

# **Followership in U.S. Military Interventions in the post-Cold War Era**

---

Raphael Kunz  
Seoul National University

**August 2014**

# **Followership in U.S. Military Interventions in the post-Cold War Era**

**Raphael Kunz**

**Seoul National University**

## **Abstract**

This essay addresses the motivations and strategies of followers regarding military interventions led by the dominant state/hegemon in international politics. The concept of ‘followership’ can be described as largely understudied field in International Relations (IR). The present study aims to contribute to the nascent literature on followership by applying two concise case studies – the Polish and Turkish contributions to the U.S.-led military interventions in Iraq in 1991 and 2003, respectively. For the two cases, process-tracing reveals that international level factors related to fears of abandonment/entrapment can most convincingly explain the extent of followers’ contributions from the existing hypotheses on followership in military interventions. Moreover, as the Turkish case in the Iraq War suggests, when a military intervention contradicts national security goals, domestic politics might be used to justify reduced contributions for the hegemon.

Followership in IR • U.S. military interventions • Poland • Turkey • Security • Iraq War • Gulf War

## **I. Introduction**

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States (U.S.) has become the preponderant ‘unipole’ in the international system (Wohlforth 1999, 11). With the major geopolitical adversary gone, the end of the Cold War provided a unique opportunity for the U.S. to reshape the world to its liking. Consequently, U.S. governments adopted a foreign policy strategy aimed at maintaining the newly-won U.S. primacy well into the future by “looking beyond the country’s immediate self-interests and collaborate actively with like-minded governments” (Spanier and Hook 2010, 192). Liberal pundits argued that the U.S. should renew its “commitment to multilateral institutions” which would facilitate the burden-sharing of a ‘new world order’ (Nye Jr 1992). Despite the emphasis on multilateralism and collective action, the self-ascribed role as the ‘world’s policeman’ led to one military intervention after another.<sup>1</sup> As a result the U.S. has been “the most militarily active state in the world” in the post-Cold War era (Downes 2011, 8). This phenomenon occurred notwithstanding an overall improvement of Washington’s security situation with threats being “indirect rather than immediate, local not global [and] not to vital material interests of the United States but to moral interests” (Betts 2012, 355). In order to share the burden of maintaining this world order and to efficiently utilize followers’ support, the U.S. continued to sustain a series of formal and informal international institutions.

This essay concentrates on two major U.S.-led military interventions in the post-Cold War era: the Gulf War in 1991 and the Iraq War in 2003. Both interventions occurred in the same geographic region and were directed against the same adversary (Saddam Hussein's Baathist regime). Yet, the Gulf War garnered substantial international support and was regarded as a case of legitimated use of force, while the Iraq War was highly controversial and failed to receive a final UN resolution (Moravcsik 2003, 88).<sup>2</sup> This study seeks to test and refine hypotheses on followership in military interventions. *What are the factors that motivate secondary states to follow the hegemon into war?*

It is beyond the scope of this essay to provide detailed answers to the motivations and rationale of *all* followers that took part in these military interventions.<sup>3</sup> Thus, two followers which contributed to varying degree to both interventions, Poland and Turkey, will be examined by employing a case study approach.<sup>4</sup> Poland supported both U.S. military interventions despite the absence of a direct link between its own security and the interventions. In the case of Turkey, (limited) contributions were forthcoming although both interventions ran counter to its security interests.

## **II. Literature Review**

An examination of the existing IR literature reveals that the focus has almost exclusively been on the hegemon and the role this leader occupies in international politics. While these analyses inform about the interests of leaders, such an approach tells little about the dynamics of followership and even distorts "how we understand leadership in international politics" (Cooper, Higgott, and Nossal 1991, 395).<sup>5</sup> Yet as Brunn (1999, 18) pointed out, regardless territory seize or population, each secondary state has its own worldview. The existing literature on followership-leadership relations in IR can be broadly divided into materialist and normative approaches. Materialist approaches define hegemony as a relationship of dominance in which the hegemon maintains international order by using its predominant power to reward and coerce secondary states. Conversely, normative approaches focus on the hegemon's ability to lead international society by "engendering consent and consensus around an ideological program for the achievement of common goals" (Lee 2010, 2). According to Ikenberry and Kupchan (1990, 283), hegemons can assert their control over other states through manipulating material incentives. Alternatively, they can socialize followers into cooperating through getting the elites to internalize the norms that are articulated by the hegemon (Ikenberry and Kupchan 1990, 286). Conversely, neorealism does not support the notion of permanent alliance and expects that secondary states will eventually balance against a predominant power in the international system in order to reestablish a balance of power. Walt (1985) argues that states will balance not only against accumulation of capabilities but also threats. For neorealism the post-Cold War unipolar system is effectively 'underbalanced' and thus it is expected that either a balancing coalition is formed or a single rising great power will emerge to challenge the hegemon (Mearsheimer 2010, Waltz 2000). Given the primacy of U.S. military power, secondary states may only engage in 'soft balancing'

strategies that entail diplomacy, international institutions and law in order to constrain the actions of the hegemon (Pape 2005, Brooks and Wohlforth 2005). Moreover, the existence of a regionally-based threat can work as incentive for secondary states to align themselves with the hegemon (Walt 2005). Jesse et al. (2012) synthesized different IR theories in regard to secondary states strategies vis-à-vis the hegemon. On the continuum between ‘opposing’ and ‘accommodating’, there are several strategies secondary states may opt for, ranging from ‘hard balancing’ (use of force against hegemon) to ‘bandwagoning’ (unconditionally support hegemon).

Continuum of responses to hegemony by secondary states (Jesse et al. 2012, 14)								
Opposition		↔		Resistance		↔		Accommodation
Hard balancing	Soft balancing	balking	Blackmail	Leash slipping	neutrality	binding	bonding	Bandwagoning

Since this essay examines followership in U.S. military interventions, only secondary states responses between resistance and accommodation will be explained. ‘Balking’ is a strategy where a state ignores the hegemon’s demands. ‘Blackmail’ strategy is an attempt of secondary states to gain concessions from the hegemon by threatening “undesirable consequences” (Jesse et al. 2012, 13). A slightly weaker resistance strategy of secondary states is called ‘leash slipping’. Christopher Layne (2006, 9) argued that states which do not fear being attacked by the hegemon may build up their military capabilities to “maximize their ability to conduct an independent foreign policy”. They use this weak form of internal balancing as some kind of insurance against a hegemon’s future behavior (Jesse et al. 2012, 30). While neutrality is self-explanatory, ‘binding’ strategy derives from neoliberal institutional approaches, and focuses on the way followers can constrain a hegemon’s actions through membership in institutions.<sup>6</sup> Moving towards accommodating responses, collaboration with the hegemon can also stem from a real sense of shared interests with the hegemon. Through a deep alignment with the hegemon, secondary states hope to influence the dominant state’s policies (‘bonding strategy’).

Cooper, Higgott, and Nossal (1991) in their analysis of followers’ contributions to U.S. war efforts in the Gulf War argue that a more nuanced conception of leadership (rather than coercion or side-payments) would have facilitated much broader support by other members of the coalition. Applying leadership conceptions from social psychology to international politics, the authors concluded that followership gained through ‘leadership’ is less costly and more effective “than submission extracted through dominance” (Cooper, Higgott, and Nossal 1991, 399). In a study on the same topic, Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger (1994) suggest that the so-called ‘collective action hypothesis’, i.e. the stability of global oil markets and maintaining the norm of territorial integrity of international borders, may only explain U.S. motivations and actions, but fails to fully account for followers’ support.<sup>7</sup> They argue that followership may be driven by both external (collective action, balance of threat, alliance dependence) and internal factors (state autonomy, domestic and bureaucratic

politics). In a quantitative study, Vucetic (2011) proves that countries belonging to the ‘Anglosphere’ possess a significantly higher propensity to support U.S.-led military interventions. Besides belonging to the English-speaking world, military capability, presence of threat in the home region, and existing military alliances are strong indicators of military participation by followers (Vucetic 2011, 35-36).<sup>8</sup> Vucetic’ findings confirm the constructivist argument on the positive relationship between the degree of global legitimacy conferred to a particular military intervention and follower’s support.<sup>9</sup> Schuster and Maier (2006) examined factors that explained divergent stances among European countries toward the Iraq War. They argue that public opinion alone cannot explain whether states followed the U.S. or not. While Western European countries’ support seemed dependent on the ideological orientation of the government in power (conservative), among Eastern European states factors associated with systemic forces yielded most explanatory power.

### **III. Case Studies**

As seen above, followers adopt strategies vis-à-vis the hegemon (leader) as a result of international level, dyad-level, and/or domestic level factors. Other factors that affect contribution are related to state and military capacity. Thus, whether secondary states follow or not depends on various variables on different levels of analysis. Against this theoretical background, two case studies of followership in U.S.-led military interventions will be analyzed. As seen in the section above, although various hypotheses on followership behavior exist it is often unclear under which circumstances a specific causal mechanism comes into existence. The method of process tracing, a within-case analysis to evaluate causal processes, allows detecting more refined hypotheses on followership concerning military interventions. A good method to avoid selection bias in small-N comparison studies is to select cases according to their characteristics on the independent variable (Halperin and Heath 2012, 143). Poland and Turkey were selected for the case studies for the following reasons: firstly, both have sufficient and comparable military/state capacities to contribute to military interventions. Secondly, both countries can be regarded as regional powers (middle powers). Thirdly, they both have a history of contribution to U.S.-led interventions and can be regarded as close U.S. military allies (NATO members).<sup>10</sup> Lastly, both countries were governed by democratically-elected governments before and after the interventions took place. Furthermore, none of the existing studies on followership has dealt with these cases in detail. However, as will be shown below, both countries adopted diverging followership strategies vis-à-vis the hegemon.

The U.S. rationale behind the Gulf War was the perceived threat to the global oil supply and violating the international norm of territorial integrity (Bennett, Levgold, and Unger 1994, 50-69). The Iraq War was justified by the conjunction of terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Despite massive efforts on behalf of the U.S. to garner international support, the actual invasion in 2003 did not receive UN authorization and thus, was much less internationally

legitimized as the war a decade earlier. Nonetheless, the U.S. attacked Iraq, backed by a substantially smaller alliance that became known as the ‘coalition of the willing’.

### **Followership Motivations of Poland**

“America will not forget that Poland rose to the moment.”<sup>11</sup>

After the communist regime was toppled, Poland quickly took steps to prove itself a worthy military partner for the West. Consequently, during the Gulf War, Poland provided limited military and intelligence support to the invasion force (Dunn 2002, 69). Against the background of Poland’s various internal difficulties in the transition period from communist rule to a free-market society, Poland’s contributions to the U.S.-led intervention in the Gulf can be described as small but significant. As way of gratitude Washington not only provided economic aid to Poland but also lobbied hard in Europe to forgive Poland’s Cold War debts (Richter 1993, Risen 1991). The Gulf War marked the beginning of Poland’s close political relationship with the U.S. in the post-Cold War period.<sup>12</sup> In the first decade after the end of the Cold War, Warsaw tried to utilize every opportunity to get closer to NATO membership (Dunn 2002, 67). The strategic rationale of Poland to seek membership in NATO, and particularly close relations with the U.S., are a result of the country’s geostrategic location (sandwiched between Germany and Russia) and its historical experiences with these powers. The preservation of NATO in the post-Cold War era made it possible for Germany and Poland to normalize relations “in the context of continued American commitment to Europe” (Michta 1999, 41). Yet, relations to Russia remained strained and Poland’s drive into NATO (joined in 1999) was harshly criticized by Moscow. Although Poland did not perceive Russia as a direct military threat in the 1990s, Warsaw insisted on entering NATO because of the residual fear of a possible resurgent Russia (Michta 1999, 47). Thus, it is in Poland’s national interest to keep a strong military alliance with Washington. Even though Poland’s strategic identity emphasizes territorial defense, its security alliance with the U.S. has forced Warsaw to repeatedly participate in military missions that are not related to Poland’s direct security interests. While Warsaw’s threat perceptions are still dominated by the fear of Russia, its “pro-Atlanticist” orientation requires to show flexibility in deploying Polish forces wherever the U.S. wants them to be (Chappell 2010, 226; 233).

Hence, Washington’s ‘new model ally’ (Dunn 2002, 82) was quick in announcing its full support for U.S. intentions to invade Iraq in 2003. Poland not only deployed naval vessels into the Gulf region but was also one of only four countries that contributed combat troops (Hummel 2007, 22).<sup>13</sup> While public opinion was against the war, Warsaw managed to push through the country’s participation in the ‘coalition of the willing’.<sup>14</sup> Shortly before the war, the Polish government underlined its commitment by signing the ‘Letter of Eight’ which intended to be a European endorsement for the intervention. The Polish government circumvented domestic opposition by framing the contribution to the invasion efforts as minimal. The government’s statements prior to the war not only downplayed

Poland's role, but also omitted outright facts (Hummel 2007, 24). This strategy resulted in legislative support and Washington's demands were met. Poland's leaders effectively defied public war aversion and sided with the U.S. intervention. Despite the fact that the military intervention did not serve Warsaw's immediate security needs, Poland's motivations for supporting the U.S. intervention were largely a result of strategic calculations that aimed at 'bonding' the U.S. as much as possible. Thus, the regional threat (Russia) was the driving force of Poland's 'bandwagoning' with the hegemon. To a lesser extent Poland saw also opportunities to alleviate its main security threat: energy dependence on Russia (MoNDP 2009). The Polish foreign minister Cimoszewicz stated that Poland had never "hidden [its] desire for Polish oil companies to finally have access to sources of commodities" in Iraq (BBC 2003). Yet, after the war, Warsaw's expectations for new economic investment opportunities, diversified oil supplies, and international recognition of Poland as a regional power enjoying a "special relationship" with the U.S., were largely not met (Melamed 2005, 10).

### **Followership Motivations of Turkey**

"You are either with us or against us."<sup>15</sup>

Traditionally Turkey preferred to avoid active involvement in Middle Eastern affairs. President Özal broke with that tradition in 1990 when he agreed to the U.S. request for Turkish support during the Gulf War. In order to comply with the economic sanctions that the UN imposed on Iraq, Ankara closed down oil pipelines. Turkey deployed massive troops along the borders to Iraq which caused the latter to divert significant numbers of troops to its northern territories. Furthermore, Turkey authorized U.S. aircraft to use the military air base at Incirlik for raids over Iraq (Kapsis 2006, 35). Those measures ruined Ankara's relations with Baghdad, which was economically, strategically, and politically painful. Iraq used to be one of Turkey's main trading partners and the two countries were also united in their common fear of Islamic (Shiite) fundamentalism. Occasionally they even cooperated in counterinsurgencies against Kurds in northern Iraq (Altinkas 2005, 140). Turkey's cumulative losses from the sanctions regime against Iraq ranged from \$20 to \$60 billion (Jones 2004, 19). Turkey feared that a destabilization of Iraq could threaten its predominantly Kurdish populated eastern provinces. Despite all those adverse aspects, Turkey substantially supported the war coalition. Three major reasons may explain Ankara's support: firstly, President Özal, who was determined to support the U.S. even against the Turkish political establishment, was successful in convincing other decision-makers that siding with the U.S. was the lesser of two evils. Secondly, Turkey calculated that it could enhance its prospects for achieving membership in the European Community (EC). Thirdly, Ankara hoped to gain "important foreign-policy dividends in terms of strengthening the 'strategic partnership' with the United States" (Larrabee 2010, 7). Because Ankara knew that it could not stop the U.S. from going to war against Iraq, it calculated that war support would still be better than balking and consequently losing Western support. Turkey, similarly to other key members of NATO, feared that the U.S. would disengage from its security commitments after the dissolution of the Soviet

Union (Bennett, Leggold, and Unger 1994, 74). During this period, Ankara was to some extent driven by 'fears of abandonment'. As Snyder (1984, 1997) argued, secondary states make strong and credible commitments to an ally's cause in order to reduce the risk of abandonment. At a time of considerable uncertainty Turkey hoped that strong followership would strengthen its ties with the United States and NATO. For Washington the invasion was a success militarily, but the pre-war fears of Ankara slowly materialized in the aftermath of the Gulf War. For Turkey the Gulf War is "where the trouble started" (Lesser 2006, 84). First of all, Ankara felt that it had not been sufficiently compensated for its contributions nor for the economic losses it had incurred as a consequence of the war. The war significantly exacerbated the security challenges on Turkey's south-eastern borders, especially the Kurdish problem, which has long been regarded as an existential threat to Turkey's national integrity (Larrabee 2010, 9, MoNDT 2000).<sup>16</sup> Because of the breakdown of central government control over Iraq's northern territories in the aftermath of the Gulf War, Kurdish insurgencies increased and large number of refugees flowed into Turkey which in turn intensified Ankara's anxieties of Kurdish secessionism.

Turkey's post-Gulf War experience shaped its opposition against the Bush administration's plans to invade Iraq again. Despite strong American inducements, the Turkish government voiced its implicit disagreement with the U.S. position. Turkey repeatedly stated its commitment to a peaceful solution to the Iraq-U.S. conflict over WMD disarmament (Ümit 2003). The Turkish decision-makers feared that the U.S. policy towards Iraq would eventually lead to the establishment of a Kurdish state in northern Iraq that could potentially threaten Turkey's territorial integrity. Yet, the U.S. demanded that it could open a second front using U.S. ground forces from eastern Turkey into northern Iraq (Larrabee and Lesser 2003, 134-135).<sup>17</sup> Facing massive popular opposition against the war (90%), the Turkish government started back-channel negotiations with Washington (Kapsis 2006, 39). Wikileaks documents reveal that the U.S. not only demanded access to northern Iraq via land routes through Turkey, but moreover, insisted that Turkey's military would militarily participate in the 'coalition of the willing' (Hürriyet 2011). Although the newly incoming 'Justice and Development Party' (AKP) government led by party leader Recep Tayyip Erdogan<sup>18</sup> committed itself to fulfil the U.S. demands, it tried retrieve as much from the deal as possible. Turkey requested an economic aid package worth \$32 billion for its potential war participation which the U.S. rejected (Filkins and Schmitt 2003). Erdogan tried to receive an authorization from the parliament in order to solve the dilemma he was facing. Similarly to the President Özil's considerations a decade earlier, Prime Minister Erdogan, while not favourable of a U.S. invasion of Iraq, believed that a U.S. invasion was inevitable and that Turkish acquiescence would give Ankara at least a say in post-war policies concerning northern Iraq. On March 1, 2003, a parliamentary vote rejected the authorization with 264 against 251 votes (with 19 abstentions).<sup>19</sup> The result "shocked and embarrassed" the AKP party leader who had assured the U.S. that he could deliver a positive vote, given the strong AKP majority in the parliament (Kapsis 2006, 32). Even though Turkey finally contributed to the war efforts by providing U.S. access to air bases on



Turkish soil and overflight rights, Washington felt betrayed by its loyal ally (Larrabee 2010, 12). Turkey's behaviour can be explained as a 'balking' strategy, simply refusing the key demands of the hegemon. In retrospect it can be said that unlike in the Gulf War, the Turkish political establishment as well as the military did not push hard to fulfil Washington's demands in the first place. Since those demands ran counter Turkish national interests of normalizing the situation in Iraq rather than starting another war, Turkish balking may not be too surprising. However, Ankara also overestimated its negotiation position vis-à-vis the U.S., because it assumed that U.S. military planning was depending on opening a second front from Turkey (Kapsis 2006, 35). In the end Turkey was not indispensable to U.S. war efforts and the invasion went on as scheduled. Conversely, the U.S. exercised poor leadership in its dealings with Turkey. Washington did not fully grasp Turkey's uneasiness with a renewed war in Iraq. Also Washington failed to consider that Turkey had enhanced its 'portfolio' of friendly countries, and thus improved its overall standing as a regional power. As a result of the changing security environment after the end of the Cold War, Ankara revived a more independent foreign policy which seeks to establish Turkey as a confident regional superpower (Taşpınar 2012, 128-129). At the same time, Turkey has increased its military spending since the early 1990s (Yentürk 2014, 14-15), which may allow Ankara to adopt a 'leash slipping' strategy in the long-term. These developments have made Turkey relatively less dependent on the U.S. hegemon.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The case studies provide mixed support in regard to existing hypotheses on followership in military interventions. In the two case studies, international level dynamics, especially the 'alliance security dilemma' appears to be a determining factor in explaining follower's support. For Poland in both intervention cases and for Turkey in the Gulf War, fears of abandonment constituted a major incentive to support Washington. This is noteworthy in the case of Turkey's support during the Gulf War as the intervention directly exacerbated the country's security situation. In the post-Cold War era, many secondary countries were concerned with the prospects of a renewed fall-back to multipolarity and (perceived) instability. Thus, 'bonding' the U.S. to its long-term security commitments was a central motivation for both countries in their support for military interventions. Moreover, 'fear of entrapment' may partly explain Turkey's 'leash slipping/balking' response to the Iraq War. As a result of the adverse security consequences of the Gulf War experience, Ankara partly reoriented its foreign policy alignment and managed to decrease its security dependence on Washington. The end of the Cold War removed the main rationale behind U.S.-Turkish security partnership and thus Ankara has increasingly shown signs of moving from accommodating strategies to resistance. It appears that the alliance dependence dimension is at least as important as the often-cited 'international legitimacy' dimension which cannot explain Poland's strong support for the Iraq War. Although the Iraq War was not internationally legitimized, Poland's contributions significantly increased when compared to the Gulf War. Poland's increased support is not only a consequence of enhanced military/ state capacities

(after a decade of economic growth in the post-communist era), but also of the continued existence of a regional threat (Russia) that requires a sustained bonding strategy towards the United States. In Turkey's case the domestic opposition was so fierce that it became impossible for Ankara's policy-makers to reconcile domestic and international imperatives simultaneously. Domestic politics was tactically used to legitimize limited support in the case of Turkey (Iraq War). In this particular case, Robert Putnam's (1988) 'two-level games' theory may be appropriate to further investigate Turkey's response to U.S. demands for support. Public opposition towards the Iraq War was also strong in Poland, but policy-makers were willing to override such opposition. The insights from the case studies can be expressed in following hypotheses which may be used as a starting point for future research:

- 1) The higher the fear of alliance abandonment, the stronger is a follower's support for the hegemon's military intervention.
- 2) The more serious a regional-level threat to a follower, the stronger is the support for the hegemon's military intervention.
- 3) If a hegemon's military intervention contradicts a follower's national interests, domestic politics is utilized to legitimize weaker support or even resistance vis-à-vis the hegemon.

Keohane (2005, 39) noted that IR scholarship should pay more attention to the "frequently neglected incentives facing other countries in the system" and "explore why secondary states defer to the leadership of the hegemon". 'Leaders' (hegemons) are well advised to seek consensual relations with their followers. Such a consensual relationship may entail early consultations, explanations, as well as occasional persuasion by the leader. If followership is not rewarded (as in the case of Turkey's contribution to the Gulf War), and the follower is simply coerced to support, the dominated follower is likely to seek defection from the alliance once a pragmatic opportunity arrives (e.g. its security dependence on the hegemon decreases). Both interventions have resulted in a deterioration of Turkey's security environment. Thus, Ankara looks for alternative partners regionally and globally (Cagaptay 2009). Conversely, leader-followership relations between the U.S. and Poland are exemplary. Both sides receive substantial benefits from their relationship: the U.S. guarantees Poland's national security, while Poland supports U.S. military missions. As the only Muslim NATO member, Turkey has been central to the Obama administrations' outreach to the Middle East. Washington has been backing most of Ankara's positions during the course of the Arab Spring, while it also conceded to Turkey's military actions against Kurdish separatists (Kessler 2010; Wright and Abramowitz 2007). Because leader-follower relations are dynamic and can transform over time in a "continuing process of negotiation and renegotiation" (Jesse et al. 2012, 24), it has not been too late for Washington to address the security concerns and underlying ambiguities in its relationship with Ankara.

## Bibliography

- Altinkas, Evren 2005. "The Iran-Iraq War and Its Effects on Turkey." *Review of International Law and Politics* 4 (1):137-144.
- BBC. 2003. "Poland seeks Iraqi oil stake". BBC, July 3. Accessed June 10, 2014. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3043330.stm>.
- Bennett, Andrew, Joseph Leggold, and Danny Unger. 1994. "Burden-sharing in the Persian Gulf War." *International Organization* 48 (1):39-75. doi:10.1017/S0020818300000813.
- Betts, Richard K. 2012. "From Cold War to Hot Peace: The Habit of American Force." *Political Science Quarterly* 127 (3):353-368.
- Brooks, Stephen G., and William C. Wohlforth. 2005. "Hard Times for Soft Balancing." *International Security* 30 (1):72-108. doi: 10.2307/4137459.
- Brunn, Stanley D. 1999. "The worldviews of small states: A content analysis of 1995 UN speeches." *Geopolitics* 4 (1):17-33.
- Bush, George W. 2003. "Remarks by the President to the People of Poland." The White House, May 31. Accessed June 9, 2014. <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030531-3.html>.
- Cagaptay, Soner. 2009. "Is Turkey Leaving the West?" *Foreign Affairs*, October 26.
- Chappell, Laura. 2010. "Poland in Transition: Implications for a European Security and Defence Policy." *Contemporary Security Policy* 31 (2):225-248. doi: 10.1080/13523260.2010.491312.
- CNN. 2001. "'You are either with us or against us'." CNN, November 6. Accessed June 9, 2014. <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/gen.attack.on.terror/>.
- Cooper, Andrew F., Richard A. Higgott, and Kim Richard Nossal. 1991. "Bound to Follow? Leadership and Followership in the Gulf Conflict." *Political Science Quarterly* 106 (3):391-410. doi: 10.2307/2151739.
- Downes, Alexander B. 2011. *Targeting Civilians in War*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.
- Dunn, David H. 2002. "Poland: America's New Model Ally." *Defence Studies* 2 (2):63-86.
- Filkins, Dexter, and Eric Schmitt. 2003. "Turkey Demands \$32 Billion U.S. Aid Package if It Is to Take Part in a War on Iraq." *The New York Times*, February 19. Accessed June 9, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/02/19/international/europe/19TURK.html>.
- Garamone, Jim. 2003. *Coalition of the Willing Provides Formidable Force*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense.
- Halperin, Sandra, and Oliver Heath. 2012. *Political Research: Methods and Practical Skills*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hummel, Hartwig. 2007. *A Survey of Involvement of 10 European States in the Iraq War 2003*. In *paks Working Paper Series 9*, edited by Research project on Parliamentary Control of Security Policy (paks). Düsseldorf: Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf.

- Hürriyet. 2011. "Wikileaks documents reveal Turkey-US Gulf War II negotiations." *Hürriyet Daily News*, March 18. Accessed June 8, 2014. <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/default.aspx?pageid=438&n=wikileaks-documents-reveal-turkey-us-gulf-war-ii-negotiations-2011-03-18>.
- IISS. 2006. *Military Balance 2006–2007*. London: Routledge.
- Ikenberry, G. John, and Charles A. Kupchan. 1990. "Socialization and hegemonic power." *International Organization* 44 (03):283-315. doi:10.1017/S002081830003530X.
- Ikenberry, John G. 2009. *After victory: Institutions, strategic restraint, and the rebuilding of order after major wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jesse, Neal G., Steven E. Lobell, Galia Press-Barnathan, and Kristen P. Williams. 2012. "The Leader Can't Lead When the Followers Won't Follow." In *Beyond Great Powers and Hegemons: Why Secondary States Support, Follow, or Challenge* edited by Kristen P. Williams, Steven E. Lobell and Neal G. Jesse, 1-30. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press.
- Jones, Vivian C. 2004. *Iraq's Trade with the World: Data and Analysis*. Edited by Congressional Research Service. Washington D.C.: The Library of Congress.
- Kapsis, James E. 2006. "The Failure of US-Turkish Pre-Iraq War Negotiations: An Overconfident United States, Political Mismanagement, and Conflicted Military." *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 10 (3):33-45.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2005. *After hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kessler, Glenn. 2010. "U.S. acts to restore ties with Turkey with Turkey; foreign minister likens attack to 9/11." *The Washington Post*, June 2. Accessed July 20, 2014. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/01/AR2010060103877.html>.
- Larrabee, Stephen F. 2010. *Troubled Partnership: U.S.-Turkish Relations in an Era of Global Geopolitical Change*. Santa Monica (CA): RAND Corporation.
- Larrabee, Stephen F., and Ian O. Lesser. 2003. *Turkish Foreign Policy in an Age of Uncertainty*. Santa Monica (CA): RAND Corporation.
- Layne, Christopher. 2006. "The unipolar illusion revisited: The coming end of the United States' unipolar moment." *International Security* 31 (2):7-41.
- Lee, Lavina Rajendram. 2010. *US Hegemony and International Legitimacy: Norms, power and followership in the wars on Iraq*. London: Routledge.
- Lesser, Ian O. 2006. "Turkey, the United States and the delusion of geopolitics." *Survival* 48 (3):83-96.
- Marcus, Aliza. 2007. "Turkey's PKK: Rise, Fall, Rise Again?" *World Policy Journal* 24 (1):75-84.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 2010. "The Gathering Storm: China's Challenge to US Power in Asia." *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3 (4):381-396.
- Melamed, Mark. 2005. "Polish-American Relations in the Aftermath of the War in Iraq." *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest* 2 (15):7-21.

- Michta, Andrew A. . 1999. "Poland: A Linchpin of Regional Security." In *America's New Allies: Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO* edited by Andrew A. Michta, 40-73. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- MoNDP. 2009. *Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland*. Ministry of National Defense of Poland. Warsaw: Ministry of National Defense of Poland.
- MoNDT. 2000. *Defense White Paper 2000*. Ministry of National Defense of Turkey. Ankara: Ministry of National Defense of Turkey.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2003. "Striking a new transatlantic bargain." *Foreign Affairs* 82 (4):74-89.
- Nye Jr, Joseph S. 1992. "What New World Order?" *Foreign Affairs* (Spring 1992).
- Pape, Robert A. 2005. "Soft Balancing Against The United States." *International Security* 30 (1):7-45.
- Putnam, Robert. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42: 427-460. doi:10.1017/S0020818300027697.
- Richter, Paul. 1993. "Poland Viewed as Model for Eastern Europe, Gore Says." *Los Angeles Times*, April 21. Accessed June 8, 2014. [http://articles.latimes.com/1993-04-21/news/mn-25496\\_1\\_vice-president-al-gore](http://articles.latimes.com/1993-04-21/news/mn-25496_1_vice-president-al-gore).
- Risen, James. 1991. "Western Nations Reward Poland by Halving Its Debt." *Los Angeles Times*, March 16. Accessed June 8, 2014. <http://articles.latimes.com/1991-03-16/business/fi-228-1-western-nations>.
- Rumsfeld, Donald H. 2001. "Text: Rumsfeld's Pentagon News Conference." *The Washington Post*, October 18. Accessed June 09. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/rumsfeld\\_text101801.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/rumsfeld_text101801.html).
- Schuster, Jürgen, and Herbert Maier. 2006. "The Rift: Explaining Europe's Divergent Iraq Policies in the Run-Up of the American-Led War on Iraq." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2 (3):223-244.
- Snyder, Glenn H. 1984. "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics." *World Politics* 36 (4):461-495. doi:10.2307/2010183.
- Snyder, Glenn H. 1997. *Alliance Politics*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.
- Spanier, John W, and Steven W Hook. 2010. *American Foreign Policy Since World War Two*. Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Taşpınar, Ömer. 2012. "Turkey's Strategic Vision and Syria." *The Washington Quarterly* 35 (3):127-140.
- Ümit, Pamir. 2003. "Statement by His Excellency Ümit Pamir, at the Open Meeting of Security Council on Iraq." Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, February 18. Accessed June 10, 2014. <http://www.iraqwatch.org/government/Turkey/turkey-mfa-pamir-021803.htm>.
- UNSC. 1990. Resolution 678 (1990). In *S/RES/0678*, edited by United Nations Security Council. New York.
- Vucetic, Srdjan. 2011. "Bound to follow? The Anglosphere and US-led coalitions of the willing, 1950-2001." *European Journal of International Relations* 17 (1):27-49.
- Walt, Stephen M. 2005. "Taming American Power." *Foreign Affairs*:105-120.

Walt, Stephen M. 1985. "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power." *International Security* 9 (4):3-43.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 2000. "Structural Realism after the Cold War." *International Security* 25 (1):5-41.

Wohlforth, William C. 1999. "The Stability Of A Unipolar World." *International Security* 24 (1):5-41.

Wright, Robin and Michael Abramowitz. 2007. "U.S. Warns Iraq to Halt Rebel Raids On Turkey." *The Washington Post*, October 23. Accessed on June 20, 2014. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/22/AR2007102200746.html>.

Yentürk, Nurhan. 2014. "Measuring Turkish Military Expenditure." *SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security* 1 (March 2014): 1-20.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'new world' which George H. W. Bush proclaimed after liberating Kuwait from its Iraqi occupiers in 1991, should be one in which the U.S. would use force to "impose law, democratic norms, and world order" (Betts 2012, 360).

<sup>2</sup> UNSC resolution 660 (August 2, 1990) condemned the invasion and demanded the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait. UNSC resolution 661 (August 6, 1990) placed international sanctions on Iraq. Ultimately, UNSC resolution 678 (November 29, 1990) authorized the use of force against Iraq to "uphold and implement resolution 660 and all subsequent resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area". See UNSC (1990).

<sup>3</sup> Thirty-five states formally joined the U.S. coalition during the Gulf War, while many more contributed through indirect support. According to the U.S. Department of Defense, the Iraq war was supported by a "coalition of the willing", consisting of thirty countries. See Garamone (2003) and Cooper, Higgott, and Nossal (1991, 399).

<sup>4</sup> The choice for Poland and Turkey are fourfold: both have sufficient military and state capacities to contribute to military interventions (middle powers), both contributed in some ways to the U.S.-led interventions in 1991 and 2003, both are formally allied to the U.S. (NATO members; or intended to join NATO later as in the case of Poland) and none of the existing studies have exclusively dealt with these two cases.

<sup>5</sup> Followers are in the IR literature often referred to as secondary states (regional powers) and tertiary states (small countries depending on outside powers), or simply, 'small states'.

<sup>6</sup> This argument is most vocally advocated by Ikenberry (2009).

<sup>7</sup> The six countries studied are Britain, Egypt, France, the United States Germany, and Japan. The two latter countries did not contribute troops to the war, but instead made significant monetary contributions to the former's military intervention.

<sup>8</sup> All in all, a state is most likely to join a U.S.-led war coalition if the intervention is targeting a proximate state and has a UN authorization, and when the state is big, well-armed, officially allied, and part of the Anglosphere (Vucetic 2011, 39).

<sup>9</sup> Global legitimacy was measured whether an intervention was authorized by the UN. The findings indicate that followers were eight to nine times more likely to join a U.S.-led coalition if the intervention carried a UN mandate; see Vucetic (2011, 36).

<sup>10</sup> Poland not NATO member when it participated in the Gulf War. Yet Warsaw has consistently shown its willingness to join NATO since the end of communist rule and officially became a member country in 1999. Turkey has been member of NATO since 1952.

<sup>11</sup> Quote from former U.S. President Bush during a speech at Krakow, Poland on May 31, 2003; see Bush (2003).

<sup>12</sup> This is also reflected in the high number of state visits between the two countries. President H.W. Bush visited Poland both as Vice-President (1989) and President (1992), during a time when the country was under a system transformation from socialism to a free market democracy. President Clinton visited the country twice as well, in 1994 and 1997. During the second visit Poland was invited to join the NATO. President George W. Bush visited Poland even three times during his tenure (2001, 2003, and 2007). Every Polish President has visited Washington so far. See the American Embassy to Poland Website: "U.S. and Polish Presidential Visits throughout History", online accessible: [http://poland.usembassy.gov/pres\\_visits.html](http://poland.usembassy.gov/pres_visits.html) (accessed on June 9, 2014).

<sup>13</sup> Initially Poland contributed 200 special armed forces for the invasion. In the aftermath of the invasion Poland took over the military command of one Iraqi province and sent another 3,200 troops to Iraq. See IISS (2006, 136).

<sup>14</sup> According to the EOS-Gallup Europe poll of January 2003, a clear majority of 72 per cent of Polish citizens did not regard national involvement in the Iraq war to be justified (Hummel 2007, 22).

<sup>15</sup> Quote from former U.S. President George W. Bush at a joint news conference with the French president on November 6, 2001; see CNN (2001).

<sup>16</sup> Turkey has been fighting a war against the Kurdish Worker's Party (PKK) and other Kurdish guerrilla groups since the mid-1980s. The insurgency has resulted in the death of close to 40,000 Turks and Kurds since 1984 (Marcus 2007).

<sup>17</sup> The U.S. asked for the authorization to let 62,000 U.S. ground troops cross Turkish territory into northern Iraq; see Kapsis (2006).

<sup>18</sup> At the time of the voting, Erdogan was not prime minister yet nor did he hold any official government position due to a legal sentence that banned him from holding political office. He would not assume the post of prime minister until 2003, when the AKP majority in the parliament passed a law to expunge his record; see (Kapsis 2006, 37).

<sup>19</sup> The AKP enjoyed a comfortable majority in the Turkish parliament at that time with 361 deputies (out of total 550 parliamentarians).

