

**REPRESENTATIONS AS A FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS TOOL IN SOVIET-
TURKISH RELATIONS (1920-1946): A CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST
APPROACH**

A Master's Thesis

by

KIVANÇ COŞ

**Department of
International Relations**

**Bilkent University
Ankara
July 2006**

to Michel Foucault

**REPRESENTATIONS AS A FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS TOOL IN SOVIET-
TURKISH RELATIONS (1920-1946): A CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST
APPROACH**

**The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University**

by

KIVANÇ COŞ

**In Partial Fullfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS**

in

**THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA**

July 2006

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assistant Professor Pınar Bilgin
Thesis Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assistant Professor Nur Bilge Criss
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assistant Professor Oktay F. Tanrısever
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

REPRESENTATIONS AS A FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS TOOL IN SOVIET-TURKISH RELATIONS (1920-1946): A CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH

Coş, Kıvanç
M.A., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Pınar Bilgin

July 2006

This thesis provides an account of Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Soviet Union in the inter-war and post-war eras from a critical constructivist point of view. It is argued that the radically different responses given by Turkish Foreign Policy makers to the contextually similar demands of the Soviet Union was allowed by the (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union in Turkish Foreign Policy discourse. It is further indicated that the Soviet ‘demands’ throughout the inter-war years did not alter the ‘sincere friend’ identity of the Soviet Union, while similar ‘demands’ in the post-war era entirely changed the identity of the Soviet Union to an ‘enemy’. Whereas the ‘sincere friend’ identity allowed for maintaining good relations

with the Soviet Union, the ‘enemy’ identity allowed the move towards the United States as opposed to the Soviet Union.

Keywords: Critical Constructivism, Representations, Identity, Threat, Soviet-Turkish Relations, Turkish Straits

ÖZET

1920-1946 YILLARI ARASINDAKİ TÜRK-SOVYET İLİŞKİLERİNİN İNCELENMESİNDE DIŞ POLİTİKA ANALİZ ARACI OLARAK TEMSİLLER: ELEŞTİREL İNŞACI BİR YAKLAŞIM

Coş, Kıvanç
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Pınar Bilgin

Temmuz 2006

Bu tez, Türk Dış Politikası'nın 2. Cihan Harbi öncesinde ve sonrasında Sovyetler Birliği'ne yaklaşımını eleştirel inşacı bir bakış açısından incelemektedir. Türk Dış Politikası'nın karar mercilerinin Sovyetler Birliği'nin benzer taleplerine verdiği köklü biçimdeki değişik tepkilerin, Türk Dış Politikası söylemindeki Sovyetler Birliği temsilinin (yeniden) inşası sayesinde mümkün kılındığı savunulmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, 2. Cihan Harbi öncesindeki Sovyet 'taleplerinin' Türk Dış Politikası söylemindeki Sovyetler Birliği'nin 'samimi dost' kimliğinde herhangi bir değişikliğe neden olmazken, 2. Cihan Harbi sonrasındaki benzer 'taleplerin' Sovyet kimliğinin tamamiyle değişip 'düşman' olarak inşa edilmesine yol açtığı belirtilmektedir. 'Samimi

dost' kimliđi, 'taleplere' rađmen Sovyetler Birliđi ile dostane iliřkilerin korunmasını mmkn kılarken, 2. Cihan Harbi sonrasında (yeniden) inřa edilen 'dřman' kimliđi, Trk Dıř Politikası'nın Sovyetlere karřı Amerika Birleřik Devletleri lehine yn almasını mmkn kılmıřtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eleřtirel İnřacı kuram, Temsiller, Kimlik, Tehdit, Trk-Sovyet iliřkileri, Bođazlar

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Pinar Bilgin for her intimate attention during the realization of this thesis. Without her guidance, this humble work would not have been completed. Furthermore, Nur Bilge Criss for her insightful comments should be thanked.

Also I would like to thank to my family and friends who had supported me for so many years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: REALIST AND CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACHES TO FOREIGN POLICY: CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.....	9
1.1. Realism.....	11
1.1.1. Main concepts of the realist tradition — power and national interest.....	14
1.1.2. Waltz, Walt and Schweller’s alliance theories.....	17
1.1.3. The explanatory power of alliance theories for the Turkish case	19
1.2. Critical Constructivism.....	23

1.2.1. Epistemological and ontological foundations of critical constructivism.....	25
1.2.2. Critical constructivist accounts of foreign policy.....	30
1.3. Conclusion.....	35
CHAPTER 2: SOVIET-TURKISH RELATIONS IN THE INTER-WAR ERA	
EPISODE ONE: ‘SINCERE’ FRIENDSHIP AND SOVIET ‘DEMANDS’ FOR JOINT DEFENSE OF THE STRAITS.....	
36	
2.1. Soviet-Turkish relations and the Straits during the Turkish War of Independence and Lausanne.....	37
2.1.1. Initiation of relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union and the 1921 Treaty of Friendship.....	42
2.1.2. Soviet Union’s material support for the independence movement.....	46
2.1.3. The Straits and the Lausanne Peace Conference.....	47
2.2. Soviet-Turkish relations after the War of Independence.....	48
2.2.1. Intensification of Soviet-Turkish relations during the 1930s.....	50
2.2.2. Montreux Conference and the Soviet ‘demands’ for bases.....	53
2.2.3. The ‘gathering storm’ and 1939 negotiations for alliance.....	57
2.3. Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER 3: SOVIET-TURKISH RELATIONS DURING THE POST-WAR ERA EPISODE TWO: ‘STALIN’S DEMANDS’ ON THE STRAITS AND THE ‘SOVIET IMPERIALISM’	
63	

3.1.	The Second World War and Soviet-Turkish relations: the emergence of the ‘air of suspicion’ and ‘mutual distrust’	64
3.1.1.	The (re)construction of the representation of Turkey in the Soviet Union into a ‘potential source of conflict’	67
3.1.2.	Conferences of the ‘Big Three’: The Soviets begin to ‘reveal their insidious nature’	69
3.2.	Sarper-Molotov talks: the ‘crisis’ begins.....	71
3.2.1.	‘Stalin’s demands’ and (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union.....	75
3.3.	Potsdam Conference and the internationalization of the ‘crisis’	80
3.3.1.	Soviet notes, Turkish replies.....	87
3.4.	Conclusion.....	90
	CONCLUSION.....	91
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	99

INTRODUCTION

On 7 June 1945, Vyacheslav Molotov, then-Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, informed Selim Sarper, Turkish Ambassador to Moscow, that certain issues had to be agreed upon to maintain the ‘friendly’ relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union: (1) the Kars and Ardahan districts had to be retroceded to the Soviet Union; (2) Soviet Union should have bases located at the Straits for the joint-defense of the Straits; (3) the two countries would have to agree on the revision of the Montreux Convention before convening a multilateral conference. For the Turkish foreign policy makers in the immediate aftermath of World War II (WWII), Soviet demands of 1945-46 for bases positioned at the Turkish Straits and for territorial concessions regarding Northeastern Turkey constituted an obvious security threat to Turkish independence and sovereignty. It was not only policy makers but also prominent newspapers and analysts of Turkish foreign policy who confirmed and reaffirmed this conception of the Soviet demands. It was argued that facing a clear and severe security threat to its existence from the Soviet Union, Turkey sided with the Western World and its leading ‘protector’, the United States, to preserve its survival as an independent state. But did the mere fact of Soviet

demands of 1945-46 render inevitable the confrontational relationship between Turkey and the Soviet Union that ensued?

The answer for the policy makers was quite straightforward. These ‘unjustified’ demands were not only ‘shocking’, but also totally ‘unexpected’ and ‘unthought-of,’¹ according to İsmet İnönü, who was at the time the President of Turkey. According to Feridun Cemal Erkin, who was at the time the General Secretary of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, the 1945-46 demands demonstrated that the Soviet Union had been prisoner to “age old ambitions of the Tsars.”² Thus, the clear aim of the Soviet Union was to control the Straits and Turkey. And, if the Soviets insisted on territorial concessions and on pursuing Tsarist policies, the enmity of the nineteenth century would be certainly revived, maintained Kâzım Karabekir, an influential member of the Parliament.³ Any discussion of the threat was deemed to be fruitless, since “even the children know what the national security threat is [: the Soviet Union].”⁴ It was also stressed that the only reason for the deterioration of Soviet-Turkish relations was the change in Soviet foreign policy, most clearly exemplified by the 1945-46 demands. On the other hand, Turkish foreign policy, which was broadly defined by Şükrü Saracoğlu as protecting Turkey’s independence and sovereignty⁵, was represented as the same as in the past.

¹ Nazmi Kal, İsmet İnönü: Televizyonda Anlattıklarım (Ankara: Bilgi, 1993), 79.

² Feridun Cemal Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), 254.

³ Kâzım Karabekir, T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, 7. Dönem, 20 Aralık 1945, cilt 20 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946), 256-259.

⁴ T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, 8. Dönem, 4 Aralık 1946, cilt 3 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1947), 16. For the entire discussion, see T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, cilt 3, 13-24.

⁵ Mümtaz Faik Fenik, “Dış politikamızda devamlılık,” Ulus, 12 Temmuz 1945. Also see “Boğazlar meselesi,” Cumhuriyet, 6 Aralık 1945.

Although the 1946-46 demands were represented by the major actors of foreign policy making of the time as the indication that the Soviet Union had deviated from its friendly policy towards Turkey and gone back to the imperialistic policy of Tsarist Russia, the mere fact of the 1945-46 demands cannot be considered as having determined the course of Soviet-Turkish relations in the following years. After all, very similar demands for the joint defense of the Straits and for territorial concessions were put forth by the Soviet Union throughout the period between 1920 and 1939, an era of ‘sincere friendship’ between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Like the 1945-46 demands, those demands were rejected by Turkey, but Soviet-Turkish relations were not allowed to deteriorate, and the Soviet Union was not represented as a threat to Turkish independence and sovereignty. This contrast between the inter-war and post-war character of Turkey’s policy towards the Soviet Union has inspired this thesis. Put as a question: How can we understand the difference in representations of the Soviet threat in Turkish foreign policy discourse in the inter-war and post-war eras? I address this question by analyzing the processes through which the representation of the Soviet Union was (re)constructed to enable Turkish foreign policy before and after WWII.

Although the realist tradition, the most prominent approach to international relations (IR) and Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA), have introduced a number crucial concepts for the study of foreign policy (such as state interest, power, security and threat), their treatment of these concepts cause serious limitations for understanding this puzzle. First, realist accounts of foreign policy treat their ‘object of study’, the state, and its interests as exogenously given and fixed. Although some limited freedom is given to states regarding how national interest should be pursued (balancing or internal increases

in power), the interpretation of security, threat, national interest or survival by different states at different times is totally discarded.⁶ Furthermore, the deductive derivation of the fundamental concepts of the realist tradition from the anarchy and self-help assumptions leads to a conception of those concepts “that is too broad, too general, too vague, too all-inclusive to explain state action.”⁷ Second, realism’s metaphysical portrait of states, their interests and foreign policies as pre-given and fixed, dependent on a positivist epistemology, which assumes that concepts like national interest, power, threat can be ‘realistically’ and ‘objectively’ assessed by the policy makers and analysts both.

Yet, acting upon ‘reality’ always requires interpretation. When a state is faced with a particular situation, it first needs to define what the situation is. Then, the national interest of the state with respect to that situation is determined.⁸ However, determining whether or not a particular situation constitutes a threat, and deciding on the corresponding national interest is never self-evident. For example, determining that the 1945-46 demands of the Soviet Union constituted an ‘obvious’ security threat to Turkish independence and sovereignty was the result of significant ‘interpretive labor’⁹ on the part of Turkish decision makers. Initially, these demands were differentiated from similar demands of the Soviet Union before WWII. Then, the Soviet policy toward Turkey was combined with those of Tsarist Russia and Nazi Germany. Presented as such the Turkish national interest was represented as resisting the Soviet threat and strengthening Turkey’s security by allying with the Western powers, especially the United States.

⁶ Jutta Weldes, Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis (United States of America: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 278.

⁷ Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 6.

⁸ Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 7.

⁹ Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 8.

Students of the realist tradition point to the change in the international context between the inter-war and post-war era in order to account for the change in Turkish foreign policy. According to the realist alliance theory, the emergence of a bipolar system in the post-war period ‘necessitated’ Turkey to ‘bandwagon’ against the Soviet Union. However, ‘bandwagoning’ defined by the prominent contributors of alliance theory, namely Kenneth Waltz, Stephen M. Walt, and Randell L. Schweller, does not fit the Turkish case. Waltz emphasis on ‘power’ fails to explain the excessive references given in the Turkish foreign policy discourse to the Soviet ‘threat’. On the other hand, Turkish decision to ally with the West falls under the category of ‘balancing’, not ‘bandwagoning’ in Walt and Schweller’s theories. Realism, with its assumption that states respond to threats that are objectively given (and can be objectively assessed), cannot account for the difference in Turkey’s foreign policy adopted towards similar Soviet demands in different periods. In order to explain this difference, the utilization of other analytical tools is necessary.

In contrast to realism’s ‘static’ and ‘fixed’ conception of states and their interests, critical constructivists analyze foreign policy as a discursive social construct. Discourses are structures of signification, in which a set of rules and procedures are linguistically put into play for the formation of objects, speakers and themes.¹⁰ Although ‘social reality’ is composed of diverse and competing discourses, for the purposes of critical scrutiny critical constructivists are inclined to study dominant or hegemonic discourse(s). Correspondingly, critical constructivist studies, especially in the study of foreign policy, choose to focus predominantly, but not exclusively, on the officials

¹⁰ Michael J. Shapiro, “Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy: The Representation of ‘Security Policy’ in the Video Age,” *International Studies Quarterly* 34:3 (September 1990): 330.

inhabiting the offices of the state, who are directly engaged in the (re)construction of the dominant or hegemonic discourse.¹¹ The major aim of this critical endeavor is to denaturalize (make strange, problematize, defamiliarize) existing structures of ‘reality’ and ‘knowledge’ by exposing their arbitrariness, and their dependence on power relations and interests in order to open up room for change.¹²

Dominant discourses populate the world with meaning and linguistic tools out of which representations of both the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ are (re)constructed. Furthermore, dominant discourses, through representations of the ‘self’ and the ‘other’, construct a ‘common sense’ that predefines what the ‘intelligible’ and ‘rational’ courses of action and speech are. By labeling certain actions as ‘intelligible’ or ‘rational’ (and others as ‘unintelligible’ or ‘irrational’), ‘common sense’ (re)constructed by dominant discourse(s) performs an enabler/limiter role for foreign policy.¹³ Representations of the objects populating the world, (re)constructed by dominant discourse(s), are significant for the analysis of foreign policy. Foreign policy actors make sense of the world through representations.¹⁴ By the construction of representations, actors at the same time (re)construct the ‘reality’ in which those representations make sense.

¹¹ Jutta Weldes and Diana Saco, “Making State Action Possible: The United States and the Discursive Construction of ‘The Cuban Problem’, 1960-1994,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 25:2 (1996): 377; Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, “US Foreign Policy, Public Memory, and Autism: Representing September 11 and May 4,” Cambridge Review of International Affairs 17:2 (July 2004): 359.

¹² Richard K. Ashley and R. B. J. Walker, “Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies,” International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (1990): 263; James Der Derian, “Post-Theory: The Eternal Return of Ethics in International Relations,” in New Thinking in International Relations Theory, eds. Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, 54-76 (United States of America: Westview Press, 1997), 60.

¹³ For the enabler/limiter effect of discourse, see Roxanne Lynn Doty, “Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent-Structure Problematique in International Relations Theory,” European Journal of International Relations 3:3 (1997): 378.

¹⁴ Weldes, “Constructing National Interests,” 280.

It was noted above that the realist tradition, although pointing to key concepts in the analysis of foreign policy, was limited by the ‘static’ and ‘fixed’ understanding of its concepts. Consequently, the realist approach provides limited insight into the Turkish case. On the other hand, the discursive analysis of foreign policy employed by critical constructivism provides crucial insight for understanding how Turkey’s decision to sever relations with the Soviet Union and the ensuing membership to NATO was rendered sensible and rational. And how other courses of action such as doing nothing, remaining neutral or preserving ‘friendly’ relations with the Soviet Union were excluded, respectively, as ‘irrational’, ‘unworkable’ or ‘ridiculous’. Furthermore, critical constructivism’s key concepts such as representation, discourse, identity and interest provide the students of foreign policy with the analytical tools to understand the changes in states’ foreign policies. For example, the (re)construction of the representation and identity of the Soviet Union in the post-WWII period by Turkish foreign policy makers provides the analyst with the insight to understand the difference in Turkey’s reaction to Soviet demands in the inter-war and post-war eras.

The aim of this thesis is to provide an account of Turkish foreign policy towards the Soviet Union in the inter-war and post-war eras from a critical constructivist perspective. The study has two more specific aims corresponding to the normative and analytical goals of critical constructivism. First, the analytical aim of the study is to examine the constitutive relationship between discourse, representations and identities, and foreign policy. Second, the normative aim of this study is to open up room for change by presenting a critique of the dominant or hegemonic discourses of Turkish foreign policy and exposing the constructedness of Turkish foreign policy discourse.

In order to achieve these aims, the thesis is presented in three chapters. Chapter 1 lays out the theoretical foundations of realism and critical constructivism. It is argued that the ‘static’ and ‘fixed’ conceptualization of power and interest in the analysis of foreign policy limits the explanatory value of realism for the Turkish case. It is further argued that by employing the critical constructivist approach makes up for this limitation. The study then moves on to consider two distinct eras of Soviet-Turkish relations, namely the interwar and post-WWII eras. Chapter 2 focuses on the (re)construction of the Soviet representation in Turkish foreign policy discourse as a ‘sincere friend’ in the inter-war era. It is argued that Turkish foreign policy makers differentiated the representation of the Soviet Union from that of the Russian Empire. This in turn, enabled close relations with the Soviet Union. Close relations became possible, via the ‘sincere friend’ representation of the Soviet Union, even when demands for the joint defense of the Straits were made by the Soviet Union. Chapter 3 argues that the 1945-1946 ‘crisis’ between Turkey and the Soviet Union was not the inevitable product of the ‘Soviet demands’ for ‘unacceptable’ concessions. Rather, the 1945-46 demands and the Soviet Union were represented as ‘threats’ to Turkish ‘sovereignty’ and ‘independence’. This, in turn, became possible through the (re)construction of the Soviet representation as an unfriendly power during and in the immediate aftermath of WWII. It is further argued that Turkey’s decision to ally with the ‘West’ was not an ‘inescapable’ outcome of the Soviet threat, but was made possible by the (re)construction of the representations of the United States as the ‘defender’ and the Soviet Union as the ‘greatest enemy’ of world peace and freedom.

CHAPTER 1

REALIST AND CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACHES TO FOREIGN POLICY: CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The main objective of Chapter 1 is to build the theoretical background for the thesis by pointing to the core arguments of realism and critical constructivism. Chapters 2 and 3 will focus on the enabling or restricting role of the (re)construction of the Soviet representation in Turkish foreign policy discourse from a critical constructivist perspective. Realism has so far been the predominant approach to the analysis of Turkish Foreign Policy (TFP), as well as the study of international relations (IR).¹⁵

¹⁵ On the hegemonic place the realist tradition enjoys in International Relations, see K. J. Holsti, "Hegemony and Challenge in International Theory," chap. in The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory 1-14 (Boston: Allen & Unwin: 1985); Robert O. Keohane, "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond," in International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, eds. Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi, 153-183 (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997); Rey Koslowki and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System," International Organization 48 (1994): 215-247; John A. Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition," American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 899-912; Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" International Security 24:2 (Fall 1999): 5-55, Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, Explaining and

Realism's contributions to our understanding of TFP will be analyzed together with its restrictions. These restrictions, it will be argued, are to a great extent made up by critical constructivism. Hence the dual focus of the Chapter.

In order to make good on this rationale, the presentation of Chapter 1 takes the following steps. Part 1 presents a critical overview of the realist approach to IR and Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA). First main tenets of the realist approach to foreign policy will be identified, while paying attention to the epistemological and ontological assumptions of the realist tradition. Then, the operationalization of key concepts of the realist tradition — power and national interest — will be discussed. This part will end with a critique of the alliance theories of the leading figures of the realist tradition, such as Kenneth Waltz, Stephen M. Walt, and Randell L. Schweller. The analytical power of the realist 'theories' in accounting for Turkey's decision to ally with the West after the Second World War will be examined to illustrate the contributions and limitations of realism in analyzing Turkey's case. In the second part of Chapter 1, critical constructivism and its approach to IR and FPA will be presented. This part of the Chapter will identify the divergence between conventional and critical constructivists. The theoretical reasons for employing a critical constructivist approach will be put forth. Subsequently, the epistemological and ontological stand of critical constructivism will be spelled out. Finally, the main arguments of critical constructivism on discourse analysis, in relation to FPA, will be presented.

Understanding International Relations, (Great Britain: Clarendon Press, 1991); David Campbell, Writing Security: United States and the Politics of Identity, 2nd edn. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 4; Stephen M. Walt, "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," Foreign Policy 110 (1998): 29-46.

1.1. Realism

Realism in IR is a site of contested claims and ontological disputes. It should not be understood as a coherent theoretical position.¹⁶ The following description of realism certainly will leave out some important nuances and it will blur some differences between the authors that are lumped together as contributors to the realist tradition. Nevertheless, this analysis seeks to capture the basic thrust of the tradition by pointing to widely shared epistemological and ontological stances of realists in IR. Similar generalizations lumping together realism, neo-realism, and even neo-liberalism are made by several IR theorists. Emanuel Adler categorizes realists, neo-realists, and neoliberal institutionalists as ‘rationalists’, while labeling postmodernists, poststructuralists, critical theorists, and feminists as ‘interpretive’.¹⁷ John Gerard Ruggie combines neo-realism and neo-liberalism as ‘neo-utilitarianism’.¹⁸ Martin Hollis and Steve Smith divide the discipline into two main traditions: ‘explaining’ and ‘understanding’.¹⁹ Robert Cox differentiates between ‘problem solving’ and ‘critical’ theories.²⁰ Such approaches generate the disadvantages of overgeneralization.²¹

¹⁶ R. B. J. Walker, “Realism, Change, and International Political Theory,” International Studies Quarterly 31:1 (March 1987): 65-86. Also see Walt, “International Relations: One World, Many Theories.”

¹⁷ Emanuel Adler, “Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics,” European Journal of International Relations 3:3 (1997): 319-363.

¹⁸ John Gerard Ruggie, “What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge,” International Organization 52:4 (Autumn 1998): 855-885.

¹⁹ Hollis and Smith, Explaining and Understanding.

²⁰ Robert Cox, “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,” in Neorealism and Its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane, 204-54 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

²¹ For a critique of identifying diverse and ‘irreconcilable’ authors within the realist tradition, see Legro and Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?”; Kenneth N. Waltz, “Evaluating Theories,” American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 913-917.

Realist accounts of foreign policy treat their ‘object of study’, the state, and its interests as exogenously given and fixed.²² States are assumed to be rational actors interacting in an anarchic, self-help international system, in which material or material related capabilities are pivotal.²³ The aims of states in foreign policy are deductively derived from these assumptions, and especially from the anarchy assumption. States ‘rationally’ pursue their aims (be it power-maximization, survival, or security) within an anarchic environment. Yet, the emergence of anarchy or different implications of anarchy on different states at different times is not questioned at all. The logic of self-help, the absence of a supracountry Leviathan, is assumed to be a fixed, omnipresent product of the anarchic nature of international politics.²⁴

Another significant conclusion derived from the anarchy assumption and its ‘logical’ deduction, self-help, is that states are sensitive to relative, not absolute gains.

²² Mark Laffey, “Locating identity: performativity, foreign policy and state action,” Review of International Studies 26 (2000): 430; Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, “Introduction: Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East,” in Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East, eds. Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, 1-25 (New York: Cornell University Press, 2002), 21; Marc Lynch, State Interests and Public Spheres: The international Politics of Jordan’s Identity (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 9-16.

²³ For the role of the state in analysis, see Keohane, “Theory of World Politics,” 156; Charles L. Glaser, “Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help,” International Security 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 54; Joseph M. Grieco, “Realist International Theory and the Study of World Politics,” in New Thinking in International Relations Theory, eds. Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, 163-201 (United States of America: Westview Press, 1997), 164; Kenneth N. Waltz, Theory of International Politics (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979), 94. For the anarchy assumption, see Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 88, 105-107, 111-112; Joseph M. Grieco, “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation,” International Organization 42:3 (Summer 1988): 492-499. For an atypical analysis of self-help, anarchy and their implications for cooperation, see Glaser, “Realists as Optimists.” For the rationality assumption, see Stephen M. Walt, “The Progressive Power of Realism,” American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 932; Kenneth N. Waltz, “Reflections on Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics,” in Noorealism and Its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane, 322-345 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 330-331; Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 113, 118-119; Glaser, “Realists as Optimists,” 54; Grieco, “Realist International Theory,” 165; Legro and Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” 12-13. For the prominence of the ‘material’, see Legro and Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” 16-18; Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, fifth edition (New York: Knopf, 1978), 5; Waltz, “Theory of International Politics,” 93-99.

²⁴ The implications of self-help logic will be discussed in relation to the choice of concepts in explaining state aims and preferences. On the nature and implications of self-help, see Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 105-107, 111-112.

This is because increases in the relative position of one state over another may have fatal implications for the relatively weakened state. So, foreign policies of states should be directed at minimizing relative loss of power or relative gain of power on the adversary's part, which is theoretically every other state.²⁵ Thus, realists ontologically define international politics as a field marked with conflict and competition,²⁶ and try to 'empirically' account for the struggle for power and security in an anarchic world through the employment of generalizations and simplifications.²⁷

Realism's metaphysical portrayal of states and their interests as pre-given and fixed depends on a positivist epistemology,²⁸ which holds that: (1) the same kinds of analysis used in natural sciences are also applicable to the social world; (2) a strict separation between (supposedly theory-neutral) facts and values is required in every aspect of theory; (3) a commitment to identifying patterns and regularities, which exist apart from the ways employed to identify them, in the social world is the main motive behind social theory; (4) empiricism defines what counts as knowledge.²⁹ The strong fact/value distinction of the positivist epistemology rests on the assumption that an

²⁵ Jutta Weldes, "Constructing National Interests," European Journal of International Relations 2:3 (1996): 278.

²⁶ See Joseph M. Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation," International Organization 42:3 (Summer 1988): 492-499. Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 118; Richard K. Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," International Studies Quarterly 25:2 (June 1981): 205; Mervyn Frost, "A turn not taken: Ethics in IR at the Millennium," Review of International Studies 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 123. Also see Martin Hollis, The Philosophy of Social Science (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 64. For an atypical analysis of self-help, anarchy and their implications for cooperation, see Glaser, "Realists as Optimists."

²⁷ Waltz, "Evaluating Theories," 913.

²⁸ It should be mentioned that classical realists like Hans Morgenthau and Reinhold Niebuhr have employed a more lenient positivist approach. And this lenient approach was the main *raison d'être* behind the so-called Second Debate. See Hollis and Smith, Explaining and Understanding, 28-32.

²⁹ Steve Smith, "Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It: Social Construction and International Relations Theory," in Foreign Policy in a Constructed World, ed. Vendulka Kubalkova, 38-55 (United States of America: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2001), 42. Also see Frost, "A turn not taken," 119-132; Steve Smith, "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory: A Reply to Osterud," Journal of Peace Research 34:3 (August 1997): 330-336.

independent and objective reality can be objectively assessed by the analyst.³⁰ Both parts of this axiom are evident in realism. On the objectiveness of reality, Hans J. Morgenthau maintains that “politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.”³¹ Similarly, E. H. Carr writes that “theories do not mould the course of events, but are invented to explain them.”³² On the objectivity of the analyst, John J. Mearsheimer writes: “[t]he principal aim of social science, after all, is to free the analysis of critical social phenomena from the risks of personal prejudice and unsupported assertion.”³³ Through the objectivity assumption, the ‘social reality’ is defined as *a priori* of the constituents of that ‘reality’. Thus ‘social reality’ becomes a natural process of history which is not questioned.

1.1.1. Main concepts of the realist tradition — power and national interest

The claims of the realist tradition regarding the policies of states have to be understood within the analytical framework established by the above stated core assumptions of the realist tradition. The most significant concept employed by the realist tradition is power. Yet, the utilization of the concept somewhat varies among realists, mainly between classical and structural versions of realism. Morgenthau, while forming the basis of his

³⁰ See Jutta Weldes, Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis (United States of America: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 279; Frost, “A turn not taken,” 123.

³¹ Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, 4.

³² E. H. Carr, The Twenty Years’ Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations (London: Macmillan, 1946), 69.

³³ Stanley Hoffmann, Robert O. Keohane, and John J. Mearsheimer, “Back to the Future, Part II: International Relations Theory and Post-Cold War Europe,” International Security 15:2 (Autumn, 1990): 196. For a splendid critique of the objectivity of the analyst assumption, see Ido Oren, “Is Culture Independent of National Security? How America’s National Security Concerns Shaped ‘Political Culture’ Research,” European Journal of International Relations 6:4 (2000): 543-573.

theory on ‘interest defined in terms of power’, maintained that “the struggle for power is universal in time and space and is an undeniable fact of experience.”³⁴ In other words, Morgenthau considered the main aim of states as power maximization and international politics as power politics. Nevertheless, Morgenthau stressed the need to take into account the political and cultural contexts from which foreign policies of particular states originate.³⁵ Yet, the argument for a historical analysis should not indicate a divergence from the primacy of material factors, since power is still considered as a simple quantitative capacity and a zero-sum game.³⁶

Waltz’s structural realism, which claimed to provide a systemic (thus more scientific) and refined version of realism, was a response to behavioralist criticisms of classical realists.³⁷ The focus of structural realism is on the structure, not on particular ‘units’ in the international system. In contrast to Morgenthau, Waltz argues that “if states wished to maximize power, they would join the stronger side, and we would see not balances forming, but a world hegemony forged.”³⁸ According to Waltz, states, in their quest for ensuring survival and security (not power-maximization),³⁹ exhibit “certain repeated and enduring patterns” of the tradition of *Realpolitik*. Waltz argues that the most central pattern of the *Realpolitik* tradition is balance of power, which

³⁴ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 36, a similar formulation is also present on page 10.

³⁵ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 9.

³⁶ Paul Hirst, “The Eighty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1999 — Power,” *Review of International Studies* 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 133.

³⁷ For a condensed account of behavioralism, see Hollis and Smith, *Explaining and Understanding*, 28-36.

³⁸ Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 127.

³⁹ Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 126; also see 91-92. For a critique of structural realists for the neglect of revisionist powers, see Randall L. Schweller, “Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In,” *International Security* 19:1 (Summer 1994): 72-107; for an argument in favor of maximization of relative power, see John J. Mearsheimer, “The False Promise of International Institutions,” *International Security* 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 5-49.

Waltz considers to be the only distinctive theory of international politics.⁴⁰ As the name of the ‘fundamental theory’ of international politics for Waltz suggests the concept of power occupies a central place within the structural version of realism. It is assumed that the distribution of power in the system is an independent reality that can be objectively assessed by the units in the system.⁴¹ This assumption rests on the fungibility of power, in which material factors (mostly military power) play a pivotal role.⁴² Furthermore, structural realism does not take into account the context in which the distribution of power is assessed by a particular state, which played a key role in classical realism.⁴³

Another central concept employed by the realist tradition, especially in explaining state action, is that of ‘national interest.’ In an anarchic international environment marked by ‘competition’ and ‘conflict’, maintain the realists, the national interest of any given state is to ensure its survival and security against encroachments by other states.⁴⁴ Accordingly, ‘good foreign policy’ for a state is fulfilling the requirements of its national interest by ‘rational’ evaluation of the distribution of power in the system.⁴⁵ Yet, when it comes to the question of how ‘good foreign policy’ is conducted, we more clearly see the connection between two predominant concepts of the realist tradition — power and national interest. States have to be powerful enough to successfully pursue their national interests. This is self-evident when Morgenthau

⁴⁰ Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 117. Waltz defines balance of power as the fundamental theory of international politics on pages 5, 6, and 9.

⁴¹ See Weldes, “Constructing National Interests,” 279.

⁴² For the risks of taking power as fungible, see David A. Baldwin, “Power Analysis and World Politics: New Trends versus Old Tendencies,” World Politics 31:2 (January 1979): 161-194; Hirst, “The Eighty Years’ Crisis,” 133-136.

⁴³ While Waltz later accepted that power is not totally fungible, he still maintains that power “is more fungible than [many of my critics] allow.” Waltz, “Reflections on Theory of International Politics,” 333.

⁴⁴ Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 134; Telhami and Barnett, “Introduction,” 16; Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 277-279.

⁴⁵ Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 278.

defines interest in terms of power.⁴⁶ Yet, the same holds for Waltz's structural realism, since balancing of power decreases the relative power of an adversary, and thus increasing one's own relative power. National interest, depending on a strictly fixed conception of power, is also conceived as fixed and uniform for all states by the realist tradition. Although states may choose between balancing or internal increases in power for pursuing their national interests, the interpretation of security, threat, national interest or survival by different states at different times is totally discarded.⁴⁷

1.1.2. Waltz, Walt and Schweller's alliance theories

The aim of this section is not to give a complete account of balancing behavior literature in the realist tradition. Providing such an account goes beyond the limits of this Chapter. The section will concentrate on three contributors to the realist balancing theory, namely Waltz, Walt, and Schweller, prominent figures in the contemporary realist tradition. Their 'theories' on balancing constitutes the core of the realist literature on balancing.

According to the realist logic, a state engages in balancing behavior to decrease the detrimental consequences of changes in the distribution of power in the international environment. In other words, states balance to guard their pivotal national interests, namely: survival and security. As noted above, Waltz maintains that balance of power theory is *the* theory of international politics. Furthermore, Waltz elevates balance of power theory – which is, after all, a theory – to the position of law when he writes:

⁴⁶ Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, 10.

⁴⁷ See Weldes, Constructing National Interests, 278.

“For Morgenthau, balances are intended and must be sought by the statesmen who produce them. For me, balances are produced whether or not intended.”⁴⁸ This mainly results from Waltz’s argument that while power is a feature of the unit, the distribution of power is a systemic characteristic,⁴⁹ and this characteristic finds its best expression in systemic polarity, the number of great powers in the system.⁵⁰ Yet, this argument implicitly depends on the rational assessment of the polar structure of the system by states. On the other hand, in direct opposition to balancing, bandwagoning is allying with the strongest power in the system.⁵¹

Stephen Walt’s ‘balance of threat’ theory provides another approach to alliance behavior.⁵² Walt incorporates variables like power, geography, offensive capabilities, intentions within the more general concept of threat,⁵³ and argues that states do not, like Waltz asserts, balance against the strongest state in the system, but against the most *threatening* one, while bandwagoning refers to alignment with the source of danger.⁵⁴ Walt illustrates his point by analyzing East-West relations during the Cold

⁴⁸ Waltz, “Evaluating Theories,” 914.

⁴⁹ Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 95-101.

⁵⁰ For Waltz’s argument that bipolar systems are more stable than multipolar ones, see Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 138, 158-159, 163-176. For Waltz emphasis on the importance of great powers, see Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 93.

⁵¹ Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 126.

⁵² Legro and Moravcsik are rigorously critical of Walt’s ‘balance of threat’ theory, and claim that it has serious degenerative consequences for the realist theory, since ‘threat’ is not an ‘objective’ concept like ‘power’. The inclusion of ‘perceived state interests’ within the assessment of threat makes the variable irreconcilable with the realist theory. Legro and Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” 36-38.

⁵³ Walt, “The Progressive Power of Realism,” 933. Also see Stephen M. Walt, The Origins of Alliances (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987), 21. Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder argue for the inclusion of domestic factors, perceptions and ideology in analyzing strategic choices of states. See Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, “Progressive Research on Degenerate Alliances,” American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 919-922.

⁵⁴ Walt, The Origins of Alliances, 17, 21-22.

War, and shows that if states were really concerned with power, they would not have allied so extensively with the United States to form an overwhelming coalition.⁵⁵

Randall Schweller puts forth an alternative view on alignment behavior by claiming, against both Walt and Waltz, that bandwagoning is more common than balancing, especially among dissatisfied (revisionist) states in the system.⁵⁶ Schweller argues that the debate on alliances is deeply mistaken in considering bandwagoning as in direct opposition to balancing. For Schweller, while balancing is mainly driven by the motive of achieving greater security, bandwagoning is driven by the desire of easy gains.⁵⁷ Furthermore, Schweller argues that his bandwagoning argument focused on major powers — that is precisely the states likely to balance according to structural realist theory's claims.⁵⁸ Yet, he seems to agree with Waltz and Walt's claims that it is mostly the weak states that choose to bandwagon.⁵⁹

1.1.3. The explanatory power of alliance theories for the Turkish case

The relevance of the insight of realism and especially structural realism for foreign policy analysis is a much contested issue. Various scholars have argued that the Western-bias of the realist tradition, combined with the disproportional attention given to great powers, prevents realism from providing a full account of the underdeveloped

⁵⁵ Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, 273-281. Also see Stephen M. Walt, "Testing Theories of Alliance Formation: The Case of Southwest Asia," *International Organization* 42 (Spring 1988): 275-316 for Walt's illustration of his theory in the Middle East and in Southwest Asia since World War 2.

⁵⁶ Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit," 72-107.

⁵⁷ Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit," 74.

⁵⁸ Randall L. Schweller, "New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz's Balancing Proposition," *American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997): 928.

⁵⁹ Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit," 102.

world.⁶⁰ Waltz accepts that realism's primary occupation is with great powers, since, structures (meaning the polarity in the structure) are defined by these states.⁶¹ A brief illustration of the relevance of realist alliance theories for Turkey's decision to guard its national interests by allying with the Western alliance and its institutional manifestation the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is helpful for demonstrating realism's contributions and limits. After all, the so-called 'crisis' between Turkey and the Soviet Union after the Second World War regarding the Turkish Straits and the districts of Kars and Ardahan may be understood as a straightforward example of the importance of material factors on alliance behavior. For this purpose, first a brief historical background on Turkish-Soviet relations in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War will be provided. Then, the explanatory power of above presented theories of Waltz, Walt, and Schweller will be explored.

In 1945 the Soviet Union announced its intention to denounce the Treaty of Friendship and Non-Aggression of 1925. Vyacheslav Molotov, then-Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, told Selim Sarper, Turkish Ambassador to Moscow, that certain alterations were required to adapt the Treaty of Friendship to the post-war international environment.⁶² The major issues of concern for the Soviets were: the revision of the eastern border between Turkey and the Soviet Union that is the cessation of Kars and

⁶⁰ For a discussion on the relevance of realism in the Third World, see Stephanie G. Neuman, "International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron?" in International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 1-29 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); Mohammed Ayoob, "Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory Meets the Third World," in International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 31-54 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); K. J. Holsti, "International Relations Theory and Domestic War in the Third World: The Limits of Relevance," in International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 103-132 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); Barry Buzan, "Conclusions: System versus Units in Theorizing about the Third World," in International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 213-234 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

⁶¹ Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 93.

⁶² Feridun Cemal Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), 246-250.

Ardahan to the Soviet Union; the revision of the Montreux Convention; and granting bases on the Straits to the Soviet Union for the joint defense of the Straits.⁶³

In two notes sent to the Soviet Union as replies to Soviet demands, it was emphasized that the Turkish government was against any bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union for the revision of the Montreux Convention, and any type of joint defense of the Straits.⁶⁴ The Turkish government noted that the Soviet demands posed a threat to Turkish ‘independence’ and ‘sovereignty’. Furthermore, it is generally argued in the literature on Turkish foreign policy, which is built on realist assumptions, that the Soviet threat was the main motivating force behind the decision to ally with the West for ‘protection’ in an emerging ‘bipolar’ international structure.⁶⁵ In the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, the Soviet ‘threat’ was a basic assumption for the decision makers in Western Europe as evidenced in their discourse.⁶⁶

According to Waltz, Walt, and Schweller, weak states are likely to bandwagon when faced with a threat.⁶⁷ Turkey is certainly not a great power by the realist definition of great powers. It was not even a ‘middle-range’ power in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War. Thus, according to the realist alliance

⁶³ Cevat Açıkalın, “Turkey’s International Relations,” *International Affairs* 23:4 (October 1947): 487.

⁶⁴ For the complete text of both the Turkish and the Soviet notes, see Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri*, 414-440.

⁶⁵ See, for example, Mustafa Aydın, “Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 36:1 (January 2000): 103-109; Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, “Turkey’s Security Policies,” *Adelphi Papers* (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies), 12-13; Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, “Turkey’s Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma,” *The International Spectator* 27:1 (January-March 1992): 19; William Hale, “Turkey and the Cold War: The Engagement Phase, 1945-63,” chap. in *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000*, 109-145 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 110; John M. Vander Lippe, “Forgotten Brigade of the Forgotten War: Turkey’s Participation in the Korean War,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 36:1 (January 2000): 95.

⁶⁶ See Michael McGwire, “Deterrence: The Problem — Not the Solution,” *Strategic Studies* 9:4 (December 1986): 26.

⁶⁷ Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 113; Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, 29-31, 263; Schweller, “Bandwagoning for Profit,” 102.

theory Turkey, a small power,⁶⁸ should have bandwagoned against the Soviet Union by entering into an alliance with the West. Yet, excessive references given to the Soviet ‘threat’, rather than Soviet power, by the decision makers seem to undermine Waltz’s emphasis on power. Then, it may be argued that Turkey bandwagoned threat, not power. Walt, on the other hand, defines bandwagoning of threat as giving in to the source of threat, which in this case is the Soviet Union.⁶⁹ Yet, Turkey did not give in to the Soviet Union. In contrast, Turkey entered into a military alliance, NATO, aimed against the Soviet Union. Thus, the Turkish decision does not fit into Walt’s balance of threat theory either.

Finally, Schweller’s argument that bandwagoning is more common than balancing may be more helpful. Schweller argues that while balancing aims the achievement of greater security, bandwagoning is done for profit and easy gains. Since, for a weak state, balancing is always costly and includes active participation in an alliance.⁷⁰ It is difficult to identify Turkey’s motive in allying with the West as seeking profits and easy gains. Turkey’s decision to join NATO, a formal alliance, is considered as costly in Schweller’s argumentation. In other words, Turkey balanced against the Soviet Union by allying with West. Yet, Turkey did not fit in the ‘great powers’ category that are expected to balance rather than bandwagon. Furthermore, it is

⁶⁸ The effort of the Turkish decision makers to stay out of the Second World War, even though Turkey entered into a military alliance with Great Britain and France in 1939, may be understood as an evidence of this weakness on the part of the Turkish decision makers. Built on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, Turkey had neither a considerable heavy industry nor a strong economy, let alone an army with proper material capabilities. For information on Turkey’s economic situation, see the State Institute of Statistics, Statistical Indicators: 1923-1992 (Ankara: The State Institute of Statistics, Printing Division, 1994); Yakup Kepenek and Nurhan Yentürk, Türkiye Ekonomisi (İstanbul: Remzi Press, 1996); for an introduction to Turkey’s foreign policy during the Second World War, see William Hale, “Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45,” chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 79-108 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000).

⁶⁹ Walt, The Origins of Alliances, 17, 21-2.

⁷⁰ Schweller, “Bandwagoning for Profit,” 93; Schweller, “New Realist Research on Alliances,” 929.

generally argued in the Turkish foreign policy literature that Turkey allied with the West for ‘defending’ its national interest from an ‘imminent’ security threat.

As the thesis will seek to demonstrate, the main reason for this shortcoming in accounting for Turkey’s crucial foreign policy decision to ally with the West is realism’s static view of national interest. When Turkey’s different response to similar Soviet demands on the Straits in 1936 and 1939 are discarded from the picture to present a more consistent account, the events of 1945-47 make little sense. An analysis with more explanatory power must contemplate on how Turkey’s national interest was (re)constructed to make the representation of the Soviet Union as a foe possible.

1.2. Critical Constructivism

Constructivism provides the necessary tools to understand the change in the representation of the Soviet Union after WWII. Yet, recent attempts of mainstream IR theory to include constructivism within the positivist realist tradition necessitate making a distinction between ‘critical’ and ‘conventional’ constructivism. Steve Smith argues that the radical possibilities promised by constructivism are in ‘danger of being hijacked’ by the mainstream to provide auxiliary explanations of what the positivist mainstream finds hard to account for.⁷¹ Furthermore, a ‘middle ground’ approach, that will incorporate positivism with post-positivism, is advocated by several ‘conventional

⁷¹ Smith, “Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It,” 39.

constructivists'.⁷² Although united in their opposition to critical constructivism, these scholars present contradictory claims. Alexander Wendt, Theo Farrell and John Gerard Ruggie stress that constructivism differs from realism mainly on ontology, while sharing the positivist epistemology.⁷³ On the other hand, one of the most prominent advocates of the 'middle ground' approach, Emanuel Adler claims that constructivists are 'ontological realists'.⁷⁴ Another crucial claim of 'conventional constructivists' is that constructivism should be used as a tool for 'explaining' the world, not for changing it, since for them after the 'reality' is constructed it is an object of study that can be objectively accessed.⁷⁵ Yet, when Adler is arguing for moving the research task of security studies towards 'security communities'⁷⁶ or when Wendt claims that constructivism's aim is to open up room for change,⁷⁷ they point to the importance of the interest in change. However, such an interest is in direct contradiction with positivist epistemological claims that Adler and Wendt argue for. Furthermore, the inclusion of

⁷² Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground," 319-363; Georg Sørensen, "IR Theory after the Cold War," *Review of International Studies* 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 84; Jeffrey Checkel, "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory," *World Politics* 50:2 (1998): 327; Jeffrey Checkel, "Norms, Institutions, and National Identity in Contemporary Europe," *International Studies Quarterly* 43 (1999): 108; Theo Farrell, "Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program," *Review of International Studies* 4:1 (1998): 56-60, 62-72; Alexander Wendt, "On constitution and causation in International Relations," *Review of International Studies* 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 102; Alexander Wendt, "Constructing International Politics," *International Security* 20:1 (Summer 1995): 72. Ruggie while arguing that constructivism and realism cannot be added together, nevertheless, positions himself within the same group with 'conventional' constructivists. Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together?" 881, 885.

⁷³ Farrell defines constructivism as 'positively positivist, normatively neutral.' Similarly Wendt explains that he shares positivist epistemology along with main assumptions of realism. Farrell, "Constructivist Security Studies," 56-58; Wendt, "On constitution and causation in International Relations," 102; Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together?" 879.

⁷⁴ Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground," 323. For a critique of Adler's claims on 'constructivist' ontology, see Frost, "A turn not taken," 127; Smith, "Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It," 39-43.

⁷⁵ Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground," 333-334; Farrell, "Constructivist Security Studies," 51, 59-60; Sørensen, "IR Theory after the Cold War," 88.

⁷⁶ Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground," 344-345.

⁷⁷ Wendt, "On constitution and causation in International Relations," 117; Wendt, "Constructing International Politics," 74.

ideational factors and identities as intersubjective beliefs does not fit the positivist ontology that predominantly focuses what is directly observable.

1.2.1 Epistemological and ontological foundations of critical constructivism

The epistemology of critical constructivism is also a critique of positivist epistemology. As noted above, the objectivity assumption is a crucial constituent of the positivist epistemology, which the realist tradition adopts. Two implications of this assumption for the realist tradition need to be noted before moving on to the discussion on critical constructivism's epistemology. First, by describing 'social reality' as a priori, realism reifies the existing structures in favor of the dominant ones. When 'social reality' is portrayed as the natural process of history, "the dominant will always retain an interest in realist concepts and claims; and being dominant, they will try, with varying degrees of success, to make the world in reflection of those concepts and claims,"⁷⁸ writes Richard K. Ashley. In this very sense, realism is particularly political, since not paying attention to how the existing 'social reality' came about is in the interest of the dominant. The second implication of the objectivity assumption is its firm rejection of value judgments. It seems that much has changed since one of the founding figures of

⁷⁸ Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," 234. Also see Walker, "Realism, Change, and International Political Theory," 77.

the tradition, E.H. Carr, wrote: “[w]e return therefore to the conclusion that any sound political thought must be based on elements of both utopia and reality.”⁷⁹

Critical constructivism shares the epistemology of post-positivist approaches to IR, such as critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism, feminism.⁸⁰ Epistemologically, critical constructivism rejects the possibility of acquiring theory-neutral and objective ‘reality’ *per se*, of which ‘knowledge’ is an indispensable component. Instead, critical constructivist epistemology focuses on the constructed character of the subject matter of IR. This character has two crucial metatheoretical implications. First, what we call ‘reality’ is a human construct that reflects and reifies relations of power.⁸¹ Even the ‘material reality’ is a part of this construction that finds its meaning within the intersubjective knowledge system of human beings.⁸² For example, the definition (or representation) of a car strictly depends on the readily available intersubjective knowledge system (or discourse). A car is connoted as a beneficial

⁷⁹ Carr, The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 93. For a different and critical interpretation of E. H. Carr, see the special issue (volume 24, December 1998) of the Review of International Studies entitled “The Eighty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1999.”

⁸⁰ Although these approaches have essential differences on ontological matters, they have much in common, especially regarding epistemology. Thus, it is possible to talk about a critical theory tradition, like a realist tradition, in IR theory. For a discussion of the commonalities of post-positivist approaches, see Jim George and David Campbell, “Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations,” International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (September 1990): 270; Wendt, “Constructing International Politics,” 71-72; Yosef Lapid, “The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era,” International Studies Quarterly 33:3 (September 1989): 235-254; Ashley, “Political Realism and Human Interests,” 208-209; Frost, “A turn not taken,” 126.

⁸¹ Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall, “Introduction: Constructing Insecurity,” in Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger, eds. Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 9; Richard K. Ashley and R. B. J. Walker, “Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline: Crisis and the Question of Sovereignty in International Studies,” International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (1990): 374-76; Jutta Weldes and Diana Saco, “Making State Action Possible: The United States and the Discursive Construction of ‘The Cuban Problem’, 1960-1994,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 25:2 (1996): 368.

⁸² Jennifer Milliken, “The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods,” European Journal of International Relations 5:2 (1999): 229; James Der Derian, “Post-Theory: The Eternal Return of Ethics in International Relations,” in New Thinking in International Relations Theory, eds. Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, 54-76 (United States of America: Westview Press, 1997), 58-59, 65; Wendt, “Constructing International Politics,” 78; Weldes and Saco, “Making State Action Possible,” 374.

device that enables human beings to travel longer distances or as an indicator of a person's status within the prevailing knowledge system. Yet, the same car would be represented as a detrimental and even an uncivilized tool, which seriously contributes to the degradation of environment, within an environmental oriented discourse. As a reply to the standard criticism of relativism, of course the car (or the table, plane, tanks, nuclear weapons, soldiers, etc.) exists. However, its representation is made sensible through the human construction of meaning. In other words, its existence is "conveyed by interpretive and discursive fields as well as perspectival action."⁸³ There is an objective reality outside discourse, but we cannot conceive that reality, since our thinking is always dependent on available knowledge systems.⁸⁴ This does not mean that a reference to what we perceive in the world cannot be made. After all, these references are made in every study, be it constructivist or realist. Yet, these references do not arrange themselves in a single and self-evident explanation.⁸⁵ This brings us to the second metatheoretical implication.

Human reflection on this intersubjective 'reality' ('knowledge') is bound to be subjective. Thus, "[t]he illusion of objectivism must be replaced with the recognition that knowledge is always constituted in reflection of interests."⁸⁶ Or as Cox put it in an oft-cited phrase "[t]heory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose."⁸⁷ This stand directly challenges realism, which considers theory and practice to be distinct phenomena. Furthermore, it is argued that IR theorists, while reflecting upon the world,

⁸³ Der Derian, "Post-Theory," 65.

⁸⁴ Campbell, *Writing Security*, 6.

⁸⁵ Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *European Journal of International Relations* 4:3 (1998): 273; Smith, "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory," 333.

⁸⁶ Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," 207.

⁸⁷ Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders," 207.

are also engaged in the construction of ‘reality’, which they reflect upon.⁸⁸ So subjectivity is questioned for both the subjectivity of ‘reality’ and the researcher. Yet, this metatheoretical stand is not just directed against realism or other positivist approaches. Critical constructivism is reflexive, meaning that it problematizes its own claims being aware that they are only impartial reflections.⁸⁹ Closely related with the subjectivity of ‘reality’ and ‘knowledge’, critical constructivism rejects that analysis can or should be value-neutral. Furthermore, critical constructivism is motivated by a normative aim to denaturalize (make strange, problematize, defamiliarize) existing structures of ‘reality’ and ‘knowledge’ by exposing their arbitrariness, and their dependence on power relations and interests in order to open up room for change.⁹⁰

The realist tradition’s commitment to empiricism is closely connected with methodology and ontology. Such a commitment rules out the use of interpretive strategies for understanding social phenomena, and it ontologically defines reliable knowledge as the knowledge that can be attained through the employment of empirical methods. Through such methods, ideational factors, the economic and politico-social aspects of social phenomena are either not considered at all, or subordinated to ‘material factors’.

⁸⁸ Frost, “A turn not taken,” 126; Der Derian, “Post-Theory,” 62; Onuf, “Speaking of Policy,” 77.

⁸⁹ Weldes et al. “Introduction,” 13; George and Campbell, “Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference,” 285; Price and Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons?” 277-278.

⁹⁰ Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, “US Foreign Policy, Public Memory, and Autism: Representing September 11 and May 4,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17:2 (July 2004): 358; Richard K. Ashley and R. B. J. Walker, “Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly* 34:3 (1990): 263; Jef Huysmans, “Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier,” *European Journal of International Relations* 4:2 (1998): 233; Weldes et al. “Introduction,” 13; Der Derian, “Post-Theory,” 60; Milliken, “The Study of Discourse in International Relations,” 237; Ashley and Walker, “Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline,” 375; Ashley, “Political Realism and Human Interests,” 208.

The realist ontology entirely and intentionally ignores challenges much more common in international relations than ‘armed conflict’ like economic collapse, political oppression, overpopulation, ethnic rivalry, environmental degradation, disease, ‘scarcity’ of main elements of life like water, food, shelter and clothing.⁹¹ Furthermore, realism’s anarchic world marked by self-help, rivalry, and violence helps to reify and (re)construct such a world. As Steve Smith maintains, “[c]ertainly if one’s focus is on peace, then perhaps a theory that is open to cultural diversity and to the effect of language, culture and power on knowledge is to be preferred to a rigid and very time- and culture-specific positivism.”⁹² Ironically, in this sense, the facts are exactly theory-dependent, since knowledge accumulated is strictly dependent on the ways employed to achieve that knowledge.

On the other hand, the ontology of critical constructivism widens the focus of IR to match the complexity of the world. In this attempt, critical constructivism (re)introduces the largely neglected ideational and linguistic factors (along with ‘material’ structures) to the study of IR. Critical constructivism’s ontological focus is on the mutually constitutive relationship between the construction of intersubjective meaning or discourse, and the identities and interests of agents, predominantly but not exclusively states.⁹³ It was said above that the realist tradition takes the interests of states (‘survival’ or ‘power maximization’) as exogenously given. Critical constructivism argues that understanding the social construction of interests, which are

⁹¹ Ken Booth, “Security and Emancipation,” *Review of International Studies* 17 (1991): 318.

⁹² Smith, “Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory,” 335. Also see Nicholas Onuf, “Speaking of Policy,” in *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, ed. Vendulka Kubalkova, 77-95 (United States of America: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2001), 84; Friedrich Kratochwil, “The Embarrassment of Changes: Neo-realism as the science of Realpolitik without Politics,” *Review of International Studies* 19 (1993): 64-66.

⁹³ Price and Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons?” 266-267; Weldes and Saco, “Making State Action Possible,” 371-373.

mutually connected to identities and discourse(s), is the key to understanding international phenomena. Furthermore, the explanations of the social construction of interests, identities, and discourse(s) also seek to identify the historicity of interests, identities, and discourse(s). Such an approach not only promises significant insight into states and their actions,⁹⁴ but also makes the inclusion of ethics, socio-economy, gender, environment, race, culture and history in IR theory possible.⁹⁵

1.2.2. Critical constructivist accounts of foreign policy

Things in the world do not have meanings independent of actors, but are made meaningful through social construction. Critical constructivist works increasingly utilize discourse analysis to account for the process through which meaning is constructed. Discourses are structures of signification, in which sets of rules and procedures are linguistically put into play for the formation of objects, speakers and themes.⁹⁶ Dominant discourses populate the world with meaning and linguistic tools out of which representations of both the 'self' and the 'other' are (re)constructed. Furthermore, discourses work as enabler or limiter of what can be experienced and/or what the

⁹⁴ Walker claims that the realist tradition has not treated the state seriously enough, since there is *no* significant theory of state within the realist tradition. Walker, "Realism, Change, and International Political Theory," 68, 78.

⁹⁵ Latha Varadarajan quite appropriately identifies that constructivists while trying to distance themselves from materialist ontologies have ignored the constitutive effect of global economy on identity. See Latha Varadarajan, "Constructivism, identity and neoliberal (in)security," Review of International Studies 30 (2004): 319-341.

⁹⁶ Michael J. Shapiro, "Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy: The Representation of 'Security Policy' in the Video Age," International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (September 1990): 330.

experience means and, thus, construct a 'common sense' that predefines what is 'intelligible' or what is 'rational' to do or to say.⁹⁷

Such a definition may seem replacing the all encompassing concept of 'structure' with another one, that of 'discourse'. However, as Roxanne Lynn Doty maintains, "discourses do not mechanically or instrumentally produce practices, nor do practices mechanically or instrumentally reproduce a particular discourse."⁹⁸ Rather, it is through the articulation of representations, whereby identities and interests are (re)constructed, that actors, primarily but not exclusively states, make sense of the world and act upon it.⁹⁹ Yet, the 'play' of articulating representations is neither innocent nor neutral. It involves an interrelationship between power and representational practices.¹⁰⁰ The interrelationship between power and discourse (the 'politics of representation') directs the students of critical constructivism towards the study of dominant or hegemonic discourses. As noted above, the aim of such an endeavor is to denaturalize what is taken as 'common sense' by "revealing their internal (conceptual and logical) contradictions and external (descriptive and interpretive) inadequacies."¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ For the enabler/limiter effect of discourse, see Trevor Purvis and Alan Hunt, "Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology...", *British Journal of Sociology* 4:3 (September 1993): 485; Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent-Structure Problematique in International Relations Theory," *European Journal of International Relations* 3:3 (1997): 378; Weldes and Saco, "Making State Action Possible," 373.

⁹⁸ Doty, "Aporia," 377.

⁹⁹ See Jutta Weldes, "Globalisation is Science Fiction," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30:3 (2001): 648; Milliken, "The Study of Discourse in International Relations," 236-242.

¹⁰⁰ Der Derian, "Post-Theory," 59; Weldes et al., "Introduction," 2; Huysmans, "Security! What Do You Mean?" 245; Shapiro, "Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy," 331; Smith, "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory," 33-334; Hirst, "The Eighty Years' Crisis," 136.

¹⁰¹ Der Derian, "Post-Theory," 59; also see Huysmans, "Security! What Do You Mean?" 233; George and Campbell, "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference," 276-278; Ashley and Walker, "Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline," 375; Ashley and Walker, "Speaking the Language of Exile," 262-263.

Representations of the objects populating the world are significant in two ways. First, it is through representations that actors make sense of the world.¹⁰² Second, by the construction of representations, actors at the same time (re)construct the ‘reality’ in which those representations make sense. Jutta Weldes provides ‘articulation’ and ‘interpellation’ as analytical tools for understanding the process of the (re)construction of representations. According to Weldes, representations themselves are constructed in a social process of ‘articulation’, by which meaning is (re)produced out of the available cultural resources, and ‘interpellation’, through which “‘identities or subject-positions are created and individuals are hailed into or interpellated by them.”¹⁰³ Studies employing discourse analysis to study foreign policy focus on how representations make certain actions possible (Turkey’s decision to ally with NATO), while excluding others as ‘irrational’ (doing nothing), ‘unworkable’ (remaining neutral) or ridiculous (preserving ‘friendly’ relations with the Soviet Union). Weldes’ analysis of the Cuban Missile Crisis reveals how the masculinist Cold War identity of US was (re)constructed during the crisis through attaching meaning to the already present cultural resources in the dominant discourse in US (articulation), and through positioning both the self and the ‘other’ (the Soviet Union) within the articulated meaning (interpellation).¹⁰⁴

The enabling or constraining role of representations mainly stem from the mutual relationship between representations, identity and interests. Through the (re)construction of representations of both the self and the other, identities are (re)constructed and interests are linked to those identities. Adopting a critical

¹⁰² Weldes, *Constructing National Interests*, 280.

¹⁰³ Weldes, *Constructing National Interests*, 287.

¹⁰⁴ Jutta Weldes, “The Cultural Production of Crises: U.S. Identity and Missiles in Cuba,” in *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*, eds. Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 35-62.

constructivist approach allows us to explore the intersubjectively constituted identities and interests of states.¹⁰⁵ Identities are always (re)constructed in relation to difference.¹⁰⁶ Thus, one dimension of identity is always what one is not. State identities are no different. When one state identifies itself as a peace-loving country, the identities of other states are at the same time (re)constructed as either peace-loving or peace-disturbing. The identities (of both the self and the other) constructed by the particular state in question enable or constrain relations with other states in line with their 'given' identities. When a state's identity is constructed as a peace-loving country, at the same time its interests are also constructed. Of course, this example is an oversimplification. There are always multiple identities involved.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, these identities and thus, interests linked with identities are always in a process of (re)construction.

A crucial methodological issue concerning the (re)construction of representations is regarding the prominent actors involved in the politics of representation. It was noted above that for the purposes of critical scrutiny, critical constructivists are inclined to study dominant or hegemonic discourse(s). Correspondingly, critical constructivist studies choose to focus on the actors engaged in the politics of representation who are predominantly, but not exclusively, the officials inhabiting the offices of the state.¹⁰⁸ After the end of the Cold War, it has been argued

¹⁰⁵ Weldes, *Constructing National Interests*, 280.

¹⁰⁶ Campbell, *Writing Security*, 9; Weldes et al. "Introduction," 11.

¹⁰⁷ Telhami and Barnett, "Introduction," 11.

¹⁰⁸ Weldes and Saco, "Making State Action Possible," 377; Laffey and Weldes, "US Foreign Policy, Public Memory, and Autism," 359; Weldes, *Constructing National Interests*, 281; Huysmans, "Security! What Do You Mean?" 233; Weldes et al., "Introduction," 14-15, 17. Yet, some of leading figures of the critical tradition believe that modernity, sovereignty, or the exclusionist state is facing a crisis, and 'dissident scholarship' should embrace this crisis. See Ashley and Walker, "Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline," 395; Ashley and Walker, "Speaking the Language of Exile," 262; Der Derian, "Post-Theory," 55-57; Ken Booth, "Security and Emancipation," 314-315. However, students of critical constructivism maintain that states are still crucial in international relations.

that the impact of media in politics of representation as a counter-discursive actor has been intensified.¹⁰⁹ Yet, it should be noted that the counter-discursive impact of the media does not always materialize, especially when the issue is defined as a national security problem, and when popular mass media may still be employed to promote state discourse(s).¹¹⁰

In contrast to mainstream scholars, discourse analysis is not devoid of any method of empirical analysis. Discursive studies seek to account for the (re)construction of representations through ‘empirically’ analyzing language practices. At least two methods utilized by discourse analysts in their studies may be identified — predicate analysis and metaphorical analysis. While predicate analysis focuses on the verbs, adverbs and adjectives that are attached to nouns that construct those in a particular way in diplomatic documents, theory articles or transcript of interviews, the focus of metaphorical analysis is on metaphors.¹¹¹ Deconstructive (showing how ‘common sense’ can be reversed or displaced), juxtapositional (demonstrating the inherently political nature of discourse(s), genealogical (involvement of power in dominant discourse(s) is illustrated by historical studies of past discursive practices) and subjugated knowledge (alternative accounts are explored in detail to render problematic the existing ones) methods are employed to demonstrate the internal contradictions and external inadequacies of dominant discourses.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ See Shapiro, “Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy,” 335.

¹¹⁰ See Laffey and Weldes, “US Foreign Policy, Public Memory, and Autism,” 356; Shapiro, “Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy,” 337-339.

¹¹¹ Milliken, “The Study of Discourse in International Relations,” 231-236.

¹¹² Milliken, “The Study of Discourse in International Relations,” 242-244.

1.3. Conclusion

The main aim of Chapter 1 was to provide the theoretical background for the thesis. For this purpose, initially the main tenets of the realist tradition were presented. Then, the core arguments of the realist tradition in accounting for foreign policy were operationalized to present an illustration of Turkey's foreign policy towards the Soviet Union. The static conception of power and national interest employed by the realist tradition proved to be inadequate for the Turkish case. In the second part, the cornerstones of critical constructivism were presented. The major areas of concern were critical constructivism's metatheoretical and metaphysical stand, and its utilization of concepts like discourse, representation, identity and interest in explaining foreign policy. Yet, this part also presented a critique of the realist tradition and its approach of taking states and their interests as exogenously given and fixed. In order to point to the constructedness of the study of states (furthermore reality itself), critical constructivism's metatheoretical and metaphysical stand was presented. On the other hand, to demonstrate the limits of taking state interests as given and fixed, the mutually constitutive relationship between discourse, identity and interests was made obvious. Chapters 2 and 3 will analyze Turkey's foreign policy towards the Soviet Union in the inter-war (Chapter 2) and post-war (Chapter 3) eras, which is the illustration of the limits of the realist tradition and the promises of critical constructivism.

CHAPTER 2

SOVIET-TURKISH RELATIONS IN THE INTER-WAR ERA

EPISODE ONE: ‘SINCERE’ FRIENDSHIP AND SOVIET

‘DEMANDS’ FOR JOINT DEFENSE OF THE STRAITS

The main objective of Chapter 2 is to illustrate how the Soviet Union was represented by the Turkish foreign policy makers with a distant identity from the Russian Empire starting with the War of Independence. It will be argued that this different identity was coupled with a ‘sincere’ friend representation of the Soviet Union in the Turkish foreign policy discourse. This, in turn enabled the Soviet calls for ‘joint defense’ of the Straits to be represented not as a threat to Turkey’s security, but as mere ‘demands’. The first part of the Chapter will focus on the initiation of Soviet¹¹³-Turkish relations between 1919 and 1923, and the discussions on the Straits during the Lausanne Peace Conference. This part will point to the difference between the identities of the Russian Empire and

¹¹³ The Bolshevik government in Russia was called Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic until the constitution of the Soviet Union in 30 December 1922.

the Soviet Union as represented in the discourses of Turkish foreign policy makers. Then, the Chapter will show how the (re)construction of the Soviet Union's identity enabled the initiation of the Soviet-Turkish relations. Subsequently, the material aid supplied by the Soviet Union to the independence movement, and the role of this in the War of Independence will be looked at. This part will conclude with the discussions on the Straits at the Lausanne Peace Conference.

The second part of the Chapter will explore how the Soviet representation was (re)constructed on the memories of the War of Independence. The second part of the Chapter, will first examine Soviet-Turkish relations in the 1920s. Afterwards, economic cooperation in the 1930s and the intensification of relations will be explored. Then, the focus will be on the Montreux Conference and the Soviet 'demands' for joint defense of the Straits. This part will conclude by looking at the alliance negotiations between Turkey and the Soviet Union during 1939.

2.1. Soviet-Turkish relations and the Straits during the Turkish War of Independence and Lausanne

The Turkish War of Independence and the Bolshevik Revolution gave birth to a new era in Soviet-Turkish relations, one characterized by close collaboration. Earlier relations of Russia and Turkey are more generally referred to as one of 'enmity', although some periods of collaboration can be pointed to.¹¹⁴ This 'enmity' is represented as having its

¹¹⁴ Turko-Russian 'enmity' is not taken as a given in this study. However, analyzing how and why the relations between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire were constructed as one of 'enmity' is a

roots in the thirteen wars between the Russian and Ottoman Empires, which “created a bellicose atmosphere of traditional enmity between the two nations.”¹¹⁵ The first sign of the change to come was the official renunciation of the secret agreements between the Russian Empire and Entente powers concerning İstanbul and the Straits after the Bolshevik Revolution. Yet, it is crucial to point out that even before the Bolshevik Revolution during the provisional government, Bolsheviks were critical of the other elements of the provisional government that argued for the possession of the Straits.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, P.N. Milyukov, Foreign Minister of the provisional government and one of the leading advocates of the necessity to conquer İstanbul and the Straits, had to resign from office after the harsh criticisms of the Bolsheviks, who saw the seizure of foreign territory as an imperialist motive, and considered some members of the provisional government such as Milyukov as imperialist agents.¹¹⁷

At this point, it is crucial to point to the importance of the Straits for Russia so that one can grasp the significance of this change in Russian foreign policy. The

task clearly beyond the objectives of this thesis. Yet, it should be mentioned that although Russia and Turkey fought wars before 1774, studies focusing on the hostile relations between Turkey and Russia prioritize the period after 1774, when Russia challenged Turkish dominance in the Black Sea by gaining a ‘foothold’ on the Black Sea coast. Russia’s increasing power necessitated the construction of Russia as a foe both for the analysts to make sense of the Ottoman response to Russia, and for the rulers of the Ottoman Empire to ‘fight back’ against the ‘Russian expansion’. Such a construction was not necessary when the Ottoman Empire was controlling the whole Black Sea and its surrounding territories, and when Russia was not ‘strong’ enough to constitute a challenge.

¹¹⁵ Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, “The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey,” *Journal of International Affairs* 54:1 (Fall 2000): 203. Also see Rıfıkı Salim Burçak, *Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri (1791-1941): İkinci Cihan Harbinde Türkiyenin Durumu* (İstanbul: Aydınlık Matbaası, 1946), 50-51; Harish Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927: A study of Soviet policy towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan* (Geneva: Michael Joseph Limited for the Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies, 1966), 87; Feridun Cemal Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi* (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), 11; William Hale, “Foreign Relations of the Late Ottoman Empire, 1774-1918,” chap. in *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000*, 13-43 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 36.

¹¹⁶ Samuel Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” *Russian Review* 8:3 (July 1949): 212.

¹¹⁷ Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” 212-214; Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927*, 90.

Russians view the Straits as “keys to their house,”¹¹⁸ that is, of utmost economic and military importance. The Straits is the only seaway through which Southern territories of Russia can gain access to the Mediterranean and thus to European markets. In 1919, Russia was sending 70 percent of its grain, 88 percent of oil, 93 percent of manganese, 61 percent of steel, and 54 percent of all Russian exports to world markets through the Straits.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the issue was not only a matter of reaching out to ‘warm waters,’ but also one of who will gain access to the Black Sea. The Southern provinces of Russia are always vulnerable to military attacks if antagonistic powers gain access through the Straits. Thus, the main aim of Russia in the Turko-Russian wars was generally accepted as the control of the Straits and thus İstanbul.¹²⁰ Furthermore, Milyukov states that one of the motivating aims of Russia in entering World War I was the acquisition of the Straits.¹²¹

Most analyses of Soviet-Turkish relations during the War of Independence point to the uneasy situation both the Soviet Union and Turkey were in and overemphasize the strategic character of the relations between the two countries.¹²² The

¹¹⁸ The phrase ‘keys to our house’ was used by Alexander I. Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” 205. Later while Litvinoff described them as Russia’s ‘vital lifeline’, Stalin after the Second World War was to say Turkey was holding Soviet Union by ‘the throat’. These phrases were articulated by Russian decision makers to emphasize both the importance of the Straits and the ‘legitimate’ interests of Russia regarding the Straits.

¹¹⁹ Cemil Bilsel, “The Turkish Straits in the Light of the Recent Turkish-Soviet Russian Correspondence,” The American Journal of International Law 41:4 (October 1947): 731.

¹²⁰ Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” in Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974), 21; Yücel Güçlü, “The Uneasy Relationship: Turkey’s Foreign Policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union at the Outbreak of the Second World War,” Mediterranean Quarterly (Summer 2002): 58; Kapur, “Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927,” 87-89.

¹²¹ Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” 208.

¹²² Kamuran Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), VII; Rıfık Salim Burçak, Moskova Görüşmeleri (26 Eylül 1939-16 Ekim 1939) ve Dış Politikamız Üzerine Tesirleri (Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Basın-Yayın Yüksekokulu Basımevi, 1983), 9-10; Burçak, Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri (1791-1941), 50-55; Gönlübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 20; Karaosmanoğlu, “The Evolution of the National Security Culture,” 203.

Soviet Union was facing serious constraints after the devastation of the First World War and then the Civil War. Its relations with the European powers were severely strained as a result of the fear on the part of the European powers that the Russian Revolution would spread to their countries. Furthermore, if the hostile entente powers were to control Turkey, the newly created Soviet Union, which was already facing grave challenges, would be vulnerable to further pressures of the entente powers from its southern border. Thus the analysts argue that it was in the interest of Soviet Union to construct friendly relations with Turkey and the Kemalist movement.¹²³

Yet, it is not taken into consideration that when the Bolsheviks were arguing for the denunciation of the secret agreements, arguing that the possession of the Straits was unnecessary, the Ottoman Empire and Russia were still at war. Furthermore, more than a year passed between the peace agreement between the Ottoman Empire and the Soviet Union (3 March 1918), and the initiation of the independence movement in Turkey (19 May 1919). In other words, the denunciation of the Soviet interests in the Straits was not a ‘strategic’ move to guarantee friendly relations with a Kemalist Turkey and to insure a friendly Turkish policy regarding Soviet interests in the Straits. Rather, Soviet interests were denounced when it was clear that the entente powers, with whom the Soviets were experiencing tense relations, were going to control the Straits. This was an indication of the reconstruction of Russian interests by the Bolsheviks. The newly created Soviet Union was presented as an anti-imperialist attraction center for the oppressed countries of the world extends beyond simple strategic concerns.

¹²³ Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, VII; Gönübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 18-22.

When the independence movement was initiated in Turkey, the leaders were well aware of this change in Russia. Ali Fuat Cebesoy notes in his memoir that the leaders of the movement “thought of ending the enmity, which was created by the tsars, between Turkey and Russia and establishing friendly relations between the two peoples when the Bolshevik regime was formed in Russia.”¹²⁴ Later Şükrü Saracoğlu, who served as Foreign Minister between 1938 and 1942, and as Prime Minister between 1943 and 1946, commented on the initiation of friendly Soviet-Turkish relations by noting that these two nations “were able to wipe away centuries-old grudges in one step.”¹²⁵ Such quotes illustrate the differentiation of the Soviet representation from that of the Russian Empire. By blaming the tsars of the Russian Empire and/or the *Padişahs* of the Ottoman Empire for the ‘enmity’ between Turkey and Russia, the (re)constructed representation of the Soviet Union enabled ‘wiping away’ that enmity. Thus, such a representation opened the room for friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

The ‘strategic’ need to establish friendly relations with the Soviet Union and to secure economic and possibly military aid from the Soviet Union stemmed from the fact that the Mustafa Kemal’s movement was in war with all the entente powers, namely a proxy war with Great Britain, Italy and France, and a tangible one with Greece and Armenia. The country was already impoverished by the wars that went on for a decade (1912-1922). Finding the resources needed to fight the great powers of the time was a demanding task. At the time, the Soviet Union was the only foreign power Turkey could turn to for help in order to help its campaign against the entente powers.¹²⁶ Yet, Mustafa

¹²⁴ Ali Fuat Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları* (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyatı, 1955), 121.

¹²⁵ Cited in Burçak, *Moskova Görüşmeleri* (26 Eylül 1939-16 Ekim 1939), 12.

¹²⁶ Gönlübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 19-20; Kapur, “Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927,” 89-91. Yet it should not be forgotten that the partition scheme of entente powers

Kemal would be reluctant to ask for aid from the Soviet Union, if the latter did not reform the tsars' policy on the Straits. On the other hand, a Soviet Union aiming the occupation of the Straits would not be willing to assist the independence movement in Turkey even if both countries had enemies in common.

2.1.1 Initiation of relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union and the 1921 Treaty of Friendship

The unofficial initiation of relations between the Mustafa Kemal's movement and the Soviet Union date back to 1919. In May 1919 Mustafa Kemal met with Colonel Semen Mihailovich Budienni, who offered Soviet economic and military aid to Turkey.¹²⁷ Yet, Budienni made it clear that the Soviet Union expected Mustafa Kemal's movement to turn into a communist revolution. In order not to alienate the Soviets, Mustafa Kemal's answer was that the movement aimed at forming 'state socialism', which would resemble the Soviet system.¹²⁸ At this stage, Mustafa Kemal is argued to be using

necessitated a significant military commitment. Of course the entente powers were able to provide such commitment, but they were also war-torn. Furthermore, their peoples were not at all willing for another major military commitment after a world war. It was only the Greek state that had clear territorial interests in Anatolia and, thus the only state willing to engage in massive military commitment. See William Hale, "Resistance, Reconstruction and Diplomacy, 1918-39," chap. in *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000*, 44-78 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 48. The possibility of getting help from the United States was ruled out mainly because of greater Armenia arguments of the US leaders. Furthermore, US turned to an isolationist policy after the War and not very likely to come out of it because of Turkey and still standing against its allies. See Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927*, 90.

¹²⁷ Salahi R. Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika I: Mondros Bırakışmasından Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin Açılışına Kadar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), 83; Ali Kemal Meram, *Türk-Rus İlişkileri Tarihi: Ayrıca Mustafa Kemal'den Sovyetler'e, Sovyetler'den Mustafa Kemal'e Mektuplar ve Milli Mücadele* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınları, 1969), 235; Gürün, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953*, 8. Yet it should be mentioned that not all accounts agree that such a meeting took place or don't see it as an important event J. C. Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics, A Documentary Record: British-French Supremacy, 1914-1945* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979), 251; Burçak, *Moskova Görüşmeleri (26 Eylül 1939-16 Ekim 1939)*, 10.

¹²⁸ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika I*, 83.

socialist rhetoric and emphasizing the common anti-imperialist stance of both countries to ensure Soviet support.¹²⁹

The Soviets, at this time, were not enthusiastic about giving material support to movements that were not openly communist. However, a crucial change occurred on the part of the Soviets in the summer of 1920. V. I. Lenin put forward his thesis on national movements during the Second Congress of the Comintern, and argued that national movements were progressive and worthy of communist support.¹³⁰ Luckily for the Turkish movement, this change took place before the Foreign Minister Bekir Sami, who left Ankara in 11 May 1920, could reach Moscow in 29 July 1920.

The aim of the Turkish delegation was to secure a military pact with the Soviet Union to ensure extensive support for the independence movement. The Soviet Union, having its own problems with the Entente powers, was not willing to go that far, but offered a friendship agreement.¹³¹ Salahi R. Sonyel argues that the Turkish delegation was given instructions to inform Soviet authorities that Turkey was ready to link its future to the future of the Soviet Union if Turkey's sovereign rights were recognized; and that Turkey was ready to acknowledge the rights of free passage of the Black Sea states and was ready to accept the joint defense of the Straits.¹³² This is not noted in most sources. Even if this was not the case, the results of the negotiations were crucial for the independence movement in Turkey. According to the agreement draft two signatory states were not going to accept any agreement that was forcefully imposed on one another; all the agreements between the Ottoman Empire and Russian Empire were

¹²⁹ Salahi R. Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II: Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin Açılışından Lozan Antlaşmasına Kadar (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1986), 5.

¹³⁰ Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 92.

¹³¹ Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 93-96.

¹³² Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 9.

to be considered null and void; the Straits regime would be decided in the future in a conference held among the Black Sea riparian states.¹³³ Yet, the agreement could not be ratified by the signatory states because of the differences regarding Armenia. The Soviets argued that Muş, Bitlis and Van should be given to Armenia, but Turkey rejected such proposals.¹³⁴ Thus, the agreement was not to be signed for seven months, until 1 May 1921.

The use of socialist rhetoric by Mustafa Kemal or the ‘concessions’ given to the Soviet Union regarding the Straits in the 1921 Treaty of Friendship are considered to be ‘strategic’ moves by the independence movement to gain the support of the Soviet Union.¹³⁵ Furthermore, the rejection of the Soviet demands regarding Muş, Bitlis and Van are pointed to as the main reason behind the breakdown of negotiations in 1920, which is considered to be a sign of the independence movement’s devotion to the principles of Misak-ı Milli.¹³⁶ Yet, such demands, although postponing the conclusion of an agreement, did not eliminate the determination to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union and the agreement was signed seven months later. Furthermore, both before and after the 1921 Treaty of Friendship was signed, Mustafa Kemal praised the

¹³³ Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 15.

¹³⁴ Gönlübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 23, 28. For the full text of the 1921 Treaty of Friendship, see Hurewitz, The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics, 250-253.

¹³⁵ Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 5; Karaosmanoğlu, “The Evolution of the National Security Culture,” 203. The use of the word ‘concession’ in the above statement is purposeful. The reasons are twofold: (1) In 1945 Stalin’s demands including a similar request is labeled as such. Yet the connection between this ‘concession’ and the requested ‘concessions’ of 1945 will be discussed below; (2) Regarding the negotiations in 1920, Gönlübol and Sar argue that while it had to be agreed on a Black Sea conference on the Straits at the time, Mustafa Kemal was successful in eliminating such demands later. Although Gönlübol and Sar don’t explicitly state what they mean by later, it is most probable that they had the Lausanne Conference in mind, since the same clause was included in the 1921 Treaty of Friendship. Gönlübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 22.

¹³⁶ Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, 36-38; Gönlübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 23-24, 28; Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 95-96; Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 17-18.

relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union in several speeches as ‘most friendly’.¹³⁷ When Mustafa Kemal was asked if the Soviet occupied Armenia was posing a threat to Turkey in the Assembly on 3 January 1921, he answered “we want to believe in the sincerity of the Bolshevik Russian government towards us. This belief is not the product of our imagination, our perception or our deception by pleasant words.”¹³⁸ The date of the speech is after the breakdown of the negotiations in 1920 and before the signing of the 1921 Treaty of Friendship. In another speech on 19 September 1921 Mustafa Kemal explains the reason of friendly relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union with the following words: “Russia recognized our sovereignty before any other. And respected that sovereignty.”¹³⁹

Such speeches strengthened the differentiation in the representation of the Soviet Union from that of the Russian Empire. Moreover, they helped to (re)construct the Soviet representation as a ‘sincere’ and ‘devoted’ friend of Turkey. It was through such a representation that the demands on the northern territories of Turkey were constructed as ‘difference’ in views, and not as efforts directed against Turkey’s sovereignty. It was again this representation that enabled the trust needed to leave the future of the Straits to a conference between Turkey and the Soviet Union. The ‘strategic’ attempts to secure Soviet help would have been unimaginable if the representation of Soviet Union was not (re)constructed as a ‘sincere’ friend, since the

¹³⁷ A. Shemsutdinov, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri*, translated by A. Hasanoğlu (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazatesi adına Çağdaş Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2000), 11, 57; Yavuz Aslan, *Mustafa Kemal-M. Frunze Görüşmeleri: Türk-Sovyet İlişkilerinde Zirve* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2002), 111.

¹³⁸ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III (1906-1938)*, 3rd ed. Vol. I (Ankara: Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Basımevi, 1981), 135.

¹³⁹ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III (1906-1938)*, Vol. I, 186.

traditional enemy representation of Russia would not have enabled turning to Soviet help.¹⁴⁰

2.1.2. Soviet Union's material support for the independence movement

Although detailed accounts of Soviet material help to the independence movement are not available, most of the sources agree that the Soviets provided 10 million gold roubles and enough military supplies to equip three Turkish divisions.¹⁴¹ Besides the 1921 Treaty of Friendship, Ukrainian Commander-in-chief Mikhail Vasilyevich Frunze's visit to Ankara was also crucial in materializing the Soviet aid. During the meetings between Frunze and Mustafa Kemal, problems between Turkey and the Soviet Union were discussed and resolved.¹⁴² Mustafa Kemal, speaking at the reception given by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in honor of Frunze, stressed the good neighborly relations between the peoples of Turkey and Soviet Union, and praised Soviet support by emphasizing that "the Soviet Russian Government has been trying, by all means and on every occasion, to affirm its 'sincere' attitude to us."¹⁴³ Years later, Mustafa Kemal underlined the importance of the Soviet aid by noting that the War of Independence "would have cost incomparably more resources, and perhaps would even

¹⁴⁰ Of course it is very probable that there would be a clear differentiation between the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union, if the Soviet representation was not (re)constructed.

¹⁴¹ Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 114; Shemsutdinov, Kurtuluş Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 53; Hale, "Resistance, Reconstruction and Diplomacy, 1918-39," 51; Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 190. For a more detailed account of the amounts of military equipment delivered to Turkey, see Shemsutdinov, Kurtuluş Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 65.

¹⁴² See Aslan, Mustafa Kemal-M. Frunze Görüşmeleri, 31-35.

¹⁴³ Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 111.

not be won,” had the Soviet Union not helped Turkey.¹⁴⁴ The material aid of the Soviet Union was represented as the ‘affirmation of its sincerity’ and thus the Soviet Union was (re)constructed as a true friend that tried to show its sincerity ‘by all means and on every occasion’. Hence Mustafa Kemal’s declaration on 1 March 1922 that friendly relations with the Soviet Union constituted the ‘crux of Turkish foreign policy’.¹⁴⁵

2.1.3. The Straits and the Lausanne Peace Conference

The independence of the Republic of Turkey was recognized as a result of the Lausanne Peace Conference by the Treaty of Lausanne signed on 24 July 1923. The treaty resolved most of the differences between Turkey and the contracting parties. However, the Straits was the only crucial topic that concerned Soviet-Turkish relations during the Lausanne Peace Conference. The Soviets argued for the closure of the Straits at all times to all the warships of every nation (except Turkey) and maintained that Turkey should have complete sovereignty over the Straits. The ideal resolution of the issue for Turkey was very similar to the Soviet proposal.¹⁴⁶ Yet, the Turkish delegation did not consider achieving this ideal resolution as a *sine qua non* for several reasons and at the end they accepted the British proposal¹⁴⁷ after some modifications for gaining concessions on

¹⁴⁴ Boris B. Potkhveriya, “1920 ve 1930’lu Yıllarda Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri,” in Türk-Rus ilişkilerinde 500 yıl 1491-1992: Ankara, 12-14 Aralık 1992 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), 190; Shemsutdinov, Kurtuluş Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 97.

¹⁴⁵ Sonyel, Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II, 191.

¹⁴⁶ Güçlü, “The Uneasy Relationship,” 59; Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 124-126.

¹⁴⁷ According to the British proposal the Straits were to be demilitarized, and an international committee was to be formed to monitor the passage of ships. Furthermore, although there were other details, every country was allowed to have a fleet not exceeding the largest fleet of the Black Sea (in other words Soviet Union). For the complete text of the Lausanne Peace Agreement see Lozan Barış Andlaşması Lozan'da

other topics they considered to be more crucial to Turkish sovereignty.¹⁴⁸ The Soviets were not at all satisfied with this way of resolving the Straits problem, and criticized the Turkish delegation for not having pressed harder for what would have been a more beneficial solution for both the Soviet Union and Turkey. Yet this controversy did not sever the ‘sincere’ friendship between Turkey and the Soviet Union.¹⁴⁹

2.2. Soviet-Turkish relations after the War of Independence

Throughout the rest of the 1920s Turkey was mostly involved with internal reconstruction of the war-torn country. The major foreign policy objectives during this period were resolving the unsolved territorial problems of Mosul with Great Britain and of the Sanjak of Alexandretta with France, and the population exchange problem with Greece. These problems necessitated normalizing relations with the West. Nevertheless, cordial relations with the Soviet Union remained the cardinal principle of Turkish

imzalanan sözleşmeler, senetler, barış andlaşmasına ekli mektuplar ve Montrö Boğazlar Sözleşmesi: bugünkü Türkçe'yle tam metinleri (Ankara : T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, 1984). The dangers of the proposal for Soviet security were clear in the Soviet opinion. Britain and France, Soviet Union's main enemies, could have a fleet double the size of the fleet of the Soviet Union. Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” 216; Güçlü, “The Uneasy Relationship,” 60; Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 126-127.

¹⁴⁸ Yet, it should be noted that when Georgij Vasilevic Chicherin complained to İsmet İnönü that Turkey was giving in to the British proposal too easily. İnönü replied if the Turkish delegation insisted on closure of the Straits, it would mean that the armistice would end, and Turkish troops would have to contact with British troops. İnönü asked Chicherin whether or not the Soviets were ready to actively take Turkey's side if war begun. The answer was not satisfactory, thus İnönü stated that Turkey was not willing to start the fight again on a topic that could be modified later. Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, 97-98. It's impossible to know what would happened if the Soviet answer were positive, but even asking such a question is an indication of the level of friendship between Turkey and Soviet Union.

¹⁴⁹ Nur Bilge Criss, “Turkey's Relations with the West (1908-1945),” in Fundamenta Turchiae, ed. Erik Zürcher (forthcoming), 19.

foreign policy during this period.¹⁵⁰ The Soviet Union actively supported Turkey on the Mosul problem. Chicherin even remarked during a meeting of the Central Executive Committee in October 1924 that “[i]t is absolutely clear that Turkey will not abandon an important part of its people because the English capitalists and other capitalists want to take petrol from the Mosul.”¹⁵¹ Immediately after the unfavorable decision of the League of Nations regarding the Mosul dispute, Turkey signed a treaty of neutrality with the Soviet Union on 26 January 1925.¹⁵²

At the time the Soviet Union was in favor of a more elaborate treaty that would have contained an important clause regarding the ‘peaceful resolution’ of any conflict arising from the passage of military ships through the Straits.¹⁵³ In practice, accepting this scheme of bilateral resolution would have meant that Turkey would side with the Soviet Union, probably against Britain, if the Soviet Union violated the related clauses of the Lausanne Treaty. Although Turkey declined this proposal, Turkish foreign policy makers did not represent the Soviet ‘demand’ as an expansionist proposal resembling the ‘imperialistic’ policies of the Russian Empire as they would do in the late 1940s and 1950s (see Chapter 3). The treaty was signed anyway, and Turkey did not seem offended by the Soviet ‘demand’. Mustafa Kemal again stressed the ‘sincerity’ of the relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union in the Assembly, and his statements

¹⁵⁰ Güçlü, “The Uneasy Relationship,” 61-62.

¹⁵¹ Cited in Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 135. Also see Potskhveriya, 1920 ve 1930’lu Yıllarda Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri, 192.

¹⁵² According to the clauses of this treaty contracting parties undertook to abstain from any aggression against the other. Furthermore, they undertook not to participate in any alliance or agreement whatsoever directed against the other. Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 137.

¹⁵³ Kapur, Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, 135-136.

were reported to be ‘continuously applauded’.¹⁵⁴ Any possibility of an armed conflict between Turkey and the Soviet Union was removed by the signing of the 1925 Treaty.

It is generally argued that Turkey’s strained relations with the West, at the time, necessitated Turkey to lean towards the Soviet Union. However, if the ‘enemy’ representation of the Tsarist Russia was maintained such a policy would have been impossible to contemplate. It was the (re)construction of the Soviet representation as a ‘sincere friend’ that enabled friendly relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Later, relations were further strengthened by the official visit of the Turkish Foreign Minister to the Soviet Union in 1926.¹⁵⁵ By 1927, when the trade agreement was signed, the two countries promised reciprocally to adopt most-favored-nation treatment. Consequently, the volume of economic relations between the two countries was doubled.¹⁵⁶ Moreover, Turkey supported all the proposals of the Soviet Union in the disarmament conference and in other international meetings, and praised them for upholding peace.¹⁵⁷

2.2.1 Intensification of Soviet-Turkish relations during the 1930s

The 1930s saw further intensification of relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. After the Great Depression of 1929, Turkey decided to change the course of its

¹⁵⁴ Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III (1906-1938), Vol. I, 342.

¹⁵⁵ Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927*, 140.

¹⁵⁶ Dilek Barlas, *Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey: Economic and Foreign Policy Strategies in an Uncertain World, 1929-1939* (Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1998), 124.

¹⁵⁷ Gönübol and Sar, “1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası,” 86.

economy, and adopt ‘etatist’ economic policy.¹⁵⁸ Adaptation of a national economic plan constituted the core of this policy, and the Soviet Union was very influential in the preparation of this plan.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, the Soviet Union provided nearly a quarter (8 million dollars) of the forecasted 35 million dollars needed to materialize the plan.¹⁶⁰ The terms of the aid were decided during İsmet İnönü’s visit to Moscow in 1932, and were more than favorable. The Soviets did not demand any interest, the aid could be paid back in 20 years and Turkey could pay back in terms of goods instead of money.¹⁶¹ İnönü described the visit in the following words: “we were met with complete friendship, we were met with very good friendship, and our visit ended in a reciprocally comforting mood.”¹⁶²

It was not the intention of the Turkish government to abolish private property, as in the Soviet Union, through state planning. Nonetheless, for a nation that remembered the devastating consequences of *Düyun-u Umumiye* the employment of a policy resembling the Soviet approach to economy, and getting material help from the Soviets to carry out that policy, could not have been possible outside a ‘sincere’ and ‘devoted’ friend representation of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Mustafa Kemal’s

¹⁵⁸ On etatism, see Osman Okyar, “The Concept of Etatism,” *The Economic Journal* 75:297 (March 1965): 98-111; Z. Y. Hershlag, *Turkey: The Challenge of Growth* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968); Barlas, *Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey*.

¹⁵⁹ For a discussion on the Soviet impact on planning, see Z. Y. Hershlag, *Turkey: The Challenge of Growth*; Z. Y. Hershlag, “Atatürk’ün Devletçiliği,” in *Atatürk ve Türkiye’nin Modernleşmesi*, ed. Jacob M. Landau, 221-232, translated by Meral Alakuş (İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1999); Selim İlkin, “Birinci Sanayi Planının Hazırlanışında Sovyet Uzmanların Rolü,” *ODTÜ Gelişim Dergisi* (1979-1980, special issue): 257-288; Mümtaz Soysal, “Kuzeyli Komşu,” *Cumhuriyet*, 1 September 2004, 2.

¹⁶⁰ Yakup Kepenek and Nurhan Yentürk, *Türkiye Ekonomisi* (İstanbul: Remzi Press, 1996), 68.

¹⁶¹ İsmet İnönü, *Cumhuriyet’in ilk yılları:1923-1938* (İstanbul : Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, 1998), 142-143.

¹⁶² İnönü, *Cumhuriyet’in ilk yılları:1923-1938*, 153.

emphasis on economic independence should not be forgotten.¹⁶³ As a result, Mustafa Kemal could declare in the Assembly during a speech in 1 March 1934 that

[o]ur cordial relations with the Soviet Union are, as always, strong and sincere. Our nation considers this friendship bond, which was constructed during our hard times, as an unforgettably precious memory... The two states, both with their governments and their nations, have demonstrated to the whole world how much they believed and trusted each other at every possible occasion.¹⁶⁴

Turkey was very careful not to damage the friendly relations established with the Soviet Union. Before joining the League of Nations in 1932, İnönü had told Stalin about Turkey's intention to and its reasons for joining the League.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, when joining the League, Turkey put a reservation stating that Turkey would not feel itself bound by the Covenant, if the members of the League were to unjustly take any action against the Soviet Union.¹⁶⁶ In 1934, the Soviet Union also joined the League of Nations, and the two countries, which were among the few openly criticizing the aggressive actions of Italy and Germany, argued for the strengthening of the League's role against aggressive states threatening world peace.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶³ See Kepenek and Yentürk, *Türkiye Ekonomisi* (İstanbul: Remzi Press, 1996), 32.

¹⁶⁴ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III (1906-1938)*, Vol. I, 381.

¹⁶⁵ İnönü, *Cumhuriyet'in ilk yılları: 1923-1938*, 148-149.

¹⁶⁶ Barlas, *Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey*, 127.

¹⁶⁷ Burçak, *Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri (1791-1941)*, 59.

2.2.2. Montreux Conference and the Soviet ‘demands’ for bases

Fascist Italy’s aggressive policies in the Mediterranean were the main security concern of Turkey at the beginning of the 1930s. This concern was the major reason behind Turkey’s determination to change the Straits regime. Yet, it should not be forgotten that Turkey’s leaders considered the Straits regime of the Lausanne Peace Treaty as a ‘temporary arrangement’ right from the beginning. İnönü had explicitly expressed Turkey’s views on the Straits regime to Chicherin during the Lausanne Conference.¹⁶⁸ Turkey believed that the time for changing the Straits regime had come with the change in the international context, and began to argue for the remilitarization of the Straits.¹⁶⁹ Turkey declared its will at several international conferences until the Geneva Conference of 1932.¹⁷⁰ The Soviet Union, dissatisfied with the Straits regime as much as Turkey, supported Turkey’s call for a Straits conference. Yet, Great Britain, fearing such a conference would enhance Turkish-Soviet cooperation, rejected Turkey’s demand for an international conference.¹⁷¹

After the 1935 Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1936, Turkey sent an official note to the League of Nations and the signatories of the Lausanne Peace Treaty demanding a conference to be convened on the Straits. Turkey’s arguments depended on the *rebus sic stantibus* principle, and emphasized that it was not possible to secure the Straits under the existing Straits regime. As before, the Soviet Union was the first

¹⁶⁸ Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, 97-98.

¹⁶⁹ Erhan Başyurt, Ateş Yolu: Boğazlarda Bitmiyen Kavga (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 1998), 54-56.

¹⁷⁰ Barlas, Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey, 129. Turkey repeated its demand to militarize the Straits in 1933 and 1935. Başyurt, Ateş Yolu, 55-56.

¹⁷¹ Barlas, Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey, 129. Furthermore, depending on the British archives Barlas argues that Britain’s attempts for a non-aggression pact between Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan were also aimed at drifting Turkey away from the Soviet Union. Barlas, Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey, 131.

country that responded to the Turkish request. The Soviet government declared that Turkey's fear was legitimate and its wish to modify the regime was understandable.¹⁷² According to Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, the Montreux Conference "came about largely because the Soviet Union supported Turkey's request for an international conference on the Straits."¹⁷³ Still, the Soviet Union had supported Turkey before, but with little success. It was the support of Great Britain, and the international conjuncture¹⁷⁴ that made the difference this time. Great Britain, seeing that change in the Straits regime was now a necessity, decided to support Turkey. The British seemed to have calculated that being on friendly terms with Turkey would prevent Turkey from leaning further towards the Soviet Union.¹⁷⁵

When the Montreux Conference was convened on 22 June 1936, all the participants (the signatory countries of the Lausanne Peace Treaty) agreed on the remilitarization of the Straits. The main topics of disagreement concerned the navigation of warships through the Straits and the Straits Commission. According to the Turkish plan regarding the passage of warships, during peacetime, the fleet size of non-Black Sea states passing through the Straits was limited to 14.000 tons, and the total size of the fleets of non-Black Sea states in the Black Sea was limited to 28.000 tons and their stay duration to 15 days. On the other hand, Black Sea states were allowed to send up to 25.000 tons of warships through the Straits at a time. In the event of war where Turkey was a belligerent or when Turkey perceived a threat of war, Ankara could restrict the

¹⁷² Süleyman Kocabaş, Türkiye'nin Canı Boğazlar (İstanbul: Vatan Yayınları, 1994), 155; Barlas, Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey, 164.

¹⁷³ Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, "Turkey's Security Policies," Adelphi Papers (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies), 11.

¹⁷⁴ Germany's remilitarization of Rhineland, Italy's invasion of Abyssinia and fortification of the Dodecanese Islands, Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations were clear indications of the incapability of the League of Nations to prevent assaults against peace.

¹⁷⁵ Barlas, Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey, 165-166.

passage of warships as it saw fit. In the event of war, where Turkey was neutral, the same restrictions of peacetime would apply. Furthermore, Turkey argued that the Straits Commission should be abolished, and that Turkey should monitor the passage through the Straits on its own.¹⁷⁶

The Soviet Union argued for complete freedom of passage for the warships of Black Sea states during peacetime. In the event of war in which Turkey remained neutral, the Soviets argued that the passage of non-riparian belligerent states' warships should be prohibited. Furthermore, the Soviet delegation maintained that passage towards the Black Sea should be totally prohibited for warships if one of the Black Sea states was at war. On the other hand, the British, taking advantage of the disagreement between Turkey and the Soviet Union, argued that the same restrictions for the non-riparian states' warships should apply to those of Black Sea states. In addition, they were against the abolishment of the Straits Commission.¹⁷⁷ The French mainly supported the arguments of the Soviet Union. Balkan states supported Turkey.

Bilateral discussions were carried out to settle the differences between the Turkish and Soviet delegations. During these discussions Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov asked Turkish Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüşdü Aras what would Ankara think about the potential for 'collaborating' with the Soviet Union for the defense of the Straits. Aras emphasized that Turkey did not have such an intention.¹⁷⁸ 'Collaboration' is a vague term, but it suggested that the Soviets wanted to have a say in the administration of the Straits. Nevertheless, towards the end of the conference, following the instructions from Ankara, the Turkish delegation decided to support the Soviet

¹⁷⁶ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 70-73.

¹⁷⁷ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 73-75.

¹⁷⁸ Gürün, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953*, 153-156; Barlas, *Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey*, 167.

proposal rather than the British. It was communicated to the delegation that the British proposal was not only against Turkish interests, but totally against Soviet interests. Turkey did not want to antagonize the Soviet Union by supporting the British proposal.¹⁷⁹ Turkish decision makers decided that Soviet interests should be upheld. We do not know whether Ankara was informed of the Soviet ‘demand’ or not. Even if we are to assume that Litvinov’s demand for joint defense of the Straits was communicated to Ankara, the decision was nevertheless made. This was allowed for by the Ankara government’s avoidance of representing Soviet demands as a ‘threat’. This indicates that at the time the Soviet ‘demand’ for joint defense was not represented as a ‘threat’ to Turkish ‘independence’ and ‘sovereignty’.

Thus, Britain was left alone and had to accept the final proposal, satisfying Soviet demands. This proposal dictated that in peacetime non-riparian states could send only light surface vessels through the Straits not exceeding 15.000 tons, and the aggregate tonnage of non-riparian states was limited to 30.000 tons and their stay in the Black Sea was limited to three weeks. Black Sea states were not restricted by number, type or tonnage provided that their warships passed through the Straits one at a time. In wartime, if Turkey was a belligerent or if it perceived a threat of war, Turkey was free to regulate the passage of warships as it saw fit. But, if Turkey was neutral, only neutral states’ warships were allowed navigation through the Straits according to the same limitations in times of peace.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ Barlas, *Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey*, 169. There are analysts who argue that demands for joint defense of the Straits started in 1934. Mustafa Sitki Bilgin and Steven Morewood, “Turkey’s Reliance on Britain: British Political and Diplomatic Support for Turkey against Soviet Demands, 1943-47,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 40:2 (March 2004): 25.

¹⁸⁰ For the complete text of the Montreux Convention, see Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 397-410.

2.2.3. The ‘gathering storm’ and 1939 negotiations for alliance

The restrictions of the Montreux Treaty were quite close to the maximum demands of the Soviet Union. On the day of the signing of the Treaty, Litvinov made a speech and declared that “all who have participated in this conference will depart satisfied, and that there will be no malcontents.”¹⁸¹ Litvinov also maintained that the “Conference must have seen that the close friendship which has united for the past fifteen years the two regenerated countries of Turkey and the Soviet Union is indissoluble, and by no means a temporary shift.”¹⁸² *Izvestia*, in an article reviewing the Montreux Treaty, declared to the public that the Treaty was a total success for the Soviet Union and for Turkey, which got back its sovereign rights on the Straits.¹⁸³ The reactions on the Turkish side were not different. İnönü, in his speech evaluating the Montreux Conference, stressed that, besides satisfying its own interests, Turkey was very pleased to see that every contracting party was also satisfied. Moreover, “our friend, the Soviet Union, which had not signed the 1923 Lausanne Treaty, signed the Montreux Convention. It gives me great pleasure to state this.”¹⁸⁴

In spite of these positive representations, within the same year of the signing of Montreux, Litvinov again proposed to Aras a pact for the joint defense of the Straits.¹⁸⁵ Aras, again, declined the offer and emphasized that such a pact would be

¹⁸¹ Bilsel, “The Turkish Straits,” 728.

¹⁸² Bilsel, “The Turkish Straits,” 730. For the full text of the speech, see *Boğazlar Meselesi: Lozan ve Montrö* (İstanbul: Aydınlık Yayınları, 1977), 114-117.

¹⁸³ *Boğazlar Meselesi: Lozan ve Montrö*, 118-119.

¹⁸⁴ *İsmet İnönü’nün TBMM’deki Konuşmaları (1920-1973): Vol. I (1920-1938)* (Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 1992), 397-398.

¹⁸⁵ Nur Bilge Criss, “U.S. Forces in Turkey” in *U.S. Military Forces in Europe- The Early Years, 1945-1970*, eds. Simon W. Duke and Wolfgang Krieger (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1993), 335.

against Turkey's understanding of sovereignty. Cevat Açıkalın,¹⁸⁶ later represented that Turkey did not welcome "this unexpected testimonial of friendship and interest in the defense of the Dardanelles."¹⁸⁷ The Turkish authorities explained to their 'sincere friends' the reasons why they declined this offer. This explanation was not satisfactory for the Soviet Union and in 1947, Açıkalın, who was one of the prominent actors in designing post-war Turkish foreign policy, maintained that Turkey's friendly relations with the Soviet Union continued as before this interlude, but "to a close observer, there was evident a slight touch of bitterness on the part of our friends."¹⁸⁸

Neglecting the Soviet 'demands', Aras paid a visit to Moscow in 1937, and emphasized the common interest in maintaining the excellent relations between the two countries.¹⁸⁹ Similarly, İnönü emphasized in the Assembly after Aras' visit to Moscow that cordial relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union would remain as the fundamental constituent of Turkish foreign policy.¹⁹⁰ Within the 'sincere' friend representation of the Soviet Union, which was (re)constructed again throughout the 1920s and 1930s, these demands themselves were represented as contrary to Turkish national interests. Yet, the Soviet Union itself was not considered as a threat to Turkey. Thus, even after a call for joint defense, Turkish officials could visit Moscow and praise the excellent relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union.

By 1938, the German-Italian threat was becoming more and more clear, and Turkey felt the need for alliances in order to counter that Treaty. Turkey's relations with

¹⁸⁶ Açıkalın was a high ranking official of the Turkish Foreign Ministry in 1930s. He later served as the Turkish Ambassador to London in 1945.

¹⁸⁷ Cevat Açıkalın, "Turkey's International Relations," *International Affairs* 23:4 (October 1947): 479.

¹⁸⁸ Açıkalın, "Turkey's International Relations," 479.

¹⁸⁹ Güçlü, "The Uneasy Relationship," 65.

¹⁹⁰ *İsmet İnönü'nün TBMM'deki Konuşmaları (1920-1973): (1920-1938) Vol. I*, 423.

Great Britain had substantially improved after the Montreux Conference, and Turkey started to negotiate an alliance treaty with Great Britain and France. The Soviet Union was informed about Turkey's negotiations. Moscow did not oppose these negotiations. After all, Soviet Union was also negotiating with the British and French for an alliance. Still, the Soviet Union was increasingly growing suspicious of the intentions of France and especially Britain.¹⁹¹ Litvinov had always argued for the 'indivisibility of peace' in the League of Nations after the Soviet Union joined the League. However, the British followed an appeasement policy against the aggressive actions of Italy and Germany. By that time, the Soviet Union had started to believe that Germany was intentionally being driven towards the East by the French and the British to destroy communism in the Soviet Union.¹⁹² This belief was one of the most crucial reasons of the breakdown of the negotiations between the Soviet Union, and the British and the French for an alliance.

At the same time, Turkish and Soviet Foreign Ministries were exchanging notes for forming an alliance between the two countries. Turkish Foreign Ministry hoped that such an alliance could be integrated to the Tripartite Alliance between Turkey, France, and Britain, as a joint front against the German-Italian coalition.¹⁹³ Yet, the suspicions of the Soviet Union led it to conclude the non-aggression pact with Germany. Nonetheless, the invitation made to the Turkish Foreign Minister, Şükrü Saracoğlu, for negotiating a treaty between Turkey and the Soviet Union was repeated, and Saracoğlu decided to go to Moscow. By that time however, the Soviets had promised Germany that they would use their influence on Turkey to guarantee its

¹⁹¹ Burçak, *Moskova Görüşmeleri* (26 Eylül 1939-16 Ekim 1939), 20, 50; Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 128-129.

¹⁹² Burçak, *Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri* (1791-1941), 82.

¹⁹³ Güçlü, "The Uneasy Relationship," 75.

neutrality.¹⁹⁴ Furthermore, it is argued that the first aim of the Soviet Union was to avoid getting involved in the war that was clearly approaching.¹⁹⁵

With these purposes in mind, the Soviet Union made several demands on the Turkish delegation. Three of these demands were of utmost significance. The Soviets wanted: (1) to sign a pact of joint defense of the Straits; (2) a guarantee that warships of non-Black Sea powers would not be allowed right of passage through the Straits; (3) and to put a reservation in favor of Germany, providing that the Soviet Union would only honor the terms of the treaty if they would not result in a conflict between the Soviet Union and Germany.¹⁹⁶ Saracoğlu declined the Soviet demands. After all, one of the main objectives of Turkey in signing a treaty with the Soviet Union was to secure Soviet help against Germany. The German reservation proposed by the Soviets eliminated the possibility of achieving that objective. Furthermore, Turkey concluded that the demands for joint defense of the Straits were against its interests. Still, Erkin, who was a member of the Turkish delegation during the 1939 negotiations, maintained publicly that the negotiations ended within a friendly atmosphere. The joint declaration also emphasized that friendly relations and the preservation of peace were the main tenets of the foreign policies of both countries.¹⁹⁷ İnönü noted similar points during his speech at the Assembly regarding the negotiations:

¹⁹⁴ Gürün, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953*, 205; Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 137.

¹⁹⁵ Burçak, *Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri (1791-1941)*, 100.

¹⁹⁶ Ahmet Şükrü Esmer and Oral Sander, "İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası," in *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973)*, eds. Mehmet Gönübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974), 153; Türkkaya Ataöv, *Turkish Foreign Policy: 1939-1945* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1965), 58-59; Açıkalın, "Turkey's International Relations," 481; Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 142-148. It is crucial to point out that Erkin and Açıkalın were the two high ranking officials, who accompanied Saracoğlu throughout the negotiations in Moscow.

¹⁹⁷ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 155.

The special conditions and the limitations set by the circumstances of our time should not affect the friendship between the two countries. In the future, as it was in the past, we shall follow the natural course of a policy of friendship with the Soviets.¹⁹⁸

Most of the analysts referring to the Soviet-Turkish negotiations of 1939 argue that the negotiations damaged the relations between the two countries.¹⁹⁹ However, the words used to explain this damage at the time lack the severity of those used after the Second World War. The impact of the 1939 negotiations are described as ‘the breakdown of Soviet-Turkish closeness,’²⁰⁰ or as ‘hard knocks’²⁰¹ to the relations of the two countries, or as ‘overshadowing,’²⁰² or as the ‘separation of the paths’ of the two countries.²⁰³ The relatively milder tone of these descriptions will be much more accurately identified after the next Chapter, which will focus on the representation of both the Soviet Union and its demands in the post-war era.

¹⁹⁸ İsmet İnönü’nün TBMM’deki Konuşmaları (1920-1973): Vol. II (1939-1960) (Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 1993), 2-3.

¹⁹⁹ William Hale, “Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45,” chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 79-109 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 84-85; Selim Deringil, “Aspects of Continuity in Turkish Foreign Policy: Abdülhamid II and İsmet İnönü,” International Journal of Turkish Studies 4:1 (Summer 1987): 42; Sezer, “Turkey’s Security Policies,” 12; Criss, “Turkey’s Relations with the West,” 31.

²⁰⁰ Criss, “Turkey’s Relations with the West,” 31.

²⁰¹ Selim Deringil, “Aspects of Continuity in Turkish Foreign Policy,” 42.

²⁰² Hale, “Turkey and the Second World War,” 85. There are of course analysts using harsher language. Güçlü argues that after the 1939 negotiations the Soviet Union became a major worry for Turkey. See Güçlü, “The Uneasy Relationship,” 91. Nevertheless, there are others using even much more moderate language than the above cited. For example, Açıkalın maintains that the negotiations ‘marked a crucial point’ for Soviet-Turkish relations. See Açıkalın, “Turkey’s International Relations,” 482. Similarly, Gürün argues that Soviet-Turkish relations were never as friendly as previous to the 1939 negotiations. It should also be mentioned that some of the important works on Turkish foreign policy don’t even mention the demand for joint defense. See Sezer, “Turkey’s Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma,” The International Spectator 27:1 (January-March 1992): 17-32; Hale, “Resistance, Reconstruction and Diplomacy, 1918-39,” 44-78.

²⁰³ Esmer and Sander, “İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası,” 154.

2.3. Conclusion

The major objective of Chapter 2 was to show how the Soviet Union was interpellated by Turkish foreign policy makers with a different identity than the Russian Empire during the 1920s and 1930s, and how this different identity enabled the construction of the representation of the Soviet Union as a ‘sincere friend’ by Turkish foreign policy makers. Within this representation certain demands of the Soviet Union from Turkey were generally presented as mere differences in the respective outlooks of Turkey and the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union was never presented as a ‘threat’ to Turkey. The Turkish leaders always emphasized the ‘sincere’ friendship between Turkey and the Soviet Union. As argued above, throughout the 1920s and 1930s, during crucial negotiations between Turkey and the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union, numerous times, asked for the joint defense or the joint regulation of the Straits. All of these demands were rejected by Turkey (except the demand made in 1920 to decide the future of the Straits in a conference between Black Sea states). But the Soviet Union was never represented as ‘expansionist’, ‘imperialist’ as in the post-war era (see Chapter 3). On the contrary, during the inter-war era the ‘sincere’ friend representation of the Soviet Union enabled the strengthening of Soviet-Turkish relations. Chapter 3 will focus on how this representation was (re)constructed into an ‘enemy’ representation of the Soviet Union.

CHAPTER 3

SOVIET-TURKISH RELATIONS DURING THE POST-WAR ERA EPISODE TWO: ‘STALIN’S DEMANDS’ ON THE STRAITS AND THE ‘SOVIET IMPERIALISM’

Chapter 2 analyzed how the representation of the Soviet Union was (re)constructed as a ‘sincere friend’ of Turkey between in the inter-war years. This representation was in direct contrast with that of ‘Tsarist Russia’. Furthermore, within the ‘sincere friend’ representation of the Soviet Union, a number of Soviet demands concerning the Straits and some eastern provinces of Turkey did not result in a crisis between the two countries. Chapter 2 seeks to illustrate how the ‘sincere friend’ representation of the Soviet Union was (re)constructed during the post-war period into a state that was ‘threatening’ to Turkish sovereignty and independence.

The first part of the Chapter will focus on Soviet-Turkish relations during WWII in an attempt to demonstrate how mutual trust eroded throughout WWII. The

second part will look at the Soviet demands for bases and territorial concessions in 1945. This part will point to the ways through which Soviet demands, which were similar in content to those of inter-war years, were differentiated by the Turkish foreign policy makers from those of the inter-war years. Additionally, how the representation of the Soviet Union was (re)constructed using the already available resources in the Turkish foreign policy discourse will be looked at. The concluding part of the Chapter will explore the internationalization of the ‘Straits crisis’ and the Turkish quest for Western support. A further aim of this part will be to demonstrate the dichotomy between the representations of the United States and the Soviet Union and their ‘demands’. The literature inspired by traditional approaches represents Turkey’s reaction to Soviet ‘demands’ as ‘unavoidable’, thereby failing to explain how similar threats were represented and responded to in radically different ways.

3.1. The Second World War and Soviet-Turkish relations: the emergence of the ‘air of suspicion’ and ‘mutual distrust’

It was mostly during WWII that the representation of the Soviet Union in Turkish foreign policy discourse underwent a major (re)construction.²⁰⁴ The possibility of a

²⁰⁴ The broader Turkish foreign policy throughout the Second World War will not be considered in this part due to space limitations. The main focus of this part is Soviet-Turkish relations (mainly regarding the Straits) during WWII. Nonetheless, some general aspects of Turkish foreign policy will be mentioned, e.g. Turkish neutrality during WWII, in relation to Soviet-Turkish relations. Yet, it should be mentioned that these aspects have other dimensions than those regarding Soviet-Turkish relations. For more general accounts of Turkish foreign policy during WWII, see Edward Weisband, 2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye, translated by M. A. Kayabağ and Örgen Uğurlu (Istanbul: Örgün Yayınevi, 2002); Selim Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War (Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1988); Ahmet Şükrü Esmer and Oral Sander, “İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası,” in

crisis with the Soviet Union after the war was being considered by the policy makers well before the end of WWII. Turkish suspicions were mainly concerning the ‘designs’ of the Soviet Union on the Straits supported by a fear of Soviet ‘liberation’ of the Balkans. On the other hand, the Soviets were greatly concerned by Turkey’s policies during WWII. Most of the Turkish sources underplay the events that created dissent on the Soviet side, but these events were significant in the (re)construction of Turkey’s representation in the Soviet Union. The aim of this part is to analyze this mutual (re)construction, which constitutes the background of the Soviet demands in 1945 and Turkey’s response.

During the initial years of the war, until Germany attacked the Soviet Union, Turkey was subject to continuing Soviet pressures for a military base at the Straits. These demands, Bruce Robellet Kuniholm has argued, demonstrating ‘Soviet designs’ on and ‘ill will’ toward Turkey was the main reason why Turkey did not enter WWII in 1940 after Italy declared war on the Allies.²⁰⁵ Similarly, it is argued that Soviet demands largely shaped Turkish foreign policy between 1939 and 1941.²⁰⁶ Yet, it should not be forgotten that the major aim of Turkish foreign policy throughout WWII was to avoid being dragged into the war.²⁰⁷ Furthermore, the British saw the Turkish decision to

Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974); William Hale, “Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45,” chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 79-109 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000); Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları, 1939-1946 (Ankara: TC. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1973).

²⁰⁵ Bruce Robellet Kuniholm, The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East: Great Power Conflict and Diplomacy in Iran, Turkey, and Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980), 69-70.

²⁰⁶ Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin and Steven Morewood, “Turkey’s Reliance on Britain: British Political and Diplomatic Support for Turkey against Soviet Demands, 1943-47,” Middle Eastern Studies 40:2 (March 2004): 27.

²⁰⁷ Weisband, 2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye, 9; Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 102.

invoke Protocol 2 of the Tripartite Agreement²⁰⁸ as an excuse for not honoring the obligations of the Alliance, since the British saw no possibility of an armed conflict between Turkey and the Soviet Union if Turkey entered the war.²⁰⁹ Although Protocol 2 was probably invoked by the Turkish government as an excuse for not entering the war²¹⁰, it could be considered as an indication of the changing attitude towards the Soviet Union.

The Hitler-Molotov talks of November 1940 strengthened Turkish suspicions regarding the Soviet ‘designs’.²¹¹ During these talks Hitler proposed to replace the Montreux Convention with one more favorable to the Soviet Union. More specifically, Hitler offered a regime in which the Soviet Union would be able to navigate its warships through the Straits at any time and without any restrictions. While all the warships of non-Black Sea states (except Germany and Italy) would be denied passage.²¹² Yet, Vyacheslav Molotov did not consider these proposals as satisfactory for Soviet interests. Molotov insisted on a guarantee for a (light naval and land forces) base at the Straits.²¹³ After the Soviet Union was attacked by Germany in the summer of 1941, both the

²⁰⁸ Protocol 2 of the Tripartite Agreement provided that Turkey was not obliged to carry out its obligations under the Treaty if these obligations may result in an armed conflict between Turkey and the Soviet Union. For the full text of the Agreement, see Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 189-192.

²⁰⁹ Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 102-106. For a defense of Turkish neutrality during WWII, see Harry N. Howard, Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 161-209; Feridun Cemal Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), 161-245.

²¹⁰ Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 106.

²¹¹ Turkey was informed of the Soviet demands on June 1941 as a part of the German propaganda on Turkey against the Soviet Union.

²¹² It is quite interesting that Hitler’s proposal was very similar to the US proposal of 1945. And in both cases the Soviet Union declined because the proposals did not satisfy Soviet demand for bases. The argumentation of the chapter will return to this topic after the part on Soviet demands of 1945-1946. For the complete texts of the German proposal and the Soviet counter-proposal, see Ferenc A. Vali, The Turkish Straits and NATO (Stanford, California, Hoover Institution Press, 1972), 224-229.

²¹³ George Lenczowski, “Evolution of Soviet Policy Toward the Middle East,” The Journal of Politics 20 (1958): 164.

Soviet Union and Britain declared that they were loyal to the Montreux Convention. This was intended to alleviate Turkish suspicions of an agreement between Britain and the Soviet Union at Turkey's expense. Nevertheless, the incident only helped the erosion of trust between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Soviet criticisms of Turkey's pro-Axis attitude after the Battle of Stalingrad and, later, criticisms of Turkish neutrality were regarded as 'unfair' by the Turkish authorities, strengthening Turkey's suspicions of the Soviet Union.²¹⁴ The (re)constructed representation of the Soviet Union (although not as an 'enemy' yet) was the most important factor of Turkey's response to 'Stalin's demands' after WWII. The next part of the Chapter will focus on the 1945 demands, yet before moving on it is essential to discuss some of the crucial events, which led to a (re)construction of the representation of Turkey in the Soviet Union.

3.1.1. The (re)construction of the representation of Turkey in the Soviet Union into a 'potential source of conflict'

When the German army entered France in 1940, they got hold of many classified documents of the French. One of these documents had a severe impact on Turkey's image in the Soviet Union. According to this document, Rene Massigli, the French Ambassador to Turkey, had asked Şükrü Saracoğlu, the then-Prime Minister, for Turkey's permission for French planes to pass through Turkey to bomb strategic oil

²¹⁴ Kuniholm, The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East, 69-70.

facilities in Baku in 1940.²¹⁵ This was intended to cripple the war potential of the Soviet Union and Germany, to which the Soviet Union was providing oil. Although Saracoğlu did not give official permission for such a plan, he had clearly indicated that Turkey would not oppose it.²¹⁶ After this came out, Turkey's representation in the Soviet Union began to change to a country participating in plans to directly attack the Soviet Union.

The German offensive against the Soviet Union that began in June 1941 added to the Soviet resentment against Turkey. This was because the Soviets believed that Turkey was 'emotionally' supporting the Germans against the Soviet Union.²¹⁷ The remarks made by Saracoğlu during a conversation in August 1942 with Franz Von Papen, the German Ambassador to Turkey seemed to have created this perception. During this conversation Saracoğlu reportedly told Von Papen that "he would very much like to see the collapse of the Soviet Union and an opportunity like this one comes only once in every thousand years. Yet, as the Prime Minister he must make sure that Turkey maintains its neutrality."²¹⁸ Lastly, the Soviets were greatly concerned by the pan-Turkic (pan-Turanist) activities in Turkey. There was a sizeable Turkic-Islamic population within the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party considered these people as a permanent threat to Soviet national unity.²¹⁹

Throughout the Atatürk era, Turkey was very cautious of Soviet Union's sensitivities on this issue. Still these pan-Turanist elements in Turkey were not acted

²¹⁵ Ali Halil, Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1968), 50; Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 93-97.

²¹⁶ Halil, Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye, 51; Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War, 94.

²¹⁷ Artiom A. Ulunian, "Soviet Cold War Perceptions of Turkey and Greece, 1945-58," Cold War History 3:2 (January 2003): 37; Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl, 248.

²¹⁸ Franz Von Papen, Memoires (Paris, Flammarion, 1953), 306, cited in Halil, Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye, 64.

²¹⁹ Ulunian, "Soviet Cold War Perceptions of Turkey and Greece," 42.

upon until May 1944 (when it was clear that the Allies were going to win the war). The Soviet Union argued that pan-Turanists in Turkey were trying to create dissent among the Turkic population of the Soviet Union.²²⁰ It is important to note at this point that the Turkish government exercised a considerable control over the media during WWII. The government had the power to close any newspapers it believed to be endangering Turkey's national security.²²¹ The government's inactivity regarding this small but influential pan-Turanist group, knowing that the Soviet Union will be offended by their activities, signifies that the Turkish government was abandoning its cautious policy toward the Soviet Union. Furthermore, like the British, the Soviets were also critical of Turkey remaining neutral during WWII. Yet at the same time, the Soviet Union was also critical of the attempts (especially during the Adana Conference) to bring Turkey to the war fearing that these attempts were aimed at limiting Soviet influence in the Balkans.²²² When the war was coming to an end, Turkey's representation in the Soviet Union was more as a 'potential source of conflict' than a 'sincere friend'.²²³

3.1.2. Conferences of the 'Big Three': The Soviets begin to 'reveal their insidious nature'

The question of the Straits was internationally raised for the first time by the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin at the Allied conference at Tehran in November 1943. During the

²²⁰ Weisband, *2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye*, 225.

²²¹ Weisband, *2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye*, 58.

²²² Weisband, *2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye*, 131.

²²³ Ulunian, "Soviet Cold War Perceptions of Turkey and Greece," 37.

conference, Stalin raised the issue of Soviet need for 'warm water ports'. Winston Churchill agreed that some changes have to be made to the Montreux Convention in favor of the Soviet Union.²²⁴ Later, in October 1944, during Churchill's visit to Moscow, Stalin raised the issue once again and complained about the 'disproportional' rights of Turkey regarding the Straits. Stalin emphasized that the decision to close the Straits should not be only in Turkey's discretion. Stalin made his stance clear by expressing that the Montreux Convention was 'unacceptable' and a 'spearhead' aimed at the Soviet Union.²²⁵ Churchill, even more disappointed with Turkey by this stage due to Turkey's reluctance to enter the war, agreed that the Soviet Union had 'a right and moral claim' for access to warm waters.²²⁶ Furthermore, Churchill agreed with Stalin that the Convention was 'inadmissible' and 'obsolete'.²²⁷

On the other hand, Anthony Eden, who was the British Foreign Minister at the time, was critical of Churchill's remarks to Stalin regarding the Straits. Eden believed that giving a free-hand to the Soviet Union in the Straits would jeopardize British interests. Eden's arguments were influential in the change of Churchill's views regarding the Straits.²²⁸ Before the Yalta Conference in February 1945, Eden believed that the Soviets would ask for a new regime that would enable their warships to pass

²²⁴ Churchill's attitude is generally linked to Britain's disappointment with Turkey's neutrality. Thus, in Tehran Churchill implied that if Turkey should fail to enter the war, Britain would take 'a cold view' of Turkey, and would largely leave it to the Soviet Union to resolve the matter. Anthony R. DeLuca, "Soviet-American Politics and the Turkish Straits," Political Science Quarterly 92:3 (Autumn 1977): 510.

²²⁵ Hale, "Turkey and the Second World War," 1939-45, 101.

²²⁶ Anthony R. DeLuca, Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits: The Montreux Conference and Convention of 1936 (New York: East European Monographs, Boulder Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1981), 149.

²²⁷ Hale, "Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45," 101. Although the approach of the Soviet Union is criticized for trying to change a Convention it praised in 1936, it should be recalled that the Turkish arguments for changing the Straits regime of the Lausanne Convention also rested on the change in the international situation. See Harry Howard, "The Straits After the Montreux Conference," Foreign Affairs 15:1 (October 1936): 200.

²²⁸ DeLuca, Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits, 150; Howard, Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy, 212.

through the Straits in time of war. The Americans, on the other hand, hoped that the issue would not come up.²²⁹ Still, Stalin raised the Straits issue during the Yalta Conference. Actually, Stalin generally repeated what he told Churchill in Moscow. The Soviet leader criticized Turkey's right to close the Straits unilaterally not only during times of war but also if Turkey decides that there is a threat of war. Stalin also stressed that the Convention was 'outmoded'; and (as a new point) emphasized that the Montreux Convention was signed at a time when Soviet-British relations were not 'perfect'.²³⁰ Stalin maintained at the Yalta Conference, after pointing to Soviet Union's discontent, that "it was impossible to accept a situation in which Turkey had a hand on Russia's throat."²³¹ In all of the conferences mentioned above, Turkey and its policy throughout WWII was repeatedly criticized by Stalin and Molotov. Furthermore, Turkey was represented by the leaders of the Soviet Union as a country endangering the security of the Soviet Union. This was perhaps the most obvious indication that Turkey's representation in the Soviet Union had severely changed throughout WWII.

3.2. Sarper-Molotov talks: the 'crisis' begins

Despite the mutually unfavorable atmosphere created throughout WWII, the significance of Soviet friendship was still emphasized in Turkish foreign policy discourse. On 23 February 1945, Faik Öztrak (then-president of the Republican

²²⁹ Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, 212.

²³⁰ A. Suat Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk: Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 1920-1964* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1992), 261.

²³¹ DeLuca, *Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits*, 150.

People's Party's Parliamentary Group) maintained that achieving "a good relationship with the Soviet Union was one of the main pillars of Turkish foreign policy."²³² Similarly, M. Ökmen, then-Minister of Justice, emphasized that Soviet-Turkish friendship was a fundamental aspect in the creation of the Turkish Republic and had remained so for the last twenty-five years.²³³ The Soviet army and its achievements during WWII were also praised by A. R. Tarhan, Saracoğlu and Ökmen in the Turkish Parliament.²³⁴ During this period, the potential for a clash between Turkey and the Soviet Union was publicly dismissed by Turkish policy makers. In an interview Numan Menemencioğlu, Foreign Minister, represented the Soviet Union as a 'sincere friend' and maintained that "centuries-old ambitions of Russians on the Straits were imaginary myths."²³⁵ When asked later, İnönü emphasized that he would have considered the demands made by the Soviet Union in June 1945 as 'out of the question' in March 1945. He explained that his plan at the time was signing separate alliances with both the Soviet Union and Western powers.²³⁶ However, it is clear that Selim Sarper, Turkish Ambassador to Moscow, warned as early as December 1944 that the Soviet Union would probably denounce the 1925 Treaty and propose some revisions in the Montreux Convention. Furthermore, Sarper pointed out that the attitude of his Soviet counterparts toward Turkey was far from being friendly.²³⁷ In other words, although the

²³² T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, 7. Dönem, 23 Şubat 1945, cilt 15 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1945), 131.

²³³ T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, cilt 15, 128.

²³⁴ Ş. Saracoğlu, T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, 7. Dönem, 11 Mayıs 1945, cilt 17 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1945), 45; A. R. Tarhan, T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, cilt 15, 127; M. Ökmen, T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, cilt 15 129.

²³⁵ "Türk-İngiliz ve Türk-Sovyet münasebetleri," Cumhuriyet, 10 Şubat 1945.

²³⁶ Nazmi Kal, İsmet İnönü: Televizyonda Anlattıklarım (Ankara: Bilgi, 1993), 78. The groups İnönü implies are the Soviet Union and the West.

²³⁷ Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl, 247-249.

representation of the Soviet Union was maintained, publicly, as a ‘sincere friend’, the Turkish foreign policy makers were informed of the change in Soviet foreign policy.

On 19 March 1945, Molotov informed Sarper that the Soviet Union would not extend the 1925 Treaty of ‘Friendship and Non-Aggression’. Molotov emphasized that the Treaty was 20 years old and that ‘serious improvements’ had to be made in order to reflect the conditions of the day.²³⁸ When Sarper asked what he meant by ‘improvements’, Molotov replied that he could not provide specific details. However, he stressed that further discussions depended on the will of the Turkish government to draft a new treaty.²³⁹ The denunciation of the 1925 Treaty by the Soviet Union was an expected move. Sarper again informed Ankara that making revisions on the Montreux Treaty was what Molotov meant by ‘improvements’.²⁴⁰ Still, Turkish newspapers generally responded positively to the denunciation of the 1925 Treaty, and argued that it was ‘natural’ for the Soviet Union to ask for improvements in an old treaty in order to better serve both Turkish and Soviet interests.²⁴¹ Furthermore, key columnists argued that Soviet-Turkish relations were cordial despite some minor disagreements, while accepting that the new international situation called for changes in the Soviet-Turkish Treaty of 1925.²⁴²

²³⁸ Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, 216.

²³⁹ *Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl*, 250-251.

²⁴⁰ Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 266; *Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl*, 252; Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War*, 179.

²⁴¹ Weisband, *2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye*, 293-294. “Türkiye-Sovyet Rusya arasındaki dostluk ve tarafsızlık antlaşmasının feshi,” *Ulus*, 22 Mart 1945; “Türk-Sovyet münasebetleri,” *Cumhuriyet*, 22 Mart 1945. Yet, the governments’ ‘advice’ was an influential factor of this optimism. This episode is another indication of the power of the government on the newspapers at the time, and hints that the government did not capitalize on this power against the pan-Turanist groups as a part of its policy.

²⁴² Nadir Nadi, “Türk-Sovyet dostluğunun yarını,” *Cumhuriyet*, 9 Nisan 1945; Mümtaz Faik Fenik, “Türkiye ve Sovyetler,” *Ulus*, 8 Nisan 1945.

After considering Molotov's remarks, the Turkish government declared its wish to discuss a new treaty with the Soviet Union. After the declaration of the Turkish government, two 'unofficial' conversations were held between Sarper and the Soviet Ambassador Sergei Vinogradov during May 1945. The main subject of the conversations was the Straits. Vinogradov strongly stressed Soviet Union's concern for the security of the Black Sea in a way to indicate that the new treaty also had to tackle this issue. Subsequently, Sarper asked if he meant something like an alliance.²⁴³ Vinogradov took the issue very enthusiastically and answered in the affirmative.²⁴⁴

During the conversation that followed this crucial dialogue, Sarper hinted that Turkey would agree to close the Straits to the warships of non-Black Sea states, while allowing the passage of Soviet warships during times of war.²⁴⁵ It was also noted by Sarper that in order to share the extra burden caused by such a scheme, the Soviet Union would have to assure its 'support' when the security of the Straits was severed as a result of the obligations Turkey undertook in a possible alliance.²⁴⁶ These conversations were considered as promising by the Turkish Foreign Ministry.²⁴⁷ Before Sarper returned to Moscow for the negotiation of a new treaty, he was given directions by the Turkish Foreign Ministry. These directions clearly emphasized that the issue of passage of warships through the Straits could be addressed during the negotiations for an alliance in the manner discussed between Sarper and Vinogradov.²⁴⁸

²⁴³ This question had a great impact on Soviet Union's demands, since Soviets interpreted (or presented) the conversation as a proposition of an alliance.

²⁴⁴ Kamuran Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), 278-282.

²⁴⁵ Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl, 258-259. For a critique of the conversations, see Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, 282.

²⁴⁶ Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl, 261.

²⁴⁷ Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 252.

²⁴⁸ Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl, 263-264.

Encouraged by the conversations with Vinogradov, Sarper asked for an interview with Molotov after his return to Moscow. The meeting took place on 7 June 1945, during which Molotov informed Sarper that certain issues had to be agreed upon before moving on to the negotiations of an alliance: (1) the Kars and Ardahan districts had to be retroceded to the Soviet Union;²⁴⁹ (2) Soviet Union should have bases located at the Straits for the joint-defense of the Straits;²⁵⁰ (3) the two countries would have to agree on the revision of the Montreux Convention before convening a multilateral conference. In addition, Molotov referred to a fourth demand, which is believed to be a call for the reorientation of Turkish foreign policy, which would have made the other demands unnecessary.²⁵¹ During a second meeting on June 18, Molotov repeated the same demands and stressed that without an agreement on these topics, the Soviet Union would not resume negotiations for an alliance.

3.2.1. ‘Stalin’s demands’ and (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union

According to sources who witnessed the period, the general impression in the Turkish Foreign Ministry at the time was that territorial demands were put forth as a negotiation tactic by the Soviet Union in order to achieve a desirable solution to the problem of the

²⁴⁹ Sarper immediately objected to such a demand. Molotov maintained that the issue *could be left aside*, but without agreement on this topic negotiations of an alliance could not go on. For the minutes of this conversation, see Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 269-271.

²⁵⁰ Sarper, again, immediately objected to a demand for bases on the Straits. Molotov asked if this rejection was for the times of peace, and if the Turkish government would accept to give bases during time of war. Sarper replied that this topic will have to be discussed between the militaries when the time came.

²⁵¹ Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East*, 258.

Straits.²⁵² The British Foreign Office and American State Department also shared this view.²⁵³ Although Sarper stressed that the Turks were used to such ‘war of nerves,’ Stalin’s demands are often marked as the beginning of the ‘Straits crisis.’²⁵⁴ After ‘Stalin’s demands’ were announced, major policy makers were ‘shocked’ by the content. İnönü maintained that the demands were totally ‘unexpected’ and ‘unthought-of.’²⁵⁵ Similarly, Cevat Açıkalın, in 1947, described Turkey’s feelings as “it was sad that after believing for twenty years in a sincere understanding and friendship with Russia, the Turkish people had to witness the most unjustified attacks.”²⁵⁶ The Turkish policy on the issue was outlined by then-Foreign Minister, Hasan Saka. Saka maintained that there was no question of territorial concessions and that any changes in the Montreux regime concerned all of the signatory states of the Montreux Convention and required an international conference.²⁵⁷ Prime Minister, Saracoğlu emphasized that there was no change in Turkish foreign policy. “As in the past, contemporary Turkish foreign policy aims to protect Turkey’s independence and sovereignty.”²⁵⁸ If the Soviet Union honored these principles, good relations could be (re)built.

Then, Turkish foreign policy makers represented, the change in Soviet Union’s foreign policy alone as the cause of the deterioration in Soviet-Turkish relations. The change in Soviet foreign policy was further represented as a restoration of

²⁵² Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 271. See “Sovyet talepleri,” *Cumhuriyet*, 25 Temmuz 1945.

²⁵³ Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East*, 256.

²⁵⁴ Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 275, 293.

²⁵⁵ Kal, *İsmet İnönü*, 79.

²⁵⁶ Cevat Açıkalın, “Turkey’s International Relations,” *International Affairs* 23:4 (October 1947): 488. Açıkalın at the time was the Turkish Ambassador to London, and had a great impact on both the formation of Turkish response and the British stance regarding the ‘crisis’.

²⁵⁷ “Dış Bakanımızın yaptığı demeç,” *Cumhuriyet*, 12 Temmuz 1945; Mümtaz Faik Fenik, “Dış Bakanımızın demecini yorumlarken,” *Ulus*, 14 Temmuz 1945.

²⁵⁸ Mümtaz Faik Fenik, “Dış politikamızda devamlılık,” *Ulus*, 12 Temmuz 1945. Also see “Boğazlar meselesi,” *Cumhuriyet*, 6 Aralık 1945.

the imperialist policy of Tsarist Russia. Maybe the most influential person in formulating the policy of the Turkish Foreign Ministry on the issue, Feridun Cemal Erkin, represented the Soviet Union as being prisoner to “age old ambitions of the Tsars.”²⁵⁹ Kâzım Karabekir, who was an Assembly member in 1945 and who also served as the commander of the Eastern Army during the War of Independence and was one of the crucial actors in the formation of the Soviet-Turkish friendship in 1920, underlined in the Parliament that he wished that good relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union could be maintained. But he warned, if the Soviets insisted on territorial concessions and if the Soviets were insistent on pursuing Tsarist policies, the enmity of the nineteenth century would certainly revive.²⁶⁰

The articles printed in Turkish newspapers were of significance in the (re)construction of the Soviet representation throughout the period following the 1945 demands. The stance of the government was mainly communicated to the public through newspapers. This influence also resulted from the lack of public statements by foreign policy makers.²⁶¹ After publicly stating Turkey’s stance regarding the Soviet demands, foreign policy makers did not publicly discuss the matter further. According to Karabekir, the conviction that such a course could have undermined Turkey’s position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union was an influential reason for this policy.²⁶² Yet, another reason was the profound belief that the situation was considered to be quite straightforward. The Soviet Union asked for concessions that would severely undermine

²⁵⁹ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 254. The ambitions that Menemencioğlu described as ‘imaginary myths.’ See “Türk-İngiliz ve Türk-Sovyet münasebetleri,” *Cumhuriyet*, 10 Şubat 1945.

²⁶⁰ *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, 7. Dönem, 20 Aralık 1945, cilt 20 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946), 256-259.

²⁶¹ For the lack of public statements, see Falih Rıfkı Atay, “Boğazlar meselesine dair,” *Ulus*, 7 Aralık 1945; Kâzım Karabekir, *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, cilt 20, 256-257.

²⁶² See Kâzım Karabekir, *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, cilt 20, 256-257.

Turkish sovereignty and independence. Any discussion addressing how and why the Soviet Union was a security threat was ‘fruitless’. This conviction was most evident during the parliamentary discussions on the issue of the extension of the state of emergency in İstanbul and nearby cities. When some members of the Parliament asked the government to convene a closed session to further discuss the national security threat for extending the state of emergency, the answer was presented in a simplified manner as: “Even the children know what the threat to our national security threat is. Have you forgotten the [Soviet] demands for bases in the Straits?”²⁶³

The (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union as a ‘prisoner to the imperialism of Tsarist Russia’ was reinforced by Turkish newspapers. Falih Rıfkı Atay, one of the most prominent columnists and also a member of the Parliament, blamed Soviet policy makers for abandoning the ‘sincere friendship’ built during the time of Lenin and the return to what he represented as ‘Tsarist policy’.²⁶⁴ Nadir Nadi, who was the leading columnist of *Cumhuriyet*, argued that the demands of the Soviet Union revealed that Moscow reverted to the Tsarist policy of expansion after 20 years.²⁶⁵ Similarly, *Cumhuriyet* represented the Soviet demands on the Straits as the continuation of the Tsarist policy of expansion into the Mediterranean.²⁶⁶ The link between the Soviet Union and Tsarist Russia was completed by arguing that the ‘*Moskof* obsession’, hinting at the historical continuity with Tsarist Russia, with reaching the Mediterranean and occupying the Straits has always been revealed when Russia felt

²⁶³ *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, 8. Dönem, 4 Aralık 1946, cilt 3 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1947), 16. For the entire discussion, see *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, cilt 3, 13-24.

²⁶⁴ Falih Rıfkı Atay, “Rusya ile münasebetlerimiz hakkında,” *Ulus*, 22 Aralık 1945.

²⁶⁵ Nadir Nadi, “Bir milletten toprak istemek,” *Cumhuriyet*, 13 Temmuz 1945. Also see Nadir Nadi, “Milli Misak şuuru,” *Cumhuriyet*, 28 Aralık 1945.

²⁶⁶ Kenan Kan, “Anglo-Saksonlarla Rusların rekabeti,” *Cumhuriyet*, 4 Kasım 1945.

itself strong enough. Furthermore, this ‘obsession’, it was argued, had been the major cause of numerous wars between Turkey and Russia.²⁶⁷ Correspondingly this ‘reversal’ to imperialism was the sole reason for the deterioration of Soviet-Turkish friendship after WWII.²⁶⁸

The (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union as the successor of ‘Tsarist imperialism’ utilized readily available cultural and linguistic tools of the Turkish foreign policy discourse. Following the 1945 demands, the Soviet Union was represented in Turkish foreign policy discourse also as the follower of Nazi ideology (territorial imperialism) and tactics (coercion and oppression). Prime Minister Saracoğlu represented the territorial demands of Georgia as the interpretation of Hitler’s *Lebensraum* (living space).²⁶⁹ Such associations, although indirectly, were also implied during the parliamentary discussions. M. B. Pars, a member of the Parliament, stated his fear of the ‘revival of Hitler’s spirit’.²⁷⁰

Turkish newspapers upheld this view and, further, argued that these demands were ‘strategic manipulations’ of the Soviets.²⁷¹ Nadi reminded the readers that Hitler used to put forth ethnic, linguistic or historical arguments in order to mask his imperialist aspirations.²⁷² Nadi argued that the Soviet Union employed Hitler’s methods, however the former’s utilization of these methods was more likely to become

²⁶⁷ Abidin Dav’er, “Montreux andlaşması ve Boğazlar meselesi,” *Cumhuriyet*, 22 Temmuz 1945; Abidin Dav’er, “Rusya doğu Akdenizde niçin liman istiyor?” *Cumhuriyet*, 15 Mayıs 1946; Abidin Dav’er, “Dış tehlike vardır, gafflete düşmiyelim!” *Cumhuriyet*, 3 Ağustos 1946; Abidin Dav’er, “Sovyet Rusyanın gerçekleştirmek istediği emeller,” *Cumhuriyet*, 21 Ağustos 1946.

²⁶⁸ “Türk-Rus dostluğunu tekrar kurmanın tek şartı,” *Cumhuriyet*, 22 Aralık 1945.

²⁶⁹ “Başbakanımızın demeci,” *Cumhuriyet*, 7 Ocak 1946; “Saracoğlu dedi ki,” *Ulus*, 7 Ocak 1946.

²⁷⁰ *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi*, 7. Dönem, 8 Mayıs 1946, cilt 23 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946), 30.

²⁷¹ Nadir Nadi, “Profesörlere cevabımız,” *Cumhuriyet*, 8 Ocak 1946; Abidin Dav’er, “Bağazlarda üs istiyen Rusya, Akdenizi istiyor demektir,” *Cumhuriyet*, 14 Ekim 1945.

²⁷² Nadir Nadi, “O metod bizde sökmez,” *Cumhuriyet*, 23 Aralık 1945.

real.²⁷³ Similarly, it was argued in the pro-government *Cumhuriyet* that the Soviet Union possessing larger resources of population and land than Germany posed a greater danger to world peace.²⁷⁴ Thus, by utilizing the already available symbols and representations in the Turkish foreign policy discourse, the image of the Soviet Union was (re)constructed in the post-war period as not only a clear threat to Turkish sovereignty and independence, but also as a threat to world peace. It was emphasized that the Soviet policy had gone through significant change, while Turkish policy remained stable. And this change (to imperialism and Nazism) was represented as being solely responsible for the ‘crisis’ between Turkey and the Soviet Union. This representation clearly aimed to differentiate the Soviet Union of the time from the Soviet Union of the inter-war years, and represent the identity of the Soviet Union as a combination of Tsarist Russia and Nazi Germany. The next part will seek to show how this differentiation was strengthened through the (re)construction of the representation of the ‘West’ (especially the United States) in direct opposition to the Soviet Union and how the dichotomy between the constructed identities of the ‘West’ and the Soviet Union was represented as a necessity for ‘choosing’ between two separate worlds.

3.3. Potsdam Conference and the internationalization of the ‘crisis’

The first signs of US interest in the Straits issue were seen during the Potsdam Conference. On 22 July 1945, as presented to Sarper beforehand on June 7, Molotov

²⁷³ Nadir Nadi, “Manzara,” *Cumhuriyet*, 23 Kasım 1946. Also see Falih Rıfkı Atay, “Olan bitenler karşısında,” *Ulus*, 29 Ocak 1946.

²⁷⁴ “19 milyon şiarı olan 10 kelime,” *Cumhuriyet*, 27 Aralık 1945.

proposed a new regime for the Straits based on joint-defense. Neither the United States nor Britain was not ready to accept such a proposal, and Churchill stated that this proposal went well beyond what was discussed before.²⁷⁵ Harry Truman had proposed the internationalization of the Straits (along with other in-land waterways), but this proposal was turned down by Stalin.²⁷⁶ Once it was understood that no decision could be reached, the ‘Big Three’ decided to leave the matter till later. It was decided that all parties would pursue the question through ‘direct conversations’ with Turkey.²⁷⁷ Yet, during a private conversation between Stalin and Churchill, Stalin asked whether the Soviet Union could be given a base at Dedeagatch (in Western Thrace) if it was not possible to provide bases located at the Straits.²⁷⁸ The issue of territorial demands was also addressed during the Conference. However, Stalin underlined that these demands were made because the Turkish government asked to conclude an alliance with the Soviet Union. Otherwise the Soviet Union would not have raised the issue.²⁷⁹

Although the Potsdam Conference somewhat increased Western interest in the Straits issue, this was not accompanied by a clear backing of the Turkish arguments

²⁷⁵ Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 283.

²⁷⁶ Stalin and Molotov justly argued that a proposal of internationalization not including the waterways controlled by Britain and US (Suez, Panama) would be unfair. Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 285-287; Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East*, 264.

²⁷⁷ The Soviet and Western interpretations of this decision differ significantly. While the Soviet Union interpreted the decision as ‘direct negotiations,’ United States and Britain saw ‘direct conversations’ as a step for an international conference. Although several sources mention this issue, neither of them argues that this was an intentional tactic of the Soviet Union. See Mehmet Gönlübol and Haluk Ülman, “Genel Durum,” in *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973)*, eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974), 210; DeLuca, “Soviet-American Politics and the Turkish Straits,” 512-513.

²⁷⁸ Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East*, 263; Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 284.

Furthermore, Stalin on several other occasions mentioned that Soviet Union could be satisfied with less than permanent bases. Furthermore, Soviet attempts to obtain bases on the Straits were very similar to US efforts for bases in Iceland, Greenland, Panama, Azores and the Western Pacific. Melvyn P. Leffler, “Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952,” *Journal of American History* 71:4 (March 1985): 810. It should also useful to recall that Molotov in both of his conversations with Sarper had asked whether if Turkey could give bases at times of war.

²⁷⁹ The Soviet demands for territorial concessions were discussed in length above, and Stalin’s argument is in line with Molotov’s arguments during his conversations with Sarper.

– not yet in 1945.²⁸⁰ Erkin described Turkey’s ‘frustration’ in the following words: “we were left all alone against the Soviet threat.”²⁸¹ Therefore, a significant pillar of Turkish policy should be ‘to look for, find, and *if nonexistent to create*’ the context to mount Western support.²⁸² United States, in accordance with the Potsdam decision on the subject, was the first power to give a note to Turkey. The proposal, in general, suggested that the Straits should be closed to warships of non-Black Sea states, while the warships of Black Sea states should enjoy the right to navigate through the Straits at all times.²⁸³ According to Mehmet Gönlübol and Haluk Ülman, prominent observers of Turkish foreign policy, this note was an indication of the change in US policy regarding the issue, since the United States, while leaving aside the former internationalization scheme, was abandoning the idea which had been most contrary to Turkish interests in the first place.²⁸⁴

Yet, it should be noted that a regime providing the right of unrestricted passage through the Straits to Soviet warships and entirely denying the passage of other nations’ warships was also threatening to Turkey. Indeed as Erkin argued, it was not less threatening than the internationalization of the Straits (if the Soviet Union is represented as a threat).²⁸⁵ If such a regime was accepted, during the time of war when the Soviet Union is a belligerent and Turkey is neutral, the Soviet ships could have freely attacked any fleet in the Mediterranean or the Aegean and retire safely back to the Straits. And if

²⁸⁰ Mustafa Aydın, “Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 36:1 (January 2000): 107.

²⁸¹ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 256, 295.

²⁸² Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 278.

²⁸³ Ahmed Şükrü Esmer, “The Straits: Crux of World Politics,” *Foreign Affairs* 25:2 (1947): 297-298.

²⁸⁴ Gönlübol and Ülman, “Genel Durum,” 213. Also see Yavuz Abadan, “Boğazlar rejimi ve Amerika,” *Cumhuriyet*, 12 Kasım 1945. For a praise of US’ internationalization scheme, see Nadir Nadi, “Truman’ın güzel nutku,” *Cumhuriyet*, 12 Ağustos 1945.

²⁸⁵ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 271-272, 336.

the ships attacked by the Soviet Union wanted to pursue the Soviet fleet, they had to be stopped by Turkish forces, as a result of which Turkey would probably be forced to join the war.²⁸⁶ How such a regime could be practiced during a time war in which Turkey and the Soviet Union were on different sides would be even more problematic.²⁸⁷ In fact, if the demand for bases was rejected for preventing Turkey's obligatory 'dependence' on the Soviet Union, such a regime would have 'forced' Turkey to a similar outcome. Notwithstanding such problems, the Turkish government accepted United States' proposal as a basis for discussions with certain reservations.²⁸⁸

Although British interests in the area were far greater than US interests, as Howard argues it wouldn't have been 'strategic' for Britain to firmly reject Soviet proposals, since Britain controlled both ends of the Mediterranean.²⁸⁹ Still, the British were in the Mediterranean, while the Soviets were not, and Britain wanted to keep things as they were.²⁹⁰ In other words, British policy was one of putting the issue off as long as they could. Yet, this should not be read as a clear support to Turkey. When Turkey, in February 1946, asked Britain to declare that the 1939 Alliance²⁹¹ was still valid, British Foreign Office's response was negative.²⁹² Nevertheless, something Erkin represents as 'very significant' took place in mid-February 1946. The Soviet

²⁸⁶ Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 271-272, 336; Esmer, "The Straits: Crux of World Politics," 301.

²⁸⁷ The US proposal did not mention any restrictions in size, number or time for the passage of Soviet warships.

²⁸⁸ Probably above mentioned points were the major concerns of the Turkish government. Yet, if the Soviet Union had accepted an international conference, how much impact Turkey could have to restrict the US scheme is questionable.

²⁸⁹ Howard, Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy, 241.

²⁹⁰ Kuniholm, The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East, 71.

²⁹¹ The Alliance that the Turkish government declared invalid in 1940, after the occupation of France.

²⁹² Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 287.

Ambassador had a ‘very friendly’²⁹³ talk with Nurullah Sümer, acting Turkish Foreign Minister, at a party at the British Embassy. Such a talk was considered to be ‘extraordinary’ given the nature of the Soviet-Turkish relations at the time. Erkin later represented this move as an acceptance, on the Soviet part, of the failure of coercive tactics, and noted that he was exceptionally relieved at the time.²⁹⁴

Maybe it was with the help of the confidence boost provided by this event that Saracoğlu was able to tell the Soviet Ambassador in February 1946 that “you [Soviets] are fascists and Nazis.”²⁹⁵ This was an example of the (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union, in the Turkish foreign policy discourse, as the successor of Nazi Germany. It should be noted that clear support of the Western powers was not yet present. In other words, Turkish authorities were able to stand ‘firm’ against the Soviet Union without clear support from the Western powers. ‘Clear’ indications of Western support to Turkey started with Truman’s speech in the United States Congress on April 6, in which he stressed that if Turkey was attacked by another state, the United Nations, and if the U.N. fails, the United States would come to Turkey’s aid.²⁹⁶ On April 15, the greatly hailed *USS Missouri* battleship arrived in Turkey.²⁹⁷ Ernest Bevin also

²⁹³ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 280.

²⁹⁴ Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 280-284.

²⁹⁵ Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 298.

²⁹⁶ Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, 241.

²⁹⁷ Most of the sources attach great significance to the event, and interpret the event as a warning sign to the Soviet Union. Mensur Akgün and Turan Aydın, *Türkiye-Rusya İlişkilerinde Yapısal Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri* (Istanbul: Tüsiad, 1999), 51; Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 173; George Harris, *Troubled Alliance: Turkish-American Problems in Historical Perspective, 1945-1971* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1972), 20; Gönlübol and Ülman, “Genel Durum,” 215; Aydın, “Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy,” 108.

declared on June 4 in the House of Commons that Britain would honor its obligations to Turkey under the 1939 Alliance in case of a threat to Turkish independence.²⁹⁸

Yet, even before these ‘clear’ declarations of support, the ‘West’, especially the United States, had begun to be represented as the ‘defender of freedom’ in the Turkish foreign policy discourse. Saracoğlu praised the efforts of Britain and the United States during WWII in the Parliament, and declared that the United States was the “defender of freedom, justice, civilization and humanity in the world.”²⁹⁹ Similarly, Nadir Nadi argued that the United States and Britain strived for the “creation of a world system, in which all states enjoyed the rights of freedom and equality,” while the Soviet Union jeopardized other states’ security in the name of its own.³⁰⁰ ‘Obviously’ the Turkish cause and struggle (against the Soviet Union) was identified as a ‘struggle for rights and freedoms’ and was linked to the Western struggle.³⁰¹

Following the greatly praised *USS Missouri*’s ‘visit’ to İstanbul, the United States was further idolized as the ‘greatest’ defender of world peace and freedom.³⁰² Nihat Erim, a columnist in *Ulus* and a member of the Parliament, declared in the Parliament that the United States not only possessed the greatest military capability, but was also the leader of all nations in ‘ethics’ as a result of its struggle for the right of every nation to freely choose its type of government.³⁰³ Likewise, Prime Minister Saracoğlu maintained that Turkey could pay its debts to Washington only by “standing

²⁹⁸ Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, 242.

²⁹⁹ *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, cilt 17, 44.

³⁰⁰ Nadir Nadi, “Churchill neye çalışıyor?” *Cumhuriyet*, 17 Mart 1946.

³⁰¹ “Amerikan sempatisinin önemi,” *Cumhuriyet*, 14 Ocak 1946.

³⁰² See H. S. Tanrıöver, *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, cilt 23, 27; M. B. Pars, *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, cilt 23, 30-31.

³⁰³ *T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi*, cilt 23, 31.

side by side with the United States on issues regarding freedom, justice, independence and humanity.”³⁰⁴

The Turkish newspapers were also influential in the construction of the identity of the United States as the ‘defender of world peace and freedom’. Atay represented the *USS Missouri* as the ‘symbol and messenger of peace and freedom’, while the United States was argued to be the defender of world security, and of ideals like freedom, equality and sovereignty.³⁰⁵ According to Turkish newspapers, the United States, the greatest power in the world, was using its power neither for expansionist and/or imperialistic aspirations nor for the forceful oppression of other states contrary to the Soviet Union. The mighty power of the United States served the ideals of freedom and justice; and was only used against those that stood for oppression and war wrote Turkish columnists.³⁰⁶

Nihat Erim, also a member of the Parliament, declared in *Ulus* that the world was being divided into two: one part consisting of the Soviet Union and its satellites, while the other, which was lead by the United States, comprised ‘free’ states.³⁰⁷ The President of Turkey, İsmet İnönü, confirmed this divide and argued that it was no longer possible to follow a foreign policy pleasing all the great powers. Turkey had to ‘choose’ sides.³⁰⁸ But, in fact Turkey had already ‘chosen’ its side when the identities of the Soviet Union and the United States were (re)constructed in the dominant discourse of the policy makers. One as the ‘defender’ the other as the ‘enemy’ of world peace and

³⁰⁴ T.B.M.M. Zabıt Ceridesi, cilt 23, 23.

³⁰⁵ Falih Rıfkı Atay, “Missouri,” *Ulus*, 5 Nisan 1946.

³⁰⁶ Nadir Nadi, “Dost Amerika’nın denizcilerini karşılarken,” *Cumhuriyet*, 5 Nisan 1946; Abidin Dav’er, “Amerika, Yakın ve Ortadoğunun koruyucusu,” *Cumhuriyet*, 8 Nisan 1946.

³⁰⁷ Nihat Erim, “Eski ile yeni çarpışıyor,” *Ulus*, 19 Haziran 1946.

³⁰⁸ “İnönü’nün Türk Milletine seçim beyannamesi,” *Ulus*, 18 Temmuz 1946.

freedom. Turkey had ‘chosen’ its side when the Soviet Union was represented as a ‘threat’ to Turkish independence and sovereignty. Yet, it was after the construction of the representation of the United States in direct opposition to the Soviet Union that Turkey’s ‘side’ became clear. The next section will aim to demonstrate the solidification of this ‘choice’.

3.3.1. Soviet notes, Turkish replies

One year after the Potsdam decision to continue ‘conversations’ with the Turkish government, the Soviet Union sent a note to Turkey on August 7, 1946. The note did not put forth any new demands (previous territorial demands were not mentioned). The Soviet proposal consisted of five points, the first three of which were the same as the US note. The other two points proposed joint defense of the Straits and called for bilateral negotiations for establishing a new regime by Turkey and the Soviet Union. The Soviet note emphasized that the ‘less-than-perfect’ implementation of the Montreux Convention throughout WWII demonstrated the inadequacy of the regime.³⁰⁹ The Turkish reply accepted the first three points, but the proposal for the joint defense of the Straits and bilateral negotiations for a new regime were rejected. Prime Minister Recep Peker explained at the Parliament that the last two points were infringing upon Turkish

³⁰⁹ Several occasions in which Axis warships were able to pass through the Straits were cited as the defense of the Soviet argument.

‘independence’ and ‘sovereignty’, and accordingly were unacceptable.³¹⁰ A detailed defense of Turkey’s record of the practice of the Montreux Convention was also included in the Turkish reply. The reasons behind the breaches pointed to by the Soviet Union were clarified.³¹¹ The Soviet note was a ‘relief’ to Turkish foreign policy makers, as they were expecting worse. This relief was clearly expressed by the Foreign Minister Hasan Saka.³¹²

The second Soviet note, presented on 24 September 1946, was milder in tone. Although repeating the demands and accusations of the first note, the idea of an international conference on the Straits was not ruled out by the Soviet Union.³¹³ This was also acknowledged by some members of the Turkish government, who called for a negotiation with the Soviet Union. Britain also advised the Turkish government to negotiate with the Soviet Union.³¹⁴ Yet, after some discussions on the issue, the idea of negotiations was rejected, and the Turkish reply was drafted as a defense of the Montreux regime, and Turkish ‘independence’ and ‘sovereignty’.³¹⁵ The Soviet demands for joint defense were represented as the indication of Soviet ambitions for expansion. It was argued that the revisions accepted by Turkey and the Western

³¹⁰ T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi, 8. Dönem, 14 Ağustos 1946, cilt 1 (Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946), 30. Also see “R. Peker’in boğazlara dair demeci,” Ulus, 19 Ekim 1946; “Ruslara notamız dün verildi,” Cumhuriyet, 19 Ekim 1946.

³¹¹ For the complete texts of both notes, see Vali, The Turkish Straits and NATO, 246-265. Turkish implementation of the Montreux regime is considered to be decent. For a critique of the Turkish record, see DeLuca, Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits, 145. Nevertheless, WWII demonstrated that Soviet Union was dependent on Turkey’s determination to implement the Montreux Convention. And this determination may not be present at every occasion. Soviet decision to move the industry to southeastern Russia intensified Soviet fears for the security of the Black Sea region. See DeLuca, “Soviet-American Politics and the Turkish Straits,” 523-529; Leffler, “Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War,” 813.

³¹² Bilge, Güç Komşuluk, 302.

³¹³ Akgün and Aydın, “Türkiye-Rusya İlişkilerinde Yapısal Sorunlar,” 52; Esmer, “The Straits: Crux of World Politics,” 300.

³¹⁴ Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953, 307; Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 306.

³¹⁵ It was accepted in both Turkish notes that some technical revisions have to be made to the Montreux Convention, but the idea of a major change was rejected. For the complete texts of the second Soviet and Turkish notes, see Vali, The Turkish Straits and NATO, 266-300.

countries to the regulations of the passage of warships defined in the first three points should satisfy Soviet Union's security in the Black Sea.³¹⁶ The Soviet Union took no further steps after the Turkish reply and the 'Straits crisis' came to an end.

The reaction of Turkish newspapers to the Soviet demand for bases positioned at the Straits was identical: yielding to Soviet demands for bases was the same as handing over the whole country. It was argued that if bases were to be given to the Soviets, Turkey would cease to exist as an independent country and would become a satellite of the Soviet Union.³¹⁷ It was also argued that an independent and sovereign state should protect its territory by itself.³¹⁸ These arguments represented the demands for bases as a 'threat' for not only Turkey, but for any 'independent' state. Yet, the issue was represented quite differently when it came to US 'demands' for bases in Europe and in the Far East. It was argued that the bases 'requested' by the United States were to be used for the protection of international security and peace. It was also argued by Abidin Dav'er, a prominent columnist of *Cumhuriyet*, that for a state, which has taken onto itself the protection of world security and peace, it was not only reasonable, but also necessary to request bases.³¹⁹ The manner of in which the Soviet Union and the United States made 'demands' was also differentiated. While the United States, which was represented as having no aspirations for territorial expansion, sought to establish bases

³¹⁶ Eduard Mark, "The War of Scare of 1946 and its Consequences," *Diplomatic History* 21:3 (Summer 1997): 405-407; Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk*, 310; Vali, *The Turkish Straits and NATO*, 70; Bilsel, "The Turkish Straits," 746. Also see Leffler, "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War," 818.

³¹⁷ Abidin Dav'er, "Sinirlerimiz gevşemiyor bilakis çelikleşiyor," *Cumhuriyet*, 26 Aralık 1945; Dav'er, "Dış tehlike vardır, gaflete düşmeyelim"; Nadir Nadi, "Rus istekleri karşısında yapılacak şey," *Cumhuriyet*, 14 Ağustos 1946; Falih Rıfkı Atay, "Rus istekleri karşısında," *Ulus*, 15 Ağustos 1946; Nihat Erim, "Sovyet notası karşısında," *Ulus*, 14 Ağustos 1946.

³¹⁸ Nihat Erim, "Sovyetlerin yeni notası," *Ulus*, 3 Ekim 1946; Abidin Dav'er, "Boğazların müştereken müdafaası mı? Asla!" *Cumhuriyet*, 23 Ağustos 1946.

³¹⁹ Abidin Dav'er, "Amerika'nın kurmak istediği daimi üsler," *Cumhuriyet*, 30 Nisan 1946.

with the consent of other states, the Soviet Union employed force and oppression to achieve its imperialistic ambitions.³²⁰

3.4. Conclusion

The major objective of Chapter 3 was to show how the Soviet Union was interpellated by Turkish foreign policy makers with a different identity than the ‘sincere friend’ identity (re)constructed throughout the inter-war years, and how this different identity enabled the construction of the representation of the Soviet Union as the successor of ‘Tsarist imperialism’ and ‘Nazi Germany’ by Turkish foreign policy makers. Furthermore, the (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union as a ‘prisoner to the imperialism of Tsarist Russia’ was reinforced by Turkish newspapers. The ‘imperialist’ Soviet Union and its ‘demands’ were represented by the Turkish foreign policy makers, and newspapers as an ‘obvious threat’ to Turkish ‘sovereignty’ and ‘independence’. The Chapter argued that the 1945-1946 ‘crisis’ between Turkey and the Soviet Union was not the inevitable product of the ‘Soviet demands’ for ‘unacceptable’ concessions. Rather, 1945 demands and the Soviet Union were represented as ‘threats’ to Turkish ‘sovereignty’ and ‘independence’ as a result of the (re)construction of the Soviet representation as an unfriendly power during and in the immediate aftermath of WWII. The Conclusion will focus on the practical and theoretical implications of the arguments presented in thesis.

³²⁰ Dav’er, “Amerika’nın kurmak istediği daimi üsler.”

CONCLUSION

This thesis set off to provide an account of Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Soviet Union during the inter-war and post-war eras. This was attempted by employing a critical constructivist approach that seeks to illustrate the constructed character of the subject matter of IR. This has implications for the practice of international politics in the way that it opens up room for change through the demonstration of the arbitrariness of existing structures of ‘reality’ and ‘knowledge’. The arbitrariness of Turkey’s foreign policy towards the Soviet Union was demonstrated by looking at the radically different responses given by Turkish foreign policy makers to the contextually similar ‘demands’ of the Soviet Union. It was argued that the Soviet ‘demands’ throughout the inter-war years did not alter the ‘sincere friend’ identity of the Soviet Union, while similar ‘demands’ in the post-war era entirely changed the identity of the Soviet Union to an ‘enemy’. Whereas the ‘sincere friend’ identity allowed for maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union, the ‘enemy’ identity allowed the move towards the United States as opposed to the Soviet Union.

The implications of this ‘move’ for practice maintained their significance in Turkish Foreign Policy. In 1946, Turkey had ‘resisted’ the Soviet demands arguing that

it did not need Soviet support for defending the Straits. Yet, interestingly the argument for closer relations with the United States was built on that very need for support in defending the Straits. There is nearly a consensus in the literature on Turkish Foreign Policy that the 1945-46 demands of the Soviet Union were the ‘major’ reasons behind Turkey ‘leaning’ towards the West.³²¹ It is also argued that had the Soviet Union not insisted on the 1945 demands, Turkey would have continued its neutral policy.³²² After the episode following the 1945 demands, Turkey sought to ‘enhance’ its security by joining Western institutions. When NATO was established in 1949, Turkish efforts were directed towards becoming a member. Bilge argues that Turkey tried to join NATO, because it was a weak country.³²³ Similarly, Erkin maintains that Turkey’s own capabilities were inadequate to defend the Straits in case of an attack. Thus, NATO had to support Turkey in a substantial way for the defense of the Straits.³²⁴ The Turkish argument, when the Soviet Union proposed a joint defense of the Straits, was based on

³²¹ Kamuran Gürün, Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası: 1939’dan Günümüze Kadar (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları ve Basın-Yayın Yüksek Okulu Basımevi, 1983), 206; Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, “Turkey’s Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma,” The International Spectator 27:1 (January-March 1992): 20; Hüseyin Bağcı, “Türkiye’nin NATO Üyeliğini Hızlandıran İki Önemli Faktör: Kore Savaşı ve ABD Büyükelçisi George McGhee,” ÖDTÜ Gelişme Dergisi 18:1 (1991): 2; “Dış Politikamız Üzerine,” Forum 161 (15 December 1960): 1; Knox Helm, “Turkey and Her Defence Problems,” International Affairs 30:4 (October 1954): 436. Mustafa Aydın also emphasizes the economic reasons behind Turkey’s decision, but Soviet demands in his analysis also play a pivotal part. See Mustafa Aydın, “Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War,” Middle Eastern Studies 36:1 (January 2000): 106, 109-112. Ali Halil argues that the decision to lean to the West was taken to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie, since Turkey could resist Soviet demands by itself. Ali Halil, Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1968), 98-99. Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu maintains that Turkey’s lean to the West could not be understood by reference to short-term interests and puts the emphasis on the urge to be become a member of the Western family of nations, but the next page argues that Soviet demands were very influential in giving momentum to this urge. Yücel Bozdağlıoğlu, Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach (New York: Routledge, 2003), 57-58.

³²² Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer, “Turkey’s Security Policies,” Adelphi Papers (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies), 13; Gürün, Kamuran Gürün, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), 315; Helm, “Turkey and Her Defence Problems,” 436; Gürün, Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası, 206.

³²³ A. Suat Bilge, Güç Komşuluk: Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 1920-1964 (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1992), 334.

³²⁴ Feridun Cemal Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), 355.

the sovereign rights of Turkey to protect its own territory by itself. Although the international context was altered substantially between 1945 and the early 1950s, the difference was constructed through the (re)representation of concepts like ‘independence’ and ‘sovereignty’.

One of the main roles of Turkey within NATO was ‘bottling up’ the Soviet navy in the Black Sea.³²⁵ Furthermore, the US need to obtain bases on Turkish territory was one of the key reasons in accepting Turkey to NATO in the first place.³²⁶ After Turkey became a member of NATO, crucial American (NATO) bases were established in İzmit (Karamürsel), İzmir (Çigli), Adana (İncirlik), Diyarbakır (Pirincilik). Relatively smaller bases were also established in Manisa, Afyon, Konya, İskenderun, Samsun, Trabzon, Erzurum and Ankara.³²⁷ Understanding how a country fiercely rejecting the idea of granting bases to another state could allow the establishment of more than ten bases on its territory demands more than a static conceptualization of ‘national interest’, along with awareness of the historical context.

Representation of the country making a ‘demand’, awareness of the historical context and conjuncture are significant constituents in understanding the construction of the difference between a ‘threat’ and a ‘necessity’. When United States was represented as the ‘defender of freedom and independence’ in the world, the acquisition of bases was represented as a ‘necessity’ for the United States to perform the ‘responsibilities’ of its role in the world. On the other hand, the representation of the Soviet Union as the

³²⁵ Bruce R. Kuniholm, “Turkey and the West,” *Foreign Affairs* 70:2 (Spring 1991): 34, 38.

³²⁶ Melvyn P. Leffler, “Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952,” *Journal of American History* 71:4 (March 1985): 813; Halil, *Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye*, 125.

³²⁷ Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus*, 137. Also see Nur Bilge Criss, “U.S. Forces in Turkey” in *U.S. Military Forces in Europe- The Early Years, 1945-1970*, eds. Simon W. Duke and Wolfgang Krieger (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1993), 341-349.

‘greatest enemy’ of world peace and freedom meant that its demands constituted a clear ‘threat’. It should also be noted that the whole responsibility of the (re)construction of the Soviet representation or the Turkish policy that followed should not be solely placed on Turkey. The Soviet policy certainly played a large part, and this was also admitted by Nikita Khrushchev and Molotov later in 1953.³²⁸ Especially, the way in which the Soviet demands were presented to Turkey was ‘alarming’. Yet, the difference between the demands made between 1920 and 1939, and those made in 1945 was largely made sensible through the (re)construction of the representation of the Soviet Union.

As a challenge to the realist accounts of Soviet-Turkish relations, and Turkish Foreign Policy in general, it was argued that critical constructivism provides a fuller account of this case. The major aim of this study was to present the processes through which Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Soviet Union was (re)constructed by Turkish foreign policy makers and how this enabled a different policy towards the Soviet Union in the post-war period. For this reason, the representations of the Soviet Union (re)constructed years later in the academic literature were omitted from the analysis. Yet, their uncritical repetition³²⁹ of the Soviet representation constructed

³²⁸ William Hale, “Turkey and the Cold War: The Engagement Phase, 1945-63,” chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 109-145 (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), 120; Eduard Mark, “The War of Scare of 1946 and its Consequences,” Diplomatic History 21:3 (Summer 1997): 414; Gürün, Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası, 200.

³²⁹ For the representation of the Soviet Union as the ‘successor’ of ‘Tsarist imperialism’, see Sezer, “Turkey’s Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma,” 19; Haluk Ülman, “Sovyetler Birliği ve Türk Bogazları,” Forum 161 (15 December 1960): 6; Samuel Kuchеров, “The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits,” Russian Review 8:3 (July 1949): 220; Cemil Bilsel, “The Turkish Straits in the Light of Recent Turkish-Soviet Russian Correspondence,” The American Journal of International Law 41:4 (October 1947): 744; Necmeddin Sadak, “Turkey Faces the Soviets,” Foreign Affairs 27:3 (April 1949): 459; Ferenc A. Vali, Bridge Across the Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 211. For sources totally neglecting the inter-war years and representing a perpetual ‘Moskof’ threat, see Mark, “The War of Scare of 1946 and its Consequences,” 388; Tarihte Türk-Rus İlişkileri (Ankara: Genelkurmay, 1976), 120; Yahya Okçu, Türk-Rus Mücadelesi Tarihi (Ankara: Doğuş, 1953), 187-189.

throughout the ‘Straits crisis’ played a crucial part in the naturalization of the ‘enemy’ representation of the Soviet Union as ‘common sense’.

All of the sources on the topic stress the importance of Turkish sovereignty and independence.³³⁰ Furthermore, they all agree that ‘Stalin’s demands’ posed a clear threat to Turkish sovereignty and independence.³³¹ Yet, most of these sources, as the policy makers and newspapers of the 1945-46 period, do not consider any of the aspects of the Soviet-Turkish relations before WWII regarding the Straits, except the 1939 negotiations for an alliance. It is not mentioned that the reason why a friendship agreement could not be reached with the Soviet Union in 1920 and why the negotiations broke down for seven months had to do with the Soviet ‘demands’ for Muş, Bitlis and Van. The Soviet ‘demands’ for the bilateral resolution of the Straits issue, accepted by Turkey in the 1921 Treaty³³² and rejected during the negotiations of the 1925 Treaty, are not criticized. Similarly, Maxim Litvinov’s ‘demand’ for a base in the Straits during the negotiations of the Montreux Convention is not included as an example of the ‘insidious intentions’ of the Soviet Union. Erkin even praises the Soviet Union’s policy during the

³³⁰ It is interesting that the same sources do not mention these concepts, on which they seem to attach so much importance, while discussing US and NATO bases in Turkey or while discussing the role of NATO in the formation of Turkey’s defense policies. The chapter will return to this issue in the last part on the representation of NATO in Turkey.

³³¹ Haluk Ülman, “Dış Politikamızın Değişkenleri,” *Yön* (13 June 1962): 14; Mehmet Gönübol and Haluk Ülman, “Genel Durum,” in *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973)*, eds. Mehmet Gönübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974), 207; Nazmi Kal, *İsmet İnönü: Televizyonda Anlattıkları* (Ankara: Bilgi, 1993), 79; “Dış Politikamız Üzerine,” 1; Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, 256; Sadak, “Turkey Faces the Soviets,” 459; Sezer, “Turkey’s Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma,” 19; Bilsel, “The Turkish Straits,” 743; Bağcı, “Türkiye’nin NATO Üyelikliğini Hızlandıran İki Önemli Faktör,” 2; Helm, “Turkey and Her Defence Problems,” 436; Hale, “Turkey and the Cold War,” 110.

³³² Cemil Bilsel argues that the clause regarding the bilateral resolution of the Straits issue of the 1921 Treaty was not intended to reach at a solution only between Turkey and the Soviet Union. The Turkish intention was to guarantee the inclusion of the Soviet Union in an international conference on the Straits. See Cemil Bilsel, *Türk Boğazları* (İstanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası, 1948), 50-51.

Montreux convention, because the Soviet Union had ‘rejected all kinds of ambitions for expansion.’³³³

Even the analyses of the commonly criticized 1939 demands for bases located at the Straits lacks the harsh tone used to represent the 1945-46 demands. The sources criticizing the 1939 negotiations³³⁴ describe the impact of the negotiations as resulting in a ‘cool off’ of Soviet-Turkish relations³³⁵, or as ‘hard knocks’³³⁶, or as ‘the breakdown of Soviet-Turkish closeness’.³³⁷ Açıkalın informs us that 1939 negotiations showed that Soviet policy ‘completely differed’ from that of Turkey’s, and thus no agreement could be reached. Yet, Cevat Açıkalın adds that the breakdown of the negotiations lead to dissatisfaction on the ‘Soviet part’.³³⁸ This portrait is certainly different from representing the 1945 demands as most ‘unjustified attacks’ against Turkish sovereignty and independence, and the Soviet Union as the greatest ‘enemy’ of world peace and freedom.

How the representations of the academic literature contributed to the maintenance of a Turkish Foreign Policy throughout the Cold War depended on the ‘Soviet threat’, and constitutes a crucial field of analysis for further study for critical approaches. However, this study, building on the contributions of the theoretical literature on critical constructivism, and critical theory in general, aimed to present a

³³³ Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 327. Similarly, Necmeddin Sadak argues that until 1939, “nothing was left of Russian policy of expansion.” Sadak, “Turkey Faces the Soviets,” 450-452.

³³⁴ For sources putting the emphasis on the Battle of Stalingrad rather than the 1939 negotiations, see A. Suat Bilge, “Kıbrıs Uyuşmazlığı ve Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği Münasebetleri,” in Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd ed. (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974), 421; Erkin, Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, 341.

³³⁵ Sezer, “Turkey’s Security Policies,” 11-12.

³³⁶ Selim Deringil, “Aspects of Continuity in Turkish Foreign Policy: Abdülhamid II and İsmet İnönü,” International Journal of Turkish Studies 4:1 (Summer 1987): 42.

³³⁷ Nur Bilge Criss, “Turkey’s Relations with the West (1908-1945),” in Fundamenta Turchiae, ed. Erik Zürcher (forthcoming), 31.

³³⁸ Cevat Açıkalın, “Turkey’s International Relations,” International Affairs 23:4 (October 1947): 481.

critical constructivist account of Turkish Foreign Policy towards the Soviet Union in the inter-war and post-war eras. The thesis sought to achieve two more specific aims. The first aim was to present an analysis of the constitutive relationship between discourse, representations and identities, and foreign policy. The second aim was to open up room for change by presenting a critique of the dominant or hegemonic discourses of Turkish Foreign Policy and exposing the constructedness of the Turkish Foreign Policy discourse. In order to achieve these aims the thesis was presented in three Chapters.

Chapter 1 argued that a ‘static’ and ‘fixed’ conceptualization of power and interest in accounting for foreign policy limits the explanatory value of realism for the Turkish case. It was further argued that by employing the critical constructivist approach this limitation is to a great extent made up for the gap. Chapter 2 argued that the Turkish foreign policy makers differentiated the representation of the Soviet Union from that of the Russian Empire in order to enable close relations with the Soviet Union. Close relations were maintained, through the ‘sincere friend’ representation of the Soviet Union, even when demands for the joint defense of the Straits were made by the Soviet Union. Chapter 3 argued that the 1945-1946 ‘crisis’ between Turkey and the Soviet Union was not the inevitable product of the ‘Soviet demands’ for ‘unacceptable’ concessions. Rather, 1945 demands and the Soviet Union were represented as ‘threats’ to Turkish ‘sovereignty’ and ‘independence’ as a result of the (re)construction of the Soviet representation as an unfriendly power during and in the immediate aftermath of WWII.

The implication of this thesis for the study of TFP is that critical approaches provide crucial insight for understanding the processes through which the Soviet Union was represented as the ‘enemy’ of Turkey in the post-war era by the Turkish foreign

policy makers, enabling Turkey's decision to ally with NATO. For the study of foreign policy the conclusions of this thesis suggest that prominent realist accounts of foreign policy leave out significant processes through which foreign policy is formulated. On the other hand, an alternative approach to foreign policy, that of critical constructivism, offers a fuller account of foreign policy making by focusing on the mutually constitutive relationship between the construction of intersubjective meaning or discourse, and the identities and interests of agents. Instead of taking these constituents of foreign policy as exogenously given and fixed, critical constructivism questions how they were constructed in the first place. Further, critical constructivism traces the impact of these constructions on the formation of foreign policy. The study has significant implications for the practice of foreign policy making as well. By demonstrating that the 'reality' foreign policy makers act upon is a social construction critical constructivist approach provides the foreign policy makers with the possibility of alternative futures. Exposing the arbitrariness and constructedness of 'reality' suggests that realism's anarchic world marked by self-help, rivalry, and violence is not the 'natural' product of history. Thus, critical constructivism suggests that 'reality' can be constructed in a different way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “19 milyonun şiarı olan 10 kelime.” Cumhuriyet, 27 Aralık 1945.
- “Amerikan sempatisinin önemi.” Cumhuriyet, 14 Ocak 1946.
- “Başbakanımızın demeci.” Cumhuriyet, 7 Ocak 1946.
- “Boğazlar meselesi.” Cumhuriyet, 6 Aralık 1945.
- “Dış Bakanımızın yaptığı demeç.” Cumhuriyet, 12 Temmuz 1945.
- “Dış Politikamız Üzerine.” Forum 161 (15 December 1960): 1.
- “İnönü’nün Türk Milletine seçim beyannamesi.” Ulus, 18 Temmuz 1946.
- “R. Peker’in boğazlara dair demeci.” Ulus, 19 Ekim 1946.
- “Ruslara notamız dün verildi.” Cumhuriyet, 19 Ekim 1946.
- “Saracoğlu dedi ki.” Ulus, 7 Ocak 1946.
- “Sovyet talepleri.” Cumhuriyet, 25 Temmuz 1945.
- “Türk-İngiliz ve Türk-Sovyet münasebetleri.” Cumhuriyet, 10 Şubat 1945.
- “Türkiye-Sovyet Rusya arasındaki dostluk ve tarafsızlık antlaşmasının feshi.” Ulus, 22 Mart 1945.
- “Türk-Rus dostluğunu tekrar kurmanın tek şartı.” Cumhuriyet, 22 Aralık 1945.
- “Türk-Sovyet münasebetleri.” Cumhuriyet, 22 Mart 1945.

- Abadan, Yavuz. "Boğazlar rejimi ve Amerika." Cumhuriyet, 12 Kasım 1945.
- Açıklan, Cevat. "Turkey's International Relations." International Affairs 23:4 (October 1947): 477-491.
- Adler, Emanuel. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." European Journal of International Relations 3:3 (1997): 319-363.
- _____. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." European Journal of International Relations 3:3 (1997): 319-363.
- Akgün, Mensur, and Turan Aydın. Türkiye-Rusya İlişkilerinde Yapısal Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri. İstanbul: Tüsiad, 1999.
- Ashley, Richard K. "Political Realism and Human Interests." International Studies Quarterly 25:2 (June 1981): 207-236.
- Ashley, Richard K., and R. B. J. Walker. "Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline: Crisis and the Question of Sovereignty in International Studies." International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (1990): 367-416.
- _____. "Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies." International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (1990): 259-268.
- Aslan, Yavuz. Mustafa Kemal-M. Frunze Görüşmeleri: Türk-Sovyet İlişkilerinde Zirve. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2002.
- Ataöv, Türkkaya. Turkish Foreign Policy: 1939-1945. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1965.
- Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III (1906-1938). 3rd ed. Vol. I. Ankara: Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Basımevi, 1981.
- Atay, Falih Rıfkı "Boğazlar meselesine dair." Ulus, 7 Aralık 1945.
- _____. "Missouri." Ulus, 5 Nisan 1946.
- _____. "Olan bitenler karşısında." Ulus, 29 Ocak 1946.
- _____. "Rus istekleri karşısında." Ulus, 15 Ağustos 1946.
- _____. "Rusya ile münasebetlerimiz hakkında." Ulus, 22 Aralık 1945.
- Aydın, Mustafa. "Determinants of Turkish Foreign Policy: Changing Patterns and Conjunctures during the Cold War." Middle Eastern Studies 36:1 (January 2000): 103-139.

- Ayoob, Mohammed. "Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory Meets the Third World." In International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 31-54. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Bağcı, Hüseyin. "Türkiye'nin NATO Üyeliğini Hızlandıran İki Önemli Faktör: Kore Savaşı ve ABD Büyükelçisi George McGhee." ÖDTÜ Gelişme Dergisi 18:1 (1991): 1-35.
- Baldwin, David A. "Power Analysis and World Politics: New Trends versus Old Tendencies." World Politics 31:2 (January 1979): 161-194.
- Barlas, Dilek. Etatism and Diplomacy in Turkey: Economic and Foreign Policy Strategies in an Uncertain World, 1929-1939. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1998.
- Başyurt, Erhan. Ateş Yolu: Boğazlarda Bitmiyen Kavga. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 1998.
- Bilge, A. Suat. "Kıbrıs Uyuşmazlığı ve Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği Münasebetleri," in Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar. 3rd ed. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974.
- _____. Güç Komşuluk: Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 1920-1964. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1992.
- Bilgin, Mustafa Sıtkı, and Steven Morewood. "Turkey's Reliance on Britain: British Political and Diplomatic Support for Turkey against Soviet Demands, 1943-47." Middle Eastern Studies 40:2 (March 2004): 24-57.
- Bilsel, Cemil. "The Turkish Straits in the Light of Recent Turkish-Soviet Russian Correspondence." The American Journal of International Law 41:4 (October 1947): 727-747.
- _____. Türk Boğazları. İstanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası, 1948.
- Boğazlar Meselesi: Lozan ve Montrö. İstanbul: Aydınlık Yayınları, 1977.
- Booth, Ken. "Security and Emancipation." Review of International Studies 17 (1991): 313-326.
- Bozdağlıoğlu, Yücel. Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach. New York: Routledge, 2003.

- Burçak, Rıfık Salim. Moskova Görüşmeleri (26 Eylül 1939-16 Ekim 1939) ve Dış Politikamız Üzerine Tesirleri. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Basın-Yayın Yüksekokulu Basımevi, 1983.
- Burçak, Rıfık Salim. Türk-Rus-İngiliz Münasebetleri (1791-1941): İkinci Cihan Harbinde Türkiyenin Durumu. İstanbul: Aydınlık Matbaası, 1946.
- Buzan, Barry. "Conclusions: System versus Units in Theorizing about the Third World." In International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 213-234. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Campbell, David. Writing Security: United States and the Politics of Identity. 2nd edn. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Carr, E. H. The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Cebesoy, Ali Fuat. Moskova Hatıraları. İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyatı, 1955.
- Checkel, Jeffrey. "Norms, Institutions, and National Identity in Contemporary Europe." International Studies Quarterly 43 (1999): 83-114.
- _____. "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory." World Politics 50:2 (1998): 324-348.
- Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder. "Progressive Research on Degenerate Alliances." American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 919-922.
- Cox, Robert. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." In Neorealism and Its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane, 204-54. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Criss, Nur Bilge. "Turkey's Relations with the West (1908-1945)." In Fundamenta Turchiae, ed. Erik Zürcher (forthcoming).
- _____. "U.S. Forces in Turkey." In U.S. Military Forces in Europe- The Early Years, 1945-1970, eds. Simon W. Duke and Wolfgang Krieger. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1993.
- Dav'er, Abidin. "Amerika, Yakın ve Ortadoğunun koruyucusu." Cumhuriyet, 8 Nisan 1946.
- _____. "Amerika'nın kurmak istediği daimi üsler." Cumhuriyet, 30 Nisan 1946.
- _____. "Boğazların müştereken müdafaası mı? Asla!" Cumhuriyet, 23 Ağustos 1946.

_____. “Bağazlarda üs istiyen Rusya, Akdenizi istiyor demektir.” Cumhuriyet, 14 Ekim 1945.

_____. “Dış tehlike vardır, gaflete düşmiyelim!” Cumhuriyet, 3 Ağustos 1946.

_____. “Montreux andlaşması ve Boğazlar meselesi.” Cumhuriyet, 22 Temmuz 1945.

_____. “Rusya doğu Akdenizde niçin liman istiyor?” Cumhuriyet, 15 Mayıs 1946.

_____. “Sinirlerimiz gevşemiyor bilakis çelikleşiyor.” Cumhuriyet, 26 Aralık 1945.

_____. “Sovyet Rusyanın gerçekleştirmek istediği emeller.” Cumhuriyet, 21 Ağustos 1946.

DeLuca, Anthony R. “Soviet-American Politics and the Turkish Straits.” Political Science Quarterly 92:3 (Autumn 1977): 503-524.

_____. Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits: The Montreux Conference and Convention of 1936. New York: East European Monographs, Boulder Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1981.

Der Derian, James. “Post-Theory: The Eternal Return of Ethics in International Relations.” In New Thinking in International Relations Theory, eds. Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, 54-76. United States of America: Westview Press, 1997.

Deringil, Selim. “Aspects of Continuity in Turkish Foreign Policy: Abdülhamid II and İsmet İnönü.” International Journal of Turkish Studies 4:1 (Summer 1987): 39-54.

_____. Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn. “Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent-Structure Problematique in International Relations Theory.” European Journal of International Relations 3:3 (1997): 365-392.

Erim, Nihat. “Eski ile yeni çarpışıyor.” Ulus, 19 Haziran 1946.

_____. “Sovyet notası karşısında.” Ulus, 14 Ağustos 1946.

_____. “Sovyetlerin yeni notası.” Ulus, 3 Ekim 1946.

Erkin, Feridun Cemal. Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi. Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968.

- Esmer, Ahmed Şükrü. "The Straits: Crux of World Politics." Foreign Affairs 25:2 (1947): 290-302.
- Esmer, Ahmet Şükrü, and Oral Sander. "İkinci Dünya Savaşında Türk Dış Politikası." In Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar. 3rd edn. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974.
- Farrell, Theo. "Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program." Review of International Studies 4:1 (1998): 49-72.
- Fenik, Mümtaz Faik. "Dış Bakanımızın demecini yorumlarken." Ulus, 14 Temmuz 1945.
- _____. "Dış politikamızda devamlılık." Ulus, 12 Temmuz 1945.
- _____. "Türkiye ve Sovyetler." Ulus, 8 Nisan 1945.
- Frost, Mervyn. "A turn not taken: Ethics in IR at the Millennium." Review of International Studies 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 119-122.
- George, Jim and David Campbell. "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations." International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (September 1990): 269-293.
- Glaser, Charles L. "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help." International Security 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 50-90.
- Gönlübol, Mehmet, and Cem Sar. "1919-1938 Yılları Arasında Türk Dış Politikası." In Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd edn. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974.
- Gönlübol, Mehmet, and Haluk Ülman. "Genel Durum." In Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1973), eds. Mehmet Gönlübol and Cem Sar, 3rd edn. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1974.
- Grieco, Joseph M. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation." International Organization 42:3 (Summer 1988): 485-507.
- _____. "Realist International Theory and the Study of World Politics." In New Thinking in International Relations Theory, eds. Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, 163-201. United States of America: Westview Press, 1997.
- Güçlü, Yücel. "The Uneasy Relationship: Turkey's Foreign Policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union at the Outbreak of the Second World War." Mediterranean Quarterly (Summer 2002): 58-93.

Gürün, Kamuran. Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası: 1939'dan Günümüze Kadar. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları ve Basın-Yayın Yüksek Okulu Basımevi, 1983.

_____. Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri 1920-1953. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991.

Hale, William. "Foreign Relations of the Late Ottoman Empire, 1774-1918." Chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 13-43. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.

_____. "Resistance, Reconstruction and Diplomacy, 1918-39." Chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 44-78. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.

_____. "Turkey and the Cold War: The Engagement Phase, 1945-63." Chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 109-145. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.

_____. "Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45." Chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 79-108. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.

_____. "Turkey and the Second World War, 1939-45." Chap. in Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000, 79-109. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000.

Halil, Ali. Atatürkçü Dış Politika ve NATO ve Türkiye. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1968.

Harris, George. Troubled Alliance: Turkish-American Problems in Historical Perspective, 1945-1971. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1972.

Helm, Knox. "Turkey and Her Defence Problems." International Affairs 30:4 (October 1954): 434-439.

Herslag, Z. Y. "Atatürk'ün Devletçiliği." In Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Modernleşmesi, ed. Jacob M. Landau, 221-232. Translated by Meral Alakuş. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1999.

_____. Turkey: The Challenge of Growth. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Hirst, Paul. "The Eighty Years' Crisis, 1919-1999 — Power." Review of International Studies 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 133-148.

Hoffmann, Stanley, Robert O. Keohane, and John J. Mearsheimer. "Back to the Future, Part II: International Relations Theory and Post-Cold War Europe." International Security 15:2 (Autumn, 1990): 191-199.

- Hollis, Martin, and Steve Smith. Explaining and Understanding International Relations. Great Britain: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- _____. The Philosophy of Social Science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Holsti, K. J. "Hegemony and Challenge in International Theory." Chap. in The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory. Boston: Allen & Unwin: 1985.
- _____. "International Relations Theory and Domestic War in the Third World: The Limits of Relevance." In International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 103-132. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Howard, Harry N. "The Straits After the Montreux Conference." Foreign Affairs 15:1 (October 1936): 199-202.
- _____. Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Hurewitz, J. C. The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics, A Documentary Record: British-French Supremacy, 1914-1945. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Huysmans, Jef. "Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier." European Journal of International Relations 4:2 (1998): 226-255.
- İlkin, Selim. "Birinci Sanayi Planının Hazırlanışında Sovyet Uzmanların Rolü." ODTÜ Gelişim Dergisi (1979-1980, special issue): 257-288.
- İnönü, İsmet. Cumhuriyet'in ilk yılları:1923-1938. İstanbul : Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, 1998.
- İsmet İnönü'nün TBMM'deki Konuşmaları (1920-1973): Vol. I (1920-1938). Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 1992.
- İsmet İnönü'nün TBMM'deki Konuşmaları (1920-1973): Vol. II (1939-1960). Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 1993.
- Kal, Nazmi. İsmet İnönü: Televizyonda Anlattıklarım. Ankara: Bilgi, 1993.
- Kan, Kenan. "Anglo-Saksonlarla Rusların rekabeti." Cumhuriyet, 4 Kasım 1945.

- Kapur, Harish. Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927: A study of Soviet policy towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan. Geneva: Michael Joseph Limited for the Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies, 1966.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Ali L. "The Evolution of the National Security Culture and the Military in Turkey." Journal of International Affairs 54:1 (Fall 2000): 199-216.
- Keohane, Robert O. "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond." In International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, eds. Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi, 153-183. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997.
- Kepenek, Yakup, and Nurhan Yentürk. Türkiye Ekonomisi. İstanbul: Remzi Press, 1996.
- Kocabaş, Süleyman. Türkiye'nin Canı Boğazlar. İstanbul: Vatan Yayınları, 1994.
- Koslowki, Rey, and Friedrich V. Kratochwil. "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System." International Organization 48 (1994): 215-247.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich. "The Embarrassment of Changes: Neo-realism as the science of Realpolitik without Politics." Review of International Studies 19 (1993): 63-80.
- Kuchеров, Samuel. "The Problem of Constantinople and the Straits." Russian Review 8:3 (July 1949): 205-220.
- Kuniholm, Bruce Robellet. "Turkey and the West." Foreign Affairs 70:2 (Spring 1991): 34-48.
- _____. The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East: Great Power Conflict and Diplomacy in Iran, Turkey, and Greece. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Laffey, Mark "Locating identity: performativity, foreign policy and state action." Review of International Studies 26 (2000): 429-444.
- Laffey, Mark, and Jutta Weldes. "US Foreign Policy, Public Memory, and Autism: Representing September 11 and May 4." Cambridge Review of International Affairs 17:2 (July 2004): 355-375.
- Lapid, Yosef. "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era." International Studies Quarterly 33:3 (September 1989): 235-254.
- Latha Varadarajan. "Constructivism, identity and neoliberal (in)security." Review of International Studies 30 (2004): 319-341.

- Leffler, Melvyn P. "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952." Journal of American History 71:4 (March 1985): 807-825.
- Legro Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" International Security 24:2 (Fall 1999): 5-55.
- Lenczowski, George. "Evolution of Soviet Policy Toward the Middle East." The Journal of Politics 20 (1958): 162-186.
- Lippe, John M. Vander. "Forgotten Brigade of the Forgotten War: Turkey's Participation in the Korean War." Middle Eastern Studies 36:1 (January 2000): 92-101.
- Lozan Barış Andlaşması Lozan'da imzalanan sözleşmeler, senetler, barış andlaşmasına ekli mektuplar ve Montrö Boğazlar Sözleşmesi: bugünkü Türkçe'yle tam metinleri. Ankara : T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, 1984.
- Lynch, Marc. State Interests and Public Spheres: The international Politics of Jordan's Identity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Mark, Eduard. "The War of Scare of 1946 and its Consequences." Diplomatic History 21:3 (Summer 1997): 383-415.
- MccGwire, Michael. "Deterrence: The Problem — Not the Solution." Strategic Studies 9:4 (December 1986): 25-42.
- Mearsheimer, John J. "The False Promise of International Institutions." International Security 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 5-49.
- Meram, Ali Kemal. Türk-Rus İlişkileri Tarihi: Ayrıca Mustafa Kemal'den Sovyetler'e, Sovyetler'den Mustafa Kemal'e Mektuplar ve Milli Mücadele. İstanbul: Kıtış Yayınları, 1969.
- Milliken, Jennifer. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods." European Journal of International Relations 5:2 (1999): 225-254.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. 5th edn. New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Nadi, Nadir. "Bir milletten toprak istemek." Cumhuriyet, 13 Temmuz 1945.
- _____. "Churchill neye çalışıyor?" Cumhuriyet, 17 Mart 1946.

_____. “Dost Amerika’nın denizcilerini karşılarken.” Cumhuriyet, 5 Nisan 1946.

_____. “Milli Misak şuuru.” Cumhuriyet, 28 Aralık 1945.

_____. “O metod bizde sökmez.” Cumhuriyet, 23 Aralık 1945.

_____. “Profesörlere cevabımız.” Cumhuriyet, 8 Ocak 1946.

_____. “Rus istekleri karşısında yapılacak şey.” Cumhuriyet, 14 Ağustos 1946.

_____. “Truman’ın güzel nutku.” Cumhuriyet, 12 Ağustos 1945.

_____. “Türk-Sovyet dostluğunun yarını.” Cumhuriyet, 9 Nisan 1945.

Neuman, Stephanie G. “International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron?” In International Relations Theory and the Third World, ed. Stephanie G. Neuman, 1-29. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998.

Okçu, Yahya. Türk-Rus Mücadelesi Tarihi. Ankara: Doğuş, 1953.

Okyar, Osman. “The Concept of Etatism.” The Economic Journal 75:297 (March 1965): 98-111.

Onuf, Nicholas. “Speaking of Policy.” In Foreign Policy in a Constructed World, ed. Vendulka Kubalkova, 77-95. United States of America: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2001.

Oren, Ido. “Is Culture Independent of National Security? How America’s National Security Concerns Shaped ‘Political Culture’ Research.” European Journal of International Relations 6:4 (2000): 543-573.

Potskhveriya, Boris B. “1920 ve 1930’lu Yıllarda Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri.” In Türk-Rus ilişkilerinde 500 yıl 1491-1992: Ankara, 12-14 Aralık 1992. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

Price, Richard, and Christian Reus-Smit. “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism.” European Journal of International Relations 4:3 (1998): 259-294.

Purvis, Trevor, and Alan Hunt. “Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology....” British Journal of Sociology 4:3 (September 1993): 473-499.

Ruggie, John Gerard. “What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge.” International Organization 52:4 (Autumn 1998): 855-885.

- Sadak, Necmeddin. "Turkey Faces the Soviets." Foreign Affairs 27:3 (April 1949): 449-461.
- Schweller, Randall L. "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." International Security 19:1 (Summer 1994): 72-107.
- _____. "New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz's Balancing Proposition." American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 927-930.
- Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu. "Turkey's Grand Strategy Facing a Dilemma." The International Spectator 27:1 (January-March 1992): 17-32.
- _____. "Turkey's Security Policies." Adelphi Papers (London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies): 1-47.
- Shapiro, Michael J. "Strategic Discourse/Discursive Strategy: The Representation of 'Security Policy' in the Video Age." International Studies Quarterly 34:3 (September 1990): 327-340.
- Shemsutdinov, A. Kurtuluş Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri. Translated by A. Hasanoğlu. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazatesi adına Çağdaş Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2000.
- Smith, Steve. "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory: A Reply to Osterud." Journal of Peace Research 34:3 (August 1997): 330-336.
- _____. "Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It: Social Construction and International Relations Theory." In Foreign Policy in a Constructed World, ed. Vendulka Kubalkova, 38-55. United States of America: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2001.
- Sonyel, Salahi R. Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika I: Mondros Bırakışmasından Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin Açılışına Kadar. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973.
- _____. Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika II: Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin Açılışından Lozan Antlaşmasına Kadar. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1986.
- Sørensen, Georg. "IR Theory after the Cold War." Review of International Studies 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 83-99.
- Soysal, Mümtaz. "Kuzeyli Komşu." Cumhuriyet, 1 Eylül 2004.
- State Institute of Statistics. Statistical Indicators: 1923-1992. Ankara: The State Institute of Statistics, Printing Division, 1994.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 7. Dönem, 11 Mayıs 1945, cilt 17. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1945.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 7. Dönem, 20 Aralık 1945, cilt 20. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 7. Dönem, 23 Şubat 1945, cilt 15. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1945.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 7. Dönem, 8 Mayıs 1946, cilt 23. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 8. Dönem, 14 Ağustos 1946, cilt 1. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1946.

T.B.M.M. Zabıt Dergisi. 8. Dönem, 4 Aralık 1946, cilt 3. Ankara: T.B.M.M. Basımevi, 1947.

Tarihte Türk-Rus İlişkileri. Ankara: Genelkurmay, 1976.

Telhami, Shibley, and Michael Barnett. "Introduction: Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East." In Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East, eds. Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, 1-25. New York: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları, 1939-1946. Ankara: TC. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1973.

Ülman, Haluk. "Dış Politikamızın Değişkenler." Yön (13 June 1962): 14-15.

_____. "Sovyetler Birliği ve Türk Boğazları." Forum 161 (15 December 1960): 6.

Ulunian, Artiom A. "Soviet Cold War Perceptions of Turkey and Greece, 1945-58." Cold War History 3:2 (January 2003): 35-52.

Vali, Ferenc A. Bridge Across the Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

_____. The Turkish Straits and NATO. Stanford, California, Hoover Institution Press, 1972.

Vasquez, John A. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 899-912.

- Walker, R. B. J. "Realism, Change, and International Political Theory." International Studies Quarterly 31:1 (March 1987): 65-86.
- Walt, Stephen M. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." Foreign Policy 110 (1998): 29-46.
- _____. "Testing Theories of Alliance Formation: The Case of Southwest Asia." International Organization 42 (Spring 1988): 275-316.
- _____. "The Progressive Power of Realism." American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 931-935.
- _____. The Origins of Alliances. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. Theory of International Politics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- _____. "Evaluating Theories." American Political Science Review 91:4 (December 1997): 913-917.
- _____. "Reflections on Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics." In Noorealism and Its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane, 322-345. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Weisband, Edward. 2. Dünya Savaşı ve Türkiye. Translated by M. A. Kayabağ and Örgen Uğurlu. İstanbul: Örgün Yayınevi, 2002.
- Weldes, Jutta, and Diana Saco. "Making State Action Possible: The United States and the Discursive Construction of 'The Cuban Problem', 1960-1994." Millennium: Journal of International Studies 25:2 (1996): 361-395.
- Weldes, Jutta, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall. "Introduction: Constructing Insecurity." In Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger, eds. Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Weldes, Jutta. "Constructing National Interests." European Journal of International Relations 2:3 (1996): 275-318.
- _____. "Globalisation is Science Fiction." Millennium: Journal of International Studies 30:3 (2001): 647-667.
- _____. "The Cultural Production of Crises: U.S. Identity and Missiles in Cuba." In Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger, eds. Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall, 35-62. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

_____. Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis. United States of America: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Wendt, Alexander. "Constructing International Politics," International Security 20:1 (Summer 1995): 71-81.

_____. "On constitution and causation in International Relations." Review of International Studies 24:5 (special issue, December 1998): 101-117.