

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mohamed Khider University - Biskra
Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages
English Department



Duality in Turkey's International Relations Case Study: Turkey and US
Relations

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English Language
Option: Literature and Civilization

Submitted by

Menaceri Djouhir Sifeddine

Supervised by

Dr. Lamjed EL Hamel

Members of the Jury

Mr. Boulegroune Adel

Mrs. Bougofa Zeyneb

Mrs. Djaalal Meriem

2021/2022

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to my beloved parents, and my grandparents.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Allah who gave me all the guidance. I express my deepest gratitude to my respected supervisor Mr. **Lamdjed ELHAMEL**, I'd like to express my profound gratitude for his valuable guidance, positive attitude, continued support, and assistance. And I do not forget the jury members who would enrich the value of this research by their precious comments.

My completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without the assistance and support of my fellow classmates. All 2017 class have my sincere gratitude.

Finally, to my carrying supportive parents my deepest gratitude for your love and encouragement. Also, my two little brothers and my little sister and to all my family members and friends thank you all.

Abstract

Whenever dealing with the Turkish-American relationship, most people perceive it as a positive, normal partnership that does not take into account many debatable issues. In addition to the circumstances and motives at play, the relationship between the two nations is founded on common interests, and each attempt to attain its objectives by proving itself and making strong and steady judgments. This study is an analysis and investigation into the Turkish-American relationship. In sum, it focuses on the nature of the relationship, in addition to the duality that occurs between the two nations in the political field. It also determines the motives and factors that guide its foreign policies. This study will employ historical methods in addition to an exploratory, descriptive, and investigative approach in order to determine whether the relationship between the two nations is indiscriminate or whether factors and motives play a role. Eventually, the bilateral relations proves that this duality is based on pursuing each country's interest at the expense of the other.

Key words: Foreign policy, Turkish-American relationship, Bilateral relations, Duality, International relations, Crisis.

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgments	II
Abstract	III
General introduction	1
Chapter One: Historical Framework of the Turkish-American Foreign Policies	3
Introduction	4
1. The Divergence within International Relations and Foreign Policy	5
1.1.1. International Relations	5
1.1.2. Foreign Policy	7
1.1.3. International Relations vs Foreign Policy	8
1.2. Turkish Foreign Policy	9
1.3. American Foreign Policy	12
Conclusion	14
Chapter Two: Historical Overview on the Bilateral Turkish-American Relations	15
Introduction	16
2.1. Ottoman Empire and the United States	16
2.2. Post-World War until the End of Cold War	20
2.3. Post-Cold War Era	26
Conclusion	30

Chapter Three: The Aspects of Duality in the Turkish-American Relations	32
Introduction	33
3.1. Aspect of Duality in Turkish-American Relationship	33
3.1.1. Obama’s Administration	33
3.1.1.1. Armenian Genocide	34
3.1.1.2. Iran	35
3.1.1.3. Mavi Marmara	36
3.1.1.4. Syria	37
3.1.2. Trump Administration	37
3.1.2.1. President Trump Letter	37
3.1.2.2. Iran	38
3.1.2.3. Israel	39
3.1.2.4. S400 Crisis	40
3.1.2.5. Lira Crisis	41
3.1.3. Biden Administration	41
3.2. The Nature of the Relationship Between Turkey and U.S	44
Conclusion	47
General Conclusion	48
Works Cited	50
ملخص	55

General introduction

Nowadays, the worldwide political scene is witnessing its peak. Where all countries are seeking power by proving their political importance and they aim to secure their interests. On their own or depending on their allies, every country seeks to play a major role in the area by being politically active and proving their eligibility through powerful and steady decisions.

However, Turkey, which is considered today as a very powerful country on a global and regional level, especially after the substantial growth in its economy, its potential, and its membership in the G-20. Even though the alliance between the United States and Turkey dates back to 1831, when the United States established diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Republic sought to re-evaluate its relations with the United States of America. Effectively, a strong and effective strategic partnership has been established between the two nations. The Turkish-American relation is based on common interests. Each country needs the other one. Turkey is now one of the important countries in the region due to its strategic location and its political influence in the area. In addition to that America, after the cold war was in need of an ally to secure its interest in the area, and Turkey was the main option. However, the relationship between the two nations is tense as it is now due to the impact of the crises in the region. Nonetheless, the decisions that were made by both nations in all fields, especially in the political field, seem to be non-stable and dual, and this depends on both countries' foreign policy laws, and concepts.

This study aims to investigate and to describe the Turkish-American relationship and its main concepts, identifying the aspects of duality in the relationship in addition to identifying the main foreign policy characteristics that control decision-making in both nations.

**Chapter One: Historical Framework of the Turkish-American Foreign
Policies**

Introduction

Since the dawn of civilization and the foundation of independent states, all countries have strived to achieve supreme status as well as securing their general interests and ambitions in the international sphere. Similarly, at present, no state can avoid implications at the international level. This implication should be systematic and established on explicit principles. These principles and objectives of a state are mainly demonstrated through foreign policy.

For instance, Turkey, which was founded in 1923, was not a great power in the twentieth century. Its geopolitical location, however, has enabled it to play a potentially higher role in world politics than what would have been otherwise possible (Aydin). Through its foreign policy, the Republic of Turkey aims to defend Turkey's interests in a highly unstable regional and international atmosphere, all while establishing circumstances conditions for long-term peace and growth in its area and beyond. In fulfillment of this mission, Turkey contributes to the maintenance of world peace, prosperity, and stability. (Republic of Turkey 1).

In parallel, the U.S after its revolutionary war (1775–1783), and after obtaining sovereignty from the British Crown, as a newly established nation, the founding fathers of America feared being a pawn of great powers at that time.

As a result, they tried to steer alliances with great powers and instead strove to keep their neutrality in foreign affairs. After several attempts and major trends in U.S. foreign policy nowadays, the United States' foreign policy has four basic goals: the safety of the U.S. and its residents and allies; the assurance of continued access to international resources and markets; the preservation of global power balance; and the conservation of democracy and freedom (U.S. Department of State 1).

According to Hill, foreign policy is the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor, which is usually a state. In sum, foreign policy is the set of objectives that guide a state's actions and relationships in its engagements with other states (The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica).

Yet, the field of international politics is vast and sophisticated, making it difficult to distinguish between politics and international relations.

1. The Divergence within International Relations and Foreign Policy

When we refer to international relations, we're dealing with a wide range of ideas and concepts that frequently overlap, and are difficult to identify. Furthermore, the theoretical difficulties that govern international politics is compounded by reality on the ground, where political and economic interests converge and become impossible to separate. However, there is a theoretical distinction between the concepts of "international relations" and "foreign policy."

1.1.1. International Relations

International relations attempt to describe how states interact in the global international order (Department of Political Science) and to provide the tools required to understand the dynamics between nation-states. In other words, the title "international relations" is impartial; it makes no claim about whether these relationships are good or bad.; rather, it describes what processes govern state conduct on a global level and gives valuable interpretations.

Furthermore, based on a study by Pfaltzgraff international relations examine actors such as:

- National governments;
- non-governmental actors;
- International organizations (both governmental and non-governmental); and

Non-fully-recognized States.

International relations studies the behaviors and interactions of such actors and provides a theoretical framework for explaining actions and strategic choices. Even within the area of international relations, however, we can identify several perspectives and theories that provide distinct interpretations of world and state interactions:

Realism according to Bell is a basic approach to international relations, holding that all nations are attempting to grow their own strength and that those governments that manage to accumulate power most efficiently will survive, as their successes can easily surpass those of less powerful states. According to the theory, a nation's first priority should be self-preservation, and growing power should always be a social, economic, and political necessity.

Liberalism, also known as "liberal internationalism," is founded on the assumption that the current international system is capable of producing a peaceful world order. Rather on the use of direct force, including military intervention, liberalism emphasizes international collaboration as a way of advancing each nation's own interests. Liberals think that the negative repercussions of using force, such as economic costs and civilian casualties, far outweigh the potential benefits. liberal politicians usually seek to use wealth and power to fulfill national objectives (for instance, obtaining the agreement of a neighboring country to help secure a border). In today's globalized society, economic strategies such as bilateral trade, agreements and foreign relations might be more effective than using force in achieving political agendas. Realism has started to fade as a viable political tactic as liberalism has grown increasingly rooted in international collaboration through the development of organizations such as the United Nations. It may be claimed that the liberalist tradition, as perpetuated by the US, has become the dominant system in

international relations, with defined ideals and international institutions in place to control this order.

World System Theory: according to Martínez-Vela, world regions can be divided into core, periphery and semi-periphery. Core countries are the major capitalist countries that accumulate their wealth by exploiting peripheral countries – the least developed and modern areas of the world. Semi-peripheral countries are the ones that allow the existence of such system. In fact, they are both exploited by the core and exploiters of the periphery. They function as a buffer between the core and the peripheral areas – that represent the majority of world countries.

Constructivism: Constructivism is founded on the notion that, rather than simply pursuing material interests, a nation's belief systems—historical, cultural, and social—explain its foreign policy initiatives and conduct. Constructivists also claim that while states are not the most significant forces in international relations, international organizations and other non-state entities can exert influence via lobbying and persuasion. As a result, Constructivism has grown in popularity and influence in recent decades. International organizations play an important role in advancing human rights and making them a worldwide standard to which countries must conform.

All of the theories listed above attempt to explain the reasons that govern states' international behavior; even though they begin with the same assumption (the anarchy of the international system), they clearly reach different conclusions and provide distinct explanations.

1.1.2. Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is a policy followed by a country in its dealings with other countries in order to attain national objectives. As a result, although "international relations" is a wide and inclusive term, "foreign policy" is more precise and refers to any activities taken by a country in respect to other states or international bodies (The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica). Such activities

differ according to the country of concern's political and economic objectives, and according to Squadrin it may include, among other issues:

- Participation in international organizations and institutions (i.e., the United Nations, the International Labor Office, the World Health Organization etc.);
- The ratification of international treaties or convention (i.e., International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child etc.)
- Military, structural, and financial assistance to states and non-state actors;
- forming political and economic alliances (both bilateral and multilateral);
- Intervention in domestic and global conflicts; and
- Assistance to natural disaster-affected countries.

Foreign policy refers to a country's actions with a certain goal in mind at a specific time. However, the acts of one country have an unavoidable impact on other countries, causing imbalances and shifts in the global system. In other words, "foreign policy" is the primary subject studied by "international relations," while "foreign policy" shapes the international scenario and alters "international relations" theories.

1.1.3. International Relations vs Foreign Policy

"International relations" and "foreign policy" vary in a number of fundamental ways, international relations are a large subject and inclusive term referring to the understanding of relationships that exist between states. In the other hand foreign policy determines how states interact with one another. Furthermore, International relations offer several theoretical frameworks for analyzing and comprehending foreign policy. Also, international relations are a theoretical concept that explain what is going on in the real world. The term "international relations" is neutral

(International relations are neither positive nor negative; they just exist and must be studied.). However, foreign policy is never impartial; instead, it is the method through which governments pursue their interests and goals.

Given the instability and complexity of politics and world affairs, distinguishing between "international relations" and "foreign policy" may appear to be an extraordinarily difficult undertaking. Indeed, the phrase "international relations" is frequently employed in ways that go beyond its true meaning, allowing for misunderstandings and ambiguous explanations. Indeed, we frequently read or hear the term used in a politicized meaning or as a substitute for "foreign policy."

However, the term "international relations" solely refers to the examination of relationships between states and the mechanisms by which international organizations monitor such interactions. In other words, international relations research and foreign policy provide a theoretical model that may be useful to the average individual to understand international dynamics and, in some situations, predict the implications and repercussions of the country of concern's foreign policies. Indeed, many interpretations and perceptions of reality may exist depending on one's theoretical background and beliefs (realism, idealism, constructivism).

1.2. Turkish Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of every single state is an integral part of its peculiar system of government and reflects its special circumstances (Frankel 1). Turkish foreign policy aims to secure Turkey's interests while also enhancing conditions for long-term peace and development in regional and global areas. Inspired by long-term objectives to achieve "Peace at Home, Peace in the World" as set out by the founder of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (Republic of

Turkey 1), As the Turkish President, Atatürk said, "reflects the enterprising spirit and humanitarian values of our nation." The Turkish Republic is applying pursuing an entrepreneurial and humanitarian foreign policy.

Globally speaking, the world has gone through periods characterized by increased uncertainties, unpredictability, crises, and conflicts threatening peace and stability. Thus, to overcome dangers and obstacles and capitalize on emerging opportunities.

Turkey has adopted a foreign policy that is strong on the ground and at the table (Republic of Turkey 3) through the implementation of intelligent and flexible diplomacy. taking advantage of its deep-rooted diplomatic heritage and gains strength from a range of aspects such as its key geographical location, rich historical background, and a robust economy. Therefore, Turkey's foreign policy demonstrates a relationship between the past and the future. Additionally, as part of her enterprising foreign policy, Turkey uses a variety of complementary political, economic, humanitarian, and cultural tools, as well as a diplomacy that thinks globally but acts locally throughout all areas of the globe.

Being part of both continents, Europe and Asia, Turkey tends to strengthen its existing strategic relations while developing new ones. In addition to the European Union's membership, which remains a priority, Turkey also has a strategic relationship with the U.S. as a NATO ally. Turkey makes a significant contribution to the concept of "the indivisibility of security" within NATO, which makes Turkey an active member among NATO contributors. Furthermore, Turkey is a founding partner of almost all European institutions, including the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. As well as others, Turkey is playing an active role in efforts to address numerous concerns that impact Europe, including mass migration. As an energy hub and transit country, Turkey is critical to European and global energy security.

International issues and solutions rely on common work shaped by cooperation and effective multilateralism. This made Turkey's diplomacy active within multilateral fora. Turkey is also an active member of the G20. It has been promoting the humanitarian-development nexus, as well as inclusive economic growth and equitable distribution. Turkey also contributed to global peace, stability, and security by participating constructively in the United Nations Security Council. Under the motto "the world is bigger than five" coined by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Turkey has been advocating the reform of the UN Security Council, the UN, and other multilateral organizations, in order for them to be fit for purpose today (Republic of Turkey 12).

Terrorism, ethnic or religious hostility, discrimination, extremism, xenophobia, anti-Islamic attitudes, and other types of restriction are all issues of concern to humanity. In dealing with such extensive threats, Turkey highlights the importance of transparency, diversity, debate, and inclusive policies. With this perspective, Turkey has taken the lead in efforts to promote mutual tolerance and shared values across diverse cultures and religions. The United Nations Alliance of Civilizations proposal, co-sponsored by Turkey and Spain, is a legitimate response to scenarios based on the so-called clash of civilizations. Terrorism and many other forms of radicalism have attained a menacing level of intensity all around the world. They threaten international peace and security. Since then, Turkey has been actively preventing terrorism unleashed by any organization under any pretext.

To ensure the efficiency of foreign policy, it is necessary to stay aware of changes and vary policy instruments accordingly. Turkey is shaping today's and tomorrow's diplomacy by developing creative ideas. From consular services to public diplomacy and from digital infrastructure to strategic foresight and analysis, the Digital Diplomacy program strives to

capitalize on the transformative power of technology in all areas of foreign policy and increase its efficiency and effectiveness.

1.3. American Foreign Policy

The American foreign policy is an evolving subject of inquiry. Not only do new issues and challenges appear on the policy-making agenda, but historians and political scientists are constantly reevaluating the past in order to better understand the present and future. (Hastedt 7). America's relations with other nations, international organizations, and other nations' people are managed by the U.S. Department of State. State Department diplomats carry out the President's foreign policy (U.S. Department of State 1) and contribute to the creation and maintenance of a safe, successful, fair, and democratic world, as well as to the creation of circumstances for stability and progress for the benefit of the American people and people worldwide.

The State Department is an important section of the U.S. government since it represents the United States internationally and communicates U.S. policies to foreign governments and international organizations via American embassies and consulates in foreign nations, as well as diplomatic missions ("U.S. Department of State | USAGov"). Furthermore, the department coordinates interagency cooperation and supervises the allocation of foreign relations resources. It promotes mutual understanding between the peoples of the U.S. and the peoples of other countries around the world. As well as negotiating and executing treaties and agreements on a number of issues varying from economics to nuclear weapons, as well as coordinating and supporting the foreign activities of other US agencies, hosting official visits and performing other diplomatic missions.

Yet the objectives of a nation's foreign policy are always subject to debate and revision. According to the American state government There are four key goals to which we can attribute

most of what the US government does in foreign policy the defense of the U.S. and its residents; the conservation of access to critical resources and markets; the maintenance of a balance of power in the world; and the protection of human rights and democracy.

The first goal is the safety of the U.S. and its residents, both when they are in the country and while traveling abroad. This security purpose is tied to the goal of defending the country's allies, or nations with which the US has a friendly and mutually beneficial relationship., is linked to this security purpose. International threats and dangers may take various forms, such military threats from other nations or terrorist organizations, as well as financial threats from boycotts and high trade tariffs.

The second goal is that American foreign policy also aims to secure the country's continuous access to important resources and markets around the world. Oil and many other natural resources, as well as economic resources, such as foreign capital investment in domestic infrastructure projects and military systems, are forms of resources. Access to the foreign marketplace, of course, provides access to goods for American consumers. Foreign policy in the United States also seek to improve the objectives of American businesses, promote regional goods in overseas markets, and promote global economic development.

The maintenance of the world's power balance is a third key goal. A balance of power indicates that no sovereign country or region is militarily more powerful than the rest of the world. Although establishing a perfect balance of power is difficult, overall stability or predictability in the operation of governments, strong institutions, and the absence of violence within and between nations could be.

For much of the history of America, policymakers viewed global stability through the perspective of Europe. If Europe was stable, so was the rest of the globe. The existence of two

superpowers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and the actual fear of nuclear devastation of which both were capable, ensured stability during the Cold War era that followed World War II. Until around 1989 and 1990, advanced industrial democracies supported one of the two superpowers.

The protection of human rights and democracy is the fourth key priority of US foreign policy. Peace and serenity are the benefits for stability that result from other US foreign policies. When it comes to foreign policy strategy, the U.s attempts to keep world peace through several aspects of its foreign policy, such as foreign aid, and by supporting and participating in international institutions such as the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (NATO), as well as the Organization of American States.

Conclusion

Every nation's foreign policy is a demonstration of principles and objectives that they need to achieve in the international sphere. This chapter has included a theoretical framework of foreign policy to better understand the concept, in addition to the main foreign policy principles of the two nations involved in this research. In the next chapter, we will look at the historical overview and context of the Turkish-American relationship.

**Chapter Two: Historical Overview on the Bilateral Turkish-American
Relations**

Introduction

The United States of America and Turkey have had long-standing relations tracing back to the Ottoman Empire. In the nineteenth century, Ottoman-American relations were mostly conducted through economic ties. With the downfall of the Ottoman Empire, the Republic of Turkey became its successor, and its relations with the United States were reorganized as nation-states at the new international system level. Although relations between these two countries were frequently disrupted, they were perceived to remain unbroken following World War II. Basically, the strategic alliance developed during the Cold War period along the axis of mutual enemy perception and interests was a kind of mutation of Ottoman-era connections, as relations were largely economic in nature. In truth, Turkey-US relations, which have seen ups and downs from the 1950s to the present, have continued unabated. In this regard, the two nations' relationships will be discussed in this chapter.

2.1.Ottoman Empire and the United States

When the foundation of US-Turkish ties is examined, the Ottoman Empire period in particular is quite crucial. From the 18th through the 20th centuries, there were two main areas of interaction between these two: economic and trade contacts; and missionary operations. The Ottoman Empire dominated the Mediterranean and Red Sea after it was founded at the end of the 13th century where the expansion of its power began in the oceans. It is worth noting that the Ottoman advance in the oceans drove it to seek different locations, and by the 15th century, it had gone to the east coast of the United States. Furthermore, Turkish sailors were the first to find the "Great Turkish Archipelago" off the east coast of the United States. It is argued in this context that

Columbus traveled to America utilizing sea route maps created by Turks and Muslims, but the West disguised this. Following this historical change, it is clear that the Ottoman Empire had a variety of issues during the era corresponding to the establishment of the United States (Bıyıklı et Yalçınkaya 380–385.). During this time, developments such as the Ottoman-Russian Wars and the effects of the French Revolution on the Empire were mixed with the empire's financial and administrative challenges.

It is clear that trade is the primary focus of Ottoman and American relations. The Mediterranean region under Ottoman authority, in particular, stands out as an essential aspect of the United States' trade interests. It was thanks to Britain that Ottoman and American trade contacts began, and American ships have entered Turkish ports under British supervision since the 17th century. The Maghreb was the initial site of contact between the Ottomans and the United States (Bostanoğlu 213-228). The United States negotiated treaties with Algeria and Tunisia in 1786, the originals of which were in Turkish, and the ability of American ships to trade freely in the region was granted in the Garp Ocaklar 3. Thus, by signing agreements with the states of Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, and Tripoli, known as Garp quarries, Maghreb quarries, and Berber quarries, the United States virtually insured the safety of its ships in the Western Mediterranean. Because the Ottoman Empire covered three continents, the United States turned to this geography for geostrategy and geopolitics (Bostanoğlu 353-359). Izmir was an important center in economic contact between the Ottoman Empire and the United States at the time. Furthermore, with the growth of bilateral relations, the Ottoman government allowed American ships to sail through the Dardanelles in the context of "friendly considerations" in early 1828 (İnalçık et al. 200).

Regarding the "Monroe Doctrine," which the United States established in 1823 after its appearance on the historical stage, it is crucial to note that it also worked outside of the American

continents. A year after the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States began to prioritize its relations with the Ottoman Empire. As a result, Bostanolu emphasizes that the U.S. considers the Ottoman Empire as the "key to the East," and as a result, works to develop economic connections (Bostanoğlu,535). As a result, the U.S. was able to maintain its Monroe Doctrine "isolation policy" with some limitations until the twentieth century. By avoiding involvement in European political matters, the United States has worked to build and direct its trade contacts, which is one of the most essential measures taken by a newly formed state.

On the other hand, by the end of the 18th century, the Ottoman Empire had become the focal point of European powers in the international system, and the presence of the Russian Empire as a danger in the north had prompted the search for new alliances. In this period, one of the noteworthy happenings is the Navarin event. The Ottoman navy was destroyed in Navarin by allies consisting of French, British, and Russian ships in 1827. Following this event, the Sultan II of the time, Mahmoud, distances himself from the West, despite the fact that relations with the US are not strained. On May 7, 1830, the Ottomans and the United States signed the Treaty of Seyr-I Sefain, which granted American traders and merchant ships the title of "most favored state." The Ottoman Empire's interest in American warships and land armaments prepared the stage for the two countries to engage in a close arms trade. Following the establishment of trade relations, the United States appointed Commodore David Porter as charge d'affaires in Istanbul in 1831 (Bostanoğlu, 221). With the Tanzimat of 1839, US experts were also trained in agriculture and mining in Istanbul, while Henry Eckworth, the ship's engineer, is also known to have directed the construction of American model warships. However, due to the two countries' diplomatic connections, mutual embassies could not be established until 1867 (Bostanoğlu, 353-359.).

Looking at missionary efforts in Ottoman-US relations, we notice that the process has changed from commercial to social and political spheres. The United Powers, like many European states, benefited from capitulations and benefits under the Ottoman Empire-US treaties. Erhan emphasizes two aspects of missionary spread in the Ottoman Empire. These are missionary stations and schools. While missionary activity was centered in Istanbul inside the Empire, mission stations began to spring up throughout Asia and Europe.

Here it is necessary to give a brief overview of the United States' foreign policy and its fundamentals. In the context of the "WASP" idea in American foreign policy, it is seen that nations are divided into three by the eyes of an elected Protestant, white American. This distinction provided a legitimate ground for the missionary activities of the United States. From the concept that nations are divided into three, a division has been drawn between WASPs, who are supposed to have the power to govern others; those who can govern themselves, and those who cannot. In this context, WASP has increased its efforts to gain control of the Ottoman Empire by hastening the establishment of missionary and educational institutions. As a result of this concept, the United States dedicated its concessions to the sector of education. With the initiatives taken by the United States, particularly in the sphere of education, missionary operations gained traction. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (American Misyoner Teşkilat) attempted to propagate Christianity in the Middle East through establishing schools rather than churches (Bostanoğlu 355.).

The two countries' commercial and diplomatic connections, which had been flowing smoothly between 1867 and 1901, took a brief pause during the War of Independence (Aliriza et Aras 1). The system and actors altered throughout the First World War, which lasted from 1914 to 1918. When world history and the international system were set to shift and empires were nearing

their end, new nation-state structures began to take their place in the system. At this point, our work will use two units of analysis: the shift that occurred at the system and state levels and the Republic of Turkey's status in the international system as the Ottoman Empire's successor state in accordance with the United States relations.

The construction of an order in the system formed by the end of the First World War, which not every state was content with, quickly drew the world into the Second World War, which lasted from 1939 to 1945. Turkey faced a new challenge during World War II. After 1945, Turkey attempted to establish its place within the bipolar international system between the blocks led by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). There was no geopolitical relationship between the United States and the Ottoman Empire until the late nineteenth century; however, the Second World War resulted in a change in the international environment in which the Turkish Straits became more important for the Soviet Union (Ömür, 19 – 34). Because of the Soviet interest in the Straits, which might be viewed as a matter of life and death for Turkey, Turkey began to perceive the Soviet Union as a threat. Because Turkey chose to align itself with the United States camp, it joined the Western bloc led by the US against the Soviet threat. Relations with the United States were strengthened as a result of this decision.

2.2. Post-World War Until the End of Cold War

Although the Ottoman and American legations opened diplomatic contacts in 1867 and 1901, respectively, a tight alliance between the two countries did not evolve until after World War II. This is logical considering the relationship's lack of geographic, cultural, or economic pillars. At the starting of the Cold War, the alliance was built around pressing strategic needs. As World War II ended, the U.S. and Turkey viewed a convergence of national interests as a result of their shared but distinct conceptions of the Soviet Union as a danger.

During the early years of the Republic, Turkey had a close relation with the Soviet Union. Both arose from the ruins of empires following World War I, seeking to make their presence in the new global order. During the Turkish National Movement's War of Independence, the Soviet Union played an important role, and Ataturk's early state planning was influenced in part by the Soviets (Aliriza and Aras 1). World War II had a significant damaging impact on the relationship, as a newly strengthened Soviet Union under Stalin wanted to extend its advantage in Eastern Europe while establishing control over the Turkish Straits that connected the Soviet-dominated Black Sea to the Mediterranean. Ankara was understandably concerned by Moscow's April 1945 termination of the 1925 Turkish-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Neutrality, as well as the Soviet Union's territorial claims and desire to amend the Montreux Convention limiting the usage of the Turkish Straits.

The U.S., for its part, It rapidly understood that its former friend against Nazi Germany had become its primary foe in the new global system. As a result, as the US-Soviet conflict heated up, both Washington and Ankara progressively realized the importance of strategic cooperation. This process resulted in the formation of the key institution that would sustain the partnership for the next four decades: a close bilateral alliance within the multilateral framework of NATO, the foremost Western collective defense organization (Aliriza and Aras 1).

While progress toward a mutually beneficial partnership appeared to be totally rational, if not inevitable, for both parties, it was far from predetermined. As the struggle with the Soviet Union carried on, the United States' views on Turkey's national security and its role in Western defense shifted. Even before the ending of World War II, the United States acknowledged the Soviet Union's desire to include Turkey in its postwar sphere of influence. Consequently, it concluded that “the defense of the Republic of Turkey was vital to the defense of the United States,”

according to a statement by the American ambassador to Turkey Edwin Wilson. Ambassador Wilson reinforced this perception of a Soviet threat in a March 23, 1946, cable emphasizing that "Turkish independence had become a vital interest for the United States." (Aliriza and Aras 1).

As a result, President Harry S. Truman extended \$45 million in military and economic aid to Turkey through the Lend-Lease Act of 1941, which lasted until 1946. This aid package was merely a precursor of the much greater and longer-term money that would be supplied following the establishment of the Truman Doctrine. Truman declared in March 1947 that Turkey was "important to the preservation of order in the Middle East" and that its fall at the hands of the Soviets would have "far-reaching ramifications for the West as well as the East." (Aliriza and Aras 2). The decision of the United Kingdom to withdraw from its position in the Near East spurred Truman's action.

However, the U.S. initially did not regard Turkey as a member of the emerging Western collective defense arrangements that culminated in the foundation of NATO in 1949. As a result, instead of supporting successive Turkish bids to join NATO, the United States backed a Mediterranean Pact or a similar arrangement, which the UK also preferred, to assist soothe Turkey's security worries.

With the ongoing increase of Cold War tensions and Turkish engagement in the Korean War, sentiments in the United States began to shift. In the February 1951 memorandum, McGhee stated that Turkey's commitment to the Allied effort in Korea highlighted the "tremendous fighting qualities of Turkish troops" and "demonstrated its desire to join in collective security." (Aliriza and Aras 2). Equally significant, the first free multiparty Turkish elections in May 1950 supplied the required democratic credentials for NATO admission, an issue that several European NATO members had questioned.

Two Joint Chiefs of Staff memoranda from September 1950 and April 1951 indicate the rapid shift in the American attitudes on Turkish NATO membership (Aliriza and Aras 2). The first stated that "the addition of Turkey and Greece [in NATO] may have a negative impact on the efforts being achieved" to strengthen the collective defense organization. The second memorandum, on the other hand, said that "security interests dictate that Turkey and Greece be admitted as full members of [NATO]." From a military standpoint, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not consider bilateral security arrangements between the U.S. and Turkey or Greece to be appropriate." The strong arguments in favor of Turkey's admittance to NATO, as well as its relevance in defending the West against "Soviet domination of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia," led the United States to persuade its previously reluctant NATO colleagues to accept Turkey's entry in February 1952. This was further aided by Turkey's agreement with the United Kingdom in July 1951 to take the lead in efforts to establish a rival Middle East Defense Organization after it was admitted to NATO (Aliriza and Aras 2).

With Turkey's membership, America gained access to a second NATO country that shared a border with the Soviet Union near its "soft underbelly" in the Caucasus. In addition to the multilateral military arrangements afforded by its shared membership in NATO, the United States has established hundreds of different bilateral agreements. When the United States began to engage Turkey in a security relationship, the majority of its interactions were with the Turkish military. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to claim that the Pentagon–Turkish General Staff (TGS) alliance served as the foundation of the US–Turkish relationship for the next 40 years (Aliriza and Aras 2). As a result, the majority of the major exchanges between the United States and Turkey occurred within the context of this fundamental security relationship. In addition to the security assurance offered by the United States through NATO, Turkey relied on the protection of the United States'

"nuclear umbrella" and vast sums of military and economic assistance. Turkey received nearly \$4.5 billion in military aid from the United States from 1948 to 1975 (Aliriza and Aras 2). Needless to say, the American policies reflected the country's conception of its own security interests.

The tolerance of the Turkish military's tutelage over the political system, exemplified by the coup of May 1960, demonstrates the primacy of Cold War calculations in the relationship on the American side. A cable from US Ambassador Avra M. Warren a few weeks after the military takeover stated that the United States "intended to work with the military government just as loyally and faithfully as the US did during the Menderes government," and that the US would work with any future government to ensure Turkey's commitment to the West, "unless it is commie." (Aliriza and Aras 3).

While the US was pledged to Turkey's protection through the NATO Charter, the US felt no duty to consult or even tell the Turkish government of critical decisions when they did not appear to be in its interests. The Cuban Missile Crisis was a striking illustration of this tendency. In 1959–1960, the United States stationed Jupiter nuclear-tipped missiles in Turkey to enhance NATO defenses against the Soviet Union. This action was also viewed as a strong indication of the United States' support and commitment to Turkey. During the crisis, however, the knowledge that the Soviets had put nuclear weapons in Cuba radically altered US security calculations.

President John F. Kennedy agreed discreetly to evacuate the Jupiters from Turkey as part of the covert arrangement that ended the crisis when the Soviets withdrew their missiles from Cuba. Without informing Ankara, Washington opted to withdraw the missiles from Turkey. The lack of a necessity for Turkish input in a decision that had a big impact on Ankara plainly indicated the relationship's imbalance, but not as severe as the one between the USSR and its Warsaw Pact satellites.

The same disregard for Turkish sensibilities was shown in the Cyprus problem. The fundamental American motivation in this long-running issue was to avoid a Turkish-Greek conflict in the interests of NATO's eastern flank stability. In a letter to Turkish Prime Minister Ismet Inonu on June 5, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson went so far as to call the NATO Charter's security guarantee into question. In a warning intended to prevent Ankara from intervening in Cyprus to protect its ethnic brethren, Johnson bluntly warned that if Turkey intervened in Cyprus, "NATO allies have not had a chance to evaluate whether they had a commitment to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union." (Aliriza and Aras 3).

When Turkey ultimately participated in Cyprus in 1974, the United States Congress, prompted by the rise of ethnic politics led by the Greek lobby, entered the US-Turkish equation negatively by putting an embargo on US military supplies to Turkey. Then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who strongly opposed the congressional action, argued in an internal memo on December 6, 1974, that the alliance with Turkey was "essential to Western security, and that this relationship existed not as a favor to Turkey," but as a result of Turkey's importance to the security of not only the "Mediterranean," but of all of Europe and the Atlantic area." (Aliriza and Aras 3). As Kissinger had predicted, Ankara replied by canceling the Joint Defense Cooperation Agreement and closing US listening sites aimed at the Soviet Union. However, Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, then-deputy national security advisor, stated that while the closure of the listening stations "damaged the US for a period," Washington was able to overcome the situation by "quickly gaining Chinese cooperation to put listening posts up in Tibet." (Aliriza and Aras 4). In 1978, the Carter administration was able to persuade Congress to relax the embargo. Although the incident left a sour taste in Ankara's mouth, the necessity of joint Cold War interests insured the continuation of their strategic alliance.

2.3. Post-Cold War Era

The common tie between the two Cold War allies vanished with the Soviet Union's downfall and the cold war ending. Nonetheless, unlike many of Washington's other Cold War-era alliances, the tight relationship between the U.S. and Turkey not only survived but thrived after the Cold War. Washington and Ankara sought and discovered new justifications for a relationship that they both desired to sustain. However, it was effectively an ad hoc adjustment, the repercussions of which neither Washington nor Ankara fully contemplated.

In contrast to the Cold War's predominantly anti-Soviet alliance, the emphasis was now on how to redefine a growing alliance that was multiregional and multifaceted in nature. In his visit to Turkey, President George H.W. Bush, underscored the changing character of the relationship. He stated that Turkey's value as an ally has grown beyond simply being the "bulwark of NATO's southern flank." Turkey now serves as a "model" for newly independent former Soviet Turkic states, as well as a potential transit route for oil from the Caspian Sea to worldwide markets, bypassing Russia. Turkey had thus reclaimed its "historical status as a trading hub, integrating Europe—East and West—Asia, and the Middle East," while also serving as a "beacon of stability." Bush also told his host, President Turgut Ozal, that "there should be no doubt that Turkey deserves membership in the European Community." (Aliriza and Aras 5).

After Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Bush turned to Ozal for Turkish help, refocusing the strategic relationship between the US and Turkey. Soon after the war, Bush stated that "Turkey had held on tough and resolute despite the severe burden the Iraqi invasion had placed on its own economy." As then-National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft revealed, Bush and Ozal's personal relationship encouraged cooperation in the "political, economic, and cultural" spheres. He described Bush and Ozal's conversation as producing an "intimate, emotional" bond "where the

relationship actually became... very tight and, in a sense, less military and more political than it had ever been before," while "demonstrating Turkey's undeniable strategic importance to the United States."

President Bill Clinton would virtually follow the example of his predecessor in managing the shifting bilateral relationship. He emphasized the alliance's move "from a Cold War emphasis on military aid to shared ideals and enhanced political collaboration" in October 1993. Turkey's strategic location and history would also help to "stabilize a number of regional crisis zones." Clinton maintained Bush-era cooperation in Iraq, while also collaborating with President Suleyman and other Turkish leaders on NATO operations in Bosnia and Kosovo and actively backing Turkey's aspirations to establish an East-West Caspian energy corridor. In an April 1995 congressional hearing, Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke stated that despite the end of the Cold War, the United States still had "significant" interests in Turkey because it was "the front-line state for U.S. security interests in Europe."

Clinton also tried to renew and strengthen Turkey's institutional links with the West by pursuing EU membership. Marc Grossman, the United States' ambassador to Turkey and later Assistant Secretary of State, claimed that the "United States supports Turkey's EU membership; not half membership or three-quarters membership, but full membership." Turkey established a customs union with the European Union in 1995, paving the way for its highly sought-after candidate status, which it obtained in 1999. This step could not have been achieved without the Clinton administration's cooperation.

During his visit to Ankara, Clinton expressed his perspective of the importance of the US-Turkish bilateral partnership, declaring, "Since the Cold War ended, we have learnt something rather amazing." We've learnt that our alliance isn't based on a shared concern about the Soviet

Union, and that, in fact, our collaboration has become even stronger in the post–Cold War age." However, as important as each of these areas of collaboration was, none of them truly filled the hole left by the disappearance of a shared enemy and the Cold War certainties. During that 40-year period, each side of the bilateral partnership knew what to expect from the other and what to offer in return. The end of the Cold War provided much greater leeway for a more independent Turkish foreign policy, which the US permitted. Turkey used its newfound freedom to strengthen connections with Russia and Iran. While this created some consternation in Washington, the US nonetheless attempted to preserve cooperation, including the continuation of the No-Fly Zone over Iraq.

During George W. Bush's presidency, the post-Cold War alliance was put to the test. Following the September 11, 2001, attacks, President Bush pursued a "with us or against us" strategy as part of his Global War on Terror. The Turkish Grand National Assembly rejected Bush's proposal in March 2003 for the American soldiers to prepare to strike Iraq from Turkish bases and ports. Despite this, the Bush administration decided to blame the Turkish General Staff rather than the Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi (Justice and Development Party—JDP), which took office in November 2002. Although the relationship swiftly recovered, the incident marked a watershed moment in US-Turkish ties, not least because it accelerated the shift in Turkey's power balance between military and civilian authority.

During a visit to Istanbul, Bush emphasized the importance of Turkey's ties to the West, emphasizing its critical role in the spread of democracy in the area through what he called the "Freedom Agenda." "Because of Turkey's character...[its] success is critical to a future of prosperity and peace in Europe and the broader Middle East," he said. Turkey not only "belong[ed] in the European Union" due to its historical strategic importance in defeating the Soviets, but its

"membership would also be a vital step in ties between the Muslim world and the West, because it is part of both." (Aliriza and Aras 6).

The damage inflicted by the Iraq War divide was alleviated in part by Turkey's continued support in Afghanistan. Turkey, like other NATO countries, has responded to Washington's demand in the aftermath of the September 11 al-Qaeda attacks. Following the toppling of the Taliban regime that had housed al Qaeda, Ankara dispatched troops to assist in the establishment of public order and functional economic and political structures in Afghanistan. Turkey has been a major contributor to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and has twice served as the commander of the Kabul Regional Command. Turkey's participation had tremendous symbolic value as a Muslim-majority NATO member and a significant troop contributor to ISAF. Washington also profited from Turkey's excellent intelligence and expertise in the fight against terrorism.

President Barack Obama would emphasize Turkey's role in his declared effort to bridge the gap between the West and the Muslim world even more than Bush did. In reality, by visiting Turkey just three months after taking office, Obama underscored in a highly significant way the importance he would place on US-Turkish relations in his foreign policy. During his visit, he revealed his idea of "a model collaboration" between the two countries. In comparison to the two nations' long-standing "strategic partnership," the concept of a model partnership intended to take the relationship between the US and Turkey a step further by emphasizing greater cooperation between a global power and an assertive regional power.

Prior to his election, Obama stated that the Bush administration alienated people in many countries, particularly Muslims, during its global War on Terror. In his remarks in Ankara, Obama stated his intention to take a different path, one in which Turkey, which he emphasized belonged

to both the West and the Muslim world, will play a critical role. When President Barack Obama welcomed Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan to Washington in December 2009, he described Turkey as a "great country" with "growing influence across the world." Obama also stressed Turkey's role as a "majority Muslim nation" in "helping to develop mutual understanding, stability, and peace not only in its area but around the world."

Obama's approach reflected Washington's growing appreciation for Turkey's economic might and regional clout. This contributed to a shift in US-Turkish relations during this time period. In other words, Turkey's new multifaceted and multilateral foreign policy agenda altered the United States' assessment of Turkey's regional and global significance in international politics. Similarly, both the Bush and Obama administrations saw the JDP's roots in political Islam as a benefit, as it was more engaged in the Middle East and the larger Islamic world than any previous Turkish government.

Obama increased the level of cooperation to the point that he mentioned his "friendship and connection of trust" with Erdogan in a January 2012 interview. This special relationship, similar to that of former President George H.W. Bush and Ozal, helped to mitigate strains in 2010 caused by disagreements over Iran, Turkish-Israeli tensions, and the reintroduction of a congressional resolution on the "Armenian Genocide" issue, which had long plagued the relationship.

Conclusion

To sum up, the Turkish-American relationship had a long-standing relationship since the United States independence and its interaction with the Ottoman empire. The relationship raised again during the end of the World War II as a strategic alliance against the Soviet Union. This chapter has included a better understanding of the historical ties between the nations. In the

following chapter, the historical overview will be useful in order to analyze, investigate and describe the Turkish-American relationships and how these relations are governed.

Chapter Three: The Aspects of Duality in the Turkish-American Relations

Introduction

In world politics, all nations seek to fulfill their objectives through different means. Whether alone or in collaboration, the means can be demonstrated in the nation's decisions and its international relations' progress. Yet, occasionally, those decisions and international relations do have factors and motives that play a major role.

Recently, the Turkish-American relationship has drawn global interest. The relationship between those two nations is cross-cutting. The Turkish problems in its region or its membership in the European Union cannot be resolved without considering the United States. Vice versa, the United States affairs in the regions surrounding Turkey would remain incomplete without bringing Turkey into the equation. Despite the fact that the two countries have had a long relationship, duality in decision-making and tensions have manifested on many occasions.

In this chapter we will analyze, investigate and describe the Turkish-American relationships and how these relations are governed by a pragmatic duality.

3.1. Aspect of Duality in Turkish-American Relationship

3.1.1. Obama's Administration

The election of Barack Hussein Obama as President of the U.S. in November 2008 was appreciated in Ankara, raising hopes for the beginning of a new chapter in Turkish-American cooperation. At the time, President Obama framed the relationship as a model partnership, and this idea was intended to indicate a significant improvement in the bilateral relationship—a relationship that had been substantially damaged under President George W. Bush (Tran). Obama's concept partnership idea was intended to separate his administration's policies from those of the Bush Administration and to assist the United States in making a new start with its NATO ally. Throughout his electoral campaign, Obama clearly denounced the Bush administration's foreign

policy, notably his Middle East initiatives, and he entered office with a promise to rewrite the United States' image in the world, particularly in the Middle East.

Upon his visit to Ankara, President Obama addressed Parliament and pledged to enhance bilateral cooperation in regional affairs and trade. Obama emphasized the importance of Turkey and expressed a strong commitment to improving relations between the two countries (Erhan & Siviş-105). At the time, Turkish political leaders were pleased with his commitment. However, despite mutually beneficial intent on both sides, the model partnership and supporting words were insufficient to preserve stable connections over time. Obama emphasized that bilateral relationship will create a trusting and respectful alliance with no intercultural tensions. In one of his remarkable speeches, he maintains:

Some people have asked me if I chose to continue my travels to Ankara and Istanbul to send a message to the world. And my answer is simple: Evet -- yes. Turkey is a critical ally. Turkey is an important part of Europe. And Turkey and the United States must stand together -- and work together -- to overcome the challenges of our time. (Remarks By President Obama to The Turkish Parliament)

3.1.1.1. Armenian Genocide

One of the thorniest issues between the US and Turkey during the Obama administration has been the so-called genocide charges presented by the Armenian lobby each year. Following Obama's visit to Turkey, diplomatic flow between Turkey and Armenia surged. President Obama, Foreign Minister Babacan, and Armenian Foreign Minister Nalbandian met in Istanbul on April 6-7, 2009, during the second Alliance of Civilizations Conference. Furthermore, with the help of the EU, Russia, and mainly the United States, and via the mediation of Switzerland, two protocols were signed between Turkey and Armenia in Zurich in September 2009 (Dağcı 8). However, those

protocols were never implemented. As a result, Turkish-American ties began 2012 with a crisis — for the same reason. Following the approval of a draft resolution by the Foreign Affairs Committee of Congress requesting that the US president recognize the events of 1915 as genocide, Turkey summoned its ambassador to Washington for conversation. While Turkey saw the draft as incompatible with the spirit of the model partnership, the United States saw Turkey's reaction as harsh and saw the ambassador's presence in Washington as critical. On July 31, the United States Ambassador to Turkey was accredited to Iraq. The incoming ambassador to Turkey could not obtain Senate approval until December 30, 2010 (Yılmaz 568).

3.1.1.2. Iran

Iran's nuclear programs have been a source of dispute between the United States and Turkey. Obama repeatedly expressed his worries about the Islamic Republic's nuclear programs, arguing that they pose a severe threat to Israel and the Middle East area. He advocated more sanctions against Iran, but Turkey and Brazil rejected the plan and signed the Tehran Declaration on May 17, 2010 (Erhan & Siviş-105). The Tehran Declaration, signed by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Turkey, and Iran, outlined the structure for a nuclear fuel deal in which Iran would continue to conduct nuclear research and development but would deposit weapon-oriented uranium (1,200 kg, low enriched) in Turkey and receive fuel-oriented uranium (120 kg, high enriched) from Turkey (*BBC News-Nuclear Fuel Declaration by Iran, Turkey, and Brazil*, 2010). As a result of countering the American plan to impose further sanctions on Iran, Turkey's joint move with Brazil prompted displeasure in the US government, which believed that Iran's ultimate goal was to develop a nuclear bomb. It is well known that President Obama and then-Prime Minister Erdogan spent considerable time negotiating the Tehran statement. Turkey, on the other hand, characterized the deal as a crucial step toward non-proliferation of weapons of mass devastation (Erhan & Siviş-

106). Nonetheless, despite Turkey and Brazil's unfavorable votes in the United Nations Security Council, the United States was able to gain sanctions approval in June 2010.

3.1.1.3. Mavi Marmara

In addition to Iran's nuclear program, the Mavi Marmara event was another issue that strained relations between the two countries. When Israeli Special Forces assassinated nine Turkish individuals in international waters, the attack occurred on one of six civilian ships transporting humanitarian assistance to Gaza under Israel's embargo. The act generated a profound schism between Israel and Turkey, and Turkish authorities were even more angry with the lack of a U.S. response to the Israeli government, which was responsible for the deaths of Turkish nationals. Although Obama distanced himself from Israel in comparison to former presidents, Turkey's hopes for Israel's strikes on Gaza and the Mavi Marmara were far from met. Following Israel's death of nine Turkish citizens, Turkey's foreign minister, Ahmet Davutolu, publicly emphasized his expectation of US assistance while pushing for a forceful condemnation of Israel in the United Nations Security Council. Instead of implementing Davutolu's recommendations, US authorities appeased him.

However, even though the tension between the two nations, Turkey maintained its role as a NATO ally, continuing to support the US in Afghanistan and Iraq. Turkey remained a vital ally in the Middle East due to the United States' substantial withdrawal from the area and the shifting of its center of gravity to the Asia-Pacific (Layne). To achieve such a goal, the United States required more partners than ever before, making Turkey's relevance critical. In this context, Obama's strategy of "leading from behind" was a strong element for the administration. As a result, despite Israel's and the Jewish lobby's strong resistance to cooperating with Turkey, Obama proceeded cautiously to maintain a relationship with Turkey. In 2013, Obama's diplomacy efforts

resulted in an apology from Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu for the losses and \$20 million in compensation to the victims' families in exchange for the withdrawal of all international legal charges (Lindenstrauss).

3.1.1.4. Syria

Syria is the most important issue between the US and Turkey (Erhan). Turkey has often pressed the Syrian administration to adopt democratic changes due to Erdogan's personal ties with Assad, but to no avail. The second phase was Turkey's support for the Syrian political opposition's push for a political transition. Meanwhile, Obama was preparing for the 2012 presidential elections, and he prevented taking a strong stand opposing Assad's rule. He was willing only to condemn the tyranny. On the surface, Turkey and the US looked to have struck an agreement, but the methods for ousting Assad were never agreed upon.

Turkey, on the other hand, made significant moves, such as arming the opposition and declaring a no-fly zone, only to be met with real apathy and a wait-and-see attitude by the US. As ISIS gained strength and established itself in certain regions of Iraq and Syria, the US turned to Kurdish soldiers known as the YPG. Despite Ankara's focus on the YPG's terrorist character and its obvious links to the terrorist group PKK, the Obama administration supported the former until he left office (Martin et Kozak). Meanwhile, the US has categorically refused to support Turkey's desire to establish a safe haven for Syrian refugees.

3.1.2. Trump Administration

3.1.2.1. President Trump Letter

Relations between the two countries became quite tense when President Trump wrote a letter to President Erdogan, despite speculations that Washington had quietly given Ankara the green light to apply pressure in northern Syria when American security forces decided to withdraw from

the region and neglected Kurdish combatants who had fought side by side with US troops and played an important role in the success over militants with strong links to the Islamic State. As the pressure mounted on Trump, his administration sent a dispatch bearing President Trump's signature, addressed to the Turkish President. This letter was presented by the White House as confirmation that President Trump was aware of the latest events on the Syrian battlefield. In his direct and unconventional style of addressing domestic and international audiences, the US president minced no words in his letter, issuing explicit warnings to Turkey to maintain a control of its military stationed in the border area. America requested Ankara in no uncertain terms to halt military incursions inside Syria, warning that doing so might have disastrous consequences for Turkey's economy if the US acted and put sanctions on Ankara (Ali 286).

As predicted, President Erdogan's ego was severely harmed by the insulting US attitude. In a tit for tat reply, Ankara spokespersons told the press that the message from aggressive President Trump was a shame to the Turkish people (Ali, par. 4).

3.1.2.2. Iran

The Trump administration rejected the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) to limit Iran's nuclear weapons development and re-imposed penalties on Iran. Ankara condemned the penalties and assured Washington that Turkey would continue trading with Iran (Staff). Turkey, which is largely reliant on imported energy, has a strong bilateral economic connection with Iran, relying on it for major oil and gas supplies. For these reasons, Turkey has resisted the United States' objective of excluding Iran and has stated its desire to avoid sanctions imposed by the Trump administration on Iran (Martin 6).

Tensions have risen once more in a New York district court over an Iran penalties dispute involving Turkey. Reza Zarrab, a Turkish-Iranian businessman, is accused of assisting the Turkish state-owned bank, Halkbank, in evading US sanctions against Iran by arranging gold payment for Iranian oil and gas (Wemer, paragr.7). Zarrab was detained in March 2016 while on vacation in the United States. Zarrab turned to be the state's witness and offered to testify against Mehmet Hakan Atilla, Halkbank's deputy general manager, before the trial began. Zarrab had previously played a prominent role in a 2014 graft case in Turkey involving high-level Turkish government members that was reportedly created by Gulenist-affiliated prosecutors (Wemer, paragr.7).

3.1.2.3. Israel

A further issue of debate between Ankara and Washington over their Middle East policies is the Trump administration's strong support for Israel, as evidenced by the choice to relocate the US embassy to Jerusalem, and the Justice and Development Party (AKP) government's equally strong antipathy for Israel. This was illustrated by the heated conversation between the countries and the downgrading of their diplomatic officials following the bloodshed at the Gaza-Israel border in May 2018. The AKP's antipathy against Israel stems in part from President Erdogan's efforts to elevate Turkey to a leadership position in the greater Islamic world, which has risen in popularity through supporting the Palestinian cause, especially through good connections with Hamas. Other examples include Turkey's well-known ships transporting food and humanitarian aid to Gaza. These initiatives, along with Erdogan's severe criticism of Israeli President Shimon Peres at Davos in 2009, resulted in Erdogan being the region's most popular leader, according to a 2011 public opinion survey. Nonetheless, Ankara has recently taken secret steps to repair diplomatic relations with Israel, avoid interruption of commerce, and acquire Israeli military technology. The United States maintains a staunch backing for Israel. As a result, unless Ankara's unfavorable sentiments

toward the right-wing Israeli government soften, situations that exacerbate US-Turkish tensions are likely to occur in the future.

3.1.2.4. S400 Crisis

With the Russian S-400 air defense system set to be delivered to Turkey, a new crisis in US-Turkey ties has emerged. The fact that Ankara is moving closer to Moscow and away from its Western partners on Syria and topics such as Iran and Venezuela irritate Washington, and the debate over the S-400 is another point of contention between the two countries. However, because it includes Moscow selling its newest anti-missile system to a NATO member state, this issue has received more attention than others. The purchase also calls into question Ankara's assessment of who its true allies and foes are.

Turkey went to Russia for the S-400 air defense system after failing to reach an agreement with the United States (US) and other NATO members for an air defense system. According to Arif (2021), in 2017, Turkey announced a \$2.5 billion contract to purchase four S-400 batteries. This agreement wasn't really appreciated by the Western world, which saw it as a danger. The US was repeatedly pushed to abandon the agreement and instead opt for Patriot air defense systems, citing strong concerns in Washington that the deployment of the S-400 would cause significant interoperability issues between Russian and NATO equipment, particularly the F-35 fighter planes. However, Turkey went forward with the contract on the grounds that the S-400 will not be connected with NATO systems and will operate on a separate network.

Turkey received its first shipment of S-400 air defense systems on July 12, 2019, becoming the first NATO country to do so. As a result of this acquisition, Turkey was sanctioned by the United States under the Countering American Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA). It was also notified that it would be pulled from the F-35 fighter jet program, despite having heavily

committed to its advancement and financing. The training of Turkish pilots operating F-35 aircraft in the United States was interrupted as soon as the first cargo landed in Turkey, signaling Washington's strong opposition to the arrangement.

3.1.2.5. Lira Crisis

In less than a month, the Turkish lira has lost up to a third of its value relative to the US dollar (Erbil et Ozlale), reaching a new low. As a result, virtually all imported items have become more costly immediately. Because Turkey is so reliant on imported commodities, almost everything was impacted, notably fuel, food, furniture, and clothing. Turks are concerned about further price increases and possibly shortages of foreign medicine. This situation arose as a result of the Trump administration's decision to impose penalties on Turkey because the Turkish government refused to release an American pastor who had been held for nearly two years. Turkey retaliated by raising duties on American automobiles, alcohol, and other imports. More US sanctions are possible.

President Erdogan has blamed the lira's depreciation on an "operation against Turkey" rather than current economic problems, referring to it as "deliberate attacks" (Al Jazeera). Analysts believe that the conflict with the United States has contributed to the lira's decline. Soner Cagaptay, head of the Washington Institute's Turkish research program, said the US has an "arsenal of economic penalties" ready to be deployed against Turkey (Al Jazeera), which he believes Trump would intensify until Brunson is liberated.

3.1.3. Biden Administration

When Joe Biden came into office as the United States' newly elected president, one of the most difficult foreign-policy crises he faced has not been the work of his predecessors. Indeed, the issue of US relations with Turkey has caught both Republican and Democratic administrations off

guard. From Ankara's denial to allow US troops to bridge the Turkish-Iraqi border in 2003 to sharp bilateral disagreements over Syria policy during the Obama administration, to Turkey's more recent acquisition of Russian air defense systems despite closer ties, the US-Turkish relationship has given American presidents headaches.

However, enduring regional menaces and increasing worldwide risks highlight the importance of US-Turkish partnership to both countries, as well as the importance of a Biden administration seeking to save the partnership from further worsening caused by tensions over Turkey's invasion into northeast Syria and its resistance to Arab peace accords with Israel under President Donald Trump.

Turkey-US ties were further strained after US President Joe Biden officially used the phrase "Armenian genocide" on April 24, 2021, Armenian Genocide Remembrance Day (Lindenstrauss & Shavit, 2021, paragr. 1). As a result, Biden completed his electoral pledge and became the first US President to publicly acknowledge the Ottoman Empire's genocide against the Armenian people during World War I. President Biden personally informed Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of the move in a phone conversation on the eve of the announcement, but also stressed his interest in maintaining "a constructive bilateral relationship" after delaying the first direct call to Erdogan during his first three months in office (Lindenstrauss & Shavit, 2021, paragr. 1). The chiefs of state agreed to meet in June on the margins of a NATO summit. The US President's action occurred after many years of efforts by the Armenian diaspora in the US to raise the issue. Turkey's diplomatic inability to block the declaration is particularly stunning in light of the considerable resources Turkey has invested in denying the Armenian genocide over the years.

Unlike the Trump administration's structure of interactions with Turkey, which were largely performed through phone calls between the presidents—a system that suited Erdogan's

centralized style of decision making—the Biden administration's ties with Turkey will be dictated by an orderly strategy to be formulated by all elements in the administration and implemented in a coordinated fashion, based on defined American interests (Lindenstrauss & Shavit, 2021, paragr. 4). Ankara is particularly concerned since Biden is widely regarded as the most pro-Kurdish president to date, and he spoke about the importance of supporting the Turkish opposition before taking office. Furthermore, the government is anticipated to stress human rights problems in Turkey. Ankara is concerned that he may put pressure on Turkey to free crucial political detainees, such as leaders of the pro-Kurdish party. The administration will almost certainly pay attention to Greek complaints about Turkey's forceful behavior in the Eastern Mediterranean.

President Biden has already demonstrated in numerous settings that he wants to honor the pledges he made prior to the elections. Yet, Turkey's current weakness, both in the geopolitical and economic arenas, is probably to have enabled the step of acknowledging the Armenian genocide — a step that prior Presidents have resisted owing to the potential ramifications for US-Turkey ties. Aside from harsh language, it appears that Ankara now has few options to deploy against Washington without harming itself. Furthermore, while it was formerly assumed that Washington needed Ankara in order to advance American interests, the truth now is almost always the inverse. Indeed, Ankara's reaction to Biden's pronouncement was restrained, and in his statement, Erdogan even emphasized that he expected to usher in a new era in ties with the US, a statement that leaves little question about the limited alternatives he has.

Biden's stance regarding Turkey, as well as his previous commitment to "recalibrate" US-Saudi ties, demonstrate how his government functions. While Trump's administration is built on close personal relationships with Middle Eastern and other rulers, the Biden administration seeks to pursue American interests while still not disregarding ideals that are vital to it (Lindenstrauss &

Shavit, 2021, paragr. 8). Besides its concrete causes, it seems that the growing gap among both Turkey and the US stems from a combination of factors that also affect the administration's policies toward other countries, most notably the retreat from liberal values and the adoption of a series of moves that are perceived as clearly contrary to American interests. Furthermore, even though the underlying bilateral conditions differ, an examination of the causes of the deterioration in the United States' image of Turkey as a strategic ally necessitates focus on other nations, notably Israel. Other US allies should recognize that political and demographic trends in the US, as well as how other nations behave on topics important to Americans, may eventually influence the basic approach of American administrations to their US friends.

3.2. The Nature of the Relationship Between Turkey and U.S

Relations between the United States and Turkey have long been tough to manage. However, even in the context of a relationship subject to tensions and difficulties, the previous few years have been exceptionally challenging (Lesser, paragr.1). Some of these tensions are structural, while others are the result of political factors in both nations, as well as regional changes. The rivalries can be handled. It will be difficult to resolve. A partnership that both parties perceive as "strategic" will always encounter new challenges.

When analyzing ties with Ankara, American strategists and politicians use cognitive models in which Turkey appears at the crossroads of many fault lines stretching from the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean to the Black Sea, the Levant, and the Gulf (Lesser, paragr.2). On paper, Turkey seems to be the ideal strong ally for American security objectives in Eurasia and the Middle East. Turks have traditionally shared this cognitive model, contributing to its pervasiveness in the United States and Europe. However, this geopolitical mythology contradicts the realistic realities of international politics. In US-Turkish ties, it has always been difficult to reconcile

geography and policy. In principle, Ankara and Washington may have a common interest in regional stability and prosperity. In actuality, the nation's frequently, and sometimes significantly, disagree on individual matters. This has occurred in the Aegean, Cyprus, issues of Black Sea security, and, most recently, Syria, Iran, and Russia.

The United States and Turkey are not ideal friends since they are isolated by geography and there are reasonable variations in viewpoint between a global and a regional power. Turkey and Europe have a multidimensional connection, with significant economic and people-to-people links as well as shared foreign policy goals. In comparison, US-Turkish ties are mainly one-dimensional, with an emphasis on security and military matters. This lack of variety makes interactions between two sovereign-conscious partners fragile.

Ankara was always extremely sensitive to issues of national sovereignty and perceived challenges to the Turkish state's unity. The rise of modern Turkey has been accompanied by a geopolitical mindset in which major powers' motives and actions are viewed with distrust, even when the countries in question are NATO members (Lesser, paragr.4). In pursuit of policies toward Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Russia, the US has tended to gloss over these sensitivities, where solidarity of purpose has sometimes been taken for granted. One example is the United States' sustained support for the Kurdish People's Protection Units (YPG) in Syria. Washington regards the Kurdish force as a valuable ally in the fight against ISIS. Ankara regards the YPG as a thinly disguised branch of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which both countries consider a terrorist organization and which Turkey has been fighting for years. Such radically conflicting opinions have been managed on the ground through clever communication.

American policy is frequently at the core of Turkish arguments, and Turks know a lot about America. Turkey is a specialized issue in the United States, even among individuals in the

foreign policy establishment. Foreign and security policy specialists on both sides have typically controlled the relationship, with help from the "strategic class." On both sides, this typical pattern has failed. The increased power of the president and the AKP party over Turkish diplomacy in Turkey has expedited the shift away from its traditional reliance on the US, NATO, and the EU as essential poles in the Turkish world view. Without a doubt, the predominant tendency is Islamic and Eurasian in turns. Above all, it represents a view among ruling elites that not all methods must be developed in the West. Ankara's approach now has a strong nationalistic and "non-aligned" tone. Inevitably, this clashes with the Trump Administration's harder-edged interests-based approach.

American policymakers and security planners are alarmed by Turkey's prioritization of the anti-Kurdish war above other goals in Syria, as well as Ankara's engagement with Tehran and collaboration with Moscow. The incarceration of American individuals in Turkey, and, more importantly, Ankara's planned acquisition of the Russian S-400 air defense system, has heightened the atmosphere in Congress and wider foreign policy circles. The Trump administration's repeated attempts to persuade Turkey to reject the S-400 contract have failed. If the acquisition goes through – and there is every sign that it will – Turkey would find it difficult or impossible to get F-35s. All of this is taking place against the backdrop of Turkey's eroding political and media freedom, alienating many who have sought a values-based engagement with Ankara. Long-standing pillars of American Turkey policy, such as support for Turkish EU admission, have vanished from the table for reasons that go well beyond the EU-Turkish deadlock.

Morton Abramowitz, a former ambassador to Turkey, recently stated, "Turkey offers no security concern to the United States when contrasted to the situation in Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Russia in and around the Caucasus." Turkey is not a prominent role in dealing with the

international financial crisis, as the European Union, Japan, and China are. It is not an energy exporter in the same way that Saudi Arabia is. It does not shelter terrorists seeking to attack the United States, and it does not pose a proliferation concern in the same way that Pakistan and North Korea do. However, Turkey has maintained close bilateral relations with the United States throughout the majority of its modern years, owing to its prized geo - strategic location at the crossroads of three different regions: the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, as well as its powerful military rooted to the NATO alliance. If Turkey has been crucial in advancing US security interests in the area and beyond, it has also received billions of dollars in economic and military aid, as well as billions of dollars in armaments. Turkey's unique geostrategic location has been its key asset, whether during the Cold War to contain communism, the post-Cold War decade and the first Gulf War, or again during the war on terror. As a result, the discussion suggests that a country's physical and geostrategic relevance is primarily defined by the politics of big powers.

Conclusion

The Turkish-American relationship through three different administrations is traced in this chapter. The relationship between both nations is crosscutting. The United States needs Turkey in order to defend its interests in the Middle East region. Turkey needs a partnership with the United States in order to solve the problems in its region and its membership in the European Union. Yet, both nations manifest duality through their decisions and actions, which determine the nature of the relationship between the two nations as a bilateral relationship guided by interests.

General Conclusion

Even though the Turkish-American relationship is important for both nations and it dates back to the first interaction between the newly independent America and the Ottoman Empire, it evolved after World War II, but the relationship had several ups and downs. This research attempted to explore, investigate, and describe the Turkish-American relationship, specifically the political ties in which duality is manifested in decision making, as well as the nature of this relationship and the impact of their foreign policy values on the relationship. The research concludes that even though the old strong ties between the two nations remain, tensions and crises are manifested on many occasions. In addition to the duality in the decision-making processes in both nations, this relationship is based on common interests where both nations aim to fulfill their international objectives. Yet, the relationship is not indiscriminate and it is guided by motives and factors.

To sum up, the first chapter laid the foundations for the theoretical framework of foreign policy to better understand the concept, in addition to the difference between international relations and foreign policy, in order to differentiate between them. After that, the research introduced the main foreign policy principles of the two nations involved in this research to set the basis for the process of investigating duality in the coming chapters.

In the second chapter, the study showed the importance of the relationship between the two nations, starting with the interaction between American and Ottoman sailors. There were two main areas of interaction between these two: economic and trade contacts; and missionary operations. In addition to that, the research shows that the relationship evolved after World War

Two ended, when fighting Soviet expansion was a common objective, and this need vanished after the collapse of the Soviet Union and bilateral relations started to manifest.

Finally, in the third chapter, an attempt was made to investigate and explore the aspects of duality in this relationship. Through three different administrations, the study was able to explore aspects of duality in the relationship. We notice that even though President Obama's election raised hope in Ankara, the attempts failed because of the crisis and dual actions between the two nations. Furthermore, the Trump administration was characterized by a failure in foreign relations. Several sanctions were imposed on Turkey that made the situation even worse, which raised many other crises. Finally, the Biden administration was an attempt to save the relationship from further worsening tensions. However, nothing changed. Through these different administrations, duality in decision making is totally manifested and leads us to define the nature of this relationship.

The findings of this study may aid in the rediscovery and comprehension of the Turkish-American relationship's nature, besides assisting future researchers to investigate and explore duality in the political ties between Turkey and America. In addition to that, future researchers may use the study results in order to prove the indiscrimination of the relationship.

Works Cited

- . "Turkey-United States' Bilateral Ties: A Tale of Convergence and Divergence of Interests." *Sjesr*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2020, pp. 282–88. *Crossref*, doi:10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss4-2020(282–288).
- .Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "foreign policy". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Invalid Date, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/foreign-policy>. Accessed 2 March 2022.
- “Turkiye Enterrprising and Humanitarian Foreign Policy.” *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. n.d, <https://www.mfa.gov.tr/synopsis-of-the-turkish-foreign-policy.en.mfa>. Accessed 03 Mars 2022
- “U.S. Department of State | USAGov.” *USAGov*, www.usa.gov/federal-agencies/u-s-department-of-state. Accessed 11 June 2022.
- « Remarks By President Obama To The Turkish Parliament ». *Whitehouse.Gov*, 30 avril 2013, obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-turkish-parliament.
- Al Jazeera. « Turkey Lira Crisis : Six Things You Need to Know ». *Business and Economy | Al Jazeera*, 17 août 2018, www.aljazeera.com/economy/2018/8/17/turkey-lira-crisis-six-things-you-need-to-know.
- Ali, Murad. “Turkey and the US.” *The News International*, 30 Oct. 2019, www.thenews.com.pk/print/548497-turkey-and-the-us.
- Aliriza, B., & Aras, B. (2012). *U.S.-Turkish Relations: A Review at the Beginning of the Third Decade of the Post-Cold War Era (CSIS Reports)*. Center for Strategic & International Studies.

Aliriza, Bulent et Bulent Aras. *U.S.-Turkish Relations : A Review at the Beginning of the Third Decade of the Post-Cold War Era (CSIS Reports)*. Center for Strategic et International Studies, 2012.

Arı, Tayyar. (2020). The Prospects of Turkish-American Relations: From Strategic Partnership to Strained Partnership. 10.13140/RG.2.2.19023.84649/1

Arif, S. (2021, 1 mai). ' Turkey and the S-400 Crisis. *Centre for Aerospace & Security Studies (CASS)*. <https://casstt.com/post/turkey-and-the-s-400-crisis/356>

ATMACA AYŞE ÖMÜR The Geopolitical Origins of Turkish-American Relations: Revisiting the Cold War Years. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace*, vol.3, no.1, 2014, ss.19 - 34.

BBC News - Nuclear fuel declaration by Iran, Turkey and Brazil. (2010). BBC. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/8686728.stm

Bell, Duncan. "Realism | Definition, Theories, Examples, Problems, and Facts." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, www.britannica.com/topic/realism-political-and-social-science. Accessed 9 June 2022.

Bıyıklı et Yalçınkaya. *Türk dış politikası*. Gökkuşbu, 2008.

Bostanoğlu, Burcu. *Türkiye-ABD İlişkilerinin Politikası*. Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, 2008.

Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "foreign policy". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Invalid Date, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/foreign-policy>. Accessed 10 June 2022.

Burcu Bostanoğlu, "Amerika ve Osmanlı'nın Akdeniz'de Başlayan Seyir Defteri"

Dağcı, G. T. "Turkey-US Relations in Justice and Development Partys Era" . *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 11 (2012): 1-11
<<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/alternatives/issue/1686/20846>>

Erbil, Can et Umit Ozlale. « Turkey's Currency Collapse Shows Just How Vulnerable Its Economy Is to a Crisis ». *The Conversation*, 20 août 2018, theconversation.com/turkeys-currency-collapse-shows-just-how-vulnerable-its-economy-is-to-a-crisis-101556.

Erhan, Çağrı. « Determinants of Turkish-American Relations and Prospects for the Future ». *Insight Turkey*, 1 janvier 2017, www.insightturkey.com/articles/determinants-of-turkish-american-relations-and-prospects-for-the-future.

Halil İnalçık - Nejat Göyünc Heath W. Lowry, *The Journal Of Ottoman Studies III*, İstanbul, 1982. <https://polisci.wisc.edu/international-relations/>

J. Frankel, *The Making of Foreign Policy; An Analysis of Decision-Making* (London, 1963),

Kalin, Ibrahim. « US–Turkish relations under Obama : promise, challenge and opportunity in the 21st century ». *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 12, n° 1, 2010, p. 93-108. *Crossref*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448950903507529>.

Layne, Christopher. « Obama's Missed Opportunity to Pivot Away from the Middle East ». *Insight Turkey*, 1 juillet 2015, www.insightturkey.com/commentaries/obamas-missed-opportunity-to-pivot-away-from-the-middle-east.

Lesser, Ian. « The US and Turkey : A High Maintenance Relationship ». *ISPI*, 30 mars 2019, www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/us-and-turkey-high-maintenance-relationship-22687.

Lindenstrauss, G., & Shavit, E. (2021, 6 mai). *From Crisis to Crisis : Turkey-US Relations at a Low Point*. INSS Insight. <https://www.inss.org.il/publication/biden-turkey/>

Lindenstrauss, Gallia. « What Has Been Is What Will Be : The 2015 Israeli Elections and the State of Turkish-Israeli Relations ». *Insight Turkey*, 1 janvier 2015, www.insightturkey.com/commentaries/what-has-been-is-what-will-be-the-2015-israeli-elections-and-the-state-of-turkish-israeli-relations.

Martin, Lenore G. « Analysing a Tumultuous Relationship : Turkey and the US in the Middle East ». *Asian Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies*, vol. 13, n° 2, 2019, p. 262-77.

Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.1080/25765949.2019.1605571>.

Martin, Patrick et Christopher Kozak. « News Article ». *The Pitfalls of Relying on Kurdish Forces to Counter ISIS*, 2016, www.understandingwar.org/backgrounder/pitfalls-relying-kurdish-forces-counter-isis.

Metz et Library of Congress (U.S.), Federal Research Division

Metz, Helen Chapin et Library of Congress (U.S.), Federal Research Division. *Turkey : A Country Study (Area Handbook Series)*. Fifth Edition, Department of the Army, 1996.

Mustafa Aydin (1999): Determinants of Turkish foreign policy: historical framework and traditional inputs, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 35:4, 152-186

Mustafa Aydın, Çağrı Erhan, Cagri Erhan. *Turkish-American Relations: Past, Present and Future*. 2004 p.1.

Pfaltzgraff, Robert. "International Relations | Politics." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, www.britannica.com/topic/international-relations. Accessed 9 June 2022.

Read more: [Difference Between International Relations and Foreign Policy | Difference Between](http://www.differencebetween.net/miscellaneous/politics/difference-between-international-relations-and-foreign-policy/#ixzz7NKdXZm7Q) <http://www.differencebetween.net/miscellaneous/politics/difference-between-international-relations-and-foreign-policy/#ixzz7NKdXZm7Q>

Squadrin, Giulia. "Difference Between International Relations and Foreign Policy." *Difference Between Similar Terms and Objects*, 18 July, 2017, <http://www.differencebetween.net/miscellaneous/politics/difference-between-international-relations-and-foreign-policy/>.

- Squadrin, Giulia. "Difference Between International Relations and Foreign Policy." *Difference Between Similar Terms and Objects*, 18 July, 2017, <http://www.differencebetween.net/miscellaneous/politics/difference-between-international-relations-and-foreign-policy/>.
- Staff, Reuters. « Turkey Told U.S. It Opposes Sanctions on Iran : Foreign Minister ». *U.S.*, 24 juillet 2018, www.reuters.com/article/us-oil-iran-turkey/turkey-told-u-s-it-opposes-sanctions-on-iran-foreign-minister-idUSKBN1KE27J.
- The U.S. Department of State. *Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work*. June 2008, <https://2009-2017.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/107330.htm>
- Tran, M. (2017, 15 juillet). *US is not at war with Islam, says Barack Obama*. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/apr/06/barack-obama-turkey-armenia>
- Wemer, David. « US-Turkey Relations : From Alliance to Crisis ». *Atlantic Council*, 2 décembre 2020, www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/us-turkey-relations-from-alliance-to-crisis.
- Yılmaz, Nuh. ““Stratejik Ortaklıktan Model Ortaklığa: Türkiye’nin Bağımsız Dış Politikasının Etkileri.”” *SETA Yayınları*, 2011, p. 568.
- Zeleny, Jeff. « “Barack Obama Criticizes Bush as He Outlines Foreign Policy Goals,” ». *The New York Times*, 23 avril 2007, www.nytimes.com/2007/04/23/world/americas/23iht-obama.5.

ملخص

يهدف هذا البحث الى التعامل مع العلاقة التركية الأمريكية، ينظر إليها معظم الناس على أنها شراكة إيجابية وطبيعية ولا يأخذ القضايا التي نشأت بينهم. بالإضافة إلى الظروف والدوافع القائمة، فإن العلاقة بين البلدين تقوم على المصالح في الاعتبار المشتركة، وكل دولة تحاول تحقيق أهدافها من خلال إثبات نفسها وإصدار أحكام قوية وثابتة. هذه الدراسة هي تحليل وتحقيق في العلاقة التركية الأمريكية. باختصار، يركز على طبيعة العلاقة، بالإضافة إلى الازدواجية التي تحدث بين البلدين في المجال السياسي. كما أنه يحدد الدوافع والعوامل التي توجه سياساته الخارجية. ستستخدم هذه الدراسة أساليب تاريخية بالإضافة إلى نهج استكشافي ووصفي وتحقيقي لتحديد ما إذا كانت العلاقة بين البلدين عشوائية أو ما إذا كانت العوامل والدوافع تلعب دورًا.

الكلمات الرئيسية: السياسة الخارجية، العلاقة التركية الأمريكية، العلاقات الثنائية، الازدواجية، العلاقات الدولية، الأزمة