Back to the Past: The Origins of Turkish-American Relations from an Alternative Perspective*

Nur Çetinoğlu Harunoğlu**

Abstract

Turkish-American relations have been an important component of Turkey's foreign policy for a very long time. Starting from the beginning of the Cold War, the US has become an inseparable part of Turkish diplomacy. Although the bipolar configuration of world politics came to an end 25 years ago, this alliance still keeps its importance for both sides. Nevertheless, the existence of divergences is an undeniable fact. This article investigates retrospectively the sources of the divergences in Turkish-American relations from an alternative perspective. The perspective used in this study gives a special place to the identities summarized as Turkish communitarianism on the one hand and American cosmopolitanism on the other, to the morality provided by these identities conceptualized as pluralist/ solidarist distinction, and to the behaviors they lead to. It also considers the changing ideational structures of the international society through decades. This article aims to fulfil the gap that was revealed by those who worked both on the Social Constructivism and the English School of International Relations, by mapping Turkish-American relations through a normative framework and by providing specific examples related to that from the early years of the Republic of Turkey, the Cold War and the post-Cold War period.

Turkish-American relations have been an important component of Turkey's foreign policy. Particularly starting from the beginning of the Cold War, with the transformation of bilateral relations into an officially recognized "alliance", the US has become an inseparable part of Turkish diplomacy. The close military and political ties between Turkey and the US during the Cold War stemmed from the existence of two superpowers with an ideological division and geopolitical competition that led to the bipolar conjuncture in world politics. Nevertheless the continuation of Turkish-American relations in the same seriousness and closeness in the post-Cold War period has largely been the product of other strategic reasons especially deriving from regional dynamics in the Middle East and the Balkans since a new configuration had started to come to shape in world politics in 1990's. As said by Sayarı in 2004, "for Turkey, the American-Turkish alliance remains the most important bilateral relationship in Turkish foreign policy"[1]. In that sense the Turkish-American alliance seems to keep its importance for both parties still today. But it is also worth noting that this alliance has never meant permanence of consensus between parts. Indeed divergences in fundamental subjects have been a crucial component of the Turkish-American alliance.

Starting from the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the diplomatic history reveals that major points of divergence between Turkey and the US have been the consequence of Turkey's tendency to emphasize its national responsibilities in contrast with the American tendency, which focuses on human and global responsibilities. It is possible to argue that Turkey places a special priority on the rights and duties of states in its foreign policy such as the principle of state sovereignty and that of non-intervention, while the US foreign policy makers seem to shape their pathway with certain values such as democracy, human rights, thus with moral concerns lying behind. It seems appropriate to surmise that Turkey has mostly lead a foreign policy that takes into consideration the international order and its constituent units that are states, whereas the US has usually

---

1   Sabri Sayarı, "Turkish-American Relations in the Post-Cold War Era: Issues of Convergence and Divergence", in *Turkish-American Relations,* ed. Mustafa Aydın, Çağrı Erhan, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 92.

seemed to be interested in whether an action is just in itself. In this framework, the US seems to focus on moral conceptions of good and bad to justify its actions without questioning if these actions are in conformity or not with the international order. With all these observations deeply rooted in the reconciliation of national, human and global responsibilities in foreign policy, this article attempts to examine the origins of divergences in Turkish-American relations. It departs from the idea that values emanating from identity play a crucial role in the formulation of the foreign policy of a specific country while how values of identity are instrumentalized depend on outside factors, and particularly on the dominant norms and beliefs of the international society. Therefore this study reappraises the argument that identity and outside factors are both determinants of foreign policy and none of them is solely enough to forecast the foreign policy of a specific country,[2] while using the place of morality in foreign policy as a tool to investigate it.

With the foregoing in mind, this article starts with the foundation of a theoretical account, which could serve to investigate the state and its connections with identity and morality. Then it continues with the revelation of the main values emanating from the identities of both Turkey and the US highlighting what kind of morality they do possess and what kind of pattern these identities lead to in their foreign policies. The following sections examine Turkish-American relations first in the early Republican period of Turkey and then in the Cold War, revealing their divergences and seeking the reasons for these divergences both in their identities and in the periodic circumstances. The last section, which is at the same time the conclusion of the article, aims to serve as a launch pad to understand current relations between Turkey and the US in light of the changes in the international society.

---

2   For a similar argument see for instance Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity*. (London: Routledge, 2003)

State, Morality and Identity: What Kind of a Theoretical Framework?

The distinction between national concerns on the one hand, and human and global concerns on the other, is an important factor affecting the differentiations of states on their foreign policy preferences. Indeed, how to reconcile the rights of states with moral questions such as human rights and global responsibilities remains problematic not only for practitioners but also for scholars[3]. This theoretical dilemma has been largely examined by many schools and approaches, and one of the most important of them is undoubtedly the English School (ES) of International Relations, which focus its studies on the analysis of the international society, its institutions, as well as its norms.

According to the central figures of the School, states live in an atmosphere of anarchy since there is not an upper authority regulating their interactions. Nevertheless, despite this anarchical and decentralized structure, states form an international society since there are certain rules, norms, beliefs and practices regulating their interactions. Therefore they are "conscious of certain common interests and common values and believe themselves to be bound by a common set of rules and institutions".[4] In addition to this, "international order" is defined as a pattern of activity that sustains elementary goals of the international society.[5] By analyzing international society and international order, prominent scholars from the School have paid attention to the place of moral conceptions in world politics, and they worked on the relationship between international order, mainly constituted by states as defined above, and justice, a moral conception concerning the rights and duties of humans or humankind in general. The well-known pluralist-solidarist distinction derives its origins from the works of the founders of

---

3   Look for example at Robert Jackson and his "normative pluralism". Robert Jackson, 'The Political Theory of International Society', in *International Relations Theory Today,* eds. Ken Booth, Steve Smith, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995),pp. 110-128.

4   Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1995), p.13.

5   Ibid., p.8.

the ES, particularly from the works of Hedley Bull, the fourth chairman of the British Committee on the Theory of International Politics that paved the way for the rise of the ES with its regular meetings at the London School of Economics.[6]

The unresolved tension between the pluralists and solidarists comes from their divergent positions related to the place of morality, or as said by Bull and his followers, the place of "justice" in world politics. According to pluralists, international society does not and cannot provide a consensus on moral conceptions since moral conceptions mean ideas that "treat human actions as right in themselves" and what is right in itself can change accordingly[7]. In this framework, states are and must be the principle bearers of rights and duties, and they are only capable of agreeing on a minimum standard of principles such as the principle of state sovereignty and that of non-intervention. In addition to this, as said by Bull, one of the crucial pluralists, the subjective nature of justice makes this concept exploitable, and it has the potential to undermine order itself. In effect, Bull noticed that states were "notoriously self-serving in their policies"[8], that there was no shared understanding of morality and common conception of justice between members of the international society and that there was "no consensus on what level of human suffering would justify humanitarian intervention"[9]. From his perspective, some actors could act unilaterally in the name of justice, breach the main components of international order such as state sovereignty and challenge the concord of the society of

---

6 Here it is important to note that Hedley Bull's article titled "The Grotian Conception of International Society" is important in the sense that here Bull firstly launched the pluralist/solidarist division in this work. Hedley Bull, "The Grotian Conception of International Society", in *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics,* eds. Herbert Butterfield, Martin Wight, (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1966), pp. 51-73.

7 Bull, *The Anarchical, p.*75.

8 Hedley Bull, *Intervention in World Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), pp.194-195.

9 Nicholas Wheeler, Timothy Dunne, "Hedley Bull's pluralism of the intellect and solidarism of the will", *International Affairs*, Vol. 72, No.1, (1996), p.104.

states.[10] Although Bull was attracted to justice over time, his solidarist tendency was always balanced by "the realist in him".[11] Therefore Bull defended the priority of order over justice, an important idea which he evaluated "as the contemporary way of protecting human beings against forcible external interference".[12]

At the other end of the spectrum however, the solidarist conception claims that facing the unavoidable aspect of human and global problems, ideas related to moral conceptions could and should be incorporated into world politics. In that sense solidarism contradicts the central position of states in world politics and gives moral priority to individual persons[13], therefore it argues that exceptions to the main components of international order such as state sovereignty and principle of non-intervention should be made in certain cases. Solidarism proposes to develop a critical understanding in world politics in general and a critical conception of security in particular by launching a theoretical debate on the current place of states in world politics[14] and by arguing that "there is a universal standard of justice and morality against which the actions of states may be judged".[15] In addition to this, the outmost point of solidarism goes further to tell that relying on the state as a moral agent of humanitarianism remains totally insufficient in a world where human suffering is on its peak. Accordingly, since the reluctance of state leaders on humanitarian and global issues is remarkable, the state is the principle barrier to an emancipatory politics of humanitarianism,

---

10 Bull, *Intervention*, p.195.

11 Wheeler and Dunne, "Hedley Bull's pluralism", p.91.

12 Stanley Hoffmann, "International Society", in *Order and Violence: Hedley Bull and International Relations,* eds. J.D.B. Miller, R.J. Vincent, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p.30.

13 Andrew Linklater, Hidemi Suganami, *English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment.* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.64.

14 See Timothy Dunne, Nicholas Wheeler, "'We the Peoples': Contending Discourses of Security in Human Rights Theory and Practice", *International Relations,* Vol.18, No.1, (2004), pp. 9-23.

15 A. Claire Cutler, "'The Grotian Tradition" in International Relations", *Review of International Studies,* Vol.17, No.1, (1991), p.48.

therefore the growth of transnational social movements is inevitable.[16]

While the place of morality in world politics is held in such a way by the different normative wings of the ES, the connection of identity to these terms makes it incumbent to see the emerging dialogue of the ES with the Social Constructivism (SC). SC is a post-positivist approach, which was mainly developed in the 1990s due to the rising importance of meanings lying behind the actions. It is true that the birth of SC in the 1990's created an important turning point in IR Theory to the point that it was evaluated as "a renaissance in 'social theorizing about international relations'", as put by Reus-Smit. [17] Inspired by the works of Nicholas Onuf at the end of the 1980's[18], the central piece of SC is accepted to be the works of Alexander Wendt, particularly his *Anarchy is what states make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics* and his *Social Theory of International Politics,* in which he emphasized the social dimension of world politics[19] with a special attention attached to the intersubjective rules, norms and institutions of it, and he also argued that the identity of a state is the major determinant of the interests of that state.[20] According to constructivists, these are non-material structures that have to be considered in the understanding of identity formation, a fact which shapes the interests and thus the behavior of a state. From the same perspective, identity is not a pre-given element but it is

---

16 Nicholas Wheeler, "Agency, Humanitarianism and Intervention", *International Political Science Review,* Vol.18, No.1 (1997), pp.21-22.

17 Christian Reus-Smit, "Imagining society: constructivism and the English School", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol.4, No.3 (2002), p. 487.

18 Nicholas Onuf, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations* (University of South Carolina Press 1989)

19 Emmanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, No.3 (1997), p.322.

20 Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p.398.

constituted through historical, social, political and cultural processes that are affected by the social norms and ideas.[21]

While the details of SC in not the subject of this article, the most striking point is that as said by Reus-Smit clearly, "constructivists and the ES scholars have frequently identified each other as fellow travelers, as having complementary projects at the 'social vanguard' of the field"[22]. Also, as said by Buzan, the founders of the ES such as Charles Manning and Martin White had launched the first steps of the SC in their works[23]. In addition to this, as mentioned by Dunne, Hedley Bull also should be thought as an "example of social constructivism".[24] In other words, it would be appropriate to say that the ES and SC have shared much in common. Particularly the social bases of the international society and the constitutive power of ideational structures constitute for both the point of departure. It is also worth noting that those who wished to adapt the ES to the new circumstances of the post-Cold War period have endeavored to reveal the similarities between two approaches and combine them by establishing a connection between the prominent feature of the SC, which is identity, and the normative discussion of the ES that is the pluralist-solidarist distinction. According to Reus-Smit particularly, the connection between identity and the pluralist-solidarist distinction had long been overlooked by the constructivists[25], a point that basically needs to be developed to understand the current situation in world politics. In that sense it would be appropriate to say that this article aims to fill this

---

21 Christian Reus-Smit, "Constructivism", in *Theories of International Relations,* ed. Scott Burchill (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p.217.

22 Reus-Smit, "Imagining society", p.488.

23 Barry Buzan, "Not Hanging Separately: Responses to Dunne and Adler", *Millenium-Journal of International Studies*, Vol.34, No.1 (2005), p.189.

24 Timothy Dunne, "The Social Construction of International Society", *European Journal of International Relations,* Vol. 1, No.3 (1995), p.368.

25 Christian Reus-Smit's works on the Social Constructivism and the English School are definitely insightful here. Please look at Reus-Smit, "Imagining Society", pp.488-491, 496-499. Also Reus-Smit, "The Constructivist Challenge after September 11", in *International Society and its Critics*, ed. Alex J. Bellamy, **(**Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011),pp. 83, 86.

theoretical gap by investigating how the identities of Turkey and the US respectively pave the way for a specific conception of morality in their foreign policies and to what extent these conceptions of morality for both have undergone a modification due to the changing ideational structures through decades. But to do that, their identities are going to be analyzed first.

An Analysis based on Identity: The Republic of Turkey versus the United-States of America

One should go back to the years of national salvation to understand the social construction of Turkey's identity. The Republic of Turkey was formed following a war of independence between 1919-1923 against the colonial powers, in other words against the victors of the Great War who had occupied the Ottoman territories. The identity of this new "modern" state, which was under construction during this period, was mainly based on three major elements: nation, legitimacy and peace.

The element of "nation" was visible in the motive lying behind the war of independence led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, mostly known as Atatürk, the leading figure both in the war of independence and in the subsequent political, social and cultural reforms executed on Anatolian territories. The emphasis on "nation" during this process stemmed from the facts that the Ottoman Empire which had embraced many nations and communities had failed to survive due to its large territories occupied by Western powers in World War I and that the only exit for the people of Anatolia was to create a new Turkish state, the sovereignty and the independence of which would be unreservedly recognized.[26]. Thus, facing the inevitable collapse of the Empire just in the aftermath of World War I, a struggle for the national salvation was launched in different cities of Anatolia to create an independent state in which the sovereignty would belong not to the Sultan, as it was the case in the imperial period, but to the Turkish nation, in other words "the founder people of the new state" as defined by Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In that sense, the

---

26 Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk*. (İstanbul: Sabah, 1990), pp.13-16, 242,411.

"keen and forceful nationalistic spirit" of his struggle was undeniable[27].

In addition to the emphasis on nation, the second element in the construction of Turkey's identity, which is "legitimacy," came to surface when the primary purpose of the founders of the Republic of Turkey was clearly announced: it was to create an independent state which would take an equal place with its Western counterparts in the international society. In effect, the founders of Turkey were against the Western powers not because they were against the international system, rules and institutions embraced by them, but because of the simple reason: Western powers were occupiers of Turkey's lands. Indeed, Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave a special importance in the legitimate place that Turkey would occupy in the future with its Western pairs. In the ensuing years, Turkey's efforts to become a legitimate member of the League of Nations and its efforts to respect its duties vis-à-vis its alliances and treaties was significant in that sense. Also Turkey's efforts to catch up the parity with European nations through the adoption of Western style reforms in this turbulent period was another indicator of Turkey's search for a legitimate and equal place in the international society[28]. Here it was worth noting that the anti-imperialistic rhetoric was a major element of Atatürk's strategy[29] but this anti-imperialism was limited with the reaction given to the occupation of Anatolia and to the imposition of Western interests in the region. In other words the struggle led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha against Western imperialism aimed at delivering the

---

27 This spirit was deeply noticed by the first American ambassador in Turkey. To see the details, look at his memories: Joseph C. Grew, *Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years 1904-1945.* (London: Hammond Co. Ltd., 1953), Vol.2, p.708.

28 Indeed, "parity" is accepted as one of the ultimate purposes of Atatürk's strategy in this period. Please look at the works of the Turkish diplomats: Abdülahat Akşin, *Atatürk'ün Dış Politika İlkeleri ve Diplomasisi.* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi, 1991), p.35.

29 Türkkaya Ataöv, "Anti-Imperialistic Ideas in Mustafa Kemal's Writings and Their Importance for Asia", *Milletlerarası Münasebetler Türk Yıllığı XV.* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1975), p.8.

country from foreign invasion but this did not mean the rejection of Western civilization[30].

In a similar vein, the third element of Turkey's identity that is "peace" was apparent starting from the beginning of the national salvation process, and it was embedded in the founding philosophy of the new state: "peace at home, peace abroad". According to Atatürk, the war had to be "vital, inevitable and at last resort" since it could bring limitless costs.[31] According to him, Turkish people were fighting because they wanted to survive, in that sense their national salvation was indispensable. Apart from this, Atatürk rejected all ideas related to Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turanism, qualifying them as "illusions which are a long way from any practical value and which aroused fear and anxiety in the rest of the world".[32] Therefore according to the founder of the state, Turkey would be a modest state which would not carry expansionist aspirations but instead it would follow peaceful policies.

It appears that the social construction of Turkey's identity under the war circumstances of uninterrupted struggle against the occupiers was mainly based on the instinct to preserve the existence of the Turkish nation, a fact which paved the way for the emergence of the state of Turkey with a communitarian consciousness. In other words, it was basically a community movement that was concretized under the name of Turkish nation, which was at the heart of the struggle led against the colonial powers. In that sense, the conception of a "Turkish national ideal" was the predominant feature of the story. The founding principles of the Republic of Turkey announced in the following years and known as the "6 arrows", Republicanism, populism, nationalism, statism, reformism and laicism[33], served

---

30 Oral Sander, *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası.* (Ankara: İmge Yayınları, 1998), p.142.

31 Ibid, p.141.

32 Vladimir I. Danilov, "Kemalism and World Peace", in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancigil, Ergun Özbudun, (London: C.Hurst & Company, 1981), p.110.

33 For an analytical account of these principles, look at Enver Ziyal Karal, "The principles of Kemalism", in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancigil, Ergun Özbudun, pp.11-35.

to create a fundamental change in "the bases of political legitimation and the symbols of the political community, together with a redefinition of the collectivity"[34], and they all emphasized the communitarian spirit of the Republic by demonstrating that the collective rights of the Turkish nation, such as self-determination, political independence, economic and social development, were crucial in its founding philosophy. Therefore, communitarianism, which is known in contemporary political thought as a flux born as a reaction to the excessive individualism of liberalism and to its rejection of local particularities[35], could be the appropriate word to summarize Turkey's identity.

Similar to the Turkish national salvation story, the US had been founded following a war of independence led by 13 colonies in the American continent against the British Empire at the end of the 18th century. The motive behind this war was the idea that the peoples of the 13 colonies could not and should not be subjected to excessive tax policies and other unjust political implementations followed by the British Empire since the people of these colonies, as all humans in the world, were born equal and inherently entitled to unalienable rights endowed by the Creator. As a consequence of this political philosophy as mentioned in the Declaration of Independence dated 1776, the people could alter or abolish a Government which was destructive of these unalienable rights, among which the most important ones were life, liberty and happiness. Since "the history of the King of Great Britain was a history of repeated injuries and

---

34 S.N. Eisenstadt, "The Kemalist regime and Modernization: Some Comparative and Analytical Remarks", in *Atatürk and Modernization of Turkey,* ed. Jacob M. Landau, (Boulder CO: Westview Press,1984) from Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity* (London: Routledge, 2003), p.35.

35 Chris Brown, "Communitarianism", in *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches.* ed. Chris Brown, **(**Oxford**:** Columbia University Press, 1992), p.55; Mike Kenny, "Communitarianism", in *Contemporary Political Thought,* ed. Alan Finlayson, (New York: New York University Press, 2003), p.245.

usurpations"[36], it was their right and even the duty of the people to throw off such Government.

Although the demand of the 13 colonies for independence could be seen at first sight as being similar to Turkish aspirations for independence, the motive behind the American case was not a communitarian consciousness, unlike the Turkish case. But it was rather the idea that peoples of colonies were deprived from their inherent rights coming from their humanity. In this perspective, the individual rights of the peoples of the 13 colonies, such as the right to life, equality before the law, freedom to political participation, and limited government, were crucial in the founding philosophy of the US. The point here was that the human emancipation entitled by God put the individual at the core of the American Revolution, differently from the communitarian emphasis in the Turkish independence movement that focused on the emancipation of the Turkish community. [37] In that sense, as said by Morris, "the appeal to natural rights conformed to the political philosophy of the age, while the enumeration of basic rights reveals the unmistakable impact of the Virginia Bill of Rights".[38] In effect, the fact that a bill of rights was attached to the American Constitution dated 1787 in the subsequent years was another demonstrator of the centrality of individual rights in the American identity.

The focus on individual rights and that on human emancipation however are not the only element of the American identity. As said by Lipset, the American Revolution was the first successful revolt against colonial rule, and the United States was the first "new nation" in that sense.[39] This exceptional character of the state inevitably brought the belief that American ideas such as

---

36 "The Declaration of Independence, July 4 1776", in *Basic Documents in American History,* ed. R. B. Morris, (Princeton New Jersey: Van Nostrand Company, 1956), p.28.

37 To understand the place of individualism in the American identity, see Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution.* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1955)

38 Morris (ed.), *Basic Documents,* p.27.

39 Seymour Martin Lipset, *The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective.* (New York: Basic Books, 1963), p.2.

democracy, liberalism, and free trade aiming at human emancipation were supreme values and that they were to gain a universal validity. The focus on the universal validity of American values, which can be therefore accepted as the second component of American identity, was visible in many speeches issued by both the founding fathers and following Presidents of the state. According to Jefferson for instance, the United States was "the standing monument and example for the aim and imitation of the people of other countries"[40] while for Wilson "the interdependence and complexity of international political and economic relations render it incumbent on all civilized and orderly powers to insist on the proper policing of the world", and accordingly the United States was potentially the greatest power to ensure this mission.[41] It was obvious that this universal mission had also moral and even divine foundations for American leaders.

In this framework, the American identity, defined with the focus on individual rights and the universal validity of them, could be best summarized as American cosmopolitanism, which may be accepted as the fusion of both individualism and universalism. Known in the literature as a term coined by Immanuel Kant who defended that the idea that perpetual peace was possible in case of a cosmopolitan law valid at the universal scale[42], the term of cosmopolitanism has been used in many areas from history to philosophy, and from anthropology to politics[43]. Despite this diversity of usages, the common point of all of them is that they have argued that a standard of universal morality could exist for humankind[44], as in the case of American identity, which departs from the idea that American values based on liberal tradition are the perfect example for the world.

---

40 Adrienne Koch, William Peden, *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson.* (New York: The Modern Library, 1944), p.561.

41 Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), p.39.

42 Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Proposal* (London: Grotius Society Press, 1927)

43 Robert H. Holton, *Cosmopolitanism: New Thinking and New Directions* (London: Palgrave Mac Millan, 2009), pp.3-10.

44 Chris Brown, *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches* (Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp.23-51.

In light of all this, it seems possible to conclude that the analysis of identities for both Turkey and the US makes way for certain suggestions about the place of morality in their foreign policies. In effect Turkey's identity summarized as Turkish communitarianism seems to lead Turkey to a certain level of pluralism with its special focus on the concept of nation. Besides, other components of Turkish communitarianism such as legitimacy and peace are all in conformity with the rights and duties of states. Notwithstanding this, the values emanating from the American identity summarized as American cosmopolitanism seem to give a special place to solidarism with its focus on individual rights and global responsibilities of the US. Particularly the mission of the US to be an example for all humankind is reminiscent of a solidarist tendency that defends the existence of a universal moral standard in world politics. In that sense, Turkey and the US seem to represent different edges of the spectrum with their divergent positions vis-à-vis the place of morality in their perceptions of world politics. Once the connection between identity on the one hand and the pluralist/solidarist distinction on the other is established, a point that has been missed by those working on both the ES and SC as previously mentioned, it then seems necessary to investigate what kind of behavior these identities could encourage Turkey and the US to undertake. The first question of investigation being this, the second is to what extent the dominant ideational structures in the international society exert an impact into this identity-behavior connection. In other words how do the dominant norms and beliefs in the international society affect the instrumentalization of values coming from identities is going to be the second point of research of this article. To that end, the following section is going to be dedicated to the behaviors embraced by Turkey on the one hand and the US on the other, and it will illustrate how these behaviors affect their bilateral relations, by taking into consideration the outside factors, in other words the prominent features of the international society.

Turkish Communitarianism versus American Cosmopolitanism in the early Republican Period

It is the argument of this article that the identities of both, summarized as Turkish communitarianism on one hand and American cosmopolitanism on the other, give respectively Turkey and the US a certain framework of perception, therefore a certain standard of behavior. The diplomatic history of the early Republican period of Turkey is quite insightful in the sense that it demonstrated the first signs of what kind of behavior Turkey would embrace in general and what kind of perception Turkey would have in its relations with the US. In that sense the 1920's seem to constitute a useful period, which revealed the basic outcomes of Turkish communitarianism on the one hand and American cosmopolitanism on the other.

As previously mentioned the identity of Turkey, summarized as Turkish communitarianism, led Turkey to adopt a certain standard of behavior, which manifested itself as the reconciliation by Turkey of its global and local duties and as Turkey's finding of a middle way between them. In other words, Turkish communitarianism encouraged Turkey to adopt a "balanced" strategy between its responsibilities at the macro level, such as respecting the dominant norms and beliefs of the international society as well as respecting the demands of the global powers, and its responsibilities at the micro level, such as developing good relations with its neighbors and/or adopting strategies to preserve basically its national interests. This standard of behavior, which focuses primarily on the preservation of national interests by respecting the requirements coming from outside (an output of Turkish communitarianism) became concrete, and it differentiated from that of the US, since the latter involves a direct or indirect imposition of its own values and ideas to others (an output of American cosmopolitanism). This divergence between Turkey and the US was even visible starting from the beginning of the 1920's when the Republic of Turkey was newly born.

Indeed, at the end of the 1910's and the beginning of 1920's, there were two major subjects on the American political agenda, which the US made efforts to promote and to secure in its relations with Turkey: free trade and religious freedom.

Particularly it was noticed that the US was definitely very sensitive on the issue of free trade. Facing the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and therefore the end of political and economic privileges provided by the Empire toward the US, known as capitulations, the main purpose of the US was to ensure the continuation of these privileges with the new state. This American strategy was in the US' interests in the Middle East on the one hand, but on the other hand, free trade was a major American value that the US would like to see expanded at the universal scale for the wealth of the world, as believed by the governors. As mentioned in the tentative recommendations for President Wilson by the Intelligence Section of the American Delegation in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, American concerns focused on the probability of the emergence of an independent state on the littorals of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, which could threaten the trade and naval rights of big powers across the straits. Indeed as stated, " ...the assignment of any portion of the littoral of the Sea of Marmara or of the Straits to an independent sovereign power would result in many embarrassments, raising questions of commerce, of territorial waters, of possible naval rights, etc etc..."[45] In that sense the insistence of the then American delegation for the establishment of an internationalized state in Istanbul was understandable.

The same American position was also emphasized, only 7 months after these recommendations in the final report prepared by the King-Crane Commission, an American special commission appointed by President Wilson and responsible for investigating Ottoman territories "for the purpose of laying the essential foundations for peace-making in the Near East"[46]. The commission's conclusions about Turkey were remarkable in the sense that it demonstrated clearly the American will to preserve its economic rights with the establishment of an "International Constantinopolitan State" under a mandatory power, which could

---

45 "Tentative Recommendations for President Wilson by the Intelligence Section of the American Delegation to the Peace Conference, 21 January 1919", in *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*, ed. J.C. Hurewitz, (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1959), Vol:2, p.40.

46 Harry Howard, *The King-Crane Commission: An American Enquiry in the Middle East.* (Beirut: Khayats), 1963.

be best displayed by the US who "was the most natural power" and who could be able to "command the confidence of all nations concerned", since the US was "the only Great power territorially and strategically disinterested" in the region[47]. It was mostly noticeable here the American mandate was recommended by the commission not because of the fact that it was in the American interest, but because of the fact the US was the only power who could be able to ensure the peace and stability of the region by its exemplary status and values. It was the idea of a universal standard of rightness displayed by the US that was emphasized through the official American documents. This American credo on American cosmopolitanism was visible also in the subsequent years when Americans made important efforts even after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923 to preserve free trade rules inherited from the Ottomans' era. Indeed the first American points of concerns in the Lausanne Conference which the US participated in as an observer were the maintenance of capitulations and the protection of philanthropic, educational and religious institutions in the new state of Turkey.[48]

Not surprisingly, the aforementioned American attitude was not welcomed by the newly founded state, the Republic of Turkey, who, with its nationalist position, evaluated American efforts as an example of foreign meddling into its national sovereignty. Though national sovereignty was a sensitive point that was emphasized by Turkey's founders starting from the beginning of the independence war, and it was an indispensable part of Turkish communitarianism as mentioned before. The standard of behavior deriving from Turkish communitarianism manifested itself in Turkish efforts to reconcile these values promoted by the US with its own national concerns. This Turkish attempt to find "the middle way" between its global and local duties concretized with Turkey's acceptance of implementing free trade only under the state control, after the complete abolition of capitulations through the Lausanne Treaty, and respecting religious freedom in the missionary high schools only under the control of the

---

47 Ibid., p.235.

48 "United-States Interests and Conditions of Participation in the Lausanne Conference, 30 October 1922", in *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East*, ed. Hurewitz, p.114.

Ministry of National Education in Turkey. Thus, a raft of new regulations was adopted by Turkey in this period. In that sense, "conditions in the Turkish Republic, so drastically different from those in the Empire, resulted in a sharp curtailment of the missionary programme."[49] In addition to this, as said by John Grew, the first ambassador of the US in Turkey between 1927-1932, American efforts to preserve the principles of free trade and religious freedoms in the new Turkey were remarkable. But these efforts were mostly resisted and generally delayed by the state administration[50] under the pretext of "national independence". Nevertheless, this resistance and delay did not mean the whole rejection of the principles recommended by the US. As seen above, the standard of behavior prompted by Turkish communitarianism started to affect Turkey even in the 1920's and encouraged it for finding a balanced strategy between its responsibilities at the macro level, as the American impositions on Turkey on free trade and religious freedoms, and its responsibilities at the micro level, as preserving the national sensibilities of Turkey by resisting against the imposed principles.[51] Here Turkey seemed to find a balanced strategy with the acceptance of the principles of free trade and religious freedoms under state control. Here it is also worth noting that the pluralist tendency in Turkey's foreign policy was visible conversely to the solidarist tendency in the US' foreign policy, definitely an important point in the understanding of the divergences in the Turkish-American relations. Although the relations between Turkey and the US were not dense in this period, it seems possible to conclude from all these points that both identities constituted an important factor in the sharpening of divergences.

---

49 J.C. Hurewitz, *Middle East Dilemmas: The Background of the United States Policy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p.183.

50 Look for instance at Grew's conversations with the Turkish Ministry of Public Instruction, Grew, *Turbulent Era*, pp.746-747.

51 To see the Turkish concerns about American demands in the early Republican period, see the works on Ahmet Muhtar Bey, the first Turkish ambassador in Washington D.C. Bilal N. Şimşir, "Türk-Amerikan İlişkilerinin Yeniden Kurulması ve Ahmet Muhtar Bey'in Vaşington Büyükelçiliği (1920-1927)", *Belleten*, XLI, 162, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1977)

Turkish Communitarianism versus American Cosmopolitanism in the Cold War

Now that the identity-behavior connection is established, it is time to focus on the second point of investigation of this article: to what extent do the dominant ideational structures in the international society exert an impact on this identity-behavior connection? In other words how do the dominant norms and beliefs in the international society affect the instrumentalization of values coming from identities? This second question could be best answered under the light of changes in the international society through the beginning of the Cold War.

The Cold War is marked in the diplomatic history with an ideological division and geopolitical competition between the US and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The existence of two poles and the attempts of both superpowers to expand their zones of influence were the prominent features of the international society. Nuclear armament, strategic rivalry, and hard powers were the words most spoken Under these circumstances it was not surprising that ideas and norms related to human rights, as well as to global concerns such as global warming, global economic inequality, or refugee problems, could not find a place in world politics since the primary concern of the international society was rather the rights and duties of states. Although issues related to human and/or global responsibilities were on the agenda of the United-Nations (UN) with the adoption of many covenants and agreements, there was "a striking disjunction between some UN rhetoric and aspiration on the one hand, and what actually happens on the other".[52] In that sense, it appeared that principles such as state sovereignty and non-intervention overrode human and global concerns, which demonstrated the pluralist tendency of the international society[53].

---

[52] Adam Roberts, "Order/ Justice Issues in the United-Nations", in *Order and Justice in International Relations,* eds. Rosemary Foot, John Gaddis, Andrew Hurrell, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p.51.

[53] As said by Bull form the ES, the international order in the Cold War was "inhospitable to projects for the realisation of world justice" and it was also "inhospitable to demands for human justice". Bull, *The Anarchical,* pp.83, 85.

In other words, the existence of a universal standard of morality at the human and global scales seemed to be an illusion during the Cold War.

Under the Cold War circumstances it became inevitable for the US to determine a strategy mainly addressing the question of how to deal with the USSR. Starting from the Presidency of Truman, each President released a foreign policy doctrine aiming at the containment of the USSR and therefore at the assistance of "free peoples in their struggles against totalitarian regimes", as said in the Truman Doctrine[54], although the instruments to reach this aim differed from President to President. Once the ultimate goal of the US became to contain the USSR, as launched by a State Department officer based in the Soviet Union, George Kennan, it seems possible to say that it induced the US to act inconsistently with its solidarism. In effect, American cosmopolitanism, which was encouraging the US to promote individual liberal rights and their universal validity, transformed under the dominant ideational structures of the Cold War into a strategy based on the belief of American rightness dealing with the Soviet evilness. In effect the Cold War circumstances paved the way for the US' adoption of a superpower status, which therefore led to American engagement in many regional conflicts against the Soviet expansion. The point was that during the Cold War, US foreign policy was not based on its liberal values coming from its identity but it was mainly based on east-west rivalry. In other words, the US had to act under the Cold War circumstances to keep the international order in favor of the Western camp, at the expense of neglecting its cosmopolitan values such as its human responsibilities.[55]

---

54 *The Truman Doctrine 1947*, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine> (Accessed on 20 July 2015)

55 Indeed American insensitivity to human rights was a prominent feature of the American foreign policy during the Cold War. To see the details, please look at: John Lewis Gaddis, "Order versus Justice: An American Foreign Policy Dilemma", in *Order and Justice in International Relations,* eds. Foot, Gaddis, Hurrell, pp.155-175. Also see from the same author, Gaddis, "Morality and the American Experience in the Cold War", in *The United States and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992),.pp.47-64.

The American support of authoritarian regimes in different parts of the world, the armament fuelled by the US to the Arab-Israeli conflict throughout the 1960s and 70s[56], and US' inconsistent and unexpected manners in the pretext of containing communism such as the case of the Iran- contra-scandal over the course of Iran-Iraq war in 1984[57] were all critical examples which demonstrated how far the US could go to promote Western interests in a world divided between the US and the USSR. The only exception to this strategy based on the east-west rivalry was the first half of President Carter's period, the President who promised to bring moral conceptions and more clearly peace and "justice" at the core of the US foreign policy. But as seen in diplomatic history, this approach promoted by Carter was quickly damaged by the Iranian Islamic Revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan after which President Carter had to rearrange American foreign policy and returned to a strategy mainly based on east-west rivalry.[58] All these points made clear that the Cold War circumstances provided inevitably for the US a superpower role whose strategy was to be based on east-west rivalry. Indeed the solidarism, which had been embedded in American cosmopolitanism was in a serious deformation under

---

56 There is an important number of works on the US' arms flow to the Arab-Israeli conflict. For some of them see: John P. Miglietta, *American Alliance Policy in the Middle East, 1945-1992* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2002); Mitchell Geoffrey Bard, *The Water's Edge and Beyond* (New Brunswick: Transactions Publishers, 1991); Andrew Cockburn, Leslie Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison: the Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship.* (London: Bodley Head Publications, 1991)

57 The upshot of the US' secret arms sales to Iran during Iran-Iraq war and the use of its profits to support the anti-communist rebels in Nicaragua who were fighting against the regime had deeply damaged the US administration led by the President Ronald Reagan. See the report prepared by the special commission responsible for investigating this: *President's Special Review Board (The Tower Commission Report)* (New York: Bantam Books/Times Books, 1987)

58 The radical u- turn in Carter's foreign policy in the second half of his presidency is quite significant in the sense that it shows how much role play the Cold War circumstances in the determination of US foreign policy. Steven W. Hook, John Spanier, *American Foreign Policy Since World War II* (Washington D.C: CQ Press, 2007), pp.150-165.

the Cold War circumstances, since "alignment only with democratic states, which there were all too few, might make the US implementation of its containment policy impossible", as mentioned by Hook and Spanier.[59] Under these circumstances, the US was neither capable of realize the requirements of solidarism as seen above, nor those of pluralism since American interventions in many countries of the Third World resulting from the fear that nationalism in these countries could open the way for communism were "Washington's most questionable actions during the Cold War".[60] This dilemma had been a persistent one for Washington during the whole Cold War period.

While the dominant ideational structures of the Cold War affected the US' behavior in world politics in this manner, the impact of the Cold War on Turkey's foreign policy emerged in the 1940's first as a search by Turkey for a strong ally against the Soviet threat. The Soviet demands on Turkey in 1945 related to the revision of Turkey's eastern national borders and to the change on the status of the straits were the main reasons lying behind Turkish concerns. Turkish-American rapprochement, which was inevitable in that sense, concretized dramatically in the second half of the 1940's against the common peril.[61] Despite this close alliance which would be officially registered by Turkey's adherence to NATO in 1952, the impact of the Cold War on Turkey's foreign policy did not remain limited to Turkish commitment to the US in the long term but instead manifested itself as a strategy mainly based on the rights and duties of states, with a special focus on the principle of non-intervention into the regional conflicts, particularly starting from the 1960s. In effect, Turkish communitarianism which had been inducing Turkey to find the middle way between its global and local duties encouraged Turkey in this period to reconcile its NATO liabilities

---

59 Hook and Spanier, *American Foreign Policy,* p.48.

60 Gaddis, "Order versus Justice", p.161.

61 To see the details of the first signs of Turkish-American rapprochement please refer to Gül İnanç, Şuhnaz Yılmaz, "Gunboat diplomacy: Turkey, USA and the Advent of the Cold War", *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vol.43, No.3 (2012),pp.401-411; Oral Sander, "Turkey: the Staunchest Ally of the United-States?", *Milletlerarası Münasebetler Yıllığı* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1977).

(the inevitable consequence of Turkish membership to the Western camp since 1952) with its relations with the regional countries. This middle way stemming from Turkish communitarianism concretized under the Cold War circumstances as a strategy embracing the principles of non-intervention in other states' domestic affairs, namely priority of diplomacy for the resolution of conflicts, the enhancing economic cooperation, and as far as possible, neutrality vis-à-vis the regional conflicts.[62]

---

62 This strategy is called "benevolent neutrality" by Aykan, and it was a product of the lessons Turkey learned from the 1950's. Mahmut Bali Aykan, *Turkey's Role in the Organization of the Islamic Conference: 1960-1992* (New York: Vantage Press, 1994), p.348.

Indeed, a short flashback to the 1950's shows that the then foreign policy of Turkey had deviated from the requirements of Turkish communitarianism since the main motive lying behind Turkish foreign policy was mostly anticommunism, a universal ideology. At the time, Turkey, being a member of NATO had preferred to represent the Western alliance in the Middle East by promoting regional pacts such as the Baghdad Pact that could ensure Western influence over the Middle East, or by inducing the US to intervene into the regional problems such as the Syrian, Iraqi and Jordanian crises in the second half of the 1950's. In that sense, as said by Uslu, "The Turkish approach to the Middle East in 1950's was mainly a result of demands of their partners within the NATO alliance", in *The Turkish-American Relationship Between 1947-2003, The History of a Distinctive Alliance* (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2003), p.134. As a consequence, Turkey was perceived by its Middle Eastern neighbours as the official voice of the Western camp led by the US, and its credibility was steadily questioned. According to them, Turkey was deprived from neutrality in regional affairs due to its identification with the West. The most biting consequence of this perception was that Turkey lacked the support of the Middle Eastern states in the Cyprus issue at the beginning of the 1960's. The economic problems Turkey faced at the time can also be traced back to Turkey's isolated position from the Islamic world accompanied with its deteriorating relations with the US because of the Jupiter missile crisis in 1962 and the Cyprus issue in 1964. All these points induced Turkey to undergo a shift from the West to the Islamic world in the ensuing decades and to find a balance between them. Look for the details: Aykan, *Turkey's Role,* pp.38-64.

It appears that the dominant ideational structures of the Cold War period affected Turkey's behaviors in world politics in a manner that was in conformity with its communitarianism. In effect Turkish communitarianism, which had been hitherto inducing Turkey to adopt a balanced strategy between its different duties transformed under the Cold War circumstances into a strategy mainly based on the preservation of its local interests without damaging its global duties. In addition to this, this strategy Turkey adopted throughout the Cold War was consistent with the pluralist foundations of Turkish communitarianism. It was remarkable that during that time Turkey applied a foreign policy embracing basically the principles of state sovereignty and non-intervention.

The concrete examples of this strategy applied by Turkey starting from the 1960's are crucial in the sense that they demonstrate clearly the points of divergence with the US. In effect, with this strategy deriving from Turkish communitarianism but which is also shaped by the Cold War circumstances, Turkey ceased to perceive the USSR as a menace and defended the regionalization of Middle East security, arguing that the stability of the region was the task of the regional countries instead of global powers. Concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict, Turkey refused to open its bases to the use of the US to help Israel. Although Turkey gave support to the Palestinian cause, it did not openly favor Palestinian independence in the 1960's and was very careful in its relations with Israel. Indeed Turkey refrained from condemning Israel as "the aggressor" and tried to continue its delicate relations with this country.[63] Not only in the Arab-Israeli issue, but in other regional developments as well such as the Iranian Islamic Revolution, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the war between Iraq and Iran of 1980-1988, although the threats against Turkey's national security had increased in the eyes of Turkish leaders, Turkey made efforts to adopt a

---

[63] To see the details of this balanced foreign policy adopted by Turkey related to the Arab-Israeli issue, see Mahmut Bali Aykan, "The Palestinian Question in Turkish Foreign Policy from the 1950s to the 1990s", *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* Vol.25, No.1 (1993), pp. 94-100. See also Kemal H. Karpat (ed.), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition 1950-1974* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), p.131.

position as neutral as possible by reconciling its global and local duties and refrained from any kind of economic and military alliance which could damage its cautious stance.[64] Nevertheless, Turkey also made efforts to do nothing that could be evaluated as a deviation from its pro-Western foreign policy by ensuring that its role in the Western alliance would not harm its relations with its Middle Eastern neighbors. As said before, this policy of a "middle way" was a product of its identity that is summarized as Turkish communitarianism in this article, but it was also fed by Cold War circumstances. Although many divergences occurred between Turkey and the US particularly related to the conflicts mentioned above, these divergences did not damage deeply the Turkish-American alliance since both were parts of the Western camp. In other words, although Turkish communitarianism and American cosmopolitanism paved the way for each a different standard of behavior in world politics, the Cold War circumstances providing a pluralist atmosphere in the international society favored the appeasement of their divergences. In that sense it could be predicted that the end of the Cold War would be marked by the resurgence of divergences in Turkish-American relations.

Instead of a Conclusion: The post-Cold War Period and the Nature of Current Problems in Turkish-American relations

Unlike the Cold War period during which moral questions were not on the agenda of the international society, the post-Cold War period started with a drastic change in the place of human and global concerns in world politics. Human rights and problems such as global economic inequality, global warming, global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction (WMD), refugees, and ethnic and sectarian conflicts have become the main topics of concern. With the replacement of inter-state wars and geopolitical

---

64 Meliha Benli Altunışık, "The Middle East in Turkey-USA Relations: Managing the Alliance", *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol.15, No.2 (2013),pp.159-161; Mahmut Bali Aykan, "Türkiye'nin Basra Körfezi güvenliği politikası: 1979- 1988", *ODTÜ Geliştirme Dergisi,* **Vol.**21, No.1 (1994),p. 57.

and strategic bipolarization of the world by intra-state conflicts and other threats without boundaries, it is not a specific state or a group of states which are threatened but these are humans and humankind at the global scale which are under risk. The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today lies in this non-identifiable feature of the new threats.

The ultimate consequence of this change in the nature of threat in the post-Cold War period has been an increased awareness of human suffering and that of the threat it poses at the global scale, which led therefore to the change of the dominant norms and beliefs in the international society. Today humankind is in a period of transition from a world where the principle bearers of rights and duties were states to a world where actors other than states emerge and where exceptions to the rights and duties of states are perceived as being reasonable. Indeed, as said by Shaw, the emergence of the concept of "global responsibility" brings inevitably the breach of the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention, which necessitates the systemic intervention of the international society in individual states.[65] The most concrete outcome of this intervention has been so far the concept of "humanitarian intervention".[66] In that sense it could be appropriate to mention that "the normative structure of international society has moved significantly in the direction of greater solidarism", as Hurrell said[67], and thus to suggest that the transition from a pluralist world to a solidarist one is under way.

This period of transition and the changing ideational structures of the international society pave also the way for the modifications in states' behaviors. The US could be predicted to

65 Martin Shaw, "Global Society and Global Responsibility", in *International Society after the Cold War: Anarchy and Order Reconsidered*, eds. Richard Fawn, Jeremy Larkins (London: MacMillan Press, 1996), p.59.
66 Look for instance at Nicholas J. Wheeler and Justin Morris, "Humanitarian Intervention and State Practice at the end of the Cold War", in *International Society after the Cold War*, eds. Fawn, Larkins, pp.135-171.
67 Andrew Hurrell, "Order and Justice in International Relations: What is at Stake?", in *Order and Justice in International Relations*, eds. Foot, Gaddis and Hurrell, p.39.

return to its solidarism embedded in its cosmopolitanism in the post-Cold War period with the disappearance of the Soviet threat. Indeed at the beginnings of the 1990's, there was a euphoria that an international order encompassing justice could exist. In other words, there was a rising expectation that an international order composed principally of states could also be the protector of the rights of humans and humankind in general by being more sensitive to human and global concerns. The famous speech launched by President George H.W. Bush in the wake of the Gulf crisis in 1990 on the "New World Order" was the precursor of such a world.[68] Indeed with the Gulf crisis, the world had witnessed how supporting directly or indirectly an authoritarian leader, in this case Saddam Hussein, who had been abusing human rights by using WMD against his own population as it was the case in the Kurdish town of Halabja in 1988, could bring devastating consequences such as the invasion of Kuwait by the same leader. The US' continued support of the Iraqi regime during the periods of the worst human rights violations was remarkable in that sense. The boomerang effect of the long-lasting American and Western policies in the Middle East had become suddenly visible in 1990 through the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq in August 1990.[69] From this perspective, there was a

---

68 George H.W. Bush, "Toward a New World Order", Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Persian Gulf Crisis and the Federal Budget Deficit, 11 September 1990, (Accessed on 20 July 2015), <http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2217&year=1990&month=9>

69 In effect, Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against the Kurdish population in Halabja was well known by the American officials. There were important UN reports that were paying attention to the use of WMD by Hussein. Despite this, American support to the Iraqi regime during that time was remarkable since Iraq was at war with Iran between 1980-1988. Indeed as seen in the official documents issued by the US Department of State, the US was well aware that there were significant human rights violations in the country due to the chemical warfare launched by the Iraqi regime against the Kurdish population, which led to the US condemnation of Iraq. But it was also noticed that these condemnations did not lead to economic or political measures against Iraq. In addition to this, the continuation of US subsidies and other economic aid as well as limited military assistance to Iraq had

growing awareness that politics mainly based on national responsibilities, without considering human and global ones, could be dangerous for the peace and stability of the whole world. In that sense, the expectations about American cosmopolitanism's adoption of a pure solidarism with the outbreak of Gulf crisis were not so unrealistic.

Besides, Turkey faced the truth that it would no longer continue to apply its pluralist approach in world politics with the end of the Cold War. Indeed the connections between domestic politics and foreign policy, between democracy, human rights and peace, and between morality and national interests were established and many discussions related to these connections started to be held in the Turkish Parliament at the beginnings of the 1990's due to the Gulf crisis.[70] It was the common perception of Turkish decision makers that a leader ignoring his human and global responsibilities could be a real danger for the security and the stability not only for his region but also for the whole world. And all these paved the way for the rise of a new trend in Turkey's foreign policy: the trend of transition from pluralism to solidarism. Indeed, the main challenge Turkey has faced in the post-Cold War period is this trend which necessitates the reconciliation of his communitarianism with the requirements of the changing ideational structures of the international society. In other words, the reconciliation of the rights and duties of states with those of humans would be the main problematic Turkey has to manage in this period.

The first sign of Turkish attempts to adapt itself to the new circumstances of the post-Cold War era came when Turkey departed from its traditional principle of non-intervention/non-

---

contributed to the Iraqi government's efforts for the development of its biological weapons' capacity. Donald Riegle, "Arming Iraq: Biological Agent Exports Prior to the Gulf War". Statement of Senator Donald Riegle, 9 February 1994.

70 An important number of statements on these connections were issued by different parliamentarians in the wake of the Gulf crisis. For instance see the statement issued by Bülent Akarcalı, a parliamentarian from the political party in power (ANAP) in the parliamentary session of Turkish Grand National Assembly, dated 20 January 1990. *Turkish Grand National Assembly Reports,* Period: 18, Vol: 55, 20 January 1991, p.373.

involvement into the regional conflicts. Turkey's decision to take part in the international coalition launching Operation Desert Storm against Iraqi troops to expel them from Kuwait in 1991 was an important deviation from the approach adopted by Turkey during the Cold War in the Middle East. Nevertheless, it was also the sign of Turkey's attempt to find a balanced strategy between its macro and micro responsibilities, a basic component of its communitarianism. The second sign of Turkey's deviation from its strict pluralist position concretized when Turkey proposed the establishment of a "safe haven" in Northern Iraq, a special zone exempted from Iraq's sovereignty to protect Kurdish civilians from the Iraqi leader's repressive measures. Particularly this move to breach the state sovereignty of Iraq in the name of protecting the Kurdish population was an important demonstrator how much power the changing ideational structures of the international society were able to exert into the behaviors of Turkey and how much efforts Turkey did to meet its human and global responsibilities. Nevertheless, the fact that Turkey faced critical security problems due to the rising terrorist activities emanating from Northern Iraq in the subsequent years revealed the difficulty for Turkey to reconcile the rights and duties of states with those of humans.[71] In that sense it seems appropriate to mention that the change in the dominant norms and beliefs in the international society induced a modification in the conception of morality in Turkey's foreign policy. Turkey's identity summarized as Turkish communitarianism in this article, which paves the way for a pluralist conception of world politics and which induces Turkey to preserve its national interests by respecting the requirements coming from outside, attempts to adapt itself to the changing circumstances in the international society. But it is worth noting that this adaptation is the main challenge Turkey is still facing today since it is not always easy to find a peaceful reconciliation of national responsibilities with human and global ones.

It is also true that the Turkish-American alliance has experienced much more ups-and-downs in the post-Cold War era than before.

---

71 For a detailed account of Turkey's foreign policy in the Gulf crisis and its relations with the US, see William Hale, *Turkey, the US and Iraq* (London: The London Middle East Institute, 2007)

The reasons lying behind this are mainly challenges faced by Turkey due to the changing ideational structures of the international society on the one hand, and the US' tendency to use solidarism as a tool to intervene in regional conflicts on the other. Turkey was increasingly disturbed for instance by the US' approach related to Northern Iraq over the course of the 1990's. There was a general perception among Turkish decision makers that the US was supporting the creation of an independent entity in Northern Iraq, which could be a counter-power against Saddam Hussein's regime. Also in the next decade, Turkey's concerns about American intentions in the Middle East intensified with the war in Iraq in 2003. In effect, the basic arguments of the US to invade Iraq in 2003 were stated by the key names of the administration and they were mainly linked to human and global concerns. But the post-invasion developments in Iraq, such as the facts that there were no WMD found on Iraqi soil[72], no connection between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaida[73], and also the human rights abuses in the Abu Ghraib prison, have all put American credibility into question in Turkish decision makers' minds. All these factors, by raising doubts on American sincerity for human and global concerns, inevitably revealed that solidarism deriving from American cosmopolitanism had limits. In that sense, the optimistic projections of the early post-Cold War period on the solidarist tendency of the international society was quickly dispelled by the subsequent US foreign policy strategies particularly related to Middle East. The disappointment on the solidarism in the world of today is also reminiscent of Bull's vision on the pluralist-solidarist distinction and his predictions about the use of morality by big powers as a tool to ensure their own interests.

This article has surveyed the origins of the divergences in Turkish-American relations highlighting the effects of both their

---

72 See Duelfer Report: "Charles Duelfer Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the DCI on Iraq's WMD" 25 April 2005, (Accessed on 12 July 2015) <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-DUELFERREPORT/content-detail.html>

73 "The 9/11 Commission Report", 16 June 2004, (Accessed on 15 July 2015), <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/report/911Report.pdf>, p.65.

identities and the ideational structures of the international society on them. It has argued that Turkey's identity conceptualized as Turkish communitarianism on the one hand and the US' identity defined as American cosmopolitanism on the other brings respectively different conceptions of morality, which leads to different frameworks of behavior for each. But these behaviors are also exposed to outside dynamics that are the dominant norms and beliefs of the international society. Although Turkish communitarianism and American cosmopolitanism pave the way for different patterns respectively in Turkish foreign policy and American foreign policy and thus creates divergences in Turkish-American relations, these divergences were appeased to some extent due to the pluralist tendency in the international society during the Cold War. Nevertheless the changing ideational structures in the post-Cold War period, defined as the transition from pluralism to solidarism in this article, served to deepen the divergences in bilateral relations. The undeniable nature of ups and downs in Turkish-American relations in the post-Cold War era can be thus linked to the resurgence of morality in world politics and to the subjective content of the concept combined with its exploitable nature, which is reminiscent of Hedley Bull's concerns on solidarism. It remains to be seen though if Turkey and the US will be keen enough to overcome these divergences.