

EUROPEAN UNION FOREIGN POLICY: QUIETLY COLLAPSING DEMOCRACY

William Rogers Perlmutter

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Political Science in the Department of Political Science (Trans-Atlantic Relations).

Chapel Hill
2014

Approved by:

Robert Jenkins

Milada Vachudova

John Stephens

©2014
William Rogers Perlmutter
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

William Rogers Perlmutter: European Union Foreign Policy: Quietly Collapsing Democracy
(Under the direction of Robert Jenkins)

The European Union speaks of promotion of human rights, liberal democratic values and its influence in the world. Yet, by investigating the EU's foreign policy, we can find significant discrepancies between what is rhetorically stated in official statements and how the Union's resources are inefficiently utilized. As a matter of reconciliation regarding the stark reality of the Union's inability to influence its immediate surroundings, and with hope, the lessons that can be drawn from this project, the relationship between the European Union, Turkey and Egypt will be analyzed. Since Turkey's government, the AKP (Justice and Development Party), has taken power in 2002, the government has embraced EU reform for domestic power consolidation; in Egypt, ineffective policies without an EU accession reward left the Egyptian citizens unhappy with the Union's exacerbating policies of social inequality. Thus the EU can observe how policies can improve in the future based on previous failure.

To my family, friends and exceptional Project Director, Bob Jenkins, your care in nurturing any success that originated in my mind will always project my utmost love, loyalty and respect.

PREFACE

The purpose of the subject material presented in the thesis project below reflects my care for a striving European continent. Further, the European Union, with absolutely incredible potential, consistently seeks to be what it envisions tomorrow, without discussing what happened during yesterday and today. Thus, the project reflects a reality that the Union can do better; the actions undertaken by the European Union have effects, both diverse and averse, to the shaping of the world we will live in. I hope this project can serve as a microcosm of inspiration for anyone who also wishes to see a better world, where idealism and reality are seamless on a material plane.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER 1: EUROPEANIZATION AND CONDITIONALITY LITERATURE REVIEW	1
CHAPTER 2: TURKEY AND THE EU: REFORMING FOR INTERESTS, 2002-2005	6
CHAPTER 3: “COOLING” OF ACCESSION NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2007	11
Section 3.1: Headscarves and Elections	11
Section 3.2: Cyprus, Additional Protocol and Rise of “Right-Wing” Europe	12
Section 3.3: The Rise of Davutoğlu	15
CHAPTER 4: PIVOTAL SHIFT, 2007-2009	17
Section 4.1: Plans for a Coup and Constitutional Court Hearings	18
Section 4.2: Rapprochement with the Middle East	20
CHAPTER 5: THE ARAB SPRING AND EGYPT	24
Section 5.1: The Arab’s Spring into Transition	25
Section 5.2: The EU Legacy in Egypt: Status Quo Democratization	26
Before the Arab Spring	27
Strategic Conception	27
Policy Instruments Utilized	28
Effects on Egyptian Society	30

After the Arab Spring	31
Strategic Conception	31
Policy Instruments Utilized	33
Effects on Egyptian Society	34
Section 5.3: The AKP’s Interest in Regional, Political Islam	35
Before the Arab Spring	36
After the Arab Spring	39
CHAPTER 6: DOWNTURN OF DEMOCRACY IN EGYPT.....	41
Section 6.1: The EU Approach	43
Section 6.2: The AKP Approach	44
Section 6.3: Justifications for (non-)Action in Egypt.....	46
The EU	46
The AKP	49
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS	50
REFERENCES	54

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	Justice and Development Party
CEEC	Central East European Country
DECAF	Democratic Control of the Armed Forces
ECHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEAS	European External Action Service
ECA	European Court of Auditors
EMP	Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
ENP	European Neighborhood Policy
EU	European Union
FAC	Foreign Affairs Council
FRIDE	Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue
IMB	International Muslim Brotherhood
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MB	Muslim Brotherhood
MEDA	Middle East Democracy Assistance Programme
MENA	Middle East and North Africa Region
MÜSİAD	The Association of Independent Industrialists and Businessmen
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NSC	National Security Council
OIC	Organization of Islamic Cooperation

SCAF	Supreme Council of the Armed Forces
SPRING	Support for Partnership, Reform and Inclusive Growth
TESEV	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation
TGS	Turkish General Staff
TRA	Trade-related Assistance
USA	United States of America
WAMY	World Assembly of Muslim Youth

CHAPTER 1: EUROPEANIZATION AND CONDITIONALITY LITERATURE

REVIEW

Diffusion is conceived as a process through which ideas are spread across time and space (Börzel and Risse 2009:6). Diffusion is exactly what the EU seeks to do – the idea that regional integration is both a normative and causal idea on how best to achieve peace, wealth and social justice (ibid). Regional integration has been conceived with a premise that the EU is the anchor for neighborhood interaction and integration via norm diffusion. The presumption was based on the EU's 2004 and 2007 success in acceding twelve countries from Central and Eastern Europe into the regional organization. The desire of most CEEC's (Central East European countries) to join the EU, combined with the high volume and intrusiveness of the rules attached to its membership, allowed the EU an unprecedented influence on the restructuring of domestic institutions and the entire range of public policies in these countries (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:669).

The EU could have an unprecedented influence via conditionality. For the purposes of this project, three types of conditionality will be presented. First, democratic conditionality concerns the fundamental political principles of the EU (the norms of human rights and liberal democracy), where the main external incentive is the establishment of institutional ties (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:677). Second, *acquis* conditionality concerns the specific rules of the *acquis communautaire*, a rulebook that member states of the EU must abide by; this context starts with concrete preparations for membership, which is the major external incentive for rule transfer (ibid). Further, bilateral agreements between the EU and a neighborhood country

could also include provisions for new rule adoption and *acquis* conditionality, such a liberalization of a domestic economy. Thus, *acquis* conditionality as a form of rule transfer pertains to all actors involved with the EU, regardless of a candidate status. Finally, cross-conditionality is an alternative effort of another external actor to influence a target country, which could severely undermine the EU's efforts to target rule transfer and EU norms (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:677). Thus, regardless if membership to the EU is offered, one can observe the relationship between the EU and countries of potential membership (Turkey) and countries of the immediate neighborhood (Egypt) based on rewards the EU offered previously and effective the EU was in dispersing such rewards.

Using the external incentives model, social learning model and lesson-drawing model as a framework, relations between the EU and Turkey, the EU and Egypt, and Turkey and Egypt can be analyzed at a more practical level. The external incentives model is a rationalist bargaining model, where actors are assumed to be strategic utility-maximizers (their interest lies in the maximization of their own power and welfare); accordingly, EU external governance follows a strategy of conditionality in which the EU sets its rules as conditions that countries on the exterior have to fulfill in order to receive EU rewards (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:671). The model's most general proposition is the strategy of reinforcement by reward, meaning that a state adopts EU rules if the benefits of EU rewards exceed the domestic adoption costs (*ibid*). Such cost-benefit analysis considers determinacy of conditions (clarity and formality of a rule to be transferred), size and speed of conditional rewards given, the credibility of the EU's threat to withhold rewards or promise to deliver rewards, and the size to adopt new rules deriving from the EU (*ibid*). By the given metric, one can determine the efficacy of the EU in transferring rules in Turkey and Egypt over time.

The social learning model follows core tenets of social constructivism, where, as opposed to a rationalist model of conditionality, the model assumes logic of appropriateness (March and Olsen 1989:160-161 in Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:675); actors involved are thus motivated by internalized identities, values and norms. A state will adopt EU rules if it is persuaded of the appropriateness of EU rules (ibid). In other words, how has the EU persuaded Turkey and Egypt, separately, to adopt EU rules as countries with different statuses in relation to the EU (accession and neighborhood country, respectively)?

The lesson-drawing model suggests that non-member states adopt EU rules without EU incentives or persuasion; lesson-drawing is a response to domestic dissatisfaction with the status quo (Rose 1991:10-12 in Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:676). In other words, a state adopts EU rules if it expects these rules to solve domestic policy problems effectively (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:676). How did previous EU policies and attempted rule transfers in Turkey and Egypt frame whether EU rule transfers would be effective in solving domestic policy problems after global financial recession and Arab Spring?

Intra-regional dynamics (relationships between countries in the neighborhood of the EU) will continue, and a strategic partnership between the EU and a neighborhood country does not indicate how two neighborhood countries would interact. If regional integration is seen as the best way of managing social and political conflict, fostering economic wealth of a society and ensuring peace and stability (Börzel and Risse 2009:22), how do intra-regional dynamics function within Europe's neighborhood (countries on the periphery of the European Union, having social, economic or political ties with the Union)? Further, if the EU's relationship with one country has deteriorated over time (as is the case with Turkey), how does Turkey's

relationship with a neighborhood country (Egypt) change in light of that reality? I will attempt to answer this question within the framework of Egyptian, Turkish and EU relations.

Policies looking to secure the immediate EU neighborhood and promote democratic values via ‘democratization’ have become more difficult to diffuse due to the efficacy of policy, financial constraints, and the will of EU leadership. Confidence in the EU as a regional anchor can fluctuate over time. Still, interactions between neighborhood countries (intra-regional) continue, and the impact of diffusion between the EU and its immediate neighborhood can be observed.

“Even where (EU) membership is only a distant possibility, as with Ukraine, Moldova, or Albania, or an essentially non-existent one, as with Morocco or Libya, there is evidence that EU initiatives have had an immediate impact” (Moravcsik 2009: 410). The lack of direct EU membership represents a soft governance model, where tools of norm diffusion other than direct and immediate membership are utilized. Such a process became prominent in the early 2000s in the context of the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP), seeking to promote neighborhood countries’ approximation to the EU’s system of rules below the threshold of membership (Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2011: 866). Bilateral agreement is the emphasis of the EU soft governance model; but which initiative creates an immediate impact? When membership (or enlargement) is not included in negotiation, inconsistency and inefficiency has been the general picture (ibid); the EU foreign policy is staggered and not achieving its purpose.

The EU wishes to draw neighborhood countries closer to the Union politically, economically and socially; the Turkish government’s rejection of EU policies outside the national interest show the Union’s lack of effectiveness to persuade. Understanding how Turkey, since 2002, has economically shifted relations from the EU to the Middle East is telling of how

ineffective EU foreign policy has operated since 2002 (see Altunışık 2008, Danforth 2009 for further reading). Further, the EU neighborhood strategy in Egypt has been underfunded and produced little results to diffuse EU norms into the largest country of the Middle East North Africa (MENA) region. Finally, observing how Turkey and the EU divergently interacted with Egypt as it approached and transitioned out of the Arab Spring shows the limited degree to which the EU practically influences its neighborhood, both potential EU member state (Turkey) and non-member state (Egypt) alike. In short, the EU has not been able to diffuse its norms in the neighborhood since the ENP began because the EU lacked commitment; no enforcement mechanism truly exists to guarantee that norms will be ‘preserved’, which leads to the instrumental use of EU conditionality mechanisms to consolidate or preserve power in the case of Turkey. The rhetoric of the EU was to promote pluralistic democracy; yet, the results have yielded the struggle to usurp power in both Turkey and Egypt, and a non-collaborative effort on foreign policy calculations between Turkey and the EU.

CHAPTER 2: TURKEY AND THE EU: REFORMING FOR INTERESTS, 2002-2005

In 1998, the European Commission reported that the ‘existing military approach’ (the incredible power given to the military to intervene on any affair which undermines the Turkish, secular establishment) was the key reason for the Turkey’s overall weak status of human rights and the rule of law; further the country’s general non-compliance with the Copenhagen Criteria did not help the accession process for Turkey (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:421). When Turkey was recognized in 1999 as a future candidate country to potentially join the EU, the democratic reform process reached a level unseen since before 1999. The number of reforms increased from five in 1999 and 2000, respectively, to one-hundred and fifty one in 2001 (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:423). On the basis of the determinacy hypothesis, the effectiveness of rule transfer increases if rules are set as conditions for rewards and the more determinate they are (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:672). Under such a context, we can see the moment the EU offered the reward of future candidacy to the EU, Turkey began addressing democratic conditionality requirements set out by the EU.

The ‘democratic wave’ had struck Turkish society, and as the 2002 election approached, the Justice and Development Party (AKP), with the most ‘pro-EU’ stance and ‘Islamic roots,’ managed to become the first single-party government since 1987 (Cengiz, Hoffman 2013:422). Although the Turkish government induced modest reforms before the AKP came into power, the AKP reformed the most striking and momentous constitutional elements of 2001 and 2004 (as well as eight harmonization packages between 2002 and 2004) as a commitment to EU accession. Such reforms included change in basic legal codes, abolition of the death penalty,

freedom of expression, broadcasting in and learning different languages and dialects traditionally used by Turkish citizens, and civilian control over the military (Açıkmeşe 2010:141). Based on the country's compliance to the EU's institutional policies for accession, the European Commission declared that Turkey "sufficiently" fulfilled the political criteria and recommended that the Council open accession negotiations with Turkey, which commenced on 3 October 2005 (ibid). Once democratic conditionality was met by the AKP government between 2001 and 2004, the AKP began focusing on *acquis* conditionality, which became the specific rules which a member state must adhere to in order to become part of the EU.

The AKP's objective as the first one-party government in Turkey since 1987 was to maintain power for as long as possible. The EU reform process became a conduit for such an interest. Previously, the Welfare Party (Refah) rose to power in 1996, espousing a foreign policy vision centered on a binary, identity-based worldview: the West and the Muslim world were in opposition (Dalay and Friedman 2013:124). Prime Minister Erbakan, Refah's leader, saw Turkey as championing the Islamic world, roused suspicion of the politically dominant military of his identity-based political strategy. The National Security Council (NSC), a government organ which was the "highest advisory board of the state", consisting of the president, prime minister, three ministers, Chief of the General Staff and four other top military commanders (Rizvi 2012:14) only had two "Islamists" present out of ten members: Prime Minister Erbakan and Justice Minister Şevket Kazan (ibid). The Refah Party was disbanded in January 1998 on charges of Islamism. The Virtue Party, founded by Refah's administration, was also disbanded by the Constitutional Court in 2001 in violation of secularism. The Virtue Party split into two religion-based parties: the Felicity Party and the reformists' Justice and Development Party (AKP) in

August 2001 (Saatçioğlu 2010:17). The AKP rose out of suspicion of its predecessors and the power of the military and High courts to disband political Islam when necessary.

Most specifically during 2002-2005, Turkey underwent great legislative change. However, administrative reforms such as decreasing high court and military powers, proved much more monumental as the AKP usurped power during its early period of governance. The armed forces have always occupied a central place in Turkey's political agenda; the military has long enjoyed the privilege of an autonomous position because of its role as the guardian of Kemalism, secularism, and national unity (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:387). When political Islam or Kurdish nationalism became prominent, 'threatening' the Turkish state, the military intervened via 'coup d'état' (1960, 1971, 1980). "Postmodern" methods were also utilized, such as posting digital memorandums by the military in 1997 to force the coalition government to resign. While such measures by the military were perceived as necessary and popular at times, civilian incapacity to develop a "military free" political habitus was a marking characteristic of Turkish politics and a bottleneck to democratization (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:388) and EU accession.

The democratic control of the armed forces (DECAF) in Turkey is a large component of Turkish prospective EU membership; from 2000 onwards could be described as a period of profound and momentous change in Turkish history, enhancing civilians' power at the expense of the military's power (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:393). Under the auspices of reform, the AKP used the EU agenda as an instrument of "survival," given the party's Islamic roots in Turkey's secular legal-political system (Saatçioğlu 2010:25). Where EU rule transfer might have been seen as effective solutions to domestic policy challenges for the CEEC's, thus adopting such rules independently of EU conditionality and a desire to join (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:670), the AKP used rule transfer from the EU as a mechanism to increase the 'democratic'

nature of the country and consolidate domestic power. How did the AKP accomplish its goal specifically?

Article 118 of the 1982 Constitution organizes the functions of the National Security Council (NSC); Article 19 of the Law No. 2945 in 1982 on NSC gave the NSC unlimited access to civilian agencies and a wide scope of influence in daily politics (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:389-390). The Turkish DECAF roadmap outlined by the EU significantly reformed National Security Council powers via eight harmonization packages of legislation. In 2003, an amendment to Articles 9 and 14 of the NSC Law brought an end to the extended executive and advisory powers of the Secretary General of the NSC; particularly, the implementation of any NSC recommendation made to the president or prime minister was abolished (ibid).

The reforms placed military spending was placed under parliamentary control, and Article 118 of the Constitution was also amended, limiting NSC powers to only developing recommendations; this change made the government responsible for evaluating recommendations rather than giving them priority consideration as previously dictated (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:392). Finally, in 2004, the State Security Courts were abolished; they dealt with cases of security matters (such as terrorism and “political crimes”), under NSC auspices. The change was a basic tenant of DECAF in Turkey (ibid). The swift AKP reform actions were very popular among all walks of Turkish political life; both devout, Anatolian Muslims and secular Istanbul elites shared interests and differing values to reform Turkey. The reform process had given the AKP legitimacy (ibid). Where typical EU conditionality should ‘upset’ the domestic equilibrium by introducing (additional) incentives for compliance with EU rules, such was not the case during 2002 and 2005 in Turkey.

The AKP's "moderation" is closely linked to pragmatic considerations shaped by the Turkish political context (Saatçioğlu 2010:16). Political learning by AKP leadership included parallel strategic and electoral calculations, including a rights-based, liberal agenda promised to broaden the AKP's electoral base by boosting the party's popularity in the Turkish voters' eyes; "[I]t (not only) safeguarded Islamic lifestyle under the rubric of democratic freedom, (but also) broadened the party's appeal to liberal minded voters" (Patton 2007:343 in Saatçioğlu 2010:18). The AKP used EU reforms to increase its popularity among the broader Turkish electorate, who wished to join the EU for prospective economic benefits. Attachment to the "EU cause" helped the AKP distance itself from previous hard-core Islamist parties into the center of the political spectrum; simultaneously, having the EU's political backing, the secular establishment (military and high courts) lost ability to challenge the AKP to contain Islamist tendencies (ibid).

The loss in military and judiciary power was a direct result of the democratic reforms adopted in response to EU democratic and *acquis* conditionality. Removal of military involvement in political life was made a condition in Turkey's accession partnerships (European Council 2006 in Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:427). The AKP used the EU reform process instrumentally to increase its power electorally and legislatively, even past the point where EU commitments changed between 2005 and 2007. When the EU placed higher conditionality on the AKP government for accession into the Union, the Turkish electorate and AKP government isolated the EU and began active discussions with other trade partners (notably, countries in the Middle East). The AKP's rhetorical strategy vis-à-vis the EU negatively changed, where the EU became an enemy to Turkish society, even if portions of Turkey's reform process continued.

CHAPTER 3: “COOLING OFF OF ACCESSION NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2007

Three events occurred between 2005 and 2007, marking a definition of Turkish foreign policy objectives beginning in 2002 with a radical change of objectives going forward. First, the “headscarf issue” (a citizen’s right to wear religious items in public, government spaces in Turkey), defined by the Leyla Şahin case, was taken to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and proved discouraging to the AKP’s electoral base, disincentivizing the reform process. Second, ‘additional protocol’ the AKP government rejected of the European Commission, allowing Cyprus into Turkish shipping lanes, decreased EU’s commitment to negotiate with the AKP government for future accession. Finally, the ascension of Professor Ahmet Davutoğlu to the Foreign Ministry leadership in May 2009 was reflective for what Turkish foreign policy had become since the AKP took power. Also, how future Turkish foreign policy would be conceptualized.

Section 3.1: Headscarves and Elections

In 2005, the ECHR specifically stated a ban on headscarves in particular contexts (government spaces) did not constitute a violation of freedom of religion in Turkey. The AKP government began speaking negatively of the EU when the ECHR ruled that the Turkish secular establishment could continue to dictate freedom of religious expression, a basic tenant of founding of the Turkish Republic in 1923. The AKP strategized, “the space for religious freedoms would be enlarged and the interests of the religious conservatives against the secular state elites would be protracted through the EU membership process” (Öniş 2010:3 in Saatçioğlu

2010:24). Certain EU reforms would promote the AKP's popularity among its religious conservative constituencies, and the AKP assumed the European Commission would ask for the removal of the Islamic headscarf ban for Turkish women in public institutions (Saatçioğlu 2010:24). The EU did not meddle in Turkish affairs this time. Thus, the AKP government expressed disapproval of the EU in lieu of its domestic constituency who would vote two years later.

The AKP elites openly disapproved the decision, arguing the ECHR judges should have consulted with Muslim clergy before reaching this decision (Hürriyet 2005 in Saatçioğlu 2010:25). The Court's ruling did not incentivize the AKP government to continue reforms, as the reform process did not serve conservative and domestic constituency interests. The ECHR decision, even if not formally attached to the EU (ibid), led to increased Euro-skeptic feelings in Turkey. The AKP's own agenda of religious reforms did not always coincide with European demands, resulting in government inaction to the EU for implementing the AKP agenda (Açıkmeşe 2010:146). Within the AKP's framework, the wearing of the headscarf was considered as a liberty; thus the AKP agreed to defer, or even give up, other important human rights reforms (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:396) to prioritize the Şahin case. Further, the increased conditionality measures from the European Commission decreased trust from Turkish public opinion, shifting the electorate's trust into the AKP government instead.

Section 3.2: Cyprus, Additional Protocol and Rise of "Right-Wing" Europe

After the island of Cyprus was not re-unified, Cyprus became a Member State of the European Union, and proceeded to block the Turkish accession process. Turkey refused additional protocol from the European Commission. Specifically, Turkey would not extend the

Turkish-EU customs union to Cyprus unless the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community was adequately addressed (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:424). The Commission ruled that an extension of the customs union was a legal obligation (Commission 2006:24), and if Turkey would not comply, diplomatic measures related to accession would be taken. Specifically, eight chapters of the ‘acquis’ would not be opened, all related to the internal market (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:424). Until Turkey admitted Greek-Cypriot aircrafts and ships into its ports, no chapter would be provisionally closed (Açıkmeşe 2010:144).

“The moment when Turkey came to the brink of membership, with the prospect of negotiations, triggered alarm bells in many European capitals, mostly in Germany, Austria and France. The leaders of centre-right parties in Germany and France, Merkel and Sarkozy, formed a grand coalition in favor of a privileged partnership for Turkey as an alternative to EU membership” (Açıkmeşe 2010:145).

Turkish accession negotiations were “open-ended” as a process, where the outcome could not be guaranteed beforehand (ibid). Further, the ‘absorption capacity’ of the EU’s new enlargement strategy in December 2006 focused on integrating not only “democratic countries,” but also the ability to be accepted by European citizens at-large (Saatçioğlu 2010:9). The strategy was ambiguous and allowed more roadblocks for Turkish accession into the EU to be formalized. All forms of conditionality should not intervene coercively or supportively to change the cost-benefit assessment and subsequent behavior of the target government by inflicting extra costs via ‘reinforcement by punishment’ via or offering extra benefits via ‘reinforcement by support’ (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:671-672). However, in the accession negotiations of Turkey, the EU effectively changed the rules of the game in the AKP’s perception. What did the new conditions placed by the EU on Turkey create in the Turkish political order?

Trust from Turkish citizens in the European Commission, the body responsible for Enlargement, decreased from 39 percent in October 2004 to 17 percent in October 2007 (x1); the perception that the European Union played a positive role in Turkey’s domestic economic situation decreased from 69 percent in October 2004 to 37 percent in October 2007 (x2); the perception that the EU played a positive role in curbing rising prices and inflation also decreased from 57 percent in October 2004 to 36 percent in October 2007 (x3); finally, European Community membership being perceived as a “good thing” decreased from 62 percent in October 2004 to 49 percent in October 2007 (x4). A table is shown below:

Date	x1	x2	x3	x4
4-Oct	39%	69%	57%	62%
5-Jun	39%	67%	54%	59%
5-Oct	33%			55%
6-Apr	29%	44%	36%	44%
6-Sep	32%			54%
7-May	22%			52%
7-Oct	17%	37%	36%	49%

Source: Eurobarometer 2013

In short, Turkey’s reform process and future accession into the EU underwent significant problems between 2005 and 2007; first, expectations that Turkish reforms would include more space for public freedom of religious practice were not backed by an EU mandate. The ECHR’s decision to side with the secular establishment proved to be a disincentive for reform and the AKP government. Second, a stable EU commitment did not exist. The Union added greater conditionality requirements than previously expected (absorption capacity and acceptance by the EU citizenry were now part of the EU’s strategy), only making Turkey’s accession more difficult as well as all future potential Member States. The Turkish government, again, instrumentally used the Union’s position as a means to increase support of its constituency, as is shown by the 46.7 percent share of the national vote in 2007, as opposed to the 34.3 percent share in 2002

(Toktaş and Kurt 2010:396) in the general elections. Economic incentives from the EU were increasingly seen as accomplishments of the AKP from the Turkish electorate and not help from the Union. As the shift away from the EU rhetorically was taking place, Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu began to conceptualize how Turkey had participated in geopolitics during the past five years, as well its future role.

Section 3.3: The Rise of Davutoğlu

“Both Prime Minister Erdoğan and President Gül call him Hodja, or Teacher” (The Economist 2008 in Sözen 2010:112). The person to whom The Economist was referring is Professor Ahmet Davutoğlu, who is both the theorist and decision-maker behind Turkish foreign policy calculations (ibid). As Sözen points out, “it is imperative that the theorist’s conceptual setting should be closely scrutinized in order to comprehend the conceptual background against which the policy choices are made.” What are the tenants of Davutoğlu’s foreign policy conception?

Advisor Davutoğlu felt Turkey needed an accurate redefinition of its position in the post-September 11th geopolitical landscape (Davutoğlu 2008:78); Turkey’s new position in the world today has both an ideational and geographic basis, occupying a unique space, centrally located without one unified character (ibid). The future Foreign Minister (appointed in 2009) proposed a normative strategy through which geographical depth (central location in the world of politics) and historical depth (previous Ottoman ties with neighbors, whether former friend or foe) could transform Turkey from a peripheral state (of the Cold War) to a stronger, more central and pivotal state in the post-Cold War era (ibid). The five tenants included: balance between security and democracy (domestically-driven legitimacy of the political system), “zero problem policy

towards Turkey's neighbors" (conflict avoidance with border countries), multidimensional and multi-track policies (utilization of a foreign policy 'toolbox' with several actors and several policies), diplomatic discourse based on firm flexibility (knowing when to prioritize a hard stance on issues while being flexible on other issues), and rhythmic diplomacy, the ability to be have an international presence in multilateral settings (Davutoğlu 2008:79-83, Sözen 2010:110). Specifically, once Davutoğlu was appointed Foreign Minister in 2009, he stressed the "zero problems with neighbors" strategy, envisioning that Turkey would transform itself into a true global actor (Murinson 2012:1). What was the purpose of Davutoğlu's strategy?

The AKP, with its Islamist roots, was naturally receptive to developing strong cultural, diplomatic and economic links with the Arab Middle East and the Islamic world in general; the relationship was reciprocal (Murinson 2012:13). Thus, the AKP wished to increase influence in international organizations, such as observer status in the African Union, invitations to the Arab League twice, and dialogue among Iraq's neighbors, as fifty countries met in Istanbul to discuss regional integration in 2007 (Davutoğlu 2007:82-83). There was a clear rapprochement to the Middle East, which again, served AKP interests in building a constituency for the second and third general elections in 2007 and 2011. Cross-conditionality (other actors displaying relevant benefits for increasing relations with Turkey) served the AKP domestically and the foreign policy conceptions of Ahmet Davutoğlu. The importance of Anatolian, conservative business associations to the AKP proved crucial, as political chaos both domestically and internationally were fended off. The business associations benefitted tremendously from Turkey's economic boom and shared a common AKP value system. Thus, AKP took a larger percentage of the general election vote in each of the next two elections, both 2007 and 2011.

CHAPTER 4: PIVOTAL SHIFT, 2007-2009

The AKP, seeking reelection, used the lack of EU accession commitment for political gain and sought new opportunities abroad; however, the party did not stop reforming the military and judiciary sectors. Even as conditionality from the EU (commitment to provide incentives for reform) decreased significantly between 2002 and 2009, compliance with EU institutional demands for accession (reform) increased during the same time period (Saatçioğlu 2010:15). The credibility of EU commitment declined, reform proposals made less than minimal impact in the national political agenda; furthermore, when necessary to increase governmental powers, the AKP government has not refrained from adopting reforms touching equally contentious issues, such as the governmental oversight of the military and the judiciary (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:428).

When political threat from the secular, military establishment struck the AKP's domestic agenda, the party used the EU mandate for political reform as a tool to back party interests. Besides reforming as a means to suppress the influence of an Islamic party's grandest foes in Turkey (military and judiciary), compliance in improving human rights decreased during 2007 and 2009; the trend shows the beginning of instrumentalization (use of a foreign policy tool from an actor in an unintended way than the tool's original intention) of the EU enlargement policy to consolidate power, both domestically and regionally in the future.

Section 4.1: Plans for a Coup and Constitutional Court Hearings

The AKP government decided to nominate the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Abdullah Gül, as presidential candidate in the 2007 elections; such was disheartening to the military, looking for a secular, Kemalist to lead the country. On April 13 2007, a weekly magazine, *Nokta*, published the diaries of a retired admiral, revealing how army senior officers wanted to seize power from the moment the AKP rose to office. *Nokta* was raided by police and closed down (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:394). Further, mass protests by those committed to Kemalist principles and an e-memorandum published by the Turkish General Staff (TGS, chief decision maker of the armed forces for Turkey) showed the fear of having a non-secular-led Turkey in the future (ibid). The AKP responded by reminding the TGS that the AKP government was the civilian authority, not to be intervened upon by armed forces (ibid).

Once again, the AKP received an EU mandate to continue with the DECAF plan, thus suppressing judicial and military powers, the greatest foes of the Turkish Islamic party. Olli Rehn, the EU's commissioner for Enlargement, stated that while the EU respected the Turkish military, "the military should be aware that it should not interfere in the democratic process in a country which desires to become an EU member... It is important that the military respects the rules of democracy and its own role in that democratic regime" (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:395). Even participants in demonstrations against the AKP expressed their ambivalence towards the military with the slogan: "No Islamic government, but no coup either!" (ibid). In the end, President Gül was nominated and elected by parliamentary vote, as the further-increased AKP majority decided in August 2007 (ibid). However, the AKP still had to battle the secular establishment.

The AKP continued to press for the right of women to wear headscarves in public places. With constitutional amendments to the bills on the right to education and to equality, the AKP and Nationalist Action Party abolished the ban on wearing the headscarf in universities, only to be nullified in the Constitutional Court and deemed unconstitutional (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:397). Because the AKP had continued being a ‘center of anti-secular activities’, the Constitutional Court agreed to hear a case by which the AKP would be banned as a party; again, the EU warned the Constitutional Court prior to their ruling in 2008 that closure of the AKP would create problems for accession negotiations (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:397).

The shift in the balance of power between the government and the military was not only legal, but also symbolic: most significantly, as a response to the military opposition to Abdullah Gül’s election as president of the country, the AKP called for early elections in 2007 and won its second term in office, showing that the public sided with the government rather than the military (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:427). With the EU playing a legitimizing role for the AKP government (through improved economic performance of the AKP’s constituency and minimizing the power of the judiciary and military) on several occasions between 2002 and 2009 (Toktaş and Kurt 2010:400), did foreign policy choices from the AKP government reflect a reciprocal relationship?

In the matters of human rights and democratization, cornerstones of the EU value system, Turkey began to show signs of civil – as opposed to military – authoritarianism in the domestic system (Cengiz and Hoffman 2013:429). One challenge that the EU faces in its enlargement policy and Turkey is ensuring domestic political reforms undertaken in the 2000s – reforms that were made with explicit EU encouragement – are preserved (Kubicek 2011:911). According to Saatçioğlu (2010:5), the AKP is not a genuinely liberal party, committed to pluralism; rule of

law and human rights; “In contrast to its declared agenda of political reforms and democratization, AKP’s political priorities have practically shifted away from the pursuit of democratic norms” (ibid).

The AKP’s normative commitment to democracy is weak, notwithstanding its formal democratic agenda; rather, what seems to be the case is the AKP’s instrumental use of democracy (Keyman 2010 in Saatçioğlu 2010:21). The 2009 Progress Report from the Commission notes several areas where Turkish laws and practices did not meet EU standards, including rules on political parties, promoting minority languages, trade union rights, allegations of torture, corruption, non-discrimination for sexual orientation, bans on Internet sites, use of the Anti-Terror law against Kurdish groups, the lack of a gender equality body, and the continued political influence of the military (Kubicek 2011:919). The AKP government selectively engaged civil society actors (its constituency) in the policy-making process (ibid), regardless if actions such as constraining military power are considered “democratic” by EU standards. However, the groups benefitting from the AKP’s domestic policy became the same groups which are appearing to determine the AKP’s foreign policy: more-conservative Muslim, business elites from Anatolia.

Section 4.2: Rapprochement with the Middle East

Between 2002 and 2008, Turkish exports to the Arab world increased five times, reaching \$25 billion (Murinson 2012:13). The strategy to develop closer ties with neighboring countries through common economic interests, security interests and cultural proximity is neither a new phenomenon (certainly predating the AKP and Davutoğlu era) nor a shift which started in conjunction with the global financial crisis (Öniş 2011:57-58). The views of the rising political

elite (AKP) widely diverged from the classical Kemalism espoused by the Ankara establishment; the new elite's ideology, tinged with imperial nostalgia, emphasizes the role of small business, laissez-faire economics, and state non-intervention combined with the conservative values of Turkish society (Murinson 2012:8). Combine such features with a minimized secular establishment over time, and a structural transformation has taken place (Öniş 2011:57), where religious power impacts both Turkish domestic and foreign policy.

Further, the AKP and predecessors have strong connections with other political elites across the Muslim world. As noted by the Wall Street Journal (Merley 2011:31), the World Assembly of Muslim Youth (WAMY) created a network where conservative, Turkish elites can meet with conservative, Arab elites. WAMY is the forum where Muslim Brotherhood spokesman, Kemal Al-Helbawy, met Prime Minister Erdoğan and Necmettin Erbakan (former Turkish Prime Minister and predecessor to the AKP). Al-Helbawy concluded by saying, "We always had ties with the Islamic movement or the political party with the nationalistic and Islamic background in Turkey since its inception, even before the formation of the AKP. We had ties with the Islamic movement since the inception of the national order party formed by Erbakan and then the National Salvation Party" (Diab 2009 in Merley 2011:31).

Hence, the connection among elites in Turkey and the Arab world were cultivated years before the AKP became a dominant political force. Also, the domestic context in Turkey (after 2002) lent itself to creating expanded business opportunities with the eastern, neighborhood countries. When European markets became less attractive in 2008 and 2009, Turkish businesses saw excellent opportunities to expand business operations in the Middle East via cross-conditionality. Thus, domestic actors desired a more 'pivoted' strategy towards the Middle East as a means to create profits. As the most powerful promise of enlargement was retracted by

additional *acquis* conditionality requirements, the impact of the EU on Turkey as a candidate country lessened significantly, as discussed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2004:673).

There is no doubt that the new-style foreign policy activism has helped enhance AKP popularity in domestic politics (Öniş 2011:49). “Representatives of the lower middle class from central Anatolia formed their own union of Islamic businessmen (established in 1990), MÜSİAD, which propagates the religious connection between Islam and the values of the free market. In fact, MÜSİAD membership constitutes important, possibly crucial, support for the AKP in local and national elections” (Murinson 2012:8). Foreign policy in Turkey is no longer the monopoly of politicians and diplomats. It has been increasingly driven from below by key economic and civil society actors (Öniş 2011:56). According to a recent poll by TESEV, an Istanbul-based NGO, the number of self-identified Muslim increased by ten percent between 2002 and 2007; in addition, almost half of all surveyed describe themselves as ‘Islamist’ (Merley 2011:36). Religiosity has been increasing in Turkey, just as has been observed in many other Muslim societies. The AKP is both a beneficiary of and a stimulus for such a phenomenon (ibid).

The Middle East and the Arab world became the focal point of Turkish foreign policy efforts (involving both formal initiatives and informal activities of the NGOs), which is quite extraordinary by the standards of previous Turkish governments (Öniş 2011:50). As the result of the AKP’s central Anatolian roots and more conservative Muslim outlook, the AKP focused on the unifying character of the Ottoman Empire and the Muslim values inherited by the Turkish Republic as the key pillars of its domestic and foreign policy agenda (Murinson 2012:13). Arguably, the global financial crisis helped accelerate the transnationalization (international presence of trade) of small- and medium-sized business in Turkey, notably from the rising

centers of Anatolian capital (Öniş 2011:56). These firms took advantage of the opportunities offered by the MENA as well as Russia and the broader post-Soviet space (ibid).

In short, Turkish policy level decisions are increasingly driven by bottom-up processes, only including the EU in the process when reforms promote the AKP's constituency or continued power consolidation. If domestically, the AKP did not continue the EU's sustained reform process, then what can one say regarding foreign policy decisions? As the Arab Spring approached, Turkey and the EU chose different paths to remain relevant in the Middle East; particularly in Egypt, ideological alignment proved to be a cornerstone of the AKP's support for the initial revolutions (calling for Hosni Mubarak to step down) and continued support for the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in 2012. The EU, on the other hand, had to retract decades of policies which exacerbated inequality, and could not be a significant factor as the Arab Spring ensued and military overthrow took place in 2013.

CHAPTER 5: THE ARAB SPRING AND EGYPT

The sections above attempt to set the groundwork for understanding Europeanization and EU conditionality mechanisms, its basic tenants, and how the tenants were applied in Turkey's case. Further, understanding how Turkish foreign policy operated between 2002 and 2009 shows the progression of a government which increasingly began to consider other alternatives of economic integration and diplomacy. When the Arab Spring revolts struck the Middle East (mainly Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya) in 2011, most observers watched to see how the regional dynamics would be reshuffled; however, Turkey and the EU, as actors with stakes in the MENA (Middle East and North Africa) region, took divergent policy approaches for various reasons.

The case of Egypt will be observed, illuminating how an empowered actor (Turkey) and the actor that empowered (the EU) the previous approached a country in transition. First, a brief overview of what happened in Egypt as the Arab Spring began will be expounded. Second, understanding how the European Union's policy towards a neighborhood country (without EU membership aspirations) before and after the Arab Spring will be considered. Third, comparatively examining how the AKP and its predecessors had relations with the same country during the same time period will be observed. As military overthrow took place in July 2013 in Egypt, how did the EU and Turkey respond to a reversal in Egypt's transition to democracy? Finally, I explore reasons as to the reactions of the EU and Turkey during 2013 and beyond.

Section 5.1: The Arab's Spring into Transition

Egypt was a de facto one-party, military oligarchy, overseen by a single strongman, and the 'ruling party' was largely merged with state structures; the few tolerated opposition parties were harassed on a regular basis and stood no chance of attaining any meaningful political power (Kausch 2012:82 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Social inequality and corruption dominated political life in Egypt for decades, as President Hosni Mubarak led Egypt into an economic and social catastrophe since 1972. The 2011 Arab world uprisings happened for the sake of "freedom and dignity," where ideology and party politics played a small role in toppling the "deep state." Without the backing from parties, leaders or ideology, the 'Facebook' generation managed to mobilize the masses, articulate their demands on the streets and project them internationally via social networking sites (ibid). Regimes and parties were disbanded, and dozens of new political interests were licensed; parties played a marginal role in the revolutions (across the MENA region), but gained relevance once the transitions began (ibid).

Protests led to celebration as Hosni Mubarak stepped down; parties were forced to organize quickly for a vote of the Legislative Assembly and Presidency. The Muslim Brotherhood (MB) and President Mohamed Morsi represented the people's choice on June 24 2012 and – since the secular revolutionaries were too disorganized to put together an effective party machine – the MB was the only viable substitute for the Mubarak-era alternative (Norlén and Rivero 2012:2). The MB and several Salafist (roughly translated to ancestor) parties together accounted for two-thirds of the Legislative Assembly, benefitting from their former exclusion and/or persecution by ousted leaders (Mikaïl 2012:26 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Conservative, historically rooted Islam took power in Egypt during 2012.

The MB controlled parliamentary committees for external affairs (diplomacy, defense and energy), and Salafist parties were championing committees for economy, education and religious affairs (Mikaïl 2012:28 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). However, the People's Assembly, elected in February 2012, was dissolved five months later by the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), in June 2012 (Latek 2013:1). The election process became what some have called the "stupidest transition in history", as polls for voting were open for seventeen days over eight rounds of elections, only to end in a dissolving of the parliament and stripping of many presidential powers (Hamid 2012:1). As Mikaïl foresaw, seeking revenge on former regime loyalists was not only a call from protesters or a temptation (Mikaïl 2012:24 in Kausch and Youngs 2012), but also an action from the MB, which led to their eventual overthrow in July 2013.

Section 5.2: The EU Legacy in Egypt: Status Quo Democratization

The sentiments from citizens protesting for a change in Egypt were exacerbated partly by the European Union. The obfuscated EU policies, primarily funding authoritarianism without an enforcement mechanism, sent the wrong message to the Egyptian people, making the EU less than credible as the Arab Spring approached. The European Union has strategic partnerships with regional organizations, individual nation states and international organizations, all of which are thoughtfully considered on paper, yet practically carried out in a different manner. Egypt, uniquely positioned in the center of the Arab world, renders the country an ideal case study of EU foreign policy towards its 'southern neighborhood' (Lazarou, et al. 2013:179). Prior to and after the Arab Spring, one must observe how the EU conceived a strategic relationship with Egypt, EU policy instruments utilized to help promote Egypt democracy, and their subsequent

effects on Egyptian society. Under such a rubric, why the EU could not act with agility as the Arab Spring began and subsequent transition movements were unsuccessful will be clarified.

Before the Arab Spring

Strategic Conception

The European Union conceptualized Egypt as part of its ‘Neighborhood,’ evidenced by several agreements signed between the Union and Egypt under the European Neighborhood Policy since 2004 and previously in 1995 dialogues between the two actors. Authoritarian governments turned down the offer of membership (or EU rewards for the case of Egypt) rather than accept the political power costs of adopting liberal democratic rules (Schimmelfennig and Sederlmeier 2004:671). However, such a reality did not stop the EU from having a relationship with Egypt. The EU perceived the Mediterranean region as a source of fundamentalism, believing that democracy and reform were the best means of attaining both stability and security in the region (El Molla 2009:4). Simply put, the EU wished to avoid Islamic empowerment (Lazarou, et al. 2013:181), consistent with Hosni Mubarak’s reign as President of Egypt. The EU was not perceived by countries receiving EU aid as carrying a moral value of democracy promotion. Rather, the Union advocated democracy promotion as an ‘exported good’ (El Molla 2009:13) to be consumed and appreciated at a material level.

Where enlargement into the EU justifies and legalizes its role as democracy promoter, EU foreign policy (excluding enlargement) is driven by security interest (ibid). Thus, the EU feared the costs that may eventually result from democratic transformation, such as a radical, extremist party having power or a civil war (El Molla 2009:11). The theoretical idea of how the EU and Egypt should cultivate a relationship became operational as early as 1995 when the EU

began adopting bilateral agreements with the authoritarian Mubarak government. In other words, the EU began transferring rules of *acquis conditionality* (official rules) before or with democratic conditionality, even though democratic conditionality relies on the initial democratic conditions of a receiving country (Schimmelfennig and Sederlmeier 2004:677) and builds the institutions necessary to allow rule transfers from being grossly abused.

Policy Instruments Utilized

The EU designed a portfolio of reform and democracy promotion policies over the last two decades toward Egypt; such policies can be regarded as a kind of compensation for the lack of membership ‘carrot’ (El Molla 2009:4). To produce and sustain an institutional change, however, the membership perspective had to be credible (Schimmelfennig and Sederlmeier 2004: 678). The policies included participation in political life, an enhanced role for civil society, encouraging decentralization measures, guaranteeing judicial independence, promoting human rights, fundamental freedoms and respect for the rule of law (El Molla 2009:5). The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) and the Barcelona Process were the final output of the Barcelona Conference in 1995; the EMP is regarded as the cornerstone of Euro-Mediterranean relations (ibid), which certainly explains why the EU has not been a force for democratization in Egypt. The MEDA (Middle East Democracy Assistance) Programme was launched within EMP in 1996, directing funds towards economic, trade and education reform rather than political reform and democracy building (El Molla 2009:7).

An Association Agreement was signed between the EU and Egypt in 2001, took effect in 2004 in conjunction with the new European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) launched the same year (ECA 2013:11). Egypt is the largest country covered by the ENP, thus making the country

crucial to EU foreign policy objectives. In the years leading up to the Arab Spring (2004-2010), Egypt received a high total volume (€183 million) of trade-related assistance (TRA); Egypt pursued a course of trade liberalization, signing a number of trade agreements at bilateral, regional and multilateral levels (Christensen 2012:1 in Commission 2013). The completed policy instruments led to a reduction of Egypt's tariff barriers between 2000 and 2008 (ibid), a core EU value. In other words, *acquis* conditionality (rule transfer) was successful to specific areas of mutual interest.

During this same time period, an EU-Egypt Action Plan was signed in 2007 as part of the ENP; the framework explicitly placed an emphasis on “political dialogue and reform.” Critics, however, regarded the ENP and Action Plan as an ‘elitist policy,’ negotiated and drafted by elite (El Molla 2009:8) of military and government officials. The EU-Egypt Action Plan also coincided with the introduction of constitutional amendments, strengthening authoritarian rule via anti-terrorism laws and abolishing judicial supervision of elections (Lazarou, et al. 2013:180).

Thus, when a January 2008 resolution from the European Parliament condemned the human rights situation in Egypt, not only did it contradict announcements previously made by EU officials (El Molla 2009:10), the resolution undermined the Action Plan which the EU had negotiated with Egypt a year earlier. Further, policy instruments under the ENP, such as “Supporting Egypt's Reforms in the Areas of Democracy, Human Rights and Justice”, were given €40 million of the €558 million budgeted to Egyptian reforms in total (ibid). Democratic conditionality was virtually nonexistent.

Hence, although the EU had excellent rhetorical documents outlining ways to transform Egypt into a democratic society, the tangible financial commitment was weak at best. The Action

Plan resulting in €558 million of aid stressed security matters over democratization, was not discussed with local NGOs in Egypt (Lazarou, et al. 2013:180-181), and became a good exercise for ‘political dialogue’, only at the level of policymakers (El Molla 2009:11). The Union’s policy towards trade liberalization could neither completely end social inequality nor be quantified as such; however, the EU could have arguably raised the issue of how to reduce vulnerability that often tends to increase when an economy opens up (Christensen 2012:4 in Commission 2013). The EU policies towards Egypt did not address social inequality and a lack of democracy, one of the main reasons for the Arab Spring revolts in 2011.

Effects on Egyptian Society

Although the TRA response strategy contributed to the reduction of trade-related transaction costs through trade facilitation, a modified and condensed custom code, and training for ‘capacity building’, the strategy failed to address systemic issues (Christensen 2012: 2-4 in Commission 2013) pervading Egyptian society, such as social inequality and gross poverty among women, youth and minority communities. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership was entirely a European initiative; Egypt became a recipient of the initiative rather than partners (El Molla 2009:7). The EU had to recognize that the way in which economic liberalization was prompted in the 2000’s nourished much social discontent (Youngs 2011:152 in Kausch and Youngs 2012), where Egypt was certainly no exception to the anecdotal evidence.

The Association Agreements of partnerships across the MENA region included a human rights’ clause, which theoretically, Mediterranean partners were obliged to endorse and abide by; in practice, serious human rights’ abuses were committed without any suspension of agreements or withholding of aid from the EU (El Molla 2009:7). The recent upheavals in the MENA region

highlighted the futility and anachronism inherent in the European Union's highly fragmented foreign policy towards the region (Mikaïl 2012:35 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). The EU wished to balance 'hard economic interests' cloaked under norm protection with 'soft power' (Lazarou, et al. 2013:178) during the end of Hosni Mubarak's reign in Egypt. The spending patterns of the EU reflected the Union's interests, where political reform and democratic transformation allocations did not seem to be a priority (El Molla 2009:12). In the end, the EU acknowledged its mistake in supporting the authoritarian status quo (Echagüe 2012:100 in Kausch and Youngs 2012), as European policy-makers are now candid about the miscalculations that led to their ill-fated support for autocrats in the MENA region (Youngs 2011:103 in Kausch and Youngs 2012).

In conclusion, the EU policy towards Egypt before the Arab Spring did neither provide (as an exported good) nor encourage (as an idea) Egyptian citizens greater democratic reform. Maintenance of an economic status quo (whether by Member States or the Union itself), assurance to contain extremist, Islamic parties, and non-enforcement of bilateral agreements pertaining to democratic reform seemed to be what was important for the EU in the 2000s. Thus, as the Arab Spring occurred and transition began, not only did the citizens of Egypt have a strong mistrust of the West (Norlén and Rivero 2012:1), the EU had no role in the ebb and flow of Egypt's process of political change (Youngs 2011:147 in Kausch and Youngs 2012).

After the Arab Spring

Strategic Conception

As Christensen noted the EU did little to mainstream poverty reduction into the main trade-related assistance (TRA) interventions at design and in subsequent implementation, instead relying on 'trickledown' theory of increased trade contributing to accelerated economic growth,

which in turn is assumed to reduce poverty (Christensen 2012:5 in Commission 2013). Specifically, the ‘trickledown’ was assumed to be channeled through Egypt’s treasury. Approximately €1 billion in aid was allocated by the EU to Egypt during 2007 and 2013; more than half of the amount went through Egypt’s treasury. The European External Action Service (EEAS) lacked a budgetary transparency mechanism and ineffective audit function for the Egyptian government, leading to endemic corruption of government authorities (ECA 2013) prior to the Arab Spring. Further, the EEAS and the Commission continued to pay considerable EU funds directly to Egyptian Authorities upon recognizing such deficiencies (ibid). The European Court of Auditors (ECA) report showed the main human rights program was largely unsuccessful; a major component for enhancing civil society organizations’ capacity was canceled and EU aid was not effective in improving governance in Egypt (ibid).

Knowing the European Union’s policy towards Egypt was largely unsuccessful, the transitions in the MENA region (including Egypt) would be determined by domestic factors, rather than external actors (Echaugüe 2012:93 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Not that one could expect otherwise to be true; however the EU completely disengaged itself from Egypt’s transition to democracy due to prior policy ineffectiveness. Europe re-evaluated its prior policies (ibid), understanding that the Union had to strike a balance between doing too much and doing too little (Youngs 2011:103 in Kausch and Youngs 2012), as any country in transition cannot complete the task alone. The reality became clear: as much as Western policymakers insisted that Egyptians must make the transition on their own, the unfortunate reality is that they probably could not (Hamid 2012:2).

Arab polling suggested that Europeans must stop ‘preaching’ its experiences and models of transition, as fuzzy talk of cultural partnership and shared communities leaves them

unimpressed (Youngs 2011:147 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Arabs wanted European money and the freedom to work in Europe without interventionism and top-down approaches that failed the citizens in Egypt previously (ibid). Thus, to face the ‘notably combative’ nature of the citizens in the MENA region, the EU focus was on how the EU should be doing more to foster genuine partnership, be more generous and less self-interested, listen to local voices and be more sensitive to different forms of political organization (ibid). Yet, the focus never seemed to be materialized into real action. What did the Union do from a policy perspective to champion its philosophical pivot?

Policy Instruments Utilized

Conditionality mechanisms were undefined during the pre-Arab Spring years under the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), the EU said it would ‘take the reform track record of partners during the 2010-12 period (based on annual progress reports) into account when deciding on country financial allocations for 2014 and beyond’ (Hamid 2012:2). Many admirable (by EU bureaucrats) new European policy initiatives were introduced offering support for Arab reform (Youngs 2011:145 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Such included humanitarian assistance, revised policy programs, sanctions, military intervention (to help stabilize the country) and diplomacy; the SPRING (Support for Partnership, Reform and Inclusive Growth) was put into place to organize additional financial resources of €350 million for 2011-2012 (Echagüe 2012:94-95 in Kausch and Youngs 2012).

European leaders opted for policy upgrades, where suggestions contained little that was new (Echagüe 2012:95 in Kausch and Youngs 2012): advanced status agreements (Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas), access to the EU single market, more free movement of

labor, increased amount of aid, and a plethora of people-to-people (Youngs 2011:104 in Kausch and Youngs 2012) exchanges. Finally, tools to support reform of Civil Society were upgraded to €22 million and future plans for a European Endowment for Democracy were made (Echagüe 2012:94 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). In short, very little changed from pre-Arab Spring EU policies to post-Arab Spring transitions: grand strategies, inspirational language, increased amounts of resources and vague plans of how to accomplish the goals noted in official EU documents. Based on the lesson-drawing model, where a state adopts EU rule if it expects these rules to solve domestic policy problems effectively (Schimmelfennig and Sederlmeier 2004:676), how could the Egyptian citizens accept another EU proposal of the same policy options and rule transfers that were widely unsuccessful previously?

Effects on Egyptian Society

Although it is too early to judge whether external actors will once again suffer from short-termism or commit to the long haul, the funds committed are not large enough to reflect a “Marshall Plan” type of approach as suggested by the same actors at the beginning of the transitions (Echagüe 2012:101 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Unfortunately, the direction of deliberation is reverse: policy-makers look at what is bureaucratically feasible now, and then see what such can achieve in strategic terms; what is missing is a renewed attempt to delineate the longer term implications of current changes in the region (Youngs 2011:150 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). By only relying on the ‘trickledown’ assumption of increased economic growth benefitting the poor, the EU may have missed an opportunity to maximize poverty reduction potential (Christensen 2012:4 in Commission 2013). The social learning model postulates that a state adopts EU rules if it is persuaded of the appropriateness of such rules (Schimmelfennig and

Sederlmeier 2004:676) The rules the EU wishes for Egypt to adopt are neither appropriate nor persuadable based on previous failures and the inapplicable nature to the true needs of Egyptian citizens.

Research from FRIDE revealed that civil society organizations believe strongly that generic training and transition knowledge-sharing (people-to-people exchanges) produce relatively limited results. Arab civil society groups prefer meaningful and concrete political backing to confront reform-spoilers over an endless stream of seminars (Youngs 2011:112-113 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Ministers and policy-makers rushed to project European experiences of transition (ibid), the same approach making the EU appear to be unhelpful before the Arab Spring. The EU insisted on talking and blindly placing resources into the hands of autocrats in the past when the Egyptian people wanted concrete, targeted action. The approach does not seem to have changed. Hence, the EU's policy in Egypt and the MENA region have been more of the same, only making transition to democracy longer and more resource intensive in the future. The EU's broad framework of the EMP, where 'one-size fits all', clearly did not promote democracy; in fact the policies adopted by the EU in the southern neighborhood helped exacerbate inequality and authoritarianism, spurring the Arab Spring in 2011. How did Turkey, as a growing 'middle power' of world affairs, creating relationships in Egypt, both prior to and after the Arab Spring began?

Section 5.3: The AKP's Interest in Regional, Political Islam

Turkey, following the founding of the Modern Republic, adopted a different path from those in the Arab world in general and Egypt in particular (Uysal 2012:2). The two countries maintained what some have called a "cold peace" with each other (Boyer, Katulis 2008:16).

Nationalist groups in Egypt opposed Turkey naturally as a means to be a regional competitor; the İskenderun province, which Syria has demanded sovereignty from Turkey for more than seventy years, was a political issue where Egypt's support sided with Syria (El-Labbad 2009:55).

Further, respect of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, where Syria and Iraq are both downstream and Turkey is upstream, became a talking point for the Egyptian government in the past (ibid).

During the Cold War era, Egypt and Turkey preferred their Eastern and Western camps respectively, leading to negative relations between the two (Uysal 2012:4). Hence there was significantly less contact with the Middle East until the 1980s and into the 1990s. An opening in 1996 and 1997 changed relations between Egypt and Turkey, as the Refah Party and Necmettin Erbakan began reaching out to Egypt. Erbakan sought to initialize contacts with Muslim civil society organizations abroad; one of the first contacts Erbakan made was a prominent leader of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, which deeply disturbed Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak (Raptopoulos 2004:6).

Before the Arab Spring

The same year the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) was signed in 1996, the Refah Party won in the Turkish Parliament. The Refah Party was the predecessor to the current AKP government, continuing regional integration between Turkey and Egypt during the 1990s. The AKP victory in the 2002 general elections was considered a success for the political Islamic stream in Egypt, even if Prime Minister Erdoğan did not claim to be a leading sister party akin to the Muslim Brotherhood (El-Labbad 2009:55). The AKP made such a decision to avoid suspicions from Turkey's still-strong judicial-military, which protected civilian interests against anti-secularism. Further, EU accession negotiations and reforms were the cornerstone of Turkish

foreign policy, as described in great detail above. In general, the foreign policy approaches of Turkey and Egypt diverged; Turkey faced the West and Egypt centered exclusively on the Arab-Israeli conflict (ibid). For this reason, Turkey and Egypt governmental relations were rather sparse.

In February 2004, Egyptian President Mubarak and a small delegation visited Ankara to discuss matters of the region, mainly the Iraqi invasion (Raptopoulos 2004:9). The invasion of Iraq by the USA led to a change in the status quo in the region (El-Labbad 2009:60). Turkey refused to allow the deployment of American troops, creating an environment in the Middle East where Turkey was perceived as having returned to its roots (Ozkan and Korkut 2013:168). During the first period of governance by the AKP, the rise of Anatolian businesses increased their export potential and began moving into the Middle East. Economic prosperity was no longer the product of one or two regions of Turkey, but rather of the Anatolian periphery of medium-sized enterprises, founded by pious and conservative businessmen; these ‘Anatolian Tigers’ were the backbone of the AKP coalition (Barkey 2012:2). Turkey had distanced itself from the Arab world previously (Uysal 2012:2), yet such was the case no longer.

During the second phase of the AKP government, Turkey’s commitment to the EU seemed to be weakened and slowed, coinciding with increased MENA relations (Sümer 2013:18). The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt launched a reform project based on democracy and civil liberties, rather than sharia law, inspired by the AKP success in the 2007 parliamentary elections (Uysal 2012:7). Further, a “strategic dialogue” began between Egypt and Turkey in 2008, representing a qualitative leap in relations between two countries that integrated into the international alliance with the leadership of the USA (El-Labbad 2009:59). Never before in the

history of the Turkish Republic (1923) have Egyptian-Turkish relations reached the current level of distinguished partnership (ibid).

The Arab Spring came only months before the 2011 Turkish parliamentary elections. At first, the medium-term strategy of Turkish foreign policy-makers was that authoritarian regimes in the Middle East would continue (Öniş 2012:49). The AKP, knowing general elections were approaching, diverted attention from the Arab Spring (ibid). However, Prime Minister Erdoğan was the first leader to call for Hosni Mubarak's resignation in Egypt, a televised speech on Al-Jazeera in February 2011; further, Abdullah Gül was the first head of state to meet with the Egyptian Supreme Council after the revolution (Ozkan, Korkut 2013:171). Erdoğan's call for Mubarak to step down was the first European reaction to developments in Egypt (ibid), fueling the Prime Minister's popularity in the Arab streets (Sümer 2013:20) and the country's image.

The AKP response to the Egyptian revolutions was the most potent compared to other revolutions in Tunisia and Libya (Öniş 2012:52); the government breached the "zero problems with neighbors" policy of previous thought for siding with the legitimate demands of people oppressed by autocrats (Sümer 2013:23). To spite never being a "friend" of the Turkish government (even before the emergence of Refah or the AKP), the AKP took action to oppose the Mubarak regime because the AKP took advantage of an opportunity: became the regional power of Arab people with sprouting regional allies (Çağaptay 2013:4), a position historically dominated by Egypt in the region. How did Turkey continue relations with Egypt after the revolutions 'ceased', and to be discussed later, why did Turkey breach its own policy laid out by Foreign Minister Davutoğlu?

After the Arab Spring

After winning a third general election in 2011, the AKP increasingly saw its own experience as representing an inspirational path for the MENA region's new and struggling "democracies" (Barkey 2012:5). Once the election cycle had passed, the AKP became much more active in the MENA region (Öniş 2012:51), which included several visits to Egypt from Prime Minister Erdoğan and Foreign Minister Davutoğlu (Ozkan, Korkut 2013:171). Turkey showed an outmost interest in developing relations with Egypt after the revolution (ibid). The AKP government also lent \$2 billion to the Egyptian Central Bank immediately after Mohammad Morsi took office (Chasek-Macfoy 2012).

Egyptian voters on the eve of their presidential election were asked what role Islam should play in the Egyptian political system; respondents were given six models, where 54 percent of respondents chose "Turkey" as the 'model' (Barkey 2012:1). Newly elected President of Egypt Mohammed Morsi paid one of his first visits to Turkey (Ozkan, Korkut 2013:171). In November 2012, Erdoğan and Ministers in the AKP government visited Egypt again to sign 27 strategic agreements, establishing High Level Consultation Mechanisms to deepen future relations (ibid).

For the one year of Muslim Brotherhood power in Egypt, cooperation between Egypt and Turkey seemed to be going into never-before seen territories. Relative to the EU's relationship to Egypt prior and after the Arab Spring, which consisted of several policy actions, only exacerbating the problems in Egyptian society, Turkey's relationship with Egypt was improving drastically. As protests started in Istanbul over Gezi Park's reconstruction into an Ottoman barracks, protests over the effectiveness of governance in Egypt began to surface. The Egyptian military overthrew Mohammed Morsi on July 3 2013. What occurred during the summer of 2013

and how did the EU and Turkey respond to the anti-democratic nature in which the military of Egypt conducted itself?

CHAPTER 6: DOWNTURN OF DEMOCRACY IN EGYPT

Kausch (2011:23) stated that in Egypt, quick elections under a pre-revolutionary electoral framework will not only foster destabilization, but also distort political competition in favor of well-established parties, in particular the Muslim Brotherhood (Kausch and Youngs 2012). The new government in Egypt had limited resources with which to maneuver and deliver results to the people (Echagüe 2012:102 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Both authors were correct, as the moment the Muslim Brotherhood took the reins of power, the political situation in Egypt continued to decline. Only a month after being sworn in as president, Mohammed Morsi dismissed Field Marshal Tantawi – the Defense Minister – and Lieutenant General Sami Enan, Chief of Staff of the armed forces (Yıldırım 2013:62). A deep-rooted phenomenon is the role of the military in the MENA region as a modern sector of society, protecting the interests of the people. Not only did the political decisions of Morsi receive great criticism in Egypt, but also economic performance stumbled between July 2012 and July 2013. The Muslim Brotherhood could not manage the Egyptian economy.

During the one year when the MB had controlled policy decisions, the government failed to pass new laws on subsidies, foreign investments, or the fiscal system, exacerbating economic stagnation and leading to a protraction of negotiations with the IMF (International Monetary Fund) on a \$4.8 billion soft loan (Colombo and Meringolo 2013:4). Rising prices of basic commodities and fuel, rising crime and rampant growth of the informal sector fuelled the people's revolutionary mood. The MB policy of aggressive capitalism did not keep the military in the fold, who were historically 'middlemen' for consulting and gaining access into the

Egyptian economy (Yıldırım 2013:65). The military establishment was in turn the gatekeeper to Egyptian market access, thus reaping the benefits of such an established position. The military is at the core of a business empire built around crony-capitalist practices and public-private enterprises (Colombo and Meringolo 2013:5), representing historically one-third of the Egyptian economy (Yıldırım 2013:64).

In short, the MB miscalculated severely thinking that civil-military relations could be overhauled so quickly (Yıldırım 2013:62). However, legislatively, the Brotherhood continued giving both the citizens and the secular, military establishment reasons to overthrow the government in July 2013. In November 2012, President Morsi made all of his future decisions immune from judicial review, a decision later annulled due to protests (Latek 2013:2). Further, the immediate political settlement between the MB and the army excluded all actors who took part of the revolution just a year prior: youth revolutionary forces, opposition parties and movements, women, civil society, and Christians (Colombo, Meringolo 2013:2). Protests continued against Morsi up to June 2013, Morsi nominated 17 MB-affiliated governors (ibid) amid the Tamarrod campaign (a group looking to rejuvenate a secular opposition).

“On 3 July 2013, the military takeover, following mass demonstrations in Cairo against President Mohammed Morsi, abruptly ended the Muslim Brotherhood's democratic period in government, which had been difficult from the beginning” (Latek 2013:1). In August, the interim government killed hundreds, injured and arrested thousands of MB supporters, unleashing deadly, brutal and reckless force against its own people (The Economist 2013:11, Latek 2013:2). Further, assets of the Brotherhood were frozen and the President was also arrested (Baldé 2013). On 3 September, MB members were sentenced to life in prison (The Telegraph 2013). All

activities of the Brotherhood, its NGO and affiliated groups were banned by court order and all assets were seized on 23 September 2013 (Latek 2013:2).

The Brotherhood was dissolved as an NGO on 9 October (Anadolu Agency 2013), and Mohammed Morsi faced his trial in early November (Sirgany 2013). In short, the Muslim Brotherhood was cast as a terrorist group (after attacking the Ministry of the Interior Building) and banned from political life by the second transitional government in Egypt since 2011. The EU and Turkey took differing approaches to the events that unfolded in 2013, where the EU did not do enough and Turkey may have done too much to express concern over the downturn of democracy in Egypt.

Section 6.1: The EU Approach

Following the military overthrow, the EU resorted to several dialogues, statements and remarks from the various organs of the Union. High Representative Catherine Ashton of the EEAS gave at least twelve separate statements on various meetings with Egyptian citizens, EU organs and opinions of how to address the growing instability in Egypt. “We are here to help. We are not here to impose... I am not here to ask people to do things... This is your country, this is the Egyptian people’s country and they must decide together how to go forward” (Ashton 2013). The Presidents of the European Council and European Commission offered condolences for the families of those who died in the middle of August in Egypt, stating, “We regret deeply that international efforts and proposals for building bridges and establishing an inclusive political process, to which the EU contributed actively, were set aside and a course of confrontation was instead pursued (EUCO176/13). European Council President Herman Van Rompuy added in a separate statement: “The shocking killings in August took over 1,000 lives. This could have been

avoided” (Van Rompuy 2013). He continued by applauding Catherine Ashton’s efforts in mediating between parties, stressing the need to continue political dialogue and address structural economic problems before they get out of hand (Van Rompuy 2013).

An ‘extraordinary meeting’ of the Foreign Affairs Council was convened on August 21st 2013, which highlighted the previous statements cited above, the economic agreements which the EU has signed with Egypt since 2004, and the amount of aid which had been given to Egypt from 2007-2013 (again, mentioned in the European Court of Auditors report, cited above). “Non-compliance” with agreed conditions was noted as a reason why disbursement levels decreased over the time period (FAC 2013). The only policy change over time had been less aid given to Egypt and a ban on military equipment sales from individual member states of the EU.

The meeting was made most extraordinary by the lack of legitimate critique pointed towards the EU and its own policy related to Egypt. Finally, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on September 12 2013, replicating the same decrees as High Representative for the EEAS, the European Council and European Commission (RSP 2013). Meanwhile, the AKP government and NGO affiliates not only spoke like many EU organs did regarding Egypt’s instability, but acted in a manner that resulted in the ambassador from Turkey to Egypt being forced to leave Cairo in November 2013.

Section 6.2: The AKP Approach

The AKP took a different approach to the downturn in Egypt, by engaging and speaking with a message that was rare in Turkish foreign policy rhetoric. First, Foreign Minister Davutoğlu called army’s overthrow of Morsi a “military coup” and “unacceptable” only one day after the coup happened (Burch 2013). Further, Deputy Prime Minister Bekir Bozdağ tweeted the

West's insincerity towards Egypt, wondering why statements from those promoting democracy had not come to the forefront (ibid). On July 10, the Turkish Saadet Party hosted a conference featuring several global MB and Hamas leaders, offering a strategy of 'patience' towards the situation in Egypt (Abdel Kader 2013). "After Egyptian forces opened fire on 'pro-democracy' supporters at Rab'a al-Adaweya Square, which resulted in 200 dead and over 4,500 wounded, Turkish NGOs rallied in front of the Egyptian Embassy in Ankara on July 27; rallies were held throughout Turkey, from Istanbul to Adana (Anadolu Agency 2013***)." Prime Minister Erdoğan also called for a United Nations Security Council consultative session on the extreme nature of the 'coup' (DW.de 2013).

As relations between Turkey and Egypt began to sour, both countries recalled their ambassadors from the others' capital city (Fahim and Arsu 2013). "Rab'a" is not only the name of a mosque and square in Egypt (where MB protests and killings occurred), but also the same term for the number four in Arabic. Prime Minister Erdoğan began saluting crowds in Bursa (Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty 2013) on August 17 and again in Ankara on August 23 (r4biaplatform.com 2013****), showing solidarity and a symbol of freedom for the Egyptian people. The AKP approach went so far as to critique other countries in the MENA region for not supporting democratically elected governments in Egypt; Deputy Prime Minister Bozdağ called on the Secretary General of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), a Turkish diplomat, to resign for not condemning former President Morsi's removal (Seibert 2013). The "meritorious isolation" from partners on both the western and eastern borders would 'blow up bridges', one political scientist noted in the article (Seibert 2013).

In early September, Turkey returned its ambassador to Cairo (Moon 2013), and once again Istanbul was the site of another conference on September 25-26, discussing subjects such

as an “Islamic Parliamentarians union” (MB members) and “parliamentarians for transparency” (Abdel Kader 2013). Erdoğan gave the Rab’a salute one more time to an audience in Kosovo in October (Mauro 2013). Relations reached an apex when both ambassadors from Turkey and Egypt were kicked out of the others’ country on November 23, 2013 (DW.de 2013**). As one can plainly observe, the commitment to supporting democratically elected governments was stark between Turkey and the EU in the above-presented case of Egypt. The AKP government did not shy away from a rights’ based approach, even when other actors in the neighborhood and geopolitical actors were silent. What could potentially explain the approaches held by both the EU and Turkey in the case of Egypt’s “transition” of democracy?

Section 6.3: Justifications for (non-)Action in Egypt

The EU

The European Union, knowing that it could not provide membership status for Egypt, had to create an additional policy for countries alike that could not meet the requirements to become a Member State. Hence, the impact of the EU on Egypt would be lessened from the start. Simultaneously, the Union had to avoid creating a dividing line between countries who could be Member States and those who could not for the purposes to having a degree of influence in the entire neighborhood. Unfortunately for the EU and Egypt, the policy of the ENP created a dividing line where countries who can become Member States have more rigorous conditionality measures, receive more aid, and have greater access to the benefits deriving from the EU. Even more unfortunate is the reality that the EU created such a policy, not knowing what would happen, and now has less operating space to make a difference in Egypt.

The people from the MENA region do not want the EU to be engaged in domestic affairs; although tangible help is welcome (Youngs 2011:147 in Kausch and Youngs 2012). Arab protests were in the name of freedom from the West and not in aspiration of joining a ‘Western project’, yet ‘Western’ actors such as the EU do not seem to be understanding this basic concept (ibid). The prior policies of many ‘Western’ actors were catalysts for the revolutions across the MENA, but not in a positive manner. The EU did not have an ideological connection with those who were protesting, even if official EU organs claimed so. The bureaucratic mindset of responding to regional dynamics in MENA cannot be embellishing existing frameworks or creating another ineffectual acronym (ibid). In this context, the superior bargaining power of the external agency (the EU), crucial to the function of rewards and any form of conditionality (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:673), became nonexistent.

Further, the bureaucratic mindset only shows a continued strategic interest in keeping a previous status quo, due to the ineffective nature of previous policy arrangements deriving from Brussels. Thus, when the MB (with its ‘anti-western’ approach), was overthrown by the military, the EU did nothing innovative because the interest in keeping the MB in power in Egypt was very low. The EU always considered the MENA region a place where fundamentalism and extremism could be bred (El Molla 2009:4); thus how can we assume the EU felt differently as the MB was overthrown in Egypt. Hence, the EU as a regional organization was very slow to react to the needs of those being overthrown. One should point out, however, that the slow nature of the EU is not relevant only to the case presented above.

The AKP

There are several potential reasons why the AKP reacted in stark contrast to the EU between July and November 2013. The AKP diplomatically isolated itself from Egypt, but why? First, as the AKP realized that “zero problems with neighbors” was not realizable as the Arab Spring began, the government started picking ‘winners and losers’. Ideological affiliation was the metric for choosing who to support, where the MB affiliation to the AKP government (whether seen or unseen) is close. The AKP has been present at several conferences in Istanbul and Ankara for International Muslim Brotherhood (IMB) functions (Merley 2011:27-35,81). Further, the rise of Gülen Movement (Turkish religious group with ten schools alone in Egypt) followers (Cemaat) in the Foreign Ministry and AKP government has increased significantly since 2002 (ibid). The Arab Spring provided the AKP with the opportunity to create a belt of moderate Islamist regimes in the region (Murinson 2012:17). Foreign Minister Davutoğlu, as early as 2011, was calling for an “Axis of Democracy” between Egypt and Turkey (Fouad 2011). Thus, Turkey had a lot to lose with the overthrow of an ideologically-minded regime in Egypt due to the AKP’s prior turn away from the EU.

Second, as Foreign Minister Davutoğlu is an academic and practitioner, the way in which he rationalizes and justifies Turkish foreign policy calculations is worth noting. In October 2013, the Foreign Minister produced an academic article stressing the importance of “humanitarian diplomacy.” As the AKP took a third general election in 2011, greater confidence to step out as a bolder, more active stakeholder in the Middle East ensued (Öniş 2011:59). Given that Turkey now has the ability to take an active stance in global affairs, by nature, humanitarian diplomacy has become part of Turkish foreign policy (Davutoğlu 2013:866). He states that Turkey should be a compassionate and powerful state, neither weak nor tyrant in practice (ibid). He pushes an

agenda of increasing free movement of Turkish citizens to the “widest extent possible”, multi-channelled diplomacy ranging from both Turkish public and private institutions, and to uphold universal humanitarian values without intervening in third country affairs (ibid). He mentions Egypt, stating that Turkey will side with human dignity and will not support those who ignore legitimate demands from the citizens (ibid). In this respect, one can see how the Foreign Minister attempts to justify past and future actions through philosophical literature. The policies which will be followed in the future are unknown. If one examines the rhetoric and actions taken in Egypt during 2013, one might suggest that Turkish foreign policy will attempt to be more focused on people and less on government, which could isolate the country in future diplomatic situations which might occur.

Finally, if one establishes that Anatolian businesses, the constituency for the AKP, are increasingly looking to conduct international business, one must look at the quasi-public role (Buğra in Atlı 2011:111) of business associations in Turkey. Some business associations have been in charge of coordinating bilateral foreign economic relations and guiding the government (AKP) in this respect (Yılmaz in Atlı 2011:125). In short, business associations have an instrumental role in Turkey’s foreign policy, as long as they remain loyal to state actors (Atlı 2011:126). Turkish exports to Egypt increased ten-fold between 2003 and 2012 (Turkish Statistical Institute 2013*), and significantly increased between 2008 and 2012, when the AKP began to be more aggressive and confident in the eastern neighborhood. Further, aid to Palestinian territories, originating from the AKP and Turkey, passed through Egypt; the convoy consisted of 200 Turkish citizens and five AKP deputies (Merley 2011:74). Thus, Egypt’s significance to economic integration among the AKP constituency and aid in other foreign policy matters was crucial. Therefore, the AKP needed a “friendly” regime in Egypt.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

The EU foreign policy created a dividing line between countries that could be future potential Member States (Turkey) and those countries which cannot (Egypt); such is evident by the clear mandate and backing of the EU in the context of Turkish reforms and the lack of mandate due to poor policy implementation in Egypt. The dividing line of how to approach countries of different statuses has also not been effective over time, as the AKP government used the EU enlargement policy to increase constituency power, suppress institutional foes (high courts and military) and tout (potentially undeservingly) one of the biggest economic ‘success’ stories in a time of financial recession.

Rule transfer, focused on the adoption of EU rules in non-member states, also known as the institutionalization at the domestic level (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:670), did occur; however the rules were neither sustained nor followed in past rhetoric due to the EU’s lack of credibility and consistency in the allocation of rewards. If the EU were perceived to subordinate to other political, strategic or economic considerations (mainly, the ‘additional protocol’ crisis), the target state might either hope to receive the benefits without fulfilling the conditions or conclude that it will not receive the rewards at any rate; in both cases, the state will fail to adopt EU rules (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004:674). Given such a context, one would find it difficult to argue that the EU has been a successful actor of norm diffusion in its neighborhood; when the AKP ceased to implement reforms for Turkish citizens while simultaneously breaching its own foreign policy principles described in 2007, the EU mandate had been instrumentally used for the purpose of the AKP, and neither for the EU nor Turkish

citizens. Further, when the Turkish government shows a more staunch commitment (in rhetoric) to democracy in Egypt than did the EU (in action), the EU commitment to promoting democracy is undermined significantly.

For the EU, the Union needs to move beyond a bureaucratic mindset, overcoming the perspective that the ‘southern neighborhood’ is a burden to be lightened (Youngs 2011:153 in Kausch and Youngs 2012); when the policy of contained fundamentalism is overturned by a less-wasteful use of resources, the EU’s rhetoric and action will be reconciled. Also, the EU needs to reconcile the differences within the Union over “hard interests” and “soft power.” The EU created different policies towards Turkey and Egypt, not having the full mandate of the EU value system or credibility of an end reward (accession) at the disposal of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. When support for the decreased military and judiciary role in Turkey was demanded by the EU, the AKP pushed through reform, knowing the EU would support the decision. Such a context was not available for the MB and their similar military-judicial complex. During several instances, the EU warned that political upheaval from the courts or military would not look positive for future EU accessions in Turkey. The exact opposite happened in Egypt. When the MB attempted to solve military-civilian relations in a similarly-short period of time, the EU was not a supportive force; the MB was kicked out of office, undemocratically, after only one year of governance.

Thus, commitment from the EU to countries in the immediate neighborhood (accession or non-accession alike) needs to be consistent over time and across policy areas, regardless of the country. If not, countries will be subject to cross-conditionality (as was the case in Turkey) or a blatant disregard for ‘democratic’ provisions in bilateral agreements (as was the case in Egypt). Because the EU did not have a mandate to act in Egyptian affairs beyond giving significant

resources to autocrats, the Turkish government filled the void with economic and ideological considerations of the AKP and its constituency. Hence, the EU and Turkey were not coordinating foreign policies, but rather competing against respective foreign policies. In the case of the EU, strategic preferences of the Union and the containment of Islam were the outcome of the military overthrow of Egypt in 2013, as action was not met with rhetoric denouncing the overthrow. In Turkey's case, strategic preferences of increasing the AKP constituency's economic power became the objective amid souring relations between Turkey and Egypt. Thus, the Turkish and EU relationship must be rekindled to address regional issues of both countries.

However, two factors must be considered. First, how does the EU achieve the goal of increased foreign policy cooperation with Turkey? As one can plainly see, increased conditionality (additional requirements for accession) from the EU to Turkey in the past (2006-2007) had devastating results for preserving reforms within Turkey. If the enlargement policy did not work in Turkey (as of today), the EU using similar tools of enlargement will not work either in recalibrating strategic, convergent interests. Hence, how does the EU begin to formulate a strategic, coordinated foreign policy strategy with countries in its immediate neighborhood in an innovative fashion? Certainly, more research can be done on this topic.

Second, one must question the trustworthiness of Turkey as a partner to the EU and the 'West' at-large in the future, regardless of its accession status. If the AKP continues dominance in domestic political affairs in the near future (presidential elections in 2014 and parliamentary elections in 2015), how can the government be trusted with its increasingly anti-Western rhetoric, furthered economic integration into the East, and record of deviance when it comes to lasting democratic reforms? Will Turkey have to 'go its own way' because previous alliances are now defunct, whether it is with the EU or the USA? The overconfidence of the AKP is evident,

but the long-term ramifications could be negative vis-à-vis the short-term benefits (Öniş 2011:49). Although Turkey has a potential role of mediator in key international conflicts, its ability to play such a role rests on the assumption of adopting a neutral position (ibid), a course which has not been followed since the Arab Spring began. If Turkish foreign policy is changing from “strategic depth” to “humanitarian diplomacy,” the role of Turkey in international affairs will also have to change. Turkey cannot be a mediator, central country and pick sides simultaneously.

For Egypt, political party strength in the post-Arab Spring was only strong enough to attain power, but not strong enough to maintain power. Although democratization is a long process of struggle and readjustment that may lead to a more participatory governing system in the long-run (Norlén and Rivero 2012:2), the strength of civil society in Egypt is a catalyst for revolution when stability reaches new low points. That same intensity by NGO groups and civil society at-large needs to translate into political parties, and not only political demands; hence, if any actor wishes to help Egypt transition from authoritarianism to another form of government, resources should be focused more on society, and not only on government structures. In this way, Turkey and the EU failed the Egyptian people, focusing on institutional power rather than what the citizens actually desired (a basic tenet of democracy). Although Egypt’s democracy is unlikely to emerge in the future, greater enhancement of civil society organization and legitimate commitment from international actors (in the long term) could produce a more efficient government which responds to the demands of citizens in Egypt.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Kader, Mohammad. "Turkey's relationship with the Muslim Brotherhood." Al Arabiya News 14 October 2013, Perspective: Al Arabiya Institute for Studies. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/perspective/alarabiya-studies/2013/10/14/Turkey-s-relationship-with-the-Muslim-Brotherhood.html>>.
- Açıkmeşe, Sinem Akgül. "Cycles of Europeanization in Turkey: The Domestic Impact of EU Political Conditionality." UNISCI Discussion Papers. 23 (2010): 129-148. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Altunışık, Meliha Benli. "The Possibilities and Limits of Turkey's Soft Power in the Middle East." Insight Turkey. 10.2 (2008): 41-54. Print. <<http://files.setav.org/uploads/Pdf/insight-turkey---10---2--meliha-benli-altunisik.pdf>>.
- Ashton, Catherine. European Union. European External Action Service. Remarks by EU High Representative Catherine Ashton during her visit in Egypt. Cairo: European Union, 2013. Web.
- Atlı, Altay. "Businessmen as Diplomats: The Role of Business Associations in Turkey's Foreign Economic Policy." Insight Turkey. 13.1 (2011): 109-128. Print.
- Baldé, Assanatou. "Egypte : les Frères musulmans décapités !." Afrik.com [Paris] 23 September 2013, n. page. Web. 12 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.afrik.com/egypte-les-freres-musulmans-decapites>>.
- Barkey, Henri J. "The Evolution of Turkish Foreign Policy in the Middle East." TESEV Foreign Policy Programme. (2012): 1-8. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Boyer, Spencer P., and Brian Katulis. "The Neglected Alliance - Restoring U.S.–Turkish Relations to Meet 21st Century Challenges." Neglected Alliance. (2008): 1-42. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Börzel, Tanja A., and Thomas Risse. "Diffusing (Inter-) Regionalism: The EU as a Model of Regional Integration." KFG- Transformative Power of Europe Working Paper. 7 (2009): 1-26. Print.
- Burch, Jonathon. Turkey says Mursi's removal in Egypt an unacceptable 'coup' [Istanbul] 4 July 2013, n. pag. Web. 9 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.reuters.com/article /2013/07/04/us-egypt-protests-turkey-idUSBRE9630AJ20130704>>.
- Cengiz, Firat, and Lars Hoffmann. "Rethinking Conditionality: Turkey's European Union Accession and the Kurdish Question." Journal of Common Market Studies. 51.3 (2013): 416-432. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Chasek-Macfoy, Noah. "Turkish loan signals strengthening ties." Daily News Egypt 1 October 2012, n. pag. Web. 9 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.dailynewsegypt.com/2012/10/01/turkish-loan-signals-strengthening-ties/>>.

- Christensen, Peter. European Union. European Commission. Evaluation of the European Union's Trade-related Assistance in Third Countries. Brussels: European Commission, 2013. Web.
- Çağaptay, Soner. "Ankara's Middle East Policy Post Arab Spring." Policy Notes: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. 16 (2013): 1-7. Web. 9 Apr. 2014. <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyNote16_Cagaptay2.pdf>.
- Dalay, Galip, and Dov Friedman. "The AK Party and the Evolution of Turkish Political Islam's Foreign Policy." *Insight Turkey*. 15.2 (2013): 123-139. Print.
- Danforth, Nick. "How the West Lost Turkey." *Foreign Policy*. 25 11 2009: n. page. Web. 7 Apr. 2014. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/11/25/how_the_west_lost_turkey>.
- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. "Turkey's Foreign Policy Vision: An Assessment of 2007." *Insight Turkey*. 10.1 (2008): 77-96. Print.
- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. "Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: objectives, challenges and prospects." *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. 41.6 (2013): 865-870. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Echagüe, Ana. "The Role of External Actors in the Arab Transitions." *Trans. Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2012. 93-102. Print.
- El-Labbad, Mustafa. "Understanding the New Turkey: An Egyptian Perspective." *Insight Turkey*. 11.1 (2009): 53-61. Print.
- El Molla, Nesreen Khaled. "The EU's Role in Political Reform and Democracy Building in the Southern Mediterranean Region: An Egyptian Perspective." *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance*. (2009): 1-14. Print.
- "European Parliament resolution of 12 September 2013 on the situation in ." *European Parliament*. European Parliament, 12 Sep 2013. Web. 17 Feb 2014. <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2013-0379&language=EN>>.
- European Union. European Commission. Eurobarometer surveys. Brussels: European Commission, 2013. Web. <http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm>.
- European Union. European Council - The President. Joint statement by President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy and President of the European Commission José Manuel Barroso on Egypt. Brussels: European Council, 2013. Web.
- European Union. European Council - The President. Speech by President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy at the Annual Conference of EU Heads of Delegation. Brussels: European Council, 2013. Web.
- European Union. European Court of Auditors. EU Cooperation with Egypt in the Field of Governance. Luxembourg: European Court of Auditors , 2013. Web.

- European Union. European Court of Auditors. EU Support for Governance in Egypt – “well-intentioned but ineffective”, say EU Auditors. Luxembourg: European Court of Auditors, 2013. Web.
- European Union. European External Action Service. Remarks by EU High Representative Catherine Ashton during her visit in Egypt. Cairo: European Union, 2013. Web.
- FAC- Foreign Affairs Council. European Union. Background. Brussels: Foreign Affairs Council, 2013. Web.
- Fahim, Kareem, and Sebnem Arsu. "Egypt Expels Turkey's Ambassador, Further Fraying Diplomatic Ties." *New York Times* [Cairo] 23 November 2013, n. pag. Web. 9 Apr. 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/24/world/middleeast/diplomatic-ties-fraying-between-egypt-and-turkey.html?_r=0>.
- Fouad, T. "Egypt and Turkey, an Axis against Democracy." *democrati.net*. democrati.net, 30 Sep 2011. Web. 10 Apr 2014. <<http://democrati.net/2011/09/30/egypt-and-turkey-an-axis-against-democracy/>>.
- "'Four-Finger Salute' Shows Solidarity With Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty* 24 August 2013, Transmission. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.rferl.org/content/egypt-four-finger-salute/25085068.html>>.
- Hamid, Shadi. "A democratic transition in trouble: the need for aid conditionality in Egypt." 20 Jul 2012: 1-3. Print.
- Kausch, Kristina, and Richard Youngs. eds. *European in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2012. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Kausch, Kristina. "Constitutional Reform in Young Arab Democracies." *Trans. Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2011. 15-24. Print.
- Kausch, Kristina. "Islamist-led Foreign Policies: What Implications?." *Trans. Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2012. 157-166. Print.
- Kausch, Kristina. "Political Parties in Young Arab Democracies." *Trans. Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2012. 81-92. Print.
- Kubicek, Paul. "Political conditionality and European Union's cultivation of democracy in Turkey." *Democratization*. 18.4 (2011): 910-931. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Latek, Marta. European Union. European Parliamentary Research Service. *Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood experience*. European Parliament, 2013. Print.
- Lavenex, Sandra and Frank Schimmelfennig. "EU democracy promotion in the neighbourhood: from leverage to governance?." *Democratization*. 18.4 (2011): 885-909. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Lazarou, Elena, Maria Gianniou, and Gerasimos Tsourapas. "The Limits of Norm Promotion: The EU in Egypt and Israel/Palestine." *Insight Turkey*. 15.2 (2013): 171-193. Print.

- Mauro, Ryan. "Turkey PM Erdogan Unabashed in Support of Muslim Brotherhood." The Clarion Project. The Clarion Project, 31 Oct 2013. Web. 10 Apr 2014. <<http://www.clarionproject.org/analysis/turkey-pm-erdogan-unabashed-support-muslim-brotherhood>>.
- Merley, Steven G. "Turkey, the Global Muslim Brotherhood and the Gaza Flotilla." Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. (2011): 1-117. Print.
- Mikail, Barah. "Religion and Politics in Arab Transitions." Trans. Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East. Madrid: FRIDE, 2012. 25-34. Print.
- Moon, Timur. "Egypt Arrests Turkish 'Spy' Rasit Oguz as Relations with Ankara Sour." International Business Times 14 September 2013, Politics. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/egypt-arrests-turkish-spy-rasit-oguz-506079>>.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. "Europe: The quiet superpower." French Politics. 7.3/4 (2009): 403-422. Print.
- Murinson, Alexander. "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century." Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies. (2012): 1-35. Print.
- Norlén, Tova, and Rubén Rivero. "Egypt now: democratic spring, Arab awakening or populist winter?." . N.p., 13 Jun 2012. Print. 5 May 2013.
- Ozkan, Mehmet, and Hasan Korkut. "Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Arab Revolutions." Epiphany - Journal of transdisciplinary studies . 6.1 (2013): 162-181. Print.
- Öniş, Ziya. "Multiple Faces of the "New" Turkish Foreign Policy: Underlying Dynamics and a Critique." Insight Turkey. 13.1 (2011): 47-65. Print.
- Öniş, Ziya. "Turkey and the Arab Spring: Between Ethics and Self-Interest." Insight Turkey. 14.3 (2012): 45-63. Print.
- Raptopoulos, Nikolaus. "Rediscovering its Arab neighbours? The AKP imprint on Turkish Foreign Policy in the Middle East." Les Cahiers du RMES. 1 (2004): 1-13. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- *Republic of Turkey. Turkish Statistical Institute. TurkStat. Ankara: Republic of Turkey, Web. <<http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist>>.
- Rizvi, Hasan-Askari. "National Security Council: A debate on institutions and processes for decision-making on security issues." PILDAT Discussion Paper. (2012): 1-32. Web. 8 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.pildat.org/publications/publication/CMR/NationalSecurityCouncil-debateonInstitutionsandprocessesfordecisionmakingonsecurityissues.pdf>>.
- Rousseau, Richard. "Turkey and Egypt: Scenarios in the Aftermath of Arab Spring." (2011): 1-7. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.

- Saatçioğlu, Beken. "Unpacking the Compliance Puzzle - The Case of Turkey's AKP under EU Conditionality." KFG- Transformative Power of Europe Working Paper. 14 (2010): 1-30. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Ulrich Sedelmeier. "Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy*. 11.4 (2004): 669-687. Print.
- Seibert, Thomas. "Turkey remains defiant with support of Morsi, Muslim Brotherhood." *National*. 25 Aug 2013: n. page. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.thenational.ae/news/world/middle-east/turkey-remains-defiant-with-support-of-morsi-muslim-brotherhood>>.
- Sözen, Ahmet. "A Paradigm Shift in Turkish Foreign Policy: Transition and Challenges." *Turkish Studies*. 11.1 (2010): 103-123. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Sümer, Fahrettin. "Turkey's Changing Foreign Policy and the Arab Spring." *Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*. 18.1 (2013): 1-28. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- Toktaş, Şule, and Ümit Kurt. "The Turkish Military's Autonomy, JDP Rule and the EU Reform Process in the 2000s: An Assessment of the Turkish Version of Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DECAF)." *Turkish Studies*. 11.3 (2010): 387-403. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- "The EU's Role in Political Reform and Democracy Building in the Southern Mediterranean Region: An Egyptian Perspective." *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance*. El Molla.Nesreen Khaled (2009): 1-14. Web. 17 Feb. 2014.
- **"Turkey kicks Egypt's ambassador out of Ankara." *DW.de*. 23 November 2013, Top Stories. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.dw.de/turkey-kicks-egypts-ambassador-out-of-ankara/a-17248023>>.
- ***"Turkish non-governmental organizations protest Rab'a massacre." *Anadolu Agency [Ankara]* 27 July 2013, n. pag. Web. 10 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.aa.com.tr/en/rss/208931-c>>.
- ****"Turkish PM greets crowd with 'Rabia' sign." *www.r4biaplatform.com*. r4biaplatform.com, 23 Aug 2013. Web. 10 Apr 2014. <<http://www.r4biaplatform.com/content/turkish-pm-greets-crowd-rabia-sign>>.
- "UN Security Council calls urgent meeting on Egypt." *DW.de*. 15 August 2013, n. pag. Web. 9 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.dw.de/un-security-council-calls-urgent-meeting-on-egypt/a-17023316>>.
- Uysal, Ahmet. "The Perception about Turkey in the Middle East: Case of Egypt." *SDE Perspectives*. SDE - Institute of Strategic Thinking, n.d. Web. 17 Feb 2014.
- Van Rompuy, Herman. European Union. European Council - The President. Speech by President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy at the Annual Conference of EU Heads of Delegation. Brussels: European Council, 2013. Web.

Yıldırım, A. Kadir. "Military, Political Islam, and the Future of Democracy in Egypt." *Insight Turkey*. 15.4 (2013): 61-68. Print.

Youngs, Richard. "What Not to do in the Middle East and North Africa." Trans. *Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2011. 103-114. Print.

Youngs, Richard. "The EU and the Arab Spring: From Munificence to Geo-Strategy." Trans. *Array Europe in the Reshaped Middle East*. Madrid: FRIDE, 2011. 145-156. Print.