



**UNIVERSIDAD
EMPRESARIAL DE COSTA RICA
(UNEM)**

**REPUBLIC TURKEY'S PERSPECTIVE TO INTERNATIONAL
POLITICS AND ITS SELF-POSITIONING**

A dissertation submitted for the degree Doctor of International Relations in
.....

by

Bahadır Celal KAPILAR

2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ABSTRACT	4
INTRODUCTION	5
1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	7
1.1. Foreign Policy Conceptualization.....	7
1.2. Foreign Policy Under the Post-Structural Approach	12
1.2.1. Structuralist Approach.....	14
1.2.2. Post-Structuralist Approach.....	17
2. TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY PERIODS	28
2.1. One-Party Period Foreign Policy	28
2.2. Multi-Party Period Foreign Policy.....	31
2.2.1. NATO Membership and Foreign Policy	41
2.2.2. Turkish Foreign Policy in 1980 Era	47
2.2.3. Turkish Foreign Policy After Relations with the European Union	54

3. AKP ERA FOREIGN POLICY	65
3.1. Fundamentals of Foreign Policy Practices in the AKP Era	65
3.2. Events Directing the Foreign Policy of the AKP Era	76
3.2.1. Arab Spring	76
3.2.2. Syrian Crisis	77
3.2.3. Ak Party and Russia	78
3.2.4. Ak Party and USA Relations	80
3.2.5. Ak Party and Cyprus	82
3.2.6. Ak party and EU relations	86
CONCLUSION	90
REFERENCES	96

ABSTRACT

Humanity felt the need to deal with the issue of foreign policy, after experiencing a massive war as big as the First World War, that is, having to bear the burden of the war not only at the front, but everywhere. Turkish foreign policy makes use of many complementary tools of political, economic, humanitarian and cultural cooperation and implements a diplomacy that thinks globally but acts at the local level in every corner of the world. The most important features of Turkey's foreign policy are that it is peaceful, does not deviate from realism, attaches utmost importance to international law and legitimacy, and follows a line that prioritizes cooperation and dialogue both at the regional and international level. The aim of the research; the explanation of Turkish foreign policy with the post-structuralist approach and the impact of the post-structuralist approach will be discussed. In Turkey, perception of leadership, bureaucratic institutions, press, public opinion, economic-social organizations and the army are extremely effective parameters in the foreign policy formation process. The weight of these parameters in the process is intense according to the variety and quality of the subjects. In addition, as a society that has experienced the War of Independence and is sensitive to national values, the education level and perception of the Turkish society are important in terms of the Turkish foreign policy formation process, as the Turkish people are sometimes effective in reacting to foreign policy decisions.

INTRODUCTION

Postmodernism, post-positivism and post-structuralism entered the field of International Relations, especially in the 1980s, with the work of authors such as Richard Ashley (1981, 1984), James Der Derian (1987), Michael Shapiro (1988) and R. B. J. Walker (1987, 1993). Postmodern thinkers first attracted attention with their meta-theoretical criticisms of realism and neorealism. These counter-challenges of the post-structuralists were based on advocating the views of civil society and marginalized segments, as well as having a moral stance. Post-structuralists have started to question these concepts one by one. Instead of trying to ignore the unitary state, they focused on the historical, social and economic process of its emergence. While postmodern and post-structuralists describe themselves as opponents in this context, they also react to mainstream positivist, realist and state-centered and even masculine approaches. What this opposition has in common is their reactive and cautious approach to approaches that refer to grand narratives to legitimize knowledge. While searching for knowledge and truth, postmodern approaches focus on the excluded and think that it is not easy to understand the world from a single perspective, and therefore it was necessary for them to listen to different perspectives and marginalized voices (Bee, 2017:).

The common aspect of postmodern thinkers is that they do not aim to reach objective knowledge about political phenomena and even they think that this effort is problematic and dangerous. Postmodern thinkers severely criticize established positivist knowledge, and realism in particular. In a sense, they reveal their own stance with their critiques of mainstream international relations theories such as neorealism and neoliberalism. However, the aim of postmodern and post-structuralist thought is not to challenge existing

international relations practices and narratives and to displace all truth claims, but to come up with another claim and produce an alternative. Existing modern social structures and institutions are not the result of human, state, politics or historical progress as described so far; It is argued that it is a product of human action and thought.

David Campbell, one of the important representatives of the approach, draws attention to the fact that foreign policy cannot be seen simply as a process of relations between states, but basically a process in which a distinction is made between us and them. In other words, he argues that foreign policy should be viewed as an ongoing power game involving different segments of society. This process is based on the idea that situations that are coded as dangers such as international terrorism and illegal immigration may basically be a discourse, and may actually be related to the process of identity construction. (Campbell, 1998:46)

The main purpose of this research, in which Turkish foreign policy is the subject, is to evaluate the foreign policy steps that have taken place in the establishment of the Republic within the framework of the structuralist approach. In this context, the study is based on a literature review.

In the scope of the research; the explanation of Turkish foreign policy with the post-structuralist approach and the impact of the post-structuralist approach will be discussed. According to this; In the first part of the study, the discipline of foreign policy has been conceptually discussed and a historical framework has been drawn. While making foreign policy analysis, basic approaches, theories and foreign policy definitions of influential thinkers of the discipline are included. Definitions are given under the title of post-structural approach, which is one of the foreign policy analysis approaches, and the

similarities and differences with post-modernism, which is a more general expression, are tried to be revealed. In particular, it is seen that the theories underlying the approaches have taken place in all areas of life such as art, philosophy, politics and social life.

1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Foreign Policy Conceptualization

Foreign policy is the basic path that a state will follow in the international arena with other states. It is a set of principles-objectives. It was only after the First World War that serious thought began on this concept. Before that, the subject of foreign policy, which was monopolized by monarchs or a few top officials, was a "taboo". Even in countries with a parliamentary tradition, such as England, foreign policy was the least discussed area. There was little discussion of foreign policy, as the "higher interests of the empire" so commanded. Again, as seen in England, political parties generally did not conflict over foreign policy and implemented similar policies, although they might differ on other issues.

Humanity felt the need to deal with the issue of foreign policy, after experiencing a massive war as big as the First World War, that is, having to bear the burden of the war not only at the front, but everywhere. As in England, foreign policy "as a real subject of discussion" was only possible after a bloody World War, with the establishment of mass democracy. Science institutes working within this framework were established in the USA. Over time, foreign policy became an area studied by political scientists. Other countries also started to remove foreign policy from being a prohibited area (Kürkçüoğlu,310).

The Second World War, which was much more severe than the first, accelerated the work on this road even more.' The discipline of International Relations, which examines the subject of "foreign policy", showed a rapid development in this period. Numerous books were published, especially during the intense world events between 1945 and 1963; research institutes were established. In the new period, which gained momentum with the developments after the Second World War, especially in the USA, besides many private research centers, think tank institutions directly financed by the state were established, new units were opened to research these issues within the structure of the state, scientific centers and International Relations were established within universities to research these issues.

In addition to economic and social studies, intensive and really impressive studies have been made and are being carried out on human rights, national security and strategy. As a matter of fact, since the 1960s, important studies have been carried out to develop international politics and international relations by using other branches of science, especially biology, psychology, anthropology, sociology and economics. In addition to these, the effects of ecological factors and human relations on international politics in international relations have begun to be emphasized, the causes of war, deterrence theories, integration theory, conflict theories, systems theory, decision-making theory and game theory have become the basic theories of international relations and foreign policy. (Bee, 2017:49-50)

The field of study of foreign policy should be seen as a sub-discipline of international relations. According to Waltz, international relations explanations are not foreign policy explanations, and foreign policy explanations are not international relations explanations.

Foreign policy includes all the behaviors and outputs of a state towards other states or international political organizations. G. Modelski defines foreign policy as “the system of activities developed by societies to change the behavior of other states or to adapt their behavior to the international environment”. In other words, foreign policy can be seen as the whole of the actions of determining, directing and controlling the foreign relations of national societies. According to Goldstein, foreign policy is defined as the sum of strategies that direct the behavior of governments in the international arena, the foreign policy process is considered as the decision-making process, and it is stated that foreign policy decisions are taken by the decision-makers or decision-makers in the governments of the states. (Gunduz,2020:12)

According to Goldstein and Keohane, foreign policy is “the sum total of strategies that guide the behavior of governments in the international arena”. (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993:3) Hill defines foreign policy as “the sum of official foreign relations conducted by an independent actor (mostly a state) in international relations”. (Hill,2003:3) According to Rosenau, foreign policy can be conceptualized in three ways: "as an orientation", "as plans and commitments", and "action (behaviour)". (Roseneau, 1976:16-17) Orientations are defined as the most general behavioral guidelines. In this form, foreign policy expresses the general tendencies and principles that guide the behavior of a state in its international relations. These tendencies and principles stem from the understanding of each society embedded in their lives and historical experiences, traditions and ideals. Özcan likens foreign policy to the design of a long journey, to a roadmap prepared by the sovereigns. (Özkan,2014:328)

From many definitions of foreign policy, it is possible to list the main components of what the concept of 'foreign policy' actually means. It can be clearly seen that foreign policy firstly means an activity of the state, that is, the activity of its officials in making and implementing foreign policy decisions. Through these decisions and their implementation, state bodies seek to defend and protect their own interests, especially when confronting other states in the interests of security and welfare. However, it is understood that in the foreign policy process, states' taking their own initiatives and at the same time reacting to initiatives from other states and international organizations is an uninterrupted process. On the other hand, it is seen that the foreign policy of any state is limited depending on the interests of other states, the effects and limitations arising from the current international system and the characteristics of a certain international environment. In addition, a state's foreign policy is affected by the conditions and factors that make up its geopolitical position, as well as its objective characteristics. In other words, the foreign policy of any state depends on its geopolitical position, power, internal organization, stability, public opinion, pressure groups and interests; All of these also have a relationship with the internal political situation of the state. (Aras,2018:21)

The study of foreign policy is largely derived from the discipline of International Relations. Although there are differences between various views on the subject, basically all of them offer various answers to the question of "how does foreign policy work". In order to explain any topic they decide to work on, researchers must first identify what is important to their research and understand the need for a review of these areas. Otherwise, the research either becomes complex with many details or many important points may be overlooked.

The framework that ensures that this does not happen and presents the researcher the necessity of doing a study on which subjects is theory. Theories explain the past and help predict the future. They respond differently to the problems of the world because they start with different initial assumptions, emphasize different "critical" variables, and have different ideal endings. Theories explain the past and help predict the future. Policy makers with the ability to predict can plan their own actions. On the other hand, theories go beyond a single example; they need to generalize to specific events and timeframes. In other words, theories should assist in the development of general knowledge. (Aras,2018:32)

Scholars in different traditions may examine the same events and arrive at different explanations for why they occur and how to deal with similar events in the future. Theories give different answers to the problems of the world because they start with different initial assumptions. Theories of how foreign policy works can help policymakers generalize new experiences from the past, thereby helping them know which policies to undertake or which to avoid. Foreign policy behaviors do not occur spontaneously in response to an external stimulus.

Studies examining the foreign policy behaviors of states have created the discipline of foreign policy analysis. This discipline tries to explain the emerging behavior with certain approaches and theories while the foreign policy behaviors of states are chosen by an identifiable and recognizable mechanism within the state. One of the theoretical formations of post-positivist thought, which is one of these approaches, is post-structural theories.

1.2. Foreign Policy Under the Post-Structural Approach

Traditional foreign policy thinkers have interpreted foreign policy with a state-centered approach as a reaction of the state against political, economic and military threats or as an expression of its internal preparation. Post-structural approaches, which differ from traditional approaches that try to explain foreign policy with positivist methods, prefer to examine and understand foreign policy, which they define as a social phenomenon, through linguistic analysis. According to them, it is more important to understand the reality by asking the "how" question rather than understanding it. Understanding can only be achieved through discourse analysis and analysis of texts, in which norms and ideas are produced and conveyed. The focus of the post-structuralist approach on the analysis of language, ideas, identity and actions makes it easier for us to understand the role of bureaucracy, decision-making process, ideology and dominant discourses in foreign policy analysis.

While rational approaches in foreign policy analysis define national interests and the main goals of states as given rational decisions, the post-structural approach makes the interests, goals and expectations of state foreign policies problematic and tries to understand how they are constructed as a result of what kind of social interaction, norms and information. Another point to be noted is that with the introduction of the post-structuralist approach to foreign policy analysis, it removed the distinction between three different levels of analysis expressed as the individual, the state and the international system, and made it possible to develop foreign policy analyzes that take into account the connections and interactions between these levels of analysis. (Baklacioğlu, 2014:65-66)

However, although they are two different approaches, post-structuralism and post-modernism are generally used in the same sense in international relations. In general, according to post-structuralism, while anything finds its meaning not with what it is, but with what it is not in a structure, post-modernity is the criticism of Cartesian knowledge production, which is formed on the axis of new phenomena such as the modern bureaucratic state in the 17th century and later, and based on the subject-object opposition. This criticism argues that the object and the subject cannot be established independently of each other. (Kardaş and Erdağ, 2014:384)

According to post-structuralists, a fixed and objective foreign policy should not be expected since there is no objective and fixed national interest, unlike traditional approaches. Expressing that foreign policy produces identity and identity produces foreign policy, Lene Hansen draws attention to the fact that since the definition of threat, danger and other or others is made through identity, it is decisive in determining foreign policy. Because how we define others depends on how we define ourselves. Of course, this definition determines foreign policy. (Bee,2018:545)

According to Campbell, foreign policy is security software. The determining factor in the construction of foreign policy is the identities of the states. Identity is also a concept related to difference and requires the other. Security already means that something is secure, and that is the USA in the case of Campbell. It could be another country, another place. Of course, this also points to a special identity. However, this identity is not given and is constructed in a discursive way in an intersubjective process in the postmodern approach. In other words, while positivist theories see foreign policy as a given and distinct phenomenon aimed at protecting the country from external threats, according to

post-structuralists, it is constructed through discourse in the process and is based on the distinction between inside and outside and requires a definition of outside and foreign. Therefore, foreign policy is about the process of producing an identity, and in this context, states write security within the framework of the identity produced (Diez, 2014: 292-93).

1.2.1. Structuralist Approach

Structuralism is fed by Ferdinand de Saussure's (1985) theory of language. According to him, language is a system of signs. The sign, on the other hand, consists of two parts called the signifier and the signified. The signifier is the text, sound or sign, and the signified is the image that comes to life in the mind of the individual. For example, the image of 'cat', a small, four-legged, tailed, cute and tamable animal, is the signifier, and the word 'cat', formed by the combination of the letters c/a/t, is signifier. In this respect, each signifier points to a signified, and the sign is a combination of these two. Language, on the other hand, is a system (langue) of signs that differ from each other and acquire their own meaning. In this framework, the language system exists independently of individuals as a social phenomenon independent of time and space. Since individuals are born within this language system, the thoughts that will activate their behavior appear in it. This means that individuals' thoughts are limited to the language system in which they exist. (Butler,2008:17)

Levi Strauss was the first to bring structuralism out of linguistics. He used the structuralism method applied to linguistics to analyze the social structure. In addition to these, it is known that the Russian formalists Todorov and Propp made important contributions to structuralism in the narrative genre.

Structuralism appears before us as a method of explaining the connection between these facts, not by explaining the facts one by one. Based on the method, structuralism does not try to explain individual facts and does not focus on the fact that these facts have meanings one by one, but instead argues that the facts within the structure gain meaning through their interconnectedness. While mentioning structuralism in the sources, it is emphasized that it is a method, not a philosophical movement or doctrine. The structuralist approach argues that this uncertainty about the intentions of states under the anarchic international system structure is a sufficient factor to explain states' search for security and power. (Akpınar,2015:18)

According to this view, because history and culture condition structures, structures can be subject to misinterpretations and prejudices. How knowledge is produced is the main problem. It is historical. It tries to find out what the same concepts mean now, by focusing on how cultural resources have changed over time. He argues that the self is also built with discourses. Meaning that it is constructed by the signifier (understanding). Post-structuralists reject the notion of the essential quality of what is dominant within the hierarchy. Foucault's work shows a complex formation with organic ties to structuralism and post-structuralism at an interdisciplinary level such as philosophy, psychology, sociology and history. His most basic stance is the stance he takes to the theories that put the subject in the center. (Say,2013:332)

Structuralism originally emerged as a holistic theory of society. It showed a critical attitude by focusing his discourse on the fact that the existing structure or system is the determinant of the relations in society, and therefore it kept the attention on the concept of structure. However, its basic discourse in the sociological context focuses on the fact

that the holistic structure in society causes many negativities. In reality, structuralism tried to draw attention to the parts that make up the whole in society and to reveal the relationship between these parts. In other words, the main claim in its current form is that the structure corresponds to a system that holds the entire society as a whole, whereas such a system should not determine a social entity. According to the structuralists, the main feature that determines the social existence is the social relations that are seen as determined in the current situation. (Say;2013,333.)

According to the Constructivist Approach, political behaviors implemented by people are shaped by the quality of existing ideas. (Kaarbo, 2003: 160)

Especially, as stated in Wendt's criticism of Neorealism's founding name Kenneth Waltz in his article "Anarchy is What States Make Of It" (1992), what makes anarchy "anarchy" is actually the meaning that actors, states, give it. Just as identities and interests are shaped by intersubjective interaction, the nature of the international system is also a product of this interaction. If most of the actors in the system define each other within the identity of "enemy", then a system culture that Hobbes describes, in which each actor poses a threat to each other, becomes effective. Wendt, who does not reject the anarchic structure of the international system in terms of accepting that there is no authority above the states, differs in that he claims that this is not a given and necessary factor of the system, and that other security cultures can occur within the framework of different interactions and identity definitions. As a result of the signals sent by the states to each other in interaction and how they are perceived, it is possible that a phenomenon other than the security dilemma may occur. (İnat and Balcı, 2007: 213) In this respect, it can be mentioned that there is a "Hobbesian" anarchy in which each actor perceives each other as enemies, as

well as a "Kantian anarchy" in which states have more friendly relations in the context of their common interests.³³ At this point, it should be reminded that Wendt's critique of Structural Realism, although it has made important contributions in terms of international relations theories, has also been exposed to some criticisms. At the forefront of these criticisms is Wendt's failure to address the uncertainty of states' current and future intentions towards each other. While the structuralist approach argues that this uncertainty about the intentions of states under the anarchic international system structure is a sufficient factor to explain states' search for security and power; Wendt does not address this perception of uncertainty, emphasizing that actors within the international system can define different system cultures. (Akpınar, 2015:18)

1.2.2. Post-Structuralist Approach

The understanding of post-structuralism was influenced by the philosophy of the Continental Europe after the 1960s. However, although they are two different approaches, post-structuralism and post-modernism are generally used in the same sense in international relations. Post-structural movements have begun to show more influence in the literature, especially with the end of the Cold War. From this period, the discipline of International Relations began to be influenced by post-modern and post-structuralist approaches, which were also influential in political philosophy in the same period. (Devetak,2005:161)

Post-modernism is not only specific to International Relations, but also tries to bring an alternative perspective to all social and natural sciences. Post-modernism does not accept traditional approaches, which are described as modernist and which prescribe the management or analysis of science and society according to a set of universal rules. Post-

modernists, who advocate interpretation instead of reality, particularity instead of generality, and relativity instead of universality, try to undermine existing problem-solving methods instead of producing alternative solutions to existing problems. Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Jean-François Lyotard are considered to be the leading figures of the debate in the field of post-modernism. However, there are important points that differ from each other especially in terms of the objects of study and the way they deal with the subject. (Aras,2018:57)

It can be observed that post-positivist approaches are classified under naming such as critical theory, post-structuralism, intertextualism and post-modernism in the field of international relations. Despite the differences between them, the common emphasis of these approaches is that they are based on the idea that theories and determinations related to international relations construct, legitimize or reproduce "reality" rather than representing it. Therefore, they are skeptical of the scientific and objectivity claims of established theories. For example, one of the critical theorists, Robert Cox, questions the objectivity of scientific discourse, pointing out that theories are "always put forward for someone and for a purpose". (Diikici,2015:15)

According to post-modernism, the nation-state structure, one of the basic devices of modernity, creates a uniform individual. For this reason, post-modernism brings the individual to the forefront over the state. Post-modern theory, which criticizes the uniformist structure and identity of modernity, criticizes the uniform human model imposed by modernity and surrounded by state rules. In doing so, it underlines the differences and places identities in the foreground. Post-modernist thinkers, acting on similarities, question the pressure exerted on individuals by the nation-state model, which

emphasizes homogeneity and a single system, and criticizes the nation-state, which they accept as the basic political organization of modernity. Post-modernists, who do not examine different identities and polyphony only within the state, also argue that the Western monopoly should be broken in the international system and that the voices of differences can be heard against the West. In this sense, it opposes the Western-centered modern paradigm. (Emeklier, 2011: 170)

Despite this relationship between structuralism and language, language is very constitutive in terms of poststructuralism. Accordingly, unlike what structuralism assumes, the world does not simply present us to itself for post-structuralists. In other words, the concepts and theories that make sense of the world are actually linguistic games. Discourse and commentary on language are the second essential feature of post-structuralist theories. As it is stated that language creates the world, according to De Saussure, meaning in language is not only positive but also points to difference. Being meaningful is also about what it is not. This is also seen in Michel Foucault's works on discourse. While de Saussure is concerned with what can be said in a given language, Foucault is concerned with what is said. (Bee, 2018:528) The body of verbal and non-verbal expressions, which Michel Foucault (2011) called “discourse”, is a social system that enables the production of knowledge and meaning through certain representations and practices.

At this point, it turns out that language is not only a tool for us to express the reality in the world, but also a practice that determines how we can know and express, that is, not only reflecting but also constructing. Language enables us to make sense of the world. For example, the construction of the nation-state, as the main subject of international

relations, is made through some verbal (foreign policy statements, threat narratives, inferences about its acting, etc.) and non-verbal (ceremonies, engagements, international meetings, etc.) practices surrounding the discourse about it. In this way, states reach their reality through these practices and allow us to perceive them as holistic, rational and consistent actors. (Foucault, 2011:21) To quote Michel Foucault from Nietzsche, post-structuralism argues that “behind things, something very different exists. (Dikici, 2015:16)

Post-structuralist international relations theory should draw on some important insights from other disciplines when asking questions about how discourse shapes identity. For example, Norman Fairclough, an English linguist, studies political communication by conceptualizing it as a social practice (Fairclough, 1989; 1992; 2003). In addition to Fairclough's work, a critical discourse analysis methodology has been developed by a group of linguists such as Ruth Wodak, Siegfried Jäger, and Teun van Dijk. As Van Dijk argues, critical discourse analysis “examines how the abuse of social power, domination and inequality is enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and speech in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2001: 352). This identity formation process is an open-ended struggle (Butler 2000; Laclau 2000). In fact, this hegemonic struggle is the basis of politics. As Laclau and Mouffe (1985) argue, “the social only exists as an effort to construct this impossible object.” At a certain point, a certain discourse may become hegemonic and hold for a time. Despite the existence of alternative discourses that challenge it, hegemonic discourse has the capacity to determine how people in that society perceive reality, that is, how they read the signifier and how they perceive the signified. The capacity to shape the prevailing perception of reality also shapes the articulation of identity in that society. As Nabers (2009) argues, hegemony “reproduces our everyday

lives; it becomes hegemonic when our everyday understanding of social relations and the world as a whole begins to change according to the framework set by the hegemonic discourse".

Post-structuralism states that there are no criteria that will allow us to rank superiority among different sources of information that exceed social conditions and that can be considered valid at all times and places. In other words, it states that the information produced is not objective, but produced under socially and historically specific conditions. However, post-structuralism also draws our attention to the relationship between knowledge and power. Accordingly, they explain that political authorities have the monopoly of decision-making in determining the needs, problems and interests of a society by silencing different demands and approaches in the name of reliable information. (Kardaş and Erdağ, 381)

Post-structuralism, in particular, argues that discourse does not play a neutral role in the production, transmission or reflection of external reality, and gains legitimacy only by being articulated with various forms of power. In the framework of post-structuralism, discourse is not a passive tool used by an individual to explain his/her thought or express his/her purpose. Because the sentences used are not considered as a tool for just presenting or reflecting the thought that it mediates. Discourses also have an active and constitutive role in the first-hand production of reality. (Kardaş and Erdağ, 2012:381)

Post-structuralist foreign policy analysis is an important approach to understand this identity-constitutive role of foreign policy discourse and actions. From the 1980s, international relations researchers began to use the framework provided by post-structuralism to challenge mainstream foreign policy theories and practices. At first, post-

structuralist scholars aimed to challenge mainstream theories of international relations and foreign policy. (Ashley, 1984; Ashley, 1988; Der Derian, 1989; Shapiro, 1989).

In terms of international relations, poststructuralism aims to reveal the restrictive and even repressive qualities of some concepts and thought structures that are dominant in the discipline and accepted as natural without questioning. As a result of the concepts dominated by realism and liberalism, the discipline of international relations remained a very limited and repetitive field throughout the entire Cold War. Especially since the 1980s, but mainly after the Cold War, poststructuralism, like other critical approaches, developed as an intellectual practice applied to reveal this limitation and democratize the field. Concepts such as the state, sovereignty and anarchy, which were accepted as truth without being questioned in the discipline, were subjected to critical analysis by poststructuralist thinkers. Accordingly, it has been argued that these concepts are actually historical fictions and that what gives them their reality is the fields of knowledge and power structures that construct them as truth in this period of history. In this respect, poststructuralist thinkers aim to analyze and undermine the ontological, epistemological and methodological attitudes that dominate the discipline. In addition, it can be pointed out that approaches such as intertextualism, post-structuralism or postmodernism, unlike the critical approach, do not aim to reveal the ideological function of established theories or to reveal the hidden and hidden meanings within the texts. (Dikici,2015:16) In this context, post-structuralism draws attention to the fact that the knowledge production process is a normative and political issue. It emphasizes that texts, definitions, perspectives and theories are loaded with practice, in other words, they constitute both the subject and the object. (Devetak, 2012: 244)

Post-structuralism, which has been influential in the discipline of International Relations since the late 1980s, does not focus only on the nature and functioning of world politics. Post-structuralism is also an approach that argues that concepts such as "sovereignty", "foreign policy", "state", "security" should be re-read and evaluated. The leading representatives of post-structuralism in the discipline of International Relations are Richard Ashley, James Der Derian, Rob B. J. Walker, William Connolly, and David Campbell. It was Richard Ashley's article titled "The Poverty of Neorealism" that first brought post-structuralist debates to the discipline of International Relations. (See: Richard K. Ashley, "The Poverty of Neorealism", *International Organization*, Vol. 38, No. 2. (Spring, 1984): 225-286.) The common aspect of postmodern thinkers is objective knowledge about political phenomena. The reason is that they do not aim to reach the truth and even think that this effort is problematic and dangerous. (Cebeci,2012:570)

The destruction of the relationship between science and power and the search for an objective science have been one of the main points of criticism by poststructuralist thinkers. Within the mentioned theoretical framework, poststructuralist thinkers basically adopted two methods. The first of these is genealogy. Genealogy, which Michel Foucault (1992:59) defines as "making [today's] genealogical tree", is a method developed to analyze various power effects. The aim here is to reveal the relationship between power and knowledge and to analyze the relationship between the establishment of power structures and the construction of knowledge spaces. For this, it aims to historicize what is considered natural, ahistorical and universal for today by revealing the construction of the origins of objects. For Foucault, archeology is a method of researching how and under what conditions the facts emerged, beyond being a straight historical research (to show right and wrong). It is stated that archeology is a more neutral concept than genealogy.

However, over time, Foucault preferred to use the concept of genealogy instead of archeology, especially the concept of "Genealogy of Knowledge" inspired by Nietzsche's "Genealogy of Morals". (Devetak,2005:162)

Understanding the concept of genealogy used by Foucault is central to Postmodern perspectives in international relations. Genealogy is a type of historical thought about the power-knowledge relationship. Genealogy is a form of history with the aim of historicizing, which goes beyond history and includes things and ideas that are often excluded in historiography. Genealogy is a counter-history that aims to show the excluded processes and reveal the teleological aspect of history. History is not a display of truth and meaning from a genealogical perspective. Because, history is actually an endless repetition of the game of domination. History has been a past where a lot of domination and domination in terms of knowledge and power were experienced. Also, from the perspective of genealogy, instead of a single great history, there are many histories shaped by the influence of power-knowledge in harmony and intertwined tempo. Genealogy is skeptical that the beginning and meaning of history can be determined objectively. The genealogical approach is anti-essentialist. The subject of knowledge is limited to a political and historical context and is conditioned by certain patterns of knowledge. Knowledge never has the luxury of being unconditioned (Devetak, 2005: 163).

For postmodernists, any political event is open to different and conflicting interpretations. From the perspective of genealogy, all history represents the endless political struggle and war of different wills and desires, including the production of order. War and struggle metaphors occupy a central place in genealogy. In a sense, Foucault uses genealogy to analyze power relations related to the state in history. While taking the historical-political

discourse to the political and religious wars of the 16th century; he sees wars, which he considers as the basis of all power relations and institutions, as a continuous social relationship. This discourse is contrary to the idea that society is at peace, which is very valid in today's world (Devetak, 2005: 165).

The second method is deconstruction. Deconstruction, a method developed by Jacques Derrida (2010), is a technique used in the analysis of texts. To understand what Derrida means, it is necessary to examine his critique of Western metaphysics or logocentrism. Logocentrism is a stereotyped way of thinking based on Western thought, and it is mostly carried out on dichotomy such as inside/outside, male/female, remember/forgetting, present/non-existent. Each of these dichotomy means the opposite of the other. In fact, each distinction also symbolizes a hierarchy in which the first is superior to the second. However, according to Derrida, the primary concept cannot be considered without the other. The first concept gains meaning with the second. More precisely, the second concept gives existence to the first concept. The concept of remembering only makes sense if there is forgetting. According to Derrida, the "existing" came into existence as a result of a certain thought system.(Bee,2018:531) Accordingly, a text is also an interpretation. If we go even further, a text is a reinterpretation of any interpretation. The reader reads the text in hand with different texts and interprets the text in relation to them. In this case, what we are left with is not a direct description of an objective reality, but a multitude of different interpretations. Edward Said's (1999) *Orientalism* is one of the most important works of deconstruction because it analyzes how the geographical and political interpretation we call the West is constructed through the forgetting, marginalization or suppression of the East within the framework of intertextuality. Thus, the superiority and privilege of the West over the East is constantly reproduced in the texts through constant

repetition. (Foucault, 1992, p. 65) Through deconstruction, poststructuralist thinkers are able to analyze how exclusion works within the discipline of international relations. The emergence of international relations as a discipline right after the 1st World War and its first spread in the Western world generally confined the theoretical approaches that dominate the discipline to Western, white and male perspectives. In this respect, the relationship between theory and practice is constitutive. (Campbell, 1998, 38).

In order to understand the "deconstruction" that forms the basis of Derrida's thought, it is necessary to look at his approach to Western philosophy. According to Derrida, Western thought is based on dichotomy such as being/non-existence, identity/difference or speaking/writing, and each cannot be understood without its opposite. It is also possible to see this in the domestic/international distinction. Each concept mutually excludes the other. Something either exists or it does not; both cannot exist at the same time. Therefore, according to Derrida, we read the world through the window of such dichotomy. One of the concepts in each dichotomy is not independent of the other. For example, to understand the concept of identity, we need to know what difference is. There is also a hierarchy among them. One is more privileged than the other. (Zehfuss, 2009: 139) Generally, the latter has a negative meaning and rather expresses the undesirable. For example, identity differs; existence is preferable to non-existence. (Bee,2018:533)

However, it should be noted that the naming problem is still important. Many postmodern scholars sometimes see themselves as post-structuralists, sometimes deconstructionists, instead of describing themselves as postmodernists, and sometimes they do not accept any of these. (Bee,2018:523)

Post-structuralist thinkers preferred to focus on “limit discourses” rather than “claiming their own absolute ground, putting forward their own monological interpretations, constructing their own historical counter-narratives, and deciding on the absolute truth and falsity of others' inferences of history”. The issue here is not only what the theories say, but how their discourses have effects. (Ashley, 1989, p. 272)

The main criticism brought to poststructuralism is that it does not bring a founding analysis that it only tries to destroy. In this direction, it is stated that poststructuralism does not have any moral attitude and advocates a relativism that can be summarized as 'any way is permissible' (Keohane, 1988; Halliday, 1996).

The postmodern literature in international relations can actually be called a mixture or synthesis of the semiology of Charles Pierce and Ferdinand de Saussure, the language games of Ludwig Wittgenstein, the structuralism of Claude Levi-Strauss, Jacques Lacan and Louis Althusser, and the early Michel Foucault. However, the aim of postmodern and post-structuralist thought is not to challenge existing international relations practices and narratives and to displace all truth claims, but to come up with another claim and produce an alternative. It is to reveal that current modern social structures and institutions are not a result of human nature or the nature of the state or the rule of politics or historical progress as described so far, but a product of human action and thought. (Bee,2018:526)

It is possible to observe a serious increase in post-structuralist international relations approaches in Turkey after the Cold War. The early theoretical studies of Necati Polat (1998) and Pinar Bilgin (2002) can be cited as the first examples of poststructuralist studies. In particular, it is possible to see that many poststructuralist articles about Turkey's foreign policy have been published since the mid-2000s and that it has opened

a new field in the Turkish international relations discipline in a theoretical sense (Bilgin, 2006; Aydın-Düzgit, 2013; Balcı, 2015). Likewise, there are articles in which poststructuralism is used in different fields. It can be said that poststructuralist approaches are used about the foreign policy of the European Union and its relations with Turkey (Bilgin, 2004; Aydın-Düzgit, 2011; Aydın-Düzgit, 2012; Cebeci, 2012), the construction and execution of a global security complex (Balta-Paker, 2012) or the biopolitics of security (Çalkıvık, 2011).

2. TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY PERIODS

2.1. One-Party Period Foreign Policy

It is possible to divide the foreign policy of the 1923-1950 period into two as Atatürk period and İsmet İnönü period. In the foreign policy of the 1923-1930 period, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his friends dealt with the solution of the problems left over from Lausanne. The Turkish nation came out of the struggle for independence with a clear conscience and was successful in removing the invaders from their lands. During this period (1920-1938), President Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the only party he founded, the CHP, completely dominated the destiny of the nation and the state, and foreign policy was carried out in line with Atatürk's principle of "Peace at home, peace in the world". Although the independence struggle was fought against the western states, a foreign policy that did not turn its back on the west was carried out after that. The principles of the National Pact formed the spirit and basis of foreign policy. The general feature of İnönü governments is that the balance policy is at the forefront. As a result of this, the government has repeatedly emphasized on putting the relations with the neighboring countries on a healthy ground. The period of 1923-1930 was a period in

which Westernization efforts were at the forefront, but proactive policies were implemented in which the East was not neglected (Ülman, 244).

In the period after 1923, Turkey gradually began to deal effectively with the European developments. These developments indirectly, and even directly over time, concerned Turkey's security as well. It is seen that Turkey, under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, had a respected place in Europe at that time, as the period between the Two Wars (1919-1939) also had a quality that gave the medium power states the opportunity to be effective (Kürkçüoğlu:321). In this period, foreign policy was again under the jurisdiction of the relevant Ministers of the executive body, especially Atatürk, and to a certain extent the legislative body.

In the years 1935-1938, the bloc movement in Europe intensified, and the relations between the anti-revisionist states and the revisionist states gradually hardened. As a state that is content with its own borders, Turkey tends to get closer to Western democracies, but it has also given some right to Germany's troubles. While Turkey increased its closeness with the West, it continued its dialogue with Germany and tried not to reduce its relations with the Soviet Union below a certain level. While this multi-faceted policy understanding increased Turkey's prestige in the international community, it also ensured that the request for a change in the status of the Straits was resolved without any difficulties. The success achieved in the Straits and the subsequent Hatay problem is the result of Atatürk's versatile and active policy (Tuncer,24).

Although the first goal of the foreign policy implemented in Atatürk's period was to establish a national state that is sovereign over its own destiny, one of the unchanging principles of Turkish foreign policy from the foundation period is rationality. Atatürk's

foreign policy understanding is based on reason and science. The policy of rationality is based on mutual benefit. Due to this policy, Turkey strengthened its position against the West by establishing good relations with the Soviet Union during and after the War of Independence (Tuncer,2011:33).

It is a well-known fact that since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, there has been an effort for change and modernization on the basis of its foreign policy, and with this thought, it has tried to develop cooperation by turning to the West. However, there is another generally accepted feature, which is that Turkey has traditionally followed a policy of neutrality throughout the history of the Republic. However, Turkey, which broke its neutrality with the 1939 alliance at the beginning of the Second World War, changed the game with the start of the Cold War after the war and approached and even adapted to the West both due to the conjuncture of that period and due to the great modernization wind (Gündüz 2020:114).

After Atatürk's death, the years of the Second World War became a new critical period that necessarily kept foreign issues within certain prohibitions. The issues that dominated the international environment during the İnönü period between 1938-1950, on the other hand, developed in the shadow of the Second World War in general. Those who steered the Turkish foreign policy in the Republican period adopted a policy of balance and took care to act in a balanced way in relations with neighbors. Again, in this period, Turkey followed a policy according to its geographical location and became a part of both the East and the West (Ülman:241).

Just as Atatürk himself left his mark on the foreign policy of the Atatürk period, the chief architect of the foreign policy of the İnönü era was İnönü himself. The war years were a

tough foreign policy test for İnönü, the "Second Man", who balanced his decisiveness with his prudence while Atatürk was alive. Knowing closely Atatürk's views that the First World War was entered early and Turkey should stay away from a new war, İnönü can be considered to have fulfilled Atatürk's "foreign policy will" by saving Turkey from entering the Second World War (Kürkçüoğlu, 322). İnönü developed a foreign policy understanding towards solidarity with England and France before the danger of Mussolini in the Mediterranean and the very approaching II. World War II. In the meantime, before the Second World War, he achieved the success of joining Hatay, which Atatürk wanted so much to be realized, to the land of his homeland (Ülman, 243).

2.2. Multi-Party Period Foreign Policy

Westernization was defined as the way of modernization in the last periods of the Ottoman Empire, and it has been one of the most under-emphasized fundamental principles of Turkish foreign policy since the foundation of the Republic. Particularly in the post-World War II period, subversion was shaped with the goal of EU ownership, and full ownership of the EU was determined by foreign policy actors as the last ring of the modernization/subversion project.' This principle has been increasingly institutionalized in the functioning of Turkish foreign policy since this period, and it is fundamental for foreign policy makers! It has been perceived as a parameter, that Turkish foreign policy is and continues to be Western-oriented, and that the European emphasis of Westernization is heavily predominant, and it is possible to talk about a consensus in both academic and political interpretations that will evaluate the recent translations, since 'Ataturk' according to political actors, it is very important to be a part of European

civilization" and this project is perceived as "a project of civilization, a project of peace and a project of justice".

The western orientation is observable in the history of the Ottoman Empire in terms of culture, institutional and principle. With the establishment of the modern West, states outside Europe were shaped in the light of Europe. The Ottoman Empire was also included in these states. Each country has experienced this Westernization process in the sense of modernization in different ways. The fact that historical experiences and political geographies are different has led to the differentiation of this process. (Tuncay,2011:14)

Since the establishment of Turkey, no general lines in foreign policy have been violated in any period of government. In other words, the governments of the Republic of Turkey have always been close to the West, especially the USA, and if some exceptions are not taken into account, they generally acted in common with Western policies in foreign policy developments. The desire to participate in various Western organizations, organizations, pacts and formations since the establishment of the Republic is the most important indicator of this pro-Western policy of Turkey. For this reason, it would be correct to say that Turkish foreign policy in terms of relations with the West is not different in strong single-party governments or coalition periods. Starting from 1945, Turkey's rapid orientation to the Western world and meanwhile becoming one of the founding members of the United Nations and transitioning to a multi-party system, as well as showing more positive developments in terms of human rights and freedoms and in economic terms; It has been effective in Turkey's side with the Western regimes.(Albayrak,2004:486)

During the Cold War period, which started after the Second World War and lasted until the 1990s, Turkey, which served as a buffer against the Soviet Union's expansionism towards the Middle East and the Eastern Mediterranean, followed a "Western-oriented" policy, and this orientation sought to join NATO and integrate into the EEC. (Gündüz,2020:29)

The Second World War deeply affected the political and social life of Turkey as well as the international environment. Although Turkey was not involved in the war, there was a ready army during the war and a strict management approach brought about by this ready situation.

At the end of the war, the world began to polarize in the form of two separate blocks, and with the establishment of the National Development Party and the Democrat Party against the single-party government of the CHP in Turkey at that time, steps were taken towards democratization in Turkish political life. However, in this period, with the effect of the war in the country, the economic structure was turned upside down and the imports decreased, causing the black market to emerge in the market, which caused the rich in the society to get richer and the poor to be in a difficult situation. As a result, the years after the end of the Second World War were the years when the people in Turkey often complained about the administration, there was economic instability, and the CHP policies were insufficient to solve the country's problems. The formation of the Democratic Party emerged in such a process. (Gunduz,2020:33)

During the period of the Democratic Party government, the main parameters that determined the foreign policy understanding were the requirements arising from the developments in the country and internationally before the establishment of the Democrat

Party, and Adnan Menderes's worldview and political perception were the determining factors. When the Democratic Party was founded, there was a two-block world system led by the USA and the USSR. However, during the Menderes period, the period that determined the direction of foreign policy for Turkey and constituted a turning point in terms of Turkey's choice of sides began with the note received from the USSR on March 19, 1945. With this note, the USSR declared that they would not extend the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed between the two countries on December 17, 1925, and demanded that the terms of the Montreux Convention, which gave the management of the Straits to Turkey, be changed and that the eastern border be changed in their favor. This note of the USSR was the most important reason that brought Turkey closer to the Western bloc when the CHP was in power, and caused the Menderes Government to adopt the same attitude that would come later (eroğul, 1970:54).

Turkey's geographical position as a door opening to Asia for Europe and the West, its cultural historical ties with the Middle East region and Muslim countries, and its being a developing economy. proved to be an important country for West. For this reason, it would not be wrong to state that Turkey's desire to participate in Western integration is a part of the understanding of Westernization and acting together with the West, which has been given importance for Turkey since the first years of the establishment of the Republic. Considering that participating in this organization will both make Turkey comfortable in economic terms and help it to take important distances on the path of modernization and democracy, it has been tried to become a member of the European Community (EC), as in the Western alliance's NATO, OECD and Western European Union formations. In addition, the idea of membership in the EC has been described as a necessary and important step because of the higher level of relations with the USA, which

did not hesitate to give economic-based support, and the belief that this economic gap could be compensated by European integration with the decrease in economic aid from the USA after 1954. After the Second World War, the security aspect especially in all European countries and the USA's follow-up policy by bringing the Soviet threat to the agenda were a triggering factor in the formation of the European Community movement, and Greece's effort to join this formation was a triggering factor in Turkey's desire to become a member of this institution. . In other words, Turkey's view of the EC during the Menderes period was primarily dealt with within the framework of the idea of balancing this economic deficit with the decrease in economic aid from the USA, while Greece's membership application had an accelerating effect for Turkey in the EC membership process. Turkey made its request to become a member of the EC in 1959, 16 days after Greece's application, and tried to embody this desire. (Eralp, 1997:90).

The level of relations with the West may differ in the period of governments. Because Turkey, which has been moving in the same direction with the West since the first years of the republic, started to move on the axis of the USA, especially in the early 1950s, together with the Menderes governments. So much so that the foreign policy approaches and practices of Menderes, which he unconditionally put forward with the West and the USA, separated him from other powers. For example, Turkey's participation in the Baghdad Pact during the Menderes period led to the conclusion that it followed a foreign policy guided by the West and the USA. However, while Turkey took part in this formation, he predicted that the Baghdad Pact would essentially be an organization that would include all Middle Eastern countries, and that Turkey's relations with Middle Eastern countries would thus improve. However, especially since Egypt evaluated this organization as a self-directed formation, other Middle Eastern countries also approached

the organization hesitantly. Therefore, the Baghdad Pact, in which Turkey was a member, suddenly took the appearance of an intermediary for the imperialist aims of the West. As a result, Turkey, which wanted to improve its relations with the Middle East countries with this formation, had to move further away from the Middle East countries. (Ari, 2009:88)

Throughout the 1950s, Turkey continued to maintain its commitment to the West or its close relations with the West. Even the death of Stalin, who pursued an aggressive policy in 1956, and the replacement of the more moderate Khrushchev, did not deviate Turkey from the Western course. Khrushchev's statements that he would follow a new world policy and therefore there were no territorial demands from Turkey were also not satisfactory for Turkey. Towards the end of the 1950s, especially after 1958, an approach towards the Soviets was seen, but this did not constitute a deviation from Turkey's classical foreign policy understanding. (Bee, 2009:110)

In addition to the anxiety caused by the Soviet threat, II. During the World War II and in the early years of the Cold War, the US's policy of encircling the USSR and its practices in this direction to Turkey and other countries in the region also accelerated the process of Turkey's close relations with the US and therefore its inclusion in the Western bloc. The military leg of the US policy of encircling the USSR for Turkey is the Truman Doctrine. According to this doctrine, which came to the agenda on March 3, 1947, Turkey will buy used military equipment from the USA and the development of the army will be accelerated. The other pillar of the US containment policy was Marshall aid. According to the Marshall Plan implemented by the USA in 1948; The USA will provide economic support to Turkey. The countries that accepted this aid had to fulfill the conditions such

as importing from the USA, transporting the imported goods with American ships, and deciding in which areas this aid would be used in consultation with the USA. This condition will play a fundamental role in the Turkish economy's entry into the US. In addition, a large part of this aid was requested to be used in the military field, and this request of the USA was an important step on the path that took Turkey to NATO.⁵³ In addition to these developments, Turkey's entry into the IMF on 11 March 1947, 8 August 1949 Its admission to the Council of Europe in Turkey and its entry into NATO on October 17, 1951 and its approval by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1952 are the clearest indications that Turkey, the representative of the Western bloc, and the United States have entered into a close ally relationship (Sönmezoğlu, 2004). :428)

After the Second World War, important developments regarding foreign policy were seen in Turkey. The conclusion of the war (both Western and Soviet) with the victory of the "democracy front" accelerated the developments in the direction of pluralist democracy in Turkey. Turkey's need for the support of the West (USA) in the face of some Soviet demands also played a role in the transition to a Western-type political system. As a result of the developments directed by President İnönü himself, from 1945-46, rapid steps were taken towards multi-party democracy in Turkey. The main important aspect of this development in terms of foreign policy understanding in Turkey was as follows: The establishment of a multi-party democratic life in Turkey would mean pluralism in foreign policy, in other words, the real collapse of prohibitions (Kürkçüoğlu, 323).

In the elections in May 1950, the one-party rule that lasted for twenty-seven years came to an end and the ten-year rule of the Democratic Party began. In this period, the foreign policy of the Governments of President Celal Bayar and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes

can be summarized as tightening relations with the western world, joining NATO for our security, making maximum use of foreign aid, and providing investments and economic development that will strengthen the inadequate and outdated infrastructure (Yılmaz, 2006: 16). With the military coup of 27 May 1960, the Democrat Party was removed from power and a military administration remained in power for a while. During this period, Turkey continued to maintain its international commitments. In 1961, multi-party political life was reinstated. The Cyprus problem is now at the forefront of Turkey's foreign policy and has begun to affect its foreign relations considerably. In the 1960s and 1970s, Turkey witnessed crises related to the Cyprus problem, such as the Cuban crisis and the 1964 Johnson letter, in addition to the American embargo imposed on Turkey from 1974-1978 as a result of the peace process in Cyprus. (Sultan,2020:82)

The one-party period of the CHP, which lasted for twenty-seven years, was replaced by the DP after a disciplined understanding of democracy. To summarize the issues prioritized by the governments of President Celal Bayar and Prime Minister Adnan Menderes in their foreign policies: To increase relations with the Western world and especially America, to join NATO for our security, to benefit from foreign aid as much as possible to increase economic development, and to renew the inadequate and outdated infrastructure in the form of investments. In this period, Turkey started to look for allies against the threat of the USSR. For this reason, it became one of the few states that responded most actively to the Korean War that broke out on June 20, 1950. This move was effective in Turkey's admission to NATO. (Yılmaz,2006:17)

In 1953, the Balkan Pact was signed between Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, and the Baghdad Pact was established between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan in 1955. In these

years, military cooperation with the United States was also developed and mutual commitments were made. With the Common Market (the first form of today's European Union), which was created with the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957, our initiatives targeting NATO membership came to the fore. The Cyprus problem, which has been affecting our foreign relations for many years, has gained importance since 1955. The chaos that the DP administration could not end for ten years eventually led to military coups and the establishment of coalition governments. With the military coup of May 27, 1960, the DP was removed from power and a military administration came to power for a while. During this period, Turkey continued to maintain its international commitments. In 1961, the multi-party political life was resumed and new elections were held. After the elections, İsmet İnönü was appointed as the prime minister and the first coalition governments were opened and a coalition government was established by İnönü three times. In this period, negotiations with the AET were intensified and the Ankara Agreement was signed in September 1963, which gave Turkey the status of "associate member". Accordingly, it was foreseen that, after some preparation and cooperation stages, the final stage of "full membership" would be entered as of 1995. The Independent Republic of Cyprus, which was founded in 1960 on the basis of Turkish-Greek political partnership, continued for two years, and then the social and political balance was deteriorated enough to enter armed conflicts by getting stuck in increasing imbalances and conflicts. The events of 1963-1964 led to crises with Greece. The Cyprus problem is now constantly at the forefront of Turkey's foreign policy and has begun to affect its foreign relations to a great extent. There was a tension between America and the "Johnson Letter". Although the increasing Greek military presence and activities in Cyprus in 1967 brought Turkey to the brink of military intervention and even a Turkish-Greek war, the

period of endless negotiations was opened after various mediation activities (Firat, 1997:50-51). In the light of these developments, Turkey's relations with the neighboring USSR entered a new political process, and the stage of establishing loans and some industrial facilities to Turkey was started with high-level mutual visits.

After a coup d'etat in Cyprus with the support of Greece in 1974, Turkey deployed soldiers to the island by using its right of guarantor in the treaties with the decision of the then government of Bülent Ecevit. By carrying out the Peace Operation, Turkey established military control in a part of Cyprus and put an end to the bloody conflicts of the two communities. This situation led to a regime crisis in Greece, the ruling military junta was overthrown and a civilian administration was established. (girgin, 1994:117)

All these developments have shown new effects in Turkey's foreign relations. In particular, it has increased the ongoing difficulties and tensions in Turkish-Greek relations, both in Cyprus and in the Aegean and Western Thrace issues. In February 1975, the Turkish part declared that it established a Federated State in Cyprus (Yavuzalp, 1996: 82). Turkey's military intervention in Cyprus in July-August 1974, which it had not been able to do for years, that is, the emergence of a state of war for the first time in 50 years in the history of the Republic, brought Turkey to the fore in the international scene on a multifaceted and sensitive issue that also concerns the great powers. The Cyprus issue, which has created such important results in Turkey's foreign policy, is not a random foreign issue; it was one of the few very important international problems of the 1970s world. Being able to implement the decision to intervene in such an important issue, of course, gave Turkey confidence at home and weight abroad; but it also exposed him to intense reactions due to the international nature of the problem. This, in particular, was

effective in the constant revival of the domestic interest in the Cyprus problem and foreign policy in general (Kürkçüoğlu, 329).

During these years, various European Security and Cooperation Conference studies for a softening between the blocks in Europe were concluded and the main document that emerged, the "Helsinki Final Act", was signed on behalf of Turkey by the world leaders participating in the July 1975 summit meeting in Finland and Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel. (Hale, 1994:72)

2.2.1. NATO Membership and Foreign Policy

United Geopolitical Power Centers are centers of power that are formed when more than one state combines all of their power sources in order to gain effectiveness for a purpose in line with their national interests. Entities of this type can be considered as a single state status in terms of the content of their domains. For example, NATO is a semi-global unified geopolitical power center within the limits of its responsibility for its purposes.(Taştekin,2009:11)

Turkey became a member of NATO in 1952 within the framework of its pro-Western policy shaped by the security motive in order to be protected from the communist threat and defined its national interests according to its alliance with the West. It followed a dependent policy with increasing support from the West, and its role in the Middle East was in line with the US policy of keeping the USSR in the region. In this context, Democratic Party leader Adnan Menderes played a role in the negotiation of the Baghdad Pact, which was established in 1955 between Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Pakistan and aimed to prevent the spread of communism. However, the pact broke up after Iraq's withdrawal

in 1959 and was renamed the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Criss added that Turkey's participation in NATO and the Baghdad Pact is also in line with its vision of becoming a full member of the European community. Turkey's economic situation was also one of the factors that attracted the West because Turkey was experiencing economic difficulties and needed external financing from the West. In this sense, the Turkish economy has been dependent on the West since the 1950s. (sultan,2020:81)

Relations with the USA have been a cornerstone in Turkish foreign policy since 1947, and it is one of the most important external factors affecting Turkish foreign policy. The nature of the relations with the USA is based on the ties that Turkey established to resist the pressures of the Soviet Union. The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan implementations, participation in the Korean War, which provided the results of the European Economic Cooperation Organization and the European Economic Cooperation Organization's entry into the Council of Europe and NATO membership, protected Turkey from the pressures of the Soviets. These ties, which were established as a result of fears, made Turkey feel strong against the USSR and in its region (Çakmak, 465).

With the US aid received with the Truman Doctrine in 1947, the Turkish army was modernized, and Turkish foreign policy began to take shape in line with the US's will. By sending a military unit of 4500 people to the Korean War in 1950, Turkey strengthened its position in the eyes of both the USA and Western countries (Çakmak, 507).

The Menderes period, covering the years 1950 – 1960, is a period in which Turkey is in an effort to integrate and act together with the West in the fields of foreign policy, defense and security. For the US, Turkey was seen as a very useful ally, willingly fulfilling Western interests in the Near and Middle East, while Turkey saw the US as a factor that

guaranteed its security and development. It must be one of the international dynamics and necessities of those years, the relations between Turkey and the USA in the 1950-1960 period had mostly progressed on the axis of security and military and had a direct impact on the policies that Turkey would create both on a regional and global basis. The fact that the United States, as the new global superpower, began to take responsibilities in different parts of the world, and Turkey, which has been careful to stay away from alliances by following neutral policies since its establishment, turned to military and political alliances, especially towards the end of the 1940s, revealed the fact that the two countries had strategic interests in establishing partnerships with each other. In this context, the relations of the two countries, which were tightly connected to each other by different political, military and economic arrangements until the end of the 1950s, took place in a close, sincere, informal and sincere manner, which is rarely seen with the excitement of their new establishment and the similarity in common interest and threat perception. (uslu,2000:87)

The role of the Democratic Party, which won the 1950 elections and came to power in the development of relations with the USA, cannot be denied. The 1950-1960 period was a period when Turkey's efforts to integrate into the world capitalist system economically and to integrate with the West in foreign policy were intensified.¹⁹⁶ In this period, Turkey became a reliable part of the political and military structures formed by the USA and its Western allies. (Çakmak,465).

Turkey's sending troops to Korea in 1950, with the Truman Doctrine dated March 12, 1947, the USA's declaration that "it will provide financial and military aid to the states under the threat of communism" and in this context, 300 million dollars of aid to Greece

and 100 million dollars of aid in Turkey. and with Marshall aid sent, Turkish-American rapprochement in the aforementioned period was further consolidated. (Sander, 1996: 237-238). With Turkey's full membership to NATO in 1952, Turkey-US relations evolved into a close alliance membership process within the specified period.

After the 2nd World War, within the framework of Turkey's perception of threat originating from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the level of relations between the two countries were broad-based, political, economic and social contacts, after becoming a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1952 has risen. In particular, the USSR's declaration to the Turkish side that it would not renew the 1925 "Friendship and Neutrality" agreement signed with Turkey in 1945, and subsequently, with the concession and territorial demands from the straits transmitted through official channels, Turkey's efforts to get closer to the USA increased (Toker, 1971: 5-9). Considering the factors such as Turkey's geopolitical position, its border with the USSR, the security of NATO's southern flank, the increasing need for Turkey in its active policies towards the Middle East, and the containment policy aimed at encircling the USSR, it can be better understood that USA preferred to get closer with Turkey after the Second World War (Darıcı,2020:291).

In the period after 1952, Turkish-American relations took place at the level of close alliance relations until the 1960 Military Coup. In this period, Turkish-American relations were mainly based on the fact that Turkey was a NATO wing country bordering the USSR, and in this context, the United States (USA) was active in the Middle East geography with its containment policy aimed at encircling the Soviet Union. policy has followed a positive course (Darıcı,2020:291).

With the revolution that led to the overthrow of the monarchy in Iraq on July 14, 1955, and the bilateral agreement between Turkey and the United States on March 5, 1959, disagreements emerged. In the first event, the Government described it as "the result of external provocations" and indirectly blamed the Soviet Union and Egypt, while opposition circles evaluated the revolution as "a reaction against increasing oppression and tyranny". Thus, they expressed an indirect protest against the increasing power pressures in Turkey. It is interesting that after this date, the word "revolution" entered the Turkish political debate and the government accused the Opposition of "desiring to carry out a similar movement in Iraq in Turkey". This development showed that the opposition began to disapprove of the foreign policy of the government, with which it was increasingly at odds in domestic politics.

As for the second example; The use of the term "indirect attack" in the preamble of the agreement signed between Turkey and the United States was the subject of criticism in the Parliament by the opposition. "If the phenomenon of the strengthening of the Opposition in Turkey was to be described by the government as an 'indirect attack' according to the agreement in question, the agreement could even be used to prevent a democratic change of power." It was possible to feel such anxieties in the tense environment of those years in Turkey. In its session on 9.5.1960, the UN approved the agreement with the votes of all 308 deputies who participated in the voting, while the members of the Opposition were not present in the voting (Kürkçüoğlu,323).

If we evaluate the Turkish-American relations in the 1950-1960 period in general, we can see that after the end of the Second World War, the Soviet threat united the two countries around common interests, but Turkey was economically and the USA was more strategic

in the Middle East and Asia-Pacific. It is possible to say that they are trying to direct their relations with the thought of strengthening their interests. The USA, which started the Cold War as a result of the Second World War, went on the path of power struggle based on interests within the realist foreign policy understanding, and at this point, it acted jointly with Turkey in many areas, especially military policies. However, due to the decreasing US aid towards the last years of the Democratic Party government and the serious economic problems experienced in the country due to this effect, Turkey sought alternative partnerships. (Gunduz,2020:83)

The Cyprus problem entering a crisis period at the end of 1963 was a turning point in terms of its results. Turkey painfully saw that the foreign policy pursued until then (after 1945) did not fully realize Turkey's foreign security, moreover, it pushed Turkey into isolation in the foreign arena. The need to reconsider Turkish foreign policy was clearly felt in Turkish ruling circles. In this environment, especially in 1964, the US President Johnson sent to Prime Minister İnönü, which aimed to prevent the intervention that Turkey wanted to make in Cyprus with pressure, but while doing this, the cooperation between Turkey and NATO and the USA for years was a sign of Turkey's support. The publication of the letter, which revealed that it could not ensure its security, in a high-circulation daily newspaper at the beginning of 1966, aroused the public's intense interest in the issue of Turkish foreign policy. There was an increasing interest that justified the foreign policy criticisms that started in the first years of the 1960s but failed to attract the attention of the public. Thus, “foreign policy has lost its quality of being a subject that only draws the attention and responsibility of decision makers, and has become a subject that citizens other than decision makers are interested in, discuss and announce their opinions both to each other and to the decision maker. (Kürkçüoğlu, 326)

2.2.2. Turkish Foreign Policy in 1980 Era

If we look at the post-Menderes Turkey-EC relations periodically, with the 1960 Revolution, Europe's approach to Turkey with reservations, especially on democracy and human rights issues, as well as the domestic political problems in the 1970s negatively affected the course of Turkey-EC relations. In this context, Turkey's declaration that it froze its relations with the EC in 1978, and the efforts to restructure and normalize relations in 1980, resulting in a negative outcome as a result of the military coup, were the main developments that determined the course of Turkey-EC relations and under which headings the relations would be carried out. Özal's government's taking office after the 1960 Revolution, the democracy problems of the 1970s and the September 12, 1980 coup led to the emergence of a process in which issues such as democracy and human rights were prioritized more intensely than the normal level in Turkey's relations with the community during the Özal period. However, especially with the September 12 coup d'état, the attitude of the European institutions towards Turkey in the first years of Özal's term hardened, and both political and economic relations began to deteriorate. The relations, which entered into an environment of complete uncertainty between 1980 and 1985, started to revive after the 1983 election, with the civilian government taking over power and an attempt to implement a free competitive and open-minded industrial and foreign trade policy instead of import substitution policies. (Iacino,2007:575)

In Turkey, perception of leadership, bureaucratic institutions, press, public opinion, economic-social organizations and the army are extremely effective parameters in the foreign policy formation process. The weight of these parameters in the process is intense according to the variety and quality of the subjects. For example, we can say that the

perception and influence of leadership were at the forefront in the founding years of Turkey, then the institutional structures gained weight and importance, the business world in the 1980s and the army in the 1990s were influential in the foreign policy formation. However, it would be appropriate to say that the leadership position is more effective than other factors in the foreign policy formation process in Turkey. (Gunduz,2020:24)

Everyone knows that the year 1980 and before was not a very bright period in terms of Turkey's domestic politics. Especially in 1974, when the Ecevit government was in power and the Cyprus Operation was carried out, there was a great economic chaos for Turkey, and Turkey went through a painful period economically with the effect of standing against the West. After this painful period, the intense right-left conflict that took place until 1980 brought the military coup of September 12, 1980, and the National Security Council, which was established under the presidency of General Kenan Evren, seized the country's administration.

In 1979, while the USA was dealing with the economic crisis, the Soviet Union sent troops to Afghanistan and reactivated the world balances, and regime change was carried out in Iran with a revolution. The US has reconsidered its plans for the Middle East and Central Asia as a result of the strained relations with the new regime, which held the 50 Americans hostage in the Tehran Embassy building. At this point, Turkey has come to the position of an important ally for the USA, and it has been evaluated as a country that is suitable for the policies that the USA wants to realize in the Middle East (Gürevin,2014:64).

The most important driving force behind Turkey's ability to act by prioritizing the principles of its own foreign policy stems from its claim to regional empowerment. Since

the 1980s, the geographical focus of Turkish foreign policy began to expand and intensify its relations with its neighbors in particular. is the fundamental element of policy.

The softening period of the Cold War ended with the Soviet Union's landing of troops in Afghanistan, and the United States entered this period with the Carter Doctrine. According to this doctrine, the USA has revealed that it will fight all developments that it perceives as a threat in the Middle East region, especially in the Gulf, and that it can use all means, including the military, in this struggle. The Green Belt project, which was developed in order to prevent the USSR from increasing its influence on the Middle East countries and to continue the uninterrupted flow of oil from the Gulf to the west, was thus put into practice (Celebi, 758).

In the 1980s, as before, Turkish foreign policy was reevaluated according to the international conjuncture, and Turkey also participated in the "Green Belt Project" initiated by the USA. The project, called the Green Belt, aims to support moderate Islamist groups in the region and to develop relations between these groups and the states (Gürevin,2014:20).

As with every coup attempt in Turkey, with the 1980 Military Coup, the relations between the Turkish-American relations, which were tense until the coup took place, quickly entered a healing process with the coup attempt. In this framework, the military administration, which started to rule Turkey after the 1980 Coup, allowed some military exercises of NATO to be held in Turkey in 1982. In the UN vote on the US invasion of Panama in 1989, it took a position in favor of the US. In addition, it has started to build airports in Eastern Anatolia since 1982 within the scope of the Wohlstetter Doctrine, which is also known as the Green Belt Project, as requested by the USA. (Oran, 2002:

30-31). However, he did not veto the process of retaking Greece, which left NATO's military wing with the Cyprus Intervention, into NATO's military wing in 1980 (Özalp, 2018: 416). The tense period in question led to a softening in Turkish-American relations with the 1980 Coup. In this period, Turkey supported the Wohlstetter Doctrine, also known as the Green Belt Project, and did not veto the process of re-integrating Greece into NATO's military wing.

One of the most distinctive features of this period in the context of Turkish-American relations is the emergence of the role attributed to Turkey by the USA within the framework of new policy approaches. In the 1980s, the importance of Turkey for the Middle East region and the Asia Pacific, which is an economically highly active region, began to be felt once again. Turkey's importance for the USA has increased even more, especially since Turkey is a neighbor to the Middle East, has cultural ties with the countries of this region, and Özal is a leader with a conservative mindset in terms of the general characteristics of Middle Eastern countries. For this reason, the fact that Turkey, which is neighboring the Middle East region and has various common experiences with the countries and peoples of the region, exhibits a foreign policy that does not remain unresponsive to the events in the region, as it will become clear towards the end of the 1980s, will create a breaking point in the line of traditional Turkish foreign policy. However, there is a point that needs to be expressed about making concessions from the traditional Turkish foreign policy line from time to time, which is that what pushes Turkey to be interested in the developments in the region is not only due to a change in understanding in Turkish foreign policy, but also to other countries in the world, especially the Middle East policy of the USA. The policies it has pursued against it are also quite effective in this regard. However, Özal's thinking that he can seize new

opportunities by being involved in the developments in the region and his enthusiastic behavior accelerated the process of changing the traditional line in foreign policy.(Gündüz, 2020:85)

George Bush, who came to power in the last years of the 1980s, determined the new policies of the USA and Turkey was also affected by the developments. So much so that the closeness of George Bush and Turgut Özal left its mark on the period, and the importance given to relations with the USA increased even more. With the end of the Cold War, new security concerns have emerged in Turkey, as in the rest of the world, and in addition to military security concerns, new problems such as terrorism and illegal migration have come to Turkey's agenda. In addition, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Turkey's place in NATO has become questionable. In the same years, Turkey's application for full membership to the EU was rejected. These difficulties in relations with Western states have brought Turkey even closer to the United States. Towards the 1990s, tensions centered on Armenian claims and the Cyprus problem also emerged in Turkey-US relations. (tokmaktepe,2018:14)

During Özal's period, the framework of military relations between the two countries was the Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement (DECA), signed on March 29, 1980. Three months before the expiration of DECA, an executive agreement signed for five years to implement the NATO agreement and expected to be extended on an annual basis after five years, Turkey offered a 10-item list of demands to the United States, suggesting a change, but the United States had a strong presence in the Middle East. While approaching the modernization of the Turkish Armed Forces as a military entity warmly and positively, he stated that it is not possible to overcome the export barriers, especially

in the field of textiles, by using some technical factors as an excuse to Turkey's demand for more comfortable and easier exports to the USA. Despite the US's cold approach to opening export routes and facilitating exports, Turkey has re-signed DECA by extending it for only one year, despite some reservations. It has been stated that although the USA remained indifferent to Turkey's requests for change regarding DECA, the fact that the agreement did not cause any problems regarding the continuation of the agreement was the result of the determination of the Turkish administrators to see the support and assistance of the USA behind them and to maintain the alliance with the USA. It must be said here that the basis of this problem experienced by Turkey and the USA regarding DECA has been economic, just as Menderes has been living with the USA recently. Because after 1954, Menderes made an effort to increase US aid, but when he could not see the change he expected, he thought of diversifying his foreign policy relations. From this point of view, it is possible to say that Özal's demands on DECA, especially regarding exports, were made for the purpose of economic development, contribution to the economy and increasing the grants and aids received from the USA. Despite the fact that the USA did not approve of these economic demands, the economic relationship of the ANAP government with the USA continued to be shaped within the framework of both the US grants and debts to Turkey, and the commercial relations entered into with American companies.

In this period, the most important development regarding Turkey's neighbors in the region was the Iran-Iraq war. During the Iran-Iraq War, which started in 1980 and ended with the ceasefire decision of the UN Security Council dated 20 August and numbered 598 in 1988, Turkey stood in line with its neutrality policy, and the main parameters in Turkey's relations with the regional states in this period were the Kurdish problem and the water

problem. The problem created by the war for Turkey was beyond the uneasiness caused by a war that took place in the same region and between two neighboring countries, the fact that the Northern Iraq region was left uncontrolled due to the effect of the war and the PKK terrorist organization became effective there. The conflicts in the region and especially Syria's approaches in bilateral relations, along with the problems it caused in the said period, led Turkey to establish good relations with Israel, which we can call the base of the West and even the USA in the region.(Sönmezoğlu, 443)

New developments such as the Iranian Revolution and the occupation of Afghanistan, and the uncertainties in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and even Greece in the surrounding region, resulted in the strengthening of security cooperation between Turkey and the USA in this period. An important step taken in the military cooperation between the two countries was the production of F-16 aircraft in Turkey with the joint project of the two states. Within the framework of the project, it was envisaged that 160 F-16 aircraft worth \$4.2 billion would be produced over a 10-year period. In addition, Özal established relations with the leading segments of the US arms industry and tried to attract foreign investments in the civilian industry to Turkey. (uzgel, 2003:80) The share of US companies in the foreign capital investing in Turkey constituted 20% of all foreign capital in Turkey in this period. With the influence of the USA, especially the loans taken from the IMF and the World Bank were deemed necessary for the revival of the Turkish economy, and many foreign institutions like this one preferred to borrow money. (tokmaktepe,2018)

The 1980s have been a different period in terms of Turkey-Middle East relations and great progress has been made especially in the economic and commercial fields. While the

stagnation in relations with the West, especially with Europe, emerged with the September 12 coup, Turkey's need for new markets as a result of the necessity of implementing the 24 January Decisions triggered Özal's orientation to the Middle East and Islamic countries. For this reason, as with Özal's general policy understanding, his approach to the Middle East and his interest in the region were also on an economic and commercial basis. In line with these thoughts, the 1st Özal Government program, in which the relations to be established with the Middle East are not perceived as an alternative to the West and two cultures and two civilizations are seen as complementary to each other, are aware of the reactions and criticisms of Turkey's pro-Western policies towards the Middle East in the past. Özal stated that he opposes Turkey's role as a gendarme for other states or organizations in the relations to be established with the Middle East, and that the interests of the USA and Turkey in the region may conflict, therefore the USA cannot use Turkey for its own purposes.(Laçınok, 2007: 587.)

2.2.3. Turkish Foreign Policy After Relations with the European Union

After 1990, there were two main factors affecting Turkish Foreign Policy. One of them is the collapse of the Soviet Union and the other is the rapid progress of European integration (Oran, 2004: 326).

Looking at the relations established with Iraq between 1990-2001, the first point to be mentioned is the foreign policy practices shaped by the Gulf Crisis that broke out in the early 90s. It started when Turgut Özal served as the President of the Republic in 1991, when Turkey gave full support to the Gulf War under the leadership of the USA. Turkey supported the USA by allowing the use of the Incirlik base in the war and by imposing an economic embargo on Iraq (Tür, 2006).

During the 1990s, it turned into a unipolar structure. However, since the late 1990s, this time multipolarity has come to the fore. Because, with the relations between states taking on a much more complex structure compared to the Cold War political understanding, countries had to redefine their foreign policy visions. After the Cold War, Turkey felt the need to re-establish relations with the Middle East, the Balkans, Central Asia, Africa, the Caucasus, Latin America and Russia, apart from the USA and the EU. However, Turkey wanted to see these relations as "complementary" to each other, not as "alternatives and rivals" to each other. (Davutoğlu, 2008:82) Although the desire to implement a multi-faceted foreign policy dominated by the Middle East after 2000 is often expressed in different platforms, the origins of this practice date back to before 2000. Because, after the Cold War, Turkey initiated initiatives such as the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Assembly (BSEC) in 1992, the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) in 1985, and the D-8 in 1997 in order to diversify its relations with Turkey. Foreign policy makers, on the one hand, tried to develop and diversify relations with the USA and the EU, on the other hand, they wanted to initiate a relationship based on common interests with the new emerging powers and expansions towards the aforementioned regions. The policy of developing relations in more than one lane that Turkey has followed is a situation required by the geography and time period it is in. This principle is at the forefront of the foreign policy principles of many states in the world (Güder and Mercan,2012:59-60).

The western orientation is observable in the history of the Ottoman Empire in terms of culture, institutional and principle. With the establishment of the modern West, states outside Europe were shaped in Europe and its light. The Ottoman Empire was also included in these states. Each country has experienced this Westernization process in the

sense of modernization in different ways. The fact that historical experiences and political geographies are different has led to the differentiation of this process (Tuncay,2011:14).

Westernization was defined as the way of modernization in the last periods of the Ottoman Empire, and it has been one of the most under-emphasized basic principles of Turkish foreign policy since the foundation of the Republic. Westernization, especially in the post-World War II period, was shaped by the goal of EU membership, and full membership to the EU was determined by foreign policy actors as the last link of the modernization/Westernization project. This principle has become more and more institutionalized in the functioning of Turkish foreign policy since this period and has been perceived as a basic parameter for foreign policy makers. It is possible to talk about a consensus in both academic and political interpretations that will evaluate the recent debates on the fact that Turkish foreign policy is and continues to be Western-oriented and the definition of Westernization has a heavy emphasis on Europe. According to political actors since Ataturk, it is very important to be a part of European civilization" and this project is perceived as "a project of civilization and justice".

The 1990s were the years when the effort of the Republic of Turkey to become a member of the European Union was strengthened with the Customs Union Agreement. With the "Copenhagen Criteria" created at the Copenhagen Summit in 1993, the basic qualifications that a country must have in order to be admitted to the EU membership were determined. While the political criteria focused on stable democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for minorities, the economic criteria counted the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competition and market forces within the EU as prerequisites for membership. Turkey, which was politically

insufficient to fulfill the EU's demands, turned to the goal of economic integration with the EU, namely the Customs Union, with the Ankara Agreement in order to realize its economic priorities. With the Customs Union agreement, which was signed in 1995 and entered into force in 1996, Turkey abolished the customs duties it applied to all imported goods from the EU, but also became obliged to apply the EU's common customs tariffs to its trade with third countries. The EU, on the other hand, abolished the quotas applied only to textiles and clothing. At the EU Luxembourg Summit held in 1997, a report called "Agenda 2000" was created as the strategy of enlargement. According to this report, in summary, it was stated that the Customs Union with Turkey helped to develop the relations established and to be established between the parties that work well. After the declaration of Turkey as a candidate country at the European Union (EU) Helsinki Summit on 10-11 December 1999, there is a transformation towards the EU in foreign policy as well as in Turkish domestic policy when compared to the previous decade (güder and mercan, 2012:65).). In addition, Turkey was asked to make radical reforms on human rights, to respect minority rights, to take satisfactory steps towards a solution to the problems with Greece, and to support the UN negotiations on Cyprus in order to strengthen the political relations between Turkey and the EU. After the Luxembourg Summit, which took place on 12-13 December 1997 and where such decisions were taken, Turkey announced that it suspended its political dialogue with the EU (Çiftçi, 2010: 313).

After a problematic and passive decade after the end of the cold war, Turkey started to solve its problems with its neighbors with the initiative of İsmail Cem, who was the Minister of Foreign Affairs for a long time (30 June 1997–11 July 2002) (Uzgel, 2009, p. 72). The best-known example of this is the positive developments in relations with

Greece. These limited and isolated attempts of Cem became a stable government policy with a new conceptualization after 2002.

As we approached 1999, there was no progress in relations with the EU, with the effect of suspended relations. With the ANAP-DSP-MHP coalition established in the April 1999 elections, a new era began in relations with the EU. The candidacy status obtained at the 1999 Helsinki Summit was gained during the Democratic Left Party (DSP) and Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) periods (Koçer, 2009). It was concluded from the summit that Turkey was accepted as a candidate country to the EU. Although it was stated that the requirements in line with the Copenhagen criteria should be fulfilled in order to be a candidate, Turkey achieved the result it had been waiting for years. Following this decision, a road map was prepared in the Accession Partnership Document prepared in 2000, which includes the necessary arrangements for Turkey to gain the status of a member state. In the light of the objectives prepared under the headings of short, medium and long-term economic and political objectives, the target of Turkey's reaching the regulations within the scope of Copenhagen criteria was set. The most important step taken in this roadmap can be described as the constitutional amendments made in October 2001. In this framework, in accordance with the national program given to the Commission in March 2001, new provisions have come to the fore in the areas of freedom of thought and expression, prevention of torture, democracy, personal freedom and security, freedom of communication, residence and travel, freedom of association and equality between men and women. The New Turkish Civil Code, which entered into force on January 1, 2002, includes important provisions in this direction (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 11.11.2010) (Tuncay,2011:56).

As it can be seen, the EU is an adventure for Turkey that started a long time ago. Every development experienced in this context has only one focus, which is "Westernism". It can be observed that since 1959, within the scope of EU integration, the continuity element of westernism has not been deviated. Although the foreign policy areas implemented with the changing conjuncture after 1990 have diversified, the West and the EU have always remained as the main point. After Turkey was defined as a candidate country by the EU in 1999, Turkey started to walk towards the goal of full membership, accompanied by legal regulations. After the Accession Partnership Document and the National Program were accepted, rapid arrangements were started to be made on constitutional issues, which were always a political problem for Turkey. With the three harmonization packages put into effect throughout 2002, important legal arrangements were made. In other words, determination has been shown on what needs to be done in terms of integration with the EU. As stated at the beginning, the EU has taken its place in Turkish foreign policy practices, not as a foreign policy tool shaped by governments specific to their own periods, but as a foreign policy tool that has always been focused on the same goal, even though it has governmental and historical changes (Tuncay,2011:56).

Having a key position in the containment of the Soviet Union during the Cold War, Turkey did not lose its geopolitical importance when the Cold War ended. Moreover, this time Turkey has begun to be considered as the most convenient way of accessing important energy resources.

Turkey, on the one hand, had to determine its foreign policy preferences in the context of its multi-faceted geopolitical position, on the other hand, it found itself in dilemmas in the field of foreign policy due to the relations it established with the western powers.

Turkey's active participation in the Western alliance (NATO) in the European region determined its relations with its northern neighbor, the Soviet Union. With the end of the Cold War, a new dilemma arose in this region. With the change of the conjuncture, the complex relations between the EU, the USA and Russia have come to the fore. (tuncay,2011:16) With the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, discussions on international order emerged. Because one of the two superpowers in existence, the Soviet Union, has dissolved. For this reason, assumptions have been made about what kind of situation will replace bipolarity.

After the end of the Cold War, Turkey's relations with Russia, which started to open up with the influence of these policies, witnessed intense diplomatic relations in the early 1990s. Relations with the Caucasus and Central Asia, on the other hand, had to walk under the shadow of the Soviet Union due to its influence in the region during the Cold War. Since 1993, Russia has started to implement its new foreign policy. These new policies are named as "near environment doctrine". With this doctrine, Russia declared its immediate surroundings as a living space and developed new policies towards Central Asia and the Caucasus for this purpose. The countries of the region wanted Turkey to assume the role of "brother" in the region until 1993. In 1993, with Russia's implementation of the above-mentioned "near environment doctrine", it started to implement policies to establish better relations with these countries, resulting in the countries in the region turning to discourses "that they need cooperation rather than brothers" (Aydın, 2004: 7-8).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disintegration of Yugoslavia was a development that shook the stability in the Balkans. Turkey, on the other hand, has started

to show more interest in the Balkans, as it sees the unstable Balkans as a threat to itself. In this context, in the Bosnian War that started in 1992, Turkey did not remain silent against the treatment of Bosnian Muslims. Moreover, during this war, during the Özal period, it was decided to pursue an active foreign policy. He even brought the issue to the agenda of international politics. Although meetings were held many times to find a solution to the war with the Balkan countries, a consensus could not be reached. Moreover, Turkey, with its strong rival in the region, was supporting different sides. While Turkey supported Bosnia, Greece supported the Serbian side (Eroğlu, 2005: 24). Turkey supported NATO's air strikes against Serbia.

Turkey has adopted a similar attitude in Kosovo. While not as sensitive as there (perhaps for the reasons mentioned above), it played an active role because of the threat of instability in the region. It was included in the embargo imposed by NATO on Belgrade, and in 1999, it sent F-16 jets to be used in the air attack (Sayarı, 2000: 178).

These events, which are on the international agenda, reveal the foundations of Turkey's foreign policy in the Balkans between 1990-2001. The foreign policies implemented against the Balkan countries increased on this basis. So much so that Turkey, which played an active role in the Kosovo and Bosnia crises, took care to establish good relations and cooperation with the countries in the Balkans.

Turkey, Albania, Romania and Macedonia have started to establish diplomatic relations, including high-level political and military visits, since 1992 when they recognized their independence (Tuncay, 2011: 69).

In the 1990s, Turkey-US relations followed a course of ups and downs, and in the 1991 Gulf War, Turkey supported the US on issues such as the use of bases and the shifting of Turkish soldiers to the Northern Iraq border. In return for the support given, the USA increased its aid and lobbied in favor of Turkey regarding EU membership. It has been mentioned in the previous sections that the emergence of the USA as the sole superpower is an important breaking point in the international order. In this respect, suitable environments were created for the realization of regional initiatives in the Balkans, the Black Sea, the Caucasus and Central Asia, in other words, in the areas emptied by the Soviet Union. Moreover, Turkey's regional policies were supported by the USA. An example of this is the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (1992) (Park, 2007: 43).

In addition, a new concept called “Enhanced Partnership” was introduced in 1991 and it was aimed to diversify the relations in this way. What is meant by the diversification of relations is to advance bilateral relations in the fields of politics, defense cooperation, economy and energy, and serve regional and global peace and stability (Uslu, 2000). In this context, in the post-Cold War period, the greatest cooperation emerged during the 1st Gulf War. Turkey also supported the operations that took place in the removal of Iraq from Kuwait in 1991 (Kirişçi, 2002: 177). He allowed the "Rapid Reaction Forces" in Turkey to be deployed on its territory. It also accepted the UN resolutions against Iraq and became the first country to implement it (closing the oil lines) (Criss, Bilgin, 1997). The demand made by Turkey, which complied with the embargo imposed in accordance with the UN resolution and stopped the oil trade with Iraq by closing the Kirkuk-Yumurtalık oil pipeline, was not accepted by the US authorities. The embargo applied to Iraq after the Gulf War negatively affected Turkey economically. Turkey's export loss has reached tens of billions of dollars. The authority vacuum and confusion in Northern

Iraq after the Gulf Wars created a threat and risk zone for Turkey. Disturbed by the US's attitude towards Northern Iraq and the Kurdish issue, Turkey made a natural gas pipeline agreement with Iran and Russia in 1996, paving the way for the creation of the Blue Stream line. This situation caused relations with the USA to be dragged into a dead end again. Aiming to establish a network of close relations with the Caucasus and Central Asian states, Turkey could not achieve the desired success due to the problems caused by these countries and the USA (Celebi,2011:37).

The PKK issue also has an important place in Turkey-USA relations in the Middle East. In this respect, it should be mentioned that Turkey's interventions against the PKK and the Kurds in 1995 were criticized by the USA on the grounds that they were against human rights (Kirişçi, 2002: 181). After this development, which caused a very tense atmosphere in Turkey, and in a way triggered the "Sevres Syndrome", there was not a great break in relations. However, it should be noted that the PKK problem remained an unreconciled subject area between Turkey and the USA. Even though there were tensions due to the PKK, which is an extremely vital issue for Turkey in relations, Turkey acted together with the United States, especially in Iraq, and in the Middle East in general. For example, Turkey supported many operations such as "Peace Operations" and "Hammer Power" until 1996 (Kirişçi, 1994). This can be given as an example of the fact that the relations are not broken no matter how tense they are.

In 1996, "Operation Northern Watch" was launched in order to fully implement the UN resolutions in Iraq. Turkey both supported these operations and extended the period of support until 2003 (Uzgel, 2004b: 266). After the visits of Foreign Minister İsmail Cem and then-Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz in 1997, Turkey and the USA decided to examine

the cooperation between them under the title of “Five Part Agenda”. The items of this agenda were determined as cooperation in the fields of energy, economy and trade, regional cooperation, Cyprus and defense and security (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 16.06.2010).

The visit of US President Bill Clinton to Turkey in 1999 seemed to signal that bilateral relations would further develop. The USA had a positive view on the development of bilateral relations between Turkey and other countries and even its participation in international organizations. Also in the same year, Turkey joined the G-20 group. Moreover, after the Helsinki Summit, Clinton sent a letter to Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit congratulating his candidacy for the EU. The developing relations between Turkey and the USA became more visible in 1999 when Turkey supported NATO's intervention in Kosovo (Kirişçi, 2002: 180).

In addition, in 1999, then President Süleyman Demirel's visits to the United States within the framework of the NATO summit in April, and the then Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit's visits to the United States in September within the framework of bilateral relations, and the official visits of US President Bill Clinton to Turkey in November, It has consolidated the concept of "strategic partnership¹²", which means a multidimensional and multifaceted strategic cooperation in broad overlapping interests in regions as far as Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Middle East (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 16.06.2010).

3. AKP ERA FOREIGN POLICY

3.1. Fundamentals of Foreign Policy Practices in the AKP Era

The strong coming to power of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) after the November 3, 2002 elections expressed important changes and developments in terms of Turkish domestic politics, as well as radical changes in foreign policy. The 12-year period of uncertainty, deadlocks and economic depressions that Turkey has experienced since the end of the Cold War, was attempted to be overcome by making a method difference with the AKP government, which came to power with the 3 November 2002 general elections. It should be stated here that this method difference emerged as a multi-track and active foreign policy style by getting rid of the limited and passive foreign policy understanding of the Cold War period, and it is very important in terms of the evolution of Turkish foreign policy and the positive acquisition of international relations represented an important development. (Gündüz,2020:67)

The foreign policy of the AKP was determined by the need for transformation, which Turkey faced with the influence of external and internal factors in the 2000s. The period when AKP came to power is considered as a moment of multidimensional transformation of the Turkish political system. In Turkey's change and transformation process in the 2000s; Democratization within the scope of relations with the EU, institutional restructuring within the scope of relations with the IMF, political stability achieved with the 2002 general elections, the changing Turkish-US relations after September 11, 2001 and the development of civil society with the prominence of Turkey's geocultural importance have been influential (Gürevin,2014:21).

It would be correct to state that the Democratic Party, ANAP and AK Party had many common aspects from their party formation processes to their foreign policy initiatives during the strong single-party governments in Turkey, and that these governments did not compromise on the principle of turning their face to the West, which we call traditional foreign policy. In all three periods of power, attention was paid to establishing good relations with Western countries, especially the USA, sometimes due to threat perceptions arising from regional developments, sometimes due to the requirements of the international conjuncture, sometimes due to the claim that national interests overlap and economic reasons. By taking part in the Western Institutions of Turkey, it wanted to both trigger its economic development and not to break away from the West in social, cultural and political terms.(gündüz,2020:167)

The main parameter determining the foreign policy perspective of the AKP has been the need for transformation, which Turkey faced with the influence of internal and external factors in the 2000s. Developments such as the democratization movements on the basis of relations with the EU at the 1999 Helsinki Summit, institutional restructuring on the basis of relations with the IMF after 2001, the political stability achieved with the 3 November 2002 general elections, and the emergence of Turkey's geo-cultural importance in the axis of Turkish-US relations that changed after September 11 Turkish have been the triggers of multidimensional change in foreign policy. (feyman,2005::4)

It is possible to state that the reasons for the restructuring of Turkish foreign policy in recent years include the granting of Turkey the status of a candidate country to the EU at the 1999 Helsinki Summit and the change in world balances with the end of the Cold War. After Turkey was granted the status of a candidate country to the EU, new reforms

were made in many areas in the country and efforts were made to create an image of a country that pursues harmony and reconciliation on international platforms. In addition, in the context of economic development and development, close ties were tried to be established by establishing relations with powerful states such as China, Japan and even Russia, which are extremely important for the world economy and can be shown as economic giants, and it was aimed to increase Turkish foreign trade to a high level. Visits were made to South Asian countries, which were not considered very important before, and efforts were made to strengthen Turkey's ties with the Middle East, which is the heart of the Afro-Eurasian continent, and then with the Balkans, Central Asia and Africa, and make it a central country. (davutoglu, 2008:490)

If we put the Turkish foreign policy during the AKP rule, in which relations with the European Union occupied a very important place, on a theoretical basis by associating it with the international system and actors, the AKP's foreign policy understanding is in a constructivist structure emphasizing the mutual construction process between the actor and the structure of the international system, and cooperation is emphasized. It would be correct to say that it is close to the institutionalist tradition that brought it out.

Unlike the conflict-oriented policies of the governments in the 1990s, it is possible to see the characteristics of the multidimensional foreign policy pursuit of the Turgut Özal⁶⁸ era in the foreign policy of the AKP government, which adopted a policy based on consensus and cooperation. As in the Özal period, good neighborly policies are implemented with all the countries to which it is affiliated in terms of regional, economic and security, especially with its neighbors, during the AKP period. Characterizing values such as democracy, human rights, rule of law and transparency as universal, AKP does

not see a problem between the dominant values of Western civilization and its conservative (Islamic) roots.(Çakmak,2012:700). In this respect, it would be correct to say that Erdogan's foreign policy approach is largely reminiscent of the multidimensional and multi-track foreign policy thought of the Özal era. The AKP government, which aims to improve its relations with all countries with which it has historical, regional and cultural ties, especially with its neighbors, thinks that the problems between countries can be eliminated thanks to sincere relations and mutual dependence that takes into account common interests. (Gunduz, 2020:66)

Since 2002, the AKP has won 3 general elections, 2 local elections and 2 constitutional reform referendums with the majority of votes. During this period, AKP governments played an important role in Turkey's transformation, changing their republican patterns from the country's foundation in 1923 and replacing them with more conservative democratic patterns. This transformation has taken place in all areas of politics in Turkey, from the armed forces to the local government and the legal system, from relations with the European Union to relations with Middle Eastern countries. Therefore, it can be said that the AKP has established full control over the state mechanisms since 2002 and has made the AKP the sole spokesperson of Turkey's official discourse in both domestic and global politics.

Before 2000, Turkey had many problems with all its neighbors. Turkey, Cyprus and the continental shelf problem with Greece, the border (Hatay) and water problem with Syria, the problems with Bulgaria regarding the treatment of their fellow citizens, the problems with Armenia regarding the 1915 events, the regime problems with Iran, the PKK with Iraq. It had long-standing tense problems like the camps of the . Due to these problems,

Turkey's relations with its neighbors were also at very low levels. In fact, due to reasons such as the “Kardak crisis” with Greece in 1995 and the “Öcalan Crisis” with Syria in 1998, the situation to declare a will for war and the closeness of war between the two countries gives us clear information about the course of bilateral relations of Turkey at the time. offers. Turkey's idea of living smoothly and in peace with its neighbors prompted the country to pursue a new and different strategy. In this context, the attempt to develop relations with neighboring countries and to solve problems became the most popular foreign policy issue of the AK Party government in 2002 (dogan,2021:110).

Ahmet Davutoğlu, who is by far the most important figure in AKP foreign policy, makes the following observation in an article he wrote in Perception magazine in 1997: “Western powers, who promote democratic values and mechanisms in other parts of the world, have supported undemocratic regimes in the Muslim world. The logic was simple: a democratic system in the Muslim world could lead to anti-Western Islamist regimes. Such reasoning clearly reveals that the main motivation behind this form of presentation is self-interest rather than democratic values. The corrupt military bureaucratic elite in some Muslim countries exploited this fear and cooperated with global systemic forces to overthrow democratic processes in the Muslim world”. These statements of Davutoğlu can be read as an excerpt that largely reveals what the main purpose of AKP's foreign policy is. (Balci,2013:7)

In the first decade of the AK Party government, the new Turkish foreign policy vision and normative strategy was derived from Strategic Derinlik (the work of the Foreign Minister and then Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu) and introduced and explained five new principles: the balance between security and freedom; zero problems with neighbors;

central state; new diplomatic discourse based on tight flexibility and rhythmic diplomacy, as well as multidimensional and multidimensional policies. New Prime Minister Binali Yıldırım, who aims to increase friends and reduce enemies, with neighboring countries and increasing enemies in the region, sparking debate around the effectiveness of the zero problems policy and prompting policy makers to adopt a new foreign policy principle. In addition to the 'intelligent power' principle that most defines Turkey's policy towards Syria's civil policy, the first principle to be explained is “maintaining the balance between security and freedoms”. This principle aims to expand freedoms without compromising security needs, as security has become a priority issue in most of the world's countries after the events of 9/11. (Davutoğlu, 2008:9) In this context, Turkey has achieved a balance between security and freedoms by integrating European norms into its domestic law. structure. Turkey tried to develop its democratic identity by changing its laws. (hawk and yellow,12) For example, while Turkey was fighting PKK terrorism, it expanded individual freedoms by giving Kurdish people the right to education in their mother tongue.

İbrahim Kalın advocates the principle of balance between security and freedom, based on the idea that security without freedom leads to authoritarianism, and freedom without security leads to chaos and instability. Kalın gave an example of how domestic social and political issues such as the Kurdish question, Alevis and freedoms were securitized. Domestically, these issues were perceived as threats to national security, while regionally, neighboring countries such as Russia, Syria, Iran and Armenia were seen as enemies. After the Cold War, these domestic and regional issues are no longer perceived as threats to national security. And the countries on the enemy list have partnered with the

establishment of a more stable regime in a house that defends fundamental freedoms.
(Kalin,2011:15)

The second principle is “Multidimensional Policy”, which means that Turkey's relations with different actors are complementary and part of the coherence policy. For example, Turkey has relations with the United States and is currently a NATO member. At the same time, in addition to its relations with the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East, all of these relations do not contradict each other, but complement each other in the EU accession process. It also means that it has good relations with neighboring countries such as Asia and the Caucasus. Turkey is also interested in establishing relations with emerging global powers such as China and India in order to balance its political and economic relations with the West.

As Ahmet Sözen stated in his macro-systemic analysis of Turkish foreign policy, “Turkish foreign policy during the Cold War was shaped by NATO's security preferences and was described with a one-dimensional or one-way policy. His main concern was state-managed security. After the end of the cold war, the international system has become more dynamic and diverse. According to the change in the international system, Turkey has changed its policy from one-dimensional to multi-dimensional and expanded international relations in terms of trade, economy and culture” This principle also represents the balance between security and freedom, which İbrahim Kalin sees as a means of realizing other basic principles such as political justice and equality. It also included the deployment of all political and non-state actors in a difficult political environment.

With its soft power policy, Turkey was able to persuade other countries to follow fair, rational and widespread policies instead of using hard power.⁴⁵⁰ He had to use military force for his national security. This approach is called Smart Power by Turkish intellectuals, where the country decides to use soft or military force according to its national interests.⁴⁵¹

The fifth principle is 'Proactive Diplomacy', a type of diplomacy in which Turkey aims to take the initiative in resolving all crises around it and to develop good relations with other countries. The concept of preventive diplomacy accompanied proactive diplomacy, which was one of the basic principles of foreign policy during the AKP period. According to this understanding, before any military intervention, Turkey should adopt a foreign policy perspective that aims to prevent the occurrence of problems, especially in its close geography, or to take a leading role in solving problems by using diplomatic channels. Thus, as Davutoğlu stated, with this policy, Turkey intervenes in regional issues by using international platforms and thus creates order and security in the region.⁴⁵²

The most practical implications of this concept in foreign policy can be seen in Turkey's willingness to mediate in Arab-Israeli, Syrian-Israeli, Iran-West, and Bosnia-Serbia conflicts. According to this foreign policy principle, Turkey's foreign policy can be carried out not only among nation states, but also between actors and groups within the state to prevent or resolve crises, Turkey's attempts to make peace between Shiite and Sunni groups in Iraq. Facilitating the participation of Iraqi Sunni groups in the 2005 parliamentary elections and minimizing the effects of Turkey's policy on the region before the 2003 Iraq war is clear evidence of this policy.⁴⁵³

In the early years of AKP, TFP's pursuit of independence from the west and Turkey's refusal to participate in the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq were a sign of this policy. In the later stages of the AKP period, the new principles of TFV were adopted and this led to discussions about Turkey's openness to the Middle East. At that time, the main signifier of TFP was Middle Easternization and Islamization instead of Westernization and Secularization, and in addition it was linked to other indicators such as the central state, the balance between security and freedom, justice and legitimacy, smart power, multidimensional and proactive politics. The discourse of civilization that became more dominant during the Arab Spring years. Signs that lead us to the signifier of Middle Easternization, as discussed earlier, are: the invasion of Iraq in 2003, Hamas' visit to Ankara in 2006, Turkey's mediation between Israel and Syria in 2007, Turkey's Sudanese President Omar al. Relations with Bashir and the UN vote against sanctions on Iran and pro-Turkish. -The attitude of the Palestinians in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The main signifier of 'Islamization' and Middle Easternization is meaningful only in relation to 'Westernization', which is associated with different signifiers such as the negative other, 'Secularization' and European Civilization, Modernization. However, in the past, the negative other of the Turkish identity was the Middle East and the Arabs, whose identity, according to the Turkish people, consisted of "Undeveloped", "Traitor", "Gasoline", "Dictator Systems" nodes. But the equation changed during the AKP era, and the Middle East and Arabs are no longer the negative other in the eyes of the Turkish people, they are equivalent to the AKP's Islamic identity.

Accordingly, the AKP government is trying to change the discourse about Arabs from negative to positive at the nodes of Middle Easternization and Islamization, for example,

when Turkish President Erdogan invited the Turkish people to 'put aside' at the Turkish Grand National Assembly on July 25, 2017. By saying that 'the Arabs hit us from the back':

“The lie that the Arabs shot us in the back will not be out of reach. How can today's state, which is fighting against our war and our nation, not be affected by the war, accused of killing all the Arabs.” (Kalin,87)

According to Laclau and Mouffe, the logic of equivalence shows the general identity and the connection of certain nodes in sameness and being in a negative relationship with an opposition. The nodal point or main signifier of AKP is Islamist identity and Middle East-oriented identity, linked to civilizational displays and discourses, while opposing proactive policy, responsibility to protect, humanitarian diplomacy, Secular-nationalist and Western-oriented identity. according to the logic of difference, it establishes several positions instead of one that contains opposition. Thus, the main signifier embodies the differences in it. In this statement, the differences in the category of Islamic identity include Sunni, Shiite, Muslim Brotherhood, as in the example of Western identity, which includes different groups such as “leftist, conservative, right-wing”. However, there is a misconception in the identification of Turkish Sunni identity with the Sunni identity of the Islamic world, while we generally perceive that Turkey, the Muslim Brotherhood and Hamas share the same Sunni ideology, we note that the beliefs and norms of the Sunni identity of the Turkish people are different.

For example, the AKP believes in Sufism and temples rather than the beliefs of the Muslim Brotherhood, while the Muslim Brotherhood is against Sufism and against the AKP's construction of temples considered sacred by the Turkish elite. While Sufism is

popular in Shiite mediums such as Iran, it is generally opposed to Sunni Islam. Therefore, ideologically, even Turkey sees itself as Sunni with Muslim sections opposed to Shiite Iran, but in reality they are closer to Iran than the Muslim Brotherhood in some ideological beliefs of Sufism. This logic makes identities more fragmented or more specific. It also reduces the effect of equivalence logic, which is more polarizing because it is based on two opposite positions.

Turkey's neighbors expect Turkey to play an active role in the management of international conflicts due to its multiple identities, historical location and cultural relations. These features give Turkey the ability and responsibility to pursue a rhythmic and proactive foreign policy, to contribute to conflict resolution and the establishment of international peace and security.⁴⁵⁴

There is one additional principle, the Justice principle, which İbrahim Kalın discusses and which Turkish foreign policy has adopted in the Middle East, the Balkans and other neighboring countries; United Nations. For example, while Turkey defends the Palestinian issue, it argues that it is the responsibility of the international community to bring political justice to the occupied people.

In the 2000s, the idea of "strategic depth" gains importance while arranging relations with neighboring waters. This doctrine, which was supported by Foreign Minister Davutoglu, basically aims to improve Turkey's relations with its neighbors and while doing this, Turkey's both It is important to emphasize both Islamic and Turkish nationality. In this sense, Turkish language policy is more visible in the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and it has come to a point where it takes the initiative. Minister Davutoglu, who evaluated the situation of Turkey-EU relations in connection

with the recent policy, expressed: "We are in the Middle East through the Israeli-Syrian mediation in Liibnan, Iraq, Bosnia, Slrbistan. We are in intense activity from Turkey to the Caucasus. We want to carry out this activity in parallel and together with the EU as a candidate country. But the developments around us allow us to wait. There is no moment to say, 'Let us establish an alarm and take action together with EU. We set a stance on every issue that concerns us in our region, and do what is necessary.

The second pillar, which enabled the liquidation of the military bureaucratic structure in the country through foreign policy, was, in Davutoğlu's words, "Getting rid of the psychology of 'Turkey is surrounded by enemies' and the defensive reflex that developed accordingly", in other words, the principle of zero problems with neighbors. (Balçı ,2013:7)

3.2. Events Directing the Foreign Policy of the AKP Era

3.2.1. Arab Spring

According to Davutoğlu, four recent earthquakes have activated the dynamics of history in the form of fault ruptures. These are the Geopolitical earthquake/dissolution of the USSR (1991), the security earthquake/September 11 and the US interventions (2001), the economic earthquake/global crisis (2008) and the structural earthquake/Arab Spring (2011) (Davutoğlu, 2018: 18).

Turkey's attitude towards the Arab Spring developments has presented a very interesting picture, especially in terms of the recent Turkish foreign policy. In the pre-Arab Spring period, the AK Party government was working to develop zero problems with neighbors, establishing order in the Middle East, regional peace, stability, prosperity and similar

values (Gözen 2010, 2011). Turkey's foreign policy, which has developed around such great ideals and principles, has undergone or is going through a very sharp transformation or change during the Arab Spring process. This change can be seen very clearly when compared with Turkey's policy towards these countries, for example, a year ago. The Syria policy, which we will detail below, is the most typical and symbolic example. Because Turkey's relations with Bashar Assad's Syria were so good and advanced before the start of the Arab Spring that the two countries formed a joint 'council of ministers', abolishing visas and almost 'borders', and even Lebanon and Jordan. It was planned to create a free market area to include (Zaman 26.09.2010; <http://nethaberci>). However, in the Arab Spring, Turkey's Syria policy exhibited/exhibits a process of crisis, tension and conflict ranging from mutual threats and warnings to rumors of military intervention (gozen 2011:2)

3.2.2. Syrian Crisis

During Davutoğlu's foreign ministry and prime ministership, Syria came first among the issues that kept Turkey busy and as of 2020. The Arab Spring, which reached Syria in March 2011, quickly turned into a civil war due to the harsh response of the Baathist regime. The crisis in Syria, in which hundreds of thousands of people lost their lives and caused millions to flee their homes and countries; It has become one of the most important sources of instability involving regional and global powers such as the USA, Russia, Turkey and Iran. Davutoğlu is one of those who are seen as the most responsible for the Syrian crisis to grow so much and for Turkey to be drawn into this crisis. Davutoğlu has been intensely discussed with the Syrian Revolution ending in civil war and the Egyptian

revolution ending with a coup, that is, the reversal of the Arab Spring. Turkey- (Davutoğlu, 2011).

In 2011, the two countries came face to face with the popular movements that took place during the reflection of the Arab Spring to Syria, after Turkey demanded reform first, and the Assad administration did not implement the demands positively, but after Turkey supported the regime opponents. A political and humanitarian crisis still continues to develop and spread. In the process, the crisis continued to exist by including many different crises arising from the same conflict as it started to militarize. In the 2011 Syrian crisis, it is not possible to talk about a post-crisis phase, as the crisis situation still continues.

Until the Arab Spring period, Syrian relations took an important path in terms of good neighborliness and zero problems. However, the tensions between Israel and the Mavi Marmara and the One Minute crisis, as well as the disagreements with other regional actors after the Syrian crisis and the coup in Egypt, have brought Turkey's integrative foreign policy and its role as an order-building actor into question. (Kose,2014:208)

3.2.3. Ak Party and Russia

During the AKP rule, there were two major developments that were closely related to the whole world and thus to Turkish foreign policy. One of them is the September 11 attacks on the USA and the other is the actual invasion of Iraq by the USA. The effect of these two international developments between Turkey and Russia has been in the direction of improving the relations and cooperation between the countries. First of all, the distance between the USA and Russia, which followed security policies and became aggressive

after the September 11 attacks, and then the invasion of Iraq, Turkey's rejection of this attack and the USA's reaction to Turkey, needed Turkey and Russia. It has been an opportunity to bring them together on the political ground and on the ground of cooperation.

Despite the perception of an eternal rivalry and security threat between Turkey and Russia, the idea that Russia is following some policies on the Straits, and the strong influence of the Armenian lobby in Russia, with the development of the understanding of international relations in the 2000s, more economic relations came to the fore. emerged and became a decisive factor between the two countries. Because the developing economic and commercial relations have undertaken a triggering task in the further development of political relations. In this respect, we can say that the AK Party government is close to the Özal line in its foreign policy approaches to Russia, and advocates a trade-oriented relationship, away from traditional paranoia. (Gunduz,2020:123)

Turkey followed previous principles during the first decade of the AKP government. However, after the Arab uprising, new challenges and regional problems emerged and contributed to shaping a new regional and international balance of power over the affected Middle East region; The great powers that shaped the multipolar system in the cold war have returned to find their allies in the Middle East. As a result of these changes, Turkey's relations with some of its neighbors and regional countries such as Egypt and Russia, as well as its relations with Israel, which deteriorated as a result of the crises that emerged before the Arab uprising, were adversely affected. The Palestinian issue, such as the parliamentary crisis, the Davos crisis, the Mavi Marmara issue. In the context of these

developments, Turkey re-evaluated the foreign policy principles it adopted in the first decade of the AKP era. And when the new Prime Minister Binali Yıldırım took office, he declared the new principle in Turkish foreign policy aimed at reducing enemies and increasing friends, and defended the effectiveness of this policy in re-establishing ties with countries such as Egypt, Russia and Israel. This is evident in his speech at the meeting with AKP deputies:

“Turkey has many problems. We have regional problems. Conflicts in our region and in the EU, Cyprus and the Caucasus increase the importance of our country in our region. We are aware of this. So, what are we going to do? It is very simple: we will increase the number of our friends; we will decrease the number of enemies.”

3.2.4. Ak Party and USA Relations

The effects of the September 11 attacks were not limited to Turkey alone. After this date, security-based programs have come to the fore in the domestic and especially foreign policies of all countries of the world, and relations on the axis of the economy have remained in the shadow of security concerns, albeit a little. In this context, this attack, which actually targets not only the USA but also globalization, places Turkey, a country that has constantly experienced the troubled and security concerns of the 1990s, at the top of the most important ally candidates in the region for the West, while creating a multi-track structure. and made it difficult to implement the Turkish foreign policy, which includes historical ties. Turkey's special efforts and efforts to establish relations with the Middle East and Muslim states after the September 11 attacks, as well as the attitude of the USA towards Muslim countries, caused the AKP government to have problems in its

foreign policy practices from time to time. However, at the same time, the importance of Turkey's role between the West and the Islamic world has increased.

The AKP government's search for a multi-dimensional foreign policy, which is especially important, and the fact that AKP administrators generally come from a nationalist and purely pro-Muslim background brought to mind the possibility that Turkey might be in close cooperation with countries such as Syria, Iraq and Iran, which disturbed the USA to some extent. This concern of the USA manifested itself with the problem of "declaration" that occurred in March 2003, during the first years of AKP rule. However, as stated in the party program, the government's relations with the United States were primarily dealt with in the economic context, and it was thought to create a fully strategic alliance relationship by adding economic balances and ties to the relations that previous governments dealt with mostly on strategic and defense basis. (Dağı, 2009). İhsan Dağı, "Limits of Turkey's 'Strategic' Partnership with the USA: Issues of Iraq, Democratization and the EU" Opinion Paper, http://www.tusiad.us/specific_page.cfm?CONTENT_ID=243, 25 Temmuz 200

During the AKP period, Turkey saw the EU more as a measure compared to the USA in foreign policy tendencies and reformist approaches within the country, and prioritized relations with European countries in the process of EU integration, although it tried not to offend the USA with a traditional approach. For this reason, almost all the governments that adopt a multi-track understanding in Turkish foreign policy and think that the USA is important for Turkey have stated that this search for a versatile foreign policy has never been implemented in order to find an alternative to the USA.

3.2.5. Ak Party and Cyprus

It can be said that the AK Party government, which came to power in the general elections held on November 3, 2002 in Turkey, stood at a more advanced point than the government of Menderes and Özal in terms of its approach to the Cyprus problem and its solution, and followed a more diligent policy as a solution. In this context, although the AK Party government is in the same direction as Özal, who thinks that a solution would be more beneficial than a deadlock in the Cyprus problem, the main reason underlying this thought and belief for the AKP is that, different from the economic and commercial approaches in Özal's period, the Cyprus problem is the same. The problem has been seen as a major obstacle in the EU membership process. The AKP followed the line that advocated the view that the solution of the Cyprus problem, which started with Özal but could not be put into practice, would pave the way for Turkish foreign policy in many areas. Just like Özal, AK Party leaders, who accept that economic relations are an important trigger in relations between states, have stood closer to a solution in the Cyprus problem mostly due to the political obstacles, pressures and necessities in the EU membership process. In addition, one of the main reasons for the AKP government to support a solution on the island, which is aware of the fact that soldiers will be stationed on the island and the influence of the military in political life will continue as the Cyprus problem continues, was the thought of reducing the effectiveness of the military in politics.²⁴⁸ In other words, it has been seen that Turkey's rapid progress in the EU process and the domestic policy targets of the government are effective in determining the political policies on Cyprus. AKP supported the Annan Plan on the island and tried to show that Turkey is the party that favors a solution, but it should be stated here that the AKP's support of the search for a solution on the island, such as the Annan Plan, was opposed by the Chief of

General Staff of the time. The statement that a solution that does not meet their needs will “complete the imprisonment of the Turk in Anatolia” and the statements of the soldiers that they support Denktash revealed that the AKP government and the military wing do not think the same about the solution. (Şimşir, 2003:277)

Contrary to the previous governments on the Cyprus issue, he did not favor the status quo and emphasized that something should be done to solve this problem. At this point, the Annan Plan was said to be "yes" as a result of the atmosphere created in the TRNC and the policies of the Turkish government, in order to prove that the Turks did not have a negative attitude in the deadlock of the Cyprus problem and that the Greeks brought this problem to a dead end. While the section devoted to foreign policy in the 2002 AKP Election Declaration is the same as in the program, the only change concerns Cyprus: “Our party believes that a solution to the Cyprus problem must be found. There is no doubt that the existence, identity and right of self-determination of the Turkish people on the island cannot be ignored in the solution to be found. As in Belgium, the establishment of a state administration consisting of two dominant societies is in favor of both parties. The admission of Greek Cyprus to the European Union before this issue is resolved will complicate the issue. In other words, with these words, it was told that a state consisting of two societies, not two states, and a federation is made from the confederation thesis by referring to the Belgian model. These statements show that the AK Party will abandon its traditional foreign policy on Cyprus and will change towards seeking a solution. In this respect, the most important developments regarding the Cyprus problem, shortly after the AK Party government came to power, were the Annan Plan, which was prepared on 11 November 2002 and submitted to a referendum on 24 April 2004, after various changes, and the subsequent developments. The Annan Plan emerged with the proposal of the

United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, to unite the island of Cyprus, which was divided into Turkish and Greek parts, outside the British bases area, as an independent state. With the acceptance of the referendum by Talat and the Greek Cypriot administration, who are known for their closeness to the Annan Plan, despite the acceptance of the Turkish Cypriots in the referendum on the Annan Plan on April 24, 2004, this plan could not be implemented due to the rejection of the Greek Cypriots. However, the fact that the Turkish Cypriot side said "yes" to the Annan Plan gave the message in the international community that the Turks were sincere for the solution of the Cyprus problem, and just like the Annan Plan, the image that the Greek public did not look forward to the solution on the island was created in previous solutions. Despite the fact that the Turkish Cypriot side proved its good will for a solution as a result of the referendum, the Annan Plan was eliminated due to the failure to ensure the integrity of the island, and the most profitable party from this process was the Greek Cypriot side, whose membership was accepted to the EU. The report of Secretary General Annan was not brought to the agenda after the Russian Federation announced that it would veto, and the EU, together with Greece, has now come under pressure from the Greek Cypriot side. When Turkey's domestic problems were added to these, the expected progress in Turkey-EU relations could not be achieved.²⁵³ In addition, the cautious efforts of the United Nations and the European Union to rescue the Turkish Cypriot side from isolation still did not bring any significant results, and both the UN and the EU agreed that these initiatives should be carried out in a way that does not mean recognition and only in certain areas. Therefore, as a result of the policies pursued by the AKP on Cyprus, it has been shown through the Cyprus issue that the rigid patterns of the Turkish foreign policy shaped within the logic of the Cold War can be broken.(Firat, 451) After the Annan Plan,

the developments in the Cyprus problem were especially related to the EU process, with the Greek Cypriot part of Southern Cyprus becoming a member of the EU. In the 19th article of the text published at the end of the EU Brussels Summit on 17 December 2004, Turkey was asked to extend the Ankara Agreement to include 10 new EU member states. While Turkey accepted this with an additional protocol, it signed a declaration stating that the expansion of the Ankara Agreement to include 10 new members by Turkey does not mean recognizing the Greek Cypriot Administration. (Kasim, 2008:1018) With this approach, Turkey has shown that it avoids making a negative impact on the functioning of the EU process. The Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, which is a member of the EU, tried to hinder Turkey's EU membership with the advantages of being a member of the union, and at the same time, forced Turkey to recognize its membership in the EU with political maneuvers. The Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, which frequently argues that it is not possible for Turkey to become a member of the EU by not recognizing a member state of the EU, has made a lot of efforts to put Turkey in trouble in this process. (Sonmezoglu,624)

Relations for a while progressed in line with these developments and Turkey tried to eliminate these political pressures and to show that it is still an advocate of a solution to the Cyprus problem. In this context, Turkey, while advocating the elimination of isolations against the TRNC, has also made a new initiative in order to resolve the Cyprus problem and the Turkish government has presented an action plan. AK Party executives stated that this action plan was built on the aim of starting a new process that will facilitate a comprehensive solution to the Cyprus problem and achieving rapprochement between all parties. (Firat, 451)

However, although Turkey and the TRNC suggested and tried to resolve the Cyprus problem with various initiatives and approaches, these efforts were not enough to bring a concrete solution to the Cyprus issue. Turkey has tried to solve the Cyprus problem without harming the negotiation process and to prevent this problem from becoming a stalemate in Turkish foreign policy. Greece, on the other hand, tried to neutralize any move by the Greek Cypriot side that could mean recognizing the TRNC and did its best to prolong Turkey's EU process.

3.2.6. Ak party and EU relations

Although the European Union integration is a partnership for economic and trade purposes, it is seen as an institution that will also provide democratization, modernization, development and integration with the West for Turkey, and Turkey's EU membership goal will be averted after the conservative-leaning AKP, composed of cadres belonging to the National Opinion, came into power. It brought to mind the thought of going away. However, the AKP government did not take a negative attitude towards the EU as expected by the domestic and foreign public opinion, on the contrary, most of the AKP period consisted of EU-related studies. For the new world order, AKP has turned to the EU, which is an integrating supranational institution, rather than the US axis, which sometimes turns to violence. During the AKP period, the process of harmonization with the EU was entered without breaking relations with the USA, and at the same time, it was sought to establish a close partnership with countries such as Russia, China and Japan, which have great military and economic importance in the world, in every field, especially in the economy. In this context, it would be correct to say that the AKP government,

unlike Menderes, tends to follow a multidimensional foreign policy like Özal. (Gunduz, 2020:108)

In this period, in terms of Turkey-EU relations, the Copenhagen Summit, which was decided to be held at the end of 2002, which coincided with a period when the AKP government was newly established, was of great importance for Turkey. Although AK Party leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was not in the executive staff of the 58th government, he went on a tour covering almost the whole EU and tried to persuade the leaders to start the negotiation process by meeting one-on-one. At the Copenhagen Summit held on 12 – 13 December 2002, the necessity of stating that Turkey fulfills the Copenhagen Criteria was mentioned in the Progress Report to be published in 2004 in order for the full membership negotiations between Turkey and the EU to start. Although no important decision regarding Turkey's full membership came out of this meeting, the importance attached to the EU process by the AKP government did not decrease.(Usul, 2006:205)

The process of harmonization with the EU comes first among the "opportunity" areas for the AKP's desire to transform the Turkish political system. The EU membership process, around the consolidation of Turkish democracy after Helsinki, emphasizes military-civilian relations, human rights, minority rights, the Kurdish issue and the Alevis and is based on their resolution. Obstacles faced by Turkey in 1987 are included in the "Recommendations" and "Issues" sections in the report given to Turkey in 2004 and are repeated every year. The 2004 Progress Report given by the EU is the cornerstone of Turkey-EU relations, and it is seen that the reports given in the following years accept the 2004 report and the principles therein as the basic documents, repeating them and sometimes making additions to them. .(Usul, 2006:205)

The need for the EU, which was seen as a savior in the face of Kemalist policy makers in the first years of his rule, did not remain as before after the 2007 Presidential elections, in which the 367 crisis was experienced, after the periphery prevailed in the center. It would not be wrong to say that the AK Party, which designed both foreign and domestic politics with a post-structuralist approach, no longer needs the EU, and that leaders in Europe who do not want Turkey in the EU came to power, thus accelerating the alienation from the EU. While moving away from the EU, on the one hand, spread the AK Party's foreign policy from a single point to a wider line, on the other hand, it gave the impression of moving away from democracy, which is the biggest soft power tool of opening to the Middle East.(dođan, 2021:124)

According to ınar, the AK Party, which follows an Islamist agenda, evaluates especially the Middle East policy as various political tactics to consolidate its power, aiming to "become in power, protect the power, and stay in power" (ınar M. , 2017). In other words, he followed a post-structuralist path. Kissinger defined Muslim Brotherhood Islamism, which comes to mind when Islamism is mentioned, as a way of being modern without having to be Western without giving up its own values after the war (Kissinger, 2016, p. 129). In this context, it can be said that Kissinger's definition and Davutođlu's understanding overlap. Kıvan also claimed that if the ideology, ideas and feelings of the book SD, the source behind the TDP, shaped by Davutođlu and painted by Erdoğan, are recognized and comprehended, the Turkish Pan-Islamism embodied in the AK Party will be understood (Kıvan, 2015:21)

At the last point reached with the EU, Cyprus has been the reason for the blockage of relations with the EU. In order to start negotiations, Turkey signed the Additional Protocol

extending the Customs Union to include new EU member states in 2005, but it has declared in a declaration that this does not mean that it recognizes Southern Cyprus. On the other hand, the EU has clearly stated its position and declared that the non-implementation of the Customs Union regarding Southern Cyprus will cause the negotiations to be suspended (Gürevin,2014:59).

In 2005, there were problems in AKP-EU relations due to the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights, and in 2006, EU officials openly criticized Turkey, saying that the reforms were slowing down.

The Balkans is a priority for Turkey, both geographically, politically and economically, and in terms of historical, cultural and human ties. The special position of the region in the historical process that has shaped the Turkish nation, the goal of regional integration and EU membership are also of great importance with the potential it contains. After the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia, Macedonia and Slovenia, which witnessed wars and ethnic cleansing in the 90s, the borders became definite with Montenegro's declaration of independence in 2006 and Kosovo in 2008. The Balkan countries and Turkey were interested in developing their own pure national culture and identity and avoided any mention of their common imperial past, which they saw as an obstacle to their ethno-national development. (dogan,2021:119) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey's Balkan policy shaped by considering the principles of 'regional ownership' and 'inclusiveness'; high-level political dialogue, security for all, maximum economic integration and the preservation of multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious social structures in the region, and it has set the

target to increase cooperation and regional integration by creating 'areas of common interest' (Ministry D. 2019).

CONCLUSION

If we talk about the 85-year-old Turkish political life and the Turkish foreign policy process, it is possible to divide Turkish foreign policy into periods under different headings, within the framework of the influence of different foreign powers in the country at different times. Although it is not possible to talk about a definite line in the first years of Turkey, we can say that as a country that fought the War of Independence, Turkey successfully overcame the problems at that time and used the opportunities very well. However, especially in the years when strong social reforms were made in Turkey and the multi-party system was followed, we can now see the effect of foreigners on the country and how the country's foreign policy has changed. Turkey, which was under the influence of the Soviet Union, especially during the War of Independence, was strongly influenced by the West, especially the USA, in the 1950s. In the 1960s and 70s, intense relations were entered into with the Middle East and the West was influenced in a large part of the political process. With the September 12 Revolution, especially after the Özal years, the influence of the USA was clearly evident in Turkish foreign policy, but this dominant effect was tried to be broken and balanced with a multi-track policy approach. With the end of the Cold War in the 1990s and the transformation of the world into a unipolar international system, Turkey also strengthened its relations with the USA and the West, while on the other hand, close relations were established with the newly independent states and especially with the European states. In other words, the scope of foreign influence in the formation process of Turkish foreign policy has taken different

forms in different periods since the establishment of the republic. This difference has emerged as a result of changes in Turkey's internal structure, the coming to power of governments with different worldviews and policy perceptions, and changes in the international system on the other hand.

In Turkey, perception of leadership, bureaucratic institutions, press, public opinion, economic-social organizations and the army are extremely effective parameters in the foreign policy formation process. The weight of these parameters in the process is intense according to the variety and quality of the subjects. For example, we can say that the perception and influence of leadership were at the forefront in the founding years of Turkey, then the institutional structures gained weight and importance, the business world in the 1980s and the army in the 1990s were influential in the foreign policy formation. However, it would be appropriate to say that the leadership position is more effective than other factors in the foreign policy formation process in Turkey. Because when it is considered that the Council of Ministers manages foreign policy on behalf of the state in the political sense, the choice and attitude of the leader, his behaviors, cultural development and historical perceptions are determinative in the formation of the cabinet and the fact that the formed cabinet acts in a certain harmony.

As in every era, the human factor maintains its importance in international relations and in determining and maintaining foreign policy. Undoubtedly, a limited number of decision makers in non-democratic and totalitarian governments can be the only determinant in understanding a state's policy. However, in the same way, although institutions and rules are important in democratic regimes, it is observed that people are

sometimes quite decisive and at the forefront. When the human factor is mentioned in the decision-making phase, the concept of “leader” appears.

In addition, as a society that has experienced the War of Independence and is sensitive to national values, the education level and perception of the Turkish society are important in terms of the Turkish foreign policy formation process, as the Turkish people are sometimes effective in reacting to foreign policy decisions. The closest example of this situation regarding foreign policy is the violent reaction of the people of the country, the rallies and actions, and their action in the framework of Israel's Gaza operation and its attack on the Arabs, and their activating the country's government and bringing the issue to the Parliament's agenda and making it official. Although the reactions and actions in foreign policy developments cannot definitively lead the state to take decisions in this direction, they cannot be ignored due to the governments' concerns about being in power or staying in power. This reveals the interaction between domestic policy and foreign policy to some extent.

The fact that countries' foreign policies cannot be considered independently of regional or global effects and developments is very important in terms of making sense of foreign policies. For example, the effects of the end of the Cold War on the regional balances in the global sense and the emergence of new independent states by the disintegration of the Soviet Union has greatly changed the strategic character of Turkey's near land, sea and continental basins. After this profound change, Turkish foreign policy makers turned to a serious scale-up effort and finally sought a new strategic position towards the end of the nineties.³⁶ With the end of the Cold War, new ethnic and regional conflicts with new neighbors with ethnic, historical ties and independent has been included in the foreign

policy circle. At the same time, while Turkey was affected by these regional developments, on the other hand, it had to be sensitive to the changes in the international system. Certain policies and structures of the state, the old system monopolized by the power of being a state, have changed and a new process has emerged in which different forces that affect the foreign policy in which civil organizations and political formations develop. In this recent period, many economic, social and political factors have emerged that determine Turkish foreign policy approaches and are effective in the decision-making process. While the EU process is undoubtedly the most important factor determining Turkey's adaptation to the changing global system, independent organizations such as multinational companies and non-governmental organizations have gained importance in this sense.

For countries, foreign policy and regional effects are intertwined issues. If we consider Turkey in this context, we can say that there are different regional developments that affect Turkish foreign policy from time to time. For example, the policy initiatives of the Soviet Union and Turkey's threat perception forced Turkey to take the Soviets into account, especially when making foreign policy decisions regarding this region. Another important example that can be given in the same direction is undoubtedly the effects of the Iranian Revolution and the Iranian revolution export policy on Turkish foreign policy, and this regional development prompted Turkey to take measures for the export of the revolution. However, apart from regional developments, the international system and serious developments in the international arena have affected Turkey, as in every country, at the point of decision-making and in the context of the general characteristics of the policies to be followed. For example, after the World War I, the serious losses of the war were felt in the world, which led the states to better understand the importance of

international relations. In this context, the process from the years when the republic was newly established to the period of the Second World War caused the Turkish foreign policy to stand at a neutral point and a more introverted structure emerged by taking steps towards the development of domestic institutions. In addition, the fact that a people from the Ottoman culture faced great reform movements, that these reform movements came from the top, not from the people, and that the country came out of the war a short time ago, had a great impact on the emergence of such a structure. Just as regional developments were effective in Turkish foreign policy, global developments also affected foreign policy, and the existence of the Cold War after the 1940s became the most important factor determining Turkish foreign policy. During the Cold War period, which started after the Second World War and lasted until the 1990s, Turkey, which served as a buffer against the Soviet Union's expansion towards the Middle East and the Eastern Mediterranean, followed a policy towards the West, and this orientation led to membership in NATO and the EEC. It was even more clearly revealed by movements such as the effort to integrate. As a matter of fact, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, the Soviet threat, which forced Turkey into a Western alliance and made Turkey's relations with the West obligatory at one point, disappeared. Therefore, the end of the Cold War created a shock effect both in Turkey and in other medium-sized countries in terms of politics and economy. However, the main impact of this development on Turkish foreign policy has been at the point of many states gaining their national independence and the emergence of new states. This development, which is highly effective in regional and global terms and also affects the international system, has closely interested Turkey and this dynamic process right next to Turkey has been extremely important for Turkish foreign policy.

Looking at the general lines of the TDP, generally passive foreign policy and staying away from the Middle East, apart from security-oriented initiatives such as the Montreux Straits Convention, Sadabad Pact and Balkan Entente, which secured the borders with Hatay's accession to Turkey between 1923-1950, Unipolar foreign policy between 1950-1960, in which active Western/American policies were at the forefront; Questioning the unipolar policy due to the 1963 Cuban Missile and 1964 Cyprus Crises with the USA between 1960-1965, the intention to open up to the USSR and the Middle East; Openings to the USSR and the Middle East between 1965-1980 and multidimensional foreign policy, rapprochement with the USA between 1980-1999, economic-based foreign policy and normalization of relations with the Middle East, security concerns coming to the fore due to the increase in PKK attacks and it can be categorized as Turkey's return to the Middle East, with the development of democracy, one of the biggest tools of soft power, between 1999 and 2011. The return of the Arab Spring to civil wars since 2011 has caused Turkey to face difficulties in the Middle East, and since 2016, it has started to intervene directly in the region due to the terrorist threat.

REFERENCES

Albayrak, M. Türk Siyasi Tarihinde Demokrat Parti (1946 – 1960), Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları, 2004.

Arı, T. “Türk Dış Politikası'nın Ana Ekseninde Bir Değişiklik Yoktur”, içinde Habibe Özdal, Osman Bahadır, Mehmet Yegin (Edt.), Mülakatlarla Türk Dış Politikası, Ankara: USAK Yayınları, 2009.

Ashley, R. K. (1989). Living on Border Lines: Man, Poststructuralism, and War. In J. Der Derian, & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics (pp. 259-322). New York: Lexington Books

Aydın-Düzgıt, S. (2012). Constructions of European Identity: Debates and Discourses on Turkey and the EU. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Aydın, M. (2004). Foucault's Pendulum : Turkey in Central Asia & the Caucasus. Turkish Studies, Vol.5 No.2.

Baklacıođlu, N. Ö. 2014. “Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininde Dış Politika Analizinin Gelişimi”, içinde Faruk Sönmezođlu ve Özgür Erler Bayır (eds.), Dış Politika Karşılaştırmalı Bir Bakış, (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2014)

Balcı, A. (2015). Dış Politikada Hesaplaşmak: AK Parti, Ordu ve Kemalizm. İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları.

Balta-Paker, E. (2012). Küresel Güvenlik Kompleksi: Uluslararası Siyaset ve Güvenlik. İstanbul: İletişim.

Balta, Tahsin Bekir Türkiye’de Yürütme Kudreti, (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1960).

Bayır Ö. E. ve Sönmezoğlu, F. 2014. “Dış Politika Analizinde Temel Ögeler” içinde Özgün Erler Bayır ve Faruk Sönmezoğlu (eds.) Dış Politika Karşılaştırmalı Bir Bakış, (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2014).

Bilgin, P. (2004). A Return to ‘Civilisational Geopolitics’ in the Mediterranean? Changing Geopolitical Images of the European Union and Turkey in the Post-Cold War Era. *Geopolitics*, 9(2), 269-291.

Bilgin, P. (2006). “Only Strong States Can Survive in Turkey’s Geography” : The Uses of “Geopolitical Truths” in Turkey. *Political Geography*, 26(7), 740-756.

Butler, J. (2008). *Cinsiyet Belası*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Revised Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Çakmak, H. 201. *Türk Dış Politikası 1919-2012*, 2. Baskı, Ankara, Barış Kitapevi, 2012.

Çelebi, Ö. (2011); Demirağ, Yelda: *Türk Dış Politikası Son On Yıl*, Ankara, Palme Yayınları.

Cebeci, M. (2012). European Foreign Policy Research Reconsidered: Constructing an ‘Ideal Power Europe’ through Theory? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(3), 563-583.

Çalkıvık, A. (2011). Ölümüne Yaşatmak: Bir Güvenlik Sorunu Olarak Yaşam. Toplum ve Bilim, 122, 19-37.

Çiftçi, K. (2010). Türk Dış Politikası, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.

Criss, Nur B., Bilgin, P (1997). Turkish Foreign Policy Toward the Middle East Meria Journals, Vol.1, No.1

Güder, S. ve Mercan, M. H. (2012). 2000 Sonrası Türk dış politikasının temel parametreleri ve Orta Doğu politikası. İnsan ve Toplum, 2 (3), 57-92.

Darıcı, A.B. (2020). Türk Dış Politikası Ve Abd İlişkileri, Atlas Akademik Basım Yayın, Ankara.

Davutoğlu, A. "Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Vizyonu: 2007'nin Bir Değerlendirmesi", Insight Turkey, Cilt 10, No.1 (2008), s. 9.

Devetak, R. (2012) "Post-Yapısalcılık", Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri, ed. Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, çev. Ali Aslan, Muhammed Ali Ağcan, 1.bs. (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Emekler, B. 2011. "Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininde Epistemolojik Paradigma Tartışmaları: Postpozitivist Kuramlar", Bilge Strateji, Cilt 2, Sayı 4, Bahar 2011.

ERALP, Atila, Türkiye ve Avrupa, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, 1997.

Eroğlu, Z. (2005). Turkish Foreign Policy Towards the Balkans in the Post-Cold War Era. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). ODTÜ/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

EROĞUL, Cem, Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi SBF

Yayınları, 1970

Fuat Keyman Değişen Dünya, Dönüşen Türkiye, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.

Fırat, M. 1997. 1960-71 Arası Türk Dış Politikası ve Kıbrıs Sorunu, Ankara.

Foucault, (2011). Bilginin Arkeolojisi. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Girgin, K. 1994. Osmanlı ve Cumhuriyet Dönemleri Hariciye Tarihimiz, Ankara

Goldstein J. and Keohane, R. O. (1993) Ideas and Foreign Policy Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,1993.

Gözen, R.2011. Türkiye Ve Arap Baharı: Değişimi Açıklamak Ve Anlamak Adam Akademi, 2011/2: 1-25.

Hale, W. 1996. Türkiye'de Ordu ve Siyaset, İstanbul, 1996.

Halliday, F. (1996). The Future of International Relations: Fears and Hopes. S. Smith, K. Booth, & M. Zalewski (Eds.), International Theory: Positivism and Beyond (s. 318-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, C. 2003. The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy, (New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

İnat, K. Balcı, A. 2007. “Dış Politika: ‘Geleneksel’den ‘Post-Modern’e Teorik Perspektifler”, Uluslararası Politikayı Anlamak, ‘Ulus-Devlet’ten Küreselleşmeye, ed. Zeynep Dağı, (İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2007): 212-287.

Kalın, İ. “Türk dış politikası: Çerçeve, değerler ve mekanizmalar”, International Journal, Cilt. 67, No. 1, (Aralık 2011),

Kardaş, T. ve Ramazan Erdağ, “ Post-Yapısalcılık ve Uluslararası İlişkiler”, Ramazan Közen (ed.), Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri içinde. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014, 379-404.

Kasım, K., “Kıbrıs Sorunu”, içinde Çakmak, Haydar (der.), Türk DışPolitikası 1919 – 2008, Ankara: Platin Yayınları, 2008.

Keohane, R. O. (1988). International Institutions: Two Approaches. International Studies Quarterly, 32(4), 379-396.

Kıvanç, Ü. (2015). Pan-İslamcının Macera Kılavuzu - Davutoğlu Ne Diyor, Bir Şey Diyor Mu? İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

Kirişçi, K. (1994). Huzur mu Huzursuzluk mu: Çekiç Güç ve Türk Dış Politikası. Faruk Sönmezoğlu (Ed.), Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi içinde, İstanbul: Der Yayınları, s.273-289

Kirişçi, K. (2002a). The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy Toward Middle East. Barry Rubin, Kemal Kirişçi (Ed.), World Politics and Emerging Multiregional Power içinde, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press

Kirişçi, Kemal (2002b). US-Turkish Relations: New Uncertainties in a Renewed Partnership. Barry Rubin, Kemal Kirişçi (Ed.), World Politics and Emerging Multiregional Power içinde, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Koçer, Gökhan (2009). Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği Politikası: Uluslararası İlişkiler Açısından Bir Analiz. *International Journal of Economic and Administrative Studies*, Year:1 Volume:1 Number:2, Winter 2009 ISSN 1307-9832

Köse, T. (2014). Stratejik Derinlik ve Düzen Kurucu Dış Politika. K. Talha, A. Okumuş, & B. Duran içinde, *Stratejik Zihniyet; Kuramdan Eyleme Ahmet Davutoğlu ve Stratejik Derinlik* (s. 189-219). İstanbul: Küre.

LAÇINOK, Nevra Yaraç, "Turgut Özal'ın Liderlik Profili ve Dış Politikaya Bakışı", içinde Demir, Ali Faik (der.), *Türk Dış Politikasında Liderler*, Ankara: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 2007.

Oran, B. 2009. "Türk Dış Politikası / Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar", Cilt I: 1919-1980", İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Özkan, G. 2014. "Dış Politika Analizi", içinde Evren Balta (ed.), *Küresel Siyasete Giriş: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Kavramlar, Teoriler, Süreçler*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Park, Bill (2007). *US-Turkish Relations: Can the Future Resemble Past?*, *Defense and Security Analysis*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 41-54

Polat, N. (1998). Poststructuralism, Absence, Mimesis: Making Difference, Reproducing Sovereignty. *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(4), 447-477.

Roseanau, J. 1976. "The Study of Foreign Policy", içinde James Rosenau (ed.), *World Politics: An Introduction*, (NY: The Free Press.1976)

Sander, O. 1996. "Siyasi tarih 1918-1994". İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.

Say, Ö. 2013. Yapısalcılıktan Post-Yapısalcılığa Çoğulculuğun İnşası ,Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi (Journal of Academic Inquiries) Cilt/Volume: 8, Sayı/Number: 2, Yıl/Year: 2013)

Sayarı, Sabri (1997). Turkey and the Middle East in the 1990s. Journal of Palestine Studies, 26, No.3, Spring, pp. 44-55

Şahin M. ve Sarı, B. “Suriye Krizinde Türkiye: Orta Güç Dış Politikasının Sınırları.” Ortadoğu Etütleri (ORSAM), Cilt.8, Sayı.1, s. 12.

Şimşir, B. N., AB, AKP ve Kıbrıs, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2003.

Toker, M. (1970) “Türkiye üzerinde 1945 kâbusu”. Akis Yayınları, Ankara.

Tuncer, H. (2011), Atatürkçü Dış Politikamızın İlkeleri, Derleyenler: Yelda Demirağ, Özlen Çelebi. *Türk Dış Politikası Son On Yıl*, Ankara, Palme Yayınları.

Tür, Ö. (2006). Türkiye ve Ortadoğu: Gerilimden İşbirliğine. Zeynep Dağı (Ed.) AK Partili

Uslu, N. (2000). Türk-Amerikan İlişkileri. Ankara: 21. Yüzyıl Yayınları

Nasuh U. “1947’den Günümüze Türk – Amerikan İlişkilerinin Genel Portresi”, Avrasya Dosyası, Yaz 2000, Cilt:6, Sayı:2.

Uslu, N. (2003). The Russian, Caucasian and Central Asian Aspects of Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post Cold War Period, Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol.2, No.3&4

Sander, Oral; Ülman A. Halûk: “Türk Dış Politikasına Yön Veren Etkenler (1923-1968) II”, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt.23, Sayı.3.

Soysal, Mümtaz. Dış Politika ve Parlamento: Dış Politika Alanındaki Yasama- Yürütme İlişkileri Üzerinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1964.

Sönmezoglu; F. (der.), Türk DışPolitikası'nın Analizi, İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2004.

Taştekin, Ş. , Asya-Pasifik Bölgesinde Yaşanan Gelişmeler Ve Bu Gelişmelerin Gelecekte Türkiye'nin Güvenliğine Olan Etkileri, 2009.

Usul, A.R. “Helsinki'den Müzakerelere Türkiye – AB İlişkileri”, içinde Zeynep Dağı(der.), Doğudan Batıya Dış Politika: AK Partili Yıllar, Ankara: Orion Yayınevi, 2006,

Uzgel, İ. “Türk DışPolitikasının Uygulanması”, içinde Baskın Oran (der.), Türk DışPolitikası: KurtuluşSavaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, Cilt: 2, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Yıllar: Doğudan Batıya Dış Politika içinde, Ankara: Orion yayınevi.

Yavuzalp, E. 1996. Liderlerimiz ve Dış Politika, İstanbul.