

## CORE TENETS AND PRACTICES OF ATATÜRK’S DIPLOMATIC POLICY\*

### ATATÜRK’ÜN DİPLOMATİK POLİTİKASININ TEMEL İLKELERİ VE UYGULAMALARI

Elif ÖZDİLEK\*\*

Makale Bilgisi/Article Info: Geliş/Received: 18/04/2025 Düzeltme/Revised: 27/06/2025 Kabul/Accepted: 27/06/2025

#### Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

**Atıf / Cite as:** Özdeş, E. (2025). Öre Tenets And Practices Of Atatürk’s Diplomatic. *Bellek Uluslararası Tarih ve Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1), 18-35. <https://doi.org/10.52735/bellek.1701558>

#### ÖZ

Günümüzde devletlerin gelişme kapasiteleri, küresel dinamiklere uyum sağlama ve bunları ulusal hedeflere ulaşmak için kullanma kabiliyetlerinden büyük ölçüde etkilenmektedir; bu nedenle, “Türk dış politikasının ilke ve hedefleri nelerdir?” sorusu önemli bir endişe olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, “Atatürk döneminde Türk dış politikasının hedef ve ilkeleri nelerdi? Bu hedef ve ilkeler günümüzde de uygulanabilir mi?” sorularını araştırmak elzem hale gelmektedir. Tartışılan konuları aydınlatmaya en uygun bilim dalı tarihtir, çünkü tarih amaçsızca katlanılan bir deneyim değildir. Tarihin sağladığı kapsamlı dersler bizi hem bugünün hem de yarının uygulamaları için donatır. Geçmiş etkili şekilde araştırmak, bugünü ve geleceği incelemekle eşdeğerdir. Sonuç olarak, değerlendirmeler yapmak için öncelikle Türk Devrimi’nin temelini oluşturan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun çöküşünü ve bu düşüşü aşmayı amaçlayan reform girişimlerini ve batılılaşma çabalarını analiz etmek esastır. Atatürk’ün öncülük ettiği modernleşmenin temelinde zihniyetteki değişime dayanan geniş bir değişim ve gelişimsel sorun yelpazesini kapsadığı gerçeğinden ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu farkındalık, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun son iki yüzyıldır sürdürdüğü modernleşme çabalarını önemli ölçüde etkilemiştir. Süreç, laboratuvarlarda gerçekleştirilen deneylere benziyordu ve bu denemeler aracılığıyla doğru ile yanlış arasında daha net bir ayırım yapılmasına olanak sağlamıştır. Yeni Türk Devleti kurulurken, deneyim zenginliği devrimci ilkelerin oluşturulmasında kapsamlı şekilde kullanılmıştır. Bu sayede geçmişin hatalarından arınmak, en akılcı ve gerçekçi yolu tespit edebilmek mümkün oldu.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Atatürk, Dış Politika, Uluslararası İlişkiler, Temel İlkeler, Türkiye.

#### GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Cumhuriyet’e giden dönemde, batılılaşma çabaları yeterli toplumsal, bilimsel ve ekonomik temeller olmadan yürütülmüş ve bu da istenilen sonuçlara ulaşamamasına yol açmıştır. Batılılaşmanın yalnızca bir seçenek değil, dünyada mevcut olan tek medeniyetin dışında kalmak için olmazsa olmaz olduğu fark edilmemiştir. Sonuç olarak, uygun yanıt bu olguyu reddetmek değil, onu özgün bağlamına yeniden entegre etmek ve uygun şekilde uygulamak olmuştur. Dahası, Avrupa medeniyeti yalnızca antik Yunan ve Roma medeniyetlerini değil,

\* Bu araştırma sürecinde; TR Dizin 2020 kuralları kapsamında “Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesinde” yer alan tüm kurallara uyulmuş ve yönergenin ikinci bölümünde yer alan “Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine Aykırı Eylemlerden” hiçbirini gerçekleştirilmemiş olup, “Etik Kurul İzni” gerektirmeyen bir çalışmadır.

\*\* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ufuk Üniversitesi, elif.ozdek@ufuk.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-0907-8771

aynı zamanda insanlığın geliştirdiği tüm diğer kadim toplumları da aşan bir kültürel ilerlemeyi temsil emektedir. Modernleşmenin öncelikle zihniyette bir değişim olmak üzere kapsamlı bir dönüşüm ve gelişmeyi gerektirdiğinin farkına varılması, Atatürk'ün rehberliğinde Türk Devrimi'ne yol açmıştır. Türk Devrimi'nin dış politikasının temel amacı, tamamen bağımsız ve ulusal egemenliğe dayalı yeni bir Türk devleti yaratmaktır. Lozan Antlaşması ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurulmasının ardından amaç, ulusal egemenlik ilkesi üzerine kurulu bağımsız Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ni ve Türk Milleti'ni medeni dünyada haklı konumuna yükseltmeye ve aynı zamanda ülkenin barış, güvenlik ve refahını sağlamaya doğru kaymıştır. Bu dış politikayı izlerken, akılcılık, gerçekçilik, eşitlik, esneklik, uluslararası iş birliği, proaktif yaklaşım, iç huzur, küresel barış, uluslararası hukuka saygı, tutarlılık ve güvenilirlik gibi ilkelere bağlı kalmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu ilkeler hem esnek hem de dinamik olan uygulamalara uyarlanmış ve değişen koşullara ve çağdaş taleplere hızla yanıt verilmiştir. Bu nitelikler, bu dönemde belirlenen hedef ve ilkelerin güncel dış politika stratejilerine değerli içgörüler sağlayabileceğini göstermektedir. Küreselleşme, yeni dünya düzeni, birlik oluşturma stratejileri ve egemen devletlerden gelen girdilerle karakterize edilen bir sistemi Atatürk dönemindeki Türk dış politika hedefleri ve ilkeleri merceğinden incelemek, üç temel dış politika girişimini tanımlayan Türkiye merkezli bir bakış açısını ortaya koymaktadır: Avrupa Birliği, Türk cumhuriyetleri ve İslam ülkeleri. Türkiye'nin jeopolitik konumu bunların ötesinde ek dış politika girişimleri için fırsatlar sağlasa da, Afrika, Uzak Doğu ve Latin Amerika gibi bölgeler yukarıda belirtilen üç girişime kıyasla ikincil öncelikler olarak kabul edilmektedir. Türkiye'nin medeni milletler arasındaki statüsünün önceliklendirilmesi, İslam ülkeleri ve Türk cumhuriyetlerinin girişimlerinin göz ardı edilmesi anlamına gelmez. Atatürk döneminde oluşturulan proaktif ve çok boyutlu dış politika ilkelerine uygun olarak hem Türk cumhuriyetleri hem de İslam milletleriyle siyasi, ekonomik, kültürel ve askeri ilişkilerin geliştirilmesi esastır. Ayrıca, orta ve uzun vadede birliği teşvik etmeyi amaçlayan bir stratejinin gerçekleştirilmesi için uygun bir temel atılmalıdır. Bu varlıklarla bağların güçlendirilmesi, Türkiye'ye asimetrik avantajlar yoluyla ek kaldıraç sağlayacaktır. Türkiye'nin, tarihi mirasından kaynaklanan bu gücü etkili bir şekilde kullanması ve bu girişimler için bir model olarak rolünü geliştirmesi hayati önem taşımaktadır. Bu çabaların gerçek faydalarının ancak Türkiye kendisini çağdaş medeniyet standartlarının ötesine taşıdığına gerçekleşebileceği unutulmamalıdır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Gazi Atatürk'ün en önemli başarısı olarak durmaktadır. Türk Milleti'nin başarısıyla birlikte onun en önemli başarısı hem bağımsızlık hem de özgürlük için mücadele eden Orta Doğu ve Afrika'daki birçok ulusun başaramadığı bir başarı olan Kurtuluş Savaşı sırasında emperyalizme karşı kazanılan zaferdir. Çok sayıda devlet ve ulus, emperyalist güçlere karşı mücadelelerinin ardından bağımsız olarak ortaya çıktı; ancak gerçek özgürlüğe kavuşamadılar. Bağımsızlık kazanmalarına rağmen, bu varlıklar ekonomik, kültürel veya entelektüel alanlarda gerçek özerkliği gerçekleştiremediler. Egemen devletler kurarken, özgür vatandaşlardan oluşan bir halk yetiştiremediler. Atatürk'ün farkı hem bağımsızlığı hem de özgürlüğü bünyesinde barındıran bir toplum, devlet ve bireyler yetiştirme becerisinde yatmaktadır. Atatürk, savaş meydanlarındaki askeri başarılarını, siyasi ve diplomatik zaferlerini elde etmek için bir temel ve araç olarak kullanmış, askeri ve siyasi zaferlerin ekonomik başarılarla tamamlanması ve sonuçlandırılması gerektiğini; aksi takdirde kalıcı ve istikrarlı bir bağımsızlığın elde edilemeyeceğini ileri sürmüştür. "Ekonomi olmadan bağımsızlık olmaz" demiştir. Mali egemenliğin ulusal egemenliğin önemli bir unsuru olarak önemini vurgulamıştır. Her biri kendi başına önemli bir konu olan farklı kültürel, politik ve ekonomik koşulların bir araya gelmesi, genel sorunu daha da kötüleştirir. Dış politikanın bir ulusun iç yapısı ve otoritesiyle karmaşık bir şekilde bağlantılı olduğu kavramı göz önüne alındığında, Türkiye'nin içeride politik, ekonomik ve sosyal istikrarı sağlayarak hızla ilerlemesi hayati önem taşımaktadır. Bu çabalara yanıt olarak Türkiye, esneklik ilkesini de göz önünde bulundurarak gerçekçilik, akılcılık ve eşitlik ilkeleriyle uyumlu dış politika stratejileri formüle etmelidir. Böyle bir stratejik çerçeve içinde Türkiye sürece aşamalı olarak yaklaşmalı, bağları koparmadan veya geri dönüşü olmayan kararlar almadan zamanın uzatılmasına ve ilişkilerin ilerletilmesine izin vermelidir. Özetle, Atatürk dış politika alanında barışa, dengeye ve istikrara büyük önem vermiştir. Gazi'nin dile getirdiği "Yurtta barış, dünyada barış" ifadesi, iç politika ile dış politika arasındaki içsel bağlantıyı vurgulayarak, dış ilişkilerin iç meselelerden izole bir şekilde yönetilemeyeceğini vurgulamaktadır. Atatürk'ün konuşmasında vurguladığı gibi, dış politikada başarıya ulaşmanın en önemli ön koşulu, "Asıl mesele iç cephedir" iddiasıyla, milletin birliği, beraberliği, bütünlüğü ve bilincidir. Sonuç olarak, Atatürk dönemindeki Türk dış politikasının hedefleri ve ilkeleri, çağdaş dış politika manzarasıyla birlikte değerlendirildiğinde, Türkiye'nin ulusal gücünün, tarihi ve kültürel çerçevesinin, jeopolitik bağlamının, birlik oluşturma stratejisini yürütmenin temel unsurlarının yanı sıra uluslararası durum ve zamanlamanın, onu Türkiye'nin dış politika çabaları arasında en önemli öncelik haline getirdiği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Atatürk dönemindeki ilkeler ve reformlar, Türk dış politikasının amaçlarına ulaşmak için önemli bir araç görevi görmektedir.

## INTRODUCTION

Atatürk's foreign policy includes both the general principles of foreign policy, and he has learned very important lessons from the process of the liquidation of the Ottoman Empire and the reasons for its dissolution, and also includes Atatürk's political and ideological preferences.

He is peaceful, Atatürk's words "Peace at home, peace in the world" are an expression of this. He is regionally oriented, the Balkan Entente (Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania) established under the leadership of Turkey in 1934 and the Sadabad Pact (Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan) established in 1937 are proof of this. He is anti-imperialist, and he is careful to keep his distance from the great powers of the West and not get too close. He is very sensitive about complete independence.

Atatürk was rational and realistic. Mustafa Kemal, who came to Sofia on November 20, 1913 and served as military attaché until January 20, 1915, foresaw that World War I would soon break out. He also drew attention to two points as the cause of the war: the first was the British-German rivalry. The second was Serbia's claims on the Slavs south of Austria and Hungary.

Atatürk is a leader who, in addition to his realistic situation assessments and highly accurate predictions, also suggests and implements solutions. While he was still a young officer, Mustafa Kemal said, "The Ottoman lands where the Arab majority is dominant can be taken away from the Ottomans by England and France," and added: "In the future, we should form our politics by accepting the lands where the Turkish majority is as a border, without acting emotionally in any way, and we should defend those lands. We should move away from ideas such as Pan-Turanism and Pan-Islamism. Neither our organization nor our means are suitable for the implementation of these policies"<sup>1</sup>.

Atatürk is the most competent among military diplomats. Because he successfully benefited from military victories at the diplomatic table and in diplomatic negotiations, and he made excellent diplomatic moves during the war. He used military power effectively and deterrently to achieve what he wanted in diplomacy. For example, after the Battle of Sakarya, he showed once again that he was the real leader of the Anatolian movement against both France and Russia, and he also gave the signal that the War of Independence would definitely end in victory. For example, during the period of tension with Italy, his promise through the press, "I will put the boots on my feet," immediately caused Italy to back down. For example, he told his interlocutors that if the Hatay issue was not resolved through diplomatic means, he would resort to military force if necessary.

Both soldiers and diplomats have to be realistic. They do not have the comfort or luxury of being maximalists or wanting the maximum. They want what is possible, what can be achieved. They aim to gain the most they can with the least loss and the least compromise. Soldiers and diplomats focus on the right target, the achievable target. Because setting the wrong target is as bad as trying to reach an unattainable target.

Atatürk is also a soldier and leader who knows that he cannot get everything he wants. He is a commander who knows how far he should go and where he should stop. In his own words, he is aware that "politics should not be done at the expense of the country." He is not an adventurer or a dreamer. He does not gamble with the future of the nation. He said that if the life of the nation is not at stake, war is murder. He also emphasized that "Military action begins at the point where political activity is hopeless."

### 1. Fundamental Principles of Atatürk's Foreign Policy

The foreign policies pursued by the Ottoman Empire in the past have been a determining factor in the place of the Republic of Turkey in world politics and its relations with other countries, and even formed the foundations of Turkish Foreign Policy<sup>2</sup>. The foreign policy of

<sup>1</sup> İlker Başbuğ, *Mustafa Kemal Anlatıyor Savaş ve Barış*, Kırmızı Kedi Yayınevi, İstanbul 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Ramazan Gözen, *Dış Politika Yapımın Aktörleri, İmparatorluktan Küresel Aktörlüğe Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Palme Yayıncılık, Ankara 2009.

the modern Republic of Turkey, determined by Atatürk during the War of Independence, aims to "continue the prosperity, happiness and existence of the Turkish nation and state"<sup>3</sup>.

The main goal of foreign policy during the Atatürk period was to introduce the Republic of Turkey to the international system<sup>4</sup>. The basic principles of Turkish foreign policy that were shaped for this purpose were realistic, independent, peaceful and rational. M. Kemal Atatürk implemented the "balance of power" strategy, a classical foreign policy approach, to protect national sovereignty and security, and especially in the 1930s, he turned the situation that developed against him to his advantage<sup>5</sup>. With the death of Atatürk, a new era began in Turkey, and İsmet İnönü was elected as the president and brought to the presidency. Turkish foreign policy during the İnönü period was generally continued along the foreign policy axis determined by Atatürk, while in particular it was based on the principle of caution.

When the history of Turkish foreign policy is examined, it is seen that the ruling elites, in order to avoid being in any conflict or war environment, have implemented "balance politics" together with "neutrality and non-alignment strategies", while on the other hand, they have tried to implement "strategies of inclusion in diplomatic and military alliances" in order to create an environment of peace and security.

These principles are briefly given below.

The basis of the Westernization approach, which plays an important role in Turkish Foreign Policy, dates back to the Ottoman Empire. The Westernization approach, which developed rapidly especially during the Tulip Era, still has an important place today.

In general, there are many reasons why a state with a large part of its territory in the east follows a pro-Western policy. It will be possible to clarify these reasons by examining the principle of Westernism from four perspectives: historical dimension, socioeconomic dimension, intellectual dimension and leader dimension.

In the historical dimension, we come across the view that the Western movement in the political sense comes from the Young Turk and Union and Progress tradition and that all Western reforms, except for the idea of the "Republic", started during the Union and Progress period. In the socio-economic dimension, it is emphasized that Turkey's social and economic structures are closer to the West compared to other countries. In the intellectual dimension, it is argued that it is easier for Turkish intellectuals who do not experience imperialism to implement Western modernity. In the leader dimension, it is mentioned that Atatürk's being a Harbiye graduate and his entrepreneurship influenced Turkish Foreign Policy in the direction of Westernism<sup>6</sup>.

The basis of adopting a Western foreign policy and adhering to it closely was the effort to remain neutral towards the great powers of the period in order to avoid a situation that would threaten the security and territorial integrity of the country. The fact that the War of Independence was fought against Western powers rather than Western civilizations, and that

---

<sup>3</sup> Mahmut Bali Aykan, *Türk Dış Politika Anlayışı*, (der.) Haydar Çakmak, *Türk Dış Politikası (1918-2008)*, Platin. Ankara 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, *Dış Politika Nedir? Türkiye'deki Dünyü Ve Bugünü*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dergisi, Ankara, 1980, C. 35, s.309.

<sup>5</sup> Ramazan Gözen, *Dış Politika Nedir? 21.Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, (der.) İdris Bal, Lalezar Yayınları, Ankara 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Baskın Oran, "Türk Dış Politikası: Temel İlkeleri ve Soğuk Savaş Ertesindeki Durumu Üzerine Notlar". Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, Ankara 1996, 51(01).

with the declaration of the Republic the West was seen as a side to cooperate with rather than fight against, made Westernism a part of the country's ideology<sup>7</sup>.

Knowing that Europe had tried to exclude the Turks and push them out of the continent for centuries, Atatürk acted with the belief that giving the new Turkey a western structure was almost a security necessity. According to him, Europe could only agree to live together with a Turkey that was similar. Atatürk draws attention to the fact that victories won on the battlefields would not have any meaning or value on their own. "No matter how great the political and military victories are, if they are not crowned with economic victories, the victories achieved cannot last and will soon fade away. Our most powerful weapon against enemies will be the solidity and success in economic life."<sup>8</sup>

In foreign relations, Atatürk gave priority to the West. He saw Turkey's reaching the level of contemporary civilization in "westernization". Countries are diverse, but civilization is one, and for a nation to progress, it is necessary to join this civilization. At that time, the most advanced civilization was the West. For this reason, Atatürk gave priority to the West. Atatürk stated this as follows: "In our Foreign Policy, there is no infringement on the law of any state. We do not have any hostile feelings towards foreigners, and we desire to establish sincere relations with them. Turks are friends of all nations."

The Atatürkist understanding of Westernism is never compatible with an ordinary bourgeois Westernism that has come to terms with Imperialism. Because Atatürk was absolutely against imperialism. He spent most of his life fighting against imperialism. Although Western Europe was the one that tried to destroy the Turkish nation in recent centuries and did not give it the right to live, there was no other way to modernize than Westernization. Because civilization was in the West. In this respect, it can be said that "Atatürk adopted Westernism despite the West<sup>9</sup>."

Atatürk states that regarding Westernism or turning to the west, the west is not taken as a geographical term. Atatürk's views are humanistic, national and contemporary developments brought about by movements such as humanism, reform and the Renaissance, which started in the west but spread outside the west<sup>10</sup>.

Balance politics, which dates back as far as states, is a policy that is fundamentally based on the diplomatic skills of those who govern the state. Many of the wars or conflicts that have occurred in the world have been between states of equal power. The balance politics applied by states that act to protect their own interests and benefits varies according to the events and processes that occur in the international arena. States that follow the balance politics well, which does not include religion and ideology, can become great powers and have a say in the international arena<sup>11</sup>. Some states have used balance politics to maintain their existence, to protect themselves in the international arena, while others have used it to grow and become stronger.

The Ottoman state, from the 18th century when it entered the modern era until the First World War, built its foreign policy on the policy of balance in order to obtain the maximum

<sup>7</sup> Emre Cengiz, *İsmet İnönü ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları Türk Dış Politikası*, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas, 2012, s. 20, (Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi).

<sup>8</sup> Erol Mütercimler, *Yüksek Stratejiden Etki Odaklı Harekâta Geleceği Yönetmek*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, s.406-407.

<sup>9</sup> Oral Sander, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, 2006, s.71.

<sup>10</sup> Oral Sander, *Yeni Bir Bölgesel Güç Olarak Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Hedefleri*, Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi, Ed: Faruk Sönmezoğlu, Der Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998, s.607.

<sup>11</sup> Tacibayev Raşid İbrahimoğlu, "Çok kutuplu dünyaya doğru ilerlerken uluslararası ilişkilerde denge politikası analizi". *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, (1), 2014, 138-147.

benefit it could obtain by using the balances and imbalances between the states to its advantage or to keep the damage it could suffer at a minimum level. The Republic of Turkey, which was founded on the land and human elements inherited from the Ottoman state, also followed the policy of balance in certain periods. The most important factor shaping the foreign policy of Turkey, which has been extremely sensitive to independence and territorial integrity since its establishment, has been security concerns. For this reason, despite the different actions and objectives in the early periods of the Republic, the continuity of the policies followed in the Ottoman period is clearly noticeable in Turkish Foreign Policy<sup>12</sup>. The Republic's policy of balance was pursued in the form of rapprochement with both the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and Western states between 1923 and 1936, with England against the threat of Italy and Germany between 1936 and 1945, and with the USA against the threat of the Soviets after 1945, and its orbit shifted towards Western politics.

Knowing very well the sufferings of the Turkish Nation, who suffered from imaginative and adventurous behaviors, Atatürk pursued a foreign policy far from adventurism, while at the same time not neglecting to be active. In Atatürk's Turkey, foreign policy always had the upper hand over domestic policy. Especially during the years of the National Struggle, foreign developments were closely followed and most of them were immediately and appropriately intervened in. Even after the victory, although domestic reforms occupied an important place on the agenda, Turkey showed the utmost interest in foreign developments. Turkey, which had just emerged from years of exhausting wars, closely followed foreign developments and pursued an active foreign policy in order to consolidate its place in the international arena. Atatürk considered it in the national interest to participate in regional cooperation as well as in broader pacts.

As seen in the period before the Montreux Convention Regarding the Straits in 1936, Turkey implemented an active diplomacy and was a country whose opinion on European developments was valued in the 1930s<sup>13</sup>. Turkey's interest and support in the Briand Kellogg Pact of 1928, its leading role in the Balkan Pact of 1934 and the Sadabat Pact of 1937 are indicators of an active policy. In addition, the policy it followed regarding Hatay and Turkey's efforts and success in the participation of some friendly and neighboring Islamic countries in the League of Nations can be evaluated within this framework.

When we look at the meaning of the word status quo, we see that it is derived from the concept of "status quo ante bellum". This concept, which is included in peace treaties, is in a scope that expresses the return of occupied lands to the conditions existing before the war. As a policy, the status quo advocates the preservation and continuity of the distribution of power. States generally make treaties and establish alliances in order to preserve the current situation and balance that emerged after the war. The peace treaties that are made actually aim to legally express the changes resulting from the changing distribution of power after the war and to ensure stability<sup>14</sup>.

The Turkish government, especially during the Atatürk era, made attempts to not lose what it had by pursuing a status quo foreign policy. İsmet İnönü, who came to power after the Atatürk era and was accepted as the National Chief, followed a similar attitude. Knowing that an early decision had been made in the First World War and that Turkey should stay away from a new war, İnönü continued the status quo state understanding in foreign policy with the

<sup>12</sup> Mehmet Gök, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Dış Politikasının İç ve Dış Kaynakları", *Atatürk Türkiye'sinde (1923-1983) Dış Politika Sempozyumu Bildiriler*, İstanbul 1984, ss. 49-66.

<sup>13</sup> Mehmet Gönübol ve Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, "Atatürk Dönemi Türk Dış Politikasına Genel Bir Bakış", *Atatürkçü Düşünce*, Ankara, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 1992, s. 1051-1075.

<sup>14</sup> Tayyar Arı, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri ve Dış Politika*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul 2001.

“neutrality”, in other words, the balance policy he followed against the efforts of the warring parties to drag Turkey into the Second World War<sup>15</sup>.

Ataturk's Turkish foreign policy was generally status quo and he preferred to strengthen his domestic policy in accordance with the requirements of international conditions and to maintain his current situation in his foreign policy unless there was a direct threat to security and territorial integrity.

One of the most striking features of Turkey's foreign policy during the Ataturk era was its pacifism. In fact, Turkey was obliged to follow a pacifist policy due to its historical and political course. “When analyzing a country's foreign policy, it is necessary to look at the number and composition of its neighbors, which are among the factors that affect this policy. A state like Canada, which has been a friend of a single country for a very long time and has a border with the United States, and a state like Turkey, which has had various disagreements with its neighbors throughout history, sometimes leading to war, and has many borders to defend, should have a different foreign policy.”

This principle, formulated as “Peace at home, peace in the world”, is a fundamental foreign policy principle that Turkey adopted after Atatürk<sup>16</sup>.

After the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey preferred to resolve its important foreign issues by peaceful means. A peaceful foreign policy is a realistic approach for Turkey. If Turkey, with a population of 16 million, were exhausted after long wars, to pursue a policy that rejected the Paris order, it could also endanger what has been achieved. The principle of pacifism, which constitutes one of the foundations of Turkish foreign policy during the Ataturk era, states that there is no room for adventure and aggression in foreign policy, but that peace, stability and tranquility should be the primary goal.

Pacifism was an important foreign policy principle that Atatürk defended throughout his life. Even during the most difficult days of the National Struggle against invaders, Atatürk was a fervent advocate of peace at every opportunity. Mustafa Kemal said the following in December 1921: “Gentlemen, there is no infringement on the rights of any other state in our foreign policy. However, we are and will be defending our rights, our country and our honor<sup>17</sup>.

Again, Mustafa Kemal expressed the following words about peace in March 1921: “Just as we do not want to violate anyone's rights, we have no other cause than that others respect our right to life and independence. The legitimate rights of the Turkish Nation, which has no other aim than to live freely like every civilized nation, free from foreign intervention within our national borders, will finally be surrendered by the world of humanity and civilization. Our assembly and government are far from being belligerent and adventurous. On the contrary, they prefer peace and salvation...”<sup>18</sup>.

Although Atatürk was the great commander of the battlefields and the great master of military art, he believed in peace, not war. He sincerely emphasized his belief in peace with the following words he said years after the War of Independence. “Become a warrior because I know the tragic situations of war better than anyone else.” Again, Mustafa Kemal Pasha emphasized that war should be valid in vital situations by saying, “War is necessary and must

<sup>15</sup> Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İkinci Adam III. Cilt*, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1968, s. 583-586

<sup>16</sup> Tahsin Ünal, *Türk Siyasal Tarihi*, Ankara 1978, s.566.

<sup>17</sup> Enver Ziya Karal, *Atatürk'ten Düşünceler*, İstanbul 1981, s.131.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

be life... We can go to war saying we will not die against those who say we will kill<sup>19</sup>. However, war is murder unless the life of the nation is in danger<sup>20</sup>.

Ataturk's pacifism does not mean peace at all costs. An unjust solution that would preserve peace was an application that Ataturk did not accept. Indeed, during the National Struggle, the Turkish Nation fought until it fully gained its independence and sovereignty. Here, it is understood that Ataturk risked war until the end when necessary for a just peace. In fact, it can be said that the most effective way to achieve national sovereignty and independence is to be ready for war. If peace is desired, it may be necessary to be prepared for war, and even to risk war<sup>21</sup>.

After the declaration of the Republic, pacifism was accepted and implemented as one of the most fundamental principles in Turkish foreign policy. Atatürk stated that in order to ensure world peace, every nation should consider the peace of other nations as well as its own peace and prosperity. He considered all of humanity as a body and a nation as an organ of this body, and drew attention to the fact that just as a pain in a finger affects the whole body, a discomfort anywhere in the world will affect all nations. According to Atatürk, "the first and most important condition for the development of international political security is for nations to unite sincerely at least in the idea of preserving peace."

Atatürk was a great Turkish Nationalist. Just as Atatürk was proud of his Turkishness, he tried to make Turkishness and Turkish Nationalism the main pride of the Turkish Nation. Atatürk expressed his loyalty and belief in the Turkish Nation and Turkishness at every opportunity and brought the principle of Nationalism to the forefront in foreign policy as well as domestic policy. Atatürk, who said, "My only pride and fortune in life is nothing but being Turkish"<sup>22</sup>, applied the principle of Nationalism in foreign policy in two different ways during the War of Independence and the Republic periods.

While the principle of Nationalism was implemented in the form of the concept of the "National State" during the War of Independence, it was implemented in the foreign policy of the Republican period as "keeping Turkey's interests above all else".

While Atatürk put forward the concept of "National State" based entirely on the Turkish Nation on national lands, based on the National Pact dated January 28, 1920, he also made great efforts to ensure that the Turkish nation gained its self-confidence. Because the Turkish Nation, which constituted the foundation of the Ottoman state, had been virtually forgotten in the last century. The principle of Nationalism, which was the fundamental basis of the National Struggle, was put into practice in foreign policy after the declaration of the Republic in the form of protecting the national interests of the Republic of Turkey and the Turkish State. Atatürk said the following on this subject. "There are only interests in the politics of nations. Let us know that no one can be friends with another"<sup>23</sup>. (M. Kemal did not go beyond the borders of the country for official visits after being elected President and received foreign heads of state in his country.)

Ataturk expressed the "National foreign policy" he envisioned for Türkiye as "National politics". Ataturk explained national politics as follows.

<sup>19</sup> Fahir Armaoğlu, "Atatürk'ün Dış Politika İlkeleri", *Atatürk'ün Ölümünün 50. Yılı Sempozyumu*, (31 Ekim-1 Kasım 1988), Ankara 1989, s.164.

<sup>20</sup> Ramazan Gönen, *Dış Politika Nedir? 21. Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, (der.) İdris Bal, Lalezar Yayınları, Ankara 2006.

<sup>21</sup> Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Tek Adam Mustafa Kemal 1922-1938*. Remzi Kitapevi. İstanbul, 2011.

<sup>22</sup> Fahir Armaoğlu, "Atatürk'ün Dış Politika İlkeleri", *Atatürk'ün Ölümünün 50. Yılı Sempozyumu*, (31 Ekim-1 Kasım 1988), Ankara 1989, s.164.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.



“The political profession that we see as clear and possible to implement is national politics. There can be no greater mistake than being a dreamer in the face of the current conditions of the world and the truths that centuries have gathered in their minds and characters. In order for our nation to live strong, happy and continuously, the state must follow a completely national policy and this policy must be in accordance with our internal organization and must be based on it. When I say national politics, the meaning I mean is this: To work for the happiness and development of the nation and the country by preserving its existence, relying first and foremost on our own power and strength within our own national borders... Not to occupy the nation with excessive ambitions and not to cause harm”<sup>24</sup>.

It is possible to deduce the following elements from these words describing national foreign policy. First of all, national policy is a foreign policy that has the ability to be implemented. Again, national policy is based on its own power. Another element is based on staying within national borders. However, when evaluated as a whole, the phrase “national borders” is not an element that restrains Turkey’s foreign policy. In addition, elements of realism and equality are also among the elements that national policy contains<sup>25</sup>. (Atatürk said, “If we want the world to respect us, first of all, we must be able to show this respect to our own identity and nationality, feelingly, intellectually, and practically, with all our deeds and actions. Let us know that nations that cannot find their national identity are prey to other nations.”

However, there is absolutely no extremism in the line of Nationalism that Atatürk tried to implement. Nationalist movements that reached the level of racism, such as those in Italy and then Germany from the 1920s onwards, are incompatible with Atatürk's understanding of nationalism and Atatürk's nationalist movements. Atatürk always gave importance to humanitarian values, (“Making people slaughter each other in the name of making them happy is an inhumane and extremely regrettable system”) and saw all the nations in the world as relatives to each other<sup>26</sup>. (“Today, all the nations of the world are more or less relatives and are busy being so. In this respect, a person should think about the peace and happiness of all the nations of the world as much as he thinks about the existence and happiness of the nation, he belongs to...”.) Atatürk's Nationalism is not expansionist or aggressive.

The establishment and continuation of the country’s full independence is the fundamental point on which all nations meticulously agree. Full independence means complete sovereignty and freedom in political, economic, financial, judicial, cultural and all areas. For Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the leader of the New Turkey, who had seen that the Ottoman Empire had become dependent on the outside in every way in recent times, full independence was one of the primary goals. Atatürk stated what he understood from independence as follows.

"When we say complete independence, of course, we mean complete independence and complete freedom in all matters such as politics, finance, economy, justice, military, culture and the like. Deprivation of independence in any of these matters means deprivation of the nation and country of all true independence". The principle of complete independence was the main principle of the National Struggle. In fact, almost all of what Atatürk said during the National Struggle was related to the concept of independence<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> İsmet Giritli, “Nutukta İç ve Dış Politika”. *Atatürk’ün Büyük Söylevi’nin 50. Yılı Semineri, Bildiriler Tartışmalar*, Ankara 1980, s.190-191; F. Armaoğlu, “Atatürk’ün Dış Politika İlkeleri”, *Atatürk’ün Ölümünün 50.Yılı Sempozyumu* (31 Ekim –1 Kasım 1988), Ankara 1989, s.168.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> İzzet Öztoprak, “Atatürk, Çağdaşlaşma ve Dış Dünyadaki Etkileri” *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi (A. A. M. Dergisi)*, C:1 Kasım 1984, sayı:1, Ankara 1990, s.288-289; “Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri -II, s.325-326.

<sup>27</sup> Fahir Armaoğlu, “Atatürk’ün Dış Politika İlkeleri”, *Atatürk’ün Ölümünün 50. Yılı Sempozyumu, (31 Ekim-1 Kasım 1988)*, Ankara 1989, s.164.

Atatürk saw independence as closely related to the honor and integrity of a nation, especially the Turkish Nation. Atatürk expressed this view in his Speech as follows: “The essence is for the Turkish Nation to live as a noble and honorable nation. This essence can only be achieved by having complete independence. No matter how rich and prosperous it is, a nation deprived of independence cannot deserve a higher treatment than being a servant in the face of civilized humanity.” On June 9, 1922, he said the following about independence: “The Turkish people are the heroic children of a nation that has lived freely for centuries and has considered independence a vital necessity. This nation has not lived, cannot live and will not live without independence”<sup>28</sup>.

Atatürk’s “principle of independence is not a principle that only concerns the National Struggle phase, but is a principle that he has made dominant in all Turkish foreign policy. Atatürk’s Turkey has given great importance to the continuation of the Lausanne balance in preserving the country’s independence.

Atatürk's foreign policy is not dogmatic but realistic. In other words, he does not act according to fixed ideas, he always seeks the truth. Atatürk knew the limits of his power very well and could determine his goal realistically. Atatürk's reality is clearly seen in his following words. "...We are not one of those fraudulent people who chase after big dreams and pretend to do things we cannot do. Because we pretend to do big and imaginary things without doing them, we have drawn the hostility, spite and grudge of the whole world onto this country and nation.... Instead of increasing the number of our enemies and the pressure on us by running after concepts that instill fear and panic in the whole world, let us resort to our natural limit, our legitimate limit. Let us know our place... We are a nation that wants life and independence. And we will sacrifice our lives (without hesitation) for this alone and only”<sup>29</sup>.

During the National Struggle, Atatürk preferred to implement the National Pact instead of turning to Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism. As a result of his peaceful understanding, Mustafa Kemal kept the door of dialogue open with the enemy even during the National Struggle. During the National Struggle, when the opportunity arose to meet with the enemy, Atatürk knew how to use it to explain national goals. He was always ready to end the war as soon as the other side accepted the national demands.

In the period between the two world wars, Mustafa Kemal implemented the concept of establishing friendships regardless of regime differences in the international environment where opposing regimes were formed. During the War of Independence, Atatürk entered into a tactical alliance with Soviet Russia, one of the greatest rivals of the Turkish Nation, and this provided a great advantage in the realization of national interests.

During the National Struggle, we see Mustafa Kemal's realistic attitude not only in relations with Soviet Russia but also in the policy pursued against all states. The TBMM Government was sent as a Representative to the London Conference upon the call of the Allied Powers after the First Inonu War, and moreover, the Istanbul Government and the Turkish Grand National Assembly Government were invited to this conference together. Mustafa Kemal used this conference as an opportunity to be recognized by the Allied Powers. Then, the war with France was ended with the Ankara Treaty<sup>30</sup>.

England, which supported the Greeks the most against Turkey during the War of Independence, continued its hostile attitude towards Turkey in the early years of the Republic.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Enver Ziya Karal, a.g.e. s.130; U. Kocatürk, *Atatürk*, Ankara 1987, s.184-185.

<sup>30</sup> İzzettin Doğan, “Atatürk’ün Dış politika ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Anlayışı”, *Çağdaş Düşünce Işığında Atatürk*, İstanbul, Eczacıbaşı Vakfı Yayınları, 1983, s. 148-149.

It even caused a great injustice to Turkey by using its power in the League of Nations in the Mosul issue. Despite this, Turkey signed a friendship treaty with England in 1926.

## 2. The Republic Period

After the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey tried to stay away from international ties that could limit its independence and to develop friendly relations with its neighbors by following a peaceful policy. Atatürk guided Turkey's foreign policy based on good neighborly relations. The foreign policy that Atatürk tried to implement was carried out within the framework of national politics based on national interests. National politics was determined in accordance with the principles of the National Pact, national independence, and respect for international law, and peace at home and in the world. Thanks to the principles of realism, rationality and scientific knowledge, imaginative policies were avoided. Changes in the international relations environment were evaluated in accordance with national power and internal organization, and by providing the necessary flexibility, attempts were made to solve the problems remaining from Lausanne at the beginning. Subsequently, an active role was taken in the international relations system to protect regional and world peace.

There were various reasons for Turkey's peaceful policy during this period. The most important of these was that it made radical revolutions in almost every area of domestic politics and social life. A new constitution was accepted, the caliphate was abolished, education was unified, and reforms in dress, law, letters, etc. were implemented. The uneasiness created in society by the reforms made in line with the principle of secularism was further increased by the poor state of the country's economy and the restrictions the government imposed on foreign trade. The Sheikh Said rebellion that broke out in the east in 1925 during the most rapid period of the revolutions continued with short intervals until 1938. Then, the Izmir assassination attempt on Atatürk was carried out, and the Menemen incident occurred in 1930. In addition, Turkey became a neighbor of all the powerful countries of Europe after the Treaty of Lausanne. England became neighbors of Turkey due to its colony of Iraq, France became neighbors of Turkey due to its colony of Syria, Italy became neighbors of Turkey due to the Dodecanese Islands, and the Soviet Union became neighbors of Turkey<sup>31</sup>.

Until 1932, although international developments were dealt with, they were mainly concerned with the solution of some problems remaining from Lausanne. These problems were; Mosul with England, the debt issue and the Syrian border with France, the issue of population exchange with Greece and some issues related to capitulations. By 1932, Turkey had largely solved its domestic and foreign problems and was able to enter a more active period in the international arena.

During this period, Atatürk's peaceful foreign policy encountered some obstacles abroad from time to time. The great powers that had become accustomed to the capitulation regime during the Ottoman Empire wanted to continue this and attempted to intervene in our internal affairs in every field. In this context, England opposed the transfer of the capital from Istanbul to Ankara<sup>32</sup>. However, thanks to Ankara's determined stance, it gave up resisting. The French made efforts to maintain their old status in their schools in Turkey, but they were unsuccessful in doing so.

The Ankara Agreement had initiated a rapprochement with France. With this agreement, the Syrian border was determined and a special regime was accepted for the İskenderun region.

<sup>31</sup> Mehmet Gönübol ve Cem Sar, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Ankara, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara 1990.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

However, the rapprochement did not last long. During the Lausanne Conference, Turkey's attempt to abolish all kinds of privileges had caused fierce discussions with France, which had benefited the most from the capitulations. As a result, after long discussions, France was forced to accept Turkey's demand for the abolition of privileges.

After Lausanne, the most frequently discussed issue in Turkish-French relations was Hatay and the debts. Hatay and therefore the Syrian border were generally determined by the Ankara Treaty, and the details were set forth in Article 3 of the Lausanne Peace. In addition, France maintained the special status it had accepted in the Ankara Treaty for Hatay. However, France began to encounter some difficulties in the administration of the Sanjak from 1925 onwards. In January 1926, the representatives of the Sanjak in the Syrian Assembly requested that the Sanjak be separated from Syria and directly connected to France. However, this request was not accepted by France. Thereupon, the Assembly prepared a constitution in March 1926 and declared its independence. When Syria objected to the decision to grant independence to the Sanjak, the issue was discussed again in the Assembly, and the Assembly reversed its decision and decided that the Sanjak would remain autonomous within the Syrian state.

After resolving the border dispute between them, Turkey and France initialed the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighborhood on February 18, 1926. However, the Mosul issue was continuing at this time. France was siding with England on the Mosul issue. Therefore, the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighborhood was signed on May 30, 1926, after the Mosul issue was resolved. With the Turkish-French Treaty of Friendship, the Syrian border was determined and a general agreement was reached between the two countries.

Another issue in Turkish-French relations during this period was the issue of debts. Since the Ottoman Empire owed the most to the French, France had a strict stance against Turkey regarding the payment of debts. For this reason, this issue could not be completely resolved at the Lausanne Conference. Debts were reconsidered in 1925. At that time, Turkey agreed to pay 62.54% of the Ottoman debts before 1912 and 73.59% of the debts after 1912. In another agreement made in Paris on June 13, 1928 through the League of Nations, Turkey took over the Ottoman debts totaling 107,528,461 gold liras, 82,456,337 liras of which were principal. Payments were to begin in 1929<sup>33</sup>. However, the onset of the 1929 economic crisis made it difficult to pay the debts. In this case, Turkey wanted to benefit from the "Hoover Moratorium" (debt postponement). As a result of the negotiations held in Paris, a new agreement was signed on June 22, 1933, with more favorable payment terms than the first, and the Ottoman Debt Issue was resolved.

Three years after Lausanne, on August 2, 1926, a ship flying the Turkish flag called Bozkurt and a ship flying the French flag called Lotus collided off the coast of Midilli. The Turkish ship sank and eight Turks lost their lives. When the Lotus ship arrived in Istanbul, the Turkish courthouse intervened and arrested the captain of the French ship, Demons. The French Embassy demanded the release of the captain. Turkey informed the courthouse that the government could not intervene in any way. The French press escalated the situation and wrote violent articles against Turkey. It was claimed that the Turks did not know international law and did not deserve the result they achieved in Lausanne. There were some hesitations among Turkish newspapers and lawyers. Mahmut Esat tried to convince everyone, saying that withdrawing from this issue would shake Turkey's international reputation and would revive the judicial capitulations that were abolished with great difficulty in Lausanne. Mahmut Esat's explanation of this issue to Atatürk and Atatürk's response were important in terms of foreign policy principles. "Pasha, let's go to the Hague Court of Justice, let's see who is right. I am sure

<sup>33</sup> Mehmet Gönübol ve Cem Sar, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Ankara, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara 1990.

of our rights. If you allow me, I will defend our case. If I lose, I will never return to my country. But we will win. Moreover, if we do what the French say without going to the Court of Justice, we will have bowed down to the threats of the French State, and this will give them the courage to continue the same threats on other issues. However, if we go to The Hague Court, even if we lose the case, our honor and dignity will not be damaged. Because complying with the decision of an international court is not dishonorable, on the contrary, it is a great honor.” Upon these words, Atatürk said to him: “Go happily, you will win, even if you do not win, the country will embrace you”. As a result, the Bozkurt-Lotus case was brought to the International Court of Justice<sup>34</sup>.

The decision announced by the Court of Justice on September 7, 1927 was the second legal victory of the young Republic in the international arena after Lausanne. The decision said that Turkey, which arrested and convicted the captain of the Lotus ship Demons, had acted in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne and its sovereign rights, and France's claim for compensation was rejected.

Turkey's request that history and geography lessons be taught in Turkish-by-Turkish teachers in French missionary schools was another issue that caused problems in relations with France. Although France opposed this arrangement, it could not achieve results in the face of Turkey's determined stance. Turkey's desire to purchase the Adana-Mersin railway in accordance with the law it enacted on January 10, 1929 was another source of problems in relations with France. However, due to political developments in Germany and preparations for the Balkan Entente, France changed its stance and the problem was overcome. The railway was purchased in accordance with the agreement made with France in June 1929.

At the end of World War I, Italy, which had failed to achieve what it had hoped for in the secret agreements made before, was the first country to establish good relations with Turkey. However, after Mussolini came to power, Italy took advantage of Turkey's connection to Mosul and renewed its ambitions in Anatolia. The resolution of the Mosul issue and the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Non-Aggression with France in the same year allowed our relations with Italy to improve again. Italy conveyed to Ankara that the statement containing expansionist statements made by Mussolini did not include Turkey, which was considered a European country, and began to follow a friendly policy towards Turkey. One of the reasons that led Italy to reconsider its relations with Turkey during this period was the strained relations with Yugoslavia due to the policy that this state was pursuing towards Albania. Yugoslavia had approached France because it was wary of Italy. In the face of this situation, Italy abandoned its imaginary colonial idea in Anatolia.

France wanted to create a security system against the “Little Entente” formed between Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Romania, by taking Bulgaria with them, together with Italy, Turkey and Greece. In addition, Turkey was rapidly gaining strength. For this reason, Italy abandoned its expansionist policy and began to pursue a policy of friendship towards Ankara<sup>35</sup>. This policy of Italy resulted in the signing of a Neutrality, Conciliation and Judicial Liquidation Treaty with Turkey on May 30, 1928. According to the treaty, the two parties would not participate in any agreements, political or economic arrangements directed against each other, if one of the parties was attacked, the other party would remain neutral for the duration of the dispute and the parties would resolve the problems between them through peaceful methods. Within this scope; the dispute that arose regarding the island of Meis and the islands close to the Anatolian coast was brought to the Hague Court of Justice by signing an Arbitration Treaty on May 30, 1929. However, without waiting for the Court to make a decision, the parties signed

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ahmet Şükrü Esmer, *Siyasi Tarih 1919-1939*, AÜSBF Yayınları, Ankara 1953.

a Convention on the Delimitation of the Territorial Waters between the Anatolian Coast and Meis Island and the Sovereignty of the Black Island opposite Bodrum in Ankara on January 4, 1932, and resolved the issue through peaceful methods<sup>36</sup>.

Italy was one of the Western countries closest to Turkey, despite some minor disagreements between 1923 and 1930. For this reason, cooperation with Italy was developed, especially in the field of trade. Many of Italy's major banks opened branches in Istanbul. Turkey ordered warships from Italy, which were necessary for its security. Cooperation in the field of trade was also seen in the political field from time to time, and this situation forced Greece to make an agreement with Ankara.

### 3. 1932-1939 period

By 1932, Turkey had largely implemented domestic reforms, established and strengthened its internal organization, resolved a significant portion of the problems left over from Lausanne, and began to develop positive relations with its neighbors. All of these had brought Turkey to a strong position in international relations, giving it an independent and equal status. It could now play a role in regional and global developments and contribute to stability and peace.

Turkish-British relations followed an unfriendly course due to the negative attitude of the British in the Lausanne negotiations and the Mosul issue. However, Turkey's foreign policy of cooperation with Western states began to yield results as of 1932. Germany and Italy's expansionist Eastern and Mediterranean policies brought the two states closer together as of 1934. The British supported Turkey at Montreux. In addition, Britain gave guarantees to Turkey, along with Spain, Yugoslavia and Greece, which Italy threatened, because they had complied with the coercive decisions taken by the League of Nations. In the event of an attack by Italy, Britain would help the attacked state. Along with Yugoslavia and Greece, Turkey also accepted the guarantee given in January 1936. In return, all three states gave guarantees to Britain. This development was very important for Turkey's security as well as for the development of Turkish-British relations. In line with these developments, Turkey supported England at the Nyon Conference of 1937, which was held to prevent submarine piracy in the Mediterranean, as mentioned earlier. Economic relations also developed in parallel with political relations. Of the financial resources needed to realize the first five-year industrial plan (1934-1937), 3 million pounds sterling was received from England as a facility loan and allocated to the construction of the Karabük Iron and Steel Factory and the Çatalağzı Power Plant. On 27 May 1938, another 10-million-pound credit agreement was signed between the two states. This rapprochement between Turkey and England would lead to an alliance in 1939.

Turkey had always taken the Soviet Union into consideration in its foreign policy practices and coordinated its initiatives with it. In this context, Turkey had sought the opinion of the Soviet Union during its entry into the League of Nations in 1932 and had stated with reservations that it would not participate in the League of Nations' decision to impose coercion on the Soviets. Furthermore, the Soviet Union's membership in the League of Nations in 1934 had prevented possible tensions between the two states. This result was also an indication that Atatürk's Turkey had put the right thing into practice before the Soviet Union. Turkey had also informed the Soviet Union about the establishment of the Balkan Pact and had assured that the Pact had no initiative against it<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> Rıfat Uçarol. *Siyasi Tarih (1789-2001)*, 6. bs., Der Yayınları, İstanbul 2006.

<sup>37</sup> Ahmet Şükrü Esmer ve Oral Sander, *İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası*, A.Ü. SBF Yayınları, Ankara, 1973, s.141

After the signing of the Montreux Straits Convention in 1936, the development of Turkish-English relations caused positive relations with the Soviet Union to decline from their peak. After this date, Turkey made efforts to develop good relations with both the Soviet Union and Western countries in its foreign policy. Atatürk's basic strategy was to develop Turkish-English relations without offending the Soviet Union. As a natural result of this, relations with England improved while relations with the Soviet Union began to weaken. From 1939 onwards, there was a rapid change in the Soviet Union's policies towards Turkey. The joint defense of the Straits and territorial claims from Eastern Anatolia brought the two states face to face from time to time.

Turkish-German relations had begun with negotiations following the Treaty of Lausanne. They had improved with the signing of the Turkish-German Friendship Treaty in Ankara on March 3, 1924. A trade agreement was signed between the two countries on January 12, 1927<sup>38</sup>. These positive developments began to change when Hitler came to power in Germany. Germany's expansionist efforts in the Balkans, the Middle East and the Mediterranean by developing its relations with Italy and its desire to establish economic and political influence over the region had disturbed Turkey. Germany had opposed the signing of the Balkan Treaty, and even the visit of the German Foreign Minister to Turkey had been postponed<sup>39</sup>. Although Germany had not attended the Montreux Conference, it had announced that it did not approve of its provisions. Turkey, on the other hand, had stated that Germany had no right to intervene in the Straits Regime because it was not a party to the Treaty of Lausanne and did not have a coast in the Mediterranean. Despite these negativities in the political arena, economic relations had improved. The ratio of Turkey's exports to Germany to total exports was around 40-50%. The import ratio was almost the same<sup>40</sup>. Again, during this period, a long-term loan of 20,000,000 liras was received from Germany in 1934. The agreement for the 150-million-mark loan, which was agreed upon during the visit of German Trade Minister Funk to Turkey in 1938, was signed in Berlin on January 16, 1939<sup>41</sup>. However, Germany's efforts to establish economic influence over Turkey were unsuccessful and Turkey sided with the anti-revisionist states in 1939.

## CONCLUSION

The relations of the Turks with Europe began with their settlement in Anatolia and developed rapidly with the conquest of Rumelia. The Ottoman State was open to cultural elements coming from the West during its establishment and rise. In this way, many innovations entered the Ottoman state system and ensured the continuous development of the system. The economic, social and administrative maturation achieved during the reign of Fatih, although reaching its peak during the reign of Kanuni, also brought about a relaxation and deterioration, perhaps due to the opportunities presented by the development. While Europe showed an almost limitless development with the Renaissance, Reformation and geographical discoveries, those who governed the Ottoman State began to believe that the system and procedures were unique and to evaluate every innovation as a deviation. Since the interaction with Europe was cut off, the classical Ottoman system, which was once admired both domestically and internationally, was inadequate to keep up with the changing internal and external dynamics, and this situation heralded the beginning of the crisis period.

<sup>38</sup> Cemil Koçak, *Türk-Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939)*, TTK Yayınları, Ankara 1991.

<sup>39</sup> Mehmet Gönülöbol ve Cem Sar, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara 1990.

<sup>40</sup> Oran Baskın, "Dönemin Bilançosu 1919-1923", *Türk Dış Politikası*, ed. Baskın Oran, c. 1, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2002, s. 97-109.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

The Ottoman Empire tried to solve the bad situation it had fallen into against the European powers within the system for a long time. However, when it was understood that the problems actually stemmed from much deeper reasons, it initially began to examine the West and subsequently began to adopt some institutions and technologies that were thought to provide superiority to the West. The idea of Westernization, which began as an effort to resemble the West, transfer innovations from the West, establish a Western-style army and train soldiers, gradually spread in a way devoid of social, scientific and economic content under the influence of the new liberal ideas spread by the French Revolution. Westernism, which was implemented in the form of reforms as needed at the state level, aimed to save the state, which was more of a political structure. However, what was done was often inadequate because it was done with a formal and imitative understanding of Westernism that was far from the essence.

In the period until the Republic, the westernization efforts were carried out without sufficient social, scientific and economic content, so the desired result could not be achieved. In reality, it was not understood that westernization was not a matter of choice but rather a matter of remaining outside the only civilization in the world. Therefore, the solution was not to reject it, but to be able to place it in its original orbit and to implement it correctly. Moreover, European civilization was a civilization that rose not only above the ancient Greek and Roman civilizations, but also above all the ancient civilizations created by humanity. The awareness that modernization was a problem of comprehensive change and development, primarily a change in mentality, created the Turkish Revolution under the leadership of Atatürk.

The foreign policy goal of the Turkish Revolution was initially to establish a new, unconditionally independent Turkish state based on national sovereignty. After the establishment of the Republic of Turkey with the Treaty of Lausanne, the goal was to raise the independent Republic of Turkey and the Turkish Nation based on national sovereignty to the level they deserve in the civilized world and to ensure the peace, security and prosperity of the nation. In the foreign policy practices carried out in line with this goal, attention was paid to the principles of rationality, realism, equality, flexibility, international cooperation, proactive foreign policy, peace at home, peace in the world, respect for international law, consistency and reliability. The principles were transformed into flexible and dynamic practices that quickly adapted to changing conditions and the requirements of the age. These characteristics showed that the goals and principles could also shed light on today's foreign policy strategies.

In summary, Atatürk gave importance to peace, balance and stability in foreign policy. Gazi's words "Peace at home, peace in the world" indicate the close relationship between domestic and foreign policy and that foreign policy cannot be handled independently of domestic policy. The most important condition for success in foreign policy is the unity, solidarity, integrity and consciousness of the nation, as Atatürk emphasized in his speech "What is essential is the domestic front".

## REFERENCES

- Arı, Tayyar, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri ve Dış Politika*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul 2001.
- Armaoğlu, Fahir, "Atatürk'ün Dış Politika İlkeleri", *Atatürk'ün Ölümünün 50. Yılı Sempozyumu*, (31 Ekim-1 Kasım 1988), Ankara 1989, s.164.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, *İkinci Adam III. Cilt*. Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1968.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, *Tek Adam Mustafa Kemal 1922-1938*. Remzi Kitabevi. İstanbul, 2011.



Aykan, Mahmut Bali, Türk Dış Politika Anlayışı, (der.) Haydar Çakmak, *Türk Dış Politikası (1918-2008)*, Platin. Ankara 2008.

Başbuğ, İlker, *Mustafa Kemal Anlatıyor Savaş ve Barış*, Kırmızı Kedi Yayınevi, İstanbul 2002.

Cengiz, Emre, *İsmet İnönü ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları Türk Dış Politikası*, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas, 2012, (Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi).

Doğan, İzzettin, “Atatürk’ün Dış politika ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Anlayışı”, *Çağdaş Düşünce Işığında Atatürk*, İstanbul, Eczacıbaşı Vakfı Yayınları, 1983.

Esmer, Ahmet Şükrü ve Sander Oral, *İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası*, A.Ü. SBF Yayınları, Ankara, 1973.

Esmer, Ahmet Şükrü, *Siyasi Tarih 1919-1939*, Ankara, AÜSBF Yayınları, 1953.

Giritli, İsmet, “Nutukta İç ve Dış Politika”. *Atatürk’ün Büyük Söylevi’nin 50.Yıl Semineri*, Bildiriler Tartışmalar, Ankara 1980, s.190-191; F. Armaoğlu, “Atatürk’ün Dış Politika İlkeleri”, *Atatürk’ün Ölümünün 50.Yılı Sempozyumu* (31 Ekim –1 Kasım 1988) Ankara 1989, s.168.

Gök, Mehmet, “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Dış Politikasının İç ve Dış Kaynakları”, *Atatürk Türkiye’sinde (1923-1983) Dış Politika Sempozyumu Bildiriler*, İstanbul 1984, ss. 49-66.

Gönlübol, Mehmet ve Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, “Atatürk Dönemi Türk Dış Politikasına Genel Bir Bakış”, *Atatürkçü Düşünce*, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 1992, s. 1051-1075.

Gönlübol, Mehmet ve Sar, Cem, *Atatürk ve Türkiye’nin Dış Politikası*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara 1990.

Gözen, Ramazan, *Dış Politika Nedir? 21.Yüzyılda Türk Dış Politikası*, (der.) İdris Bal, Lalezar Yayınları, Ankara 2006.

Gözen, Ramazan, *Dış Politika Yapımın Aktörleri, İmparatorluktan Küresel Aktörlüğe Türkiye’nin Dış Politikası*, Palme Yayıncılık, Ankara 2009.

İbrahimoğlu, T. R, Çok kutuplu dünyaya doğru ilerlerken uluslararası ilişkilerde denge politikası analizi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (I)*, 2014, 138-147.

Koçak, Cemil, *Türk-Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939)*, TTK Yayınları, Ankara 1991.

Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, *Dış Politika Nedir? Türkiye’deki Dünü ve Bugünü*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dergisi C. 35. Ankara, 1980, s.309.

Mütercimler, Erol, *Yüksek Stratejiden Etki Odaklı Harekâta Geleceği Yönetme*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006.

Oran, B. “Türk Dış Politikası: Temel İlkeleri ve Soğuk Savaş Ertesindeki Durumu Üzerine Notlar”. Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 1996, 51(01).

Oran, Baskın. “Dönemin Bilançosu 1919-1923”, *Türk Dış Politikası*, ed. Baskın Oran, c. 1, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2002, s. 97-109.

Öztoprak, İzzet, “Atatürk, Çağdaşlaşma ve Dış Dünyadaki Etkileri” *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi (A. A. M. Dergisi)*, C:1 Kasım 1984, sayı:1, Ankara 1990, s.288-289;” *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri -II*, s.325-326.

Sander, Oral, *Türkiye’nin Dış Politikası*, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, 2006.

Sander, Oral, *Yeni Bir Bölgesel Güç Olarak Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Hedefleri, Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi, (der.) Faruk Sönmezoğlu, Der Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998.*

Uçarol, Rıfat, *Siyasi Tarih (1789-2001)*, 6. bs., Der Yayınları, İstanbul 2006.

Ünal, Tahsin, *Türk Siyasi Tarihi*, Ankara 1978, s.566.