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I looked elsewhere at the structural determinants of Turkish foreign policy, which included the factors that have traditionally influenced and shaped the foreign policy of Turkey from imperial times, through the inter-war years with Atatürk, to the present-day Republic. Thanks to these structural determinants and their strong influence upon Turkey, it has been able to display a remarkable degree of continuity in its foreign policy, in contrast to frequent internal changes. It is, to a large extent, due to these factors that Turkish foreign policy has been praised for its high degree of rationality, sense of responsibility, long term perspective, and ‘realism found in few developing nations and far from universal even among the democracies of the West’.3

Yet, there are other factors that have affected Turkish foreign policy and its daily happenings. These conjunctural factors, the result of international and domestic changes over the years, have also helped to shape Turkey’s contemporary foreign policy. Due to their dynamic and changeable character, however, they exerted a temporary influence on the country’s foreign policy, especially on its implementation. But due to these factors, Turkey’s foreign policy has undergone some rapid changes in its implementation, even if no major deviations have occurred in the ultimate national goals. These factors have modified the foreign policy of Turkey through the years to establish a better defined and more relevant foreign policy to meet the requirements of the contemporary world.

Though there are several of them, this article will deal with only a few major conjunctural factors that have affected Turkey’s foreign policy and its international environment. Bearing in mind that almost every happening in domestic or international politics could affect and change a country’s foreign policy in one way or another, it is imperative to be selective. The selection of factors has been determined by the importance of the changes that they caused. In this respect, the most decisive reason for choosing
certain conjunctural factors was the sudden shift they had caused in either the implementation or more importantly the foundation of the foreign policy of Turkey.

An overview of Turkey's foreign relations shows that the single most important development had been the transition from the Cold War, which dominated relations between the East and the West in the 1950s, to the process of détente. Another important factor in the making of Turkey's foreign policy has been the Cyprus issue, which became a permanent problematic of Turkey's foreign relations since its inception. In the mid-to-late 1960s it was the continual Cyprus crisis which gave impetus to a process of reconsideration of the basic orientation of Turkish foreign policy. And in the 1970s it was another Cyprus crisis which led to fundamental changes in foreign policy, though not as dramatic as pulling the country out of the Western states system. Other important factors which caused some considerable changes in Turkey's attitudes to certain groups of states, have been the constitutional and political development of the country, together with its economic ambitions and problems; the different views of political parties and groups which came into existence after the 1960 military intervention; the 1961 Constitution, together with social and political evaluation it embodied; and the changes in attitudes of certain states towards Turkey.

Some of the conjunctural factors that had affected Turkish foreign policy were ephemeral in character. Others continued to affect its patterns for some time and were usually interrelated. Since it is virtually impossible to identify the exact result of each factor separately and any foreign policy action is influenced by a combination of factors, this article, instead of looking at certain factors and their effects through the years, will attempt to deal with Turkish foreign policy in different periods, distinguishable by their distinctive patterns in foreign policy. The above-mentioned conjunctural factors, then, will be discussed in-depth in their relevant periods, under the overall 'guidance' of the traditional inputs.

During some 50 years of the existence of the Republic of Turkey (between 1923 and 1980), one can distinguish at least three different periods which could be identified with their distinct patterns in the country's foreign policy attitudes. The inter-war period under the leadership of Atatürk and İnönü found Turkey Western in its inclination but jealously guarding against any intimation that its independence, either economically or militarily, might be jeopardized. The foreign policy of this period was essentially shaped by the factors that I have previously labelled traditional or structural. Particularly Mustafa Kemal's understanding and practice of foreign policy was important. As these factors were examined earlier, there is no need to engage in further discussion about this period. The second period,
1945–60, during which Turkey’s foreign policy was dominated by total Western dependence, was followed by a period of disillusionment with the West, late détente with Eastern bloc and rapprochement efforts with the Third World (1960–70). The 1970s, in addition, saw a pattern of alienation from the West encouraged by the Cyprus crisis of 1974, which in turn showed Turkey the cumulative result of the foreign policy it had been following since the end of the Second World War: loneliness in the international arena. Hence, the 1970s witnessed Turkey’s efforts to come back to the international arena as a reliable and friendly nation, just as she was during the inter-war period.

Modern Turkey’s Western orientation and rapidly modernizing features were firmly consolidated under the leadership of Atatürk. His foreign policy was dominated by the priority of peace, sovereignty and national development over expansionist-revisionism. After Atatürk’s death, one of his close associates, İsmet İnönü, took over the presidency of Turkey and the Republican People’s Party (RPP) in a one-party political system. He was so committed to the Kemalist ideology in general, and foreign policy principles of peace and sovereignty in particular, that Turkey under his leadership ‘faithfully followed the Kemalist regime in every domain and the foreign policy remained unchanged’. Although ‘the gathering storm’ over Europe in 1939 forced Turkey to enter into an alliance with France and Great Britain, it was able to stay out of the war until the last minute.6

Despite surviving the Second World War virtually unscathed, Turkey however, was soon to see that the situation after the war was demanding careful diplomacy as much as it had done previously.7 Throughout the war, İnönü came to the conclusion that Turkey’s biggest problem after the war would be the prospect of facing all alone the more powerful Soviet Union. In fact, he was convinced that if Turkey entered the war, the Soviets would occupy Turkey either as a member of the Axis or as a ‘liberator’.8 He also foresaw the Soviet post-war domination of Eastern Europe.9 Hence, he was determined not to give the Soviets an excuse to set foot on Turkish soil, though learned soon that all his careful manoeuvring to avoid alienating the Soviet Union had been to no avail.

The Second World War marked a watershed in Turkey’s foreign policy as well as in its domestic developments. Although Turkey’s political and economic alignment with the Western countries after the Second World War may be treated as a natural outcome of its desire to become a fully modernized (= westernized) country, its dependence on the Western powers went too far to represent a reversal in its earlier policies. It is true that the pre-war Republic under Atatürk’s leadership attempted to adopt the
institutions and the values of the West in order to accelerate the process of modernization and economic development. This inclination to the West did not, however, imply a dependency on the Western powers, either militarily or economically. Moreover, Turkey was reluctant to form any economic bonds which might lead to any real or imaginary dependency. On the contrary, Turkish foreign policy before the Second World War was independent in nature, despite a series of regional pacts, and based primarily on conciliation with all big and regional powers. During this period, Turkey maintained friendly relations with all the major states of the time but avoided any formal attachment with any of them until 1939. Even during the Second World War, its main foreign policy aim was to find a way to stay out of the war and not to endanger the delicate balance of its relations with all the parties. Why then did Turkish foreign policy reverse itself following the Second World War?

A number of domestic and systemic factors had pushed Turkey towards Western tutelage in general, and Western-dependent foreign policy in particular. It was no accident that significant changes occurred simultaneously in both foreign and domestic policies, for as we shall see there was a linkage between the two.

In the international arena there were basically two more important and interrelated developments that were instrumental in Turkey’s decision to establish closer ties with the Western countries. First of all, there was a change in the nature of the international system which rapidly evolved from a ‘balance of power’ structure to a ‘bipolar’ structure. In such a structure, as Aron’s paradigm states, a policy of neutrality was not very realistic or possible at all for a country like Turkey, a middle-range power situated in such a geopolitically important area. Other important developments in the international arena were the emergence of the Soviet Union as a superpower, and, more delicately for Turkey, its subsequent demands upon Turkey. As most observers noted, the impetus for Turkey’s shift to Western alignment did not come from the West, but rather resulted from its reaction to Soviet pressures.

Already during the war, it became obvious to Turkey that the Soviets were pursuing a policy designed to gain territorial concessions from Turkey. During the secret German–Soviet negotiations in November 1940, Turkey was one of the bargaining pieces, and was a price asked by the Soviets to enter the Berlin Pact. Subsequently, allied with the West, the Soviets brought their demands to Yalta and Potsdam Conferences in 1945. Having received Churchill’s acquiescence at the Moscow Conference (October 1944), Stalin presented Soviet position at Yalta (February 1945) vis-à-vis the Turkish Straits. ‘It is impossible,’ remarked Stalin vis-à-vis the Turkish Straits. ‘It is impossible,’ remarked Stalin ‘to accept a situation in which Turkey has a hand on Russia’s throat.’
Having already received these hints about Soviet intentions on its territorial integrity, and alarmed by the Soviet note of 19 March 1945, denouncing the 1925 Treaty of Friendship and Non-aggression, Turkey was terrified by another Soviet note on 7 June 1945, demanding Soviet bases on the Straits in addition to the territorial adjustments in the Soviet-Turkish border as the price for renewing the Treaty of Friendship and Non-aggression. President İnönü’s response was sharp and emotional, telling the Grand National Assembly of Turkey that they were ‘under no obligation to give up Turkish soil or Turkish rights to anyone ... We shall live with honour and die with honour.’ The Assembly speaker further warned Soviets in a firm and equally emotional manner that ‘if the Russians insist on their demand, we shall fight to the last Turk’.

When Turkey refused these initial demands, from mid-1945 onwards, the Soviets started to exert heavy political pressures on Turkey. In this situation, Turkey unsuccessfully tried ‘to involve the United States in defending Turkey against the Soviet Union’, and ‘bring the United States position on the Straits into harmony with the minimum Turkish view’. However, the United States and Great Britain, under the mistaken belief that meaningful co-operation with the Soviet Union after the war would be possible, stood aside. What they did not know at the time was that the Soviet demands on Turkey were a part of Stalin’s efforts to take advantage of the power-gap of the wartime and immediate post-war international situation by provisional demands just beyond Soviet borders. Furthermore, Turkey’s neutrality during the war had left its future status in ambiguity in contrast to most European countries where the post-war spheres were clearly defined. While this ambiguity made Turkey a tempting target for Stalin’s post-war expansionism, the Western (US and UK) attitudes at the end of the war, which were slow to adopt a firm position against Soviet demands, must have encouraged Stalin about his proposals upon Turkey.

Meanwhile, at the Postdam Conference (17 July–2 August 1945), the Soviets sought to obtain an Allied consensus that the problem of the Straits was a matter between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Though the Conference broke up without resolving the matter, it was agreed in principle to revise the Montreux Convention. In the meantime, the Western attitude towards Turkey, and the Soviet demands in general, began to change gradually. Taken in conjunction with Soviet actions elsewhere, and in the light of the unsuccessful conference of foreign ministers in December 1945, the Soviet demands started to appear to President Truman to demonstrate an intention to invade Turkey and control the Straits.

With the declaration in March 1946 by Great Britain that the 1939 Treaty of Alliance was still in force and obliged the UK to help it in the event of aggression, Turkey realized that its post-war isolation had now
ended. Turkey was further relieved by another sign reflecting the changed American stance: the battleship Missouri anchored at Istanbul on 15 April 1946, carrying the remains of Turkish Ambassador M. Ertegün, who had died in Washington during the war. This was seen as a sign of American readiness to protect Turkey. Nevertheless, the dispute over the Straits continued until the end of 1946.

On 7 August 1946 the Soviets presented their proposal over the Straits as authorized at Postdam. The proposal called for control of the Straits to be in the hands of Turkey and ‘other Black Sea Powers’, with Turkey and the Soviet Union sharing joint defence of the waterways. They also sent strong notes to Turkey to complain about the administration of the Straits during the war. This time the Americans and the British backed Turkey in its rejection of Soviet demands, and in September 1946, shortly after the proposed regulations presented by the Soviets, the United States announced its intention to maintain a permanent naval presence in the Mediterranean.

Although later in September the Soviets repeated their earlier demands, they dropped the issue toward the end of October 1946 after another refusal from Turkey, backed by the United States and Great Britain.

The answer to the question as to what actually persuaded the Soviets to back out of their demands on Turkey is difficult to give, and has been controversial. Many, especially foreign observers, tend to emphasize Western support. And the Turkish officials, who tried to persuade the US to continue its aid to Turkey, tend to reinforce this connection. On the other hand, many Turkish scholars, specially since the mid-1960s, have argued that the years of maximum threat were 1945 and 1946 and Turkey, without any formal connection with the United States, had to stand all alone against Soviet demands. They further argue that when finally the United States agreed to give aid to Turkey through the Truman Doctrine, the Soviet Union had already backed down in its claims. It seems fair to state that it was the combination of determined Turkish resistance, opposition of the Western powers, and the loss of will on the Soviets’ part that caused the Soviets to back down.

Whatever the reasons for the USSR’s failure to follow up its claims, Turkey, thoroughly alarmed by Soviet actions, reverted to its historic animosity for its Russian neighbour and continued to seek protection from the West, mainly from the United States. To this end, it attempted to dramatize the Soviet threat, and continued to argue that Turkey’s geographical position made it the key to the Middle East, supposedly the final target of the alleged Soviet aggression. Although by the end of 1946 the Allied position had hardened in opposition to Soviet demands on Turkey, it was not until 1947, in reaction to Communist activities in Greece and the British announcement of their intention to withdraw from its
responsibilities in the area, that the United States became actively involved. The result was the Truman Doctrine which forged the initial bonds between Turkey and the United States, despite the fact that United States personnel, who began to be stationed in Turkey, quickly aroused memories of the Capitulations.  

One of the main Ottoman foreign policy aims for a lengthy period was to ally Turkey with a powerful state, against its traditional antagonist Russia. Now, in the bipolar international system, modern Turkey, faced with renewed Russian threat, was forced to find an ally to protect its interests against the Soviet Union. There were a number of reasons why the United States was the natural candidate for the post. Apart from the fact that the United States was now assuming the leadership and protectorship of the Western democracies, and it was the only country capable of lending money which Turkey’s economy badly needed at the time, it was also significant to the Turks that the United States had no history of colonial domination and was geographically located a considerable distance from Turkey.

Though the Soviet threat in the late 1940s stands out as the most instrumental factor in pushing Turkey into the Western camp, there were other reasons for Turkey to choose the Western course. First, as war ended with a victory for the Western democracies, the future seemed to be on their side and with their political system. This belief in the Western democratic system must have contributed to Turkey’s willingness to alter its position of non-alignment and seek closer links with the West. Moreover, apart from international and systemic factors, internal political and economic pressures also played an important role in Turkey’s new orientation in foreign policy. Most importantly, a dramatic change in the Turkish political system, namely the transition to a multi-party system, was occurring concurrently with above-mentioned international developments. Turkey’s post-war foreign policy goals, at least in part, affected this change in its domestic politics which in turn had an effect on Turkish foreign policy.

Although there can be little doubt that the real impetus behind change was President İnönü’s accurate assessment of Turkey’s domestic scene, it would also be fair to argue that desire for Western support against Soviet demands strongly influenced his decision to promote truly democratic, multi-party elections. Internally, there was mounting criticism about RPP’s one-party regime, which failed to produce viable economic policies and generated strong opposition with its capital levy during the war. At the same time, similar criticisms by the United States Congress must have had considerable impact upon İnönü, who was now seeking closer relations with the United States and wishing to join the Western community. The social changes and specific events which were instrumental in the formation of a multi-party system in Turkey are too numerous and beyond
the scope of this article. Whatever the reason for its introduction, however, this political experiment challenged RPP’s almost exclusive privilege of governmental policy-making and offered the rural groups an opportunity to gain political influence alongside an urban elite composed of former high-ranking military officers and bureaucrats. This in turn had inescapable effects on the implementation of Turkish foreign policy.

Beyond the political factors, economic needs necessitated a Western leaning in foreign policy. Although by the end of 1946 Turkey had gold and foreign exchange reserves around $262 million, this was mainly due to favourable prices that the fighting powers offered Turkey’s agricultural products and raw materials such as chromium. Moreover, at the end of the war Turkish officials, who were now considering the possibility of war with the Soviet Union, did not want to use these reserves and, therefore, tried to utilize international loans in order to enable Turkey to maintain a large army with its economic consequences.

Under the RPP government, Turkey had already started to receive American aid through the Truman Doctrine (1947), and later Marshall Plan (1948), although both schemes were not primarily arranged for Turkey, and there were restrictions on the use of American aid. Further, Turkey had also established additional formal links with the Western Community. In 1948 Turkey became a member of the newly established Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which in turn enabled Turkey to be automatically included in the Marshall Plan, and in 1950 it joined the Council of Europe. Turkey’s participation in these purely European organizations was of primary importance for its future economic and political relations and policies.

This pattern of economic dependency continued under the Democrat Party (DP), which won a decisive victory over the RPP in 1950. Democrats were at least as anxious as the Republicans to tie Turkey politically and economically to the West, and particularly to the United States. Although they encouraged free enterprise in their campaigns, they soon found it convenient to continue to build up the state enterprises after gaining power, thus came to rely heavily on foreign, mainly American, economic and military assistance. As a result, Turkey’s need for foreign aid became an integral part of its foreign as well as domestic policy.

Turkey’s economic system under the DP was modelled along Western lines and relied heavily on private initiative and foreign investment, and during the period 1947–61 Turkey received $1,862 million in military assistance and $1,394 million in economic assistance from the United States. As a result of this extensive assistance, Turkish leaders apparently became insulated from economic reality, and consequently established Turkey’s long-standing dependency on foreign assistance.
After an impressive economic start which lasted through 1953, the economic situation in Turkey deteriorated rapidly. Its initial success was due mainly to the expansion of private investment, the boom in agricultural production as a result of government subvention in prices and the opening of new farming areas, the mechanization of farming, and favourable weather and high world prices for agricultural products because of the Korean War. Despite early indications and Western warnings of serious economic problems, the Menderes government, encouraged by early successes, continued to pursue ambitious but uncoordinated development policies. After 1953, however, Turkey's economy began to deteriorate and its foreign trade deficit grew. 16

Even though the Turkish government refused to follow its economic advice, the United States continued to provide essential assistance under the, sometimes exaggerated, view of Turkey's geographical importance. Finally, when faced with bankruptcy in 1958, Menderes accepted the stabilization programme imposed by an international consortium composed of the United States, Germany, Great Britain, the European Payments Union, and the International Monetary Fund. In return the consortium rescheduled Turkey's debts and provided an aid package of $359 million. 17

In addition to establishing Turkey's dependency on foreign assistance and creating a less than favourable image of the Turks' ability to manage their finances, the fiscal policies of the DP government led to significant social changes in Turkey. The increased correlation of status with power and the rise of the new middle class, based on economic activity, resulted in a concomitant decline in the status of the salaried bureaucrats, intellectuals and military officers. And the danger was the Democrat Party government did not understand the new forces of instability developing in the society. Thus the stage was set for domestic conflict.

Meanwhile, Turkey's main foreign policy objective was to be a full member of NATO. This desire for membership was based on political and economic factors rather than strategic and military concerns, since by 1950 the main Soviet threat had already been averted. Although Turkey's wish to enter NATO should be seen as a natural outcome of the foreign policies that Turkey had been following since the Second World War, the economic concerns must also have played a considerable part, and the idea that its exclusion might lead to a decrease of US interest and subsequent reduction in American aid must have had its weight in the government's decision. Furthermore, domestic political considerations of the DP also played a significant role in this decision. First of all the DP, which was advocating liberal economy in Turkey, might have seen that it was difficult to establish such a system without attaching Turkey to the West. Secondly, the leaders of the DP genuinely believed that Turkey's entrance to NATO was
necessary for the future of the democratic system in Turkey and their own existence. In fact, it was quite clear from their statements during the election campaign of 1950 that the DP leaders, under the earlier experiences of multi-party system in Turkey, were afraid of the possibility that the RPP would not deliver the government even if they lost the election. They thought that joining NATO would prevent the RPP from playing such games. Finally in 1952, after the Korean War, and Turkish participation in the conflict, Turkey and Greece joined into NATO, which marked the Turkey’s military commitment to the West as well as its economic dependence.

As a result of its economic and military dependency on the West, Turkey’s foreign policy also started to tilt toward the West. Turkey’s active role in the creation of such alliances as the Baghdad Pact and the Balkan Treaty which gained it no additional security and the awkward role she played at the Afro-Asian Bandung Conference in championing the cause of Western powers may all be interpreted as a part of Democrat Party’s efforts to appear as an indispensable ally in order to secure greater aid from the West. Likewise, its support of the Western powers at the Suez crisis of 1956; its fierce opposition to the 1958 Iraqi coup; its threats to Syria in 1957, in the heat of the US-Syrian crisis, to invade should the Communists, or the Soviet Union, gain control over the Syrian government, were all the parts of Turkey’s efforts to exacerbate the Communist threat in its immediate borders in order to get more economic and military aid as well as the result of the Democrat Party’s foreign policy thinking which was essentially anti-Soviet.

As one could expect, relations with the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries were far from friendly during the period under consideration. After Soviet territorial demands on Turkey, relations further deteriorated proportionate to Turkey’s alignment with the West through the Truman Doctrine (1947), and its membership in NATO (1952), the Balkan Pact (1954), and the Baghdad Pact (1955). Turkey’s political preference of multi-party system based on free elections, and economic choice centered on free enterprise were also reflections of its commitment to Western-style democratic system. Harsh and often threatening Soviet responses only helped Turkey to move closer to its Western allies. Turkey’s suppression of the leftist parties and their organs during the 1940s and 1950s was also caused, in part, by Soviet hostility. On the other hand, the Soviet fear that Turkey might be used as a base for a Western attack against the Soviet Union dictated Soviet policies toward Turkey for a long time, which remained openly hostile and intimidating until 1953 when a culmination of several factors resulted in change. In May 1953, barely three months after Stalin’s death, the Soviet government renounced its territorial claims to Turkey’s eastern provinces and its desire for control of the Straits.
Since the Turkish government regarded these peace moves as a new Soviet tactic designed to separate it from the West, there were no immediate benefits to Turkish–Soviet relations. Consequently, Soviet efforts to establish intimate relations with Egypt in 1955 and the Syrian and Iraqi crises of 1957 and 1958 invoked further fears in Turkey about being surrounded by hostile pro-Soviet states, and the crushing of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 by the Red Army only helped to confirm Turkish suspicions about Soviet moves. As a result, when the Cold War entered a period of limited détente in 1954, Turkey was left behind in the process of normalization of East–West relations.

Finally, when Turkish premier Menderes agreed on exchanging visits with Krushchev in April 1960 as a result of mainly Turkey’s need for economic assistance, and the basic changes in Soviet policy, which was no longer insistent on radical change in Turkish Foreign Policy as the price for improved relations, it was too late, because Menderes was to be ousted by the military coup of 27 May 1960, which caused a Turkish–Soviet standstill for another four years.

During this period, Turkey’s relations with the Middle Eastern Arab countries, and Third World states in general, were literally an extension of its Western-dependent foreign policy, as well. Even before Turkey’s accession to a Western defence system, there were enough factors leading to a deterioration of Turkish–Arab relations. First of all, historical experiences, that is, the relationship between the rulers (Ottoman Turks) and the ruled (Arabs), surely coloured the relations. Secondly, Atatürk’s reforms created a difference between two Islamic peoples, and the general secularization of Turkey in the name of modernization (Westernization) created profound resentment and mistrust among Arabs. Moreover, the question of Alexandretta, which resulted from the attachment of the region to Turkey in 1939, was still a matter of tension between Turkey and Syria.

Furthermore, Turkey’s Western orientation, which led Turkey to adopt political, social, cultural and economic ideas from the West and eventually to join NATO, had significant impacts on Turco-Arab relations. In its Middle Eastern relations Turkey was looked upon by the Arabs as a pawn of the West. This perception was not altogether untrue, but it would be unfair to assume that Turkey was acting only as a Western proxy. Indeed, Turkey had a real desire to secure its southern borders. Beyond, the emergence of Israel had an immediate and long-lasting effect on Turkish–Arab relations. Originally Turkey opposed the partition of Palestine, but, after establishment of Israel, changed its stance to be the first Islamic nation to recognize it and exchange ambassadors.

Further, Turkey’s efforts in 1951 to help establish a Middle East Defence Organization (MEDO) and the Arab states’ resentment against this as
another form of Western and Turkish imperialism in the region worsened the relations. Though MEDO had failed, Turkey later joined the Baghdad Pact of 1955, which was also opposed by many Arab countries, especially Egypt.\(^4\) Though the effectiveness or utility of the Baghdad Pact had certainly been questionable, the role it played in the alienation of Egypt and its allies from the West in general and Turkey in particular are obvious. It most assuredly cast Turkey in the image of a tool of the Western powers.

During the period Turkey’s foreign policy objectives in the Middle East, as mentioned above, mirrored its pro-Western alignment and reflected Turkey’s fears that the Soviet Union was enlarging its influence over Middle Eastern countries, and Turkey could be soon contained by pro-Soviet and hostile Arab states.\(^5\) Therefore, it could be said that, by contributing to Turkey’s rapprochement with the West, and placing great pressure upon it, the Soviet threat indirectly influenced Turkey’s further alienation from the Middle East.

Turkey in the 1950s certainly failed, as Karpat assesses, to understand the trend of development, the political objectives and resentments of its Arab neighbours.\(^6\) On the other hand the Arabs, too, failed to understand Turkey’s security needs and fears from the Soviet Union. They were geographically removed from the Soviet Union by the buffer that Turkey and Iran had created between the two areas. For the Turks, the Russians were not merely a dangerous historical enemy but also, because of their proximity, a credible threat to the existence of themselves. As Aykan assesses, ‘no matter how the Arabs could have felt about the Soviet danger, their feelings could not have been so deep-seated as Turkey’s feeling’.\(^7\)

Meanwhile, Turkey’s defence of the West at the Bandung Conference in 1955 further strained its relations with the Third World Countries.\(^8\) Originally Turkey did not even want to join this conference. But later, under pressure from the West, it changed its mind and went to the conference in order to warn these states against the threats caused by ‘middle of the road measures’.\(^9\) At this conference of Afro-Asian nations Turkey strongly defended its Western alliance with harsh attacks on non-alignment, socialism and communism.\(^10\) As a result, Turkey became isolated from the Third World, an isolation which would later be felt in the United Nations.

Throughout the 1950s Turkish foreign policy was clearly a product of its Western alignment and an extension of Western policies toward both the Soviet Union and the non-aligned countries. During this period the leaders of Turkey did not agree that a ‘détente’ would be possible between two blocs, and did not believe in the sincerity of ‘peaceful coexistence’ policy which they regarded as another tactic by the Soviet Union to deceive the free world.\(^11\) They did not accept non-alignment as a viable solution and further believed that it would help the Soviet Union to dominate the world.
in the long run. However, in the 1960s, due to systemic and internal changes as well as American policy toward Cyprus, Turkey began to re-evaluate its strictly Western orientation.

It would have been hard to imagine in the late 1950s that the Turks would ever be disappointed with the West and would join in the world-wide anti-American sentiment. Yet, the Turkish–American friendship, which began with the Truman Doctrine and flourished in the 1950s, began to cool during the 1960s and deteriorated in the 1970s. What happened to the Turkish–American ‘honeymoon’ in such a short time? What had changed in Turkey and in the international arena that affected Turkey’s relations with the United States in particular and generally with the Western alignment?

In fact, it was not only Turkish–American amity that was altered throughout the inter-coup period. The whole of Turkish foreign policy thinking, actually, was experiencing a re-evaluation and reorientation process along with the rise of anti-American sentiments in Turkey. Although the 1964 Cyprus crisis is commonly regarded as the turning point in Turkish–American relations and Western alignment in general, in reality the process of reorientation in the mind of intellectuals and some politicians started well before that year. Admittedly, the Cyprus question stands out as being the most significant factor in bringing about the reappraisal and diversification efforts of Turkish foreign policy during the inter-coup period. In point of fact, however, there were other factors both domestic and international involved in Turkey’s policy shift.

The détente process and the consequent loosening of the bipolar balance, which had initiated important changes in world politics, also greatly affected Turkey’s international position. The Cold War had earlier necessitated, on the one hand, Turkey’s dependency on the West, but on the other, also sustained unquestioning Western support either militarily or politically including economic aid. During the 1950s the Soviet threat was felt by Turkey so much that there was no reason on the Turkish part to question its total dependence to the West, as long as the West (mainly the US) committed itself to protect Turkey from Soviet aggression. But, the 1960s saw a softening of inter-bloc tensions. Furthermore, the rise of China and France as rebellious countries against bipolar arrangement of the post-war years signalled a change in the power balance of the world which has eventually turned to be a multipolar one. Although, international relations continued to be overshadowed by the two strong poles, the growing interdependence among nations, and increasing roles of the secondary states in world politics have caused a loosening of the bipolar balance and the emergence of a more complex and multidimensional configuration.

This multidimensional interplay can also be observed in economic developments. While seeking a fulcrum between East, West, and the other
focuses of power, the world, at the same time, had to sustain the
discrimination of the North towards the developing countries of the South. On
the other hand, the rising economic consciousness of the South has brought
along a set of political consequences and has introduced new actors to the
world political stage. Of these actors, the ‘Group of 77’ on the economic
stage, and the ‘Group of Non-aligned Countries’ on the political stage became
the representatives of rising consciousness of the so-called ‘Third World’
countries. These events have introduced the concept of economic
development to world politics and have also resulted in considerable cross-
alliance relations. While the world became more inter-dependent, both
economically and politically, the period of détente, which slowed down inter-
superpower rivalry, also made it possible for small members of alliance
systems to have broader economic and political relations with the other states
disregarding military blocs. In such a fragmented world Turkey had to expand
its relations to these new centres of economic, political and military power in
order to take full advantage of its economic and political potential.

Moreover, an official NATO report, the Harmel Report, issued in
December 1967, gave way to inter-alliance relations and must have
dispelled possible Turkish apprehensions that its changing relations with the
Eastern bloc could jeopardize its position in NATO. The report stated that
since all NATO members are ‘sovereign states, the allies are not obliged to
subordinate their policies to collective decision ... each ally can decide its
policy’, and called the Allies to seek improved relations with the USSR and
the countries of Eastern Europe.53

The expansion in Turkish foreign policy, however, would have required
more developments both domestic and international level other than détente
itself, though they were not far away in the early 1960s.

During the inter-coup period, Turkey went through important socio-
political changes, a combination of which affected the thinking of Turkish
people in general and their approach to the matters of foreign policy in
particular. The internal evolution of Turkey after the 1960 coup, therefore,
deserves further attention.

Since the 1960 coup was a result of various social, economic and
internal political factors rather than based on any foreign policy
consideration,54 its immediate effect on foreign relations was minimal.55 The
only visible foreign policy modification of the military junta was an attempt
to improve relations with the Arab countries, and a desire to establish closer
contacts with the newly emerging nations.56 The military government also
attempted to regularize the various bilateral agreements with the US and
emphasized Turkish national interests in this connection.57

Although the 1960 coup and the military government afterwards did not
produce any immediate real foreign policy changes, the relatively free
political atmosphere after the coup and the ‘liberal’ constitution of 1961 had a significant impact on Turkish domestic politics, and subsequently affected Turkish foreign policy. Up to the early 1960s Turkish foreign policy-making remained in the almost exclusive privilege of a small elitist group. Public criticism of government foreign policy was generally considered unpatriotic. Under the presidencies of Atatürk and İnönü, the very nature of the authoritarian single-party politics precluded any real opposition in the foreign policy area as well as in domestic policies. Under the DP governments, too, public discussion of foreign policy, and indeed all other issues, were tightly controlled chiefly in parallel with Menderes' efforts to suppress opposition in the country.

Besides suppression, it is evident that the opposition RPP’s views on foreign policy were very similar to those implemented by the DP governments. Although Menderes did not consult with the opposition party on matters of foreign policy, he was usually criticized only on matters of implementation rather than decision itself. For example, the opposition criticized his decision to send Turkish troops to Korea, one of, if not the most important, Turkish foreign policy decisions of the 1950s, more because of the way it was made than for its content.²

Apart from this, one of the foreign policy acts of the Menderes government did in fact create great unrest among Turkey’s intellectual community and the RPP, shortly before the 1960 military coup. This was the 1959 bilateral agreement between Turkey and the United States, which stated that the United States would come to Turkey’s aid in the event of ‘direct or indirect’ aggression.²² Soon, the term ‘indirect aggression’ created great concern among the intelligentsia and the opposition who saw an American commitment in the agreement to intervene on behalf of the Menderes government in the event of a coup or even an electoral defeat.²² The criticism directed against the government was so strong that the submission of the agreement to the Grand National Assembly for ratification was postponed for a year.²²

But still discussion of foreign policy matters was limited, and in any case, confined to the intelligentsia. However, after the 1960 coup and the reconstruction of the constitutional government, Turkey’s foreign relations entered inter-party discussions, together with relatively pluralist political life, and attracted people’s attention.

Moreover, the constitutional and electoral changes introduced by the National Unity Committee (NUC, the military junta) have influenced Turkish politics, both foreign and domestic, for a long time.²² The new electoral law introduced a system of proportional representation which allowed small parties to enter parliament and therefore created multiplicity in foreign as well as domestic policies. The new constitution, moreover, put
a series of checks and balances to prevent democratic system to turn, in effect, into one-party totalitarianism as happened during the 1950s. On the negative side, however, the new electoral system made it increasingly difficult for a single party to obtain a majority. What followed was a series of weak and generally ineffective coalition governments.\textsuperscript{34} Due to the major ideological differences between Turkey’s various political parties, the long periods of coalition rule created an atmosphere within which a general consensus on policy, either foreign or domestic, was rarely reached. This, of course, created ineffectiveness and inactivity in Turkish foreign policy during the 1970s.

The new system also created a plural society alongside the pluralist parliament, by spelling out in the 1961 Constitution the ‘fundamental rights’ – freedom of thought and belief, freedom of press, of publication, of association, and many others.\textsuperscript{35} Under this air of freedom, foreign policy, like domestic policies, became a topic of open public discussion. This was contrary to the previous practice of the Republic, in which the public, as mentioned above, was generally silent on matters of foreign policy.

Another factor which was to contribute indirectly to the reorientation of Turkey’s foreign policy was the emergence for the first time in Turkey’s history of a genuine socialist movement. The emergence of the new Turkish left was signalled by the publication of the weekly Yön (1961) and the establishment of the Turkish Worker’s Party (TIP, also in 1961), which was later outlawed after the 1971 military intervention. They advocated the destruction of Turkey’s ties with the West and the normalization of relations with the non-aligned and communist countries. As a natural extension of their socialist ideology, they were against the strong American presence on Turkish soil and ran an anti-American campaign throughout the country.\textsuperscript{36} Although these callings of the new Left drew many followers from the intelligentsia, its anti-Western campaign did not attract widespread support from the masses until the Cyprus crisis of 1964. It was, however, at least in part responsible for a basic policy shift within the RPP, which adopted a ‘left of centre’ stance on the eve of the 1965 general election in an apparent attempt to win back the intellectuals from TIP and to gain support from the working class.\textsuperscript{37}

Concomitant with the Worker’s Party, other splinter parties advocating nationalistic and religious ideas also emerged. Parties, and indeed any other organization, acting on these grounds were not allowed before the 1960s. With the free atmosphere the new constitution created, however, these parties found a chance to come out and be represented in the parliament. The fragmentation of the Turkish political system after the 1960 coup also played a part in this result.

Another significant feature of the inter-coup period was the extraordinary degree of radicalism espoused by the Turkish youth. Though
in the late 1960s it was undoubtedly affected by the world-wide trend, especially by student insurrection in France in 1968, the relatively free atmosphere and extreme fragmentation in Turkish political system created after the 1960 intervention were, at least, partly responsible for the result. What began in the late 1960s as peaceful student demonstrations against poor social and educational conditions, soon assumed political significance, grew radical, and became polarized between the Right and the Left and turned into bloody armed clashes in the 1970s."

Anti-imperialism was a common platform for both sides. But, while the Leftists attacked Turkey’s alliance with the West, which they believed restricted Turkey’s freedom of action, the Rightists were strongly anti-Communist and opposed Soviet imperialism, which at the time was no longer an obvious threat to Turkey. The clashes between extreme Left and Right grew in the 1970s and spread outside the political arena. More importantly, in the 1970s another wave of violence surrounded Turkey with its roots in cultural and religious grounds as well as politics. As far as foreign relations were concerned, increasing political and social instability generated by political violence and terrorism seriously damaged Turkey’s image in the world at a time when Turkey was in great need of economic and political support.

Moreover, it was quite certain that during the late 1970s any foreign policy, like any domestic policy, of the government would generate a strong challenge from at least one of the extreme groups. Under these circumstances, governments had to restrain themselves to the daily happenings of the foreign relations instead of trying to map out general guidelines for Turkey’s foreign policy problems. This strategy in turn contributed to Turkey’s inactivity and isolation on the international front.

In terms of fostering a new direction in Turkish foreign policy, the factors outlined above involved only a limited circle of politicians and intellectuals until the Cyprus crisis of 1963–64. The democratization of Turkish politics, with the growth of a vocal and fragmented opposition and the emergence of foreign policy as a political issue, created an atmosphere in which a shift to a more independent foreign policy was not only likely, but also considering Turkey’s need for foreign capital, very probable. However, not until the Cyprus crisis of 1963–64 did the emerging independent policy trend at the top find wide support. Widespread anti-American sentiments emerged. But more importantly, events surrounding the Cyprus crisis forced Turkey’s leaders to recognize that their strict adherence to a pro-Western alignment in a period of a changing international system had left Turkey virtually isolated in the World Community. Cyprus then was the catalyst which forced Turkey to re-examine its foreign policy in the light of a rapidly changing world system.
While the history of Cyprus and developments of crises over Cyprus between Greece and Turkey are not of prime importance to this paper, it is sufficient to know that various forces made the Cyprus issue one of vital importance, for both the Turkish government and the Turkish people. First of all, the geographical position of the Island of Cyprus in the Eastern Mediterranean made it strategically important for Turkish security thinking. The scenario that Greek-held Cyprus would cut Turkey off from the open sea encouraged Turkey’s resistance to Greek designs on the island since the 1950s. Secondly, the large Turkish community on the island which the Turks felt compelled to defend against the Greek majority made the issue highly emotional. Furthermore, enosis (union with Greece), then the Greek position on the island, was seen by many Turks as a first step for achieving the Megali Idea (re-establishment of the old Byzantine Empire), and therefore the Cyprus issue became a matter concerning national pride.

This highly emotional and therefore political appeal of the Cyprus issue can clearly be seen in the statement issued by the Turkish Foreign Ministry, in late 1963, in reply to President Makarios’ proposed constitutional changes, which would have reduced the status of the Turkish community in the island from a community with equal rights to a minority. The statement ended: ‘A government that can abandon some 100,000 dear members of our race to the arbitrary administration of foreigners will never come to power in Turkey.’\footnote{1} It is obvious that the fragile Turkish coalition governments of the 1960s could not dare to negotiate a compromise when Turkey was drawn into the crisis by the violent clashes between the two communities on Cyprus at the end of the year 1963.

Initially, Turkey sought support for its position in NATO where the United States had the dominant voice. Although NATO seemed to be a natural forum for Turkey and Greece to seek a solution, it was soon evident that the other NATO states, especially the United States, were reluctant to enter into what was seen as a local discord between two members of the same alliance.\footnote{1} Moreover, the United States was restraining itself from imposing any solution on the Cyprus dispute for fear of alienating either Greece or Turkey.\footnote{1}

Turkey, on the other hand, was fully expecting American support under what now appears as faulty appraisal of the extent of support the United States could or would extend. It is evident that Turkey, at the time, had failed to take into account the changed circumstances in which international relations were operating during the 1960s.\footnote{2} It was easy for the United States to use leverage on Turkey and Greece to reach compromise on Cyprus in the 1950s when the effects of Cold War still felt and both countries were in need of American aid. By the 1964, however, both Greece and Turkey were feeling less strained by the Cold War. Furthermore Greece, due to its
association with the EEC, became much less dependent on American economic aid, and therefore American economic leverage on Greece had greatly diminished. Moreover, Cyprus had become an independent state in 1960 and Makarios was now taking an independent stand from Greece.

Another faulty assumption, on which Turkey based its expectations, was that the relative importance of Turkey to the United States was more than that of Greece because of its more strategic location. But what Turkey could not see at the time was that the thaw in the Cold War and the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles diminished the American need for Turkish bases to maintain the nuclear balance of power. Ulman also points out the effect of the large and well-organized Greek-American community and the scope of world Christian protest against the restrictions Turkey placed on the activities of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchal of Istanbul.

Thoroughly frustrated by America's and NATO's neutrality on Cyprus; faced with public outcry at home; and fuelled by the Cypriot parliament decision of June 1964 to establish general conscription for the Greek Cypriot defence forces, İnönü’s government informed its allies that Turkey had decided on unilateral intervention. The American response was the now infamous Johnson letter of 1964, which was described by İnönü in his reply as 'disappointing' both 'in wording and content'.

The contents of the letter, which was not made public until 1966 but nevertheless partially leaked to the press, was shocking for many Turks who now came to the conclusion that Turkey could not rely on its allies unconditionally. In the letter Johnson warned Turkey that its 'NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO Allies'. He further reminded that 'the United States can not agree to the use of any US supplied military equipment for a Turkish intervention in Cyprus under present circumstances'.

The second part of the letter, which was to play a most important role nearly ten years later, passed more or less unnoticed. The questioning of NATO support, however, as İnönü’s reply reflected, created great concern among Turks and forced them to rethink the reliability and trustworthiness of the alliance with the West. They realized, as İnönü put in his reply to Johnson, that 'there are ... wide divergence of views' between Turkey and the United States 'as to the nature and basic principles of the North Atlantic Alliance'. In Turkish understanding, the NATO Treaty 'imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of an aggression' unconditionally, and to debate the issue of 'whether aggression was provoked' and 'whether they have an obligation to assist' would jeopardize 'the very foundation of the Alliance ... and it would
lose its meaning'. They further realized that the national interests of Turkey were no longer identical with those of the United States or the Western alliance. From then on, the question of re-examining and redirecting Turkey's foreign relations, a notion that the progressive intelligentsia had been advancing for a long time, spread out to cover the hitherto silent mass; and put all Turkish governments, as Harris notes, "on the defensive in regard to the American connection, and memories of the Johnson letter would color popular impressions of the United States for many years to come"."

Beyond the deteriorating effects of the Cyprus crisis and the Johnson letter, there were other problems concerning Turkish–US relations. As noted above, in the 1960s, because of domestic developments there was growing anti-American sentiment in Turkey even before the 1964 Cyprus crisis. The general areas of friction, such issues as American sovereignty over military bases on Turkish soil: misuse of US installations in Turkey:” alleged covert activities of the CIA,” what the Turks considered to be American abuse of the ‘status of forces agreements’;” alleged US involvement in domestic policies: and the lack of sufficient American military aid, were already pressurizing the Turkish government to re-examine its relations with the United States.

In addition to these, two specific events which were to have an impact on Turkish–American relations took place during the 1960s – the Cuban missile ‘deal’ and NATO’s adoption of the ‘flexible response’ strategy. Although the two events probably did not arouse the general Turkish public, as much the Cyprus crisis did, they surely created concern among Turkey’s political and military leaders.

At the risk of further alienating the Soviets and making Turkey a prime target, the Menderes government had agreed in 1958 to the deployment of medium-range atomic warhead Jupiter missiles in Turkey. In point of fact, the missiles had been rendered obsolete even before they became operational in July 1962. And in 1961 the United States had begun negotiations with Turkey for closure of missile sites. Under pressure from the military, however, the Turkish government opposed the idea and the United States dropped the matter." As a result, the missiles were still in Turkey when the Cuban missile crisis broke out and became a bargaining point when the Soviets proposed that the Jupiters be withdrawn in exchange for their withdrawing the missiles from Cuba. Although the US State Department denied any kind of ‘deal’ over the missiles, they were in fact removed from Turkey in 1963, apparently without consultation with the Turkish government, which actually owned the missiles but not their warheads."3

The removal of the Jupiters gave rise to several issues which would make a deep impression on Turkish–American relations. First of all, the suddenness with which the Cuban crisis occurred and the limelight which
Turkey shared because of missiles on its soil brought about a basic change in Turkish attitudes. The experience had demonstrated that a war could occur almost without warning and the possession of strategic offensive weapons makes any country a primary target. The realization that Turkey might become a target for a Soviet nuclear attack because of the US bases, and that having bases that would attract such an attack might not be in the security interests of Turkey, gave rise to the sentiment in Turkey, as Harris states, 'in favor of removing weapons systems which the Soviets considered especially dangerous, in order to decrease the likelihood that the country could be dragged into a conflict against its will'.

Equally important, was the impression given by Kennedy's unilateral action that during a crisis the United States could and would act in its own best interest without consideration of, or consultation with its allies. The Turkish public was also offended by the idea that the US treated Turkey as a client whose interests were negotiable. "This, coupled with the strategy of 'flexible response' and the doubt cast on the United States commitment to Turkey by the Johnson letter, created great concern in Turkey.

Soviet development of thermo-nuclear weapons in the 1960s necessitated a rethinking of the concept of 'massive retaliation', whereby an attack on an American ally would elicit an automatic nuclear strike against the aggressor. The United States opted for a strategy of 'flexible response' which did not entail an automatic nuclear response. In light of previous American actions surrounding Cuba and Cyprus, this new strategy doubtfully created great concern in Turkey. The outcome of this concern was reappraisal by Turkey of its role in NATO.

In the late 1960s all these frictions and problems abroad and the basic changes in Turkey's socio-political life outlined above were showing only one direction – the need for a new and fresh foreign policy. But, as Ahmad pointed out, 'throughout the sixties ... the intelligentsia was able to inhibit the activities of the government by constant criticism but ... never able to force the government to reformulate the policy'. Although after the Cyprus crises of 1963–64 and 1967 the signs of re-evaluation of basic fundamentals of Turkish foreign policy were evident even in the governmental circles, soon the outcry that Cyprus and other problems created died out, or at least shadowed, due to mounting pressure of the domestic politics as a result of growing violence and economic problems.

Nevertheless, there were basic changes in Turkey's attitudes, if not in main directions, towards certain countries in an apparent attempt to break its loneliness in the international forums and find support to its position on Cyprus. One of the major changes in Turkish foreign policy in the late 1960s was the rapprochement with the Soviet Union. Although there had been a movement towards rapprochement with the Soviets as early as 1959
because of economic needs, the real thaw in Turkish–Soviet relations started after 1964 and was undoubtedly influenced by American actions during the Cyprus crisis. But attempts by Turkey to improve its relations with the Communist bloc were motivated by other factors as well. The Turkish desire for Soviet economic assistance in view of declining American economic and military aid; the development of a highly vocal political opposition; and growing anti-American sentiment in Turkey all contributed to Turkey's rapprochement with the Soviet Union.

In his memoirs, former Turkish foreign minister F.C. Erkin claims that Turkey moved to normalize relations with the Soviet Union because the Soviet threat to Turkey had decreased due to the NATO alliance, the rise of China as a balancing force, its economic difficulties on the domestic front, and demands for autonomy by the Soviet Union's allies in Eastern Europe.14 Just as important were the signals from Moscow that the Soviets had abandoned their harsh policy toward Turkey and that better relations between the two countries would not be contingent on Turkey loosening its NATO bonds. Clearly, there were a variety of factors dictating the desirability for better relations, but just as clear is the fact that Cyprus was the catalyst for rapprochement.

Ülman/Dekmejian acknowledge three factors, related to Cyprus, that forced Turkey to consider rapprochement with the Soviet Union.15 First of all, the Turks probably felt that signs of a Turkish–Soviet rapprochement would pressure the United States and NATO into inducing the Greeks and Greek Cypriots to accept a solution favourable to Turkey. Secondly, Turkey hoped to win positive Soviet support for its position on Cyprus, and therefore, secure the support of the Communist bloc in the United Nations. Finally, the least they could expect was a neutral Soviet position, thereby denying support for the Greek position. Taken into consideration with Turkey's isolation in the international arena, the lack of Western support, and the Soviet warning to Turkey during the 1964 Cyprus crisis about the integrity of the island, this attempt to secure Soviet support on Cyprus issue seemed all the more appropriate.

What began as a tactic to secure support for its position on Cyprus soon became a firm conviction of Turkish foreign policy. Talks and visits between Turkey and the Soviet Union increased after 1965 and the dialogue was extended to other matters of mutual interest to the two countries. Perhaps most significant was the increase in trade and the beginning of a Soviet aid programme for Turkey. As a result, Turkish exports to and imports from the Eastern bloc rose rapidly and their share in Turkey's total trade increased from 7 per cent in 1964 to 13 per cent in 1967.16

A basic tenet of Turkey's rapprochement with the Soviet Union was the belief that the Soviets had abandoned their harsh, militarist policy and
would accept, however unwillingly, Turkey’s membership in NATO. Therefore, the Soviet’s armed repression of the liberalization movement in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the Brezhnev doctrine claiming the right of intervention for the Soviets to uphold the socialist regime in any country must have had more than a sobering effect in Turkey. It was, according to Harris, ‘a blunt reminder that Moscow had not renounced force where its interests were concerned’. The most immediate reaction to the Czech crisis was the decision of the Demirel government, in a reversal of its previous position, to co-operate in a multilateral force to be created in the Mediterranean under NATO auspices."

Although Turkish–Soviet dialogue continued after a short break, two ominous developments outside the realm of diplomatic relations caused growing apprehension in Turkey. The first of these was the increased Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean and the other was the growing ideological impact of socialist doctrines within Turkey. These two developments were to impact on Turkey’s foreign and domestic policies of the 1970s in that the former again highlighted Turkey’s strategic location, and the latter created instability in both the political and social life of Turkey.

Concomitant with its rapprochement with the Soviet Union, Turkey also attempted to improve and expand its relations with the non-aligned countries, especially those in the Middle East. Although many factors, such as obvious cultural, geographic and religious affinities; the idea that Turkey, for strategic political reasons, must become a bridge between East and West; and the commercial opportunities in the new markets in the Arab countries undoubtedly influenced this shift in Turkish foreign policy, Turkish–Third World relations in the 1960s, however, were conditioned above all by the Cyprus dispute. The almost total lack of Third World support in the UN for the Turkish position on Cyprus forced Turkey to realize that its policy toward the non-aligned nations in general and the Middle East in particular had isolated it from the rest of the world. As could be expected Turkey moved to break away from this isolation. Therefore, behind Turkey’s new Arab policy was the desire to marshal support in the UN for its Cyprus stand, as well as to indicate to the United States that Turkish support on various issues could no longer be taken for granted.

Despite the fact that Turkey’s rapprochement policy with the Third World initially ended with failure, as the 1965 UN vote showed,7 Turkey nevertheless went ahead with its multi-faceted foreign policy initiatives. Illustrative of Turkey’s new policy in the Middle East was the diplomatic position taken by Turkey in the Arab–Israeli conflict. During the period following the 1964 Cyprus crisis up until the 1967 Arab–Israeli war, Ankara’s position on the Middle East dispute was one of guarded neutrality.
It was characterized by extreme caution designed to avoid antagonizing the United States, the Soviet Union and the Arab nations. In the aftermath of the war, the new direction of Turkey's foreign policy became evident in the UN. Mindful of the importance of the thirteen potential Arab votes in the UN, as well as of future Communist bloc support for its position on Cyprus, Turkey voted for the Yugoslav resolution calling for Israeli withdrawal from captured Arab territories. Yet at the same time, in an apparent attempt to balance its interests with the West, Turkey abstained on the Soviet resolution that labelled Israel an aggressor."

Another event manifesting the diversification of Turkey's foreign policy was the creation by Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, of the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD). It was an economic and cultural agreement parallel to but separate from the Western dominated Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Although Turkey's leaders initially were not enthusiastic about turning back towards the East, on cultural and especially Islamic grounds, Pakistan's proposal for RCD was timely and caught the Turks in the moment of their political isolation.

Thus Turkey, whose credit with the non-aligned bloc had been bankrupt in 1964, began to pursue a more independent foreign policy in the Third World designed to alleviate the impression created at Bandung that she was running errands for the West. However, at the end, there were few Third World countries who actually accepted Turkey's eagerness to improve relations with them.

As stated earlier, towards the end of the 1960s Turkey became preoccupied with its internal economic and political problems, and therefore ignored the international situation. Although Turkey continued to follow a multi-faceted foreign policy, and its restrained position in the 1967 Cyprus crisis paid off as some Arab states started to take a more favorable stand with regard to Turkey in the international forums, soon Turkey was dragged into domestic conflicts and consequently inactivity in the foreign policy area. The period of caretaker governments of 1971–73 after the 1971 intervention can be identified with the lack of foreign policy initiative. The bureaucrats who occupied government posts without much authority and with limited popular bases of support were in no position to undertake courageous steps in foreign policy. Before another Cyprus crisis dominated Turkey's foreign policy, there were two developments, one internal and one foreign, that would affect Turkey's and the United States' policies during and after 1974 Cyprus crisis, which in turn positively determined Turkey's foreign policy for the rest of the 1970s.

Turkey's biggest problem with the United States between 1966 and 1974, was the cultivation of opium poppies in Turkey and the US reaction to it. As early as 1968 the United States started to pressure Turkey to adopt the strictest control to prevent the illegal trafficking of opium in Turkey.
which they believed constituted 80 per cent of the heroin illegally consumed in the United States. By 1970 the US Congress started to take an interest in the issue, and in 1971 required the President ‘to suspend all military sales and aid [and] economic assistance’ to governments that failed to prevent narcotics produced in their countries from reaching the United States.’ In 1971 criticism of Turkey grew and even went so far as to question Turkey’s utility to the United States. Finally, US pressures had an effect on Turkey’s caretaker government after the 1971 military intervention, and the Prime Minister announced on 30 June 1971 that he banned poppy cultivation because of Turkey’s ‘humanitarian obligations’. However, this American pressure, which finally caused the Turkish Administration to ban poppy cultivation, contributed to anti-Americanism and to a decrease in American prestige in Turkey. Further, Turks were outraged in August 1972 when they learned that the United States had decided to ask India to increase its opium production to meet the world-wide shortage estimated by the International Narcotics Board.

Although very unpopular, the ban remained active until the RPP-NSP (National Salvation Party) coalition government revoked it on 1 July 1974. The United States immediately signalled its displeasure by recalling its Ambassador to Washington for consultations. And he was still in Washington when the Cyprus crisis broke out. Congress reacted more harshly to the poppy crisis than did the Executive. Members of the House and Senate proposed a number of draft resolutions asking for the imposition of embargoes. Finally when Resolution 507, which provided authority to the President ‘to terminate all assistance to the Government of Turkey’, was approved by the Congress on 5 August 1974, the Cyprus crisis had already been on the way. As a result, Congress did not pressure the President to implement the resolution because after the second Turkish intervention in Cyprus on 14 August 1974, congressional opponents of the poppy cultivation chose to support the arms embargo favoured by the Greek Lobby and ‘the rule of law’ opponents.

The Turkish government and the Turkish public were outraged at Congress’s eagerness to adopt coercive measures against a loyal ally. The Ecevit government further judged Congress’s action as an indication of, at the least, insensitivity toward Turkish national interests. The fact that when the coup took place in Cyprus, the United States ambassador to Turkey had already been recalled to Washington and Congress was discussing ways to penalize Turkey symbolically illustrates the lack of trust between the two countries.

Meanwhile, an important development took place in Turkey, specifically inside the RPP, which would later have effects on subsequent Turkish foreign policy in general, and Turkey’s Cyprus policy in particular. Bülent
Ecevit, who had been advocating a ‘left-of-centre’ stand for the RPP, replaced İnönü as party chairman in May 1972. More importantly for Turkish foreign policy, Ecevit believed that Turkey could afford to adopt an assertive, in contrast to İnönü’s cautious, foreign policy vis-à-vis the superpowers. His argument that smaller allies did not need to correlate all of their foreign policy actions with those of the superpowers did in fact reflect the widely shared belief within the RPP and Turkey. He suggested that Turkey should disassociate itself from the Cold War rhetoric of NATO. There was no question of Turkey abandoning its alliances, such as NATO and CENTO, but within the alliances Turkey would pursue a policy designed to serve its national interests and not those of others. That, according to Ecevit, was to be the difference between his foreign policy and that of his predecessors. He also criticized Turkey’s assumption of the role in the Middle East on behalf of the United States, and consistently maintained that Turkey’s participation during the 1950s in schemes like the Baghdad Pact was harmful to Turkey’s national security interests. Though his insistence on more independence within NATO distinguished him from his predecessors, the major characteristic of his administration was his assertiveness in Turkish–Greek relations. As his foreign minister told the National Assembly in 1974 that Turkey wanted to live in peace with Greece, but that ‘just because this is so, Greece will certainly not be allowed to gnaw away at Turkish interests in any manner whatsoever or to upset the balance between the two countries’. Unlike his predecessor’s cautiousness, Ecevit was a risk taker when he felt the stakes were high enough, and stakes were poised to grow high enough soon.

With the above-mentioned developments inside and outside Turkey, the stage was set for another Cyprus crisis which would be the catalyst for change in Turkish foreign policy during the 1970s. The 1974 Cyprus crisis served to intensify animosity between Greece and Turkey. It not only precipitated a sharp deterioration in relations between the two countries, but also stretched Turkish–American relations to near breaking point. The background to the crisis and specific events that participated the Turkish intervention in July 1974 and subsequent prolonged stay in Cyprus are too involved and varied to permit adequate description here. However, a brief examination of some of the perceptions and motives of the various actors is necessary within the context of this study.

The coup against Makarios in 1974 was apparently inspired by the Greek junta’s need to find a foreign policy success abroad to offset their domestic weakness, and was based on a total misreading of United States policy and the international situation, just as Turkey had done in the 1964 crisis. The colonels apparently felt that the United States, based on its tacit approval of their regime, would condone, or at least tolerate, the coup and
restrain Turkey as it had in 1964 and 1967. But the circumstances in 1974 were different from those that had existed in those earlier years; Turkish-American relations had undergone a transition, and the United States no longer had the leverage on Turkey that it had in 1964 and 1967. And the impression given before the Turkish intervention in 1974 was that the United States would not use its leverage even if it had any. In 1974, however, Turkish–Soviet relations were much improved and the Soviets, furthermore, no longer opposed Turkey’s Cyprus thesis. In addition, they chose to remain silent about Turkey’s intervention preparations, indicating that they did not oppose it. Moreover, Turkey’s isolation in the UN had diminished since 1965. Relations with the Eastern bloc and Third World countries became ‘friendly’ and therefore the fear of anti-Turkish resolutions had been reduced. And the fact that the Colonels Junta in Greece had erased its favourable image in world public opinion, hence meant that they faced world-wide disapproval when they arranged the coup in Cyprus in 1974.

Within Turkey the situation was also quite different from that of the earlier Cyprus crisis. The earlier crisis had boosted rising anti-Americanism and contributed to a polarization of domestic policies in Turkey. In turn, these forces contributed to increased political instability. Given the fact that it was not possible to argue that the Greek supported coup was an internal affair in which the guarantor powers – Great Britain, Turkey and Greece – had no legal right to intervene, Ecevit’s weak coalition government had no viable option other than intervention. The aftermath of Turkey’s intervention is well known. By the end of the summer of 1974, the Turkish army had overrun about 40 per cent of Cyprus. In February 1975 the United States Congress, under pressure from the Greek-American community, imposed an arms embargo on Turkey. Turkish–American relations reached a ‘low’, when later in 1975 the Turkish government suspended the activities at all American bases in Turkey except those related to NATO. It is important to note that the arms embargo was imposed by Congress but opposed by the President, the State Department and the American Military. This difference of opinion allowed the Turks to maintain their relations with the United States, such as they were, and still save face. The embargo, which was partially lifted in the late 1975, was fully lifted in the summer of 1978.
Aside from its impact on Turkish–Greek and Turkish–American relations, foreign reaction to the 1974 Cyprus intervention once again created a sense of diplomatic isolation in Turkey. The failure of its diplomatic efforts, begun in the 1960s, to gain support among Arab and non-aligned countries for its policies in Cyprus was strikingly displayed at the 1976 Colombo Conference of non-aligned nations (as it had been at Lima in the previous year), while a UN General Assembly vote on a draft resolution on Cyprus in November 1976 showed 94–1 against Turkey, with 27 abstentions. Consequently, Turkey redoubled its efforts to expand friendly relations with not only the Eastern bloc countries, but also the Arab and non-aligned countries.

After 1974 Cyprus became both a main problematic for, and a determinant of, Turkish foreign policy. Moreover, because of its emotional and political character, the Cyprus problem has affected Turkey’s domestic politics, which in turn determined foreign policy of Turkey with feedback. This new direction in foreign policy must however be viewed against the background of Turkey’s internal political, social and economic problems, as described earlier.

Apart from the political and social evolution of Turkey and international developments, economic considerations also played an important role in influencing the course of Turkish foreign policy in the inter-coup period, specially during the 1970s. As mentioned in the preceding section, as far back as the late 1950s economic necessities had led the Menderes government to consider rapprochement with the Soviets in order to obtain economic aid. Among many other considerations, the mismanagement of the economy by Menderes was at least in part responsible for the military takeover in 1960. Seeing the damage done by the short-sighted and uncoordinated economic policies of the previous government, the NUC established the State Planning Organization (DPT) and initiated the First Five Year Development Plan in 1963, which emphasized the importance of speeding up the rate of economic development.

Economic planning placed a new emphasis on Turkey’s requirements for external capital. And when the NATO countries refused to sponsor an aid consortium, Turkey turned to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in order to assure a steady flow of external financing for its development plans. Although the OECD consortium for Turkey was established in July 1962 after strong American behind-the-scenes pressures, it never came up to Turkish expectations. Also a sharp cut in American aid, under the supposition that European allies would come forward to fill the gap, only helped to offend the Turkish authorities.

Under the Menderes government, Turkey had further tried to link its economic policies to the West through the European Economic Community
(EEC). In 1959 she applied for an associate status in the EEC. Its application was probably motivated more by political considerations than economic realities. Undoubtedly, Turkey’s desire to be considered ‘European’ influenced its decision to seek closer ties with the EEC, but the fact that it followed so closely a similar request by Greece indicates that the Greek application prompted the Turkish action; for as Birand points out, ‘traditions of Turkish foreign policy required that Greece be watched very closely so that it would not use the political and economic weight resulting from a new relationship with Europe against Turkey’.116 Finally, in 1962 Turkey negotiated an agreement of association with the EEC.

In the 1970s economic factors continued to play an important, if not crucial, role in influencing the course of Turkish foreign policy. In a series of Five Year Plans, Turkey committed itself to a massive economic modernization effort during the period. Beside, at the same time, for reasons related to its NATO commitments and its rivalry with Greece, it had been compelled to maintain a high degree of military preparedness. The economic trends of 1970s both within Turkey and in the international arena, however, made balancing of these objectives increasingly more difficult. Although Turkey’s economic growth rate in the 1970s was relatively high, averaging between 7 and 8 percent annually, it was not due to healthy growth of the economy. This high rate of growth was achieved at the expense of massive imports without any significant increase in exports, and was financed by heavy foreign loans. At the same time high unemployment and inflation became endemic in Turkey.

Turkey’s economic difficulties had been exacerbated and complicated in the 1970s by its own policies as well as international developments. Though Turkey’s economic policies are to blame to some extent, it would still be unfair to argue that Turkey’s economic woes were solely a result of its domestic policies. Certain international events such as the economic recession in Europe, the world-wide energy crisis and the 1974 Cyprus crisis, along with its repercussions, all adversely affected Turkey’s economy and forced it to diversify its foreign policy. Turkey’s balance of trade and foreign currency reserves were affected by the recession in Europe. While its trade deficit with the EEC, its main trading partner, was rising, at the same time remittances from Turks working in Europe, Turkey’s only self generated source of income other than exports, dropped off significantly.117 These set-backs were further exacerbated by the world-wide energy crisis which was set-off by the 1973 Arab oil embargo. According to 1978 figures, the cost of oil imports equalled Turkey’s entire export earnings.118 A dramatic rise in military defence expenditures following the 1974 Cyprus crisis also strained severely Turkey’s economy. The American arms embargo, the intervention in Cyprus and the following arms race with
Greece, together with aimed self-sufficiency, required high defence spending, which competed for scarce domestic resources.

With the factors outlined above, Turkey's need to obtain outside credits and loans became all the more pressing. Hence, it is not surprising that Turkey, faced with a long list of austerity measures as requirements for future loans from the IMF, wanted to expand its foreign relations to include the Soviet Union and oil-rich Arab countries. Meanwhile, Turkish-EEC relations continued to be strained. The preferences given by the EEC to the former colonies and to several Mediterranean countries, and the failure of the EEC to extend what Turkey considered sufficient credits led to charges of discrimination in Turkey. Its failure to gain new agricultural concessions and the restrictions imposed on its textile exports disappointed Turkey and created suspicions about the Community's attitude and motives. Additionally, the probability of Greek accession to the EEC led to worries in Turkey that the unanimous voting rule in the EEC Council might be used by the Greeks to block pro-Turkish EEC initiatives. Moreover, relating the close link between economic concerns and foreign policy objectives, Turkey's association with the EEC further polarized Turkey's political parties, which in turn had adverse effects on Turkish-EEC relations.

In the inter-coup period, Turkish foreign policy changed its structure but not its foundations. While still resting upon the principles of identification and alliance with the West, it was now marked by a trend which stressed the pursuit of Turkey's national interests in its foreign relations and greater independence in decision making.

This new orientation was influenced by psychological factors introduced in the 1960s, such as the reversal of the intimidating Soviet attitude towards Turkey; the Cuban crisis and subsequent removal of the Jupiter missiles from Turkey; the American attitudes towards the continuous Cyprus crises; the formation of the EEC; NATO's adoption of the 'flexible response' strategy; and the lack of support in the UN for its Cyprus policy. These psychological factors were exacerbated in the 1970s by such events as the 1973 Middle East War and the ensuing oil crisis; a sharp deterioration in relations between Turkey and the United States, first on the poppy question and then on Cyprus; tension between Turkey and Greece on Cyprus and the Aegean problems; Turkey's differences with the EEC; and, again, lack of support in the UN for Turkey's Cyprus policy.

These significant international events paralleled domestic developments in Turkey. Increases in communication, education and social as well as physical mobility led to higher expectations and a greater politicization of the Turkish people. In turn these factors, together with the factors discussed
earlier, resulted in ideological polarization and party fragmentation. The net result was weak coalition governments, which proved to be ineffective in the field of foreign relations. Thus, at a time when international political and economic imperatives called for solutions to Turkey’s outstanding foreign policy problems, such as Cyprus, the Aegean, its relations with the EEC and the US, Turkey did not have a government with enough political prestige to make compromises necessary for a lasting settlement to those problems.

On the other hand, the insistence on a more autonomous Turkish foreign policy from both the Right and the Left was strengthened by international events, outlined above, particularly the energy crisis which had a devastating effect on Turkey; and the American arms embargo which brought into question Turkey’s Western defence alliance. Therefore, while little or no progress was made on Cyprus and the Aegean issues, Turkey exhibited strong moves in this period toward developing good political and economic relations with the non-aligned states, particularly those in the Middle East and the Balkans, and the Eastern bloc countries.

The emergence of diversification in Turkey’s foreign relations also coincided with Ecevit’s rise to power in the RPP. His political philosophy, which was quite similar to that of the European ‘social democrats’, was most closely associated with pursuit of national interests and independence in foreign policy making. Therefore, it was clear when Ecevit won the 1973 general elections that his government would attempt to exercise more independence in its foreign policy. Hence, on the eve of the world-wide energy crisis and the Cyprus intervention, with all its ramifications, the stage had already been set for a search to find new orientations for Turkish foreign policy.
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