



Complexities of Foreign Policy and the Role of Turkey in the System of International Relations

Elyor Nabiyeu

Head of Department for Youth Affairs, Spirituality and Education, Tashkent State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v9i3.3590>

Abstract

Turkey is a country that has been able to make significant changes in its development over the past hundred years. The process of modernization that began with the coming to power of Mustafa Kemal is interpreted in the context of the revolution. The creation of a secular state and an economically and politically influential state on the path of modern development, typical of the West, is evidence of the correctness of the modernization process in Turkey. In this regard, the study of the Turkish experience of foreign policy, the scientific study of the path of development is of great importance.

Keywords: *Turkey, USA; Europe; Middle East; Israel; Foreign Policy; Economy; West; Ataturk; Modernization; Democracy*

Introduction

Turkish foreign policy since the time of Ataturk has been characterized by a realistic approach, flexibility, consideration of its own interests and the use of contradictions between the leading powers.

As N.G. Kireev notes, in the thirties of the twentieth century, Turkey took a number of successful steps to determine its place in international politics, based on Ataturk's slogan "peace in the country, peace throughout the world" [1, p. 82].

The Second World War radically changed the balance of power in the international arena. The emergence of a socialist system in a number of states contributed to the strengthening of the national liberation movement against colonial oppression in Asia. In an attempt to strengthen their positions, the ruling circles of the large capitalist countries of England, France, the United States, which have their own interests in this region, and not being able to directly interfere in the internal affairs of the former colonies, have embarked on a policy of uniting the Middle Eastern states into various blocs under their patronage. To implement this political course, the Western development of the state chose Turkey, which is closely connected with the Arab countries by strong and long-term economic relations, which has a common religion and culture with them. Turkey, for its part, was ready to carry out the life of the ideas of Western countries in this region.

The Main Part

Despite the help of Soviet Russia in the national liberation struggle during the time of Ataturk, the Turkish leadership agreed to participate in the creation of international pro-Western blocs that prevent the spread of the "Soviet and communist threat" and national liberation movements. The Turkish leadership believed that an alliance with developed Western countries (England and the United States) would help strengthen Turkey's leading position in the Middle East, among states that are no longer Western protectorates, but have achieved independence or are still in the process of liberation struggle [2, p. 78].

The Russian academician E.M. Primakov: in the early 1950s, the United States in its Middle East policy gave priority to the task of creating a military bloc with the obligatory involvement of the Arab states in it [3, p. 102].

Thus, in the fifties of the twentieth century, Turkey helped the United States and leading European states in the implementation of their political plans to create international blocs against the socialist countries and national liberation movements in the region. The policy of involving the countries of the region in such blocs was agreed upon by the Turkish government with the United States. Coercion to partnership in these blocs used a rich arsenal of methods: blackmail, diplomatic pressure (Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan); the threat of outside interference (Iraq, Syria), as well as direct military intervention (Cyprus).

Of all the states of the Middle East, Turkey was the only country that supported the aggression against Egypt by England, France and Israel. The pro-American, foreign policy course of Turkey was explained by the desire of the leadership of the ruling Democratic Party to achieve leadership in the region, implementing American plans and hoping for the support of this mighty power.

However, in the 60-70s, the vector of Turkish foreign policy changed due to economic considerations: the need to open new markets for Turkish goods, increase oil imports, and became aimed at developing relations with all Arab states. The leadership of Turkey needed the support of the Arabs in the Cyprus issue. At the same time, Turkey maintained economic and diplomatic relations with Israel.

The duality and attempts to maneuver Turkish foreign policy was observed in its approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict. It should be noted that Turkey's political course has softened in relations with the countries of the region, in contrast to the pro-American line pursued in the 1950s, which was associated with the predominance of the country's economic interests.

In the late 1970s, the role of Turkey's economic relations with the Arab countries increased due to the onset of the economic crisis. Mutually beneficial economic cooperation between Turkey and the Arab countries implied the need for Turkey to support the basic demands of the Arab countries in the Middle East conflict.

Speaking on the side of the Arab countries, in some cases Turkey resisted pressure from the US on the settlement of the Middle East situation. The change in Turkey's foreign policy contributed to the strengthening of its influence in the region and the stabilization of its economy. These trends became especially noticeable in the early 1980s.

After the conclusion of the Camp David Accords between Egypt and Israel, according to which Egypt for the first time recognized Israel as a state and concluded trade and economic agreements with it, which caused displeasure of the rest of the Arab countries, Turkey found itself in a difficult position of choice: The Turkish leadership had to support either oil-producing Arab countries, or the United States and the NATO bloc, of which Turkey has been a member since 1952.

Turkey found itself between a difficult choice: it needed both US assistance and Arab oil, and both sides of the conflict needed Turkish support and put pressure on Turkey. As a price for support, in May 1979, the Kuwaiti leadership offered numerous benefits for Turkey in the sale of oil in response to the severance of diplomatic relations with Israel. This situation has strengthened the Turkish leadership in the opinion that it is necessary to decide on the choice of a supported side and strengthen economic ties with the Arab countries, and for the success of a political dialogue with which one religious and historical community is not enough, strong political ties are needed.

The military coup took place due to a deep economic and political crisis in the Republic of Turkey. On September 12, 1980, the military, who came to power, outlawed all political parties, dissolved parliament, and introduced a state of emergency in the country.

In foreign policy, despite the preservation of the course of previous governments, new accents emerged, among which the most significant was the strengthening and development of Turkey's comprehensive ties with the United States and NATO.

After the military coup in Turkey in 1980, as a result of which the military came to power, political and economic ties with the United States were significantly strengthened. The American administration significantly increased the amount of aid to Turkey: the amount of which was comparable to the US aid to Israel and Egypt [4, p. 129].

At the same time, it was officially declared that Turkey does not interfere in local conflicts and remains neutral, but if necessary, at the request of the parties concerned, it can act as a mediator to resolve the disputed situation.

Despite the official rhetoric, it was clear that the development of military-political relations with the United States was directed against the interests of the peoples of the Arab countries, who opposed the American military presence in the region, considering the American presence as a threat to their security.

The events in the Middle East related to the conflict between Lebanon and Israel forced the Turkish leadership to make the final choice in relation to the participants in the conflict. Turkish leaders continued to maneuver between Arab interests and the interests of the United States: they verbally condemned Israeli aggression and defended the territorial integrity of Lebanon, but, on the other hand, concluded a "transit agreement" with the United States, allowing the use of the Incirlik military base for use by American military units, located in Lebanon. The concession to US interests is due to American support for Turkey in resolving the Cyprus issue.

As the Turkish press noted, Turkey found itself between mosques and American missiles. It is necessary not to be involved in the adventurous plans of the United States, which pose a threat to the security of Turkey itself and complicate its relations with neighboring countries [5].

Counting on American assistance in response to support for the American political course in the Middle East, the Turkish government in 1984 turned to the United States with a request for military assistance in the amount of \$ 1.3 billion and economic assistance in the amount of \$ 300 million [6, p. 87]. However, in response to this request, the US administration provided only half of the requested funding, which caused discontent in Turkish government circles. The US position of the Russian political scientist V.A. Avatkov explained that Turkey did not always support the United States, especially when solving problems related to the Middle East course (for example, the Palestinian problem) [6, p. 94]. The United States was also dissatisfied with Turkey's refusal to deploy medium-range ballistic missiles and cruise missiles on its territory.

During the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988), Turkey was a country actively participating in the settlement of this conflict, which was explained both by historical, religious and cultural similarities, as well as by the presence of well-established bilateral cooperation with both countries. The head of Turkey, K. Evren, called on the leaders of Iran and Iraq to stop the "fratricidal war" and present their proposals on the terms of the settlement. However, conservative Arab regimes began to put pressure on Turkey to take the side of Iraq, as the Arab world, according to many political scientists, considered Turkey a more effective ally in this conflict than Egypt. The US administration, which imposed economic sanctions against Iran, called on Turkey to join this action.

Despite political pressure, Turkey was not interested in weakening its economic ties with Iran, so the Turkish leadership refused to support American proposals to impose economic sanctions against Iran. On the contrary, trade and economic cooperation between Turkey and Iran has only strengthened. Turkey has increased its exports to Iran of its traditional exports, mainly agricultural products, and Iran has increased its oil exports.

Despite Turkey's efforts to remain neutral in conflicts between Arab countries, in 1991 the political leadership of the country had to take an anti-Iraqi position. During the political crisis in the Persian Gulf, when Iraqi forces invaded Kuwait (which was formerly part of the Ottoman Empire), the balance of power changed, and Turkey came out against Iraq on the side of the United States. For the first time in history, the USSR and many other countries that are members of the UN acted on the side of the United States. The Turkish leadership allowed American aircraft to use military bases on Turkish territory to carry out air raids on Iraq and blocked the gas pipelines through which oil from this country came to Turkey.

As a result of this conflict, the price of oil on the world market fell, an economic embargo was introduced against Iraq, and Ankara's foreign trade with Baghdad was significantly reduced. The Turkish economy suffered significant economic damage as a result, which was partially offset by Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

In the late 90s of the twentieth century, relations between Turkey and Israel began to strengthen, which caused discontent among the Arab countries. At the same time, the Kurdish problem escalated in Turkey. The state of Kurdistan was never created, the Kurdish language was banned, as a result of which the Kurds, taking advantage of political differences between Turkey, Syria, Iraq, used the territories of Iraq and Syria to train Kurdish military formations and extremist groups for sabotage in Turkey.

In response to accusations of Arab countries in cooperation with Israel, the Turkish leadership declared Iran and Syria "the general headquarters of anti-Turkish terror" [7]. The Turkish leadership was afraid of attempts by Iran and Syria to acquire their own nuclear and chemical weapons. These concerns prompted Turkey to cooperate with Israel's more advanced defense industry. Israel and Turkey feared a rapprochement between Iraq and Syria, since the union of these eternally warring countries could not serve peaceful purposes.

References

1. Kireev N. G. History of Turkey XX century. M.: Kraft + IV RAN. 2007.
2. Medvedko L.I. East and West of Suez: The Decline of Colonialism and the Maneuvers of Neocolonialism in the Arab East. M.: Politizdat, 1980.
3. Primakov E.M. Anatomy of the Middle East conflict. M.: Thought, 1978.

4. Ivanova I.I. The evolution of the Middle East policy of the Republic of Turkey in the XX-XXI centuries. / Ed. A.V. Shtanov; MGIMO MFA of Russia. -M.: Publisher Vorobyov A.V., 2019.
5. Hedefler [Electronic resource] // Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi. Access mode: <http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/hedefler/P18>.
6. Avatkov V.A. Foreign policy ideology of the Republic of Turkey under the rule of the Justice and Development Party: diss. for the degree of Cand. political Sciences. M., MFA, 2013.
7. Guber A.A., Kim G.F., Kheifets A.N. New history of Asia and Africa. M., Knowledge, 1982. p. 479.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).