TURKEY FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY: A STUDY OF HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY

[1]Mohd Ikbal Mohd Huda, [2]Nabiela Ismail

[12]*Centre For History, Politics and International Affairs, Faculty Of Social Sciences & Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

Abstract

Turkey a rising middle power in international politics is known for its assertive behaviour. Having gone through a phase of reformation in their foreign policy structure, Turkey under the Justice and Development Party (AKP), being led by Recep Tayyib Erdogan emerged as a Muslim identity nation with a conservative democracy prevailing ideology. Turkey, which was once known for its secularism under Ataturk has displayed significant shifts in the uphold of religious values among the ruling power. By the end of the year 2020, Turkey has been recognized by the UNHCR as the largest host of refugees worldwide. While the country prides its enthusiasm on humanitarian aides, there has been an observation that this is the way Turkey is conducting its humanitarian diplomacy in international relations, as well as a part of its foreign policy strategy. Humanitarian diplomacy emerged as a concept in the early 2000s. In the effort of persuading decision-makers and leaders to act, at all times and in all circumstances, in the interest of vulnerable people and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles. Foreign policy and strategic interests increasingly overlap in the contemporary scenario. This transformation of power in Turkey is a result of internal and external developments that have contributed to the shift from being a "hard power" to "soft power" over the last few decades. The mission behind humanitarian diplomacy is to avoid the securitization of issues into security issues, while diplomatic relations should take precedence in tackling global challenges. This article examine the limits and challenges of humanitarian diplomacy to be an alternative approach to smart power strategy.

Keywords: Turkey, Foreign Policy Strategy, Humanitarian, Diplomacy, Challenges.

SOFT POWER PURSUIT

We have witnessed a significantly new transformation among global powers as Turkey, a member of NATO shifted its foreign policy structure from a "hard power" to a "soft power". As defined by Joseph Nye (1990), soft power is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment. A country's soft power rests on its resources of culture, values, and policies.

While a smart power strategy combines both hard and soft power resources. In the quest for soft power, diplomacy plays a pivotal role in foreign policy structure. Moreover, diplomacy is readily conducted in various ways depending on the need and capability of the power. One of the most common and popular types of diplomacy, public diplomacy has a long history as a means of promoting a country's soft power. Public diplomacy was the most essential element in winning the longstanding geopolitical tension between the United States and the Soviet Union with respective allies during the Cold War. Since the coming of humanitarian diplomacy, the discourse on public diplomacy is viewed to have an

alternative approach that is aimed specifically at humanitarian development that could bring benefits to mutual parties involved.

The aspect of power includes when one country gets other countries to want what it wants, contradicts with hard power, soft power applies the command in a way to order others to do what it wants. While in the effort to collect the "weapons" and "equipment" to conducting its soft power strategy, public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of smart power rather than hard power. Smart power constitutes a smart public diplomacy strategy that requires an understanding of the roles of credibility, self-criticism, and civil society in generating soft power. It is not a new phenomenon that the resources of soft power comprised of cultural attraction, international institutions, and ideologies. It is through the intricacies of these values, soft power has the ability to creep in minute details in influencing the way one perceives an idea, hence transforming their innate beliefs in a subject. This is how powerful soft power strategy is as it creeps into the minds of the people, which in this regard, targeting decision-makers within crucial departments of leadership in politics.

Josephy Nye (1990) discussed the potential of humanitarian diplomacy to be an alternative approach to smart power strategy. However, this idea seems to have left some voids in the research gap as the concept of humanitarianism convolutes diplomacy. Soft power is a form of meta-power. Meta-power is the product of power which is fixed within social relations that influence the relations and the outcomes that develop from the interactions between actors (Davutoğlu, A., 2013). This explains further the involvement of soft power includes not the only state as an actor, but also international organizations and community at large to be willing to participate in accomplishing the objective.

Depending on the geopolitical needs, a state's foreign policy strategy takes the shift in transforming from a "hard power" to a "soft power". Soft power is taking the national resources that can help the country's ability to affect others through accepting the means,

persuading, and extracting positive attraction to gain preferred outcomes. (Tilovska-Kechedji, 2018) Opposite of soft power is the hard power which is the ability of a country to use its military or economic might and it is a forceful force. As the instruments of power change, so do strategies in the conduct of foreign policy. As Joseph Nye (1990) suggests, "The fragmentation of world politics into many different spheres has made power resources less fungible. Instead, money is fungible, in that it can be easily converted from one currency to another. Power has always been less fungible than money". For a state to utilize the money to control power in the conduct of its foreign policy strategy shows the intuitive move one can acquire.

Soft power elements include various aspects such as ideology, culture, values, health, religion, and history. Many factors contribute to the initiation of soft power capacity including relative economic progress, and increased diplomatic presence in foreign regions as well as closer diplomatic ties through bilateral relationships, and also the expansion of air travel routes as an impact from fostering familiar foreign relations. These are the tools often utilized in objectifying soft power. Hard power and soft power are linked because they are both aspects of the ability to achieve one's purpose by affecting others. The distinction between them is in the nature of the behaviour and the distinction of the resources. In the case of Turkey, "soft power potential extends over the former Ottoman territories, representing the new geopolitical imagination, which takes root in Ahmet Davutoğlu's foreign policy doctrine". (Akpınar, 2013)

Another argument is that the main difference between soft power and hard power stems from 'logic of action' that governs the behaviour of agents, (Oğuzlu, 2007) which in this context is referring to a state. If a significant logic of action were in consideration, meaning if the foreign policy goal were to force others to make a cost-benefit analysis through coercing or alluring strategies, then one would plausibly talk about hard power. If the end goal of foreign policy were to ensure that others would automatically obey the game rule of the

dominant power due to the force of attraction the dominant has in the eyes of the dependence, then one could refer to the existence of soft power. This study analyses the implementation of soft power and public diplomacy within Turkish foreign policy under the Justice and Development Party (AKP) ruling in the year of 2000s in the reformation process of mentality and institutional framework of the country.

The main research question of this article is that why did Turkey shift towards soft power and implementing public diplomacy in the configuration of humanitarian diplomacy for the first time in the years the 2000s during the administration of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) era? The fundamental argument of this question is made on the observation of a new vision and identity of the ruling party leaders effectiveness in the transformation process that facilitates "the shift towards soft power and public diplomacy in foreign policy strategy within a modern understanding". (Muharrem & EROL) Moreover, the pursuit of a "soft power" policy has also been gaining popularity in managing diplomatic ties as a potential strategy for states in building their global brands which eventually leads to the power of dominance.

HUMANITARIANISM & HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY

As it has been discussed earlier, diplomacy is an essential tool in achieving the objective of soft power. State uses humanitarian diplomacy in practice as a form of balancing conflicts, especially during vulnerable situations. The act of benevolence serves as a significant symbol to rekindle any severed ties for broken relations and enhancing the relations between close acquaintances.

Fundamentally, diplomacy forms the basis for the effort in peacemaking, economics, culture and trade wars between two nations with unsteady relations. This process requires creativity in the communication of various representatives in performing negotiations. Some notable quotes on diplomacy featured by a distinguished figure in the field of

international relations are Henry Kissinger where he recalled "diplomacy is an art of restraining power". In addition to that, Zhou Enlai cites "All diplomacy is a continuation of war by other means." President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas quotes: "We have always hoped American diplomacy to deploy itself in dialogue and persuasion rather than by ultimatums. That is the path we want in international relations". As observed in the quotes by these dignitaries, the essence of diplomacy revolves around the idea of peacemaking without coercion. As compulsion is not involved in diplomacy, persuasion will become a lengthy proceeding to influence the mindset by using an emotional and psychological approach.

The main functions of diplomacy are aiming at four objectives. It is imperative to have a goal in diplomacy that is standardized as diplomat posts are changing personnel throughout time but the functions of diplomacy will always remain. The significance of humanitarian diplomacy will be obvious at times when the crisis involved are years or even decades-long. This is essential for the purpose of revisiting the initial plan of choosing to conduct humanitarian diplomacy. Within the modern states system, diplomacy fulfilled the international order concerning several aspects. Based on the book The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics written by Hedley Bull (1977), diplomacy mainly functions as a facilitator in communication between the political leaders of states and other entities in world politics. In the past, communication between governments was essentially done through human to human interaction. Thus, diplomats were once known as the messengers between governments. Besides diplomats to diplomats interaction, humanitarian diplomacy has been improving the dynamics of diplomatic work as it now involves government to people, or foreign non-governmental organizations to people, which is distinct from the traditional practice of diplomacy where only personnel in suits are involved in the process, but rather, taking civil society into the framework. As argued by Hans J. Morgenthau, in light of the actual power that

is available, the objectives of meeting to interact have to be made clear beforehand.

Diplomacy is essentially about the representation of one polity to another polity. Humanitarianism, on the other hand, is about advocating for and helping people in need. Diplomacy is characterized by compromise and pragmatic dealings, whereas the public image of humanitarian action is the opposite: it is about working for ideals and universal principles regardless of the interests of specific political actors. Unravelling this tension and exposing the complex diplomatic architecture of humanitarian aid (with the variety of actors and intentions involved) makes the study of Humanitarian Diplomacy crucial, timely and important.

For this, humanitarian diplomacy is defined "as a dialogue (private or public) between governments and (or) humanitarian organizations, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or other non-state actors". (Veuthey, 2012) Various actors from the international community including civil society also plays a significant role in the operation of humanitarian diplomacy to groups of affected people. It is the collaborative effort between sets of different actors, humanitarian diplomacy can produce effective impacts in delivering humanitarian aides during a crisis.

As much as diplomacy is known as a tool for the pursuit of soft power, Turkey has a good justification that it sees humanitarian diplomacy as an actor of soft power (Davutoğlu, A., 2013). This research is conducted on the literature dedicated to humanitarian diplomacy and has found that it is a very new conduit of diplomacy. The definition that dates from 2007 is the following: "The concept of humanitarian diplomacy encompasses the activities carried out by humanitarian organizations, to obtain the space from political and military authorities, within which to function with integrity". (Regnier, 2011, pg. 1215) These humanitarian activities to accommodate efforts such as arranging for the presence of humanitarian organizations in a given country, while negotiating access to

civilian populations that require assistance and protection, monitoring assistance programmes, promoting respect for international law and norms, supporting indigenous individuals and institutions, and engaging in advocacy objectives, are all the core objectives on the administration of humanitarianism.

Turkish humanitarian diplomacy can be viewed in different facets, part of which will facilitate the possibility of enforcing humanitarianism on affected grounds. This stance will only be made feasible with the merging of compassion and power, "that is what is meant by humanitarian diplomacy". (Davutogˇlu, 2013) For Turkey to be considered a soft power, Turkey's Western partners have to also recognise Turkey's soft power identity as legitimate. And this establishment has been amplified by the recognition Turkey has received from the European Union, the champion for humanitarian diplomacy. Citizens of the Turkish Republic constitutes the first dimension of humanitarian diplomacy. Turkey highly regards its own people's power in terms of their knowledge and qualifications, knowing the limited energy resources the country has. Thereby, Turkey uses the power of its people to allow them mobility throughout the world, following wherever their citizens go by setting up an embassy to serve its people's needs, which eventually will pump productivity blood back to the country. This dimension of expanding Turkey's visa policy takes pride in their culture and manifesting it to the world to attract attention to the country.

The next dimension of humanitarian diplomacy to be examined is the attitude of a country in crisis zones that is based on human-oriented. A country with a political vision that extends beyond the globally perceived limits in the system, sees the importance of developing the right attitude towards crisis areas. Human-oriented foreign policy is easily deemed as an ambivalent purpose as determining the boundary between benevolent acts and political objectives require thorough scrutiny on every effort, transparent data sharing to the public at every step of the process, and comprehensively shared altruism between the government and its people. The augmentation of humanitarian

diplomacy needs to determine the line between psychological boundaries and the region. In the case where a country is facing the dilemma between its national interest conflicts with the crisis zone that it is channelling assistance to, the conscience in helping a hand must not halt at breaking point between different political powers. Turkey has proved itself to be performing well in this regard. When calamity strikes one particular area, a country that is providing relief aid is responsible for distributing an equal and equitable service regardless of the people's citizenship within the crisis zones. Acting on the same principle without discriminating against citizens and non-citizen becomes the fundamental basis in humanitarian diplomacy.

The third dimension of humanitarian diplomacy concerns an inclusive humanitarian perspective at the global level, which in this context, the United Nations system is the driver of this mission. The representation of the international community is in the grey line between the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Security Council. The issue of humanitarian diplomacy must be classified accordingly before any draft resolution is brought to vote, and the process of selecting the right parties to join in the voting process. The main objective of creating a global humanitarian perspective is to unify the reflection of participants that are willing to be part of the process. While the placement of humanitarian issues is confused with the United Nations Security Council, a veto of two countries takes precedence in defeating the global major support in the resolution to distort the existing order of the global system. The United Nations initiative will be highly valued as a significant component of humanitarian diplomacy.

CRITIQUE ON HUMANITARIAN NEUTRALITY

In order to support economic development and good governance in a region, intervening countries need to develop bilateral ties with most of the receiving countries by providing development aid and trade concessions. Humanitarian efforts can be challenged by a regional competition between traditional donors and new donors, as well as the ability of international humanitarian organizations to remain relevant and faithful to humanitarian principles. Intervening countries may be involved in a region to facilitate a peace process as the aid donor or helping in nationbuilding efforts. Despite all these philanthropic efforts, other major challenges in humanitarian diplomacy include the legitimacy of the intervening countries and the evolving relationship between humanitarian action and other forms of support, like development assistance, peace and stabilization operations.

Neutrality is seen as necessary to prevent humanitarian actors from taking sides or engaging in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature. However, this proves difficult. Humanitarian organizations often depend on developing a network of formal or informal relations with parties involved in armed conflicts to guarantee access to aid. The direction of humanitarianism is to save and preserve life, to reduce or prevent suffering, to safeguard the integrity and dignity of people affected by humanitarian crises. "The priority of humanitarianism is to ensure that the aid is managed in the most effective way, whilst respecting the principles of international law and the principles of equality, neutrality, humanity, nondiscrimination and independence". (Tilovska-Kechedji) Emergency support can only be provided where disaster is severe with wide-ranging humanitarian consequences. Through the privileged relations between intervening countries and receiving countries, the promotion of common values, influencing democratic notion, awareness on the basic rights of human beings, the deserving good governance that a nation should have, marketing the economy of intervening countries, and lastly ensuring a sustainable development within the affected region. These factors that are transferred through the channel of humanitarian diplomacy will require a clear boundary on the performance of neutrality as each factor inter-twines political constituencies.

Humanitarian neutrality may be maintained by focusing on the aspect of partnership in these areas; the political and security aspect for peace and stability, the economic and financial aspect, and the social, cultural and humanitarian aspect that aims to develop human resources. As the author, Elena Tilovska-Kechedji suggests in her article writing The European Union Humanitarian Diplomacy Used As A Soft Power In The Middle East And Turkey, the main aim of the humanitarian partnership is to develop the standard of life, cultural level, respect for human rights and democracy. Henceforth, it is imperative for intervening countries to pay attention to these aspects to maintain the values of humanitarianism and differentiating it with political goals that could monetize the atrocities of people within affected crisis zones. As it has been criticized, the conduct of humanitarian diplomacy and its neutrality has always been questioned by scholars and practitioners that have been involving in groundwork experience in crisis zones and have witnessed the severity of the humanitarian crisis. This constant interrogation is due to the relevance of hidden political interests, the politics of humanitarian negotiation, and the broader sphere of humanitarian diplomacy in providing access to humanitarian aid. Indeed, the tension between negotiations and the principle of neutrality has traditionally represented a challenge for humanitarian organizations. Neutrality, along with humanity, impartiality and independence constitute the foundations for humanitarian action.

The line of neutrality has always been blurred when there needs for intervening countries to engage with non-state actors in providing legitimate entry to the affected crisis zones. The work being put forward by intervening countries to help refugees and migrants include a variety of foreign policy actors in order to obtain access in delivering aids. This provides further clarity to the claim that intervening countries is not basing off their work only a sense of altruism, but rather hiding behind proxy compassion towards those in adversities. If a state were to benefit from humanitarianism materially, why would it go to a certain extent beyond its capability in providing assistance to communities that are deemed unfamiliar to them?

LIMITS TO TURKISH HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY: CASE OF SOMALIA & SYRIA

The Syrian refugee crisis is one of the worst ongoing humanitarian crises in the most recent decade. Echoing from the Arab Spring, the Middle East continues to be the region with the most political upheaval areas in the world. Besides Yemen and Palestine, Syria is another country currently experiencing a high number of refugees calling for urgent humanitarian assistance. The Middle East region has witnessed growing instabilities, and it has been caught in a complex geopolitical situation and rising terrorist threats. (Tilovska-Kechedji) Since the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War in 2011, various domestic and foreign forces have been fighting against the Syrian Arab Republic government under the leadership of President Bashar al-Assad, who is claimed to have been strongly supported by Russia. The long-lasting conflicts in Syria have created a lasting humanitarian crisis, which resulted in the displacement of millions of people. This conundrum has been made more complex on Syrian soil with the intervention of many allies and forces, domestic and internationally. The impact of this political turmoil has affected the most civilians in Syria, causing chaos and putting the country in economic unrest situation. On a daily basis, there is a growing number of Syrians having forced to flee the country to protect their lives. More than 6.6 million Syrians had to make off since 2011 while another 6.7 million are remained internally displaced. This is an indicator that Syria is in dire need of humanitarian assistance.

Slightly different from Syria, Somalia, a country in East Africa is also a struggling nation in combating internal conflicts such as the rise of terrorist groups within Somalia and the crippling state of the internal economy. On July 20, 2011, the United Nations declared a famine in southern Somalia, affecting some 3.1 million people. (Maxwell, 2012) Although it is

largely described by the media as being caused by drought, the Somalia famine of 2011 was caused by multiple factors including drought, conflicts, rapidly rising global food prices, and other long-standing structural factors. The response given by the Somali government as well as a foreign intervention to the famine was made substantially complicated by several more factors, which altogether combined to make the crisis worse. These include constrained humanitarian access, and the absence of the World Food Programme in the region to provide emergency assistance. In the absence of incentives for early action, Turkey seized this opportunity by taking a proactive approach to its humanitarian policy. As part of a larger reorientation of Turkish foreign policy strategy, Turkey is digressing its influence towards Africa by beginning to pivot in Somalia. The strategy plan was explicitly uttered by the Turkish ambassador to Somalia, Kani Torun when he said Somalia is part of this win-win strategy between Turkey and Somalia bilateral relations. Somalia is in need of a model in its development cooperation whilst Turkey is pinning its presence in the region.

SYRIAN REFUGEE CRISIS

Turkey is the neighbouring country to Syria with its southeast border. While the relation between Turkey and Somalia is separated by distant geographical, it is strongly tied to the relation between Muslim majority nations. Turkey's foreign policy strategy views the need and responsibility to respond to the inefficiency international community managing the Syrian crisis. Turkey's reckoning of presenting the "Turkish model" to the world is a window of opportunity in conferring its humanitarian diplomacy. Since the outbreak of the Syrian war, Turkey has reached the limit of its power, capacity, and instruments in turn due to the Syrian crisis. Turkey has been a long-time channel for the European Union to conduct its soft power through humanitarian diplomacy. It is worth noting that Turkey's demeanour in humanitarian diplomacy would not have been made possible if not there is compelling support from the European Union in this

measure. However, Turkey experienced troubled relations with the European Union because the ongoing struggle with the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) terrorism at home decreased Turkey's ability to set in motion such a process (Oğuzlu, T., 2007). Turkey's Europeanisation process has certainly accelerated the politicisation of the Kurdish dispute.

The reason the Kurdish dispute becomes a highlight to Turkey's politics is due to the reason of internal political factors within domestic politics that could pose an issue to the country's credibility in assessing demographic differences. If Turkey is not capable of managing its internal crisis, how can the world expect its commitment to mitigating crisis zones on the soil of other territorial states? To refute the claim, the Turkish government has made a clear difference between PKK-led terrorism and Turkey's Kurdish problem. In the past, the two were seen as synonymous. Today the former is seen as an obvious security issue involving terrorism, whereas the latter is mainly considered as a political problem that needs a political solution. The Kurdish dispute with Turkey has impeded the humanitarian diplomatic process when Turkey cannot enter northern Iraq as freely as it could before the war, to which, similarly in Syria some areas have limited the presence of Turkish humanitarian aid relief from reaching they are controlled by the Kurdish rebel groups. Neither the Americans nor the Kurdish groups would allow such an action to give ways for humanitarian agencies to have access, and Turkey's European friends would also find it unacceptable in terms of the dynamics of the ongoing accession process. The strengthening of the Kurdish rule in northern Iraq has started to impact developments inside Turkey. It is crucial that Turkey finds a political solution to the Kurdish dispute because Turkey's Kurds will not want to lag behind the Kurds of northern Iraq in terms of economic, social and political achievements. This Kurdish crisis continues to become a challenge for the structure of Turkish foreign policy strategy and limited the effort of humanitarian diplomacy being attempted on the ground.

As has been discussed in the first section, public diplomacy is the most common tool in the construct of soft power pursuit. The exploration of alternative approaches to public diplomacy has suggested humanitarian diplomacy being a feasible option to opt for in circumstances where crisis zones are densely affecting civilians, especially in border areas. The framework of the new institutional design of public diplomacy with humanitarian diplomacy is amplified by the application of humanitarianism Turkey is undertaking in lending emergency assistance to the Syrian refugees. The reaction given by Turkey in its sense of responsibility towards the Syrian refugees is assumed when number recorded by the United Nations Human Commissioner Rights (UNHCR) shows there are 3.6 million Syrians hosted in Turkey itself until the end of the year 2020, as compared to 330 000 people of other nationalities. Turkey's refugee response is based on a comprehensive legal framework, which provides refugees with access to services upon registration. Turkey has been progressively implementing a policy of inclusion and harmonization, by including refugees in public services and supporting them to become self-reliant and live in harmony with their host community.

The reason for Turkey admitting a large number of Syrian refugees may be explained by several reasons, one of which is the rise of new powers. Turkey has made its mark in the fields of humanitarianism, mediation and peace-building. As an aspiring middle power, Turkey has undertaken a growing commitment to humanitarian work over the past decade, introducing a new modus operandi and execution plan. One such concept is that of humanitarian diplomacy, which combines national interests and norms in the calculation of humanitarian policy. While closer to home, the Syrian crisis has been a greater challenge for its risks to Turkey's internal stability and the mass influx of refugees. Turkey's achievement in the humanitarian effort was recognized more popularly around the world when in 2012 Turkey was ranked the fourth-largest humanitarian donor, according to the Global Humanitarian Assistance report.

SOMALIA CRISIS

Away from the Middle East, Turkey's pivot in East Africa begins with Somalia as a part of Turkish larger reorientation foreign policy strategy in improving bilateral relations with the African continent. In contrast to the Syrian crisis where Turkey's foreign policy strategy is based on its reactive policy, assistance in Somalia is a basis of proactive humanitarian policy. Turkey's humanitarian engagement first gained international interest after then-prime minister Erdogan visited Somalia in 2011, refocusing international attention on the conflict there. Somalia remains one of Turkey's largest humanitarian commitments, where Turkey's effort is noted for its holistic approach and ability to deliver to beneficiaries on the ground.

Turkey had chosen Somalia as the platform to expand its Ministry of Foreign Affairs' policy goals through the reinforcement of humanitarian projects on the ground while allowing peace-building initiatives to take place. Turkey's assistance to Somalia is clearly defined through the foreign policy and has brought advantage in delivering bilateral aids. Somalia was the second-largest recipient of Turkish humanitarian assistance in the year 2012. By 2013 according to OECD figures, Somalia was the fifth-largest beneficiary of Turkey's global aid after Syria (OECD, 2014b). As the data suggests, there is not a huge number of Somali refugees in Turkey due to the explanation that the humanitarian diplomacy being conducted in Somalia is based on the distinctive approach of proactive policy by setting a foot in Somali land rather than reception of Somali refugees on Turkish land. The best motivation to Turkish making a presence in Somalia is due to the reason that Turkey needs a market to direct its development corporation while Somalia is in dire need of a model nation, hence the complementary relationship these two nations progress toward is viewed as the perfect collaboration presented at the right time. Turkey has extended its humanitarian and development aid in Africa and Asia, and characterizes its foreign policy as Humanitarian Diplomacy. (Tilovska-Kechedji)

Another indicator of the identity transformation of the government is the relation with the Muslim world. (Muharrem) The Justice Development Party leaders developed a policy of relations within the Muslim world for the first time in Turkish foreign policy. In this context, a critical reason why the Middle East gained significance in the ruling party's foreign policy is the proximity of the Justice Development Party's leading figures to the Muslim communities in terms of their values, identity and culture. It was aimed with this policy to make sure that Turkey first expands to the markets of the Muslim world and then tries to become the leader of the Muslim world eventually. Besides the assistance in facilitating peace-building initiatives in Somalia to combat rebel groups, Turkey as a country with limited natural resources provides developmental corporation by bringing in the Turkish expertise in infrastructural planning and encouraging investments in Somali land.

Another reason for the Justice Development Party to put Somalia as a focus of foreign policy was the party's Islamic identity. The Justice Development Party's Islamic identity leads it to be connected to East Africa. In addition to this, the ruling leaders made use of Islamic identity, public diplomacy and other programs to deepen the ties with the East African continent. The Justice Development Party government conducted identity-based public diplomacy to gain sympathy from Muslim societies by highlighting their Islamic ties and identity in general discourse. Accordingly, Turkey was to be viewed as a model country when it comes to Muslim countries by highlighting its traits of being a conservative Muslim democracy, a neoliberal and capitalist developing economy, and at the same time being both a NATO member and a member-candidate country for the European Union. (Muharrem) The Justice Development Party government tried to realize their goal of being a model country for the region by practising public diplomacy with the soft power image. Within this context, Turkey introduced a model country-based public diplomacy towards Somalia under the Justice Development Party rule.

According to the Foreign Policy Institute, which is a self-proclaimed "First Foreign Policy Think Tank in Turkey", in an early assertion of the benefits of Turkey's 1998 Africa Action Plan, Turkey is ready to offer to African countries her experience of nation-building (Karaca 2000, 119), and Turkey's development, progress and achievements in modernization, as well as her democracy and secularism, are considered in African countries as a good and viable model to be followed by the Somali. Africa needs Turkey for her experiences and Turkey's developing economy needs Africa as a new market. (Hazar 2000, 111) This assertion has made Turkey's motive clear in why Turkey is involving in Somali's development compared to other neighbouring countries in East Africa. On the ground, beneficiaries of the Turkish approach commend it for its efficiency, its delivery methods of humanitarianism by Turkish humanitarian workers working closely with the local population. In contrast to the case of Syrian, in Somalia, the non-governmental organizations involved in facilitating humanitarianism are such as public agencies including the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA). The role of these organizations are not only limited to engaging locally with Somalia's leaders, officials and civil society as that will ultimately influence the impact of the Turkish aid. Without the lubrication effort reinforced by the NGOs on Somali land, Turkish humanitarian diplomacy will not have been made possible.

CONCLUSION

To recapitulate, Turkish foreign policy strategy is centred around the pursuit of soft power in consolidating its image globally as an aspiring middle power. By utilizing the alternative approach to public diplomacy, Turkey laid hold of its opportunity in optimizing the resources it possesses in bringing about the impact of humanitarian diplomacy to other nations. Humanitarian diplomacy serves as an imperative tool in synthesizing a state's position in global branding. The "Turkish model" in humanitarian diplomacy sets an example of a

benevolent and righteous venture to the international community in manoeuvring the difficulty and complexities of refugee crisis management. This article argues that the synergy of humanitarian diplomacy works substantially as an alternative approach to smart power strategy, however, it is accountable to perceive that the return of an investment will require a long time as Turkey is faced with formative and architectural limits and challenges before the complete implementation becomes visible among foreign relational powers.

References

[1] Akpınar, P. (2013). Turkey's peacebuilding in Somalia: The limits of humanitarian diplomacy. Turkish Studies, 14(4), 735-757.

[2] Bull, H. (2012). The anarchical society: a study of order in world politics. Macmillan international Higher education.

[3] Baird, T. (2016). The geopolitics of Turkey's 'humanitarian diplomacy' in Somalia: a critique. Review of African Political Economy, 43(149), 470-477.

[4] Cevik, S., & Sevin, E. (2017). A Quest for Soft Power: Turkey and the Syrian refugee crisis. Journal of Communication Management.Diplomacy, H. (2018). CMI BRIEF.

[5] Davutoğlu, A. (2013). Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: objectives, challenges and prospects. Nationalities Papers, 41(6), 865-870.

[6] Maxwell, D., & Fitzpatrick, M. (2012). The 2011 Somalia famine: Context, causes, and complications. Global Food Security, 1(1), 5-12.

[7] Muharrem, E. K. Ş. İ., & EROL, M. S. The Rise and Fall Of Turkish Soft Power and Public. Gazi Akademik Bakış, 11(23), 15-45.

[8] Nye, J. S. (1990). Soft power. Foreign policy, (80), 153-171.

[9] Oğuzlu, T. (2007). Soft power in Turkish foreign policy. Australian Journal of International Affairs, 61(1), 81-97.

[10] Said, E. (2020). Orientalism (pp. 423-426). Routledge.

[11] Tank, P. (2015). Turkey as a humanitarian actor: the critical cases of Somalia and Syria. Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre.

[12] Tilovska-Kechedji, E., & Rakitovan, D. THE EUROPEAN UNION HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY USED AS A SOFT POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND TURKEY. Godina XXXVII/2018 Broj 2.

[13] Veuthey, M. (2012). Humanitarian Diplomacy: Saving It When It Is Most Needed. In Humanitarian Space. Webster University Geneva 16th Humanitarian Conference.Geneva, Webster University (pp. 195-208).