



IIB INTERNATIONAL REFEREED ACADEMIC SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Spring April-May-June 2012 Volume:03 Issue:04 Kodu:JEL Z

www.iibdergisi.com

CONTINUITY AND PERIOD OF CHANGE IN TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY

Murat ERCAN

University of Bilecik, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Science

Abstract The main feature or understanding of Turkish foreign policy has been analysed in three dimensions in the article called “Change and Transformation in Turkey’s Foreign Policy”. The first one the foreign policy is depended on the West in terms of its international system and this dependence beginning with the foundation of the republic is divided into two sub-terms. In the term till the beginning of the Cold War, Turkey was inclined to be closer to the West. During the second term from the beginning of the Cold War up to this date, Turkey has been integrated with the Eastern Bloc and its institutional bodies under the leadership of the EU and has tried to make its domestic and foreign policy be consistent with the EU, NATO, and Europe. In the second dimension, the foreign policy, in terms of the infrastructure of the philosophy and theory of the foreign policy has been adopted to the Western values and principles; in other words, modernization, nation state and hegemony. Within the scope of the third dimension, the foreign policy has given importance on political, ideological and military methods and tools. Turkey’s political; military and strategic, economic, social and diplomatic relations have been shaped according to the Westernization targets. In this study, it has been examined whether there is a change and transformation or if so, in what direction the change and transformation is, the position of Turkey in the current international composition and whetheter there is a change and transformation in any if these areas. On the other hand, the latest progress in the foreign policy has also been taken into consideration.

Keywords: Foreign Policy -Cold War- EU ABD, Turkey

INTRODUCTION: Theoretical framework for the Transformation and change

First of all, we shall explain what we mean by change and transformation. In order to find out whether there has been a change in international policy in general and a change in Turkish foreign policy in particular; it will be good to refer to the views of the Realist/Neo-Realist theory and the Liberal/

Neo-Liberal theory.

According to Realists and especially Neo-Realists, a change in international policy is out of question until the “anarchic structure” of the current international system ends and a totally different international system structure such as a hierarchic one is in force. Therefore; since 17th century when the “Westphalia System” was set up, inter-

national relations have continued without any change, and quality has always been the same. And there will be no change as long as the anarchic structure of the system lasts.

As for Neo-Realists, a change in international policy is possible; anarchic structure of the international system has been improving gradually and positively. Especially the international institutions and organizations that have come up, and the international legal orders and regimes that have developed within the last fifty years have caused a significant transform in the anarchic structure of the international system. Though the anarchic structure hasn't totally disappeared, a semi-hierarchic and semi-anarchic composite structure has been on the rise. Some of the most significant indicators of this transformation are the following: no more (big) battles in international politics; partial transfer of domination from the governments to international superstructures such as in the example of the European Union; in many international issues, functioning of international regimes consisting of rules, procedures and organizations.

Considering these two theories; the first step we shall take in order to find out whether there has been a change or a shift in Turkish foreign policy or not, and if yes, in which way, is to reveal the position of Turkey in current international anarchic structure and among the international power holders, the

main characteristics of its foreign policy and to analyze whether there has been a change or shift in these issues.

For this purpose, we are going to reveal the main characteristics of Turkish foreign policy at first. And then, we are going to go over its historical performance. Finally; we are going to view recent developments.

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS/

CONCEPTION OF TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY

It is possible to analyze the main characteristics or conception of Turkish foreign policy in three aspects: Firstly; 'concerning the main trend or attitude within the international structure', Turkish foreign policy heads towards the West. This trend which started with the foundation of the Turkish Republic has mainly developed under two sub-periods. Until the beginning of the Cold War, Turkey had actually intended to establish closeness with the West; however, because of the troubles with the U.K. and France, it got close to the Soviet Union and followed a balance of power policy. Even so; this policy did not prevent it from forming close relations with the U.K., France or the United Nations they dominate, or forming efficient economical and commercial relations with Germany and Italy. In the second sub-period that is from the beginning

of the Cold War since today; Turkey has got integrated with the Western Block and its corporation structures, and started to establish both its domestic and foreign policies in accordance with the USA, NATO and Europe to a large extent (Baskın, 2006:45).

Secondly, ‘concerning the theoretical or philosophical sub-structure of foreign policy’, Turkish governmental policy in general, and foreign policy in particular were formed within the framework of Western values and principles, which means modernization, nation-state and sovereignty (Bal, 2002: 33). Its main characteristic in this sense is that, it was established and implemented according to classical Realist theory. The Realist theory played a significant role in Turkey’s taking side with the USA in Cold War against the Soviet Union and empowering its Westernization trend (Gözen, 2010: 17-35).

Thirdly, ‘concerning the means and methods of foreign policy’, Turkish foreign policy mostly depended on political, ideological and military means and methods. Partially as a requirement of USA-NATO strategies within the sense of Cold War, and partially as a requirement of the historical structure of the Turkish Republic (Dağı, 2005:6) and foundational philosophy principles; “Realist scepticism and hard power” means were used in international politics. It was considered that, ideological and political values of a state had to be in parallel with its

economic, commercial and social relations, and any foreign policy channel that failed to ensure this harmony was less developed. Ideological, military and political relations/connections (high politics) overlapped with economic, commercial and social relations/connections (Ayata, 2007: 95). To put more precisely we can say that; both political, military, strategic relations and commercial, social, diplomatic relations of Turkey took form in parallel with Westernization objectives.

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY WITHIN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Looking from the historical perspective, we can claim that there hasn’t been any structural change or shift in basic characteristics of Turkish foreign policy since the beginnings of the Cold War until today. Though some breakups or fluctuations had actually occurred, these cannot be viewed as changes, as they do not affect the basic character or the core. We will try to support this claim of ours in subsequent chapters with some arguments, examples and data from Turkish foreign policy history.

There is a large literature stating that there had been a change in Turkish foreign policy between the years 1960-1990; that is, it drifted away from the USA-NATO based

foreign policy. According to this literature; Turkey abandoned the USA-Western based policy and followed a “multi-sided” and “relatively independent” one instead. Thus; it headed towards regions and states from the Soviet Union to the Middle East, which have different types of ideologic, politic, religious and economic features (Armaoğlu, 2004: 452).

These literature and claims are not valid; because, there has never been a significant change in Turkey’s main foreign policy trend and theory: There has not been any shift from its tendency towards the USA, NATO and the West in general though Turkey tried to develop its diplomatic and commercial relations with the Soviet Union and the Middle-East countries (Nas, 2011:117-131). And this attitude was not based on a philosophical, theoretical or instrumental shift, but on its reaction against the policies of the USA and the Western countries, concerning the Cyprus issue especially. In other words; Turkey’s heading towards the Soviet Union, Arabic and Islamic countries was just a reactional attitude against the West, it was not a core change. USA-NATO based (Udo, 1996: 23), real-political and ideological foreign policy of Turkey has largely continued.

Diplomatic and economic closeness seen in this period with the Soviet Union, Arabic and Islamic countries may be regarded

as a partial instrumental change in foreign policy (Bostanoğlu: 2008: 416). As Turkey developed its commercial, financial and economic relations with the Soviet Union, the degree of threat from this country was relatively decreased; and the risk for an ideologic, military or political battle rapidly disappeared in time. This instrumental change in foreign policy helped Turkey develop powerful economic, commercial, social, energy and contractor ship relations with the Soviet Union, especially as from the second half of 1980s(Hale,2002: 113). The Soviets became a “commercial partner” from then on (Ayata, 2007: 95).

A similar change in the means of foreign policy concerning the Arabic and Islamic countries powerfully emerged, especially in 1980s. It was such a powerful change that, the most significant foreign trade partners of Turkey in mid-1980s had been the 5 countries in the Middle-East (Iraq, Iran, Libia, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait). When this state, which came along during the period of Özal superseded the commercial relations of Turkey with Western countries; some complaints, views or worries considering that Turkish foreign policy started to move away from the West, emerged both in Turkey and in the West(Gözen,2000: 53).

However; these worries and complaints were ignoring the main dynamic of Turkish policy, which was the USA and NATO. In

this period, Turkey's relations with the USA and NATO lived its "golden age" in history. Ozal's governments and governmental institutions were in a "strategic consensus" with the USA. The mild policy of Turkey regarding Iran's Revolution, Iran-Iraq War and Arab-Israel battle did not disturb Western countries; and even, it empowered its strategic significance in the eye of these countries. As a result, the relationship between Turkey –the USA was experiencing a favorable period with 1980 DECA (Agreement on Defence and Economic Cooperation)(Armaoğlu,2004: 465) Thus; Turkey's extension towards the Middle-East and the Soviets was not a change in its foreign policy, but rather, an improvement that was in conformity and parallel with the strategies of the USA and NATO. In 1980s, there was an attitude "additional" to the Western one instead of the "reactional" attitude followed in 1960s- 1970s against the West (Barış ve Aslı, 2002: 7). This new attitude did not change the main direction of Turkey or its structural state in the sense of ideology/theory.

The most significant evidence and indicator of this is Turkey's policy regarding 1990-1 Gulf War. Following Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, Turkey placed an embargo on Iraq, which had been its most significant commercial and economic partner (Hibeler, 2006: 1-19). Turkey took an indirect role

in the military operation and supported the Gulf Coalition policies under the leadership of the USA. Even though this policy is understandable as it was formed within the framework of the decisions given by UN Security Council of the Coalition established against Iraq; it shall be accepted all process was carried out under the leadership of the USA (Father) Bush Management and this; it is an American strategy in the core. So; Turkey's Gulf War policy can be regarded as a USA assistance policy deep down.

TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY AFTER THE COLD WAR

When the Post- Cold War Period that developed along 1990s came out, two- poled structure of the international system had significantly changed (yet, its anarchic structure remained the same); but, there had not been any basic change or shift in Turkey's foreign policy. That is, its main foreign policy trend, ideology and means remained USA and NATO based (Yenigün, 2004: 27). Even, it strengthened more. Though there had been some changes on social and intellectual levels, no significant change took place regarding the government and foreign policy issue.

Some politicians and intellectuals claim that; Turkey followed a different foreign policy at this period. According to them;

Turkey adopted a “Eurasia” based foreign policy instead of a Western one. It desired to play the role of a leader or moderator and lead the re-structuring of the region. These views have reality, but the question is; can they be regarded as a change, a shift in the main policy?

First of all, we have to realize a point: Turkey’s Eurasia opening or policy did not develop independently from the USA and NATO strategies actually. In close cooperation with the USA, NATO and even Israel, and within the framework of Euroean values and ideology; Turkey tried to re-structure Eurasia. It is a fact that, this attempt aimed to strengthen the power and benefits of Turkey eventually; yet, it does not imply a change or a shift in Turkish foreign policy.

The exclusive exception that emerged in 1990s as a core change in Turkish foreign policy was the Refah-Yol Government including Refah Party. Though the coalition partner, President of Doğru Yol Party and the State Vice-President, Çiller had not been in favor of the change; the President Necmettin Erbakan and his team made a great effort to head Turkish foreign policy towards the Islamic and Eastern countries (Kurubaş, 2009: 59). He led the foundation of D-8 project for this purpose; and made attempts for the change of Turkey’s policy concerning Iraq and the Middle-East. However; Refah-Yol Government was dis-

missed by a coup after being in force for a period as short as one year. Therefore; neither the projects could be implemented appropriately, nor the objective for a change or shift could be realised.

There have been some serious attempts and developments in order to achieve a change and shift in Turkish foreign policy in the late period that emerged when AK Party came into power in 2002, and they are still in progress; yet, this process could not be fully completed. There aren’t any firm signs or clues forecasting this, either. It shall be accepted that; during AK Party governments, there have been attempts to realise a change and shift in Turkey’s foreign policy. Here are some of these attempts: “With the Letter of 1st March, 2003, for the first time in history Turkey followed a Middle-East policy obviously different from the USA’s; on 3rd October 2005, the European Union full membership process started; Turkey tried to play an active role within the Islamic Conference Organization; Neo-Ottomanism politics was robustly put into practice (İnat, 2006: 25).

UNDERSTANDING OF THE AKP’S FOREIGN POLICY

Though this surprising development experienced in Turkey-EU relations after 2002 may seem as the follow-up of the traditional

Westernization ideology, it implies a shift in Turkey's foreign policy from the USA-NATO axis towards the EU. And considering the battles of balance and benefits seen between the USA and EU, it can be regarded as a serious change. Moreover; this included a change in ideological and theoretical aspect. For the first time in Turkey's history, a government tried to adopt a foreign policy in parallel with Liberal/Neo-Liberal theory instead of the Realist one (Gözen, 2010: 27).

The Neo-Liberal policy adopted by this period's leader actor AK Party in political and economic issues is the main reason for the process of change and shift in Turkey's foreign policy dynamics. AK Party's ideologic policy which is mainly based on freedoms in political arena, state of law, pluralism and market economy and its attempts towards full membership in the EU which plays the main role in implementation of this ideology, i.e., radical reforms made in order to meet the Kopenhagen Criteria have inevitably shifted Turkish foreign policy from the USA-NATO axis towards the EU (Davutoğlu, 2004: 43). This change in the sense of trend and theory reflected in foreign policy instruments, as well. Thus; Turkey and its foreign policy started to use soft politics instruments such as economy, identity, human rights, civil government and dialogue rather than hard politics instruments such as military and strategy. That Turkey

stood against the USA's occupation of Iraq can be regarded as an important sign of this change. Because, with this attitude, Turkey has adopted a policy in favor of peace instead of war.

However; this process rapidly slowed down especially after 2005, and even came to a stop in many aspects. Turkey's European Union full membership process experienced a radical failure and as a result, there was an unfavorable development in Turkey's view of the EU. EU scepticism has increased on state, government, bureaucracy and social levels. Thus; a shift towards the past periods got empowered in theoretical and instrumental aspects, and the rapid change and shift seen between the years 2003-2005 came almost to a full stop.

There are three main reasons for this: First of them is the resistance and different attitudes revealed within AK Party itself and by "national (ist) actors" outside. EU scepticism, defined as "Reform Fatigue" by some, i.e., the rejection that "We shall not precede such rapidly for the EU" caused opposition within AK Party. Opposition that emerged within Turkey shall also be mentioned. Campaigns, acts and play politics held by military, political, economic and bureaucratic "nationalist" actors in order to hinder the EU full membership process suppressed the AK Part government. As a result; the government and party members, and es-

pecially the President, Erdoğan preferred a more “nationalist” policy and statement (Gözen, 2010: 28).

The second one is the opposition that emerged and developed within the EU against the membership of Turkey. Sarkozy and Merkel being the firsts, the EU countries started to stand against the full membership of Turkey. It shall be paid attention that, in this process, European Court of Human Rights gave decisions against “turban freedom” (Baç, 2006:11). Both the oppositions in EU countries and these kind of decisions given by EU organizations helped to strengthen the views of the government and social actors in Turkey which claimed that “the EU did not want Turkey”.

As the third, the USA’s Middle-East policy which includes Iraq, Iran, Arabia-Israel and Afghanistan, and developments based on this caused Turkey head towards the Middle-East again (Migdalovitz, 2010: 2). That Turkey has focused on the Middle-East in this context may exclusively mean it shifted back to its traditional Turkish foreign policy: The policy that aimed to re-structure the Middle-East and especially Iraq in cooperation with the USA was a policy seen in 1950s and 1980s actually. This policy not only covered the “trend” towards the USA, but also the requirement for a Realist and hard politics based foreign policy in “theoretical” and “instrumental” aspects(Gözen,2010:

29).

Eventually; Turkish foreign policy gradually started to take form and be implemented according to the old/traditional (Cold War period) view. The most significant point we shall emphasize in this period and process is the reflection of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prof. Dr. Ahmet Davutoğlu’s “Strategic Depth” based view on Turkish foreign policy (Davutoğlu, 2009: 67). This is significant not only because Davutoğlu served as AK Party’s Foreign Policy Chief-Advisor since 2003, but also because of the fact that he was assigned as the Minister of Foreign Affairs in May, 2009.

Saying at the beginning, what we are going to tell in the end; “Neo-Ottomanism” lies in the core of Davutoğlu’s foreign policy philosophy. Neo-Ottomanism was first put forward by the Deceased President of the Republic, Turgut Özal and the intellectuals around him in early 1990s. Davutoğlu reformulated this view in a more academic and systematic style in his book titled as “Strategic Depth: Turkey’s International Standing” that was issued in 2001(Çınar, 2011:10). At first glance, this “Neo-Ottomanism” policy supported both by Özal and Davutoğlu seems to bring a change and shift in Turkish foreign policy; because it requires that, Turkey heads towards the Ottoman geography “as a trend”, acts according to the cultural, social and historical codes of the region “as

a theory”, and uses religious, cultural, social and historical means “as instruments” (Çalış, 2001: 418).

On the other hand; Davutoğlu’s Neo-Ottomanism policy has significant differences from Özal’s. These differences can be summarized as the following: Davutoğlu’s Neo-Ottomanism policy is mostly “government-based”, so, it is compatible with the “Realist theory”. The conception of “Strategy” Davutoğlu uses is mostly in “macro or grand theory” category and depends on “military-strategic force”. Thus; it is more “status-quoist” concerning human rights, market economy and the superiority of law. It generally analyzes international relations within the sense of “classical security”. Although Özal and Davutoğlu both accepted the USA and NATO as the trend of Turkish foreign policy, due to the structure of the international system after the 11th September period, we can say that Davutoğlu relied more on the USA, and less on the EU. Turkey’s membership in the EU is an important objective for Davutoğlu, yet it is neither a “crucial necessity” nor a measurement for civilization or values (Çaman, 2005: 55). The Middle-East and the Ottoman geography and civilization is much more important and crucial.

Davutoğlu is a decision maker who had played a significant role in the formation of Turkey’s Middle-East policy, and the trend

towards the region. Hence; his assignment as the Minister of Foreign Affairs was not a casual but a “deliberate choice” that would help him play a more active role concerning the developments about Iraq, Iran, Syria, Philistine and Lebanon which are among the important issues of Turkish foreign policy. On the other hand; Davutoğlu focused on the USA ever since his early days. That he made one of his first visits to the USA and stated as “The benefits of Turkey and the USA (under the management of Obama) totally overlap with each other” confirms the impression that Davutoğlu will focus on traditional trend, theory and means in Turkish foreign policy. If this impression comes to life, it is possible to predict that the traditional state of Turkish foreign policy will continue and the process of change and shift seen between the years 2003-5 will stop giving no way to a similar attitude in near future.

Here it shall be mentioned that, the Neo-Ottomanism policy is not in conflict with the USA managements or the strategies of other Western organizations anyway. Actors such as the USA and Israel, which see the Neo-Ottomanism policy as a an “anti-dote” or a “balance factor” against Iran’s radical ideology and politics, sympathize with AK Party and Davutoğlu who try to follow Neo-Ottomanism in coordination with the USA and West; and they support Turkey’s active role

in the region. Turkey is glad to be working in cooperation with the USA, and the USA considers Neo-Ottomanism as a favorable alternative, this mutual support requires stability both in domestic and foreign policies of Turkey (Uslu, 2006: 132). AK Party and its current policies are regarded as being necessary for the endurance of this stability.

Even though Turkey's latest foreign policies concerning critical countries such as Iraq, Syria, Iran, Israel and Armenia and the Middle-East, Caucasia and the Balkans are the results of its own initiative; they are not in conflict with the strategic perspectives of the USA or the NATO coalition. As a matter of fact, it may even be possible to claim that, Turkey's "strategic depth" of Turkey overlaps with the USA-NATO's "strategic depth".

CONCLUSION

The attempts for change and shift seen lately in Turkish foreign policy is not an alternative against Turkey's "USA-NATO – Western" based foreign policy adopted since the Cold War. On the contrary, they have developed within the framework of a close contact or "modus vivendi". Turkey's full membership in the EU, its Neo-Ottomanism policy, and active role in ICO are not fully independent, autonomous or alternative policies. Instead, it is a new state that emerged as a result of

the harmony between the new hegamonia or imperial structure of the USA and the power of Turkey stemming from its identity advantage in a new environment and period after the 11th September.

In other words; the EU and Neo-Ottomanism policies of Turkey have not brought a significant and core change to its traditional foreign policy dynamics and structural position. Considering Turkey's structural position in the international system as the main indicator, we cannot say that change processes that came out time to time failed to be influential. Because, the USA-based trend and attitude of Turkey it has obtained in AK Party period, and the Liberal (Unrealist) and identity based foreign policy are not in contrast with each other; on the contrary, they are complementary.

In conclusion it can be said that; a serious change or shift in the main dynamics of the USA-NATO-Western based foreign policy of Turkey which has last since the Cold War is not in question. Turkey still continues its foreign policy in contact and communication with this focus. Turkey has gained significance in current structure and paradigm; however, this change in significance developed within the USA based foreign policy and paradigm that had been in use for more than 50 years. So to say; the passengers in a bus may have a better position when they change seats, however, this won't change

the destination they are to arrive at. The states of Turkey and its foreign policy suit this analogy.

Therefore; the conditions below shall come true for the emergence of a real and permanent change and shift in Turkish foreign policy: The US hegemony in the international system shall change, or at least, Turkey shall establish or take place in a different structure. The closeness seen lately between Turkey-Russia and Turkey-EU is not that kind of a state. The Neo-Ottomanism project can only come true if these countries adopt a structure that is different from the USA's, which is not probable today. Turkish foreign policy shall give importance to civilization perspective. If this brings a new order based on contemporary values of the region, it may create a structural shift.

The developments seen in two issues above will increase the trend towards using "soft politics" means in Turkish domestic and foreign policy. That is; instead of military forces or means, Turkey will initiate the use of mechanisms that will improve dialogue, negotiation, democracy, peace and cooperation to solve its troubles in domestic and foreign policies.

It is obvious that; Turkey shall renew its domestic policy at first in order to achieve such change in Turkish foreign policy. Democracy, superiority of law, pluralism, market

economy and human rights which are the essentials of an effective domestic policy may be reflected on Turkish foreign policy, as well. Hence; the constitutional, legal, social, economic and cultural structures have to be strengthened; and for Turkey, this is a critical choice between change and status quo. It is not only a conceptual choice, but also a choice between the ones that are in favor of change and the ones that are in favor of status quo.

Current international system, i.e., the anarchic structure will continue to be the "borders" of change and shift in Turkish foreign policy as long as the roles of Turkey's historical position and traditional USA-NATO based foreign policy in this structure last.

REFERENCES

- AYATA, A., (2008)**, „Die Türkei Als Partner Europäischer Außenpolitik Im Mittleren Osten“, Zeitschrift Südosteuropa Mitteilungen, Jahrgang, 48, 04/2008 ss. 68-83.
- AYATA, A., (2007)**, Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der Türkei 1970-2005 Der Weg der Türkei zu einem modernen Staat und ihre Bedeutung für die internationale Staatengemeinschaft, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

BAC, MELTEM M., (2006), Türkiye - Avrupa Birliği İlişkilerine Güvenlik Boyutundan Bir Bakış, DIŞ Politika Analiz Serisi. 4, TESEV Yay.,İstanbul.

BOSTANOĞLU, B., (2008), Türkiye ABD İlişkilerinin Politikası, İmge Yay, Ankara.

BAL, İ., (2002), 21.Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Dış Politikası, Alfa Yay., İstanbul.

BAL, İ., (2010), “Türk Dış Politikasının 87 Yıllık Analizi”, stratejik Boyut, 22 Şubat 2010,<http://www.stratejikboyut.com/haber/turk-dis-politikasinin-87-yillik-analizi--31850.html>, (14.05.2010).

BARIŞ, Y., GÜRKAN, A., (2002), Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerine Bakış, Ana Temalar ve Güncel Gelişmeler, TÜSİAD ABD Temsilciliği Değerlendirme Raporu..

BASKIN, O., (2006), Türk Dış Politikası, 1980- 2001, kurtuluş Savaşında, İletişim Yay., İstanbul.

CÜNEYT, Y., (2004), Soğuk Savaş Sonrası TBMM ve Dış Politika Belgeler Yorumları, Nobel Yay.,Ankara.

ÇALIŞ, Ş., (2001), “ Hayalet Bilimi Hayaletli Kimlikler: Özal, Balkanlar ve Neo Osmancılık”, (ed.) İhsan Sezal, İhsan Dağı, Türk Politikasında Bir Reformist: Özal, *Kasım*, İstanbul.

ÇAMAN,E., (2005), Türkische Außen Politik nach dem Ende des Ost -West Konflikts, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin.

ÇINAR, Y., (2011), “Turgut Özal ve Ak Parti Dönemi Türk Dış Politikasına Teorik Bir Bakış Örneği: Liberal Düşüncenin Türk Dış Politikasına Etkisi” Akademik Bakış, Sayı: 26 Eylül.

DAVUTOĞLU, A., (2004), “Türkiye Küresel Güçtür”, Anlayış, sayı 10/3/ 2004, ss. 40–45

DAVUTOĞLU, A., (2009), Stratejik Derinlik, Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu, Küre Yay.,İstanbul.

DAĞI, İHSAN, D., (2005), “Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization”, Turkish Studie, Vol 6, No 1.

EROL, K., (2009), “Etnik Sorun- Dış Politika İlişkisi Bağlamında Kürt Sorunun Türk Dış Politikasına Etkileri”, Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergi, Cilt: 8 (1/ 2009) ss.39–69.

GÖZEN, R., (2010), “Türk Dış Politikasında Değişim var mı?” Türkiye'nin Değişen Dış Politikası, Der: Cüneyt Yenigün, Ertan Efeğil, Nobel Yay., Ankara.

GÖZEN, R., (2000), Türk Dış Politikası
Barış Vizyonu, Palme Yay.,Ankara.

HALE, M. W., (2002), Turkish Foreign
Policy, 1774–2000,Routledge.

HİBELER, S., (2006), “Regionalmacht
Türkei?”, FES, 2006,ss.1–19.

İNAT, K., BURHANETTİN D., (2006),
“AKP Dış Politikası: Teori ve Uygula-
lama Ak Partili Yıllar” Ak Partili Yıl-
lar: Doğu’dan Batı’ya Dış Politika,
Orion Yay., Ankara.

MIGDALOVITZ, C., (2010), “Turkey: Se-
lected Foreign Policy Issues and U.S.
Views”, Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress, Congressi-
onal Research Service, November 28,
2010, www.crs.gov (11.02.2011).

NAS, Ç., (2011), “Changing Dynamics Of
Turkish Foreign Policy and the Euro-
pean Union”, *Turkish Policy*, Volume,
9 Number, 4,ss. 117–131.

STEINBACH,U., (1996), Die Türkei im 20.
Jahrhundert, Bastei Lübbe,Gladbach.

USLU, N., (2006), Türk Dış Politikası Yol
Ayrımında, Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Yeni
Sorunlar, Yeni İmkânlar ve Yeni Ara-
yışlar, Anka Yay.,Ankara.



TÜRK DIŞ POLİTİKASINDA SÜREKLİLİK VE DEĞİŞİM SÜRECİ

Özet: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, imparatorluktan cumhuriyete geçiş sürecinde hayatın her safhasında bir dizi devrim gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu değişim sürecine Türk dış politikası da dâhil olmuş, amacı sadece ulus devletin sınırlarını koruma, varlığını devam ettirme noktasına gelmiştir. “Türk Dış Politikasında Süreklilik ve Değişim Süreci” olarak adlandırılan bu çalışmada Türk dış politikasının temel özelliği ve anlayışı, farklı dönemlere ayrılarak analiz edilmektedir. Bunlardan ilki, Atatürk dönemi Türk dış politikasıdır. Bu dönem öncelikle devletin oluşumu ve devletin bağımsızlığının korunmasına yönelik uygulanan politikaların dönemidir. Bu dönemde Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Batı taraftarı politikalar izlemeye başlamış, batılaşmak için hayatın her safhasında reformlara gitmiştir. Soğuk savaşın başlangıcına kadar olan dönemde Türkiye Batıya yakın bir tavır sergilemiştir. Soğuk savaşın başlangıcından bu güne kadar olan ikinci dönemde ise Türkiye, Avrupa Birliği önderliğinde Batı Bloğuna ve onun kurumsal yapısına entegre olmaya çalışmıştır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, iç ve dış politikasını oluştururken NATO ve Avrupa Birliğiyle uyumlu olmasına özen göstermiştir. Başka bir ifade ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, dış politika felsefesini Batı değerleri ve prensipleri üzerine kurmaya çalışmış ve Batı değerlerini bir prensip olarak kabul etmiştir. Başka bir ifadeyle Türkiye, modernleşme, ulus-devlet ve hegomanya gibi kavramları kullanmıştır. Türk dış politikasının 1990–2002 yılları arasında kapsayan üçüncü döneminde ise Türkiye; siyasi, ideolojik ve askeri yöntem ve araçlar üzerinde önemle durmuştur. Bu dönemde Türkiye Avrupa Birliği uyum süreci konusuna ağırlık vermeye başlamış Avrupa Birliği yolunda ciddi bir adım atmış ve 1996 yılında Gümrük Birliği Anlaşmasını onaylamış, yürürlüğe koymuştur. Yine 1990- 2002 yılları arasında Türkiye, Avrupa Birliği yolunda yeni bir sayfa açmış, 1999 yılında AB, Türkiye’ye adaylık statüsü vermiştir. Bu dönemde Türkiye-AB arasındaki ilişki normalleşmeye başlamıştır. 2002 sonrası dönem ise Türkiye’nin Ankara merkezli düşünmeye başladığı ve gerçek bir bölgesel güç olduğu, bölgesel ve hatta küresel hedeflerin ortaya atılmaya başlandığı bir dönem olmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, öncelikle başından günümüze Türk dış politikasına şekil veren temel faktörlerin çerçevesini çizmek, daha sonra ise Türk dış politikasındaki temel değişimleri özetlemek ve 2002 sonrası yeni yönelimleri vurgulamak ve analiz etmektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dış Politika, Soğuk Savaş, Ab, Türkiye.