measurement difficulties and to reach more reliable indicators.[26]

The Grand National Assembly, without any opposition, or even any serious debate, in the parliamentary committees usually approves defense budgets. The reason for this stems more from a lack of politician interest than the assertiveness of the military. As a rule, Turkish politicians have

TABLE 5
Relative Size of Defense Expenditure, Turkey: 1997–2002

	1997	*1998*	*1999*	*2000*	*2002*
Central Government Budget Defense Expenditures (percent)					
1. Percent of GNP	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.5
2. Percent of Total Budget Expenditures	10.9	10.4	10.1	9.5	10.0
3. Percent of Total Budget Noninterest Expenditures	15.2	17.2	16.3	16.9	17.7
4. Percent of Total Budget Revenue	15.1	13.7	16.0	13.2	13.7
5. Percent of Total Budget Tax Revenue	18.5	17.5	19.2	16.7	16.8
Memo items (percent of GNP)					
Additional nonbudget	0.7	0.8	0.8	na	na
Foreign resources (for national defense)	0.5	0.6	0.6	na	na

Note: The estimates are derived from data given in the 2002 Central Government Consolidated Budget document (*Bütçe Gerekçesi*) submitted to Parliament by the Ministry of Finance. The source for the underlying GNP data is the *2002 Annual Program, State Planning Organization* (p. 16). The estimates for additional nonbudget resources are based on *White Book 2000*, Ministry of National Defense (MND). Defense expenditures are the sum of budgetary spending by the MND, *Gendarmerie*, and coast guard. Figures for 2002 are calculated from 2002 program and budget documents.

TABLE 6
GNP, Budget, and Defense Expenditure, Turkey, 1999–2002

	1999	*2000*	*2002*[a]
		US$ billion[b]	
Gross National Product (GNP)	187.5	202.1	155.8
Central Government Budget	67.3	75.4	54.5
Total expenditure	41.6	42.6	31.0
Noninterest expenditure	6.8	7.2	5.5
Defense expenditure	n.a.	n.a.	4.6
Central Government Budget	45.0	53.4	40.0
Total revenue	35.4	42.4	32.5
Tax revenue			
Memo item:			
Real GNP Index, 1998 = 100	94	100	95

[a] Official program estimates.
[b] All data are converted to US$ units at the annual average exchange rates.

not professed great interest in involvement in the technicalities of defense policy. They usually take office with no knowledge of military strategy and weapon procurement issues. Thus, in most cases, the advice provided by TGS members plays a determining role. A growth in the role of civilian politicians in defense policy and budgeting then would depend to a great extent on increasing their interest in and knowledge about defense matters and on creating civilian research institutes of defense policy.

Defense Industry and Procurement

In the mid-1980s, the defense industry underwent reform. Until then, cooperation between the private and public sectors remained limited. Most of the plants were owned by the state and run either by the armed forces or by the Machinery and Chemicals Industries Institution, another state enterprise. Factories belonging to the Institution produced a range of relatively low-cost and low-technology weapons and ammunition, including machine guns, mortars, howitzers, and rockets. In addition, the armed forces had naval shipyards and maintenance and overhaul capabilities.

In 1985, the government began to take steps to use the country's industrial base and technical skills more rationally to promote development of

the defense industry. The government established the Defense Industry Development and Support Administration (DIDA), whose aim was to promote cooperation between the private and public sectors and to encourage transfer of technology and capital to Turkey. DIDA also administered a Defense Industry Support Fund that generated income through indirect taxes levied on luxury imports, alcohol, and cigarettes. To a considerable extent, financing of the defense industry and joint projects was realized through this fund. This system continues to operate, with a slight modification. The DIDA, which was reorganized in 1989 as the Undersecretariat of the Defense Industry (SSM) and subordinated to the Ministry of Defense, has a separate legal personality and a separate budget of its own, which does not pass through the Parliament and is not audited by the Court of Public Accounts.

The Defense Industry Support Fund, administered by SSM, is a highly flexible mechanism that guarantees a constant flow of financial resources, free from bureaucratic formalities. Since 1986, the Fund has had revenues amounting to US$11 billion. Eighty percent of this amount was spent for domestic production purposes, 16 percent on direct purchases, and 4 percent on advanced technology projects.[27]

Turkey's defense industry policy envisages that defense industrial activities should be open to foreign enterprises as well as domestic firms. It does suggest, however that defense industrial cooperation with foreign countries should not be sensitive to changing political conditions. It also provides that priority be given to the domestic defense industry to provide any equipment and systems that are procured. If procurement from abroad is deemed necessary, priority then should be given to proposals that allow for offset applications that will contribute to domestic industry. The defense industry aims to develop its international market capability and export potential. Moreover, the policy envisages that the defense industry should not limit itself to defense production; it also should acquire the capability to produce for civilian purposes.[28]

Turkey spent a total of US$27.8 billion on defense procurement over the 1988–97 period. In other words, it annually invested approximately US$3 billion in acquisition of equipment and materiel for the armed forces. According to a current plan, it expects to invest more than US$100 billion for the continuing modernization of its armed forces between now and 2030.[29] On the other hand, efforts are underway for collaborative projects with American and European firms. The Turkish-German frigate program is a good example of such bilateral cooperation.

Turkey actively participates in the Independent European Program Group (IEPG), where it has been involved in collaborative projects such as the manufacture of *Stinger* and *Maverick* missiles. Some other joint ventures include those undertaken by Turkish Aerospace Industries (TAI), such as production of *Cougar* helicopters and CASA CN-235 transport aircraft. TAI also will have a 5.5 percent production share in the Airbus Military Company's A400M transport aircraft program. At the invitation of the United States, Turkey began to negotiate for participation in the engineering and manufacturing development stage of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program at a cost of US$800 million. TAF plans to include the new generation JSF to its inventory, replacing its F-16 fleet by 2015.[30]

The most important step taken in developing the defense industry through joint ventures, however, has been the F-16 project with the United States and the creation of TAI in 1984 for that purpose. TAI has produced 278 F-16 jet fighters, forty-six of which have been exported to Egypt, and the rest have joined the Turkish air force. Turkish partners hold 51 percent of the shares in TAI; General Dynamics and General Electric have 49 percent of the shares. Thanks to this project, Turkey's new domestic aircraft industry has made considerable progress in the 1990s, and Turkey has acquired new technology. In addition, it has contributed greatly to improving managerial capabilities that can carry over to the next generation of aircraft production projects.

Defense industry policy has not attained its objectives fully, however; it continues to suffer from serious deficiencies despite the increasing number of collaborative projects. It is particularly weak in R&D work because of the high cost of such activities. The low level of cooperation between Turkish public and private sectors is another important hindrance to "cross-fertilization" of the economy. The Undersecretary of Defense Industries, Prof. Ali Ercan, points to the poor state of R&D as one of the major obstacles preventing further development of defense industries. He underlines the reluctance of advanced countries to transfer the technology of some critical systems. Although this is not an easy problem to overcome, the Undersecretary argues, Turkey could balance this insufficiency by concentrating on areas that require very little equipment transfer, such as developing indigenous software source codes that rely on human resource capacity. An example of such a project is the "mission computer," composed of hardware and software source codes, which is the most crucial part of the attack helicopter (145 AH-IZ King

Cobra) co-production deal with the United States. When the U.S. administration refused to transfer the most critical parts of the mission computer, the SSM concluded an agreement with the Turkish Scientific Research Board to produce it locally. The SSM expects the project to be successful because it depends primarily on human resource capacity.[31]

Nevertheless, Turkey still depends on foreign companies for nearly 60 percent of its main systems requirements. In the electronics industry, local contribution is about 20 percent; in other projects, the proportion increases to 80 percent. In other words, the average local contribution to defense products is around 40 percent. In addition to weak R&D, other obstacles are the insufficiency of raw materials and the general state of the economy, which has been hit by consecutive crises since 1990. Some legal restrictions worsen the economic problem as well. Defense industry funds cannot be converted into U.S. dollars automatically. The revenues are kept at the Central Bank in Turkish liras, whereas SSM spending usually is transacted in foreign currency. Consequently, the Undersecretariat of Defense Industry suffers from considerable losses because of the high inflation rate.[32]

The defense industry has difficulty increasing its exports. Turkey exports approximately 10 percent of its defense industry products, while 90 percent of them go domestically to the TAF and the civilian sector. The SSM finds it difficult to get the offset agreements implemented by foreign companies. So far, the Undersecretariat has signed forty-one offset agreements with joint venture firms; however, only five of those firms have fulfilled their offset pledges. The total amount of offset pledges is US$3.4 billion, but only US$1.64 of that amount has been realized.[33] Nevertheless, offset agreements have paved the way for many Turkish firms to international markets and promoted their business connections with foreign companies. Taking into consideration the benefits of offset agreements, the SSM recently adopted new offset regulations providing more flexibility to the parties to the agreement.

From time to time, some NATO allies have imposed restrictions on their exports to Turkey on the grounds of human rights violations. For that reason, Turkey has made efforts to diversify its suppliers. An example of this policy of diversification is Ankara's signing an agreement with Korea to procure self-propelled howitzer components. Rapidly increasing trade with Russia may include a significant element of defense procurement in the future. Cooperation with Israel also has provided Turkey with a new and valuable source of weapons procurement.

Restrictions have never been a formidable obstacle to the sustainability of modernization efforts; despite efforts to diversify resources; the United States, Germany, and France have remained Turkey's major suppliers.

Executive Summary: Lessons Learned

Defense reform has been successful to a great extent because of the absence of civilian opposition to the demands of the military and the sustained political consensus about threats the country has had to counter. Civilian governments also have a share in the reform, not only because of their passive acquiescence, but also because they had the vision to plan and initiate certain radical reforms. The liberalization of the economy in the 1980s by the Özal government had a very positive impact on the defense industry, and it encouraged the public sector to cooperate with private firms. The technological, financial, and managerial resources of the private sector, combined with foreign partnership, facilitated development of the defense industry. The Defense Industry Undersecretariat and the Defense Industry Support Fund were established through the initiative of the same government. More important, as a result of these changes, the growing role of civilian government in exploring joint venture possibilities has rendered the military establishment increasingly dependent on civilian politicians and managers. By the same token, internationalization of the economy and the increasing role of private foreign business in the defense industry have moderated the military's State-focused concept of internal and international politics.

Turkey's somewhat peculiar geostrategic conditions, its excessively unstable regional environment, and its internal conflicts differ radically from those of Central Eastern European countries, with the possible exception of southeastern Europe. While some of Turkey's experiences may be relevant, others do not seem to be applicable to the new members of NATO and the candidate states whose perceptions of threat are far less pressing, and whose primary foreign and security policy objective is to join NATO and the EU.

Turkey's military reform policy has been influenced by two conflicting trends that characterize the present international system. While its NATO membership, EU candidacy, and participation in peace operations are inspiring internationalization, multilateralism, cooperative security, and democratic control of the armed forces, its regional environment is suggesting security through power politics. As a result, Turkey's

reform policy has pursued two broad objectives: (1) to improve deterrence capacity against threats emanating from the region by developing a forward defense capability, and (2) to prepare TAF for the new missions of NATO, EU, and other international organizations, namely peace support, peacekeeping, peacemaking, and crisis-management tasks.

These two different currents in the contemporary international system have had a somewhat positive impact on TAF, which has been able to pursue a sustained reform and modernization policy. The process has been carried out in the form of modernization, further professionalization of the officer and NCO cadres, and a very slow reduction in the land forces conscription system; and in the form of modernization only in the naval and air forces that are already highly professionalized by their nature. The reform and modernization process has not required a thorough overhaul of the defense organization. Nevertheless, creation of a number of new institutions within the existing organization has become necessary for sustainable, effective, and flexible implementation of reform policy. One prominent example of such institutions is the SSM. Others examples are the peacekeeping departments that have been established in the TGS and in each of the three armed forces.

Preparation for peace operations requires establishing contacts with international organizations and NGOs and developing the skills to operate in multinational formations. This implies a certain denationalization of defense policy and introduction of a more pluralistic approach to defense planning.

Transparency of military activities, especially concerning budgeting and spending, cannot be improved without parliamentary oversight and nongovernmental examination by the media, academia, and research centers. Parliament and political parties can hardly offer critical views and alternative strategies in an esoteric field such as defense planning if they are not intellectually equipped to do so. The same is equally valid for media and universities. If the political parties wish to contribute to the security and defense policy and increase transparency and civilian control over the military, they should create research institutes and/or encourage existing civilian institutions by funding them to carry out research projects on defense policy. It is also important to include strategic studies programs in university curricula, especially at the graduate level. This would create a resource of defense experts who might offer their services to political parties, parliamentary committees, the media, and research centers. Such a development, however, would require civilian

funding. It cannot be initiated unless the civilian sector seriously believes in the necessity of civilian control of the military.

A long-term modernization program should be considered simultaneously with the development of defense industry. It is impossible to consider the defense industry of a country independent of the general state of the economy of that country, however. An unstable economy would constitute the major obstacle for R&D and the growth of defense industry, even if the country in question has adequate human resources. Another retarding factor is undoubtedly the lack of cooperation between the private and public sectors.

No country would transfer state-of-the-art technologies that cost billions of dollars to develop. A country would transfer a technology to another country relatively easily, however, when it has developed a new system to replace the old one. This problem could be eased in two ways. First, R&D should be oriented to systems that do not require raw material or equipment but human resource capacity, provided the country has that capacity. Second, joint ventures with technologically advanced countries would facilitate the transfer of know-how in factory management and production of technologically sophisticated weapon systems.

Financial problems may be overcome to some extent through cooperative projects and offset agreements that promote exports. It may be useful as well to create a defense industry fund separate from the general budget of the government. Such a solution would provide the government with an additional resource and greater flexibility. On the other hand, however, it would decrease transparency and avoid parliamentary oversight.

Endnotes

1. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, "Europe's Geopolitical Parameters," in S. Togan and V.N. Balasubramanyam (eds.), *Turkey and Eastern European Countries in Transition: Towards Membership of the EU*, London: Palgrave, 2001, pp. 278–79.

2. *White Book 2000*, Ministry of National Defense, p. 36.

3. H. Sönmez Ateşoğlu, "Turkish National Security Strategy and Military Modernization," *Strategic Review* (Winter 2001): 29.

4. Temel Ersoy, "Changing Role and Structure of the Turkish Navy after the End of the Cold War," unpublished paper, 2001; *Naval Forces* (special issue, 2001).

5. Interview with General Atilla Ateş, Commander of the TLF, *Military Technology*, 24, no. 6 (2000): 78.

6. Ibid., p. 80.

7. Ibid., pp. 80–81.

8. Ibid., pp. 81–82.

9. For a detailed account of Turkey's attitude towards nuclear disarmament, see Mustafa Kibaroğlu, "Turkey," in Harald Muller (ed.), *Europe and Nuclear Disarmament: Debates and Political Attitudes in 16 European Countries*, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, Brussels: European Interuniversity Press, 1998, pp. 161–93; also see Duygu B. Sezer, "Turkey's New Security Environment, Nuclear Weapons and Proliferation," *Comparative Strategy*, 14, no. 2 (1995): 149–73.

10. There were no harsh debates in the Grand National Assembly during the process of ratifying the BTWC in November 1974, the NPT in April 1980, the CWC in May 1997, or the CTBT in November 1999.

11. See, in this respect, Mustafa Kibaroğlu, "Turkey and Israel Strategize," *Middle East Quarterly*, 9, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 61–65.

12. See Ed Blanche, "Israel and Turkey Look to Extend their Influence into Central Asia," *Janes Intelligence Review* (August 2001): 34.

13. See *Hürriyet* (daily newspaper), 15 December 2001, p. 10.

14. Ibid.

15. Richard Sokolsky, "Imagining European Missile Defense," *Survival*, 43, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 177.

16. General (Ret.) Çevik Bir "Whom Will the US Missile Shield Protect?" (in Turkish), *Ulusal Strateji-National Strategy*, 3, no. 19 (September–October 2001): 50–51.

17. See an interview with General Hüseyin Kıvrikoğlu, Chief of the General Staff, "Peace in the Nation, Peace in the World," *Military Technology*, 23, no. 9 (1999): 9–20.

18. Interview with General Atilla Ateş, Commander of the Turiksh Land Forces, *Military Technology*, 24, no. 6 (2000): 78–79.

19. Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey," *Journal of International Affairs*, 54, no. 1 (Fall 2000): 213.

20. Ümit Cizre Sakallıoğlu, "The Anatomy of the Turkish Military's Political Autonomy," *Comparative Politics*, 29, no. 2 (January 1997): 153.

21. Gareth Jenkins, "Context and Circumstances: The Turkish Military and Politics," *Adelphi Paper* No. 337, IISS, 2001, pp. 41–45.

22. Karaosmanoğlu, op cit., p. 215.

23. Jenkins, op cit., p. 83.

24. Karaosmanoğlu, op cit., p. 216.

25. *White Paper 2000*, p. 109.

26. The authors are grateful to Professor Merih Celasun for his valuable comments on measurement issues as well as for Tables 5 and 6.

27. "Recently Completed and Ongoing Turkish Defense Procurement Programs," *Military Technology*, 25, no. 9 (2001): 12.

28. *White Book 2000*, p. 115–16.

29. "The TuAF Modernisation Programme: A Status Report," *Military Technology*, 23, no. 9 (1999): 20.

30. Lale Sarýibrahimoğlu, "Turkish Defense Industry in Retrospective," *National Strategy*, 3, no. 19 (September–October 2001): 92, 95. For the current defense industry and procurement projects, see "Recently Completed and Ongoing Turkish Defense Procurement Programmes under SSM," *Military Technology*, 25, no. 9 (2001): 19–30.

31. Sarıibrahimoğlu, op cit., p. 92–93.

32. Ibid., p. 94.

33. Ibid.