



DIŞ POLİTİKA - FOREIGN POLICY

Biannual Journal of the Foreign Policy Institute

Vol. XXXIV – No.1 2017

Dış Politika Enstitüsü-Foreign Policy Institute

Foreign Policy Institute founded in 1974, is a private corporation engaged in research, organising conferences, seminars and working groups on foreign policy and strategic issues. It is currently affiliated to the Turkish Foundation for International Relations and Strategic Studies.

Editorial Board Members: Seyfi Taşhan, President FPI, Assoc. Prof Ersel Aydınlı, Secretary of Fulbright, Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı, Department of

International Relations, METU, Armand Clesse, Director IEIS, Luxembourg Institute for European and International Studies, Prof. Dr. Ali Karaosmanođlu, Prof. Mustafa Kibarogđlu, Chair Department of Political and International Relations, MEF University, Heinz Kramer, Researcher, Engin Ömer Lütem, Ambassador (Ret), Prof. Dr. Ersin Onulduran, Nathalie Tocci, Deputy Director, Istituto Affari Internazionali, Oktay Aksoy, Ambassador (Ret), Foreign Policy Institute.

By its statute and law, Turkish Foreign Policy Institute is not allowed to express views on political matters. Therefore, the views expressed in this publication are solely those of their authors.

Published in July 2017

Publisher for Foreign Policy Institute: Seyfi Tařhan

Editor: Oktay Aksoy

Foreign Policy Institute

İlker 1. Cadde 1024 Sokak No: 19/1 Ankara, Turkey Tel.

+90 312 478 52 50-59 Fax: +90 312 479 86 72 e.mail:

fpi@foreignpolicy.org.tr

Web Site: <http://www.foreignpolicy.org.tr>

TABLE of CONTENTS

Notes on Recent Events and This Issue5

Oktay Aksoy

Tackling Current International Developments 11

An Interview with Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı conducted by Seyfi Taşhan

An Overview of Major Trends in The Turkish Foreign Policy

1919 – 2000 Inclinations and Orentations 27

Numan Hazar

A Nutshell Review of Trump’s Foreign Policy 47

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gökhan Akşemsettinoğlu

**TURKEY’S Development-Oriented Humanitarian Policy Inspiring The
Global Humanitarian System in The Post-WHS Process:**

New Way of Working to Transcend Development and

Humanitarian Divide 63

Dr. Hasan Ulusoy

Africa in World Politics and Somalia: A Comparative Case Study 77

Numan Hazar

Notes on Recent Events and This Issue

Changes in International Landscape

The first half of 2017 was full of drastic changes in the international scene. Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45th President of the US and the many controversial promises he has made during his election campaign and his attempts to break with the established policies not only domestically but also internationally leave many to wonder what his administration's next steps will be.

Another revolutionary change in leadership and politics was in France with the surprise rise to power of a young and ambitious newcomer, Emmanuel Macron. One wonders if his 65% win over an ultra-rightist candidate, while it was a relief in many quarters, would prevent the rise of dangerous populist trends in many countries in Europe. Shortly after his stunning victory in Presidential elections, his newly formed centrist party "La Republique en Marche" swept to parliamentary power in the lowest turnout National Assembly elections reflecting weariness with the existing discredited political class. Would his example to go along without formal party structures be an inspiration for many others discontented with the solidified establishments and attracted to increasingly radicalised populist temptations?

Another important shift in the European scene will definitely be UK's leaving the EU following a referendum held last year. British Prime Minister Theresa May's gamble to call snap elections with the hope of gaining sufficient majority and support in Parliament in conducting the Brexit negotiations with the EU officials from a strong position did not produce what she had hoped for and negotiations started with a weak minority government.

Meanwhile politics in Turkey was also very active during the first few months of the year as we witnessed a referendum on April 16th for constitutional change shifting the presidential system to an executive presidential one.

Trump as the US President

With President Trump in office, the world is trying to figure out how his administration will make changes in international politics. Trump's "America First" stance has increased concerns among those oriented for close

cooperation on global issues and more so among the allies whether this will erode the existing confidence in strategic relations. His participation in the NATO Summit in Brussels, where Montenegro with troops numbering merely 2 thousand joined the Organization as 29th member, relieved some allies that this important security apparatus will still play an indispensable role in Euro-Atlantic relations but his declining to affirm the important Article 5 of the Treaty, crucial for collective defence, left many disappointed. President Trump's first visit overseas starting with Saudi Arabia and a visit to Israel and a meeting with the Palestinian President Abbas, gives some indications of his interest in the region. As a businessman, some expect his stand in diplomacy to be "transactional". However, many are perplexed with conflicting, even sometimes contradicting statements coming from different departments in Washington, D.C. and wonder how it will finally take shape as developments are not restricted to this particular geography and has implications far and beyond. His decision to exit from the Climate Change Accord signed only recently in Paris was also met with anguish and highly criticised.

Palestinian Peace Process

While contacts between the leaders of the world are intensifying, the problems between Israel and Palestine somehow seems to have lost its urgency while Hamas has gone through a transition. Even some call the Palestinian peace process already "dead and buried". How to revive the two state solution may now need more time and effort.

Stress in Turkey's Relations with the West

Turkish President Tayyip Erdoğan's long awaited visit to the US to meet with the US President Trump, delayed because of the referendum process in Turkey, took place shortly before the two met at the NATO Summit in Brussels. It was hoped that relations between the two allies, occasionally

Notes on Recent Events and This Issue

strained particularly over developments in Syria, would clarify where the two stand and generate a new start. It did not necessarily bring about a clear picture as contacts at different levels are still continuing to reduce misunderstandings and Turkey's concerns over the US insistence to provide

heavy weapons to the Syrian Kurdish group linked to the PKK with which Turkey is carrying a long fight and which is considered not only by Turkey but also by the US and other allies as a terrorist organization.

Meanwhile, efforts to rejuvenate negotiations between Turkey and EU aimed at its eventual membership has not yet met with enthusiasm expected and the European Parliament has adopted a resolution while this journal was going to press advising conditional suspension of negotiations. Moreover, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, where Turkey is among its founding members, adopted a resolution in April to reopen the monitoring procedure due to Turkey's deteriorating state of democratic norms and human rights.

Turkey's Relations with Russia

Turkey's bilateral relations with Russia have continued to improve since our last issue. Difficulties in exporting of some agricultural produce have been gradually eliminated and tourism has gained impetus, the construction of the Turkish Stream natural gas pipeline to carry natural gas to from Russia to eventually Europe has begun. But since Russia is kind of a neighbor to Turkey also on its southern borders establishing itself Syria, contacts between Presidents of the two countries on problems emanating from the situation there have increased and progress has been witnessed on the future of Syria and the establishment of conflict free zones through the Astana Process.

Ending of Cyprus Talks

Negotiations between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders to produce a federal solution to the Cyprus problem as envisaged by the UN Security Council was conducted in Crans Montana, Switzerland under the auspices of UN Secretary General Antonio Gueterres and, when this issue of our Journal was going to press, it ended without any agreement. It was a continuation of the earlier meeting in January which had failed to produce any progress. Participation of Foreign Ministers of Turkey, Greece and UK as guarantor states, as well as the presence of high level observers from EU gave weight to expectations to find a lasting solution on the basis of a federal structure for Cyprus. The most important subject to be dealt with was the guarantees and security item which is of vital importance for the Turkish

Cypriots. But also the issue of power sharing which is crucial for a federal structure to survive, as well as the subjects of the territorial adjustments in each federal state aimed to prevent sources of future conflicts, property rights of the two peoples of the Island were all considered. One has to remember the earlier attempts for a solution when the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan had produced a plan in 2004 which was approved by 65% of the Turkish Cypriots and rejected by 76% of the Greek Cypriots at a simultaneous referendum. Yet awarding of the Greek Cypriots to become members of EU presumably representing the whole Island has made a lasting solution practically impossible. Still Turkish Cypriots try hard to convince their Greek Cypriot counterparts that if reunification will be realized it should produce a formula on how power will be shared by the two peoples of the Island who had earlier agreed at the founding of the State. UN negotiated federal solution to Cyprus makes it difficult to expect a fair deal but Turkish Cypriot side with support from Turkey conducted the negotiations with open mind. Yet the Greek Cypriots focus only on the status of guarantees, as a result of which the Turkish troops are based in the Island which is crucial for the security of Turkish Cypriots. After all it was the Turkish Cypriots who had suffered under Greek Cypriot aggression leading to the Turkish intervention back in 1974 based on these Treaty rights.

As we have a saying in Turkish “Perşembe’nin gelişi Çarşamba’dan bellidir” meaning “the way things will be on Thursday is possible to predict having a good look at things on Wednesday”. The way negotiations were carried in Crans Montana with Turkish Cypriots making every constructive effort to reach at an equitable solution to the Cyprus problem on a bi-zonal, bi-national basis as envisaged by the U.N. and reminding all the time that the original premises in establishing the state more than 60 years ago required an equitable sharing of power which the Greek Cypriots try to completely eliminate and give the Turkish Cypriots a minority status, it was evident that no positive result could be achieved. So, it was a big disappointment both for the Turkish side and also for the new UN Secretary

Notes on Recent Events and This Issue

General who must have hoped to crown his term with at least a reasonable end to an ongoing dispute in the Eastern Mediterranean’s hot geography. Will there be another attempt or will it be the beginning of a search for a two state solution there as well?

Euromesco Annual Conference

Turkish Foreign Policy Institute is among the founding members of the Euromesco (Euro-Mediterranean Study Commission) network of research institutes on politics and security in the Mediterranean created in 1996. It organizes annual conferences tackling many problems the region is facing. This year's conference was held in Barcelona, Spain on June 1 and 2 entitled "Confronting Violant Extremism in the Euro-Mediterranean Region". It is a subject currently keeping the minds of all in the region and considered as a common threat to the security of the region. What responses could be considered to the rise of this trend, what relationship could be established between this trend in the region and rise of populist, nationalist, Islamophobic and authoritarian trends.

Contents of This Issue

The many changes in the international scene and how to tackle them is the subject of an interview we have in this issue of our Journal conducted by Mr. Seyfi Taşhan, President of the Turkish Foreign Policy Institute, with Prof. Hüseyin Bağcı from the METU International Relations Department. While there has been some time past since the interview was conducted, nothing much has changed to revise Prof. Bağcı's views and there still exists an ambiguity in the international scene.

An interesting article by Ambassador (Rtd.) Numan Hazar who has reviewed the major trends in the formation of the Turkish foreign policy since 1919, the year efforts for the declaration of the republic was initiated by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his close followers, through the year 2000.

As interest in how politics in the US will take shape and particularly how President Trump will conduct his foreign policy is running high, an article by Assoc.Prof. Gökhan Akşemsettinöglü from Çankaya University Political Science and International Relations Department could be a timely contribution reviewing the possibilities to be expected.

Readers of our Journal will remember that last year the first World Humanitarian Summit was held in Istanbul and we had an article aimed at providing insights on the process leading to the Summit and the positions taken by Turkey on this important issue. This time Ambassador Dr. Hasan Ulusoy, Director General for Multilateral Political Affairs at the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, elaborates on Turkey's development oriented

humanitarian policy focusing on the new way of working to transcend development and humanitarian divide.

As is known, Turkish Foreign Policy Institute is following closely developments in Africa and our Journal has been publishing articles reflecting on different aspects of Turkey's relations with countries in this vast continent. This time Ambassador (Rtd.) Numan Hazar has a comparative case study on how Somalia has been impacting world politics.

Oktay Aksoy / *Editor*

Tackling Current International Developments

An Interview with Prof. Hüseyin Bağcı¹

Turkey's position

Seyfi Taşhan: How do you evaluate recent developments?

Prof. Hüseyin Bağcı: Turkey should not be a disturber in the Middle East but rather be a stabilizer, but at the same time it is expected that Turkey is not going to become a crisis creator, but rather a crisis manager, as Turkey was during the 1900s and early 2000, when Turkey was mediating between Israel and Syria, as well as Iran and the Western countries. So, Turkey was, in those years, reflecting the consciousness of the Middle East because Turkey did not take any sides among the conflicting parties. Therefore, at the moment, in recent years, since the Arab Spring in particular, Turkish perception has changed. Turkey has miscalculated, misperceived the Arab Spring and made a lot of mistakes definitely, but at the same time the Arab Spring was also an attempt to create a new design of the Middle East and all these changes and developments in Middle East.

Perception of Major Powers

S. Taşhan: I would like to interfere here to say that our idea for this interview was to listen to your views on international developments as much as Turkey is involved. I would like to hear your views on current international developments also on global approaches of the giants such as EU, US, Russia and China. I think the Turkish position could be developed after this. Because the students ask “why Turkey is not giving up the US, because it is hated so much in the country”, or Europe with which we are having so many problems, “why don't we turn our direction towards the Shanghai 5” and so on. I think the position of the major powers in the current international scene would be more explicit for clarifying the Turkish position.

¹ Interview conducted on May 10th, 2017 by Mr. Seyfi Taşhan, President of the Foreign Policy Institute, with Prof. Hüseyin Bağcı, International Relations Department, METU

H. Bağcı: Then, I start first of all, with these permanent power centers and emerging power center which is China. Permanent powers include US, EU and Russia. First of all, the US is still the number one country in military terms and in scientific terms at the moment in the world which is controlling the entire globe. US is the only country which can deploy so many soldiers outside of its territory as no other empire has done before. United State's position at the moment is that it has to accept that there are other new power centers. It is not anymore as perceived after the end of the Cold War that the US is the only super power. It was changing after 9/11 in particular and American perception of the world that the American values have to be distributed around the world is not any more having the same validity as it was the case in the past. Remember President George W. Bush, he was saying that, "the 20th century was the century of US". He said this was true in 1990 September, when he was speaking in the American Senate. But in the 21st century, America has to share global options and the global aims despite the fact that America remains as the solid power which is unchallengeable within military terms. With one difference: US under the new administration, in particular, is having the slogan which is 'Make America Great Again' meaning that America has lost its greatness. It is a process of regaining of the greatness. Whether America is going to do this is another thing but American perception both in Turkey and abroad, in the last ten years, have been very negative, in particular in the Islamic world. So, this is why Barack Obama's policy was reconciliation with the Islamic World, in particular. America's soft power, in the sense of Joseph Nye, has been defining the entire 20th century and also in the first quarter of the 21st century. We do not debate American greatness in this case. We debate how far America is prepared for the new challenges, emanating from Chinese appearance in the international scene, also because of Russia's strength and because of European developments particularly after Brexit. Looking from the American perspective, America tries to control the global developments, shape them and direct them. This is the American aim, but how this is going to be applied under this new presidential change is an open question. Donald Trump probably

will be the most important American President not only for the American continent contrary to the former American Presidents. Former American Presidents when they came to Europe they were mostly welcomed but this time there were unwelcoming protests during his visit to Germany, to Britain, to France and so on. What ever it is, America remains, also in economic terms, still one the most important powers but it is faced with new challenges. First, how to deal with China and secondly with the EU.

Is EU Changing?

The transatlantic partnership in the sense of economic terms, does not function any more because of America's new President's rejection. In Europe, Brexit will create definitely a big problem for the EU. EU is at the moment undergoing a very interesting economic, political and philosophical debate. Economic debate is what happens to Europe after Brexit, politically speaking the emergence of populist movements, as some call that "healthy nationalism". Populism, healthy nationalism you can choose the words. The fact is, EU is not anymore the same EU after Arab Spring and after the refugee crisis, in particular, where the value based system of the European set-up was being questioned. Mind of Europeans have been mostly value based, not security based. But those values from human rights to freedom of speech are very strongly criticized now because the recent developments such as the emerging of Islamic movements and emergence of other groupings also prove that the European values do not apply anymore universally as it was the case before. Also within the EU, we have Central and Eastern European countries which now want to get more of their voices heard because they feel that they are treated as second class members of European Union. The psychology of Europe is changing. We do not have anymore one Europe composed of 28 countries speaking with one voice. There are new voices emerging, there are new groupings within the EU and I think after Brexit, France and Germany will be the leading countries. But how far can they keep the unity of EU is another question. Philosophically speaking Europe is definitely the center of power, the center of knowledge. No doubt about it. Looking from the Turkish perspective the modernization model has always been the European one. But at the moment, due to the American and Russian policies, and also Chinese emergence, EU is not anymore defining the world politics but rather influenced by the external

dynamics and changes much more than ever before. Whether Europeans will survive this is an open question. But we know that Europe is debating very strongly. “The King is Dead, Long Live the King” is the new slogan in Europe because EU at the moment is undergoing a process, where the classical European groupings are losing their importance because of these populist movements. Europe is in the wake of emerging different strong nationalisms, whether in France or Belgium or in Germany. And these political parties will definitely shape all the way of thinking, political thinking in the long run of the European Union. EU is not going to be destroyed, it will survive but it will be a giant with no teeth.

Importance of NATO

There is no security concept of EU. It is depending on the American security cover. That is why NATO is the primary institution for European security, now and also in the future. This is also what America at the moment sees. The statement of Donald Trump that “NATO is obsolete” first but then “military is necessary” proves that his visit to NATO at the end of May will be one of the interesting visits to define how the Americans would contribute to the security of Europe in the coming years or would he demand the Germans and the others to pay more for the security. So there is an internal NATO conflict, who is going to pay more. As you know, in the late ‘80s we had this “leadership in partnership”, it means if you want to be leader than you have to contribute for security more. A similar process is going on now. The biggest problem of Europe is how Russia is moving and behaving. The Ukrainian conflict is the biggest mistake of NATO and of the European countries. In 2008 at the Bucharest meeting they were not able to provide a road map to Georgia and Ukraine. And it was Germany, by the way, Angela Merkel who prevented to provide a road map. If NATO had given a road map for full membership, probably today, the Black Sea would have been an American or NATO lake rather than a Russian lake. Here in this case one has to note that Romania and Bulgaria, as new members of NATO of course, make part of NATO’s security concerns. But we have a specific situation, since 1774 Turkey and Russia share the Black Sea. Turkey and Russia share the Black Sea and the Montreux Treaty provides Turkey the right to control the straits and this is the biggest asset for Turkey and Turkey is playing this

towards NATO and America and Russia. So, Turkey's strength is that, still Turkey controls which type of warships may pass and may not pass.

Relations with Russia

European countries, in particular Germany, I would say, they made a big mistake to get after Russia after the Crimean intervention starting with the economic embargo. Russia survived the economic embargo but the European economies do not survive the embargo. At the moment we see from Poland to Germany, from France to many other countries how they actually would like to get into economic cooperation with Russia. A loan of five hundred billion euros is already lost because the German companies cannot invest anymore in Russia. Russians, on the other hand, under Putin, just yesterday, commemorated the victory day of Soviet Union, the end of World War 2. They still celebrate the day of May 9th as the victory day against Hitler, against Germany. It means under Putin we have a new Russian identity, being a military power not an economic power but a military power, at the moment, is more important than economic power.

Russian Challenge?

S. Taşhan: May I ask a question at this point? If Russia as a military power gets stronger and Europe militarily remains a neutral power, then don't we turn to the situation before the Second World War?

H. Bağcı: There are some arguments at the moment, that the world is going to have the same similar intellectual and military environment as before WW2. This is one view. The second view is, at the moment the Russians in particular being among G20 and being a good ally with China and holding all this Eurasian space together, the 21st century is definitely going to be the Asian century. It will not be the century of Europe as far as we can see. But you are definitely right, the deployment of American troops in Poland, Estonia, Latvia, so in the Central and Eastern Europe, the American presence, military presence at the moment is providing a deterrence towards Russia. They're not European soldiers, they are American soldiers and Russia exactly knows that nobody can get Russia out of Crimea anymore. It is past, it is history and Ukraine is going to be divided, there will be no strong regime in

the long run, and Europeans still hesitate neither to take them into NATO, nor into the European Union. So, Europe is squeezed between Atlantic and Ural mountains. The American perception towards Europe and the Russian perception towards Europe is having one common aim: the weakness of Europe. They realize that Europe is getting weaker. The Brexit process helped to give the chance for the first time to Russians to appear much stronger. For the Americans it is important in economic terms that European countries as competitors, European Union is not anymore so big a threat for America as is the case of China. Americans will exercise more economic, I would say, influence over Europe, over Germany in particular when you look to the banks, the Volkswagen, the BMW cases. These are big German companies which have certain problems with American companies, making troubles to the American companies, so I think the new American policy will be to push Europeans to the corner in security terms but also in economic terms and I expect Europe to be more dependent on America then it was the case before. This European policy to get more independent from America gradually declined. So, it will be another patron-client relation, most probably, in the coming years. The Russian influence can only be prevented, if the Americans want the Europeans to choose between two evils. Lesser evil is better and America is better, I would say, for them, America is less evil than Russia. The Russians would not intervene in the European continent. Putin does not think about it but Putin is definitely trying to increase the military capabilities of Russia, when I look to the modernization of Russian army, the new technological developments of Russia, including high tech, regional airplanes or military planes. Russia will remain as a military power anyway which Europe will never somehow block or stop it. It is maybe this sentence I have to use: the Russians under Putin do not consider Europe as an equivalent partner. For Russians, America is the equivalent partner and definitely, you are right, we have the Cold War conditions there, during the Cold War conditions, America and the Soviet Union had been dealing about disarmament issues and then informing the allies, NATO or Warsaw Pact countries. Maybe one interesting development at the moment is: we have the Visegrad countries, we have Balkan countries and suddenly we see also in Central and Eastern Europe increasing Russian influence, the Russian political culture, Russian language, Russian way of thinking is returning back after twenty five years of independence. It could be considered the weakness of the European democracies that they were not able to create

institutions there which is very strong. The advisor of the French President used to say that the Central and Eastern European countries all the young people from there leave for Germany, for France and for Britain, so there will not be enough young people in those Central and Eastern European countries to keep the institutions strong. Who is the profit maker? Germany. Germany, in economic terms, in political terms, also in the sense of the human reserves, is the most important profit maker. This is more dangerous than after WW2 because if there are not enough young people in those countries, who is going to not only manage the political institutions but also the economic institutions, agricultural development? Who is going to do this? So Russia is now looking from a distance at Europe smiling and saying to Europe: “you are losing weight”.

A Europeanized Germany?

S. Taşhan: One question. Germany may change policies when German nationalism grows enough, and Germany, if they decide to arm themselves and give up the nonintervention policy abroad and grow to become a major military power, then where do we go?

H. Bağcı: The situation at the moment in Germany is this: the German intellectuals are not interested to have big Germany, nor militarized Germany and they prefer much more Europeanized Germany than Germanized Europe. At the moment the German nationalists are not too strong to change the political structure, it is not possible at the moment. We will probably be going to have another coalition under Angela Merkel with Social Democrats or even the Free Democrats, it could be another opportunity if the wind of Martin Shultz is finished. At the moment the elections in Saarland and Kiel (Schleswig-Holstein) proved once again that the Christian Democrats are coming. Now we have elections in Northern Rhine-Westphalia which is the biggest federal republic within Germany. My expectation is that Germany is trying to make a balance of power politics between Russia and America. We know Angela Merkel is more pro American than Russia but Germany would not be a danger for Europe in the foreseeable future. After the French elections, in particular, I think Macron and Merkel will come together and their primary concern in the coming years will be to keep the European Union alive. European Union is crippled,

it is not as strong as before. Now there is a regeneration of European Union after the Brexit. I think the British will leave, they will try, if there is a way, to make divorce as cheap as possible. And Theresa May is one hundred percent for the separation and the British-American cooperation will be much more interesting. By the way, Britain never wanted to be part of Europe and even Winston Churchill in 1946 said that European countries should come together and establish the European Union but without Britain. He was not mentioning that Britain should be part of it. And Britain had always this special status option, they never joined the space of Europe, they always had this option to leave and they have never forgotten to have been rejected twice by France. If I would like to say how Europeans are going to be a permanent power in the future or will it be possible to continue to be a power center, I would say yes, economically European Union is strong, the institutions are strong, Europe is the problem on the one hand and on the other hand the solution of the problem. The only thing is that the democratic effectiveness is not so strong, fast and as in the case of Russia, Turkey and US. But you must not forget that Hungary under Orban is also rebelling against the classical European values. And not alone. Very interestingly most of the Balkan countries are also afraid because they do not have any high technology, they do not have any big innovation programs. They will be more and more in the orbit of the European Union and they psychologically feel as second class members of NATO. The question of European Union is "How Germany and France will manage to keep European Union alive".

S. Taşhan: May I add here, the enlargement to Eastern Europe was a German desire, to bring them in for security purposes, rather than economic purposes, greater German influence in Eastern Europe. Original European concept was that, Germany and France together with smaller states Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg and Italy would make up the Union. Now Italy, Greece and Spain together with Portugal, even France are consumer countries in the European Union. How long can Germany continue to providing the European Union with money to survive?

H. Bağcı: Germany is once again still the biggest investor. All the European countries have debts to Germany even now with France after Macron won the elections Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel was asked "who is ruling in France", because Germany is investing in France, France is depending on

German investments. He said, “of course we are neighbors, we will do together” but Germany is the profit maker. But my question here would be or rather explanation; Germany was the primary country to promote the reintegration of Central and Eastern European countries both into the European Union, as well as into NATO. They have done it. NATO enlargement and EU enlargement to the east is an uneconomic decision. This is a political decision and it proves itself now as a wrong decision. Three countries: Sweden, Finland and Austria they joined the European Union but they did not join NATO. So they are still neutrals. Why they do not join? They have other reasons. The Central and Eastern European countries after 25 years of their independence, they still have difficulties to adjust to democratic conditions. Because after being under Soviet rule for so many years, the leadership of those countries, they oppose in the same way to European values as Putin does. I follow the discussions, I follow the base. Poland for example is one of the best example in this sense. Hungary, even the Czech Republic started to act like this because this mind set of the former communist understanding is returning back and this is the biggest threat for the European Union and classical western democracies. At the end of the day the main question is, are they successful to integrate those countries into the European Union or not, failure or success. It all depends on which part you see if the glass is full or half full. My interpretation is this: Germany has done it from ethical and moral reasons because the Germans have given those countries from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania to the hands of Russians, including Poland. So I think this moral and ethical responsibility of the Germans proved itself in the sense of political enlargement. There is no economic concern and still Germany is paying for this. One more point, the Baltic countries are protected by America not by Germany. This is another thing. I do not expect that Germany is losing its economic influence. Germany will not be going to be a military power there. It is not allowed and the two countries as Prof. Michael Shermer says: two countries are not allowed to have nuclear weapons, they are Germany and Turkey. It was the former German Foreign Minister Under Secretary Friedrich Kreuz telling me in one interview like we do now, he said “Mr. Bağcı, we have taken Eastern and Central European countries because we felt ourselves guilty that we handed them to the Soviets after 1945. Now we take them back. We know that it is not an economic decision but we have to do this because of ethical and moral points of view”. This is maybe what Germany has

contributed in the last 25 years for the European security and democracy. The problem is democratic institutions in those countries, they are not so strong as they should be. This is why Russia is trying to get more influence. Ukraine is the prime example. You remember also like me, it was German Finance Minister Schauble saying in 2007 or 2008 “If we take Turkey into European Union than we should also take Ukraine into the European Union.” Neither we Turks, nor the Ukrainians are yet members of the EU. But it was a primary premise of the European Union. So, from this perspective of stability and security terms in Europe this will create more concern than economic insecurity. Economically Europe is fine.

US Confrontation with Russia in Syria

S. Taşhan: Let us now turn to the trouble spots: Syria. There are plenty of possibilities for Russian and American confrontation there. For the time being they are somewhat managing things together. Russia is playing by itself, taking Turkey along side and America is trying to do something but it doesn't really want to fully commit itself to the Syrian conflict and does not want to leave the ground for Russia alone, which is highly dangerous for American influence in the Middle East and playing with fortifying the Kurdish region there, encourage the region for security purposes against ISIL. But it is not enough to prevent increasing Russian influence and the permanent stay of Russia in Syria. So that is a problem for the Mediterranean and also for Europe in that sense. It is also a problem for Turkey since Syria and Iraq will take sides with Russia and Iran also plays to Russian tune. Another security problem is rising up. Russia was no longer a threat for Turkey since the end of the Cold War because we had no common border with Russia except presence of some Russian troops in Armenia in the East. Mainland Russia was away. Now in Syria, Russia is at our borders. Russia and Kurds are coming together. Americans can they survive in Kurdish region of Syria? It is a big problem. What do you think about the new situation? Is there going to be a race in the Middle East for Russian and American influence or dominance?

H. Bağcı: First of all, Arab Spring did not bring the expected changes, the results were not expected. We do not have big regime changes but we have some border changes in the long run. Syria is the prime example in this

framework. How the external powers can exercise their strength and try to increase their influence, redefine and design the region. Turkey is definitely one of the regional powers which is there like a colossus. You have to deal with Turkey. You cannot deny the fact that Turkey is there. Whatever formula you take, Turkey should be in it, whether with America, Russia or European Union. Starting with Russians: Russians are the winners of the day, definitely, but Syria was always supported by Russia. Entire Russian military structure was transferred to Syria even during the Hafiz Esad the period. The present situation brings Russia again to the Middle East, makes Russia one of the most important players and makes Russia even a neighbor of Turkey, it is an important new development in the Middle East. The new American administration policy is interesting. We do not see like Obama style policy based on more reconciliation, more carefulness. Donald Trump, after 100 days in power, signed this military treaty and sent all the heavy material to the Kurds because the Kurds are the most important local forces for fighting DAESH on the side of the Americans. We should not forget that Americans also promised to the Kurds, together with Armenians in 1914 in one of the articles of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points to establish independent Kurdistan and Armenia on the Ottoman territories. For the Americans it is a matter of honor. It is a promise and Americans would never give up this idea. The question is internal and external conditions of the region whether it is providing the conditions for an independent Kurdish state. We have so called de facto states in the Middle East, two de facto states: one is, independent Kurdistan region in Iraq under Barzani and Palestine, whether there will be another Kurdish state, de facto or de jure, we have to wait at the moment. The Americans are trying to fight DAESH, maybe those places taken from DAESH could be given to the Kurds later on, maybe they have ideas for that geography, you never know. But in Iraq and in Syria there will be border changes. Definitely I do expect this. Peshmerges and Barzani forces in other terms when they go to referendum for an independent state then they will loose, economically, loose the central government support of Iraq. You know much better than I do, how difficult it is if you do not have any financier, you cannot survive as a state there, if you do not have a strong economy. By the way, what the Russians and Americans do? I think the Americans and Russians have a new situation now, where they talk about the future of the region, start to increase their influences. The visit of Donald Trump to Saudi Arabia, Israel and Vatican is somehow giving the indication

that these countries, Saudi Arabia and Israel will have the primacy on the American foreign policy and this is a problem for Turkey, in particular, in the long run, because Turkey, to my mind, made a lot of miscalculations over extension of its capabilities and Turkey is trying now to change the locomotives, as a wagon sometimes attached to the Russian locomotive and sometimes to the American.

S.Tashan: It is the old Ottoman policy.

H. Bağcı: Yes, it is true but the Americans at the moment do not provide first class ticket, this is the problem. The Russians provide first class ticket in Astana. As we have seen in Moscow and in Astana the Iranians, the Russians and the Turks they talk about the future of Syria. And the Turkish position changed, before it was the regime change, now Turkey says the territorial integrity of Iraq and Syria has to be protected. So it is a shift of the original position or the official recognition as Numan Kurtulmuş said as the deputy prime minister just last week at the press conference: “the Syrian policy was wrong”. So this statement shows there is something to be corrected. What has to be corrected? The wrong policies. I think, Turkey is not a designer of the region, which former Prime Minister Davutoğlu claimed, that in the Middle East nothing can happen without the Turkish consent. I do not think anymore that Turkey is the designer of the region. No, it is the U.S. and Russia and we know one more thing, the Chinese support the autocratic regimes in Egypt, in Syria, in other Arab countries. Because they consider the Islamic radicalism as a threat for them. Also India, by the way, follows the same line. It is very interesting. So this is why Beshar Esad is not to be replaced by anyone at the moment, there is no one to replace him. In Egypt, Sisi will remain and he is the most beloved friend of Donald Trump, it is not Tayyip Erdoğan, it is Sisi. The Turkish policy one more time was wrong: President Tayyip Erdoğan says “Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt is not a terrorist organization”. American administration says “Muslim Brothers, Ehyvan is a terrorist organization”. The more this difference remains there will not be a common position on this case. Also in the case of DAESH. Turkey changed her position since 2014 NATO meeting in Wales that Turkey is fighting DAESH. But it was already an accepted fact that Turkey was providing to radical groupings access through Turkish borders to Syria. This is the image, whether the Turkish Government rejected or not is another

matter but this is the image in the West, in particular also in China. The Chinese also believe that all those people from East Turkistan they were coming to join the DAESH groups via Turkey. So this is the image and the biggest problem of Turkey is to improve the image that Turkey is not on the side with radical Muslims.

How Turkey is Perceived?

S. Taşhan: I think Turkey has now reached a position of not being the bigger country. We have a lot of money but when you compare national income with others, this is not too much. Turkey is a developing country 3% or 4% annual growth, whatever it is and it has a great power factor and economic factor in the Middle East and in the Balkans and in many other countries. When we consider this, Turkey is able to deal on an economic basis and also on a political basis with many countries. Of course when you say we should change our position, we have changed our position towards Israel and the U.S. has changed its attitude to Palestine. And in Egypt, if you remember historically, Turkey has been a rival, a competitor of Egypt. Egypt has considered itself as the leader of the region. And also there has been a war during the Ottoman era when the forces of Egypt came as far as Kütahya in Turkey. I think this coolness exists with Egypt and this coolness with Iran may also continue. That is historical fact. It is a regional competition. Then I should say that Turkey was a rule maker of NATO once, now still NATO feels it must keep Turkey as a major partner and with its population of 80 million it is a big country, I think all the way of treatment of U.S. towards Turkey, when it was a client state of the U.S. or Europe, does not exist now. We have to speak in a different term and they have to speak with us in a different term. They will understand this as time goes by. For the time being they still continue like imperial powers towards Turkey and the Middle East, as well as to other countries. I think this will change a little bit, because like China, Turkey is a rising power.

H. Bağcı: Thank you again. Because we talked now mostly on security matters. It is a different interpretation of course focusing on the economy. Yes, Turkey is an emerging power, a rising economic power in the sense of Soner Çağaptay, the first rising Muslim economic giant definitely but within the Islamic countries, 57 countries of the Islamic world, Turkey is the only

one which is trying to negotiate with the European Union, keep the region in order and also make economic progress. Turkey's present economic progress in recent years is definitely admirable, no doubt about it. Turkey has big projects, infrastructure projects. Turkey is, geopolitically speaking may be not so important now but economically speaking, Turkey is getting more and more importance if you take all the developments and when you look at all the sea, air and land connections, the connectivity of Turkey with the entire block to improve dramatically may be not any other country in the region has this connectivity what Turkey has, no doubt about it. This is an advantage and this is why I think the permanent power centers have to change their Turkish perceptions. They do not deal anymore with the same generation as 30 years ago, not with the same Turks with the level of education or not the Turks with empty pockets. It is not the case. So this economic development definitely, as you say in the case of China, Turkey is not little dragon in that sense but Turkey is like Anatolian tigers or Anatolian Marco Polos. Even I would say the Turks look to the world now from a different angle. The more economic prosperity is increasing, better Turkey is connected with the world. Starting from the banking system to the Turkish Airlines' success or to the infrastructural changes within the country which I do observe in all my travels inside the country, new tunnels, new airports, new landscape, even the architecture has changed in the country, the quality of the houses. So, Anatolian structure is changing. If Turkey would not have this PKK terrorism, probably Turkey would have much more prosperity and I do compare Turkey with the entire neighboring countries from Bulgaria, Romania, Georgia, Ukraine and of course Turkey is far ahead of them, and by the way, internationally speaking, Turkey is a member of G-20. We are among the first 17 economies in the world. According to the international figures, if Turkey would continue to have economic and political stability, most probably in the year 2025, Turkey would be in the first among the 15 world economies. This is also something important for Europe and for U.S., an instable Turkey is much more expensive than a stable Turkey for the entire political powers and from this perspective Turkey should be manageable, controllable, acceptable, and foreseeable. From this perspective, we have a new understanding of interest, a new understanding of the relations. I am sure that Turkey's identity and also the strength of the way of thinking is also related to this economic success in the last 20 years.

Oktay Aksoy: May I just interfere? Have we then come to the point where in the West it will soon be debated “who lost Turkey”?

H. Bağcı: Yes, but Turkey is not a country to be neglected. I think, there is no loss at the moment, we are at the point of mixing of the cards anew, and there will be a new summit, a new meeting where both sides will put their cards on the table and then will discuss the current situation, whether full membership or privileged partnership with EU. I do not know what type of model we can develop, but neither Turkey, nor Europe, they are not allowed to lose each other. There should be no losing for either side. There should be a win for both sides and it depends to the political leaderships of both sides. **S. Taşhan:** Thank you.

An Overview of Major Trends in the Turkish Foreign Policy 1919-2000.

Inclinations and Orientations

Numan Hazar²Ambassador (R)

It is observed that between 1919 and 2000, the Turkish foreign policy had distinct and specific forms, according to prevailing conditions in different period of times as far as its goals and orientations are concerned .

I believe that it is possible to study specificities of the Turkish foreign policy in the following time frames: 1. The period of 1919-1923

2. The Period of 1923-1939

3. The Period of 1939-1945

4. The Period of 1945-1960

5. The Period of 1960-1990

6. The Period of 1990-2000

Prior to a study of the Turkish foreign policy in the light of various inclinations and orientations, it would be necessary to take a look at basic goals in the conduct of the foreign policy of any nation. There is no doubt that every nation gives priority to consider the protection of its national interests when determining the aims of its foreign policy. The famous saying of the British Prime Minister Lord Palmerston in 1848 when he was Foreign Secretary, in a speech to the Parliament is very much significant in this sense: " We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual and those interests it is our duty to follow. "

² Former Turkish Ambassador to Nigeria and Ambassador/Permanent Representative of Turkey to the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

In this connection, it is useful to underline the fact that Turkey throughout the history has never had perpetual allies nor enemies. The status of her allies or opponents changed according to different periods of time.

It is possible to observe this situation when we look at the relations of Turkey with Great Britain, France, Germany and Russia in the whole historical process.

In that case, it is necessary to consider what interests should be protected in foreign policy. These interests are national interests. If it is necessary to define the national interests, They can be summarized in the following points:

- To protect national independence,
- To protect the territorial integrity of the country,
- To provide interests in the field of international trade and economy, -To provide security against various threats.

These interests constitute, undoubtedly, the basic interests of a nation. What needs to be done to protect national interests can be summarized as follows:

Protecting the national interests of a country is directly proportional to its national strength. Strong countries are advantageous in protecting the interests of nation. So what are the elements of national power? These elements are emphasized by various thinkers and authors. Without entering the details, it is possible to express them roughly as follows:

Military power, political power, internal stability of the country, economic and social development level, progress in the field of science and technology, population size and its composition, natural resources, level of education and so on. Apart from these, other elements are mentioned. It is stated that the geopolitical position of a country may be a source of power for a country and may also cause problems. For example, island states such as Britain and Japan are advantageous in securing their security because of their geographical location. It is not possible to say, however, the same thing for some countries surrounded by strong countries such as Afghanistan, the Baltic States and some Eastern European countries.

Some countries with geopolitical advantages also have to be strong. For example, it is imperative that a country that is able to influence developments in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa, such as Turkey, must be strong both at military and economic and political grounds. It is also normal for countries that are not strong enough or have this belief, to make alliances with other countries to ensure their security against the perceived threats. Thus, a balance is established against a center of force. In international politics it is called system of balance of power. After this general introduction, we can examine trends and attitudes taken by Turkish foreign policy at various periods.

The most important characteristic of the period of 1919-1923 was the launch of the War of Independence in order to provide national independence after the end of World War I and following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire and its allies. The main objective of the Turkish Independence War was to achieve full independence of the country and the establishment of a national state in the aftermath of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. During the War of Independence initiated by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the main objective of the foreign policy has been finding new allies to ensure total independence. With the encouragement of Britain, Greece took its armed forces to Anatolia starting to land them to Izmir on May 15, 1919, invaded Anatolia and attempted to realize Megali Idea dream. Then Entente Powers agreed to partition the Anatolian Peninsula with the Treaty of Sèvres. The Ottoman Empire expressed its acquiescence in the face of this ominous development. Kemal Atatürk however tried to find new allies as well as to increase necessary resources in order to thwart this project.

The first and important support for the liberation movement in Anatolia came from the Soviet Union in the environment that appeared following the First World War. After the military victory of the Turkish armed forces against Armenians in Eastern Anatolia and the signing of the Gümrü (Alexandropol) Treaty in 1920, the period of rapprochement in Turkish-Soviet relations began. The Gümrü Treaty was the first agreement that revolutionary Turkey signed. After the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union, which had been faced with various internal and external problems and became the target of the West, regarded the Anatolian movement in a similar position and decided to support it for its

national interests despite ideological differences. Revealing the secret agreements Western states have made with various states before the war in order to disintegrate the Ottoman Empire, the Soviet Union provided financial support and arms assistance to the independence movement in Anatolia. This process reached its peak with the Turkish-Soviet Friendship Treaty signed in Moscow between the two countries in 1921. One of the most important consequences of this treaty is that a large country officially recognizes the Turkish independence movement and the new Turkish state.

Again with the Kars treaty signed between Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia in 1921, the eastern border of Turkey has taken its present shape. The parties also accepted the Moscow treaty with this treaty.

Likewise, in the same period, France, disappointed in sharing various regions belonging to the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East due to the British attitude, was militarily defeated in Anatolia (Gaziantep, Maraş and Urfa defenses in Anatolia and the defeat of French forces in Pozanti, Adana). France has chosen to compromise with the independence movement and signed the 1921 Ankara Agreement for this purpose.

Moreover, Italy, which has been disappointed by the fact that Greece has been given the region previously promised in Anatolia by Great Britain, also chose to deal with Ankara.

These developments will lead to military and financial support for the Turkish liberation movement.

With the victory of the Independence War in 1922 and the signing of the Lausanne Peace Treaty on 23 July 1923 and the declaration of the Republic on 29 October 1923, the establishment of the Turkish national state was completed.

When the Turkish foreign policy was examined in the period from the establishment of the Republic of Turkey to the beginning of the Second World War in 1939, it will be observed that serious efforts were made to protect national independence and to solve, on the other hand, some problems that have not been solved by the Lausanne Peace Treaty.

This period of time was undoubtedly marked by the vision of Atatürk. This vision has found its expression in the phrase "Peace at Home, Peace in the World". Turkey has pursued a peaceful foreign policy in this period. In

Britain, Prime Minister Lloyd George's anti-Turkish and anti-Turkey policies, and the policy of assisting Greece to attack Anatolia, led to fierce criticism in British domestic politics. With the departure of Lloyd George from power, a rapprochement between Turkey and Britain will begin and this development will lead to the development of close friendship and alliance relations with Britain as well as with France. It is necessary to remember that these two countries were two important superpowers, at the global level, at that time.

Moreover, diplomatic relations between Turkey and the United States will be established at a later stage by a Modus Vivendi between the two governments, due to the fact that for domestic political reasons in the USA this country failed to ratify a mutual agreement between Turkey and the USA concluded at Lausanne on 3 August 1923. This mutual agreement was related to the establishment of political, consular and commercial relations between Turkey and the United States. It has nothing to do with the Lausanne Peace Treaty. The US is not a party in the Lausanne Peace Treaty. As mentioned above Lausanne Peace Treaty of 23 July 1923 provided international recognition of modern Turkey. The Modus Vivendi establishing diplomatic relations between Turkey and the United States was carried out through an exchange of Notes between the two Governments in 1927.

This period also witnessed the establishment of peaceful relations between Turkey and Greece in the aftermath of the war. It is noteworthy that close contacts together with high-level visits were aimed at creating an atmosphere of friendship between the two nations in order to forget sufferings of the past. In particular, Greek Prime Minister Eleutheros Venizelos, the leading architect of Greece's Megali Idea policy, visited Ankara. Venizelos is also known to have nominated Ataturk for the Nobel Peace Prize. Indeed, he wrote a letter to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee for this purpose. Besides, an exchange of population agreement was reached for the mutual exchange of Muslims in Greece and Greeks in Anatolia except for the Greek Orthodox population in Istanbul and the Turks in Western Thrace of Greece.

On the other hand, the Balkan Pact (Entente Balkanique) was signed between Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Romania in 1934 at Athens and the Sadabat Pact was signed between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan in 1937 in Tehran. Those are good examples of Turkey's peace policy.

In addition, the League of Nations, which was established after the First World War and was the pioneer of the United Nations today as an universal organization, invited Turkey to officially become a member in 1932. In making this invitation, Turkey's contributions and efforts in ensuring world peace have been taken into consideration.

In this period, some problems that have not been resolved in Lausanne have come to the agenda. Especially, intensive efforts were spent to change the provisions of the Lausanne Treaty's on the Turkish Straits that restrict Turkey's sovereignty. The concern due to the intensified tensions leading to war in Europe has created the foundation for these efforts. At the end of these efforts, the sovereignty of Turkey in the Turkish Straits (Bosporus and Dardanelles) was registered with the Montreux Convention in 1936.

The unsolved problem of Mosul in Lausanne was also resolved in 1926 with the agreement reached with Great Britain at the League of Nations. With this development, a mutual agreement was reached regarding the border between Turkey and Iraq. Various observers have suggested that Sheikh Said rebellion which started in Eastern Anatolia in 1925 was provoked by Britain in order to put pressure on Turkey due to the Mosul problem. As the young Republic faced a serious domestic security and foreign policy problem, this problem has thus been resolved peacefully.

The strained atmosphere created by the developments in the Mosul problem brought Turkey closer to the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the two countries signed the Treaty of Neutrality and Non-Aggression in Paris in 1925.

Another important problem that was resolved in this period was the Sandjak of Alexandretta (Hatay) question. France which has established a mandate regime in Syria, created a special administration in Hatay taking into consideration ethnic composition in that region. Because of the presence of a significant Turkish population in Hatay, Turkey's pressures due to the upcoming war winds, France had to acquiesce to granting Sandjak the right to determine its own destiny. In 1938, the Hatay State first declared its independence, and then in 1939 it decided to join the motherland Turkey.

As can be seen, the special feature of this period is that Turkey, while pursuing a peaceful policy on the one hand, has to solve some problems left from Lausanne Peace Treaty. She aimed to maintain close relations with the

UK, France and the Soviet Union. On the other hand, Turkey established friendly relations in the regional plan, In order to protect her national interests and to ensure her security.

During the Second World War in 1939-1945, the main feature of the Turkish foreign policy was to protect the independence of the country. Turkey chose to take necessary security measures against possible threats. For this reason, it is aimed to ensure that Turkey does not participate in the war despite all pressures. Knowing that the war would be destructive for the country, Turkey has been careful to remain equidistant from all belligerent countries. In the face of the intense pressures of Western countries in particular Great Britain, especially in the Adana, Cairo and Tehran conferences for Turkey's entry into the war, the Turkish government has resisted on the grounds that the war needs of the Turkish armed forces are inadequate. Turkey has been criticized by Western countries from time to time for her relations with Germany. From time to time, Turkey was also criticized by the Soviet Union which claimed that some German warships were allowed to pass through the straits by the Turkish authorities and that Turkey did not comply with the rules of the Montreux Convention on the Turkish Straits.

In this tense environment and towards the end of the war, Germany, which has been forced to withdraw from the Dodecanese islands that it has occupied previously, has suggested that these islands be restituted to Turkey. Turkey's hesitant behavior in this issue has caused criticism in domestic politics in particular. However the possibility that Turkey, which had reached such an agreement with Germany, would have been exploited by the Soviet Union. It was thought undoubtedly in the Turkish Government circles at that time that the Soviets could use this as a pretext to invade Turkey as a savior country after the war ends with Germany's defeat. In such a case, It is not known whether Turkey would have been kept in a Soviet system as a satellite country like the satellite countries established in Eastern Europe or as a federated unit like the Central Asian countries until the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. But it can be predicted that there would be no Turkey of today.

At the very last stage of the war, Turkey declared war on Germany without participating in the war and became one of the founding members of the United Nations Organization, which was formed after the war.

After the Second World War, Turkey has had to follow policies in accordance with the new conditions. The postwar atmosphere has led Turkey to adopt new orientations both in domestic politics and foreign politics.

With the defeat of Germany, allies have been in a superior position. However, we observe that among the allies, the US has become a superpower and has emerged as the leading power of the West. From the old super powers, England is no longer in this position. It has become a power that follows the US. France, which had been under German occupation during the war, has moved away from its old strength. The other allied Soviet Union has turned into a great power in spite of great hardships in the war, and has turned the eastern European countries, which it has entered as a savior, into ideologically connected satellite countries.

There has also been a fundamental change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union towards Turkey in this framework. This change was also a reflection of Russia's historical ambitions on Turkey. As a matter of fact, in 1945, the Soviet Union demanded an adjustment in its favor in the Turkish-Soviet border in the North East of Turkey and the return of Kars and Ardahan to the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet requested the correction of a situation which they had to accept when they were weak in 1918. Nevertheless, these provinces were former Ottoman Turkish lands which were taken by Russians. The USSR also requested a base in the Turkish straits. This tense atmosphere in the Turkish-Soviet relations and the intense Soviet pressure were reflected in the international public opinion, the bilateral relations as well as during the San Francisco Conference, where talks were held on the establishment of the United Nations Organization. In addition to that, the Soviet Union also annulled the 1925 Treaty of Neutrality and Non-Aggression between the two countries. When the annulment of this treaty is evaluated together with the Soviet demands, it will be possible to see the photograph as a whole. The result of this development is that Turkey has turned to the United States and England with the concern of securing her security.

In fact, from 1945 onwards, Turkey began to pursue pro-Western policies by abandoning its neutral foreign policy approach when the Government of the Republican People's Party (CHP) was in power. In 1947, Turkey voted against the partition of Palestine in the UN General Assembly, She later recognized the state of Israel, which declared its independence in 1948.

The Democrat Party (DP), which came to power in 1950, strongly insisted on a pro-Western foreign policy.

Meanwhile, in the light of the developments following the war, the United States and Britain, after their first hesitations, decided to take measures against the expansion and repression policy of the USSR in Europe. In particular, the United States adopted the Truman Doctrine in 1947, which envisaged urgent assistance to Turkey and Greece, countries threatened by Soviet pressures and communism. The US also launched the Marshall Aid Plan for the development of West Germany and European countries, which had been demolished during the war in the period 1948-51. Turkey benefited also from Marshall Assistance. The main reaction to Soviet expansionism was the conclusion of the Washington Treaty and the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949.

Turkey, which sees peace in terms of security concerns, has made extensive diplomatic efforts to enter into NATO alliance. At the end of these efforts Turkey became a member of NATO in 1952 together with Greece.

Prior to this date, Turkey decided to join the UN peace keeping forces created in the face of the North Korea's attack against South Korea. The Turkish Government sent a brigade as Turkish contingent in the UN forces. Thus Turkey, was on the side of the West against the North Korean aggression. As a matter of fact, the Democrat Party (DP) Government, which won the elections on May 14, 1950, decided to join UN forces in Korea with a brigade while considering that this development would be an important support for Turkey's admission as member in NATO.

Turkey has also been a founding member of organizations such as the Council of Europe and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which were established in the wake of the war.

An important effect of the Second World War on Turkey emerged as incentive for the transition to a multi-party regime. The victory of democracies against the totalitarian regimes in the war, resulted in a multi-party democratic regime in Turkey in 1946, instead of a one-party system. In 1950, the opposition DP won elections and came to power. The foreign policy of the DP has manifested itself in close contact with the West and especially with the United States in order to meet security concerns arising

after the War and arising, in particular, from the Soviet Union. In this context, the US has been given military bases.

The greatest feature of the 1950-1960 period was the perceived Soviet threat and the influence of the Cold War years on Turkey's rigid pursuance of pro-Western and US policy. For example, at the Bandung Conference in 1955, which marked the establishment phase of the Movement of the Non-aligned Countries and attended by the Asian-African states that had attained their independence, Turkey was stamped with being the representative of the Western countries. At this meeting, Turkey stated that the main threat to world peace came from the Communist Bloc.

Another interesting point is Turkey's negative vote on the occasion of the debates at United Nations General Assembly for the right of selfdetermination of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria. The situation in Algeria is somewhat different. Unlike the colonies or protectorate countries, Algeria was legally an integral part of mainland France, a "département". Morocco and Tunisia had the status of protectorate by virtue of an international treaty concluded with France and the rulers of these countries.

In the NATO Founding Treaty of 1949, it was emphasized that Algeria was included in the national territory of France. It is doubtful that Turkey, which is a member of NATO due to the Soviet threat and accepted the territorial integrity of France within this scope, and in fact sympathizes with the Algerian people for historical reasons, was in a difficult position. In 1955 Turkey voted against the independence of Algeria at the UN. Nevertheless, later Turkey changed its position and abstained in votings in the following years on the occasion of the UN General Assembly and the Political Committee meetings. On the other hand, Turkey secretly sent weapons and military communications materials to Algerian fighters to support Algerian independence movement. Turkey will vote in favor of the independence of Algeria in the UN after 27 May 1960 when the military government comes to power. But at that stage we must not forget that France was approaching the line of giving independence to Algeria. With independence, Turkey immediately recognized Algeria and opened a resident Embassy in this country.

In 1956, following a policy that was prone to France and Britain in the Suez problem, Turkey had a different line from the new administration of Egypt,

formed by the coup. Egypt's distancing from the West and its close relations with the Soviet Union created negative effects on the Turkish-Egyptian relations. Turkey's Baghdad Pact initiative has further strained relations.

Algeria's involvement in the Non-Aligned Movement after its independence and its close relationship with the Eastern Bloc will have negative effects on its relations with Turkey which was pursuing a pro-Western policy. At this point, we must also remember that in a completely different way from Turkey, historically, Arab countries have not perceived Russia as a threat and that the Arabs have seen Western countries as a source of threat. In this respect, it is certain that in the light of historical experiences, Turkey perceived a serious Soviet threat. During the cold war era, Turkey's policy was perhaps found too pro-Western and very much distant from Atatürk's foreign policy. Nevertheless, these critics can be assessed, in the future, more accurately in the light of history.

Again, in those years, after Turkey became a member of NATO, the Soviets tried to establish a security system in the Middle East. As a matter of fact, Soviet Union had great influence and close political, economic and defense relations with some Arab countries, including Syria. This state of affairs led to the creation of Baghdad Pact with the participation of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Britain in 1955. The US had an observer status due to the sensibility of the Arabs. The Baghdad Pact was criticized by Arab countries. After the coup d'état in Iraq in 1958, Iraq was withdrawn from the organization. The Baghdad Pact was renamed as Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). The headquarters of the Organization (CENTO) was moved to Ankara. With the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979, CENTO completed its life. Throughout this process, Turkey has become a target of the Arab countries and perceived as a representative of Western imperialism. On the other hand, in addition to CENTO, regional countries have established the Organization of Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD) for economic and technical cooperation among them. In 1985, this institution, which had been suspended by the Iranian revolution but was later thought to be useful, will become a new organization under the name of the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) by virtue of the Treaty of İzmir concluded in 1985.

In 1954, within the climate of relations between the two blocks, which was prevailing at that time, Turkey established the Balkan Pact together with

Yugoslavia and Greece. However, with the emergence of the Cyprus problem and Yugoslavia's non-aligned policy, this pact lost its validity.

Certainly one of the most important issues of the period of 1950-1960 in terms of Turkish foreign policy was the Cyprus problem. The efforts of the Greek Cypriots and Greece since the beginning of the 1950s for the annexation of Cyprus to Greece (Enosis) constituted an important agenda item of the United Nations as well as a thorny issue in the relations between Turkey, Greece and Great Britain. Cyprus was a British colony at that time. The terrorist movements of the Greek Cypriots for Enosis and the attacks on the Turkish Cypriots have had negative effects on the Turkish-Greek relations. As a result, after painstaking efforts, it was accepted that the Republic of Cyprus would be an independent state with the participation of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot Communities as co-founders of the new state by virtue of the London and Zurich Agreements concluded in 1959. Turkey, Greece and Great Britain have become guarantors of the new independent state. The Constitution of the new state was also approved in 1960 with the treaty of establishment signed in Nicosia by three guarantor states and two Cypriot communities. The Constitution provided a functional federation that envisaged the participation of two communities in the state on the basis of some percentages.

One feature of the 1960s was that the decolonization process aimed at achieving independence for all colonies was put into practice with a resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly. In this context, Turkey has supported the decolonization process and recognized all the black African states that achieved independence, and in some cases resident Embassies were opened.

In the light of all this information It can be said that during the period of 1950-1960, Turkey continued the pro-Western foreign policy which it had started to follow by leaving the policy of neutrality in 1945. However, when it came to the beginning of 1960, it was observed that Turkey, in the current international relations' environment, needed to develop relations with the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, it was agreed that the Turkish and Soviet leaders should make mutual visits and the first contact would be in July 1960 with the official visit of the Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes to Moscow. Nevertheless, he could not make it. The May 27 coup d'état will delay contacts between Turkey and the Soviet Union for a while.

Foreign policy, which began to be pursued after the coup d'état on 27 May 1960, was essentially pro-Western. In a cold war environment, the US and other western countries did not consider it appropriate to oppose the coup and they found it in conformity with their interests, since Turkish military predicted transition to a democratic regime following the adoption of a constitution. However, developments in connection with the Cyprus problem at the beginning of the 1960's led Turkey to pursue a more balanced foreign policy and to establish economic, commercial and political relations with both Eastern Bloc and Arab countries.

During the period of 1960-1980, Turkey faced various internal and external economic and political problems.

Turkey, in strategic terms, an important member of NATO, has benefited from the détente process between the East and West Blocks as well as from the implementation of the peaceful coexistence principle. As a result of this development Turkey, has developed economic and commercial relations and political contacts with the Soviet Union and other socialist bloc countries.

One important development of this period was the signing of a labor agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany in 1961. Following this agreement and other agreements concluded with some West European countries, a considerable number of immigrant workers began to flow from Turkey to countries other than Germany, such as France, Switzerland, Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands. Today, we have a third generation citizens living in these countries. Some of them have taken citizenship of the country where they live. The composition of the Turkish population has changed. Turkish population in European countries is not composed anymore, at the present time, only from migrant workers. An important part of it contains a variety of professionals as well as high school and university students. Nevertheless, as follow up of this development, incidents of xenophobia, Islamophobia, and racism emerged in West European countries.

In this period, with the 1963 Ankara Agreement, Turkey entered into partnership relations with the European Economic Community to become a full member of the European Union (the European Economic Community at that time) following a transition period. This agreement was a result of

Turkey's policy of adopting the European model in the political, economic, legal and cultural sense, within the framework of the reforms intensified during the last parts of the life of the Ottoman Empire.

Developments related to the Cyprus problem have seriously preoccupied Turkish foreign policy in this period and have influenced Turkey's foreign policies in relation to the US and Greece as well as new directions of Turkey's diplomacy.

After the independence of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960, it is observed that the Greek Cypriots considered the independence of the island as an interim solution and the main purpose of them was union of Cyprus with Greece. In 1964 and 1967, the Greek Cypriot attacks on the Turkish Cypriots led to serious crises. Especially in 1964, Turkish air forces' bombardment aimed at stopping the Greek Cypriot attacks on Turkish Cypriot villages led to the US reaction. The US President Johnson, in his message to Prime Minister Ismet Inonu, stated that the existing security materials, arms and weaponry provided by the US Government could not be used in Cyprus. He also said that in case developments in Cyprus become a security threat for Turkey at international level, existing security mechanisms could not work. Turkey reacted strongly to this message. In fact, Johnson's letter has been severely damaging regarding Turkish-American relations.

With these developments, Turkish foreign policy has turned to the openings towards Africa, Asia and Arab countries. However, these developments have not been as effective as they have been in a period when Turkey has serious domestic political problems and economic difficulties.

The greatest crisis in the Cyprus problem broke out in 1974 with the attempt of the Greek military junta in Athens to annex Cyprus to Greece together with Greek and Greek Cypriot elements on the island after a coup engineered against the Greek Cypriot Government. Upon this development, Turkey carried out military intervention in the island, using the rights granted to her by the London and Zurich agreements as a guarantor power. After the Peace Operation of the Turkish Armed Forces, the Turkish Cypriots established their own government under the autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration and later the Turkish Cypriot Federated State. This development will result in the declaration of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in 1983.

Military intervention of Turkish Armed Forces in Cyprus had immediate effect on the Turkish-American relations. The US Congress has begun to implement a military embargo against Turkey on the grounds that American weapons are used during the Turkish military intervention in Cyprus. The US embargo will be lifted by the American Congress later in consideration of the environment of East-West relations at that time. However, while doing so, the US Congress has decided to implement the 10/7 balance in US military assistance to Turkey and Greece.

Issues such as the breadth of the territorial waters and continental shelf discussed in the context of the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference have affected Turkish-Greek relations because of the Aegean Sea's peculiar characteristics. Turkey explained that if the Greek territorial waters of 6 miles in the Aegean were extended to 12 miles, the Aegean would turn into a Greek lake. As a result of this, Turkey indicated, the Aegean airspace would be closed to Turkey, worrying that Greece would make such a decision. Turkey also added that in case Greece decides to extend its territorial waters to 12 miles, this would be a *casus belli*. Greece, however, declared to the world that it is a threat to its security. In this context, oil research activities on the continental shelf of the Aegean Sea which is a territorial extension of the Anatolian peninsula, have created a tension between the two countries.

During the period of 1960-1980, *détente* process was realized in East-West relations within the framework of peaceful coexistence. In this environment, the process of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) initiated by the NATO and Warsaw Pact members with the participation of other neutral and non-aligned countries in Europe, resulted in the signing of the Final Act of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Helsinki in 1975 by the Heads of the State and Government. This Document foresees the enhancement of human contacts between two blocks and the creation of a security environment. A number of meetings were held within the context of the CSCE process in various fields. While the West emphasized the human dimension of the CSCE process, the East emphasized the security dimension. In other words, while the Western Bloc aimed to enter into an opening through human rights and human contacts, the Eastern Bloc has given importance to the protection of existing borders in Europe. Turkey has actively participated in the CSCE process. After the

disintegration of the Soviet Union the CSCE became an organization (OSCE) with the admission of the new independent states.

Meanwhile, Armenian terrorist acts that began in the early 1970s will start to occupy Turkish foreign policy. The sympathy for Armenians or lack of incentive or indifference to combat terrorism in some countries in the West like France will have negative effects on Turkey's relations with these countries.

The Turkish Armed Forces took over the administration of the country following a coup on 12 September 1980 in an anarchic environment where economic crises and terrorist acts of the militants of the right and the left were also intensified in the country. This development has also influenced Turkish foreign policy.

At that time the United States which was following a strict policy towards the Soviet Bloc and attaching great importance to the strengthening of the West from the military point of view, has refrained, due to the 12 September 1980 coup d'état, from disturbing Turkey, which has a special strategic value in East-West relations. The US supported the calendar of Turkey's transition to democracy and showed tolerance. In reciprocation, Turkey acquiesced to the return of Greece to NATO's military wing under a plan prepared by NATO Supreme Allied Commander (SACEUR) General Bernard W. Rogers. This was an important concession because of the problems in the Turkish-Greek relations.

However, on 12 September, Turkey's relations with Europe were completely different. Turkish Parliamentarians' membership in the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly has been suspended and human rights violations in Turkey have been frequently brought to the agenda. In addition, five member states of the Council of Europe have resorted to state application to the European Court of Human Rights against Turkey on grounds of human rights violations. This application will be settled amicably in the coming years. Turkey's relationship with Europe has been problematic until the end of the period of transition to democracy in Turkey.

In 1983 there was a transition to democracy in Turkey. The civil administration had been restored. Beginning in 1984, Turkey left the policy of import substitution. At that time, the process of an overseas opening had begun. Thus, the process of the reactivation of relations between Turkey and

the European Union as well as with the Council of Europe which were frozen with the coup d'état in 1980, was initiated.

Again in 1983, Turkish Cypriots declared independence. Six countries recognized independence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Nevertheless, the United States applied heavy pressures to these countries for withdrawal of their recognition. Thus it became a missed opportunity since the recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus would undoubtedly, lead to a final solution of the problem once and for all.

Turkey made an application on 14 April 1987 in order to become the full member of the European Union, without waiting for the completion of the periods provided for in the Ankara Agreement. The Commission, in response to Turkey's application, explained its position in 1989 and stated that the Community could not admit a country without completing its own internal integration. The development of relations was also proposed in the context of the Association Agreement without setting a date for the initiation of the accession negotiations.

Turkey having approved this proposal, the necessary preparations had been initiated in order to complete in 1995 the Customs Union provided for in the Additional Protocol.

The Customs Union Agreement between Turkey and the European Union entered into force on 1 January 1996 in accordance with the 1995 Association Council decision, at the end of the negotiations which had lasted two years. This is one of the important stages of Turkey's association with the European Union, which is oriented towards the goal of joining it as a full member.

The decisive turning point in relations between Turkey and the European Union was the Summit Meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the European Union held in Helsinki on 10-11 December 1999. At the Helsinki meeting, Turkey's application has been formally approved. It was also categorically stated that Turkey was on an equal footing with other candidate states. It was also decided to prepare a Document for the Accession Partnership of Turkey, as was the case for the other candidates. The first Partnership Document for Turkey's Accession was approved by the Council of the European Union on 8 March 2000. The Turkish Government submitted its national program on the calendar and program which included

the realization of the priorities of Turkey contained in the Document for the Accession Partnership.

In 1983 the electoral victory of Andreas Papandreu in Greece created certain problems and difficulties with regard to the relations of Turkey not only with Greece but also with the United States. During the election campaign and even after his election victory, Prime Minister Papandreu accused Turkey of threatening Greece and demanded of the United States guarantees against this threat while maintaining also the balance of 10/7 in the American military assistance for Greece and Turkey. Of course, it was a very weird demand taking into account that all the countries concerned were allies within NATO.

Another crisis that Turkey faced in 1985 was Turkey's relations with Bulgaria as a result of Bulgarian policy of initiating total assimilation of the Turkish minority in that country by means of changing their names by Bulgarian and Christian ones. Turkey had submitted this development to international forums such as the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. At the end a few hundred thousand Turkish citizens of Bulgaria had immigrated to Turkey.

At the end of the last century, a significant and even historical development had taken place. This was the collapse of the Soviet system and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. As a result, fifteen new independent states have become members of the United Nations. There were some analyzes in the West which considered the decline in the strategic role and even value of Turkey. Yet all those who believed in this analysis came up against a realization or surprise that the role and strategic value of Turkey was on the contrary greatly increased as a significant part of these states became independent in the Caucasus and Central Asia were Turkic-speaking countries. Turkey was not behind in establishing contacts with all these countries to develop economic, trade and cultural relations.

There was also a completely different case in the Balkans with the harmful developments and hostilities in former Yugoslavia. As a result of the disintegration of Yugoslavia, a human tragedy was unfortunately experienced due to acts of ethnic cleansing and genocide, as well as hostilities in particular in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Turkey had supported

stability in the Balkans and made efforts in international fora in this direction. Turkey has opened embassies in all countries of the former Yugoslavia, in the geography of the former Ottoman Empire, with which there were historical links. Turkey aimed to develop its relations in all fields with all these countries including the Republic of Serbia.

In 1998 Turkey opted for the policy of outreach abroad. In this context, two action plans were developed. One for the opening to the African continent and the other for the Latin American countries with the aim of developing her relations with all the countries of these two continents, including political, economic, commercial and cultural relations. With the implementation of these action plans, positive results have been observed.

As seen in the examples above, Turkey has adopted various tendencies and orientations in defense of her national interests in foreign policy in accordance with the conditions of the day. There is no doubt that there has been an interaction between internal politics and foreign policy orientations.

All this information must be acknowledged in the light of the fact that the ability of an individual country to apply a safe and secure foreign policy depends on the conditions such as stability, economic development and military strength within the country.

A Nutshell Review of Trump's Foreign Policy

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gökhan Akşemsettinoglu³

Donald John Trump was chosen the 45th president of the United States of America (USA) on November 9th, 2016. In fact, according to pre-election polls, 61 % of voters had considered him unqualified being president. However, almost 60 million Americans voted for him² so that he crossed the threshold of 270 Electoral College votes to become the new president of the USA⁴. Unlike almost all other presidential elections, writers and researchers have debated this election and the wild card, intensely. In this sense, the election of Trump as the new president has raised doubts about whether he maintains long-known ideas of the Republican Party domestically and remains committed to political and security guarantees of the USA to its allies internationally⁵.

Introduction

The presidential debates had made clear that Trump would diverge from long-held ideals of the Republican Party⁶. For example, he had attracted attention to Planned Parenthood, social security and Medicare, although they are not priority issues for the Republicans. In addition, he had stated his opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, although the Republicans have adopted it⁷. On top of that, some Republicans had criticized Trump because he had seemed too much like a CEO. This criticism was important

³ Çankaya University, Department of Political Science and International Relations 2

"Election 2016, How it Happened", The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016, p. 31.

⁴ "The Trump Era", The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016, p. 9.

⁵ Jeffrey W. Knopf. "Security Assurances and Proliferation Risks in the Trump Administration", Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 38, No. 1, 26-34. [Http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1271688](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1271688). Published Online: 11 January 2017.

⁶ "Election 2016, Lessons of the Debate", The Economist, October 1st - 7th 2016, p. 10.

⁷ George Lakoff. "Why Trump?", Political Leave a Comment, March 2, 2016.

because Mitt Romney had lost the presidential elections in 2012 due to similar reasons. Interestingly, Trump had given a class on his company's finances and its assets and commented on why he did not pay contractors⁸. Moreover, these Republicans predicted that Trump would be a sort of CEO-president, setting grand strategy while delegating daily work to Congress and his vice-president⁹.

President Trump has revealed his thoughts in statements he has made to press and to the public. He has some specific ideas such as a low-tax economy with massive tax reductions for corporations, protectionism and de-globalization of the US economy. He also emphasized state intervention in favor of big capital, private-public partnerships in infrastructure projects, and the logic of privatization and for-profit in health care and education¹⁰.

Within this framework, this short essay touches upon the political trends of the Trump Administration by examining his personal characteristics and foreign policy objectives. The article consists of six short parts. Since most of the literature and the researchers criticize Trump and his policies, first five parts reflect this tendency, but the last part shows a different perspective on Trump's policies, a pro-Trump approach. Therefore, in the first part of the article, Trump's personal characteristics and their effects on politics will be discussed. In this part, the dynamics behind his unexpected election, his domestic political ideas and world-views affecting international politics will be explained. The following four parts are based on Trump's approach to allies and international organizations; environmental issues and climate change; major powers in the international arena; and trading issues. The last part is of pro-Trump discourse.

The election, domestic issues and world-view

⁸ "Election 2016, Lessons of the Debate", op. cit., p. 10.

⁹ "The Trump Administration, What to Expect", *The Economist*, November 12th - 18th 2016, p. 34.

¹⁰ Christian Fuchs. "Donald Trump: A Critical Theory-Perspective on Authoritarian Capitalism", *Triple C Communication, Capitalism and Critique*, Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society, 15 (1), 1-72, 2017. Westminster Research <http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch> Donald Trump: A Critical Theory-Perspective on Authoritarian Capitalism.

Why was Trump elected? Why Republicans supported and then elected an inexperienced and populist candidate like Trump? In fact, conservative and even pro-authoritarian electorates have played a role in both supporting Trump as a candidate in the Republican Party and electing him as the new president of the USA. Studies show that when the conservative electorates feel themselves physically and socially threatened, they support candidates who have authoritarian personalities, having rigid ways of resolving problems and getting rid of threats, protecting the status quo and maintaining stability¹¹.

Some researchers like Marc J. Hetherington, Jonathan D. Weiler, Karen Stenner and Elizabeth Suhay have studied on authoritarianism and its effects on US politics. For example, in "Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics"¹², Marc J. Hetherington and Jonathan D. Weiler underlined the characteristics of the Republican Party that prioritized traditional values, order and law, which were established in the 1960s. According to Hetherington and Suhay, electorates who are not even authoritarian, may act as if they were authoritarian when they feel themselves threatened by not only domestic issues such as economic crises, refugees or immigrants but international issues such as terrorism, raising powers, and proliferation of nuclear weapons¹³. One of the voters said that, "I went to Trump because he has the best chance of bringing back manufacturing and jobs"¹⁴.

Maybe more importantly, they envisaged a kind of transformation on US policy in a dramatic way. They emphasized that if social change and physical threats overlap at one point, then a huge authoritarian community may awaken in the US Society. Karen Stenner, in her book titled "Authoritarian Dynamic,"¹⁵ she has emphasized pro-authoritarian people, hidden from the

¹¹ Amanda Taub. "Statüko Sarsılınca, Amerikan Otoriterliğinin Yükselişi", Turquie Diplomatique, 15 Nisan - 15 Mayıs 2016, Sayı: 86, p. 8.

¹² Marc J. Hetherington and Jonathan D. Weiler. Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ "The North-Eastern Primaries, Top Trump", The Economist, April 30th - May 6th 2016, p. 38.

¹⁵ Karen Stenner. The Authoritarian Dynamic, (Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology), Cambridge University Press, 2005.

public, can come forth when foreigners have endangered people's values and the sense of stability¹⁶. Stenner has pointed out that authoritarianism and authoritarian electorate support policies that seem getting rid of threats and maintaining the status quo. These people support actions and even military interventions if necessary¹⁷.

Most researchers agree that Trump's politics and ideology are centered on himself. Trump's attack-oriented style make him appear a leader who suggests both omnipotence and the idea that he is just one of the folks. Trump argues that he will make "America great again" and promises prosperity, wealth, and worldwide recognition to American citizens. Playing with nationalism, Trump attracts attention from the class differences within the US. Nationalist unity has an outside that is portrayed as the enemy: "the communists, the radicals, the skeptics and the Jews". In Trump's world, survival, toughness, strength, and the willingness to fight, lead and compete are moral norms¹⁸. In comparison with earlier presidents, it seems that Trump is defining American interests more narrowly. It is important because some writers agree that this understanding may endanger the American leadership role in the international system. In addition, one should not forget that he is on the side of economic nationalism rather than international cooperation. In this context, it is possible that the Trump presidency could push the US into a mild form of "competitive authoritarianism"¹⁹, a system in which meaningful democratic institutions exist yet the government abuse state power to disadvantage its opponents²⁰.

Scholars have identified political polarization as a central factor behind democratic breakdown. Democratic norms weaken as politicians become willing to break the rules, cooperate with antidemocratic extremists, and tolerate or encourage violence in order to keep their rivals out of power²¹. In this sense, writers warn that Trump declines to adopt the customary US

¹⁶ Taub, op.cit, p. 8.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Fuchs, op. cit.

¹⁹ Robert Mickey, Steven Levitsky and Lucan Ahmad Way. "Is America Still Safe for Democracy?", *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017, p. 20.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid, p. 24.

stance in favor of democracy and human rights, instead supports autocratic leaders such as Saudi Arabian King Salman and Egypt's Abdel-Fattah el, openly²².

Writers have emphasized important points about Trump's political decisions, affecting the US people. For example, David Rennie said that "Congressional Republicans will push for Trump to slash business taxes and offer a cut-rate tax amnesty for corporations willing to bring home foreign earnings."²³ In fact, Trump has delayed, suspended or reversed 90 regulations imposing government controls on everything from Wall Street to telecoms. Also, Trump says many of the nearly 2000 open executive federal positions might be "unnecessary"²⁴. Similarly, Massimo Calabresi underlined that "Trump has promised to bolster many of the federal government's largest programs, such as social security, Medicare and the Pentagon, to name a colossal tree"²⁵.

Moreover, John Ikenberry summed up Trump's worldview briefly so that it represents a kind of barrier in front of the post-war values and the new world order. First, the Trump Administration considers the international commitments of the USA as a business proposal and demands pay up from the allied countries. Second, contrary to open trade commitments of the earlier US governments, triggered by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 – which was a starting point to reopen world economy following the economic destruction of the Great Depression - Trump has displayed a more mercantilist, or zero-sum, understanding of the trade. Ikenberry underlined that in his view, "trade is a game of winners and losers, not an exchange that generates mutual gains"²⁶. Trump's decision of withdrawing from Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and demanding to renegotiate the NAFTA are good examples of his economic understanding, based on economic nationalism. Third, the Trump Administration denies the importance of international

²² Eugene Robinson. "Trump is Abdicating All the Country's Moral Power", The Washington Post, <http://article.wn.com/view/2017/06/02>, published June 1, 2017.

²³ David Rennie. "Trumpquake", The Economist, The Word in 2017, p. 47.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Massimo Calabresi. "Inside Donald Trump's War Against the State", Time, March 20, 2017, p. 36.

²⁶ G. John Ikenberry. "The Plot Against American Foreign Policy, Can the Liberal Order Survive?" Foreign Affairs, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017, pp. 4 -7.

institutions and rules out their achievements even though these institutions were created by the US itself after the WWII. In this sense, Trump had mostly laid stress on US' financial and political commitment to the UN, in election campaigns. In this respect, Ikenberry reminds us that an "America first" attitude toward global rules and cooperation "will breed a generation of anti-Americanism and it will take years to undo the damage"²⁷. Fourth, although multiculturalism has always been an important characteristic of the US Society, and "racial, ethnic, and religious diversity makes the US economy more dynamic"²⁸, Trump disdains this characteristic and prizes civic nationalism, instead of ethnic nationalism²⁸.

Allies, international organizations

Following the WWII, the US has always attached importance to the establishment of both global and regional organizations to prevent further wars and create a new order, economically and politically. However, it seems that Trump does not consider these institutions effective. Although they are known as important means of forming multilateralism and providing cooperation among countries, he considered them "riddled with bad deals"²⁹.

Trump believes that money spent in these institutions, especially at the UN, is extravagance³⁰. He suggests big cuts to America's contribution to the UN and other major institutions such as the World Bank. He has said that he would cut America's contribution to the UN by % 40. In the UN, countries' payments are spent for funding the UN agencies, such as the World Food Program, the High Commission for Refugees and the UN Children's Fund³¹.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid. 28

Ibid.

²⁹ "Donald Trump and Multilateralism, China First", *The Economist*, March 25th - 31st 2017, p. 12.

³⁰ Bruce W. Jentleson. "Global Governance, the United Nations, and the Challenge of Trumping Trump", *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, April - June 2017, No: 2, p. 145.

³¹ "America and the World, US vs. UN", *The Economist*, March 25th - 31st 2017, p. 54.

In this context he also blamed his allies. For example, he scolded Germany for not spending more on NATO and therefore on its defense.

Unlike other US presidents since the end of the WWII, Trump has adopted a more isolationist orientation to foreign policy. In this context, he highlighted how much the US has spent on defending its allies in Europe and Asia³², but now he has demanded the burden sharing. He even wanted other countries pay more towards their security. Within this framework, Trump could withdraw from NAFTA with just six months' notice, without consulting the Congress³³. However, his negative attitude would create problems on the side of the members' governments and maybe more importantly weaken NATO and leave at front-line Eastern European states vulnerable to Russia³⁴.

Environmental issues and climate change

For the new Trump Administration, pledges to curb greenhouse-gas emissions have become other important problems it has faced. Trump argued that the 2015 agreement "handicaps the US economy"³⁵ even though there is no binding deal. He emphasized that these were only voluntary pledges by each nation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, other governments, specifically the EU and China are in favor of protecting the environment by keeping their words on limiting gas emissions and developing clean-energy technologies³⁶.

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, adopted in 1992, aimed at achieving "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"³⁷. Thus, the US government decided to increase its climate-related spending in developing countries fourfold in 2010 - 2015 periods. In this context, the US government spent \$15.6 bn on

³² Knopf, op. cit.

³³ Henry Curr. "Making Recession Great Again?", The Economist, The World in 2017, p. 49.

³⁴ "The Trump Era", op.cit, p. 10.

³⁵ "Trump's Paris Pullout Endangers the Planet", USA Today, Editorial Board, June 2, 2017, Item: JOE 177370517117.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng>. Pdf.

projects for clean energy, better land use and infrastructure suited to a warming the world³⁸. Also, the Clean Power Plan (2015), directed states, in the US, “to work out how to cut emissions from power plants to avoid the pollution equivalent to the exhausts from 80 m cars by 2030”³⁹. The policy was meant to get the US almost halfway to meeting its pledge to cut emissions by 26-28 % by 2025, as measured against 2005 levels⁴⁰. On top of that, the Paris Agreement, concluded by almost all countries in the world, except Syria and Nicaragua, on 5th October 2016 (and ratified on 4th November 2016) has sought “to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius. This agreement was important for the US because America produces almost 50 % more coal than it did in 1940⁴¹. However, on environmental issues, Trump situated himself in the denialist camp, has called climate change a hoax and wants to withdraw from the Paris agreement that was a commitment made by Obama last year.

Major powers in international arena

Trump has a different perspective on major powers of the international system. His view of international relations does not fit with interdependent type of relationship among powers, led by the US. Some writers agree that the world's most powerful state has begun to sabotage the order it created. Trump suggests other countries doing their part in the system. For instance, he said, it might be time for Japan and South Korea to get their own nuclear weapons. In addition, some European policymakers have begun to talk about arranging a nuclear weapons program⁴². In addition, the US Administration has become ready to a geopolitical “grand bargain” with Russia, perhaps lifting sanctions imposed after the invasion of Ukraine in

³⁸ “America and the World, US vs Un”, op. cit, p. 55.

³⁹ “International Policy, Down and Dirty”, *The Economist*, April 1st - 7th 2017, p. 34.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ “International Policy, Down and Dirty”, op. cit, p. 34. 42

Ikenberry, op.cit, p. 4.

exchange for cooperation against terrorism⁴². Trump authorized a cruise missile strike on a known Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps intelligence headquarters, destroying three buildings and killing a dozen officers and an unknown number of civilians⁴³.

Trump accused China of destroying American jobs and stealing US secrets. “We can’t continue to allow China to rape our country,” he said⁴⁴. He also blamed China’s entrance into the WTO for the “greatest jobs theft in history”⁴⁵. The advisors of the new administration have envisaged tougher economic measures to both rectify the US-Chinese trade balance and to weaken China’s military power⁴⁶. It is important because some writers have paid attention that China has already begun to play a considerable role in the geopolitical structure, which is left by the US⁴⁷.

Similarly, Israel has been on the stocks of playing a unilateral role in its region in the Trump era. The Maale Adumim Law, extending Israeli sovereignty over Ma’ale Adumim – a colony located seven kilometers East of Jerusalem - is a step towards the annexation of 60 % of the occupied West Bank, and can be considered as the first sign that the Israeli government is using its newfound power in the Trump era to make unilateral moves. Annexing Maale Adumim would cut the West Bank in two, making it almost impossible to establish in the future a viable Palestine state⁴⁸.

As soon as Trump took office, he ended the Obama’s implementation on encouraging banks and international companies to ensure that Iran benefited economically from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action⁵⁰ (or the Iran nuclear deal) which was adopted by P5+1, the EU and Iran on 14th July 2015. The deal required that Iran’s nuclear program would be peaceful.

⁴² James Astill, “To the Victors, a Mess”, The Economist, The World in 2017, p. 48.

⁴³ Israel Shamir. “Egemenlik Arzusu, Yule Döneminde Trump”, Turquie Diplomatique, Mart 2017, p. 4.

⁴⁴ Philip Gordon. “ A Vision of Trump at War”, Foreign Affairs, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017, p. 14.

⁴⁵ “Rustproofing”, The Economist, July 2nd - 8th 2016, p. 39.

⁴⁶ Gordon, op. cit, p. 15.

⁴⁷ Ikenberry, op. cit, p. 4.

⁴⁸ “Unsettled”, The Economist, January 7th -13th 2017, p. 29.

⁵⁰ Iran nuclear nonproliferation agreement 51 Knopf, op. cit.

Basically, the Iran nuclear deal reduces some of Iran's capabilities relevant to nuclear weapons development⁵¹. In addition, it prohibits Iran from expanding its uranium enrichment capabilities for ten years. However, since the cap on this technology will be lifted after ten years, Trump disagrees the deal, freezing Iran's nuclear program⁴⁹. Trump has described Iran nuclear deal as a "disaster and the worst deal ever negotiated and said he wants to tear it up and renegotiate it⁵⁰. Even worse, Trump's advisers insisted that the only credible option was to destroy the Iranian nuclear infrastructure with a massive preventive strike, while enforcing the US presence in Iraq to deal with the likely Iranian retaliation⁵¹. Also, frustrated by the continued Iranian support for the Houthi rebels in Yemen, the Pentagon stepped up patrols in the Strait of Hormuz and released the rules of engagement for US forces⁵².

Since the WWII, the European countries and the US have been at odds many times over the years. However, the leaders of the major European powers have felt forsaken, for the first time after Trump's recent visit (May 2017) to Europe. After this visit, Trump has raised doubts about the relationship in a way none of his predecessors did even in moments of sharp disagreement⁵³. He has broken with 70 years of tradition by signaling the end of US support for the EU: endorsing Brexit and making common cause with right-wing European parties that seek to unravel the postwar European Project⁵⁴. In addition, Europe's leaders have realized that they were on their own for defense planning, at most⁵⁵. In fact, Trump had scolded European leaders for not spending more on defense, saying that they have failed to meet their "financial obligations" and that the status quo is "unfair to American taxpayers." Thus, he failed to offer an unconditional guarantee of European security⁵⁶. Some western Europeans now view the Trump Administration as a greater threat than Putin's Russia. Der Spiegel called on Europe to "start

⁴⁹ "The Trump Era", op. cit, p. 10.

⁵⁰ Knopf, op. cit.

⁵¹ Gordon, op. cit, p. 14.

⁵² Ibid, p. 12.

⁵³ Robinson, op. cit.

⁵⁴ Ikenberry, op. cit, p. 2.

⁵⁵ "Trump to Europe: You're on your own", The Conversation, <http://theconversation.com/trump-to-europe-youre-own-78786>.

⁵⁶ Robinson, op. cit.

planning its political and economic defenses against America's dangerous president"⁵⁷.

Trading issues

The Trump's nationalist trade policy aims at eliminating the trade deficit, which is the result of low national savings. He also wants to deport many illegal immigrants who would reduce the size of the labor force by up to % 5.7⁵⁸. Trump has demanded trade concessions from China, Mexico and Canada on tariffs⁵⁹, even threatened to impose trade barriers, would disrupt supply chains and dampen productivity growth. He could probably impose the tariffs he has floated: % 45 of goods from China and % 35 of those from Mexico⁶⁰. Trump has said that he is threatening to tear up trade agreements in order to achieve better trade deals.

However, most of the experts agree that trade barriers, huge unfunded tax cuts and mass deportations would cause a recession. A projection by Moody's shows a worker shortage, lower productivity growth and greater government debt leaving the economy smaller at the end of Trump's first term than it is today⁶¹. His protectionism would further impoverish poor Americans, who gain more as consumers from cheap imports than they would produce suppressed competition. If he caused a trade war, the fragile global economy could tip into a recession⁶².

Pro-Trump appeals

It seems that Trump's every decision and political move contradict with the ideas and policies that have created the postwar international system: Trade, alliances, international law, multilateralism, environmental protectionism, human rights, etc ⁶³ . However, some scholars have

⁵⁷ Ikenberry, op. cit, p. 8.

⁵⁸ "Strap up", The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016, p. 35.

⁵⁹ "The Trump Era", op. cit, p. 9.

⁶⁰ Rennie, op. cit, p. 49.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² "The Trump Era", op. cit, p. 9.

⁶³ Ikenberry, op. cit, p. 2.

emphasized that many of the controversial foreign policy statements that Trump has made have been consistent with established US policy⁶⁴. According to them, one may not be so pessimistic about Trump because, first; Trump pursues assertive nationalism rather than isolationism that imposes the costs and burdens on others. In this context, Trump has envisaged 45 % surcharge on Chinese imports, the you-owe-us to traditional allies, and the you-deal-with-them ban on refugees. Second; he has a negative attitude towards international organizations, specifically to the UN because it is not effective. Trump said that the UN is unable to resolve international conflicts and to provide peace worldwide. He said. "it is just a club for people to get together and to talk and have a good time"⁶⁵. Third, major US foreign policy failures have driven more by groupthink than analytic assessment of a range of policy options. Trump's aversion to the kind of collective decision making and policy development that are required at the UN and in other multilateral settings⁶⁶.

According to pro-Trump scholars, he has found a problematic world following the presidency election. For example, since 1945, Russia is seeking to dominate Europe. In Asia, China is undertaking a massive military buildup that the country's leaders hope will render the US unable to keep its security commitments in the Asia-Pacific. North Korea has up to 21 warheads and is on track to have nuclear missiles that could hit the continental US⁶⁷. The US oversaw the wholesale disintegration of the Middle East region and the rise of the Islamic State. Also, Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen have failed states. Iran is testing long-range ballistic missiles and projecting its influence throughout the Middle East, worsening the security of the US and its allies⁶⁸.

Even some pro-Trump scholars have asserted that Trump's calls for tax cuts, deregulations, and major infrastructure investments have already boosted domestic economic confidence. With them, under Trump, the US may finally break out of its recent cycle of low productivity, low inflation, and low

⁶⁴ Matthew Kroenig. "The Case for Trump's Foreign Policy", *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017, p. 30.

⁶⁵ Jentleson, op. cit, p. 143.

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 145.

⁶⁷ Kroenig, op. cit, p. 30.

⁶⁸ Ibid, p.31.

growth. Also, the US will need a strong military to maintain its international position, Trump has promised “one of the greatest military buildups in history”. He recognized that the US military must modernize to face a new nuclear age⁶⁹. Trump may well, as Kissinger predicted was possible, go “down in history as a very considerable president”⁷⁰. According to Kissinger, Trump’s presidency could present an “extraordinary opportunity” for US foreign policy⁷¹.

Conclusion

Donald Trump as the new president-elect of the USA has become a hotly debated person in the media, and the governments of other countries, for a while. The unordinary style of the new president and his different views, especially on international politics have been criticized by the allied countries of the USA, mostly. A close political ties to far-right figures, unilateralism, friend - enemy logic and skepticism of free international trade agreements are some of his thoughts which are unexpected not only for the US public, but also for the international community. In addition, his political distance and hostility towards certain countries such as China, Mexico, Iran and Cuba have exacerbated criticisms against him.

National and international developments such as an economic crisis, terrorism, radicalism, failed states, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and refugee movements have frightened the US electorates. When they feel themselves threatened and frightened, they support candidates who have rigid thoughts to preserve the status quo and maintain stability. This tendency has found out a president like Donald Trump.

Trump’s foreign political decisions and implementations have gotten the reaction from both domestic and international circles. His criticisms of the UN and NATO on costly burden sharing, and idea of withdrawing from NAFTA are important issues that not only weaken the leadership position of the US and decrease the reliability of the institutions in the international arena. Similarly, Trump’s disbelief on environmental issues and climate change and

⁶⁹ Ibid, p.32.

⁷⁰ Ibid, p.34.

⁷¹ Ibid, p.30.

his idea of withdrawing from Paris agreement, targeting to curb greenhouse-gas emissions have become another point of criticism of the Trump Administration.

However, some researchers have insisted that Trump has been consistent policies with US national interests. For instance, Trump's calls for tax cuts, deregulations and infrastructure investments may become a solution to so-called low productivity and low growth domestically. In addition, they support his assertive nationalism imposing costs and burdens on other countries may constitute a positive effect on other countries who sit out shouldering international burdens and problems.

Therefore, time will show us whether Trump's presidency could present an "extraordinary opportunity" for US foreign policy as said by Kissinger.

Sources

"America and the World, US vs. UN", *The Economist*, March 25th - 31st 2017.

Astill, James. "To the Victors, a Mess", *The Economist*, The World in 2017.

Calabresi, Massimo. "Inside Donald Trump's War Against the State", *Time*, March 20, 2017.

Curr, Henry. "Making Recession Great Again?", *The Economist*, The World in 2017.

"Donald Trump and Multilateralism, China First", *The Economist*, March 25th - 31st 2017.

"Election 2016, How it Happened", *The Economist*, November 12th - 18th 2016.

"Election 2016, Lessons of the Debate", *The Economist*, October 1st - 7th 2016.

Fuchs, Christian. "Donald Trump: A Critical Theory-Perspective on Authoritarian Capitalism", *Triple C Communication, Capitalism and Critique*, Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society, 15 (1), 1-72, 2017. Westminster Research [http:// www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch](http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch) Donald Trump: A Critical Theory-Perspective on Authoritarian Capitalism.

Gordon, Philip. "A Vision of Trump at War", *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017.

Hetherington, J. Marc and Jonathan D. Weiler. *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

<https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng>. Pdf.

Ikenberry, G. John. "The Plot Against American Foreign Policy, Can the Liberal Order Survive?" *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017.

“International Policy, Down and Dirty”, The Economist, April 1st - 7th 2017.

Jentleson, W. Bruce. “Global Governance, the United Nations, and the Challenge of Trumping Trump”, Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations, No: 2, April - June 2017.

Knopf, W. Jeffrey. “Security Assurances and Proliferation Risks in the Trump Administration”, Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 38, No. 1, 26-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1271688>. Published Online: 11 January 2017.

Kroenig, Matthew. “The Case for Trump’s Foreign Policy”, Foreign Affairs, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017.

Lakoff, George. “Why Trump?”, Political Leave a Comment, March 2, 2016.

Mickey Robert, Steven Levitsky and Lucan Ahmad Way. “Is America Still Safe for Democracy?”, Foreign Affairs, Volume 96, Number 3, May - June 2017.

Rennie, David. “Trumpquake”, The Economist, The Word in 2017.

Robinson, Eugene. “Trump is Abdicating All the Country’s Moral Power”, The Washington Post, <http://article.wn.com/view/2017/06/02>, published June 1, 2017.

“Rustproofing”, The Economist, July 2nd - 8th 2016.

Shamir, Israel. “Egemenlik Arzusu, Yule Döneminde Trump”, Turquie Diplomatique, Mart 2017.

Stenner, Karen. The Authoritarian Dynamic, (Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology), Cambridge University Press, 2005.

“Strap up”, The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016.

Taub, Amanda. “Statüko Sarsılınca, Amerikan Otoriterliğinin Yükselişi”, Turquie Diplomatique, 15 Nisan - 15 Mayıs 2016, Sayı: 86.

“The North-Eastern Primaries, Top Trump”, The Economist, April 30th - May 6th 2016.

“The Trump Era”, The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016.

“The Trump Administration, What to Expect”, The Economist, November 12th - 18th 2016.

“Trump’s Paris Pullout Endangers the Planet”, USA Today, Editorial Board, June 2, 2017, Item: JOE 177370517117.

“Trump to Europe: You’re on your own”, The Conversation, <http://theconversation.com/trump-to-europe-youre-own-78786>.

“Unsettled”, The Economist, January 7th -13th 2017.

Turkey's Development-Oriented Humanitarian Policy Inspiring The Global Humanitarian System in The Post-WHS Process: New Way of Working to Transcend Development and Humanitarian Divide

Dr. Hasan Ulusoy⁷²

WHS PROCESS

It is a fact that the global humanitarian system has made considerable progress throughout history, to the common benefit of peoples in need. The omnibus UN resolution on humanitarian assistance of 1991¹ had laid the foundation, through which the present system was set to function.

Yet, given the scales of humanitarian crises today, it has become undeniable over the years that the international community face tremendous challenges in the humanitarian field. In addition, the current humanitarian system can no longer adequately address today's humanitarian crises. In fact, contemporary humanitarian crises worsen in number and complexity. Moreover, such crises are transcending borders as the recent tragic exodus of refugees and effects of pandemics like Ebola and Zika have bitterly reminded the international community once again. What is more distressing is the ever-growing dichotomy between increasing needs at unprecedented levels and limited available resources in financing which marks the underlying problematic facing the present humanitarian system.

Today, 80 percent of humanitarian crises are caused by conflicts, with most being recurrent or protracted ones lasting years long. The number of people

⁷² Dr. Hasan Ulusoy is a career diplomat and ambassador currently serving as Director General at the Turkish MFA. The Directorate General which he is in charge was responsible for the preparations of the WHS and its follow-up. Ambassador Ulusoy is a PhD holder in international relations with several articles and one book published in his areas of expertise.

forcibly displaced worldwide is likely to have surpassed a record 65 million, half of which are children, mainly driven by protracted conflicts.

Natural disasters also cause loss of lives of millions and leave severe economic damages as a consequence. The number of climatic disasters has doubled worldwide in the last 25 years. Every year natural disasters impact the lives of nearly 100 million people, and in the last 15 years they have led to direct economic losses of huge scale.

In brief, as the former UN Secretary General stressed once, there exist a record number of people, who need aid to survive.²

As a whole, the foregoing realities form altogether the pressing background that led to the World Humanitarian Summit process initiated by him in 2013.

The process was led by the UN, notably the WHS secretariat, the establishment of which was supported by Turkey. It was of a multi-stakeholder nature where all interested stakeholders of the world humanitarian community were able to participate in the spirit of consultation, in contrast to the customary intergovernmental process requiring negotiations. The stakeholders included civil society, international and national aid organizations, private sector, academia, youth, faith groups, along with member states, UN specialized bodies and persons affected by crises.

Following the consultation process lasting three years³, the then UN Secretary-General articulated his vision and recommendations for the future of the global humanitarian system in his report, entitled “One Humanity: Shared Responsibility” which was issued on February 9, 2016.⁴ In this report, five core responsibilities were identified: Securing global leadership to prevent conflicts, respecting international humanitarian norms, reaching the most vulnerable and furthest behind, changing people’s lives and ending the need, and investing in humanity. The annex to this report, Agenda for Humanity, included concrete areas of action and provided the framework under which all stake holders including Member States could announce their commitments at the Summit.

The WHS process reached its culmination in Istanbul on 23-24 May 2016 with the holding of the summit. Turkey was privileged to host the firstever World

Humanitarian Summit (WHS), amid the current challenges facing the global humanitarian system.

The Istanbul Summit, in line with its inclusive structure, brought together for the first time in history, all stakeholders of the world humanitarian community, including representatives of affected populations.

The participation at the summit was marked with a record level of 9.000 participants from all stakeholders. 180 Member States, including 55 Heads of State and Government, more than 60 Ministers, as well as some 40 Secretaries/Directors General from different international and regional organizations were present therein. According to the UN figures, it was the highest number of the United Nations members who have ever come together at this scale in one single time outside its headquarters in New York.

The record level of participation from the UN member states was attained despite the reluctance shown by some UN member states in general towards the non-intergovernmental structure of the WHS process. This can be attributed to the growing interest of the world humanitarian community in the alarming challenges transcending borders such as refugee flows. However, it would also not be wrong to argue that hosting of the Summit, which was not assumed by a traditional donor country but by Turkey as a leading donor and an affected country which conducts an active humanitarian diplomacy, had an impact on this active engagement. It is with no doubt that the selection of Turkey as the host country as well as the active role Turkey has assumed in the humanitarian domain in recent years has contributed to the increasing level of engagement of the stakeholders to be present in Istanbul.

In fact, Turkey has a strong tradition of responding to those in need. Situated in a disaster-prone geography, Turkey's land has historically been moulded with humanitarian efforts. As early as in the late 15th century, the Turkish rulers provided sanctuary to several hundreds of thousands of exiled populations fleeing persecution in their homelands. Since then Turks have embraced countless peoples in dire needs, regardless of their religious, ethnic or linguistic backgrounds, throughout history.

Based on such heritage, modern Turkey has continued to provide humanitarian assistance to such peoples in need, by either hosting them in its territory or helping them in their own or third countries, to the extent of

its resources and capacities. Built on its own experiences, in recent times, this humanitarianism has been vividly reflected in Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy. This diplomacy has a broader meaning than mere humanitarian assistance which is yet an important tool of it. Humanitarian diplomacy as Turkey applies is a human-centered and conscience-driven policy having particular attention, in its efforts, on human dignity and development, in countries where humanitarian crises of all sorts occur.

Today, Turkey is long considered as the world's "most generous" humanitarian donor as the ratio of official humanitarian assistance to national income is taken into consideration.⁵ While extending its humanitarian assistance globally, Turkey also hosts millions of affected people who fled in despair from their homelands, notably Syria and Iraq. This is a unique but rather bitter experience, through which Turkey can be better positioned to see the current issues prevailing in both sides of the system, as a donor and a refugee hosting country. Beside the humanitarian assistance directed to the Syrians sheltered in Turkey, the amount allotted for overseas humanitarian assistance by Turkey has also been in steady increase. As the figures show, almost 80 percent of Turkish development aid has been used for humanitarian assistance purposes.⁶

Outcomes Of The Istanbul Summit: New Way Of Working

In accordance with its format the Istanbul Summit evolved into a high level global platform where all interested stakeholders of the world humanitarian community announced their commitments to the future of the humanitarian system, while sharing their experiences and views.

As formally stated by the UN, the Summit had three main goals⁷:

To re-inspire and reinvigorate a commitment to humanity and to the universality of humanitarian principles.

To initiate a set of concrete actions and commitments aimed at enabling countries and communities to better prepare for and respond to crises, and be resilient to shocks.

To share best practices which can help save lives around the world, put affected people at the center of humanitarian action, and alleviate suffering.

The formal conclusion of the Istanbul Summit was marked by the Chair's Summary of the UN Secretary General, which in brief reflected the announcements and commitments declared at the Summit as well as his initial views about the way forward. In the Chair's summary⁸, the following pressing issues of the humanitarian system, such as the importance of political leadership to prevent and end conflicts, the need for avoiding development-humanitarian divide and better handling forced displacement as a consequence of humanitarian crises, as well as the needs for more engagement in humanitarian financing and upholding humanitarian principles and law were all discussed at length during the summit and several ideas and commitments were presented with a view to their improvements.

The WHS has served as a unique and historic platform to address the alarming challenges of the humanitarian system and express commitments for sustainable solutions in order to improve the lives of millions of crisis-affected people. In this context, over 3 thousand commitments, be they unilateral or collective, were announced by various stakeholders ranging from member states, UN agencies, to civil society and private sector.

As it was mentioned in the Chair's Summary, the way forward in the aftermath of the Istanbul Summit is of crucial importance for the future of the humanitarian system. The then Secretary General stated in his summary: "We should collectively assess progress made in taking forward the Agenda for Humanity and the commitments we have made at this Summit by 2020. We owe it to all people affected by crises, and we owe it to ourselves in the name of our common humanity and our shared responsibility. Let us now turn the Agenda for Humanity into an instrument of global transformation."

⁹

To this end, following the Summit, he issued a road map to promote accountability for commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and to report on progress attained after the Summit. This was presented at a high-level briefing titled 'Beyond the World Humanitarian Summit: Advancing the Agenda for Humanity,' on 22 September 2016, on the sidelines of the 71st UN General Assembly. There the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, H.E. Çavuşoğlu, delivered a speech as the host country and underlined Turkey's support to the follow-up process of the Summit. With this report the former Secretary General handed over an important legacy

to his successor Mr. Antonio Guterres who is well known with his active engagement in humanitarian issues.

In this process a number of initiatives have in time come to the fore. Of these, is the new way of working (NWOW).¹⁰ On the margins of Istanbul Summit, on 23 May 2016, former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the heads of 8 UN agencies (UNICEF, UNHCR, WHO, OCHA, WFP, FAO, UNFPA and UNDP), with the endorsement of the World Bank and the International Organization for Migration, signed a “Commitment to Action” document, on the basis of core commitment 1 on “Changing Peoples’ Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending

Need.” The agencies, as indicated in the document, committed to achieve (1) pooled and combined data, analysis and information; (2) better joined up planning and programming processes; (3) effective leadership for collective outcomes; and (4) pursuing financing modalities to support collective outcomes.

The Commitment to Action which spelled out a New Way of Working towards “collective outcomes” aims to encourage humanitarian and development actors to not only work better together, but to design their cooperation towards specific goals that reduce the needs, risks and vulnerabilities of people affected by crises. The initiative is driven by the longestablished need to transcend the humanitarian and development divide. It is the notion of “collective outcomes” that holds the potential to bring the necessary capacities together to tackle drivers of need and accelerate development gains for the most vulnerable, particularly in protracted and recurrent crises.

The New Way of Working is also one of the elements of Secretary-General António Guterres reform agenda in which he calls on the “system as a whole” to break down silos and “bring the humanitarian and development spheres closer together from the beginning of a crisis to support affected communities, address structural and economic impacts and help prevent a new spiral of fragility and instability.”¹¹ In the words of the SecretaryGeneral, humanitarian response, sustainable development and sustaining peace are three sides of the same triangle.

The New Way of Working recognizes that the primary goal of humanitarian action is to provide life-saving assistance and protection in line with the

humanitarian principles, but that, especially in protracted crises, humanitarian assistance should be designed in a way that helps build a bridge between short-term assistance and medium-term outcomes. By committing to the New Way of Working, development actors, for their part, signal a renewed effort to deliver development programming and financing that will broaden the reach of development outcomes to the most vulnerable, particularly those in fragile settings.

The approach further recognizes that in order to deliver tangible development gains to the most vulnerable, “collective outcomes” offer a series of building blocks, deliverable in 3-5-year timeframes, to address the areas of persistent need, risk and vulnerability that drive humanitarian crises. These are tangible results that are measurable in people’s daily lives. For example, instead of developing separate strategies for the emergency food assistance and longer-term food security, under the New Way of Working, shared results would be identified in each of these sectors, around which humanitarian and development actors could lend their respective capacities to enable measurable results. This would provide a focus for investment for a range of stakeholders, including donors.

The New Way of Working has been met with broad interest and support from many corners, and there are numerous on-going efforts to explore the practical implications that it will have on existing tools, processes, and forms of collaboration. Several countries have been selected in Sub-Saharan Africa as case-studies. It has now been embedded in the parallel and self-reinforcing mandates created by the UN Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) for the UN Development System and the General Assembly resolution covering emergency response for the humanitarian system.

Turkey’s Development-Oriented Humanitarian Policy and New Way of Working Initiative

Turkey has shown significant attention to the NWOW as it corresponds to its development-oriented humanitarian policy which is long being implemented mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa. In fact, Turkey’s policy and field experiences have been one of the main drives in the formation of the said initiative in the preparation process of the WHS.

The development-oriented humanitarian assistance constitutes the core of Turkey's policies in its humanitarian response. Given the complexity of the present crises, the humanitarian-development nexus needs to be strengthened to increase the resilience and capacity of recipient actors to respond to humanitarian crises themselves.

This is crucially important to address the humanitarian crises of recurrent and protracted nature. Both have one underlying fact in common: severe negative impacts of a destructive nature on the country in question, including refugee plights.

In such cases, humanitarian crises are triggered as the negative impact of insufficient development, environmental issues, conflicts, poverty and lack of infrastructure. For example, in many cases in sub-Saharan Africa, there exists a vicious circle entangling the countries. Food crises mostly resulting in famine repeat themselves in circles, due to either drought or flooding which are aggravated by climatic degradation such as deforestation or desertification. Limited agricultural capacities are ruined by either droughts or floods every season due to the limited basic infrastructure (water storage or drainage systems etc.) or lack of human or institutional capacity to tackle such disasters.

This vicious circle is hard to break. Why? Because there is a huge problem on the development side. Such vicious circles might risk even causing or triggering conflicts leading to refugee crises as well.

In such cases, humanitarian crises cannot be remedied fully without developmental tools. This makes also the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals of the UN) crucial both to tackle humanitarian emergencies and to enhance peace and security. In fact, to ensure peace and security lasting and enduring, the humanitarian action needs to be supplemented with sustainable development along with democratic structures.

In order to break such vicious circles it is needed to intervene with various tools. At the first stage, Turkey intervenes at the request of the host country with humanitarian aids for emergency humanitarian relief and continues with development projects to support resilience, in tandem or simultaneously as appropriate.

This is the main philosophy behind the Turkish policy in such cases, which is marked with the combined use of humanitarian and development financing along with various tools in a concerted way.

This is not an easy task but the result is rewarding for all.

The combined use of humanitarian and development tools turns to be cost effective for donors in the longer run as affected countries become more resilient increasing their level of development, thanks to development aids on basic infrastructure, human and institutional capacity-building. This development assistance enables affected countries to resist to such humanitarian shocks, which in turn would reduce their need of humanitarian aids in future. Thus, it is a win-win approach. In this approach one thing needs to be underlined that development and humanitarian assistance tools are not utilized to the detriment of each other. In other words, the combined use of these assistance programmes is not carried out at the expense of one another in respect of the recipient country.

This model is also applied to conflict-driven protracted crises. In these cases Turkey's humanitarian and developmental efforts are complemented with political and stabilization efforts. As to the humanitarian assistance policies directed to countries of origin stricken by humanitarian crises in conflict, Turkey's policy to assist Somalia can be regarded as a exemplary case.

Somalia is in fact the most striking example of countries affected by protracted crises which are triggered by both conflicts and natural disasters. The country was hit by a severe famine in 2011. Following the visit of the then Prime Minister of Turkey, all segments of the Turkish society from public institutions to NGOs and private sector were mobilized to assist the people of Somalia. This process has gradually resulted into a comprehensive policy, comprising humanitarian, development as well as stabilization efforts in an integrated strategy. In a relatively short span of time, several projects were put into action which consisted of human and institutional capacity building, construction of essential infrastructure, providing services such as education, sanitation and health etc. while humanitarian aids such as delivering food and medicine continued.

In this multi-stakeholder process, in addition to TİKA, AFAD and the Turkish Red Crescent, the Turkish business sector, civil society as well as municipalities have also been heavily engaged with fund raising and

undertaking humanitarian and development assistance projects. While the projects on humanitarian aid and development assistance are carried out in a concerted way, political efforts of Turkey contributing to stabilization efforts have also been put into action through bilateral and multilateral channels. Naturally, all these have become possible with a holistic and integrated approach under a strong political leadership. Turkey's efforts in Somalia have long been praised as a unique Turkish model that can also guide the NWOW.¹²

Today, such an approach is increasingly recognized as an effective way to overcome humanitarian-development divide. In the related literature, there is a classic analogy to describe development-oriented humanitarian policies: Give the needy fishes to eat, but teach them also how to fish. Yet, Turkey's policy in this regard goes far beyond this as it also aims to assist the country in need to manufacture fishing tools and help for the creation of its fishing industry. This naturally requires a holistic approach.

These policies are always carried out in cooperation with the authorities of the host country in need, taking into account its demands. In this process, TIKA, Turkey's caring hand abroad along with all agencies and institutions such as AFAD and Turkish Red Crescent, as well as NGOs, act together in coordination with respective Ministries towards this end.

Naturally, there are certain conditions for the success of such combined use of different instruments and financing. Making different bureaucracies work together is not an easy task. For the success, the main key words are : case-specific but holistic approach, joint and integrated strategy and planning based on shared analyses, context-based and tailor-made programmes, concerted actions through better coordination avoiding duplication, overlapping and flexible budgeting. All these need an enhanced culture of collective labor which definitely requires a mentality change for working together. There comes the important role of strong political backing and leadership.

These abovementioned views, practices and experiences of Turkey, in particular on the joint use of humanitarian and development assistance in areas affected by protracted and recurrent crises, were extensively shared with the international community during the WHS preparation process to which Turkish stakeholders actively contributed in substance. In this process,

they were also submitted by Turkey in a compact manner as the National Position Paper¹³ to the Summit Secretariat already in June 2015.

In view of the foregoing, it is welcomed that the NWOW initiative is progressing in line with Turkey's policy to support development and humanitarian nexus. In this process, Turkey provides support to the initiative by various means including by sharing its national experiences in the field and hosted one of the workshops of NWOW to mark the first anniversary of the World Humanitarian Summit. The High Level Workshop "Advancing the New Way of Working" was held on 18-19 May 2017 in Istanbul.¹⁴ The workshop aimed at marking the progress, sharing field experiences and addressing practical challenges to further advance implementation of the New Way of Working. The key messages from the Istanbul Workshop were (1) to institutionalize the NWOW, (2) to support a network to exchange good practices, (3) to focus on practical and light tools, (4) to keep the momentum at the global level and (5) to provide support to RC/HCs and their offices. These messages and the outcomes of the Istanbul workshop, including the progress achieved up till the workshop, would be reported by the OCHA to the UN Secretary General.

Concluding Remarks

The initiative to organize the first-ever World Humanitarian Summit, and also the growing interest of the global community in the preparations of the Summit were testimony to the urgent need acknowledged to address the alarming challenges in the humanitarian system. With this understanding, President of Turkey H.E. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan called indeed on all the stakeholders at the opening session of the Istanbul Summit, stating "we should never forget our responsibilities vis-à-vis the people who locked their eyes and hearts to the messages and commitments that will arise from Istanbul"¹⁵.

To this end, Turkey on its part has been strongly engaged in the followup process both by building on the global momentum which the Istanbul Summit has generated and by working in close and genuine partnership with all stakeholders to improve collective response to humanity based on the spirit of shared responsibility. In this pursuit, while making progress in fulfilling its commitments made at the summit, Turkey continues its

humanitarian assistance both in Turkey towards Syrians and others, and beyond in various geographies whenever there happens a need. Beside these efforts, Turkey encourages and leads initiatives aiming at the betterment of the global humanitarian system, such as the NWO in respect of post-WHS process, to bring together different silos from humanitarian and development sides for better delivering help to those in need. The NWO has promising potential to be useful for the global humanitarian system. In his message for the first anniversary of the Istanbul Summit, the UN Secretary General praised the initiative as follows: “We must bring humanitarian and development actors to work together closely from the beginning of a crisis to support affected communities. Delivering the New Way of Working is a critical step to achieve this.”¹⁶

Improving the global humanitarian system should in fact be the common responsibility of each and every member of the world humanitarian community, at least to alleviate the suffering of those in need, if not to end it, so that the future of our common humanity could be secured in a sustained manner. The Istanbul Summit has sowed the seeds for a transformative change in the system encompassing a mentality, if not a paradigm, shift as well. The Summit was not of course a destination, but rather a departure point of historic journey for the future of the global humanitarian system. As Turkey does its own part, it is hoped that the world humanitarian community would continue its responsibility in the period ahead to follow up the Summit outcomes and to take the commitments forward through various channels, including intergovernmental and interagency platforms together with all stakeholders. With this understanding and hope, President of Turkey, H.E. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, made a call on the world humanitarian community in his statement on the first anniversary of the Istanbul summit in the following lines: “As Turkey, we attach great importance to maintaining the momentum generated by the Istanbul Summit and call upon all UN countries and international organizations as well as stakeholders of the humanitarian assistance system to uphold their commitments.”¹⁷

Sources

1. UN General Assembly Resolution 46/182/19 December 1991 on Strengthening of the coordination of Humanitarian emergency assistance of the United Nations.
2. Secretary-General's opening remarks at World Humanitarian Summit, <http://www.un.org/sg/statements/index.asp?nid=9723>.
3. See for details <http://worldhumanitariansummit.org/consultation-reports>
4. The report is available at <https://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org>. Prior to his report, the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing which was commissioned by him earlier, submitted its report on the proposed ways and means on how to better finance the humanitarian system. Its recommendations were instrumental to shape the preparations of the Istanbul Summit, which mostly correspond to the views of Turkey, such as on the importance of joint use of humanitarian and development assistance (the report is also available at https://consultations2.worldhumanitariansummit.org/whs_finance/hlphumanitarianfinancing.)
5. See the global humanitarian assistance reports at <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org>
6. The humanitarian assistance of Turkey reached 3,2 billion USD in 2015 . See for details <http://www.tika.gov.tr/upload/2017/YAYINLAR/TKYR%202015%20ENG/KALKINMA%20.pdf>
7. See <https://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/faq>
8. The Chair's Summary is available at <https://consultations2.worldhumanitariansummit.org/bitcache/5171492e71696bcf9d4c571c93dfc6dcd7f361ee?vid=581078&disposition=inline&op=view>
9. Ibid.
10. For details on the new way of working, see <http://www.agendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/5358>.
11. See <http://whsturkey.org/nwow>
12. Somalian Minister for Humanitarian Assistance underlined this when she spoke at the panel organized in İstanbul on 18-19 May 2016 to support the NWOW process. See for details, <http://aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/somali-insani-yardim-ve-afet-isleri-bakaniahmed-turkiye-somaliyi-yeniden-insa-ediyor/825006>
13. The paper is available at <http://whsturkey.org/turkey-and-the-summit/key-documents-for-turkey>
14. See <http://whsturkey.org/nwow>
15. see <http://whsturkey.org/turkey-and-the-summit/statements>

16. See “Statement on the first anniversary of the World Humanitarian Summit” António Guterres, <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2017-05-23/secretary-generals-1st-anniversary-whs-statement>
17. See “Message Of The President On The Occasion Of The First Anniversary Of The World Humanitarian Summit”, <https://www.tccb.gov.tr/en/speeches-statements/558/75322/dunya-insani-zirvesinin-1-yili.html>

Africa in World Politics and Somalia: A Comparative Case Study

Numan Hazar* Ambassador (R)

Prior to dealing with issues related to Somalia, it would be useful to review broadly particularities of Africa as well as problems which it faces. Although some of the problems of the African continent as a whole are also existing in Somalia itself, It should be admitted that there exists several issues which are very much specific for Somalia. In this regard, it would be a good idea to make a comparative analysis of African continent and Somalia, and to draw some conclusions from this comparison.

Before all, it should be indicated that there is a widespread view to the effect that Africa should be taken up preferably as a whole. Some countries, particularly the United States considers North Africa as a separate unit from the vantage point of its foreign policy and puts it within the context of an area of interest under the name of Middle East and North Africa (MENA). As a matter of fact, this region has a particular connection with the Middle East problem, since it is Arab Africa, part of the Arab World. Nevertheless, in the studies regarding Africa it is necessary to consider the continent as a whole. In fact, the concept of African Union does not accept such an approach of dividing Africa. On the other hand the countries in North Africa consider themselves as African countries. The main characteristics of Africa are as follows:

-Africa as a continent is large territorial mass. It comprises 20.4% of the lands on earth. Its population is approximatively 1 billion. Despite the fact that this figure is low as compared to its superficial extension there is a high birth rate.

* Former Turkish Ambassador to Nigeria and Ambassador/Permanent Representative of Turkey to the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

-Africa is a poor continent. When criteria of per capita national income, gross domestic product, economic and social development as well as the level of

industrialisation are taken into account, it will be observed that it is the poorest continent of the World.

-In return, Africa is a very rich continent as far as its natural resources are concerned. In addition to its various natural resources and agricultural potential, its rivers, mines, forests and other riches draw the attention. Oil, natural gas, gold, copper, diamond, uranium and other rich resources of the continent have always attracted the interest from outside of the continent.

-There is no single Africa. It is not uncommon to say, according to ethnic peculiarities Black Africa, White Africa or Arab Africa. Geographically the terms of North Africa, South Africa, East Africa or West Africa are used. On the other hand, there are definitions, according to formal colonial powers such as African countries members of the British Commonwealth, Portuguese speaking (Lusophone) countries of Africa, French speaking Africa (La Francophonie). On the basis of religion, it is also described as Moslem Africa, Christian Africa. Naturally there is also animism in Africa as traditional belief.

-African countries experienced in the history two big traumas: slave trade and colonialism. Slave trade caused humiliation of Africa and led to a serious loss of its population. Colonialism also created serious economic, social and political problems, since boundaries between African states were drawn on a very arbitrary manner without any heeding regarding ethnic, linguistic or religious characteristics.

-Ethnic groups are split due to the fact that state border lines are drawn in an arbitrary way. As a result of this, there are many ethnic, religious and linguistic communities in each and every country in Africa as well as a number of tribes.

-The states in Africa created artificially faced substantive problems on the way of establishing their nation-states because of all these aforementioned reasons.

After the explanation of the characteristics of the African states, it is necessary to put into perspective outstanding problems faced by the continent.

Presently the following are the main problems faced by the African countries as a whole:

-Economic and social problems of Africa were underlined within the context of the characteristics of the continent. In addition to these, or in other terms to the problems related to under-development, hunger and poverty, it is possible to enumerate other huge problems such as ethnic conflicts, civil wars, genocidal acts, migratory movements and refugees, experienced as a result of all these issues.

-Illegal migration, human trafficking (illegal or legal migratory movements are from Black Africa and Arab Africa towards Western Europe through Mediterranean basin.

-Drug trafficking from Africa to Europe.

-Terrorism: It is observed that terrorist acts attained significant dimensions in some African countries for various reasons. Some of them are related to domestic economic or social problems of the countries involved. Some of them, however, are connected to international terrorism. Terrorist attacks against the US Embassies in Kenya and in Tanzania which caused many human losses are in the memories. It is also alleged that Sudan supported terrorism some times in view of its relations with Al Qaeda. For that reason US military aircraft bombed in 1998 Al Shifa pharmaceutical factory at the outskirts of Sudan's capital Khartoum on the grounds that there were intelligence reports indicating the production of chemical weapons. Nevertheless, in the aftermath of the US air attacks, a report by the United Nations prepared following the necessary investigation said that it was not substantiated any production of chemical weapons at al Shifa factory. Interestingly, Sudan has pursued later a policy demonstrating that it has nothing to do with terrorism.

It has also been noted that terrorist acts in Africa are also linked to fundamentalist Islamic terrorism. In particular, Boko Haram in Northern Nigeria, Al Shabaab in Somalia and rebellion in Mali are mentioned within this context. As a matter of fact some linkages have been determined as far as financial resources are concerned.

-Illegal arms trade and its connection with drug trafficking and terrorism.

-Economic and social problems caused by the process of globalization: it is often emphasized that these problems adversely affect particularly African countries marginalizing Africa and create obstacles for the African continent to take benefit of positive effects of the globalization.

-Inadequacy of democracy, corruption, bad governance and human rights problems: It is admitted that totalitarian and dictatorial regimes have been harmful for Africa. This fact was a handicap for economic, political and social development.

-High birth rate, in other terms population explosion is actually a serious problem.

-Environmental issues, droughts experienced from time to time and health problems have been destructive causing human losses in some regions, especially in East Africa.

All these problems contribute to international and regional instability and threaten global peace.

At this point there is a need to underline the importance of Africa.⁷³

All the problems mentioned above are in fact serious problems faced by the humanity as a whole causing globally adverse effects. It is for this reason that efforts to find remedies to Africa's problems are of utmost importance. International community can not remain indifferent in the face of these problems. On the other hand, it is possible to say that industrialized countries can not stay safely in their ivory towers, since terrorism, migratory movements, all kinds of smuggling (human trafficking and drug trade) constitute threats directed against them.

As underlined before rich natural resources of Africa reveal its great potential. As a matter of fact, the partition of Africa was the end-result of the industrial revolution and transition to imperialism due to the needs of new markets and raw materials.

We can observe that Africa is also important from the strategic point. In North Africa is surrounded by the Mediterranean Sea and partly it is in the Mediterranean basin. In the East, because of the Indian Ocean, it has

⁷³ Numan Hazar, Why Africa is Important? Foreign Policy (Dış Politika), Volume XXXIX, No 1-2, 2013, Ankara, pp.49-60.

interactions with Arabian peninsula, India, Asian continent and Indian Ocean islands. It is at a significant juncture of the sea routes due to Suez Canal, Bab el Mandeb Strait, Aden and Persian Gulf. In the West it is a continent on the Atlantic coast.

As is known, biggest maritime power of the past, Great Britain took the control of Gibraltar in North Western Africa, in North East Egypt and Suez canal, in farther South Aden and Somaliland, in South Africa the Cape of Great Hope. British Empire was successful to keep France away from Egypt. Indeed France had historically an eye on Egypt. As compensation, France acquired Madagascar, world's fourth largest island (and as large as France itself) with the acquiescence of Britain, since Madagascar could not threaten the security of sea ways to India. This policy of British Empire demonstrates how conscious was the British from the point of strategic importance of Africa.

Undoubtedly, Africa has particular importance due to its location as a continent. As we know, eminent British strategist Sir Halford MacKinder indicated that Eastern Europe and Inner Asia which he called as Eurasian Heartland, was an important strategic center to dominate the World. It is very interesting to note Africa's location within this context. Again in the terminology of MacKinder, Africa is part of the World Island together with Europe and Asia. Interestingly, MacKinder was also defending colonialism in Asia and In Africa as well. He said "Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland; Who rules the Heartland commands the World Island; Who rules the World Island commands the World."

Rich natural resources of Africa, in particular oil, natural gas, copper, gold, uranium, created an international environment of competition. In this connection, it should be indicated that Africa's oil exports towards the US and Europe are noteworthy. On the other hand it is observed that one third of China's oil needs is provided from Africa. This is the reason why China has significant investments for oil researches in African countries including offshore oil explorations.

Africa's 54 independent countries as member states of the United Nations make the continent very attractive for countries which need political support of friends at the voting in the UN system. In the Cold War era efforts spent by the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China (Taiwan) to get

African support, constitute a striking example of such a policy. In the past, early sixties and seventies Turkey also sent special emissaries or delegations to African countries to explain Turkish views on the Cyprus question when it faced difficulties at the United Nations over the Cyprus issue.

The United States created in 2008 United Africa Command (AFRICOM) taking into account threats originating from terrorism as well as the richness of Africa in strategic resources such as oil. AFRICOM is based in Stuttgart, Germany. AFRICOM's main goals are as follows: Combatting terrorism, protection of natural resources, controlling armed conflicts and the prevention of serious humanitarian problems. It could also be added that it is also aimed at controlling Chinese influence in the continent. In 2007, the White House announced, "AFRICOM will strengthen our security cooperation with Africa and create new opportunities to bolster the capabilities of our partners in Africa. Africa Command will enhance our efforts to bring peace and security to the people of Africa and promote our common goals of development, health, education, democracy, and economic growth in Africa."

US has also military bases in Djibouti and Ethiopia.

When we take a glance specifically at the Somalia, it would be possible to observe that characteristics and problems of African continent exist also in certain way in Somalia. Nevertheless, Somalia has its own peculiar characteristics.

Before a comparative study of Africa and Somalia from different angles, it would be useful to take a look at the history.

Somalia is located at a region which was influenced from old ages of history by different civilizations. It has Moslem and Semite population.

Although Somalians speak as a whole Somali language, the country has a structure based on tribes and clans.

Somalia's relations with Turks go back to the times of the Ottoman Empire. Mameluks ruling in Egypt were not able to prevent the penetration of the Portuguese who sailed around the Cape of the Great Hope and extended their influence as far as Asia. At a later stage the Ottoman Empire took the role of Mameluks after the conquest of Egypt and organized various maritime campaigns towards India in order to protect local Moslem

populations against Portugal. The Ottoman Empire could not prevent the infiltration of the Portuguese into Asian continent, it thwarted, however, wide extension of Portuguese colonialism in East Africa as well as in Asia close to Moslems' sacred places in Arabian peninsula. The reason of failure of the Ottoman Empire to prevent Portuguese imperialism was due to the fact that Ottoman warships were made according to the Mediterranean conditions and on the other hand Portuguese owned ocean resisting big vessels representing a new technological superiority. The Portuguese settled down in South East Africa's coastal areas. The Ottoman Empire created in 1555 in this region the Province of Abyssinia which comprised coastal areas of the present day Sudan on the Red Sea, Somalia, Djibouti, Eritrea and Harar region of Ethiopia.

The Ottoman sovereignty continued legally until the beginning of the XXth Century. Nevertheless, at the end of XIXth Century the Ottoman Empire did not have actually any influence or power at this region because of the expanded European colonialism.

When my book on "Turkish-African Relations" was published in 2003 former Minister of State, Minister of Education, Youth and Sports as well as Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs and a friend of mine Hasan Celal Güzel said in the Foreword of the book the following:

" You can find the traces of Turks even in remote parts of Africa. There are pieces of arts built by Turks everywhere: Shitta Bey Mosque in Nigeria (First Mosque in Lagos) and Ulu Cami (Great Mosque) in Somalia. When I was acting Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1987 I accompanied the President of the Republic of Somalia during his state visit to Turkey. He had told to me that all the infrastructure of Somalia was built in XVIth Century by Turkish mariners including highways and system of sewages. At that time I was ashamed to ignore all these. "

The construction of the Suez Canal, and the concern of the British Empire to ensure the security of the sea ways going to India and to dominate the regions involved, affected the destiny of Somalia. Great Britain eliminated Ottoman Empire from Egypt at a time when the Ottomans were powerless and the British settled down in Egypt. On the other hand, as mentioned before the French were also ousted from Egypt. Turkey, at a later stage, had

forgone of its rights in Egypt as well as in the Sudan by virtue of the Article 17 of the Lausanne Peace Treaty of 1923 which stipulated the following:

“ The renunciation by Turkey of all rights and titles over Egypt and over the Soudan will take effect as from the 5th November, 1914.”

When Great Britain had influence in Egypt, it occupied the Harar region of Ethiopia in 1865 and also admitted in 1877 the Egyptian sovereignty over territories of Somalia on the condition that Somalia's belonging to the Ottoman Empire be recognized. Nevertheless, British Empire started to settle in 1880's in the Sudan, in Somalia and coastal areas of the Red Sea following the removal of the Khedive Ismail Pacha of Egypt from his office.

In the meantime, the Ottoman Empire continued to claim its rights during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Abdulhamid II, over the territories occupied by foreign powers taking benefit of Egypt's weakness. The Ottoman Empire was also successful to reestablish in 1884 its administration in the area between Massawa (Republic of Eritrea) and Zeyla. Nevertheless, Italy which was, at that time, in search of colonies settled down in 1885 in Massawa and the Red Sea's coastal areas of Somalia in 1886. First, not openly declared Egyptian-Italian joint administration was established, but at a later stage Italy declared the creation of a Somalian Protectorate in the region including some coastal parts of Ethiopia.

France also took the possession of Somalia's coastal areas called French Somalia. This region was called the French Territory of “The Afars and the Issas” with the names of tribes living there. It became a French colony. This colony declared its independence following a referendum in 1977 and took the name of the Republic of Djibouti.

Thus British territory in Somalia which was called Somaliland, united with the Italian Somalia in 1960 and became an independent state as the Republic of Somalia. On the other hand Ethiopia took the possession of Eritrea. Nevertheless, following a civil war Republic of Eritrea became an independent state in 1993 and ceased to become a part of Ethiopia.

As it will be seen in the light of foregoing information, Somalia was partitioned and it was not given an opportunity to experience a nation-building process. In this respect, there is, at the source of present problems, to a large extent, the process of colonialism. With such a posture, it was not possible for Somalia to experience an evolution by pursuing economic, social

and political developments in the World. Thus, Somalia, like other African countries had a bad colonial experience.

At this point we should keep in mind the fact that at the beginning of the 20th Century there were only three independent countries in Africa: Liberia, Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and South Africa).

Although we did not make a specific reference to Somalia, when it was emphasized the strategic importance of the African continent, obviously there is a particular strategic value of Somalia. As a matter of fact, it did not escape the attention that Somalia was located in a dominant situation at the exit of the sea lane from the Suez Canal to the Red Sea on the way to Indian Subcontinent. British control of Somaliland together with Egypt is a clear indication of Somalia's particular strategic value.

As is known Somalia is different from other African countries which faced civil wars because of their religious, linguistic and ethnic diversity of their social structure. The main problem in Somalia, however, was the result of the conflict of interests among various tribes and clans. Serious problems faced by Somalia are as follows: failure in the completion of nation-state building like other African countries, hunger, poverty, internal hostilities underdevelopment in economic and democratic terms, terrorism (El Shabaab and El Qaeda), Islamic fundamentalism, human trafficking, environmental issues (drought and the dumping of toxic waste in Somali waters by foreign vessels).⁷⁴

As different from other African countries it is observed that the whole state structure collapsed in 1991. In the aftermath of a coup d'état engineered against the dictator Muhammad Siad Barre a civil war began. Despite the efforts spent by the international community and UN peace keeping operations it was not possible to prevent violence and terrorism and establish public order. In 1992, UN Peace Keeping Force UNISOM- I, was sent to Somalia, later it continued as UN-USA joint operation under the name of UNITAF. On the demand of the UN, Turkey also took part in UNITAF and the Turkish Government decided to put at the UN disposal a mechanized detachment as Turkish contingent. The Turkish contingent arrived at Somalia

⁷⁴ Mehmet Özkan, *Turkey's Involvement in Somalia, Assessment of a State-Building in Progress*, SETA (Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research), Ankara, 2014, pp.24-25.

on 15 January 1993. At a later stage a Turkish general (Çevik Bir) was appointed as the commander of UNISOM- II set up by the UN. In 1995, UN peace keeping force was withdrawn from Somalia. Despite the fact that the UN was successful, it is observed that leaders in Somalia did not have good success to protect the integrity of their country.

Turkey participated in various peacekeeping operations after the Korean war and it has gained an important experience.

In Somalia which was deprived of any state authority, there was a total anarchy as a result of internal hostilities, terrorist attacks and especially acts of El Shabaab terrorist organization. At the end, efforts spent for a settlement led to the formation of a provisional administration. In 2000 a provisional federal government was formed. Nevertheless terrorist attacks and civil war continued.

It is known that Somalia has remained in the area of influence of international terrorism. As a matter of fact, following the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, plenty of mujahedin took part in Islamic terrorist activities from 1992 on in Algeria, Yemen, Chechenia and some other Moslem countries including Somalia. Osama bin Ladin who fought against the Soviet occupation armies together with Afghan mujahedin played an important role in terrorist activities in East Africa. Bin Ladin's name had been variously linked to terrorist operations in Egypt, Yemen, Somalia, Saudi Arabia and the US.⁷⁵ This example indicates that international terrorism could be very much influential in the countries such as Afghanistan and Somalia where no strong state authority exists and an anarchic environment prevails. On the other hand these countries could be used as headquarters of international terrorist movements.

In the meantime since 2005, a major security issue occurred off the Somalia's coastline caused by piracy threatening the safety of international sea ways. The necessity was felt to take international measures in order to prevent terrorist attacks and acts of kidnapping directed against commercial vessels.

In this context, Turkey has taken an active role in combatting piracy in the Gulf of Aden. Upon the continuation of the threats on this international

⁷⁵ Michael Griffin, *Reaping the Whirlwind, The Taliban Movement in Afghanistan*, Pluto Press, London, Sterling/Virginia, 2001, pp.133-140.

seaway which is very much important for world trade, a Combined Task Force was formed by the UN Security Council. Turkey contributed to this international force in 2009 and Turkish Giresun and Gediz frigates each was sent for four month mission to serve in the sea off the coast of Somalia. According to the authorization of the Turkish Parliament Turkish armed forces would not engage in ground operations against piracy and armed robbery. Instead it would provide protection to Turkish merchant and military ships within its task areas. In 2010 Gemlik and Gelibolu frigates participated in the task force.⁷⁶

In 2009 one of the leaders of the Somalian Government Sharif Sheikh Ahmed was elected as President of the Republic. He took initiatives for the settlement of the Somalian situation. First and Second Istanbul Conferences where Turkey had a leading role as well as London Conference and activities of Somalia Contact Group could be cited among international efforts. On the other hand Turkey took some initiatives to ensure contacts between Somalia and Somaliland.

In the light of the foregoing information, difficulties of Somalia to realize its nation-state could be clearly seen. At the end, Somalia is characterized as a failed state.

It would be interesting to resort to a comparison taking into consideration two examples which have general and superficial similarities with Somalia. The first of this examples is Afghanistan. Afghanistan also was categorized among failed states. Nevertheless, Afghanistan, like Somalia, has a significant geostrategic value. Due to its peculiar location, Afghanistan has been able to survive as an independent state, thus becoming a buffer zone between the Russian and British Empires. Foreign intervention (latest the Soviet military action) continued in Afghanistan until recently and Afghanistan turned out to become the hub of drug trafficking as well as international terrorism. Diversity of ethnic structure and conflicts among different tribes have played a significant role over the destiny of the country. Like in Somalia, international community had to intervene also in Afghanistan for state building. In both countries many important strides have been up to now realized.

⁷⁶ Mehmet Özkan, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.

In this context, it would be interesting to touch upon another country which may have some similarities with two other cases. This country is Switzerland. Ethnic diversity, geopolitical location as well as topographic peculiarities of Switzerland have similarities with those of Afghanistan. Switzerland remained in the middle of French, German and Italian zones of influence in a strategically important region of Europe. Its difference from Afghanistan was the continued cultural influence over ethnic groups in the country from neighboring countries such as France, Germany and Italy. In other terms, as different from Switzerland, Afghanistan has no neighboring states which had completed their nation-states with similar ethnic identity in Afghanistan's population. Nevertheless, Afghanistan did not become a Switzerland. On the other hand, Switzerland was able to unite all ethnic groups in a Swiss consciousness and prevented conflicts of interests among themselves, thus preventing external interventions in their internal affairs. At the end, Switzerland was successful to protect its own interests with Swiss identity and attained a high level of prosperity.

Profound differences or striking similarities of Afghanistan, Somalia and Switzerland could undoubtedly be an interesting comparative case study. Naturally it would be possible to explain reasons of this development, with the evolution of Switzerland in a different geographical, philosophical and political environment within the historical context. Switzerland experienced Renaissance and Reformation movements as well as Enlightenment in Europe, taking benefit of all these and also contributing to them on its own part.

Provocations of imperialist powers and their contributions to the present disorder in Somalia, internal divisions as well as the fact that Somalia did not experience the process of enlightenment led to the well-known actual developments.

In 1998 Turkey adopted, for strategic reasons, a policy of outreach to Africa and implemented this policy. As a result of this, it has been observed concrete developments in every area of Turkish-African relations: Bilateral

political, economic and trade relations, air links, technical assistance programs etc.⁷⁷

A host of assessments were made outside Turkey regarding the Turkish policy of outreach to Africa. Since those assessments do not remain within the scope of our study, we will not touch upon details of such assessments. Nevertheless, it should be admitted that Turkey's policy of outreach to Africa has been a strategic success story for the Turkish Foreign Policy.⁷⁸

Turkey reserved a special place to Somalia in its African policy. In particular, upon the indifferent posture of the international community regarding Somalia's serious problems such as poverty, internal hostilities, drought, and bad governance, Turkey adopted for Somalia very comprehensive humanitarian assistance as well as technical assistance programs. In 2011, the then Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan paid a visit to Somalia with a very large delegation consisting of technicians and high officials carrying out on the spot studies. Thus first steps to an intensified Turkish assistance to Somalia started. Prime Minister Erdoğan, with his initiative, made an appeal to the international community and international organizations. Specifically he wanted to draw the attention of the United Nations on the situation in Somalia. Turkey's efforts instigated, in a certain way, the international community. After his visit to Somalia, Prime Minister Erdoğan, addressed also the UN General Assembly and called for humanitarian assistance to Somalia as well as assistance for state-building.⁷⁹

As we know Turkish International Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA) is carrying out humanitarian, technical and development assistance programs in Somalia.

⁷⁷ Numan Hazar, Turkey in Africa: The Implementation of the Action Plan and an Evaluation after Fifteen Years, Center for Middle Eastern Strategic Studies (ORSAM), Report No.124, July 2012 (A Trilingual Report in French –original-,English and Turkish).

⁷⁸ Numan Hazar. Turkey's Policy of Outreach to Africa, An Assessment, Journal of Business, Economics and Political Science (JOBEPS), Volume 4,Number 7, April 2015, Turgut Özal University ,Ankara 2015,pp 3-11

⁷⁹ Sevim Varlıklar, Turkish Development Aid to Somalia: The Humanitarian Showcase of a Middle Power, University of Wrocław, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of International Studies, Wrocław 2013,pp.59-60.

As far as international repercussions of Turkey's policy of assistance to Somalia are concerned, there are also some assessments to the effect that Turkey would create high expectations in Somalia and Somali politicians would exploit Turkey's support.⁸⁰

On the other hand, it is indicated that Turkish initiative in Somalia resulted in a significant gain for Turkey's visibility and it was very efficient on Somali people. This state of affairs was beneficial for Turkey, Nevertheless, it is said, there are great risks for creating deceptions due to high expectations. On the other hand, it is criticised that Turkey resorted alone to a commitment in Somalia without any coordination with France or the United States, countries both present in Somalia. ⁸¹

In conclusion, it is very natural that Turkey shows a keen interest in Somalia and spends efforts to help solving Somalia's problems within the context of its African policy, taking into account its historical and cultural ties with this country.

In view of the Turkish policy of outreach to Africa it can also be said that Turkey's approach to Somalia has been significant and successful. There is

⁸⁰ Sevim Varlıklar, Turkish Development Aid to Somalia: The Humanitarian Showcase of a Middle Power, University of Wrocław, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of International Studies, Wrocław 2013, pp.69-70.

⁸¹ Gabrielle Angey, La recomposition de la politique étrangère turque en Afrique subsaharienne, Entre diplomatie publique et acteurs privés, Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI), Notes de l'IFRI, Mars 2014, Paris, pp.30-31.

no doubt, such an approach will contribute to the regional and international peace and stability.

