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Alliance formation and cohesion have been a crucial factor shaping roughly all agendas in international relations with the growing effect of interdependency. By understanding the importance of alliances in world politics, one can see that alliances can promote peace and eliminate the tension and insecure environment of international relations. In this respect, this thesis focuses on the peace-promoting role of alliances rather than their war-promoting one. The Turkey-NATO alliance underlines this situation very well, starting with the Cold War. Accordingly, this thesis presents the alliance formation and cohesion behaviors of Turkey by looking at the Cold War and post-Cold War periods and attempts to discover how Turkey provides stability in the Middle East. In this respect, different alliance theories explain Turkey’s alliance behavior in different time periods.

Turkey’s alliance behavior in contemporary history shows that it resolves conflicts and promotes stability through institutional cooperation with the Middle East while maintaining a military alliance with the West. Its western characteristics as a secular state with a western democracy and the only Muslim country in NATO make Turkey the only bridge between the West and the Middle East. In this respect, it will be argued that since interconnectedness increases by globalization, Turkey has been experiencing a high level of sphere of influence because of its historical, religious and
ethnic ties and its geopolitical importance. Studying Turkey’s alliance behavior and its close historical and cultural ties with the Middle Eastern states not only questions Huntington’s clash of civilization theory but also promises to increase cooperation between the West and Islamic countries. Alliances, therefore, should be formed and operated as “proponents of peace” rather than “weapons of war”.
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INTRODUCTION

Alliance formation is a crucial factor that shapes almost all structures of international relations. Since this thesis aims at investigating security, I will mainly focus on military alliances which can be defined simply “as a formal or informal relationship of security cooperation between two or more sovereign states” (Walt S. M., 1987, p. 1). Turkey, because of its history, geopolitics and cultural ties, has formed different alliances in different periods of time, which have served a number of purposes for the country. For instance, during the Cold War era, Turkey was able to mitigate the Soviet threat by allying with the West. After the Cold War, Turkey improved its relations with its neighboring countries, each of which has different threat perceptions and different alliance behaviors. Accordingly, the ongoing conflict along with the western interest in the Middle East promotes the necessity of regional cooperation in which Turkey can play an important role. Turkey has a common history and shares the same religion as the Muslim countries in the Middle East. In addition, its western characteristics as a secular state with a western democracy and being the only Muslim country in NATO make Turkey the only bridge between the West and the Middle East.

In this sense, Samuel P. Huntington’s (1993) theory, the Clash of Civilization, seems oversimplified. In his famous book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Huntington states that the main source of conflict in the 21st Century will be based on cultural conflicts rather than ideological or economical reasons. The conflict

---

of civilizations will be the final phase in modern times. He implies that the major conflicts among the civilizations began with nationalism and then turned to an ideological phase. With the end of the Cold War, ideological conflicts also disappeared so that now only the clash of civilizations remains, particularly between the West and the Islamic countries. However, Huntington’s theory ignores the importance of alliance dynamics as a stability and security provider. Studying Turkey’s alliance formation behavior and its close historical and cultural ties with the Middle Eastern states not only questions Huntington’s theory but also promises to increase cooperation between the West and Islamic countries.

The primary aim of this thesis is to investigate Turkish alliance behaviors by looking at bipolar Cold War politics and multipolar post-Cold War politics. In chapter one, the geopolitics and modernization of Turkey will be presented. In chapter two, I will cover the literature, specifically realist theories and institutionalist theories in alliance formation and alliance cohesion. In chapter three, I will analyze Turkey’s alliance behavior during the Cold War and post-Cold War period. In chapter four, I will present the divergences and possible limitations of the alliance cohesion of Turkey. In chapter five, I will apply realist and institutionalist approaches of alliance theory, along with Patricia Weitsman’s alliance theory, to Turkey’s alliance behavior. While doing so, I will argue that realist alliance theory properly explains Turkish alliance behavior during the Cold War period. I will show that the different levels of internal and external threats reveal the behavior of states and alliances. On the other hand, institutionalist theory efficiently explains the post-Cold War alliance behaviors of Turkey since the levels of internal and external threats are low. It will be argued that since interconnectedness
increases by globalization, Turkey has been experiencing a high level of sphere of influence because of its historical, religious and ethnic ties and its geopolitical importance. Therefore, Turkey’s alliance behavior is related to a number of different concerns and strategies. Accordingly, the context, level of threat, institutional cooperation and polarity in the international system influence the choices of forming and joining alliances. In addition, alliance cohesion is affected by transnational institutions which are becoming more influential by the growing interconnectedness in international relations. By understanding the importance of alliances in world politics, one can see that alliances can promote peace and eliminate the tension and insecure environment of international relations. Accordingly, this thesis focuses on the peace-promoting role of alliances rather than their war-promoting one. In this respect, Turkey’s alliance behavior in contemporary history shows that it is balancing against threats through cooperation with the Middle East while maintaining alliances with the West.
CHAPTER 1: THE TURKISH MODERNIZATION AND TURKEY’S GEOPOLITICS

1.1: The Turkish Modernization Process

In order to understand Turkish alliance formation behavior, it is necessary to begin with the process of modernizing Turkey. Turkey experienced a quite different path in the modernization process than did other Muslim countries. From the early years of decline onwards, the Ottoman Empire began to imitate Europe in socio-cultural, political and military spheres. These reforms reached a peak when the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923 by abolishing the Sultanate and replacing it with a western state regime. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder of the new Turkish state and forefather of the Turkish revolution, had always emphasized policies toward the West, since Turkish modernization was highly influenced by European countries. Turkish elites perceived the West as the source of “enlightenment and modernization, and the key driving principles for a future Turkish state” (Fuller, 1999, p.161). In this sense, such western institutions as nationalism and secularism were imported to the new Turkish state structure.

Kemalism\(^2\), which insisted upon western policies and was inspired by European modernization, became the primary principle for Turkish foreign and domestic policies. In order to create a modern national state, secularism, as an important dimension of Kemalism, removed every Islamic institution which had been intertwined into the

---

\(^2\) Kemalism is the principle that represents the characteristics of the Turkish Republic and Turkish reforms. The word originated from Mustafa Kemal Ataturk’s name and emphasizes the importance of modernization.
Ottoman state structure. In this sense, the abolition of the Caliphate\(^3\), replacing the *sharia* (Islamic) laws with European legal codes and the abolition of the Sultanate were important secular movements in the modernization process. Therefore, laicism\(^4\), the separation of the involvement of religious affairs from state affairs, became the primary principle for the new Turkish state. Although this transition from empire to democracy was so sharp it abolished every institutional inheritance of the Ottoman Empire, it could not abolish social and cultural aspects which were enmeshed in Turkish state traditions, so Turkey preserved its eastern-oriented core.

When the Ottoman Empire’s power started to wane in the 18\(^{th}\) Century and continued to decline into the 19\(^{th}\) Century with the effect of nationalism, two main approaches were applied to prevent the Ottoman’s dissolution. First, pan-Islamism aimed at unifying all Muslims under the same umbrella using the institution of the Caliphate, but it was not successful enough to stand against nationalist movements in the Ottoman Empire. Starting in the Balkans, many nations declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire. Second, pan-Turkism was introduced after pan-Islamism’s failure. It anticipated unification of Turks and Turkic people sweeping from Eastern Europe to Western China. However, this also failed since it required tremendous effort and mass involvement to accomplish.

\(^3\) The rulership of Islam, and representing the religious leader of a Muslim state. In the Ottoman Empire, the Caliphate was so powerful it affected all Muslims not only within the Empire’s boundaries but also outside them.

\(^4\) Laicism, from the French word *laïcité*, basically means the separation of religion and religious institutions from involvement in state affairs and vice versa. Laicism in Turkey “evolved at the expense of the autonomous development of religious identities and by making religion subservient to the nation-state after the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in 1923” (Kadioğlu, 2010, p. 490)
The modernization attempts in the late Ottoman period were carried out by the Ottoman intelligentsia holding dominantly western views, which were shared by the founders of the Turkish Republic. Consequently, the transition from empire to democracy was achieved by the elites, not by civil society, so the Turkish revolution was a revolution from above. Accordingly, the modernization period in the late Ottoman Empire also brought westernization into Turkish politics.

Westernization separated Turkey from its Middle Eastern neighbors because it implied secularization and thus weakened the common link of Islam, because Turkish westernization antedated similar movements among Muslim Arabs, introducing an element of temporal separation, and finally because, even where the paths of westernizing Turks and westernizing Arabs ran parallel, they did not cross. (Mango, 1968, p. 229)

While the Turkish intelligentsia was becoming modernized, they were also westernized, creating an ideological gap between them and society. They thought Islam was an obstacle to modernization and the fall of Islam in the unification of Ottoman Empire further contributed to their ideologies. In this respect, “from the early part of the nineteenth century to the present, the intelligentsia in question equated Islam with irrationality; they thought that Islam had fallen out of phase with life and could not be adapted to modern circumstances” (Heper, 2000, p.636). As a consequence, the transition from one political system to the other also meant political instability (Schmitter, 1991). Accordingly, Turkey experienced harsh changes in the modernization process and took some time to consolidate democracy and western institutions within the state structure, because Turkish identity changed slowly over time.

Turkey, which combined eastern-oriented social composition with western-oriented state structure, has been the best model for other Middle Eastern countries. The western countries are aware of this key characteristic of Turkey and appreciate Turkish
mediation and its existence in the reconciliation of the Middle East and Central Asia. In this respect, “the European states obviously prefer the influence of a market-oriented, secular Turkey in Central Asia rather than an Islamist Iranian or a too-dominant Russian presence” (Tunander, 1995, p. 418). Additionally, the USA perceived Turkey from its early foundation as the key of the Middle East. When President Obama first visited Turkey, he said, “Turkey's greatness lies in your ability to be at the center of things. This is not where East and West divide -- it is where they come together, in the beauty of your culture, in the richness of your history and in the strength of your democracy” (Olopade, 2009).

1.2: Geopolitics of Turkey

Turkey’s geopolitics is also an important factor shaping the country’s alliance behavior. There is no consensus on Turkey’s identity and position, given its location at the crossroads of the Middle East and the West. Some scholars see Turkey as a part of the Middle East; some see it as an Asian country; others argue it is a European or Eurasian country (Fig. 1.1). However, “Turkey has multiple regional identities that cannot be reduced to one unified character or a single region, necessitating it to extend its influence simultaneously to Europe, the Middle East, the Balkans, the Black Sea, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Caspian, and the Mediterranean” (Onis & Yilmaz, 2009, p. 8). In one way or another, geographically located in a highly strategic region, Turkey has always been taken into consideration in the foreign policies not only of neighboring states, but also of more distant states whose interests involve this region.
In this sense, Brzezinski (1997) identifies Eurasia as a “Grand Chessboard”.

Accordingly, Central Asia, the USA, Europe, the Middle East and Russia are examples of this interdependency. “A country's size, location vis-à-vis potential allies, and borders
attribute matter for alliance formation and for the distribution of gains if an alliance were to form” (Sandler, 1999, p. 746). No state or alliance could have achieved its goals or been powerful enough to consolidate its power in the Middle East without Turkey’s attachment. “The West expected to use Turkey as a relay station to transfer these acquired western values and modes of life to the newly emerging cluster of Islamic countries in the former USSR” (Karpat, 1996, p. 2). Thus, Turkey’s geopolitics has always been an important factor that affects Turkish foreign policy, which is why it is necessary to speak of Turkish geopolitics and its consequences.

One important dimension of Turkey’s geopolitics is the heritage left over from the Ottoman Empire. Since the borders of that empire spanned three continents-- Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and North Africa (Fig. 2) -- Turkey has highly developed connections among the Turkic communities, Turkic states and Muslim states of the former Ottoman territories. “As the Ottoman Empire shrank in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, Turkey had been a safe haven for Turks and other Muslim peoples who migrated to the motherland in waves” (Kut, 2001, p. 6). These remaining ties with the former Ottoman territories put more importance on Turkish geopolitics as well. For instance, after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the Turkish sphere of influence spread from Central Asia through Transcaucasia and, to some extent, the Balkans and Black Sea region (Tunander, 2010). Since Soviet control has disappeared, Turkish-speaking people in these regions began to have closer relations with Turkey by evoking their common history and language. This became an important factor for Turkey’s alliance formation and institutional cooperation, since over 150 million people in Turkic states and communities from Germany to China became more or less connected to Turkey
(Tunander). However, in the short run, Central Asian dependence on Russia became more dominant than Turkey’s ties with this region because of Russia’s remaining influence (Tunander).

Figure 2: The Ottoman Empire from 1481-1683

http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/historical/history_middle_east.html

During the Cold War, Turkey’s geographical proximity formulated its foreign policy choice since the Soviet revisionist policies threatened the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Turkey. In addition, Turkey’s geopolitical location was deadly important for the Soviets, in order to consolidate its power in the Middle East and Eastern
Europe. In this respect, Turkey chose to ally with NATO by balancing the Soviet threat and guaranteed its entity. Turkey experienced a greater amount of external threat than any other NATO members, because of being the immediate neighbor of the Soviets. For instance, when the Jupiter missiles installed in Turkey during the Cuban missile crisis, a third World War was the doorstep of Turkey. Turkey’s membership in NATO provided a great asset to blockading Soviet expansion. Further, the influence of the enemy was eliminated in the Middle East by Turkey’s geopolitical importance.

The importance of Turkey’s geopolitics augmented its institutional cooperation in the region and Turkey became a crossroad for the transnational institutions connecting Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East. This can be inferred from Turkey’s function in the energy supplies of Europe, since Europe gets the largest percent of its energy from the Middle East and Caspian oil and natural gas reserves. The proximity of Turkey’s geographical position to energy hubs is the first factor that defines its involvement with a number of institutions. After the collapse of the Soviets, this became more and more important. Since the external threat, the Soviets, was eliminated, tension in the region disappeared which created a new phase underlining the necessity of cooperation. In this respect, the second factor that increased the importance of Turkey’s geopolitics was its historical, cultural and religious ties with the Middle East and Western Asia where the majority of world energy resources are located. Additionally, after the Cold War, Turkey’s geopolitical importance also contributed to the reconciliation of the Middle East, such as the second Gulf War. These key dimensions of Turkey’s geopolitics both enabled and required Turkey to establish or to be a crossroad in a number of institutions.
Overall, Turkish foreign policy has started to be more inclusive in recent years, as if trying to increase its power to former Ottoman Empire territories. Turkey has been trying to increase its sphere of influence by developing economic agreements, cultural and intellectual exchanges and the like. One example can be seen in Turkey’s having signed an agreement with Azerbaijan for an oil pipeline to carry Caspian oil and gas to Europe through Turkey. Additionally, Turkey has started to develop closer relations with the Middle Eastern countries in the post-Cold War period.
CHAPTER 2: ALLIANCE THEORY

There are a number of alliance theories and each has a different perspective for how alliances are formed and what defines alliance behavior. This chapter will investigate the alliance literature: how alliances are formed and, once they are formed, how alliance cohesion is shaped under different contextual conditions. Since the alliance literature is very rich, I will try to focus on the theories that explain the Turkish alliance formation and dynamics. I will begin by covering alliance formation theories, specifically the realist, liberalist and rationalist alliance theories. Secondly, I will continue describing and clarifying alliance cohesion. Thirdly, I will investigate institutionalist theories and, finally, I will investigate Patricia Weitsman’s comprehensive theory of alliances.

2.1: Understanding the Importance of Alliances and Their Formation

Alliances have always been a crucial factor determining state behaviors in war and peace time, because states enter into alliances for certain reasons and are expected to behave in a defined manner. In this sense, alliances can shape international structures and policies and it is impossible to speak of international relations without referring to alliances (Liska, 1968). Correspondingly, the role of alliances in international politics increased drastically, since cooperation and interdependence increased with globalization in a multipolar world. For instance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been expanding gradually since the end of the Warsaw Pact (1991) and has contributed to a number of peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. Alliances provide a more stable and secure international environment in most cases of contemporary world politics. In this respect, alliances “do not override or modify anarchy; rather, they are instruments for prosecuting conflicts-in-anarchy, for meeting an external threat more effectively than
could be done by their members individually” (Snyder, 1997, p. 4). Alliances, thus, can reduce tension in the anarchic structure of international systems.

On the other hand, alliances along with such other factors as arms buildup and territorial disputes can promote war, increasing the level of unpredictability, instability, and insecurity in the international system. This situation is described as “alliance paradox” by Weitsman and she states that “the alliance paradox arises from the anarchic environment of international politics and the centrality of perceptions as a consequence” (2004, p. 7). Additionally, international relations can alter alliance behaviors and cohesion through rules, norms, regulations and sanctions. This mutual relationship between alliances and international relations means alliances are not only causes of international relations but also consequences of them. In this sense, alliances produce both stability-instability and security-insecurity of international relations. It should be noted, however, that alliances are not the only cause of change in international relations (Vasquez, 1987).

Several approaches in alliance theory need to be considered in order to understand and investigate alliance behaviors. These approaches include realism, liberalism, rationalism, and ideological and cultural theories (Walt, 2001). Though they help us to understand alliance dynamics, they do not provide a comprehensive theory for examining alliances alone, since each has a different perspective. For instance, in this paper, it will be shown that, in Turkey’s case, the realist theory of alliance efficiently explains wartime alliance behaviors and cohesion by focusing on threat, power and conflicts. Liberalism, on the other hand, explains the alliance formation and cohesion during peacetime by emphasizing more cooperation, similar interests and the like. In this sense, most recently,
Weitsman’s theory of alliances (2004) is a comprehensive theory for explaining alliance behavior by combining the arguments of these different approaches. Institutionalist theory, however, became more influential by explaining the growing influences of institutions in the international system. In this chapter, I will provide a review of the main arguments by different realist and institutionalist approaches as well as by other approaches in the field; I will then review Patricia Weitsman’s theory of alliance formation and cohesion.

Neoliberalism attempts to explain the persistence of alliances, particularly NATO, by using institutional theories that became popular in the post-Cold War era (Walt, 2001). Regime theory was able to explain NATO’s persistence after the Cold War (Weitsman, 2004). The neoliberal approaches explain how the decision-making procedures, capacity and bureaucracy can help clarify the persistence of institutionalized alliances, by using cost-benefit calculations (Walt, 2001). Rationalism, on the other hand, supplements realist ideas. Snyder and Schweller combined rationalist and realist approaches (Weitsman). Walt also explored ideology and cultural solidarity as alternative theories to explain alliance formation and cohesion.

The primary principle of realism is to accept that the international system is anarchic and is a self-help system. In this respect, realism emphasizes “the condition of international anarchy-- a multiplicity of independent sovereign states that acknowledge no political superior, and whose relationships are unlimitedly regulated by warfare” (Welsh, 2007, p. 137). One of the fundamental scholars in realist alliance theory, Kenneth Waltz analyzed alliance by referring to Hans Morgenthau’s theory of realism and he revealed in his balance-of-power theory that states balance against power (Waltz, 1979).
Similarly, the capability aggregation model originates from the balance of power theory and assumes states will aggregate their capabilities by forming alliances to enhance their security against a common threat (Morrow, 1991). In this sense, the main reason states form alliances is to secure themselves. Since the problems and threats in the international system are too highly complicated to face alone, states tend to form alliances to seek security and thus deal with these issues cooperatively. As Weitsman (2004) indicated, states add other powers to their own by making alliances. Accordingly, states are the main actors in balancing; therefore, Waltz further stated, international relations are both anarchic and decentralized. In this sense, the international system is a self-help system, since there is no world police or world government to maintain stability and security. Consequently, Waltz suggested that a security dilemma exists where some states gain relative to other states. This leads us to conclude that international relations, according to the neorealist, is a zero sum game.

Apart from Waltz’s balancing against power assumption, Walt (1985) stated that states balance against threats so power is one, but not the only, reason for balancing. Walt brought the concept of balancing and bandwagoning into alliance literature by stating that “It is more accurate to say that states will ally with or against the most threatening power” (1985, p. 8). Balancing stands for alignment with the weaker side to counter, or protect against, the domination of powerful states (Walt). Another behavior of states is bandwagoning, which means alignment with the most threatening state. Each of these behaviors is defined in terms of capabilities (Walt) and Walt (1987) further stated that these two behaviors describe how states respond to the threats they face. Distribution of capabilities is based on population, economic capacity, military power, resource
endowment, etc. (Waltz, 1979). Balancing behavior is more common than bandwagoning (Walt, 1987).

Randall Schweller (1994), taking a rationalist approach, claimed that states balance against interests. He further claimed that balancing and bandwagoning conceptions are not simply opposites of each other, as many scholars have argued. “The concept of bandwagoning has been defined so narrowly—as giving in to threats—as if it were simply the opposite of balancing” (Schweller, p. 74). There is a need to distinguish between balancing and bandwagoning so Schweller indicated that “the aim of balancing is self-preservation and the protection of values already possessed, while the goal of bandwagoning is usually self-extension: to obtain values coveted. Simply put, balancing is driven by the desire to avoid losses; bandwagoning by the opportunity for gain” (Schweller, p. 75).

Waltz (1979), as a structural realist, further argues that maintaining stability in international relations must be the main concern. Structural realists employ balance of power theory in order to explain stability in the anarchic structure of international relations. In doing so, the concept of polarity becomes the crucial instrument in the explanation of their theoretical framework. Waltz tested the multipolar systems before the two World Wars and the bipolar system of the Cold War, and concluded that multipolar systems are more unstable than bipolar ones. Based on his findings, he concludes, by looking at these dyads, that bipolarity provides stability, whereas multipolarity causes instability (Waltz).

Weitsman focuses on alliance formation and she provides that the balance of power theory is useful to explain alliance formation. “The predominant alliance behavior
that realists describe is that of balancing—against threat or against power” (Weitsman, 2004, p.15). In addition, she emphasizes that bandwagoning states are less likely seen than balancing states and she claims that “bandwagoning is at its core an alternative to capability aggregation” (Weitsman, p.18). In this sense, the level of threat is the main factor that defines states’ behavior whether bandwagoning or balancing (Weitsman). Consequently, Weitsman states, when the levels of threat increase, states prefer bandwagoning rather than additional alliances. She underlines two main reasons behind alliance behavior: “the substantive issues that drive states to ally and the tactical benefits that derive from the alliance” (Weitsman, p. 19). Overall, Weitsman analyzes alliance formations within their context so that she proves alliances are very changeable in their characteristics.

Coalition theories are mainly concerned with the “size principle.” “The basic elements of coalition theory are drawn deductively from the logic of N-person ‘game theory’—usually of the zero sum variety—rather than inductively from historical evidence” (Holsti, Terrence, & Sullivan, 1973, p. 6). Both balance of power theory and coalition theory have common characteristics, such as emphasizing calculation of advantage, adequate information, and rationality in alliance formation (Holsti et al). On the other hand, these two theories differ in some characteristics. For instance, balance of power theory tries to prevent the possible domination of a state, whereas coalition theory is motivated by the single goal of winning or maximizing gains (Holsti et al). However, present international relations show that coalition theories are not applicable to all coalitions, since alliances are generally formed with the aim of defense or deterrence.
rather than gains (Holsti et al). Therefore, these authors are somehow reluctant to bring adequate explanations to alliance formation.

George Liska (1968) heavily emphasized the role of alliances in international relations and he further sees alliances as a dimensional part of the international system. He further stated that alignment “may also express ideological or ethnic affinities” (Liska, p. 27). He also underlined the “opportunistic alignments” which represent that states may choose opportunistic ways when the balance of power starts to fail.

Overall, the realist alliance literature represents different approaches to what defines the balancing behaviors of the state through alliances. Waltz (1979) argued that states balance against power, Walt (1985) argued that threat is the main factor that defines balancing behavior. Schweller (1994), on the other hand, focused on the interests of the states which identify balancing. Weitsman (2004) also focused on balancing against threat and further underlined how different levels of threats respond to different reactions by the states. However, when the threat level is low, realist alliance theory is somehow reluctant to explain alliance behaviors. In this sense, the institutional modification of realism can help us solve the puzzlements in world politics (Keohane, 1984). This makes it easier to understand alliance behaviors when the level of threat is low in the international system.

2.3: Institutionalism and Alliances

Institutionalist theory agrees with realists that the international system is a self-help system and states are the main actors in international relations (Keohane, 1984): this theory also focuses on and emphasizes the role of institutions, such as alliances, that truly affect world politics. Robert O. Keohane (1993), the founder of institutionalism, stated
that *institutionalist theory* has both a realist core and a liberalist one, so it is not just a neoliberal or neorealist theory. Overall, institutionalism contributed to realism by explaining the role of institutions which are the reflection of states in international relations. “Institutions can provide information, reduce transaction costs, make commitments more credible, establish focal points for coordination, and in general facilitate the operation of reciprocity” (Keohane & Martin, 1995, p. 42).

Institutionalism, on the other hand, criticizes *realism*. As Keohane (1984) put it, in *After Hegemony*, realism put too much emphasis on the state of warfare which prevents realists from understanding cooperation in international relations. In this respect, “alliance cooperation would be easy to explain as a result of operation of a balance of power, but system-wide patterns of cooperation that many countries, without being tied to an alliance system directed against an adversary, would not” (Keohane, p. 7). This means that institutions that promote cooperation and make transnational connections became important factors, since interdependence of the states increased by globalization (Keohane, 1984). In this respect, institutions are necessary tools for states, accordingly, “facing dilemmas of coordination and collaboration under conditions of interdependence, governments demand international institutions to enable them to achieve their interests through limited collective action” (Keohane, 1993, p. 274). As can be understood, states which also control international institutions remained the primary actors in international relations.

One key presumption of institutionalism is that “perceptions define interests” (Axelrod & Keohane, 1993). Accordingly, *mutuality of interests* will be understood by how interests determine the process of making preferences. This means that “mutuality of
interests, the shadow of the future, and the number of players help us to understand the success and failure of attempts at cooperation in both military-security and political-economic relations” (Axelrod & Keohane, 1993, p. 86). When a mutual interest is provided through institutions, cooperation will be more stable. Additionally, when the number of players’ interests is well-defined, it will promote the endurance of cooperation. The shadow of the future can be elaborated through institutions which manage states’ future behaviors. In this sense, the fundamental nature of cooperation or conflict among states can be understood properly by looking at these three factors, and cooperation can be trustworthy.

Apart from realist and institutionalist approaches, a new hybrid approach, realist institutionalism, may correspond to the alliance behavior of Turkey. For instance, Ronald R. Krebs, who analyzed Greco-Turkish conflicts during the Cold War, states that realist institutionalism can explain the reason behind this conflict by combining a realist approach with an institutionalist approach.

Unlike structural realists, who believe that institutions matter only at the margins of international relations, I contend that alliances are more than mere means of accumulating power. But unlike neoliberal institutionalists, who portray institutions as mitigating the dangers of anarchy and whose reasoning bolsters the Clinton administration’s optimistic expectations, I doubt that their impact is always beneficial (Krebs, 1999, p. 344).

Having a realist institutionalist approach, Krebs (1999) stated that the conflict between Greece and Turkey has always been there, but it became a serious problem when these countries found the necessary conditions under NATO’s shelter. This means that Turkey and Greece, having eliminated the high level of Soviet threat by joining NATO were able to disagree and they both knew that if their fight grew, NATO could stop the
conflict. In this respect, alliances, under certain conditions, can provoke conflict among members (Krebs).

2.4: Weitsman’s Alliance Theory

Weitsman (2004) combines realist and institutionalist theories in order to explain alliance formation and cohesion. She argues that alliance behavior emerges under different levels of internal and external threats. Her main argument is that a “state behaves differently according to the specific level of threat they experience” (p. 18). She further argues that at a low level of threat, states tend to hedge so that “states desire to consolidate their power and project it further, to the extent that they can do so without being overly provocative to potential rivals” (Weitsman, p. 19). On the other hand, when the threat is moderate and between states, they come together to manage the conflicts. Weitsman called this behavior tethering. She further mentioned that “balancing states are not necessarily facing a threat to their statehood – these are states that can secure themselves by adding power of others to their own” (p. 18). On the other hand, states prefer bandwagoning when facing a very high level of threat. Weitsman mentioned that “when states’ survival is at stake, they will seek to ally with the most threatening state” (p. 30).

Additionally, Weitsman (2004) differentiates the conception of threat into two categories, internal and external. Internal threat is one within an alliance. For instance, an alliance member might have a certain foreign policy that clashes with the alliance collective interest so that alliance cohesion decreases. Another example is an external threat which occurs when the threat comes from outside the alliance. Accordingly, different levels of both internal and external threats alter alliance cohesion and also
define how states follow different patterns in alliance formation. In Table 1.1, Weitsman’s alliance formation theory, a detailed explanation of hedging, balancing, tethering and bandwagoning behaviors of the states under different levels of internal and external threat, is clearly represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Dyadic Alliance Motivations Under Conditions of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State A’s Motives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For simplicity, duplicate outcomes have been dropped (e.g. Balance/Hedge and Hedge/Balance do not both appear). The Tether/Bandwagon combination drops out, since tethering is reciprocal—both sides need to be of the same approximate power level. Bandwagon/Bandwagon drops out, two states will not bandwagon with each other – bandwagoning requires capitulation of one to another. The latter state will therefore have other motives, i.e., hedging or balancing.

Apart from the importance of threats, Weitsman (2004) also states that “while capabilities play an important role in determining what is deemed threatening; the other essential ingredient is intentions” (p. 33). Therefore, state intentions are also an important factor. In this respect, a threatening state, having capability and intentions, can destroy some important interests (Weitsman). This also brings the necessity of perceptions so that states might intend to make other states perceive their certain behaviors as a threat.

Weitsman’s (2004) analysis of the relationship between threats and cohesion is defined in Table 1.2. The level of cohesion changes with the level of internal and external threats. Therefore, when the internal and external threats are low, there is low cohesion. At this level of internal and external threats, states tend to hedge by associating less with alliance. When the external threat is low and internal threat is high, states prefer tethering by which states ally with an adversary to reduce conflicts and manage relations. At a high level of external threat and a low level of internal threat, states prefer balancing against power or threat. Finally, when there are high levels of both internal and external threats, it is difficult to sustain and control alliance behavior so that states can show different alliance behaviors, such as tethering, balancing and bandwagoning.
### Table 1.2: Threats and Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low internal threat</th>
<th>High internal threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low External Threat</strong></td>
<td>Moderate or low cohesion; depends on which (internal or external) threat is higher; usually hedging alliances. In these cases, insights generated from liberalist theory will hold.</td>
<td>Low or no cohesion; tethering alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High External Threat</strong></td>
<td>Moderate to high cohesion; balancing alliances. In these cases, insights from realist theory will hold.</td>
<td>Cohesion difficult though not impossible to attain; depends on which (internal or external) threat is higher. These may be tethering, balancing, or bandwagoning alliances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Overall, Weitsman’s (2004) classification of alliance behaviors under different levels of external and internal threats provides a comprehensive explanation to analyze alliance cohesion. She states that capabilities of states are important factors for analyzing the different levels of threat. Additionally, a state’s perceptions and intentions are also important in defining alliance formation and cohesion.

### 2.5: Alliance Cohesion

The different theoretical perspectives that dominate alliance literature have different definitions of alliance cohesion. Fred Chernoff (1990) argues that alliance cohesion represents the relationship between the interests of the member states and the interests of the alliance and how states manage to deal with these conflicting interests. Liska (1968) argues that common identities are assets in order to have a more cohesive alliance and the reason why alliances break up or are established is about alliance
cohesion and efficacy. Walt (1987) argues that alliance cohesion represents the durability of the alliances. Quoting Midlarsky (1988), Morrow (1991) argues that the alliances which exhibit great differences (asymmetric alliances) in capabilities are more durable or cohesive than the ones with similar capabilities (symmetric alliances) within the alliances. Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan define alliance cohesion as “to agree on goals, strategy, and tactics, and coordinate actively directed toward those ends” (1973, p. 16). Weitsman (2004) uses the same definition of alliance cohesion and she further states that cohesion is not the same as duration. In addition, Weitsman also underlines that efficacy and cohesion may not be separable, as Liska argues.

Although advocates of realist approaches of alliance theory explain the dynamics of alliances and cohesion, especially in a wartime environment, they are reluctant to explain why alliances still exist even after they have achieved their goals. For instance, some scholars, including Kenneth Waltz (1979), predicted erroneously that NATO would dissolve in time, since the Cold War ended. However, NATO has remained even after the collapse of the Soviet bloc. Weitsman (2004) explains the cohesion of NATO by saying “if cohesion were a constant function of external threat alone, we would never expect alliances to be cohesive in the absence of an external threat” (p. 25). In this sense, Weitsman underlines the importance of internal threats in alliance cohesion. Some scholars maintain that the multipolar environment which came out at the end of the Cold War, bipolarity, will bring instability, eventually leading to instability in the international system. Sooner or later, this will result in a non-secure international system. For instance, “If the Cold War is truly behind us, the stability of the past 45 years is not likely to be seen again in the coming decades” (Mearsheimer, 1990, p. 56). Similarly,
although liberalism efficiently explains the mode of alliance dynamics during a peace-time environment when there is low internal and external threat, it is reluctant to explain alliance behavior during wartime.

Alliances can show different levels of cohesion whether or not alliance members agree on mutual goals and move towards them (Weitsman, 2004). In this sense, operation of allies cooperatively toward mutual ends presents a high level of alliance cohesion. Weitsman argues that both external and internal threats are important in explaining alliance cohesion. Similarly, Holsti, Hopmann and Sullivan (1973) underline that when the threat level is high, it is expected that alliances are more cohesive. Weitsman also states that understanding the source of alliance cohesion can help to investigate the operation of peacetime and wartime alliances. During peacetime, states can use promises in their relations with other states, but in wartime, actions are what actually matter (Weitsman). Alliance cohesion is expected to be more firm within a wartime alliance than in a peacetime one, since the level of external threat is high. However, this is somehow complicated since “the symmetry of threats confronting alliance members, the clarity of the threats involved, and the commonality of threats facing the signatories will play an important role in determining wartime alliance cohesion” (Weitsman, p. 31). When one applies the three factors of threat-- symmetry, clarity and commonality-- to wartime and peacetime alliances it will be seen that alliances show different behaviors in these two different contexts. Additionally, the concept of threat is important in analyzing both peacetime and wartime alliance cohesion (Weitsman).

Overall, this chapter investigated alliance formation theories along with alliance cohesion theories. In doing so, light was shed on the importance of alliances in the
international system by emphasizing the importance of alliances as security and stability providers. Threat is accepted in this paper as the main source of alliance formation. Under different levels of internal and external threat alliance behaviors are shaped. Accordingly, alliance cohesion is linked to a number of factors. Classical realists focus on states as the primary actors of the international system. States persistently follow their own interests and augment their power by making alliances. Structural realists, on the other hand, have a system-level approach emphasizing that “‘maintain[ing] the stability of the [international] system. . .’ is the major purpose of the balance” (Waltz, 1979, p. 120). To explain (in)stability in the international system, structural realists use the balance of power theory and examine the variable of polarity. Similarly, institutionalists focus on the system-level pattern of international relations. Weitsman (2004) combines realist, liberal and institutionalist approaches and underlines the levels of internal and external threats which define alliance cohesion. In this respect, she introduces four different alliance behaviors against the level of threat perceived: hedging, tethering, balancing and bandwagoning. In the coming chapter, I apply the alliance theories to my case study in order to investigate Turkey’s alliance behavior.
CHAPTER 3: TURKEY’S ALLIANCE BEHAVIORS

This chapter will analyze alliance behaviors of Turkey starting with the Cold War era and coming to the present time. Turkish alliance formation represents a highly complex and interdependent context which extends beyond the interests of neighboring countries, because of Turkey’s unique characteristics. Since Turkey is a developing country, alliance formation is very important and shapes its foreign policy choices. This research aims to focus mainly on the Middle Eastern conflicts, along with Turkish mediation, but the relations with other neighboring countries also need to be mentioned briefly, since a contextual interpretation of Turkish alliance formation and cohesion can help to better understand Turkish alliance formation and cohesion. I will begin with analyzing the alliance cohesion of Turkey during the Cold War and then I will continue to do so with the post-Cold War era.

In my case study, while analyzing Turkey’s alliance behaviors starting with the Cold War, I form a series of 10-year periods starting from the 1950s and coming through to the present. In each 10-year period, levels of internal and external threat show that Turkey’s alliance behaviors have different characteristics and so does the alliance cohesion. In this respect, I apply Weitsman’s (2004) theory in order to explain how different levels of threat shape the alliance behaviors of Turkey. This also shows that realist alliance theories hold Turkey’s alliance behavior during the Cold War and liberal (specifically institutionalist) theories hold it in the post- Cold War period. I analyze the Turkish foreign policy along with Turkey-NATO relations in these periods so that I am able to link the changes to the alliance literature. My independent variable is levels of
internal and external threat and my dependent variable is alliance cohesion. I use process tracing in order to show casual mechanism between my variables. While measuring cohesion, I focus on how the Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion is defined by the changes (Levels of Threat) by analyzing Turkish foreign policy. In doing so, I will mainly investigate Turkey’s relationship with the USA, since this explains the Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion. The methodology that I used in my case study allows me to connect these changes to the alliance theories. In this respect, my primary concern is how Turkey’s alliance behavior has been shaped throughout its history and what the end of the Cold War brings to Turkey’s alliance dynamics.

During the Cold War period, the USA shared superpower status with Russia, but American influence grew slowly. When the Cold War ended, the US became the only superpower and consolidated its influence across the world. Turkey, from the beginning of the rise of American influence, has been an important partner. This strategic alliance contributed a significant amount of mutual advantage to both parties. Soviet expansion throughout the Middle East had been constrained by the USA alliance with Turkey, and Turkey started to increase its influence in the Middle East. The growing importance of Turkey in the region promoted the necessity of its presence in area reconciliation or restructuring, since Turkey has ties through religion and history with the Middle East. In addition, Turkey’s western characteristics, as a secular state with a western democracy and the only Muslim member of NATO, cast Turkey as a bridge between the West and the Middle East. Furthermore, Turkish partnership provided a strong stand against Soviet expansionist policies during the Cold War and after the collapse of the Soviet bloc.
Turkey’s attachment played an important role in the US reconciliation of the Middle East and Central Asia.

The collapse of the Soviets brought more opportunities than problems for Turkey (Henze, 1993). With the Soviet threat eliminated, Turkey started to establish more economic relations with former Soviet countries, and the Turkish sphere of influence in Central Asia increased. Following the Truman Doctrine in February 1947, a Turkish-American alliance was officially established and in 1952 Turkey became a member of NATO. From the 1960s to the 1980s, Turkey preferred to be neutral regarding the conflicts between the West and the Middle East (Henze, 1993). However, during the Gulf crisis in the early 1990s President Ozal sided with the US and altered Turkish foreign policy accordingly. During those same years, Turkey became extensively involved with Soviet successor states and tried to establish close relations (Henze, 1993). Therefore, Turkey rose as an important regional actor in the Middle East. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, the USA became involved with the Middle East and the Turkish partnership was a necessity for reconciliation of the area. The USA and Turkey shared the same goals about war on terrorism.

3.1: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the Cold War Period

During World War II, Turkey followed a neutral agenda in its foreign affairs by trying to avoid the conflict, since it was still struggling with maintaining its own stability which had been destroyed by World War I and the War of Independence. After World War II, Turkey’s choice to side with the USA was related to Soviet expansionist policies. The Soviets wanted to increase their influence in the Middle East and the Turkish Straits were the key to consolidation of power against the USA. Accordingly, as with any
territorial dispute, statesmen increased their power by making alliances or increasing the size of their military (Vasquez, 1996), a pattern the Soviets followed. After the Second World War, Turkey established very close ties with the United States, and then became a NATO member. In this sense, Turkey and the US held the same objective-- to deter the Soviets and provide blockage of Soviet expansion (Harris, 1972).

Noncontiguous NATO members, especially those allies either separated by a large distance or bordering an enemy, are at a decided bargaining disadvantage, leaving them no choice but to assume larger defense burdens relative to other allies. Prime examples of such allies would include the United States, the United Kingdom, Norway, and Turkey (Sandler, 1999, p. 741).

Turkey sided with the USA during the Cold War because it needed to protect its national security which was threatened by Soviet revisionist policies. In 1945, for instance, Joseph Stalin had strategic designs on Turkish territories (Kuniholm, 1996) and asserted that “the Soviet Union would not renew the Turkish-Soviet Treaty of Neutrality and Nonaggression of 1925 until Turkey surrendered the northeastern provinces of Kars and Ardahan and established joint control of the straits of Bosporus and Dardanelles with the Soviets” (Celik, 1999). Consequently, Turkey chose to balance the high level of Soviet threat by entering NATO, which was facilitated by Turkish assistance in Korea, showing that Turkey as a trusted ally (Dismorr, 2008).

Turkish-American bilateral relations became official with the Truman Doctrine in 1947. President Harry S. Truman indicated that it was highly important to have Turkey on the USA’s side and concluded that “the USA must resist, even with arms, any Soviet aggression against Turkey” (Kuniholm, 1996, p. 46). Accordingly, American policies toward the Middle East during that time were about balance of power against Soviet
expansion. “The launch of the Truman Doctrine marked a turning point in the history of
the Cold War, as well as Turkey’s search for postwar security” (Hale, 2000, p. 115).
With the Truman Doctrine, Turkey received $100 million in aid and Turkish-American
bilateral relations started to develop so Turkey was no longer isolated. During 1948,
Turkey was included in the Marshall Plan and became a member of OEEC (Organization
for European Economic Cooperation) and continued to be involved in more relations with
the West. In this respect, the level of internal threat was low during the 1950s, since there
was a high level of cooperation among alliance members.

As stated earlier, Weitsman (2004) argued that alliance behavior emerges under
conditions of threat, and during the 1950s there was a high level of external threat (the
Soviets’ revisionist policies) in the Middle East. Accordingly, Turkey's relations with its
western allies, especially with the USA, were much closer than its relations with Middle
Eastern countries. Ankara's lack of interest in the Middle East was misinterpreted by
Arab nations (Karaosmanoglu, 1983). The reasons Turkey and the other Muslim
countries diverged in terms of alliance formation are that Turkey's western
characteristics, having western institutions and a secular regime, were perceived as
alienation from Islam in the Middle East. Secondly, differences in historical
development, geographic positions and foreign policy approaches resulted in different
security perceptions. Other Muslim countries in the region did not perceive the same
Soviet threat as Turkey did (Karaosmanoglu). In this sense, Turkey preferred balancing at
a relatively high level of threat. Weitsman stated that “states will seek to secure
themselves by forming alliances to counter the state or states that most threaten them” (p.
30). On the other hand, most of the Arab states preferred relations with the Soviets to
balance American influence and gain support against Israel (Karaosmanoglu). As a result, during the early years of the Cold War era, the level of external threat (the Soviets) was high for Turkey and the level of internal threat was low so the Turkish-NATO alliance showed moderate to high cohesion. All the countries in this region started to balance or bandwagon when the threat level was high in the Cold War southern straits. Many Arab countries in this region preferred bandwagoning at a relatively high level of external threat and had close relations with the Soviets, as stated earlier.

Turkey played an important role in the peace and stability of its neighboring areas so regional states supported Turkey’s existence as a NATO member and a Muslim country. “The upgrading of the Turkish armed forces and the improvement of the bases for an effective allied reinforcement capability would serve to improve deterrence against potential attack, and would inevitably affect the regional balance in the Middle East and Persian Gulf area in favor of the West” (Karaosmanoglu, 1983). The Middle East was not in the NATO’s zone of responsibility during the Cold War period. However, Turkey provided a security network with its ties to Arab states where Soviet influence was higher, so the Soviet threat beyond NATO’s zone was constrained. Accordingly, Turkey’s increasing its relations with Middle Eastern countries provided an indirect organic tie between the West and the Middle East. Hence, during the Cold War Turkey became a barrier to Soviet expansion (Larrabee, 2008). Although, Turkey’s relations with the Middle Eastern countries increased during these years, it did not mean that Turkey chose to do so but rather that it represented western interests through its common characteristics with the Middle East. In this sense, the institutional approach does not
explain the foreign policies of Turkey in this period, but the realist approach can explain alliance behaviors of Turkey.

3.1.1: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the 1950s

Although Turkey started to draw closer to the West starting with the Truman Doctrine, it still had some doubt about whether the USA would intervene in the event of a Soviet attack (Hale, 2000). From this perspective, there were some concerns on Turkey’s side that “Turkey’s inclusion in Truman’s program was a clear signal to the Soviet Union that the United States was prepared to make a material rather than a purely symbolic contribution to the defense of Turkey” (Hale, p. 115). During the Korean War, Turkey’s contribution, showing a high level of commitment and willingness to ally with NATO, helped Turkey to enter the alliance. This was a direct need for Turkey’s national security protection by the USA. In this sense, Turkey asked for NATO membership to protect its sovereignty and what it offered “in exchange for a security guarantee was a strategic role in the defense of Europe” (Kuniholm, 1996, p. 47). Overall, Turkey’s fear of the Soviet threat was eliminated when Turkey became a member of NATO in 1952 and the West’s power was strengthened by Turkey’s membership in NATO so “Loss of Turkey to the Soviet Union, it was recognized, would give the Soviets a valuable strategic position in the region and threaten not only Western oil interests in the Persian Gulf but Europe’s economic viability as well” (Kuniholm, p. 49)

During the 1950s and 1960s, Turkish engagement with the western countries, especially the US, was serious, establishing military and economic alliances (Hale, 2000). The level of internal threat was low during this time since there were no conflicts between Turkey and the western countries. For instance, during the 1950s,
Under a series of bilateral and secret agreements, important US-cum-NATO facilities were constructed in Turkey, including, most notably, an air base at Incirlik, near Adana, with other bases at Karamursel, Cigli, and Diyarbakir, and radar stations at Karamursel, Sinop, Samsun, Tranzon, Belbasi and Diyarbakir (Hale, 2000, p. 123).

There was massive military assistance to Turkey corresponding to $2,271 million during the 1950s and 1960s (Hale). However, this was less than that given to the other NATO alliances. For instance, Greece received almost double the military assistance given to Turkey. On the other hand, Turkey provided extended military facilities which increased US capabilities to perform a much more effective strike against the Soviets (Kuniholm, 1996). In this respect, the level of commitment between Turkey and NATO was high.

Additionally, Turkish motivation for forming an alliance with the West was shaped by the primary principle of Kemalism, which was to have more western-oriented alliances. “Although relations with western governments were not always entirely harmonious, Turkey had no other foreign policy interests which clearly conflicted with those of the main western powers, so the alliance seems to have been perceived as firm on both sides” (Hale, 2000, p. 122). Along with the high level of Soviet threat, Turkey’s foreign policy choices led Turkey to form an alliance with the West. Once the alliance was concluded, Turkey provided a high commitment to the NATO members. In this respect, there was a mutuality of interests in the alliance, to deter the Soviets.

As noted earlier, during the 1950s, Turkey provided whatever was necessary to enhance NATO’s eastern straits and NATO provided valuable military aid to Turkey. Accordingly, there were mutual obligations and benefits which confirmed the alliance agreement. The mutuality of interests can be inferred from the level of cooperation
between Turkey and the USA during the 1950s, since each state having a goal of balancing against the Soviets, they agreed on mutual responsibilities, and worked toward the same ends. Turkey, along with the other members of the alliance, preferred balancing against the high Soviet threat in order to protect itself from the most threatening state. This also proved that there was a low level of internal threat in the alliance. Overall, cohesion during the early years of the alliance was high, since Turkey agreed with NATO on the obligations, goals, etc. and took on the necessary responsibilities perceived by a high level of threat coming from the Soviets.

On the other hand, Turkey’s relations with the Middle Eastern countries were not as consistent as those with the West. There were some attempts to establish more organized relations, but they were limited because of the mistrust between Turkey and the Middle Eastern countries and between the West and the Middle East. For instance, “during 1952-53, discussion took place on the possible formation of a ‘Middle East Defense Organization’ (MEDO), but these came to nothing, since among other things, the Arab states regarded the idea of cooperation with Turkey with grave suspicion” (Hale, 2000, p. 125). This was because Turkey’s collaboration with the West was perceived by Arab countries as an alienation from Islam. Turkey also put more importance on the western alliances and tried to maintain the status quo. This meant that Turkey sought more secular and western-oriented connections in order to sustain the new Turkish identity and modern Turkey.

During the 1950s, there were also some developments between the Middle East and Turkey. For instance, with the help of Turkish reconciliation, Iraq signed a military aid agreement with the USA in 1954 and, one year later, Turkey signed the Baghdad Pact
with Iraq in order to maintain their mutual security and defense. Britain, Pakistan and Iran joined the Baghdad Pact the same year, a coalition criticized by some other Arab states. In 1959, Iraq withdrew from the Baghdad Pact because a revolutionary coup d’état took control in there (Hale, 2000). During the late 1950s, cohesion of this military alliance was hard to determine, since the levels of both external and internal threats were high, as Weitsman (2004) states. In this respect, a Turkey-Baghdad Pact alliance was not supposed to be cohesive because of mistrust among the allies, but the alliance showed moderate cohesion since the external threat was greater than the internal one. After Iraq withdrew, the Baghdad Pact was reconstructed with the same members, along with the USA in observatory status, and became the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). This new alliance was weak in terms of its structure and was not as capable as NATO in terms of deterrence, since “it had no centralized military command structure comparable to that of NATO” (Hale, p. 127). In this sense, except for the USA and Britain, members wanted a command structure by emphasizing the military role of the alliance, but neither Britain nor the USA wanted to provoke a Soviet reaction to this alliance (Göktepe, 1999).

Nonetheless, CENTO was an important alliance which blocked Soviet expansion in the Middle East. For instance, some bilateral agreements were signed between the US and the members of CENTO in order to enhance economic and military capabilities of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan (Göktepe, 1999). Accordingly, security and defense needs of the members were guaranteed and the alliance balanced against the Soviet Union in the Middle East without provoking it.

Turkey’s relations with the Middle East during this period were not firm since Turkey was suspicious of how effective this cooperation might be. On the other
members’ side, except Britain, there were some cynical views that Turkey might not be reliable, since it was primarily attached to its western allies. Accordingly, Hale (2000) states “the idea that Turkey engaged in the Middle East purely as the servant of western interests, rather than on its own initiative, appears hard to sustain” (p.130). However the alliance remained cohesive in the sense that it supplemented NATO in the Middle East, as stated earlier. This meant that CENTO acted as the shadow of NATO in the Middle East and Central Asia in order to restrain the Soviets. Accordingly, CENTO was a more cohesive alliance than the Bagdad Pact, because it had a relatively lower level of internal threat while the external threat remained the same. In this respect, from the British and Turkish perspectives, “the main purpose of CENTO was to keep Iran in the western bloc, to prevent any communist or neutralist orientation on the part of Iranian governments. From the regional point of view, CENTO became a medium for cooperation and collaboration between the regional member countries” (Göktepe, 1999, p. 126).

Therefore, the Turkey-CENTO alliance was also balancing against the Soviet threat and there was a moderate to high commitment among the members. Accordingly, CENTO members were balancing against the external threat from Central Asia to the Middle East and there was a low internal threat in the alliance. This meant that the Turkey-CENTO alliance was cohesive since it had a high level of external threat and low or moderate level of internal threat so balancing was the main concern.

All these bilateral and multilateral relations among Turkey, the Middle East and the western countries came about not because Turkey wanted them, but because the western states had Turkey use its historical and religious ties in order to restrain the Soviet threat in the Middle East. In this sense, Turkey’s alliance dynamics during the
1950s show that the Turkey-NATO and Turkey-CENTO alliances were cohesive, since there were high-level commitments among the members in order to deter the Soviet’s expansion and sphere of influence in the Middle East at a high level of external and a low level of internal threat.

3.1.2: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the 1960s

Turkey and the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1961-63

In October 1959, Turkey agreed with the Eisenhower administration to install in Turkish territory 15 Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles, armed with nuclear warheads (Hale, 2000). Turkey wanted to have a stronger stance against the threats in its neighborhood by having these weapons. For instance, “the latter [the USA] believed that the Jupiters would enhance Turkey’s military strength, as a symbol of the alliance’s readiness to use atomic weapons against any Soviet attack on Turkey” (Hale, 2000, p. 133). Khrushchev stated that Soviet missiles would be installed in Cuba in retaliation for those in Turkey or to make the USA withdraw the Jupiters from Turkey. The Cuban missile crisis accelerated tension across the world so the level of the Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion was high in response to the high level of threat. Turkey’s alliance behavior was balancing during this crisis. There was some possibility of risk that Turkey might have experienced during this era and this also affected Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion.

Engagement in the alliance posed three potential risks for Turkey: First that the western powers, primarily the USA, might reduce Turkey to a satellite; second, that the alliance might drag Turkey into a global and possibly nuclear war originating in a conflict in which Turkey’s national interests were only peripherally involved; and third, that Turkey might in turn have national interests which conflicted with those of the alliance as a whole (Hale, 2000, p. 137).
These risk factors were the direct result of allies’ intentions and perceptions. Accordingly, Turkey feared being a satellite of the US, but it turned out that the USA did not become involved with Turkey's domestic politics. Therefore, the first risk did not materialize. Concerning the second perception, alliance decisions were much more mature, especially after the Cuban missile crisis. The USA wanted to remove the Jupiters from Turkey, but Turkey’s insistence on keeping them was highly risk promoting in the ongoing crisis. In the third instance, Turkey wanted to keep the Jupiters to provide immediate response to possible Soviet attacks. In this sense, Turkey wanted to keep the missiles to deter the Soviet threat. Additionally, some argued that Turkey wanted to at least provide its own defense, if the alliance did not provide any assistance in an attack was launched against Turkey. In this sense, “the Cuban missile crisis also made Turkish leaders realize that despite American commitments to Turkish security, Washington was willing to forgo its assurances to Turkey when American interests were at stake” (Celik, 1999, p. 47). Overall, states’ intentions and perceptions were as important as threat for alliance behaviors of the states (Weitsman, 2004).

After the Cuban missile crisis, with the withdrawal of the Jupiters from Turkey in 1963, the Cold War entered a smooth phase in which tension between the USA and the Soviets steadily eased. For instance, the 1963 Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty signed by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union represents how Cold War policies were stabilized by prohibiting nuclear weapons testing. In this respect, while the level of external threat was steadily reduced, internal threat increased from low to moderate level, because Turkey’s national interest was undermined during the crisis. Accordingly, Turkey showed hedging behaviors, since the threat levels were low or
moderate. Turkey combined its strategies “by seeking low level commitment agreements with potential friends and enemies” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 29). For instance, economic contacts between Turkey and the Soviets increased after the Cuban missile crisis (Hale, 2000).

The aftermath of the Cuban missile crisis, along with the reduction of tension, promoted Turkish-Soviet relations but did not affect the alliance between Turkey and the USA. However, there were some issues which threatened Turkish-American bilateral relations. Turkey was hedging while the USA was still balancing. For instance, the Cyprus conflict in 1963-64 reduced Turkish-American relations. A possible plan for Turkish military intervention in Cyprus was discouraged by the USA and finally eliminated. However, this high level of internal threat caused low cohesion in the Turkey-NATO alliance. Furthermore, the situation also led Turkey to seek different foreign policy alternatives and Turkey showed hedging alliance behavior. In this respect, Turkey used the tactical benefits of hedging that “keep a state (Turkey) in one’s camp (NATO) and simultaneously shut down avenues of expansion by a potential enemy (the Soviets)” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 21).

After developing more friendly relations with the Soviets and having uneasy relations with America, Turkey refused to help the USA in some cases. For instance, “during the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, Ankara did not permit the USA to use the bases in Turkey for refueling and supply activities” (Celik, 1999, p. 49). Accordingly, the internal threat was moderate to low and the external threat was moderate to high in the Turkey-NATO alliance, as there was moderate to low cohesion during the late 1960s. It should be also noted that American wishes did not leave totally. Turkey still allowed the USA to
use its bases for communication purposes, since Turkey wanted to maintain its status in the context by showing at least a limited commitment to the alliance.

Overall, alliance behaviors of Turkey during the 1960s showed various characteristics. During the onset of the Cuban missile crisis, Turkey preferred balancing with the high level of external threat and low level of internal threat. After the crisis ended, the external threat was reduced from high to moderate and after President Johnson’s letter, the internal threat increased from low to moderate during the 1960s. Therefore, Turkey preferred hedging alliance behavior which means that Turkey kept its options open with flexible policies while maintaining its alliance with NATO.

3.1.3: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the 1970s

Turkish Intervention in Cyprus

During the 1970s, Turkey's ties with the United States steadily weakened over the Cyprus issue. Turkey’s role in NATO and its national interests clashed on the emergence of the Cyprus problem in the 1960s. Cyprus was experiencing ethnic conflict between the Turkish and Greek peoples on the island. With the 1963-1964 Cyprus crisis and its aftermath, there was a high level of tension between the USA and Turkey. There was a correspondingly high level of internal threat and a low level of external threat for the Turkey-NATO alliance. “The conflict started when Cypriot president Archbishop Makarios’s government moved to change the island’s constitution, a change that would limit the autonomy of the Turkish minority” (Celik, 1999, p. 48). After that, the tension between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots increased when Turkish Cypriots were overwhelmed. Turkey planned to intervene militarily and informed the US of its reaction. US President Johnson’s letter (1964) informed Turkey that any intervention with Cyprus
by Turkey might endanger NATO’s alliance with Turkey (Makovsky, 2000). Alliance sanctions prevented Turkey from intervening in the Cyprus issue so that intra-alliance conflict was eliminated by removing the internal threat.

On the other hand, when a second conflict happened in Cyprus in 1974, Turkey intervened militarily in order to protect the rights of Turkish Cypriots. Accordingly, a US arms embargo in July, 1975, sanctioned Turkey and Turkish-American relations were sharply reduced (Makovsky, 2000). While Turkish-American relations were cooling off, Turkish-Soviet relations were getting better. The Soviets attempted to establish stronger relations so that “by 1978, the Soviet Union was aiding forty-four different development projects in Turkey and by the end of the decade Turkey received more Soviet economic assistance than any other country in the third world except Cuba” (Celik, 1999, p. 51). In this sense, the Turkish-NATO alliance experienced low cohesion when the internal threat was high and the external threat was low so that tethering behavior could be observed (Weitsman, 2004). Accordingly, Turkey needed “to ally with its adversary to manage its hostility and conflicts of interest” (Weitsman, p. 30), since Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion was low because of the high level of internal threat.

In this sense, Turkey, during these years, tried to establish more harmonious relations with the Soviets in order to reduce tension with this adversary. This could have eliminated the consequences of the low cohesion in the Turkish-American partnership. For this reason, “Ankara intensified its efforts to establish more cordial relations with its traditionally hostile neighbor, the Soviet Union” (Celik, 1999, p. 49). Turkey also tried to enhance its relations with the Arab world, but this was not particularly successful, since the Arab states still doubted Turkey’s dependability. The only symbolic development
with the Arab nations was Turkish membership in “the Organization of the Islamic Conference” (OIC) in 1978. Turkey tried to manage external threats by tethering behavior when Turkey-NATO cohesion was low.

The reason for the low cohesion between Turkey and NATO was due to the high level of internal threat. When the internal threat was eliminated through economic interdependency, the alliance showed moderate cohesion. Accordingly, “a conflict between dependent nations would result in significant mutual economic costs. For the Cyprus dispute, the membership of Greece and Turkey in both NATO and the United Nations provided a mechanism for ending the hostilities and separating the forces” (Sandler, 1999, p. 728). In this respect, when the internal threat was reduced by interdependency and the need for protection against the growing external threat came together, the alliance cohesion was high.

Realist institutionalism provided more explanations for how the conflict arose and how it was restrained by sanctions of the alliances. Since Greece and Turkey were members of the same alliance, further armed conflicts between them were forestalled. The reason they got into this conflict is that the secure environment that NATO provided its members became the appropriate environment for Turkey and Greece to implement their national interests. Additionally, when the external threat from the Soviets started to increase and dominated over the internal threat, Turkey-NATO alliance showed moderate to high cohesion.

Overall, Turkey was tethering following the Turkey-Greece conflict over Cyprus. This means that the level of internal threat exceeded the level of external threat so that the Turkey-NATO alliance showed low cohesion. For this reason, tethering behavior
provided Turkey a strategy “to manage relations with one’s (Turkey’s) adversary (the Soviets) by drawing closer to it via agreement” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 21). Therefore Turkey conciliated the external threat, but this was not bandwagoning behavior that Turkey did not ally with its adversary rather it eased the tension when the alliance cohesion was low. This means that tethering strategy provided a great opportunity for Turkey to accommodate the Soviets.

3.1.4: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the 1980s

During the 1980s, a new phase started in Turkish-American relations as the tension between the USA and the Soviet Union increased noticeably. Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion started to move from low to high, during a period when the Middle East and Central Asia were experiencing dramatic changes. First, Iran experienced a regime change by a religious revolution under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini, following which the U.S. Embassy in Iran was attacked (Makovsky, 2000), effectively weakening American relations with Iran. Second, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan so their growing influence became more threatening. These negative changes for NATO heightened the strategic importance of Turkey, increasing emphasis on that country. Accordingly, the level of external threat started to exceed that of internal threat which Turkey and the USA had experienced because of the Cyprus conflict. Turkey again started to balance against external threats. For instance, Turkey’s involvement became more and more important in order to restrain and eliminate the growing aggressive Soviet policies, such as the invasion of Afghanistan in late 1979. On March 29, 1980, Washington and Ankara signed the U.S.-Turkish Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement (DECA) that had been
in the works for five years (Celik, 1999). Therefore, the commitment level was high among alliance members so the alliance showed more cohesive characteristics.

After 1985, the Soviet Union started to develop relations with the western countries with Mikhail Gorbachev’s policies. The USA-Soviet Union relations again started to normalize so the two countries signed the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty in 1987, eliminating intermediate- and short-range nuclear weapons. Thus, as the level of balancing in alliances increases, so does alliance cohesion (Weitsman, 2010). This means that there is a positive relation between balancing and cohesion; when one increases, the other increases, or vice versa. Accordingly, during the late 1980s, the level of balancing with the agreement of the INF treaty decreased, effectively reducing the level of external threat from high to moderate. These changes resulted in moderate cohesion; therefore, the Turkey-NATO alliance was hedging “by seeking low-level commitment agreements with potential friends and enemies” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 29). In this respect, Turkey began to establish more cooperative relations with its neighbors, whether friends or enemies. For instance, during the Iraq-Iran war in the 1980s, both countries were heavily dependent on Turkish products and Turkey became the pathway for those fleeing to Europe to escape the conflict. Therefore, “Turkey’s growing economic interests in the Middle East inevitably raised Turkish consciousness toward Middle Eastern politics as well” (Fuller, 1993).

Overall, Turkey’s alliance behaviors experienced significant changes during the Cold War era so its cohesion underwent several ups and downs. The level of internal and external threat to the Turkey-NATO alliance during the Cold War represented different intensities in each 10-year period. Since Turkey’s geopolitical location and its ties with
the Middle East were important in the ongoing Cold War, Turkey suffered a greater level of external threat than any other NATO members. Under these difficult conditions, Turkey provided a strong balance against the Soviets and blocked Soviet expansion. When the Cold War entered a more stable phase, Turkey had a chance to improve its relations both economically and politically with the Middle Eastern countries. Overall, there had been slow, but gradually developing institutional relations between Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries, during the Cold War Era.

3.2: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the Post Cold War Period

This chapter seeks to analyze Turkey’s alliance dynamics and cohesion during the post-Cold War era. Its alliance behavior represents different characteristics in policies immediately after the Cold War and, later, policies in the post-Cold War period. In this respect, a continuing increase in Turkish foreign policy activism has enhanced the country’s sphere of influence in the Middle East and Central Asia. Institutions that promote and enhance the level of cooperation have become important factors that shape alliance behaviors of states, during the peacetime environment of the post-Cold War era. This means that the importance of military alliances, such as NATO, became less important and the main focus became the institutions which endorse economic, peace-promoting and conflict-resolution policies.

Since the level of external threat was eliminated or remained very low, realist theory did not explain Turkey’s alliance behaviors. I will, therefore, apply institutionalist theory to explain these behaviors. I will first analyze Turkey’s alliance behaviors during the 1990s. In doing so, I will also apply Weitsman’s (2004) comprehensive theory since this is a transition period having the characteristics of both the Cold War and post-Cold
War policies. In this respect, indefiniteness in the international system became the primary factor for why states continued to act as they did in the Cold War era. After that, I will investigate how the post-September 11 era shaped Turkey’s alliance behaviors.

3.2.1: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the 1990s

Turkish foreign policy entered a new phase with the end of the Cold War. With the Soviet threat eliminated in that region, power transferred to the strong states there. Turkey started to rise as a multiregional power and established good relations with the Soviet successor states through religion, history and ethnicity. Additionally, since the threat and sphere of influence of the Soviets in the Middle East had disappeared, Turkey began to develop its relations in that region, as well. In this sense, Turkey found a climate amenable to boosting its sphere of influence in the Middle East, the Caucasus, Western Asia and Eastern Europe. Additionally, when the Soviet collapse eliminated the external threat, none of the NATO members experienced a high level of threat which intimidated territorial integrity and sovereignty of NATO allies, because no state was able to stand against NATO which became the dominant alliance across the world. Although the Cold War ended, the Cold War policies remained for a period of time, due to the uncertainty in the international system. Therefore, the Turkey-NATO alliance remained cohesive as if there were a high level of external threat. For instance, the peace-keeping operations of NATO contributed to the stability of the international system and NATO also expanded by adding new member states during the late 1990s. In this section, I will apply both institutionalist theory and Weitsman’s comprehensive theory to Turkey’s alliance behaviors in the 1990s.
The end of the Cold War brought new opportunities along with new problems for Turkish foreign policy. After the collapse of the Soviet Bloc, Turkey’s geopolitics gained importance and its economic relations increased accordingly. “Certain organic geopolitical, cultural, and economic relations that had been absent during the ‘abnormal’ period of Cold War polarization may reemerge in the new ‘normal’ regional environment” (Fuller G. E., 1993). On the other hand, there was some concern as the Turkish alliance with the US and its membership in NATO started to lose their importance in the post-Cold War period (Kut, 2001). However, the importance of Turkey’s partnership was restored immediately by the role it played during the Gulf War.

On the American side of the alliance, the USA emerged from the Cold War as the only superpower, with the Soviet threat eliminated. Iraq’s invasions of neighboring Arab countries threatened the security not only of that region but of the entire world. As a result, the international community, with US leadership intervened in Iraq, beginning the Second Gulf War. During the Gulf War, Turkey played a crucial role “by shutting off the twin pipelines that carried Iraq's oil exports and permitting U.S. use of Incirlik airbase in southeastern Turkey for strikes into northern Iraq, Turkey played a key role in the UN-backed military and economic campaign against Saddam Hussein's regime” (Sayari, p.45). Turkey deployed 100,000 military troops to Iraqi borders, allied with the international community. The Turkish-American alliance continued to be convergent so that “during most of the post Cold War period, Washington counted on Ankara to stand up to rogue states such as Iran, Iraq and Syria; to support moderate regimes in the region; and to help consolidate the coming Israeli-Arab peace, notably by supplying water to the former belligerents” (Celik, 1999, p. 79). The Turkish attitude in the Persian Gulf crisis
proved that Turkey supports multilateralism and internationally sanctioned military intervention in its foreign policy, and thus followed a relatively more active policy after the collapse of the Communist Bloc (Kut, 2001). In this sense, once again, there was a high level of commitment between Turkey and its western allies under low levels of internal threat and low to moderate levels of external threats. Therefore, the Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion was high so that threat was not the only means of determining alliance cohesion (Weitsman, 2004).

During the Second Gulf War, internal and external threat levels were low, so Turkey exhibited hedging alliance behavior. In this respect, the Turkey-NATO alliance was supposed to show moderate or low cohesion, since it represented hedging/hedging characteristics. This meant that Turkey and NATO started “consolidating their power, blocking off avenues of expansion for their potential rivals while simultaneously seeking to curry favor to ensure their actions are not overly provocative” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 29).

However, the early years of the post-Cold War era were a transition period that had inherited Cold War characteristics. Although the high level of external threat was eliminated by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the alliance behaviors remained as if the threat were still out there. Additionally, the role of military alliances remained important even during the peace-time environment of the post-Cold War era so they continue “to manifest relations of enmity and amity, to manage and constrain alliance partners, to counter threats, to promote desirable behavior, and to deter and threaten aggressors” (Weitsman, p. 175). Therefore, Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion was high during the 1990s.
Apart from the remaining importance of military alliances, there were some drastic changes in international relations with the end of the Cold War. As stated earlier, institutional cooperation increased steadily, especially for states like Turkey that was geopolitically important and interconnected. This environment had a great impact on Turkish foreign policy. On the other hand, some scholars claimed that the Turkish overall foreign policy line did not change during the post-Cold War period and what changes did occur were about geopolitical issues. For instance, Kut (2001) argued that Turkish participation in the Second Gulf War on the side of the international coalition and its active involvement in the conflict could not be interpreted as a genuinely active foreign policy.

The post Cold War Turkish foreign policy can be outlined as a pragmatic policy that supports the international community’s consensus positions, advocates multilateral cooperation, and remains cautious. There is, then, much that has not changed. Turkey’s principal orientation is still toward the West and Europe and an alliance with the United States. Equally, Turkey does not seek to expand its national territory or to build a monopolistic sphere of influence (Kut, 2001, p. 10).

Although this might be true, the post-Cold War changes became the first step toward gradually altering Turkish foreign policy by providing wide-open foreign policy options. This means that Turkish foreign policy did, indeed, change, at least indirectly. On the other hand, the primary principle of Turkish foreign policy, Kemalism, which emphasized the necessity of foreign policy toward the West, remained the same. The only change is about the importance or dominance of Kemalism in Turkish foreign policy. However, it was clear that the Turkish sphere of influence had increased, causing Turkey to follow more active policies. In this sense, “the developments after the Cold War presented an environment that both enabled and required Turkey to pursue an active
foreign policy” (Kut, p. 11). This active phase in Turkish foreign policy was the immediate result of Turkey’s changing perceptions. Perceptions, in this sense, define intentions of states (Keohane, 1993; Weitsman, 2004).

The best example of activism in Turkish foreign policy is the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) project signed in June 1992. “Ankara quickly recognized newly independent states from Central Asia to the Balkans; developed diplomatic, economic, and aid relations with ex-communist states; and participated in international efforts to solve conflicts from Nagorno-Karabakh to Bosnia-Herzegovina” (Kut, 2001, p. 7). Additionally, Turkey signed the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline agreement with Azerbaijan and Georgia. This greatly increased institutional cooperation so Turkey, as a growing multiregional power, started to maintain or increase its relations with neighboring countries along with helping conflict resolution in the Middle East and Central Asia. This shows that when mutual interests of states are provided by institutions then cooperation will be more stable (Keohane & Martin, 1995). Apart from this high level of institutional cooperation, the Turkey-NATO alliance remained cohesive as well. For instance, Turkey was involved in the restoration of stability in Albania, Kosovo, Somalia and Bosnia during these years by actively participating in multilateral organizations, NATO and the UN. For instance, the Turkish Peacekeepers involved in “the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the mid 1990s, which was later followed by the Stabilization Force (SFOR) and Turkish participation in the Kosovo Force (KFOR) launched in 1999, were also important to forging the strategic partnership, as was Turkey’s importance as an energy hub”
(Dismorr, 2008, p. 150). In this respect, as Weitsman (2004) states, NATO remained to counter threats and deter aggressors, during the post-Cold War era.

The end of the Cold War affected Turkish foreign policy dramatically, due to the new context of its geopolitics which made Turkish attachment more and more important. In this respect, “the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union forced Turkey to redefine and reshape its foreign policy in important ways” (Larrabee, 2000, p. 21). During the post-Cold War era, Turkish foreign policy started to function more unilaterally as if it were necessary to have a more self-confident manner. The best example of this attitude was “Turkey’s confrontation with Syria in October 1998 over Baghdad’s support of the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)” (Larrabee, p. 21). Another example was Turkey’s curtailing deployment of SS-300 missiles by the Greek Cypriot government, by threatening to use force (Larrabee). Turkey started to rise as a multiregional power and the level of threat decreased to a level that Turkey could handle. In this respect, Turkey’s alliance cohesion in NATO was reduced.

Overall, although there had been some worries about the future importance of a Turkish partnership after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Turkey once again showed its importance in the Gulf Crisis. Additionally, the Second Gulf War also proved that NATO was still cohesive and the later roles NATO played in peace-keeping operations would continue to be cohesive. The early years of the post-Cold War era had some hold-over characteristics from the Cold War alliance policies, although external and internal threats were low. In this respect, the Turkey-NATO alliance remained cohesive since alliance interests remained the same, to consolidate its power by promoting stability and security. NATO became insurance not only for Turkey and but also for other members during the
indefiniteness of immediate post-Cold War period, since Turkey wanted to guarantee its position in the international system (Weitsman, 2004). In this respect, Turkey was hedging by making its foreign policy wide open to alternative policies, through institutional cooperation within the new context. The high level of institutional cooperation Turkey established after the Cold War shows that it is predominantly moving towards its own national interests, rather than interests of its allies. Additionally, Turkey began to resolve conflicts with NATO as a rising multiregional power that wanted “to guarantee its position in the system” (Weitsman, p. 21). Therefore, the alliance cohesion was moderate to high during this time.

3.2.2: Turkey’s Alliance Behaviors in the Post-September 11 Era

Having left the Cold War legacies, institutions, nowadays, have become more and more effective in the formation of transnational relations. In this respect, Turkey is now more interconnected mainly with the West, Central Asia and the Middle East. Therefore, this section will analyze how this interconnectedness, along with institutional cooperation among Turkey and its allies, shapes alliance behaviors of Turkey. The institutionalist theory brings more explanations to Turkey’s alliance behavior by focusing on the cooperative aspect of the international system rather than on the warfare aspect of its anarchic structure.

After the collapse of the Soviets, the USA had no adversary that could threaten its security. In this sense, the USA started to consolidate its power across the world. During the Second Gulf War, Saddam Hussein’s revisionist policies in the Gulf region fostered the notion that any Middle Eastern country with aggressive policies might rise up instantly because of the weakness and oil-richness of the region. Some scholars state that
“the gradual replacement of the communist threat with the threat of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism was evident in the 1990s, even before the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, when US targets were hit in Kenya” (Güney & Gökcan, 2010, p. 26). In this respect, the USA was massively involved with Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East and Central Asia where Turkey’s sphere of influence steadily increased after the Soviet collapse. Turkey’s partnership, therefore, continued to be pivotal and cohesive, starting with the post-Cold War period and continuing into the post-September 11 period. Turkey showed its willingness to support the USA’s war on terror and provided necessary help immediately after September 11.

After the September 11 terrorist attacks in Washington and New York, the Bush Administration shifted American foreign policy into a more preemptive phase. The war on terrorism started a new period in international relations and a new phase in the Turkish-American strategic partnership. “The US war on terrorism constituted a solid ground for the formation of a new geopolitical code which was triggered by the national trauma generated by the September 11 attacks” (Güney & Gökcan, 2010, p. 26). America invaded Afghanistan in order to destroy Al-Qaida networks and to capture the terrorists. Later on, Iraq was invaded since the USA believed Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Turkey was given a crucial role in implementation of the US war on terrorism policies, by being a strategic base (Guney, 2005).

Turkey’s attitude at Iraq’s invasion by the USA in March, 2003, reduced Turkey-NATO cohesion, since Turkey showed its unwillingness to become involved with this issue. Since eastern Turkey is predominantly Kurdish and Iraq is Turkey’s immediate neighbor, having Kurdish minorities might put Turkey in a complicated position.
Although Turkey supported the war on terrorism policies of the Bush Administration, when the USA decided to intervene, Turkey became reluctant to provide further assistance to the US. Turkey had several concerns about providing the support demanded by the USA.

Turkey repeatedly pointed out its economic loss from the first Gulf War in 1991, for which it had never been compensated fully by the US. Second, Turkey feared that a military strike on Iraq could lead the Kurds to establish an independent state next door. A possible refugee flood—as had previously happened in the first Gulf War—and the possible Kurdish control of the oil-rich cities of Mosul and Kirkuk—where a sizeable Turcoman minority lived—were also serious concerns for Turkey (Guney, 2005, p. 348).

Apart from that, Turkey’s immediate support of the USA on this specific issue had aroused direct criticism from other Muslim countries and could jeopardize Turkey’s relations in the Middle East. In addition, there was strong public sentiment against American invasion of Iraq. President Bush informed Turkey that “it might end up missing its chance to have a say in the future of Iraq and lose a multi-billion dollar aid package to protect its economy from the negative impacts of a war” (Guney, 2005, p. 351).

Therefore, Turkey had a difficult choice to make between its national interests and the alliance’s interests, but finally made the difficult decision to provide the USA with limited support by allowing use of Turkey’s air space. In this respect, Turkey, as in the Cyprus invasion, privileged its national interests over its alliance interests, since its institutional cooperation with other Muslim countries in the region could have undermined its position locally.

However, Turkey also supported the US in an overall manner, for instance, by deploying peace forces to Afghanistan (Kramer, 2000). Weitsman (2004) argued that
“hedging/balancing alliances will also have limited cohesion, since each state will enter the agreement with divergent objectives” (p. 30). During this period, the strategies of the USA, especially after the September 11 terrorist attacks, weakened its image in the world. Turkish-American relations were also weakening by that time. However, Turkey stood beside the USA with assurances that it would help with the elimination of terrorist networks (Kramer, 2000). In this respect, Turkey’s perspective on war on terror strategies began to draw closer to the European perspective in the sense that Turkey supported peacekeeping rather than peacemaking. In response, NATO’s cohesion started to move from moderate to low, since internal threat increases by divergences in this alliance while external threats remain low.

The USA started to lose its strategic partners and has been criticized even by Europe, its closest ally. “The US’s international strategy during the post-9/11 period has been characterized, to a great extent, by preventing rogue states from threatening the US, its allies and its friends with weapons of mass destruction, and the fight against terrorism, if necessary through preemptive strikes” (Guney, 2005, p. 347). In this sense, although the US had also adopted peacemaking, it increased government military spending, taking advantage of the Soviet collapse and becoming powerful throughout the world. Having relatively weak military power, Europe tended toward a more multilateral and peace-promoting role in international relations. Turkey followed that same route, but showed full support for the war on terrorism in the first place, since it, too, had been in a prolonged war with a Kurdish terrorist organization. Additionally, Europe’s lack of success against the threats made those countries more tolerant than the USA and their perceptions of threats differed (Shapiro & Byman, 2006). Overall, the transatlantic gap
among Europe, Turkey and the USA grew during the Bush Administration. Though the
Turkish-American-European alliance was gradually reduced during this period, the
Turkish-American alliance increased, since terrorism was also a problem in Turkey. In
this alliance, the USA worked at promoting European Union membership for Turkey.
However, Europe took a firm stance, unwilling to accept Turkey into the EU. Nowadays,
Turkey follows a different path with its relations with Europe and no longer seeks EU
membership (Kramer, 2000).

The most recent Pew Global Attitudes survey reveals the image of the US around
the world. This survey shows that Turkey is among the countries that most dislike
American policies, a sentiment which increased after the USA’s declaration of its war on
terrorism. Another important dimension of this survey indicates that favorable public
opinion about the EU has dropped from 58% in 2004 to 27% in 2007 (Kohut, 2007).

When President Obama took office, promising more multilateral cooperation, he
visited Turkey before any other US allies in Europe, showing that Turkish-American
relations would began to improve. Obama’s foreign policy is about protecting US
security without abandoning American values. In his speech before the Turkish
Parliament in 2009, he implied that the threat must be eliminated by refocusing on al-
Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and he indicated it would be necessary to end the war
in Iraq by leaving the security to that country’s own government. It is also necessary to
take nuclear weapons away from terrorists and promote peace in the Middle East.
However, Obama’s foreign policy so far has been quite similar to that of the Bush
Administration. The exception is that Obama follows more multilateral and bilateral
policies. This affects the alliance cohesion, since unilateral Bush Administration policies
caused low level cohesion in the alliance. In this sense, “Turkish foreign policy today is more aligned to the European mainstream than to the US position on a variety of issues such as the Kyoto Protocol and the International Criminal Court (ICC)” (Dismorr, 2008, p. 170).

Although the Turkish government, starting with the Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, AKP), pursues a new activism in foreign policies for Europeanization, one thing for certain is that there is also a continuing proactive and multilateral foreign policy concerning the Middle East and Central Asia (Onis & Yılmaz, 2009). Turkey has provided a new wave of foreign policy activism by emphasizing Europeanization, after AKP was elected in 2002 (Onis & Yılmaz). The AKP’s foreign policy emphasizes the use of soft power, increasing relations with neighboring countries and having “zero problems” with Turkey’s neighbors (Onis & Yılmaz). In this sense, this period of Turkish foreign policy seems to promote more multilateral relations. For instance, Turkey supported an internationally acceptable compromise for the Cyprus issue by promoting the Annan plan for the island (Onis & Yılmaz). Additionally, there have been remarkable changes in Turkey-Syria relations. “There is now even a free trade agreement, further integrating the economies of these avid adversaries of the 1990s, during which time Syria played the terror card backing the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) against Turkey’s water card” (Onis & Yılmaz, p. 9). This institutional cooperation between Turkey and Syria also alters Turkey-NATO cohesion, since NATO, after the end of the Cold War, started to be involving more in international conflicts.

Overall, Turkey showed tethering and hedging alliance behavior by flexible policies and NATO members differed in terms of goals and strategies during the post
September 11 era. This enabled the alliance members seek for different alternatives by associating less with the alliance, when the system-wide patterns started to play an important role. In this respect, institutional cooperation became an important factor shaping alliance behavior of Turkey during this period.

The Turkey-NATO alliance behavior starting from the end of the Cold War shows that this alliance remains cohesive. This shows that alliances have unique characteristics, differing from those of any other institutions. Although the alliance cohesion was high during this period, the Bush Administration policies, preemptive and unilateral, reduced alliance cohesion to a moderate level. In this respect, my independent variable levels of threat are inadequate to explain my dependent variable, cohesion. However, my findings show that even within existing alliances, threat levels and motivations change over time. The Second Gulf War, peacekeeping operations around the world and war against terrorist organizations are striking examples of how this alliance still endures. Additionally, the concept of threat now is somehow different than the one during the Cold War. The world is suffering a high level of institutionalized terrorist organizations so the only way to stand against these transnational groups is to enhance the level of cooperation. In this respect, NATO helps the international community promote coalitions and eliminate conflicts. I will illustrate this in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4: DIVERGENCES IN TURKEY’S ALLIANCE BEHAVIOR

This chapter will analyze the divergences that affect Turkey’s alliance dynamics. There are some issues that force Turkey to make tradeoffs between its national policies and collective alliance interests. Institutional cooperation is the main factor that causes Turkey to make these tradeoffs. After the end of the Cold War, Turkey established a high level of institutional cooperation in its neighborhood by the increase of its sphere of influence. Nowadays, although Turkey is still connected to NATO, Turkey is involved with dozens of institutions in different states whose threat perceptions and motivations are completely different. Additionally, some prolonged conflicts shadow Turkey-NATO alliance cohesion. In this sense, I will analyze the main issues Turkey challenged in obtaining alliance cohesion, and I will show that Turkey’s alliance behavior is moving toward conflict resolution by maintaining simultaneously its military alliance with the West and its institutional cooperation with the Middle East and Central Asia.

The Iranian nuclear program has grown more controversial and it has become a security problem around the world. Since Iran is the immediate neighbor of Turkey and the countries have good economic relations, Turkey will oppose any intervention into Iran. However, Turkey also perceives the Iranian nuclear program as a threat against regional stability and security. In this respect, Turkey will have a difficult debate whether or not to support NATO, if an intervention occurs. In addition, states’ perceptions are also important for describing their motivations. For instance, Iran declared that its nuclear program was peaceful, but the International Atomic Energy Agency underlined certain problems with the Iranian nuclear program that indicated the level of weapons-grade
uranium has increased. The UN Security Council put sanctions on Iran in order to reduce its nuclear program, but Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad declared this decision unfair and refused to reduce its nuclear development. Since then the Iranian nuclear program has become a troublesome issue in the security concerns of world politics. Turkey has good relations with Iran so it does not perceive Iranian nuclear development as a high level of threat as do other NATO members.

The Iranian crisis can be solved by negotiations, according to President Obama. The USA has concerns about the stability in the Middle East and any strike against Iran would make the situation difficult, so it would be helpful to engage with Iran in the first place to limit or reduce its production of nuclear weapons (Sanger, 2009). Therefore, the USA stepped away from intervention after the negotiation process. Israel, on the other hand, advocates immediate action in order to stop Iran from getting more nuclear weapons. Israel also disagrees with America about waiting for negotiation with Iran (Sanger, 2009). Russia, on the other hand, opposes unilateral military intervention by the USA in Iran, with or without approval of the Security Council (Katz, 2006). This does not mean that Russia is against economic sanctions of Iran in order to reduce its nuclear program. Like Turkey, Russia has good economic relations with Iran and, Moscow prefers a peaceful solution to this nuclear crisis. In this problematic context, Turkish mediation can be crucial by urging NATO not to intervene and by convincing Iran to reduce its nuclear arsenal. In its contemporary history, it can be seen that NATO’s involvement in moderate to low conflicts causes high level cohesion; however, any intervention in Iran might increase the level of conflict and promote future formation of a counter alliance against NATO.
In this respect, the Pew Global Survey (2007), “Global Unease with Major World Powers: Rising Environmental Concern in a 47-Nation Survey”, shows that the Israeli public is 91% opposed to Iran’s acquiring nuclear weapons and in the USA opposition is 93%; however, this ratio drops to 59% in Turkey (Kohut, 2007). This shows how states differ in terms of threat perceptions and how their perceptions define their interests. This can be explained by institutional cooperation. In the 1990s, Turkish-Iranian relations were very low so Turkish public opinion about Iranian nuclear programs could have had a higher opposition ratio in Turkey. With the level of cooperation through institutions increased along with good relations, Turkey now perceives the threat from Iran differently. Turkey gets 20% of its natural gas from Iran and Turkey became a prized outlet for Iranian transactions when Iranian banks were blocked from international finance by sanctions (Hancock, 2009). The USA valued Turkish mediation in the Iranian nuclear crisis and Iran indicated that if there were to be negotiation, it would not take place without Turkish mediation. Therefore, when the Iranian nuclear crisis accelerated quite recently, Iran offered to transfer its nuclear materials to Turkey in order to reduce tension. Overall, the Iranian nuclear program might cause a low or high level of cohesion in the Turkey-NATO alliance. If Turkey manages to solve the Iran problem by cooperation, this will affect the alliance cohesion positively; however, if there is military intervention in Iran, then Turkey’s response could dramatically increase the level of internal threat in the alliance and show no support for a NATO operation in the short run.

The Turkish-Greek problems are not new and they need careful interpretation. Although Turkey and Greece are both NATO members, they entered an arms race against each other. Weitsman’s (2004) description of this situation is that alliances can reduce the
tension when a conflict arises between the alliance members by institutionalizing peaceful relations. This means that if Turkey and Greece were not the members of the same alliance this conflict would bring instability in the region. Since they were allies, their further conflict was eliminated by the alliance role. Additionally, whenever the external threat was low these two countries increased the internal threat within the alliance so that they preferred tethering behaviors by “undermining members’ attempts to agree on goals and strategies” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 30). Under these circumstances, the cohesion was low or moderate; therefore, “both Turkey and Greece have obtained their national identities by fighting against, and interacting with, each other” (Mustafa & Ifantis, 2004, p. 23). Turkish foreign policy pays particular attention to the security policies which concern Greece and vice versa. For instance, modern Greece was born from the struggle against the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, Turkish-Greek relations are generally about conflicts and competition rather than cooperation (Mustafa & Ifantis).

The contemporary problems include conflicts on Cyprus, Turkish candidacy to the EU and the Aegean Sea. First, since the continental shelf is very close between Turkey and Greece in the Aegean Sea, there have been repeated frontier infringements crises by each side. Secondly, Turkish military intervention on Cyprus was another source of troublesome divergence which dragged the Turkish-American alliance into a dilemma. Finally, whenever Turkish candidacy for EU membership came on the agenda, Greece used its vote to veto it (Mustafa & Ifantis, 2004). These problems increase the internal threat in the alliance and cause low cohesion. As noted earlier, the Turkey-Greece conflict over Cyprus produced such a low level of cohesion during the Cold War
Turkey showed tethering alliance behavior by associating less with the alliance and managing relations with the Soviets.

Turkish-Israeli relations must be analyzed in this context. American reconciliation with the Middle East depends on how Turkish-Israeli relations are unified (Bir & Sherman, 2002). Any conflict between Israel and Turkey will damage Washington’s interests and policies in the Middle East. It will also cause low cohesion in the Turkey-NATO alliance, since there is high institutional cooperation, such as economic and military, between Israel and NATO members. Therefore, Turkish-Israeli relations are important not only for alliance cohesion, but also for stability in the Middle East. In order to have a better understanding, Turkish-Israeli relations should be investigated.

The roots of Turkish-Israeli relations can be found in the history of the Ottoman Empire. In 1492, over 200,000 Jews forced out of Europe by the Spanish Inquisition, were welcomed and found shelter in the Ottoman Empire (Lewis, 1982). Additionally, Turkey accepted many Jews who barely escaped Hitler’s massacre. When the State of Israel was established, Turkey became the first Muslim country to recognize the new nation. During the Cold War, Turkish-Israeli relations followed a path similar to Turkish-American relations, with the US axis forcing Turkey into closer relations with Israel (Aras, 2002). Israel and Turkey had been carrying out joint military maneuvers and strong trade relations as well. When the first Arab-Israeli conflict took place, Turkey stayed out of the conflict (Aras). However, the contemporary Turkish-Israeli alliance has been going through some troublesome stages, since Turkey has grown closer to other Arab states, especially Iran, a nuclear threat, and since Turkey has become involved with Arab-Israeli conflicts by criticizing Israel.
Turkey shares Israel's grave fears about Iran's nuclear agenda, and will undoubtedly support any peaceful efforts to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power. But Turkey's close ties with Iran can undoubtedly be strategically important to the region. The improved political and economic ties between Tehran and Ankara can enhance the prospect of Turkey playing a mediating role to dissuade Iran from pursuing nuclear weapons in defiance of the international community. There is no doubt that Turkey, as a predominantly Muslim state, is better received and will have far greater sway in Tehran than any western nations (Meir, 2009)

Additionally, when Turkey put greater importance on its relations with Israel than on Iranian relations, Iran started to criticize Turkey and vice versa (Aras, 2002). For this reason, Israel recently announced that it would not recognize Turkish mediation in the Middle Eastern conflicts. Turkey’s balancing is very difficult in the Middle East with the multipolar environment.

American and Turkish interests in the Middle East have been gradually diverging in recent years (Larrabee S. F., 2008). However, the US has a positive approach to Turkish mediation in the Middle Eastern conflicts. This divergence, accordingly, decreases the level of commitment between Turkey and other NATO members and it might further increase the internal threat in the alliance as well. This will obviously cause low cohesion in the alliance. It can be understood that states’ perceptions and motivations differ among the alliance members. However, both Turkey and Israel have a strong institutional cooperation. Turkey is a major trading partner of Israel in the Middle East and historically is more connected with it than any other Middle Eastern countries.

Overall, the recent diplomatic crisis between Israel and Turkey can be solved by institutional cooperation, since Turkey and Israel are interdependent and neither of them will risk losing this partnership. This will eventually reduce the internal threat in the alliance.
The Turkish-Armenian conflict, because of 1915 events\(^5\), is another factor in the Turkish sphere of influence in Central Asia that prevents straight alliances with other Turkic and Muslim countries in the region. In this respect, when Turkey signed an agreement with Armenia in order to normalize their relations, Turkey’s relations with Azerbaijan cooled off. The conflict between Turkey and Armenia also reduced Turkey’s alliance cohesion with the West, especially with European countries. For instance, though it looks to its western allies for help in normalizing relations with Armenia, Turkey is waiting for Armenia to take the first step. Additionally, it seems that Turkey will not accept the 1915 events as genocide.

During the Cold War, present-day Armenia was part of the Soviet Union, so there was no thought given to Turkey’s making good relations with Armenia, beyond maintaining the status quo. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Armenia was established and the Turkish-Armenian debate became a problematic issue standing in the way of Turkey’s relations with Central Asia. It also became an obstacle with the western countries. Until quite recently, Turkey and Armenia had agreed to normalize their relations or at least to establish a better rapport, but each party has preconditions to normalization. Turkey wants Armenia to withdraw its troops from Nagorno Karabakh where Armenia invaded Azerbaijan territory. On the other hand,

\(^5\) Turkey claims that the 1915 incident was about relocating the Armenians who lived in the Ottoman Empire, because of Armenian separatist movements against the Ottoman Empire and Armenian mass massacres of Muslim Ottomans in the eastern provinces. According to the Turkish view there was no intention of destroying all or part of the Armenian population. On the other hand, Armenia claims that Ottomans committed genocide by force-marching Armenians from their homes and systematically killing 1.5 million of them. Armenians claim this was genocide and Turkey must admit it. There are no diplomatic relations between Armenia and Turkey. This conflict also shadows Turkey’s relations with the Western allies, even with Turkey’s strong ally, the USA.
Armenia wants Turkey to admit to the Armenian genocide and pay reparation for the 1915 incident. According to the Armenian account, growing Turkish nationalism promoted hatred against Armenians and the Ottoman Sultan ordered the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenians.

Since neither party will forgo its preconditions, this conflict seems doomed to affect Turkey’s alliance cohesion with its western allies. Since some European countries which are important NATO members recognize the 1915 events as genocide this decreases Turkey’s commitment level in the alliance which in turn increases the internal threat. In the short run, this causes a low cohesion in the alliance. Additionally, the Turkish-American strategic partnership is shadowed by the Turkish-Armenian conflict. For instance, when the US House of Representatives passed a nonbinding resolution in March 2010 recognizing 1915 events as genocide, Turkey recalled its ambassador for consultations and further declared it would not sign the arms agreement with the USA.

The Kurdish question has haunted relations with Europe and put a damper on Turkey’s being a strong model for Central Asian countries. The European Union put indirect sanctions against Turkey’s involvement with Kurdish problem under the name of Turkey’s membership criteria. On the other hand, Turkey has been in a prolonged war against Kurdish terrorists or the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), which has cast a too-negative image for a Turkish model. Turkey, in this respect, “must choose between a Kemalistic state that tries to survive within its present fortress without further ambitions; or a state with a unified centre that supports some kind of local rule for the Kurdish population and extends its sphere of influence far beyond its limited state borders” (Tunander, 1995, p. 418). This is a difficult choice, since Turkey fears the foundation of
an autonomous Kurdish regime in Kirkuk, Iraq, which would threaten the territorial entity of Turkey through the possibility of provoking the Turkish Kurds.

Another dimension of the Kurdish problem was Turkey’s attitude in March, 2003, during the US invasion of Iraq. Turkey held back and declared it was not going to become involved in the intervention, since Turkey aimed at having good relationships with its neighbors, especially the other Muslim countries. In this respect, Turkey again had to make a difficult decision because “the war on Iraq waged by the US in March 2003 had very important repercussions for the long-lasting strategic partnership between the two countries [the US and Turkey] by creating a serious crisis of confidence on both sides and eventually putting the alliance under scrutiny” (Guney, 2005, p. 347). Facing a difficult choice, Turkey decided to give limited support to the US, by allowing the use of its air space.

Turkey-Europe relations are important to understand low cohesion in the Turkey-NATO alliance, since all members except the USA, Turkey and Canada are European countries. The Turkish-American partnership played an important role in making Turkey and European countries compromise and develop the necessary relations against the Soviets during the Cold War. Hence, “Turkey’s relations with the EU have always been influenced at least as importantly by strategic and political factors as by economic developments” (Kramer, 2000, p. 204). In the post-Cold War period, the Turkish-European partnership remained the same and Turkey pushed harder for acceptance into the EU. At this time, the European Union added new prerequisites in the way of Turkish membership so “with the approaching possibility of an eventual Turkish membership in the EU, cultural and religious considerations have increasingly been added to the picture”
(Kramer, p. 204). The main problems in the way of Turkey’s membership can be listed as Turkish-Greek conflicts, Cyprus, the Kurdish problem and the process of democratization. However, Turkey worked hard to get EU membership, it met with more preconditions. Therefore, Turkey recognized that its being in the EU was highly unlikely, unless it made more and more concessions in its foreign policies which would eventually damage its national interests. “Europe’s basically reluctant or hostile approach towards Turkey, consciously or subconsciously, tends negatively to influence the evaluation of other issues that are of political and economic relevance to the question of Turkey’s eventual membership in the EU” (Kramer, p. 226). This situation also decreases the level of commitment in the Turkey-NATO alliance and increases the level of internal threat. This will cause low cohesion in the alliance.

Overall, this chapter analyzed the divergences that reduce Turkey’s alliance cohesion with other NATO members. In this respect, Turkey needs to balance its relations between its western allies and the Middle Eastern countries. This will eventually increase the level of cohesion in the Turkey-NATO alliance. Additionally, this chapter also reveals that alliances are institutions distinct from other institutional cooperation. In my case, Turkey still cares about NATO and is trying to balance between its national interests and alliance interests. Turkey’s close relations with the Middle East should not be interpreted as turning away from NATO nor should its relations with the West be interpreted as an alienation from Islam and the Middle East. Turkey having connections with the West and the Middle East can promote NATO’s cohesion by managing conflicts and bridging the gap between these two different civilizations. In this respect, it is also necessary to correct the direct and indirect divergences underlined in this chapter, in
terms of Turkish foreign policy and the Turkey-NATO alliance. In doing so, the low or moderate level of cohesion in the alliance can be reduced, as long as Turkey agrees on mutual goals with other NATO members. In addition to these findings, this chapter also reveals the importance of institutions in the international system which might positively or negatively affect alliance cohesion, since states are interdependent from each other.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Turkey’s alliance formation can be characterized according to levels of threat it has experienced in wartime and peacetime periods. The findings of this paper support the idea that the level of threat defines alliance cohesion and also emphasizes that threats are not the only mean that defines alliance cohesion. Weitsman’s unified theory of alliance formation and cohesion captured and explained the regional dimensions of Turkey. The theory explained how different levels of external threats affected alliance behavior in the region and underlined the importance of states’ perceptions and motivations. This case was presented in bipolar and multipolar systems. My findings indicated how different systems influenced alliance formation and cohesion. In the bipolar system, particularly in the presence of high external threats, balancing, tethering and hedging were observed and Turkey’s alliance behavior showed moderate to high cohesion. In the multipolar system, when the external threat level was low hedging/balancing was observed. Accordingly, this case study proves that alliance cohesion needs to be contextually interpreted.

During the Cold War, Turkey formed an alliance with NATO, since the Soviet expansionist policies in the region threatened the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Turkey. Since the external threat was high and the internal threat was low, the Turkey-NATO alliance was cohesive and balancing the Soviet threat. However, after the Cuban missile crisis in the 1960s, when the external threat was reduced from high to moderate and the internal threat increased from low to moderate level, Turkey adopted hedging behavior. In the 1970s, the Cyprus problem increased the internal threat and Turkey preferred tethering by associating with the Soviets to reduce conflicts and manage
relations. During the 1980s, the Soviet influence increased in the region, particularly after the invasion of Afghanistan. Since the external threat became high, Turkey adopted balancing. After the tension between NATO and the Warsaw Pact lessened so the level of balancing decreased, Turkey was hedging by appraising different foreign policy options. Overall, Turkey’s alliance behaviors experienced significant changes during the Cold War era and its alliance behavior showed several ups and downs. My findings show that even within existing alliances, threat levels and motivations change over time (Table 1.3).

One of the major changes at the regional level was the fall of the Soviet Union. The region saw the emergence of number of new states which had historical, cultural and religious ties with Turkey. The new political environment enabled Turkey as an important actor. The early years of the post-Cold War era had some hold-over characteristics from the Cold War alliance policies, although external and internal threats were low. In the 1990s, the Second Gulf War and other peacekeeping operations in which NATO played a crucial role showed that the Turkey-NATO was still cohesive. This was because the alliance interest remained the same -- to consolidate its power by promoting stability and security. Additionally, the high level of institutional cooperation Turkey established after the Cold War shows that it is predominantly moving towards its own national interests, rather than the interests of its allies. This also served Turkey “to draw states into the hedging state’s (Turkey) sphere of interest at a very low cost” (Weitsman, 2004, p. 21).

Moreover, the concept of threat in the post-September 11 era is somehow different than the one during the Cold War. The threat is coming from non-state actors, particularly from institutionalized terrorist organizations; therefore, the only way to stand
against these transnational organizations is to enhance the level of cooperation. In this respect, NATO helps the international community promote coalitions and eliminate conflicts. Accordingly, the alliance cohesion was high during this period. On the other hand, after the Bush Administration’s policies, preemptive and unilateral policies, alliance cohesion was low.

Table 1.3: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Level of External Threat</th>
<th>Level of Internal Threat</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Turkey’s Alliance Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Balancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Balancing/Hedging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tethering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Balancing/Hedging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Low/Absent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Hedging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Low/Absent</td>
<td>Moderate/Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Hedging/Tethering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weitsman’s (2004) theory explains the Cold War alliance formation and cohesion. In this sense, a bipolar international environment and wartime perception are dominant factors that define how states acted realistically during the Cold War era. Since the threat was real the policies the states needed to follow became correspondingly realistic. That is why realist alliance theories explain my case during the Cold War period. On the other hand, in a multipolar international environment along with lower levels of threat and a peacetime environment, the role of states remains significant but institutions become more and more important by promoting more collaborative policies. This is why the institutionalist approach is able to explain more about post-Cold War politics. In this respect, Weitsman’s alliance theory, by differentiating different levels of
internal and external threats, corresponds to the alliance behaviors of Turkey during the Cold War and the post-Cold War periods (Table 1.3), since her theory combines different alliance theories.

In the post-Cold War period, realist alliance theory does not explain Turkey’s alliance behavior. This is because there are low levels of external and high levels of internal threats in Turkey’s alliance with NATO. Additionally, after the Cold War, none of the members came across a high level of threat against its sovereignty or territorial integrity; levels of threat could no longer explain alliance cohesion effectively. In this respect, today’s warfare is really complicated and different than it used to be, since the enemy is a transnational institution not a state. This brings the necessity of institutionalizing collaborations among states. Accordingly, levels of threat under some circumstances are difficult to measure. In addition, contemporary alliances are showing different characteristics than the ones in the past. In this respect, Turkey’s alliance behavior represents a good example of today’s alliance characteristics. Turkey currently tries to increase its power in the region and its influence on its neighboring countries by helping to negotiate conflict resolution. In doing so, Turkey uses its NATO membership and its economic and political institutional ties in its geopolitics. This also helps NATO’s cohesion to endure, since NATO showed, after the Cold War, the importance of its involvement in low and moderate level conflicts.

In this respect, institutionalism theory explains contemporary Turkish alliance behavior by emphasizing the high level of relations through institutions and focusing on the importance of cooperation. In addition, Weitsman’s (2004) theory also explains Turkey’s alliance behavior in contemporary history (Table 1.3). Accordingly, the
Turkey-NATO military alliance continued to be cohesive after the Cold War and managed to enhance cooperation against conflicts during this period. In this respect, tethering alliance behavior is the important tool for managing the alliance behavior (Weitsman, 2004). This explains why Turkey nowadays deepens cooperation through institutions and provides stability by resolving conflicts in the Middle East. In this respect, the Turkey’s unique history and geopolitics make the Turkey-NATO alliance more cohesive, as well. Turkey now has more connections, economically, culturally and politically, with Middle Eastern countries and Central Asian countries through institutional cooperation. For instance, over the past few years, Turkey has increased its connections and cooperation with Iran and Syria. These changes show that Turkey does not maintain only western interests in the region, as in the Cold War, but maintains its own interests as well.

Turkey’s main foreign policy still leans towards the West and these changes do not mean that Turkey will turn its back on the West. Turkey’s active history in NATO provided a strong asset for alliance cohesion. Therefore, unlike any other country, Turkey, with its hybrid identity and well-established relations with western countries as well as Middle Eastern and Central Asian ones, has a lower threat perception in its geopolitics. For this reason, the Turkish partnership is vital if the West can use it as a bridge to the Middle East. Turkey’s close relations with nuclear Iran may not reduce the Turkey-NATO cohesion; it might instead promote it by establishing more ties and bridging the gap between the West and the Middle East. This will also reduce the tension between the two sides and open negotiations concerning collective security by
eliminating or at least reducing the source of threat for the West. I will summarize my findings in this respect and then I will conclude this paper.

Turkey has been trying to get EU membership for almost half a century. Since there is no positive signal that such membership is forthcoming, Turkey has increased its relations with the Middle Eastern and other Turkic countries in the region. However, this situation does not color Turkish relations with the West, especially with NATO; it only shifts Turkey’s concentration of foreign policy toward other options by establishing wider connections. Since Turkey already had well-established relations with the EU and the USA, it would not be logical to expect it to turn its back on the West, as stated earlier. In this sense, “the Turks moved into the orbit of Europe gradually, first as a strong, even superior, enemy, then as an ally, and finally as a dependent client in order to ward off the Russian threat” (Karpat, 1996, p. 37). What Turkey will choose and where Turkey will go are some questions waiting to be answered, but it can be inferred from recent developments that Turkey not only wants to be a central mechanism in bridging the gap between the West and the Middle East, but it also wants to be the main authority in the region by using NATO membership and close institutional ties with the Middle East.

After September 11, Turkey’s alliance behavior showed moderate to low cohesion, because the USA’s unilateral policies were not favored by Turkey. Additionally, Turkey’s long wait for European Union membership discouraged its persistence for western alliances. Turkey started to establish more relations with its neighboring countries through institutional cooperation. It now has a number of institutional connections both with the Middle East and with Central Asia and it continues to establish more. This will eventually change the political context of these
regions and alliance formation of the countries there. Therefore, Turkey is now not simply a western ally, who eases conflicts with the Middle East, it is a growing multiregional power whose interests and policies cannot be undermined. These changes will make it easier for Turkey to balance its relations with its allies and other countries; however, they will bring more responsibilities as well. Overall, Turkey should learn the lessons from the past.

Having a military alliance with the West and a high level of economic and political coalitions with the Middle East, Turkish alliance behavior has always been in a troublesome process, making it hard for Turkey to formulate its alliance and balancing. Whenever Turkey emphasized a particular relationship, others that Turkey cared about were steadily eroded. This can be seen in Turkish-Iranian relations and Turkish-Israeli relations. Alliance formation also defines the structure of alliance and the Turkish case shows how difficult balancing is in an environment in which each state has different threat perceptions. As long as Turkey managed to balance between and in between its alliances and relationships, its role in the region will always be valuable. Therefore, misperceptions by the other states about Turkey are important factors that change Turkey’s alliance behavior.

Turkey is not only the meeting point of different civilizations but is also part of these different civilizations. The Turkey-NATO alliance underlines this situation very well, starting with the Cold War. In this sense, Turkey has always been made to choose to which side it belongs and to make tradeoffs between its national interests and alliance interests, especially after the Cold War when Turkey’s sphere of influence increased
considerably. That is why Turkish alliance cohesion shows several ups and downs and unpredictability in contemporary history.

To sum up, Turkish alliance behaviors in contemporary history show that Turkey seeks to balance its relations with the alliance with the West and institutional cooperation with the Middle East in order to bridge the gap between these two civilizations. This is related to the high level of interdependency in the international system and Turkey’s unique hybrid identity which fosters Turkey’s maintaining good relations with both sides of conflicts between states or institutions. In this respect, Turkey will need to provide more peacekeeping policies by reducing the distance between different civilizations. Huntington’s clash of civilizations will then be prevented through alliances which represent more coalitions, collaboration and balance of the threats. Alliances, therefore, should be formed and operated as “proponents of peace” rather than “weapons of war”.
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