

BRITAIN AND TURKEY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

MUSTAFA BILGIN

Tauris Academic Studies

BRITAIN AND TURKEY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

*For my wife and dearest children,
Elif Nur and Mehmet*

BRITAIN AND TURKEY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Politics and Influence in the
Early Cold War Era

MUSTAFA BILGIN

Tauris Academic Studies
LONDON • NEW YORK

Published in 2007 by Tauris Academic Studies,
an imprint of I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010
www.ibtauris.com

In the United States of America and Canada distributed by
Palgrave Macmillan, a division of St. Martin's Press
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010

Copyright © 2007 Mustafa Bilgin

The right of Mustafa Bilgin to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by the author in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988.

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Library of International Relations 32

ISBN: 978 1 84511 350 6

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress catalog card: available

Printed and bound in India by Thomson Press (India) Ltd
camera-ready copy supplied by katherine@projectpublish.com

CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
Introduction	1
1. Anglo-Turkish Relations in the Middle East: The Historical Background to 1945	11
2. The Emergence of the Soviet Threat in Anglo-Turkish Relations (1945–47)	42
3. Britain, Turkey and the Middle East (1945–47)	75
4. The Question of Palestine in Anglo-Turkish Relations (1947–50)	107
5. An Active Foreign Policy: Turkey's Involvement in the British Defence Plans and Her Admission to NATO (1950–52)	138
6. The Fall of the British Regional Defence Plans and the Rise of Turkish 'Triangular Strategy' (1952–53)	180
Conclusion: A General Evaluation of Anglo-Turkish Relations	226
<i>Notes and References</i>	245
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	299
<i>Index</i>	315

ABBREVIATIONS

ADM	Admiralty
BJSM	British Joint Study Mission
BMEO	British Middle East Office
CAB	Cabinet Office
CC	Conciliation Commission
C-in-C Mediterranean	Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean
C-in-C MELF	Commander-in-Chief, Middle East Land Forces
C-in-C NELM	Commander-in-Chief, Near East and Mediterranean
CIGS	Chief of Imperial General Staff
COS	Chiefs of Staff
CRME	Conference of British Middle Eastern Representatives
CRO	Commonwealth Relations Office
CO	Colonial Office
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
DCC	Defence Coordination Committee Middle East (British)
DEFE	Ministry of Defence
ERP	European Recovery Programme
FO	Foreign Office
FRUS	Foreign Relations of the United States
GA	General Assembly (UN)
GSi	General Staff Intelligence
GHQ	General Headquarters

HC	High Commissioner
HMG	Her (His) Majesty's Government
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JPS	Joint Planning Staff
JIC	Joint Intelligence Sub-Committee
MEC	Middle East Command (Allied)
MECO	Middle East Command Organisation
MEDB	Middle East Cooperative Defence
MEHQ	Middle East Headquarters
MESG	Middle East Standing Group
MFA	Minister for Foreign Affairs
MP	Member of Parliament
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NSC	National Security Council
PREM	Prime Minister's Office
PRO	Public Record Office
RAF	Royal Air Force
RPP	Republican People's Party
SACMED	Supreme Allied Commander
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander Europe
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied
S of S FA	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
TGS	Turkish General Staff
TGNA	Turkish Grand National Assembly
UK	United Kingdom
UKDEL	United Kingdom Delegation (in the UN)
UN	United Nations
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine
US	United States
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
VCIGS	Vice Chief of Imperial General Staff
WO	War Office

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a revised version of a PhD research conducted with the financial support provided by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) and Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University (KSÜ) in Turkey. It took fourteen months long and constant archival research to complete this study. I therefore would like to thank both YÖK and personnel of the KSÜ for their kindness and support given to me during my study at the University of Birmingham.

I wish to express my special gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Steven Morewood, who has always tried to provide me with all his help, knowledge and encouragement throughout my research. My heartfelt thanks also go to Prof Dr Erik Goldstein who was my former supervisor and provided me valuable insights into the issues related to diplomatic history and international relations as well as the issues related to Turkey. I am also very grateful to Prof W Scott Lucas (of the University of Birmingham) for his valuable guidance and encouragement during the preparation of this book.

I would like to thank Professors Azmi Süslü and Ömer Kürkçüoğlu (of Ankara University) for their kindly advice and support. I am indebted to Dr Eve Richards who read parts of the drafts and helped me to improve the writing of this study. I am grateful for the assistance offered by the personnel of the Public Record Office, the personnel of the Libraries of the SOAS and the LSE of the University of London as well as to the staff of the Special Collections of the Library of the University of Birmingham. I also thank the staff of Turkish Libraries in Ankara. I am also grateful for the technical assistance given by Dr Adil Akyüz during the final preparation of this book.

Last, but not least and indeed most importantly, my special thanks and deep gratitude go to my wife, Gülay, and my beloved and dearest daughter, Elif Nur, and my little son, Mehmet Murat, for their loving presence and their inexhaustible patience and forbearance in stimulating the progress of this study.

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East between 1945 and 1953. It starts from the period directly following the Second World War and continues until July 1953 when British Middle Eastern defence plans failed and were replaced first by the Turkish 'Triangular Strategy' and then by the American 'Northern Tier' defence concept. A dual approach is adopted: while Turkish policies in the region are explored initially, the nature of the British attitude towards the Turkish policies is then examined to analyse the development of Anglo-Turkish relations concerning the Middle East.

The book examines the relations between Britain and Turkey primarily in Iraq and Egypt and to a lesser extent in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon in accordance with the significance of these countries to Anglo-Turkish relations. The book also emphasises the emergence of the Palestine question as it became a dominant political factor in the region from 1947 onwards and considers the way in which this issue affected Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East. It further touches upon the development of Anglo-Turkish policies towards the other states of the region such as Iran and Pakistan. The study also provides a detailed background to Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East up to 1945 in order to better understand the nature of the relations between the two countries in the succeeding early Cold War period.

The year 1945 was an important juncture for Anglo-Turkish relations as the legacy of the Second World War signalled the beginning of immense conflicts and tensions in the Near East which posed a major threat to the interests of the West in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. This was the start of the Cold War which radically altered the nature of international politics. Britain and Turkey were among the countries which were

seriously affected by the Cold War atmosphere as the USSR emerged as an imminent threat to their interests. This naturally brought the two countries together to combat this danger. Their combination, however, was not strong enough to deter the Soviet threat and both London and Ankara sought Washington's support. This is why the book takes the immediate post-war period as a starting point in examining Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East.

There have been three main schools of thought in the historical debate over the origins of the Cold War. While the earliest view, the conventional prospect, which emerged in the 1950s, portrayed the USSR as the main cause of the Cold War, the revisionist idea, which appeared on the scene during the Vietnam War, saw the USA as bearing heavy responsibility for provoking it.¹ The post-revisionist school, which emerged in the 1980s, however, has argued that both former views fall short of providing satisfactory answers to the complicated problems of the escalating Cold War. In their view, both superpowers shared responsibility for starting the Cold War. Moreover, they have further argued that there were other European and regional powers, such as Britain and Turkey which played their part in the development of East-West tension in this period.²

No single historical interpretation among these views however fully captures the reasons for the origin and development of the Cold War. All, nevertheless, offer partial solutions to the historiographic puzzle. It is rather a combination of various views which offer the reader a better understanding of the emergence and evolution of the Cold War in the Near and Middle East. The crucial role played by Turkey in the development of the Cold War in the Middle East, especially in the post-1950 period constitutes one of the important findings of this book.³ Geo-political factors also played a crucial part with USA-USSR conflict eventually supplanting the traditional rivalry in the region between Britain and Russia.

In the immediate post-war period the Conservative government of Churchill was replaced by Labour under Attlee's premiership; the latter continued to hold power until late October 1951. Thereafter the Conservatives retook office and remained in power for the following thirteen years (1951–1964). In this period Turkey was governed by the Republican People's Party (RPP), under President İnönü until May 1950 and thereafter the Democrat government of Menderes succeeded and remained in office until a military coup overthrew it in May 1960.

These new governments (British-Labour and Turkish-Democrat) brought a change of emphasis in their respective foreign policies in Britain and Turkey. Compared with the Conservative dominated government

during the war and its first term in office from late 1951 onwards, the Labour government had a much more inward looking agenda based on the creation of a modern welfare state and the nationalisation of key industries. Nevertheless, within this framework and against the background of a limited contraction of the British Empire, Labour, under the influence of the Chiefs of Staff (COS) and the Foreign Office, still retained aspirations for Britain to continue to be a world power and in this context the Middle East maintained its strategic and political significance. Within this framework great strategic importance was attributed to Turkey because of its geopolitical position as a barrier in the way of possible Soviet expansion southwards where vital British interests had long existed.

In Turkey, in the 1945–50 period, the Republican government was determined to break out of Turkey's isolation and the threat from the Soviets by trying to develop closer relations with the West in general and with Britain in particular. However, a change of government in Ankara following the May 1950 elections signalled a substantial change both in Turkey's foreign policy and her military strategy. The Democrat government had much broader political, strategic and economic interests in the region above and beyond the Soviet threat. They were conscious of the need to maintain and extend the domestic position through a much more active foreign policy, which appealed to the electorate. In order to realise their broader political, strategic and economic objectives the Democrat leaders pursued a more active foreign policy in both Western and Eastern directions.⁴

In this period, the Turkish foreign policy was formulated by few selected Turkish statesmen. During the single party era policy decision making rested mainly with the first two Turkish Presidents, Kemal Atatürk (1923–1938) and then İsmet İnönü (1938–1950) together with the assistance of their few intimates.⁵ This system, despite a slight change, remained more or less the same even though Turkey entered into a multi-party period after 1950. This was due to the provisions of the 1924 Constitution which had granted a great deal of power to the President with regard to Turkey's internal and external affairs. In the Democrat Party period, as the new President Bayar testified in his memoirs, decisions on foreign policy were in general made by himself together with his Prime Minister, Adnan Menderes.⁶

The Democrat Foreign Minister was Fuat Köprülü, a well-respected professor of history, who also played a significant part in the conduct of foreign policy.⁷ On fundamental foreign policy issues, the Prime Minister first consulted the Foreign Minister and then brought the matter to the

attention of the Cabinet. The Cabinet in general concurred with the decision which had already been taken by the Prime Minister. Therefore, though public opinion began to be taken into account on certain foreign policy matters during the Democrat Party era, many parts of the state apparatus, including the Army remained largely outside the policy making process while the bureaucracy of the Foreign Ministry was restricted to carrying out routine jobs such as protocol, reporting world events and providing research to policy makers.⁸

During the Cold War period four main factors affected the course of Turkey's foreign policy. The first and foremost one was Turkey's geopolitical position at the intersection of three continents where the interest of the Great Powers clashed which impelled Turkey to change her neutral stance. The second was the legacy of Kemalist ideology which sought to make Turkey a part of western civilisation. By 1952 Turkey had become a full member of the Western political and military systems: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The third key factor was the weakness of the Turkish armed forces, which, alone, could not deter the threat stemming from the Soviet Union, and led Turkey to align with the West. The fourth was Turkey's need for foreign economic and military aid. Though these factors were the main concerns of both the Republican and Democrat governments of Turkey there were substantial differences in their methods of dealing with these concerns.

There have been few books and little scholarly research on the region, whether on Turkey's Middle Eastern policies, in general, or on Anglo-Turkish relations in particular. Taking into consideration its crucial geopolitical position at the crossroads of three continents, (Asia, Africa and Europe), as a bulwark in front of the USSR and its relatively good social political and military position in the Middle East, it is surprising that these have not been reflected in existing studies on Turkey.

The main reason which discourages academics from undertaking research on Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East is the hardships involved in conducting research in Britain and Turkey and the difficulty of accessing the official records of the modern Turkish Republic. Another crucial reason, as indicated by a historian, could be that 'Turkey does not fit into any neat geographical or linguistic categories [either in Asia or in Europe], and so is consistently and unjustifiably ignored by Europeanists, Sovietologists and Arabists alike.'⁹

Despite these handicaps, there is a growing an academic interest in modern Turkish studies. Some of the researchers in question, who deserve

to be named, are: Bruce R. Kuniholm, A. Kemal Meram, A. Ferenc Vali, Ömer Kürkçüoğlu, Kemal H. Karpat. The list includes recent authors such as Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, Feroz Ahmad, Hüseyin Bağcı, Clement H. Dodd, Mahmut Bali Aykan, Erik J. Zürcher, Ayşegül Sever, Ekavi Athanassopoulou, William Hale, and Philip Robins.¹⁰ However, these works, in general, through their lack of first-hand documents and concentration on economic and political developments in Turkey, have largely neglected Turkey's policies in the Middle East in relation to the Western powers. Although the works by Kürkçüoğlu, Aykan, Hale and Robins¹¹ have dealt with Turkey's regional policies on general lines they do not provide any detailed account of them and their works can not match with the present study as far as Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East are concerned in the period specified by the present book.

There have been a substantial number of books and articles which focus on British policies in the Middle East during the period under review but these generally exclude considering the Turkish dimension in the regional context. They were written by such authorities as Louis, Young, Ovendale, Silverfab, Hahn, Devereux, Leffler and Cohen.¹² These works in general examine British policies from the Western perspective and largely neglect the crucial Turkish role in the formation of British policies from the regional perspective. In some of these studies their main focus is Anglo-American relations, while other works concentrate on the Egyptian or Iraqi dimension of Western policies in the Middle East. Only books by Louis, Devereux, and Cohen touch to some extent on the Turkish dimension in relation to British or American policies.

There has therefore been a crucial missing element, the Turkish dimension, in these studies. Yet this is axiomatic to a proper understanding of developments. Without examining the Turkish role it is not possible to fully realize the mechanics of the process of supplanting British defence strategy with that of Turkey and the USA in the Middle East. The shift in the balance of power from London to Washington was beginning to take place in the region in the spring of 1951 when Britain lost much of its political influence in Turkey to the USA. The present research, by placing emphasis on these points, thus aims to fill a gap in the literature by examining comprehensively Anglo-Turkish strategic and political relations in the Middle East.

It is hence safe to say that no historian has yet produced a scholarly study which examines in depth the available materials, both British and Turkish, on Anglo-Turkish relations. This research derives its uniqueness from the fact that Turkey as a regional power and Britain as an outsider

power were among the most involved countries in the political and strategic affairs of the Middle East in the period covered by this book.

The start of the Cold War therefore made the two countries' relationship crucial in the understanding of historical events in the Near and the Middle East. To discover how the Cold War environment affected the course of Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East and how Turkey was seen by the Western powers under the Republican and the Democrat Governments in Ankara were among the main reasons which reinforced the author's desire to examine this topic.

Besides its contribution to Anglo-Turkish relations, the present study seemed to be needed for the sake of academic completeness on a number of grounds: first, by examining the Turkish case, it sheds light on the start and development of the Cold War in the Near East in the context of Anglo-American responses to the Soviet threat; second, it provides a level of understanding of the development of British Middle Eastern policy in general and of its Palestine policy in particular, by emphasising the neglected Turkish factor; third, it shows that without examining the Turkish dimension it is not possible to fully grasp the nature of Western strategy in general and British strategy in particular in the Middle East.

This was especially the case for the period in late 1952 when Britain began gradually to build its strategy on the Turco-British-Iraqi triangle. Moreover, this study seeks to shed light on the relationship between medium size and great powers in a bipolar world. It also provides a full understanding of the process of Turkey's shift from relying on Britain to the relying on USA.

By mid-1952, because of economic hardships and the new developments in nuclear weapons, faced with extreme Arab and Egyptian nationalism countering Turkish help and influence, Britain was forced to reconfigure its strategy in the context the 'Triangular Strategy'¹³ (a Turkish concept based on Anglo-Turco-Iraqi cooperation), which has so far largely been neglected by historians of this period. Thus, special emphasis is given to this development as this was one of the major contributory points in the formulation of the Baghdad Pact.¹⁴

This book concludes before the emergence of the American Northern Tier project which converged with the Turkish strategy and eventually led to the establishment of the Baghdad Pact in 1955. The emphasis here is on Britain's attempt to maintain her strategic and political position in the Middle East through Turkey's support of its defence initiative. The failure of this policy, which led Turkey to develop its own regional strategy, therefore marks the end point of this study.

This book is a revised version of a PhD Dissertation and based on extensive research into both British and Turkish archives. In Britain, the research is centred on the records held at the Public Record Office (PRO); private papers held there and at the University of Birmingham; and published British and American official documents.

Among the official British records; PREM (Prime Minister's Office), DEFE (Ministry of Defence), CAB (Cabinet), and FO (Foreign Office) files are particularly important to the understanding of British policy towards the Middle East in general and Turkey in particular. Some of them are highly classified and only recently released documents. The private papers from various high ranking British officials have also shed light on British policy: the Chief of the Imperial General Staff (WO 216); papers from the Foreign Office Private Archives (FO 800/896); the papers of Slessor (Chief and Marshal of the Air Staff, AIR 75/102), and of Sargent, Bevin, and Morrison (FO 800); together with the Eden (Avon) papers at the University of Birmingham; all provide valuable insights into the British Middle Eastern strategy and Turkey's place in it.

The most important documents illuminating Anglo-Turkish relations, and particularly the Middle East dimension, contained in the FO371 series of general correspondence. The documents of the British Embassy in Ankara (FO 195) are also important. Moreover, while the files of FO 141, relating to the British embassy in Cairo, are useful for Turco-Egyptian relations, the confidential prints of FO 421 (Iraq) FO 424 (Turkey) and FO 624 (the British Embassy in Baghdad) are crucial for studying the development of Anglo-Turco-Iraqi relations. Moreover, the extensive use of Cabinet papers (CAB 84, 119, 120, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 134), PREM and DEFE documents has greatly contributed to the understanding of the formulation of British foreign policy and strategy towards the Middle East and Turkey.

The Turkish standpoint has been illuminated through use of a vast amount of published archival documents together with the published and unpublished official documents and statements. The memoirs of those who had been in charge of foreign affairs and the secondary literature available in Turkish are also used to elucidate the Turkish perspective. The three volumes of published archival records by the Turkish Foreign Ministry including the two volumes published by the Turkish Ministry of Culture are crucial for the understanding of Turkey's foreign policy up until 1947.¹⁵

The official sources, which cover the years 1947–53 are the records of Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) and *Düstur* (official records

related to affairs of the state), and that of *Aym Tarihi* (the monthly record published by the office of Turkish Prime Ministry). The records of TGNA are: the period-7 (1943–46); the period-8 (1946–50); the period-9 (1950–54). While the records of *Düstur* (the third period) contain the years 1923–60 the relevant records of *Aym Tarihi* cover the years 1945–53. Furthermore, other official publications,¹⁶ the daily Turkish newspapers¹⁷ and the memoirs¹⁸ of high-ranking officials in Turkey's Foreign Ministry, together with other available sources shed much light on the Turkish perspective.

As a result this research shows that there is a remarkable conformity between the Turkish and British documents in terms of illuminating Turkey's position. This result however is not very surprising as both Britain and Turkey had established closer relations since the mid-1930s and thus this necessitated a profound and sincere consultation and collaboration between the two countries on the issues related to the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean especially after they faced a renewed threat from the Soviet Union in the post-1945.

The book is divided into six main chapters. The first chapter provides a brief background to Anglo-Turkish relations before 1945 to help the reader to fully understand the topic. It first observes the reasons behind the rise and fall of the traditional Anglo-Turkish friendship up to the end of the First World War. Then it examines the way in which strategic imperatives brought Britain and Turkey into an alliance from 1930 onwards after the initial momentary setbacks to Anglo-Turkish relations during Atatürk's administration. However, after Atatürk's death in 1938 Turkish foreign policy shifted under his successor, İnönü, from a search for active alignment with Britain to neutrality. Then the chapter deals with the failed Anglo-American attempts to bring Turkey into the war.

The second chapter is devoted to the issue of the Soviet post-war pressures on Turkey and Ankara's search for security from the West against the threat from Moscow. It analyses the initial differences between London and Washington in their approaches to Turkey in her attempts to gain security and emphasises their eventual collaboration in late 1946 to support the Turkish case vis-à-vis Moscow. Also special attention is paid to the implications of British withdrawal from the Near East and the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947. The chapter proves that though Britain transferred its economic role to the USA its political influence was to continue for some years to come.

The third chapter examines the development of Turkey's policies with the Arab states during 1945–47 and the way in which Britain reacted to these policies. The chapter acknowledges that Turkey's regional policies

were an extension of her general search for security. As the Anglo-Turkish alliance continued to be the basis of Turkey's foreign policy, Turkey's regional policies were an extension of her alignment with Britain. Ankara at this time faced heavy direct and indirect pressures from Moscow. Turkey tried to counteract the indirect Soviet pressures in collaboration with the states of Iraq and Transjordan.

The fourth chapter concentrates on the emergence of the Palestine question in the period 1947–50. In this period the Palestine question turned into a major international issue which immensely affected Western-Arab relations. It thus occupied a considerable place in Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East. This chapter identifies a link between Turkey's involvement in the Palestine question and its search for additional security. Since Turkey's repeated attempts with the USA with regard to her search for further security failed she looked for British mediation to realise this objective in return for Ankara's cooperation with London in the Middle East in general and in the Palestine question in particular.

The fifth chapter deals with the crucial regional and international developments which affected Western policies in the Middle East. One of these was the change of political power in Turkey. The new Democrat Party's advent to power in May 1950 signalled a significant shift not only in Turkey's internal policy but also in her foreign policy. The new government decided to pursue an active policy in both Eastern and Western directions. The outbreak of the Korean War was a first test case for the new government's active policy. Turkey's immediate response to the US pleas and the Turkish army's achievements had a significant impact on Anglo-American opinion of the value of Turkey as a regional ally in the Western struggle against the USSR. While it opened the gate of NATO to Turkey it at the same time caused to her involvement in the British defence plans in the Middle East.

The last chapter analyses the development of Anglo-Turkish relations in relation to the Western security attempts in the Middle East in the period 1952–53. More importantly, this chapter explores the emergence of the Turkish 'Triangular Strategy' as an alternative to the failed British defence plans. As Britain's defence plans for the region had shown no progress in the 1950–52 period this led Turkey to take the initiative with regard to regional defence and both countries reached an agreement in London to implement Turkish strategy from late 1952 onwards. The Turkish strategy based on a triangular collaboration between Britain, Turkey and Iraq became the core of American defence concept of the 'Northern Tier' and eventually replaced the British Middle Eastern defence plans.

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO 1945

Anglo-Ottoman relations which started to develop in the sixteenth century constitute an important factor in Turkish history. Since then the course of Anglo-Ottoman relationship showed a constant development until the late nineteenth century. This was because the political and especially strategic interests of the both countries necessitated a close cooperation between them in the face of a threat posed by the increasing challenge of Tsarist Russia. However, the nature of good relationship between the two countries was based on the condition of mutual benefit. When the basis of this relationship began to disappear with the descent from power of the Sublime Porte Ottoman-British relations began to decline. The decline started especially after the outbreak of the Turco-Russian War of 1877–78 and reached its lowest point when the both countries entered the Great War on opposite sides.

Anglo-Turkish relations began to improve only after the new Turkish Republic was firmly established. This led to the restoration of a historically deep-rooted relationship during the 1930s at a time when fascism in Europe and the Mediterranean threatened the peace and stability of international relations in general and their respective interests in particular. The mutual attitude and friendship eventually reached its climax with the signature of the Anglo-Franco-Turkish Alliance of October 1939. The Alliance,

however, was not fully put into operation due to its strategic defections during the Second World War.

The Developments in Anglo-Turkish Relations up to 1918

Relations in the Early Period

Anglo-Ottoman relations began to develop steadily after Britain signed a commercial treaty with the Ottoman Empire in 1583. During the following two centuries commercial and economic activities played an important role in Turkish-British relations. At the end of the eighteenth century the new political developments in Asia and on the African continent resulted in even closer political relations between the two countries.¹

The first major political development was the occupation of the Crimea by Russia in 1774, when she inflicted a crushing defeat on the Ottoman Empire; in consequence, her advance towards the Turkish Straits and Mediterranean via the Black Sea became imminent. This posed a serious threat both towards Ottoman territorial integrity and the British imperial route to India through the Mediterranean. The other important event which brought the Ottoman Empire and Britain into a close alliance was the occupation of Egypt by France in 1798. These events marked the beginning of close political relations between the two countries and they both realised that this was beneficial for their mutual interests.²

British policy throughout the nineteenth century continued to support the preservation of the Ottoman Empire as a barrier to Russia's Mediterranean ambitions. Great Britain, with France, sided with the Ottomans in the Crimean War (1853–56) against Russia. At the end of the war, Russia was seriously defeated and her threat to the Black Sea region contained. The war ended with the Treaty of Paris in March 1856. The importance of the treaty for the Ottomans was that for the first time the Ottoman Empire was accepted as a European State by the European powers. At the same time those powers agreed that they should maintain the preservation of the Empire. Twenty years later another Russia-Turkish War brought British diplomatic support in favour of the Ottoman Empire, but Britain refused to provide any military contribution even when Russia was on the verge of occupying the Sublime Porte in 1877.

At this time the Ottomans were left to fight alone. Britain and other powers intervened only after peace had been restored to mitigate the severity of the terms imposed by Russia. At the end of the war, the Treaty of Berlin was signed in July 1878 to modify Russia's harsh peace terms. The losses sustained by the Ottoman Empire in Europe were nevertheless serious. Therefore, the Ottoman Empire found a chance of survival with

the diplomatic support given by Britain, France, and other powers in the forthcoming decades.³

As part of the treaty of Berlin, Britain asked for the temporary possession of Cyprus in order to send military assistance to the Ottoman Empire in case of any further Russian attack to its territories. Eventually, the Sultan accepted the British occupation of the island on condition that Britain returned it after the Russian threat had passed. In fact, this British move signalled a change in its policy towards the Ottoman Empire. British statesmen came to think that the protection of the Empire against Russia would not be enough to provide for the security of her interests in India, Africa and the Mediterranean. Four years later Britain occupied Egypt in 1882 for the same reasons.⁴

In the last decades of the nineteenth century the nature of Anglo-Turkish relations began to move in reverse. This was due to the change of perceptions of Ottoman and British statesmen towards each other. From the Ottoman point of view, the occupation of Cyprus and Egypt, in particular, made a profoundly negative impact on the mind of Sultan Abdülhamit II and his administration which lost confidence in Britain's role as the only Great Power anxious to ensure the survival of the Ottoman Empire. This idea forced the Ottomans to search for alternative policies. Until the 1880s the traditional Ottoman policy had rested on the belief that their safety lay in the antagonism between Russia and Great Britain. However, Abdülhamit II modified this policy by approaching Germany, which was looking for an opportunity to enter the Middle East market, and thus was ready for collaboration.⁵

From the British point of view, this era represented an obvious shift in the traditional cordial attitude towards the Sublime Porte, for the following reasons. To begin with, the Ottoman Empire was not considered a viable state any longer. Its political effectiveness as a barrier to the Russian threat had lost its value and, sooner or later, it was expected to collapse. Thus, the Conservative government contemplated securing some parts of the Ottoman Empire, such as Cyprus and Egypt, in order to guarantee the security of the route to India via the Mediterranean against any threat from the European states. The Liberal Party, which came to power in 1880, and its leader, William Gladstone, followed a more rigid policy against the Ottomans because of false allegations that the Turks had conducted massacres against the Christian population in the Balkans and elsewhere. These controversial claims and allegations made a negative impact on British public opinion against the Turks.⁶

The other crucial reason for the change in British policy was the emergence of a strong Germany in Europe. This was a new threat to the European balance of power. It forced Britain, France, and Russia to come closer in the first decade of the twentieth century. With this new situation London was no longer concerned with Russian ambitions of expansion into Ottoman territories. Moreover, she already had the strategically important possessions of Cyprus and Egypt, which provided security for her interests in India, Africa and the Mediterranean area. For these reasons Britain, from 1880 onwards, abandoned her traditional policy towards the Ottoman Empire and this pushed the Sublime Porte to establish closer relationships with Germany.⁷

The Roots of Anglo-Ottoman Rivalry in the Middle East

Ottoman domination in the Arabian Peninsula dates back to the early sixteenth century. However, the Ottoman Sultans exercised an influence, which, at one time or another, but never continuously, had affected most parts of the peninsula, except the southeast region. The other power which established its domination there was Britain, whose influence had been at various points in conflict with the Ottomans since the second half of the eighteenth century. Great Britain first established a political footing in Arabia by a treaty concluded with the Sultan of Muscat in 1798.

However, its permanent settlement there began in 1839 with the occupation of Aden along with some other territories around the Gulf. The main British preoccupation was to secure the sea route from the Gulf to India. In the course of time Britain attributed much importance to Kuwait because of its suitable position as a harbour for its trade.⁸

The lands of Mesopotamia were conquered by the Ottomans in 1534 and were gradually incorporated into the Ottoman Empire as three main provinces: Mosul, Baghdad and Basra. Until the early nineteenth century the Sublime Porte did not establish an effective influence in the region and this hence led Britain to expand its commercial domination there. This situation however was to change when the Ottoman policy of centralisation in Mesopotamia began in the first half of the nineteenth century.

With the new Ottoman policy, Mesopotamia was to become a place where the interests of Britain and Ottoman Empire would obviously clash in the late nineteenth century. This was due to the changes in British policy, which aimed at pursuing not only commercial interests but also political aspirations to take effective control of the region.⁹ Kuwait became the centre of conflict in the Gulf, when its Sheikh signed a secret agreement with Britain by which Kuwait was placed under a British pro-

tectorate in mid-1898. However, the Ottoman Foreign Minister, Tevfik Pasha, denounced this secret agreement and declared it to be null and void.¹⁰ This resulted in open conflict between London and Istanbul in Mesopotamia and in the Gulf. The conflict in these areas was further intensified between the two countries when the Ottoman government granted a charter to Germany to build a railway from Berlin to Baghdad, which would connect Germany to Mesopotamia and the Gulf.¹¹

The Ottoman policy of centralisation in Mesopotamia was further followed by the Sultan Abdülhamit, during whose reign the Turkish administration became more effective.¹² In this period, the area attracted the attention of the major powers of Europe. Until 1881 the only European power represented at Baghdad besides Britain was France, which had no local interest, but had a connection limited to religious matters. A Russian Consulate was opened at Baghdad in 1881 and this was followed by those of other countries such as Germany, Belgium, Spain, Sweden and the USA; each acquired certain commercial interests in Mesopotamia, and opened their Consulates in Baghdad.¹³

At this time, as the Sublime Porte lost its confidence in Britain's role in ensuring the survival of the Ottoman Empire, it began to look for closer cooperation with Germany, which was ready to involve in Middle East markets. Therefore, while the appearance of Germany as a force constituted a threat to British interests it conversely provided a good deal of support to the survival of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁴

Ottoman-German relations started with cultural activities in 1880. Many Ottoman military officers were sent to Germany for training purposes. Then a German Military Mission was stationed in Istanbul (Constantinople) in order to organise the Ottoman Army, from 1883 to 1895. Moreover, the Germans financed loans for the Ottomans and the trade between the two countries grew rapidly. The visit of the German Kaiser to Istanbul marked the beginning of a close collaboration between Germany and the Ottoman Empire. The former was very keen to enter the Eastern Market. This visit paved the way for their trade agreement in 1880. This was the beginning of the German influence which would powerfully affect the course of Turkish history in the decades to come.¹⁵

Anglo-Turkish Estrangement before the Great War (1908-14)

Sultan Abdülhamit's long rule ended on 23 July 1908 with the restoration of the constitution of 1876. The Sultan had come to power with the promise of the promulgation of the constitution just before the Ottoman-Russia War started. However, though this constitution was proclaimed it

did not last long. A year later, war broke out, and then in order to concentrate on the war the Sultan shelved the constitution in 1878. His concerns were different from those of his liberal predecessors. He inherited an empire which was economically bankrupt and politically collapsed. The Empire was on the verge of dissolution as a result of many internal and external problems. In order to cope with the disastrous situation, Abdülhamit decided to take power into his own hands with absolute authority. In reality, the Sultan had managed to keep the country out of major wars and his foreign policy was largely a great success. But this had not been enough to secure the future of the Empire. The Sultan failed to take radical measures to cure the Empire of its internal defects. His long rule lasted until the Young Turks forced him to restore the constitution.¹⁶

The Young Turks set up a party called the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) against Abdülhamit II and eventually succeeded in forcing the Sultan to proclaim the constitution for the second time on 24 July 1908. This was a political revolution, which brought a constitutional regime to Turkey. The CUP won the first election, which was held in November of the same year. This was the beginning of a new era, which continued for the next ten years, ending with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in the First World War.

After the Young Turks obtained a majority in the Ottoman Assembly, they reoriented the foreign affairs of the state. Though the members of the CUP did not initially take part in government they exercised an indirect influence on policies.¹⁷ Their first priority was to re-establish the former friendship with England and thereby to stop German influence in the country. The CUP policy aimed at the maximum of European assistance to the Empire combined with the minimum of European control.¹⁸

The British Foreign Office also welcomed the new Ottoman government. This was because it was greatly disturbed by the pan-Islamist policies of Abdülhamit who had posed a serious threat to their interests in the Middle East. Initially the Foreign Office saw the new regime as liberal and progressive. Unlike the Sultan, the CUP Party was prepared to make compromises with Britain on the issues related to Egypt and Cyprus. In his report to Istanbul the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, expressed his support for the new Turkish government. The Foreign Office sent various experts to assist the Ottomans in organising the structure of the customs, irrigation schemes and the Navy. The British Ambassador in Istanbul had already established his influence on the new government.¹⁹

However, this initial optimistic environment soon gave way to suspicion following the declaration of independence from Ottoman rule

by Bulgaria on 5 October. Russia lay behind this political action. The British position of backing Russia on the issue cooled the minds of the CUP leaders towards London. Nevertheless, some leaders of the CUP visited Grey and proposed an Anglo-Turkish alliance in November 1908 because of the desperate need of Istanbul for foreign support at this time. However, Grey refused to sign an alliance and indicated that his government was only ready to assist in the organisation and reformation of the structure of the Ottoman Empire.²⁰

Despite the goal of the new regime as it came into power of goal of preserving the unity of the Ottoman Empire, it failed to cope with the political problems of the Empire during the early months of its rule. Two days after the Bulgarian declaration, Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, which it had administered since the Treaty of Berlin. In addition to this, Greece proclaimed union with Crete. These drastic political developments caused disaffection in some groups of the population, resulting in a major public mutiny on 13 April 1909. The Ottoman army in Macedonia was quick to suppress the mutiny and deposed Abdülhamit II and set up his brother, Mehmet Reşad, as puppet Sultan to be nominal head of the regime. Thus, the CUP restored its control over state affairs.

However, the new government was faced with a new problem when Italy declared war over Tripoli in September 1911. The war ended in October 1912 with the loss of Turkey's last possessions in North Africa, Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. The Dodecanese Islands were also lost to Italy in a rushed peace settlement forced by the growing threat from nationalism in the Balkans. This was soon followed by a chain of wars with the Balkan states, which pursued the final settlement of their irredentist claims over the Ottoman Empire. These wars began in October 1912 with an attack on Ottoman Balkan territories by the newly formed Balkan League (Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro). The Ottoman Army lost heavily to the Balkan coalition and in December a conference of belligerents opened in London at the behest of the Great Powers. It ended with the loss of extensive Ottoman territories from Enez (Aenos) on the Aegean to Midye (Midia) on the Black Sea, together with the island of Crete.²¹

Though they appealed to Britain for support, the Ottomans received no assistance from London. In effect, Britain had shown more sympathy with the Balkan States than with the Ottomans during the Balkan Wars. This attitude had a profoundly negative impact on Turkish statesmen. The disaster led to a coup by the unionist officers in the army under Enver Pasha's control. The new government was set up and it appointed Enver

Pasha as Minister of War, who was strongly pro-German and managed to recover Adrianople when a second Balkan War erupted.

Though Anglo-Ottoman relations initially improved with the advent to power of the CUP, later, the clash of British and Ottoman strategic and economic goals in the Middle East made this improvement short-lived. The cool attitude taken by Britain towards the Ottomans during the Balkan conflict in 1912–13 forced them to search for different alternatives to find an ally with whom to collaborate. Despite her dissatisfaction with the British policies, İstanbul once again asked London to make an alliance in 1913. However, the British government refused and the Foreign Office advised the Turks that the best course for them was to remain neutral in the emergence of any conflict in Europe.²² Inevitably, the cold British attitude pushed the Ottomans towards Germany.

Germany re-established its influence on the Empire when Enver Pasha became Minister of War in January 1914. Enver Pasha was sent to Berlin as military attaché after the Young Turks' revolution and had already established good contacts with German statesmen. In 1913, in order to reorganise the Army, the government appointed a German General, von der Goltz, to undertake the task and later another German general, Liman von Sanders, was appointed to the effective command of the Turkish forces in the capital and in the Dardanelles. Finally, a secret treaty was signed between Germany and the Ottoman Empire in August 1914, and eventually İstanbul went to war on the side of the Central Powers on 4 November 1914.²³

Turco-Arab Relations, the Great War and Responses of Great Britain (1914–18)

The Young Turks' administration envisaged three policies to pursue simultaneously and interchangeably, each one being applied at whatever time it was most appropriate. These policies were called Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turanism. Ottomanism was a conception which expressed an exclusive loyalty to the Ottoman Empire. The common level for all people was Ottoman, which required abandonment of any other national or racial ambitions among the heterogeneous inhabitants of the Empire. Pan-Islamism was an expression which aimed at bringing all the Muslims in the world within the orbit of the Caliphate. Pan-Turanism was a manifestation which revealed the unity of the Turkish world under a strong Turkish State.²⁴

Initially the Young Turks adopted a policy of Ottomanism until 1911. Then the Italo-Turkish war convinced the leaders of the party that the

policy of Pan-Islamism was a better option. This was because the resistance of the Arabs of Tripoli to Italian aggression and the contributions which flowed in from Islamic communities throughout the world to aid the Ottoman Empire encouraged the leaders of the party to follow a Pan-Islamist policy along with the policy of Pan-Turanism. The latter policy became dominant in Turkish politics after the Balkan Wars, which stimulated Turkish nationalism among the Turkish population, particularly after Enver Pasha obtained a strong position in the government.²⁵

From 1910 onwards the members of the ruling party of Turkey took some drastic decisions to establish order and peace in the Empire. They decided that the CUP was the only supreme party, and any opposition to the party should not be allowed. They wanted to establish a strong central authority over the non-Turkish elements in the Empire. However, these policies caused strong reactions in the Arab parts of the Empire. Leading Arab personalities in Basra began to oppose the radical Unionist Party in favour of Liberal Unionists. Liberal ideas began to spread throughout Iraq with the efforts of British Basra Consulate.²⁶ In addition to their Turanian policy, the Young Turks also adopted the Pan-Islamic policy of Abdülhamit which brought them into antagonism with France, Russia and England.²⁷

In the meantime, Anglo-Turkish relations in Mesopotamia began to deteriorate further. Kuwait had long been a source of friction between the two countries in the Gulf of Basra. In his articles to an Istanbul paper İsmail Hakkı, the Ottoman Deputy for Baghdad, wrote that two main spots, Kuwait and Muhammerah, became the centre of trouble, disturbing the peace in Mesopotamia, and the sole depot of English manufactured arms in Iraq. He continued to complain that Britain prevented the Turkish government from taking measures to establish order in Kuwait.²⁸ The smuggling of arms spread from Kuwait to the whole of Mesopotamia where many tribes received them, creating instability in the area. The Turkish government thus almost lost its control over the tribes.²⁹

The other troubled province was Syria which became a centre for the rapid growth of Arab nationalism. In reality, the seeds of the idea were sown long before but not developed until the Young Turks followed the Pan-Turanian policy. Beirut was the earliest centre, later replaced by Syria.³⁰

After the Ottoman entry into the First World War, Ahmet Cemal (Jemal) Pasha became Commander of the Fourth Army in Syria and Western Arabia. Cemal Pasha was aware of the activities of the 'Young Arab' committees. From 1914 onwards, he took extreme measures to

suppress their illegal activities and to maintain order in Mesopotamia and Syria. Though the Ottomans were successful in stopping the activities of the Arab organisations, they lost the sympathy of the people in Syria and in some parts of Central Arabia. In Mesopotamia, however, a considerable number of people maintained their willingness to be under Turkish rule.³¹

During the Great War, the fighting in the Near and the Middle East fell mostly to Great Britain on such fronts as Gallipoli, Mesopotamia, Palestine and in Macedonia. Two days after the Ottomans committed themselves to the fighting, the Porte declared a Holy War against the Allies in order to elicit Muslim support in the world. Britain was the first to fear that her sea route to the east could be in danger if the Arabs took hostile action against her. It thought that if the Arabs in Western Arabia, Egypt, Aden and other parts near its hinterland collaborated with the Turks then 'the possessions of Allies in the Middle and Farther East would be dangerously accessible to the enemy'.³²

In search of a local ally to combat these dangers, Great Britain turned to the Grand Sherif of Mecca, Hussein, who had long been known to desire independence for the Meccan Sherifate. The British Foreign Office considered that:

the metropolitan position of his city in Islam and his own authentic holy lineage would make very effective a refusal by him to countenance Holy War against us, and if he declared against the Turks, the geographical position of his principality would render almost impossible the materialisation of the other two dangers, (the possessions of Allies in the Middle and Farther East).³³

In the summer of 1915 Hussein opened negotiations with Britain and in June 1916 he raised a revolt, with British aid, against the Turks. In order to cope with the revolt the Turkish government decided to grant a kind of limited autonomy to Hejaz, Syria, and to Mesopotamia.³⁴

After the revolt, Ahmet Cemal Pasha made many attempts to compromise with Hussein and continued to do so until the end of the conflict. In his letter to Hussein on 13 November 1917, he urged the necessity of religious union to oppose British advances in Palestine and affirmed that the Arabs could now attain their national aims through the good will of Turkey. He expressed the view that the Allies' aims in Syria and Mesopotamia would not permit the materialisation of the Arab national aspirations.³⁵

In response to Cemal's letter, the Sherif initially thought that, subject to British approval, he might manage to bring peace between Turkey and Britain, and thereby with the Arabs, on condition that Turkey should evacuate certain territories that were to be specified by HMG. However, the High Commissioner (HC) for Egypt strongly opposed to this idea:

...it would be unwise to send any official replies to Jemal's letters. Latter is presumably acting under German instructions and probably hopes to do for action by Feisal, importance of which to Arab cause he cordially appreciates. Indicated from our information that Central Powers are seriously alarmed at creation of Arab Armenian bloc with international Jewish influence behind, and are endeavouring to defeat a scheme which destroys their hopes of dominating in future Near East and Arabia.³⁶

Following consultation with Major Lawrence and other British officials, the Sherif's son, Feisal, replied to Cemal Pasha 'nothing settles [matters] between us and Turkey except the sword'.³⁷

However, during the spring of 1918, Feisal began to suspect future Allied plans in the Middle East. In his secret written communication with Cemal Pasha, he expressed his willingness to come to an agreement with the Turks after the latter evacuated the Arab provinces. Upon learning of this secret communication, the British HC for Egypt suggested to the Foreign Office that it might utilize the Arab bridge to reach an agreement with Turkey in order to safeguard their Arab interests.³⁸ The British Foreign Secretary, however, opposed the idea on the grounds that this kind of arrangement between Turkey and Britain would jeopardise the advantages which Britain had already obtained over the latter.³⁹ Nevertheless, the Sherif and his other son, Abdullah, did not agree with Feisal, and hence this made null and void all Turkish efforts to compromise with the Arabs.⁴⁰

By 1918, Turkish authority had disappeared throughout Arabia except at Medina. Fahrettin Pasha was the only Turkish Commander who defended Medina against the rebels with the support of the Imam of Yemen, Ibni Rashid, and other pro-Turk Arab tribesmen.⁴¹ But, after the Treaty of Mudros, Fahrettin Pasha, together with the Turkish Commander at Yemen, had to evacuate the places that they had defended.⁴²

One of the most important fronts to which the British attributed much importance during the war was the Mesopotamian Front. This was because it held both strategic and economic value to them. The area

contained both sea and land routes to India, along with rich oil reserves and refineries at Abadan. The Gulf of Basra was also crucial for the security of the route to India.⁴³ In November 1914 Britain attacked and occupied Basra with a force under General Barrett. At the critical moment, Turkish troops released from the Dardanelles came to the aid of Baghdad. At Ctesiphon, the Turkish Army forced back the British and laid siege to them in Kut in April 1916, and eventually captured the British Army together with its Commander, General Townshend.⁴⁴

Unlike the Arabs of Western Arabia, the Arabs of Mesopotamia, collaborating well with the Turks, fought under the Ottoman flag against the Russians during the war.⁴⁵ However, the Turkish success did not last long because of the miscalculations of Enver Pasha (Chief Commander of the Turkish Armies). He pursued a misguided strategy. Instead of throwing all Turkey's energies into the war against the British in Mesopotamia, he directed Turkish military efforts too much towards the Caucasus front.⁴⁶ This was the chief cause of the defeats of the Turks by the British Army from 1917 onwards, and by 1918 Britain had managed to occupy Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Baku and Western Persia. Under the shock of the defeats in Mesopotamia, Turkey was forced by Britain to sign the humiliating Armistice of Mudros.⁴⁷

The treaty was signed between the Ottoman Empire and Britain on 30 October 1918 by Rauf Bey, Minister of Marine and Admiral Calthorpe,

C-in-C of the British Forces in the Mediterranean. At the time of the Armistice, the Young Turks' Party was utterly discredited, and the leaders who, at Germany's behest, had dragged Turkey into the war either fled the country or were under arrest. The new Sultan Mehmed Vahid ed-din was only four months into office before becoming the captive of the British Army.⁴⁸

The End of the Great War and the Beginning of Turkish National Struggle (1919–23)

After the Allied Powers occupied Turkish soil, local Turkish resistance groups were organised by associations for 'the defence of rights' in Anatolia and Thrace in 1919.⁴⁹ As the city of İzmir (Smyrna), and its adjacent regions were allocated to Greece, it sent troops to occupy the city on 14 May 1919 and carried out atrocities against the Turkish population. This act, however, provoked Turkish nationalistic sentiment and created a unifying effect on the Turkish population which regarded the Greeks as their chief and bitterest enemies. This was the origin of the Nationalist Movement.⁵⁰

At this time, Mustafa Kemal, the most ardent of the nationalists, secured for himself the appointment of Inspector-General of the Ninth Army and left for Anatolia to organise resistance against the occupying powers from there.⁵¹ He landed at Samsun on 19 May 1919 to organise nationalist forces for this purpose. He convened two Nationalist Congresses, first at Erzurum and then at Sivas in 1919. The latter was critical for the Nationalist Movement. It demanded the unity of Turkish territory, protested against an independent Armenian State, denounced Greek designs on Anatolia, and resolved to fight for Turkish integrity.

During this time, the British government under David Lloyd George and his Foreign Minister, Lord Curzon, shared the former Prime Minister Gladstone's policy of hostility to the Turks and planned to defend British interests in the Near East and the Mediterranean through Anglo-Greek collaboration. They saw the Turkish defeat 'as a chance to dispatch the sick man of Europe and settle the Eastern question permanently'.⁵²

Although Curzon did not totally reject the idea that the Turks had to keep sovereignty over the Turkish populated areas, Lloyd George maintained that the Greeks should be pleased to have allocated to them the western parts of the Turkish territories. This plan was, however, strongly rejected by the nationalist leaders under Mustafa Kemal.⁵³

This was the general policy which Britain followed until 19 October 1922, when the Lloyd George Cabinet resigned owing to opposition criticism of his pro-Greek policy, which collapsed with the defeat of the Greek Armies by the Turks in the summer of 1922. Although Curzon continued to hold the same job under the government led by Andrew Bonar Law, he now followed a line of grater compromise towards the Turkish issue.⁵⁴

In October a general election was held in Turkey, and the nationalists won a majority. The nationalist deputies to the new government met at Ankara in November 1919 and drew up the National Pact, declaring the aims of the new movement and rejecting the proposals of the Allies. It declared that:

Peoples of Anatolia could not admit of any division. Peoples of non-Turkish race were to be excluded, and thus the Arabs and the people of western Thrace were to decide their own future. The rights of minorities [were] guaranteed. Constantinople was to be secure, but the straits were to be open to commerce by an agreement between Turkey and all other interested governments.⁵⁵

On 23 April 1920 Kemal Pasha set up a new government under the name of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) in the place of the Parliament, which was dissolved by the British forces. At this time, Kemal's movement was already recognised throughout Anatolia. The relations became severely strained between the Istanbul and Ankara governments when the former reluctantly signed the Treaty of Sévres under the threat of force of the Allied governments on 10 August 1920.⁵⁶

The London Conference was convened in March 1921 to seek a solution for the Greco-Turkish question, and when the conference ended in failure a series of wars became inevitable between Turks and Greeks. Eventually, the Turkish army smashed the Greek forces at the Sakaria River in 1921, at Dumlupınar in August 1922; entered İzmir on 9 September and cleared Asia Minor of Greek forces. After the end of the struggle an agreement was signed on 11 October 1922 and this led the way to the peace conference which opened at Lausanne in November 1922, and resulted in the conclusion of a treaty of peace in the same place on 24 July 1923.

With the Lausanne Treaty, Turkish sovereignty was recognised over all areas claimed by the National Pact with the exception of Mosul in Northern Iraq. The one area where Turkish sovereignty was limited was the Turkish Straits, which remained under international supervision until 1936, when full Turkish control was recognised.⁵⁷

A new era began in Turkey after the Lausanne Treaty. The nationalist leaders under Mustafa Kemal determined to change the political and administrative character of the new state. The first step towards this end was the abolition of the Sultanate in 1922. Then, the TGNA declared the regime of the country a republic and appointed Mustafa Kemal its first president virtually for life on 29 October 1923.⁵⁸ Thereafter elections took place and the reformists' party, the Republican People's Party (RPP) founded by Kemal Pasha, gained a majority in the Assembly.

Acquiring complete control over state affairs gave the reformists an opportunity to concentrate on carrying out critical reforms. These aimed to transform Turkey into a modern, secular nation-state whose focus was to make Turkey a part of the West. The reforms can be examined through the six principles which Mustafa Kemal designated as the foundations of his doctrine known as Kemalism: secularism, revolutionism, nationalism, republicanism, populism and etatism. Secularism occupied a central place in Kemalist principles. This reform was inaugurated with the abolition of the Caliphate in 1924 and continued with the abolition of religious schools

and offices; replacing the Shariah Law with Swiss, German and Italian codes; the change of the Turkish to Latin.⁵⁹

Britain, Turkey and the Middle East (1918–45)

Anglo-Turkish Relations in the post-Great War Period (1918–23)

In contrast to the 1914–18 period, by now the Arabs and the Turks began to come closer to each other. Just before the signing of the Mudros Treaty, the Arab leaders of Northern Mesopotamia and Syria met in Switzerland in June 1918 and declared that their policy would be Syrian and Arab autonomy under the protection of Turkey.⁶⁰ During the War of Independence, Mustafa Kemal Pasha had good contacts with the leaders of Syria, Iraq and Yemen, and pursued a policy of collaboration with them against British and French domination.⁶¹ In letters to the Syrians of January 1921, he proclaimed that the Arabs of the area should be united against the French and promised that the Turks would soon advance to Syria to help them.⁶² Fevzi Pasha (Chief of Staff of the Turkish Army) also went to Syria to discuss with the Arab Chiefs what kind of Turkish assistance could be provided for them.⁶³

In Mesopotamia, Mustafa Kemal's plans conflicted with the British schemes. In his message to Iraq, he stated that 'Feisal should not be acknowledged as King because he was appointed by the enemy to raise an army in Iraq which was to fight the Turks in the future...'⁶⁴ Kemal Pasha had a considerable influence in Mosul, and his plan was to get Prince Burhaneddin appointed King of Mesopotamia under Turkish protection.⁶⁵

However, owing to Turkey's realistic attitude and of her adaptability to the circumstances of the time Kemal Pasha abandoned the scheme of a 'Turco-Arab federation'.⁶⁶ Kemal Pasha (who later took Atatürk as a surname) reoriented his policy towards the Arab countries by relinquishing all claims to the lost imperial Arab provinces except those territories composed of a Turkish Muslim majority. This was the case when İsmet Pasha, the Turkish Foreign Minister, during the Lausanne discussions explained the views of his government to Naji El-Assil, the representative of King Hussein, on 6 February 1923. He asked the latter to telegraph to King Hussein the following message:

...İsmet Pasha had [with] the full authority of the Ankara government, declared that Turkey had no inimical intentions against the Arabs, who formed at least half of the Ottoman Empire. On the contrary Turkey recognised the full independence of Arab Coun-

tries, including Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia. Turkey had no desire except peace with the Arab nations.⁶⁷

This, in fact, did mark not only a territorial separation but also ideological and political divisions between the Arab states and Turkey as the latter embarked on an extensive reform programme to bring new state into the ranks of Western civilization. Moreover, the Arab revolt of 1916 against the Ottomans made a permanent impact on the minds of the leaders of the Turkish Republic about the unreliability of the Arabs while the Arab elites complained that the long period of the Ottoman rule was the reason for the backwardness of their lands. These reciprocal approaches though initially brought about a temporary estrangement between the two sides did not last long as Turkey started to make political contacts with the Arab states to reinforce regional security late 1920s.

Anglo-Turkish Relations in Transition (1923–30)

The only major point left unsettled in the Lausanne settlement of 1923 was the frontier issue between Turkey and Iraq. British forces had occupied the vilayet of oil-rich Mosul after the Armistice of Mudros. The British administration prepared to incorporate it into Iraq. However, the Turkish government maintained that in the Turkish National Pact (January 1920), the nationalists had declared that all the Ottoman territories inhabited by the Ottoman Moslem majority were part of the indivisible Turkish homeland.⁶⁸

Thus, the issue remained as a source of conflict between Turkey and Britain until 1926, when Turkey reluctantly agreed to the retention of Mosul by Iraq. The fear of Italy impelled Turkey to make a settlement over the Mosul question, which blocked the development of the Anglo-Turkish friendship.⁶⁹

In general, Turkey's foreign policy in the late 1920's was to achieve a balance between Russia to the North and Britain to the South. However, the British Foreign Office thought that Turkey had not succeeded in following a 'true equilibrium'. This was because she had pushed cordiality with Russia too far, though Britain had exerted pressure on Ankara not to. The British government, at one stage, had even considered offering some minor concessions to the Turkish government on the Mosul issue in order to gain her sympathy. In June 1926, after Mosul was awarded to Iraq, the British Ambassador to Ankara described Turkey's position towards Britain as 'on the one side Turkey has not compromised the future, on the other she has not burned her boats'.⁷⁰ The British Ambassador maintained that

it was in the interests of Britain to be ready to protect Turkey from all threats and encroachments. This also was a view shared by the British government.⁷¹

*The Question of Regional Security
and Anglo-Turkish Relations (1930–37)*

In the early 1930s Europe entered into a period of political instability as a result of the policies adopted by the revisionist powers. Turkey wanted to see the status quo upheld and became nervous about the irredentist policies of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. At this time the failure of the League of Nations to deal effectively with the Manchurian Crisis in 1931 indicated that the smaller states could not rely on the League to protect their security. Later, Mussolini's declaration that Italy's expansionist ambitions lay in Asia and Africa and the failure of the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1934 greatly increased Turkey's anxieties about her own security due to her strategic position between the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa.⁷²

Turkey's immediate reaction to these developments was to take a more active role in international relations and to strengthen its co-operation with her Balkan neighbours. The maintenance of the status quo in the Balkans became the main pillar of Turkish foreign policy. For this reason Turkey, since 1925, had adopted a policy of seeking bipartite treaties with the Balkan states in order to reinforce regional security around the region.⁷³

In 1934 Ankara played an active role in establishing the Balkan Pact with Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia. Turkey's main objective was to bloc Italian expansion and to check Bulgarian irredentist aspirations. However, without Great Power support Turkey did not expect much from the Balkan Pact. Consequently, Turkey continued to seek closer relations with Britain while also trying not to on upset Italy.⁷⁴ For Turkey the Balkan Pact increased its regional role and importance. Similar considerations were involved in the establishment of the Sadabad Pact three years later.⁷⁵

Apart from security considerations there were political and strategic reasons for Turkey in promoting the Sadabad Pact. The first was to increase its international status by establishing influence with the Middle Eastern nations. The second was that in the pursuit becoming of an important regional power Turkey wished to have a semi-permanent seat on the League Council. The third was that with an increased regional role

Ankara wanted to raise her political bargain power with the European powers, especially with Britain and France.⁷⁶

To realize these objectives, Kemalist Turkey adopted a strategy of forming a group of Muslim States in which her own influence should predominate in the late 1920s. From 1926 onwards, good relations with Iraq were steadily developed as the Turks found that their Kurdish insurgents were not supported by Baghdad. In June 1926 King Feisal visited Atatürk and they signed the Mosul agreement, and some other treaties which defining Iraqi borders with Turkey.⁷⁷

In the same year, Turkey also concluded a non-aggression and good neighbour treaty with Iran. Turkey continued to develop close relations with the Imam Yehya of Yemen and Ibn Saud, the King of Nejd and Hejaz. In February 1929, representatives of Ibn Saud visited Turkey and they agreed to sign a good neighbour treaty and the King decided to appoint a representative in Turkey.⁷⁸ Turkey also exercised a strong influence in Afghanistan, sending teachers and a military mission there and receiving Afghan students.⁷⁹

The process for the establishment of the Sadabad Pact started with the improvements on Turco-Iraqi relations from 1926 onwards. At this time Iraq was still under the British Mandate. By the terms of the treaty between Britain and Iraq in 1930, Iraq was to gain full independence within two years, whereas Britain retained its military bases in Iraq and undertook to train the Iraqi army.⁸⁰ With the treaty Britain was also bound to come to Iraq's aid in case of war, and Iraq pledged to consult with Britain on foreign policy issues. In 1932, Iraq gained formal independence, and was admitted to the League of Nations. At the same time, Britain retained the right to maintain RAF bases in Iraq. However, these privileges granted to Britain caused significant opposition in Iraq. In order to cope with the opposition the Prime Minister, Nuri al-Said, and King Feisal set out a policy, which aimed at reducing the dependency on Britain, of improving diplomatic ties with Turkey and Iran.⁸¹

Under these circumstances, the King and his Prime Minister visited Turkey in July 1931. In their meeting with their Turkish counterparts, the Iraqis expressed their wish to build close relations with both Turkey and Iran. The three Foreign Ministers then met in Geneva in 1932, during the sessions of the League of Nations, to discuss the issue. However, at this time the border dispute continued between Iraq and Iran, and Iraq wanted to solve this problem through Turkish mediation.⁸²

In the autumn of 1933, Iran accepted the Iraqi proposal, which offered a treaty of neutrality in the hope that it would ensure peace and security

in the area. However, before the proposed non-aggression pact was formalised, Turkey had in mind two main points that she wanted to clarify: first, she wanted to consult the Soviet government to forestall its possible objections; second, Turkey wanted Britain to be included in the proposed pact on the ground that without her participation the pact would become ineffective, since Britain retained authority over Iraq under the treaty and thereby she could easily drag Iraq into a war, for example, against Iran. Thus, the three countries decided to invite both the Soviets and the British to join the pact.

While the Soviet government indicated its willingness to enter into the pact Britain was reluctant to do it. Finally, it was decided that neither of the two powers, namely Britain and Russia, would be invited to take part in the pact.⁸³ However, Turkey was careful to show that the pact was not directed against the interests of Great Powers. This was clearly reflected in Turkish Foreign Minister's speech to the Assembly in June 1938, as he stated that the pact of Sadabad had been concluded 'with the assent and indeed the support of Soviet Russia and the British Empire'.⁸⁴

The first draft of the treaty was initialled in Geneva in October 1935 between Iran, Iraq and Turkey.⁸⁵ In November 1935, Afghanistan announced its willingness to join the pact. But Iraq insisted that Saudi Arabia also be included in the pact. However, because of the suspicions of King Ibn Saud over the activities of Nuri Said, Saudi Arabia never asked to take part in it.⁸⁶ The materialisation of the pact was delayed until 4 July 1937, due to long standing Iraqi-Iranian frontier disputes which were solved thorough Turkish mediation and eventually the Foreign Ministers of Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Turkey signed it on 8 July 1937 at the palace of Sadabad, in Tehran.⁸⁷

As the documents reveal, the main motivation among the Sadabad Powers was to set up a collective security device free from Great Power intervention. Since the mid-1920s the states of the Middle East were to be caught between the USSR in the North and Britain in the South. Because of the pressures from the Great Powers the small states could not adopt an independent foreign policy. Though these states wanted freedom of actions and political manoeuvres in international relations they were unable to do so alone and they might, in their idea, manage to do it by means of collective cooperation.

Since the Great Powers' rivalry began to intensify in early 1930s and upon a clear threat to the Eastern Mediterranean coming from Italy, the regional states felt the need for the establishment of a pact to increase the stability and their collaboration in the region. Later, the idea of turning the

Sadabad Pact into a pact of mutual assistance was a clear sign that the regional states did not want to fall under the influence of the Great Powers and they wished to follow an independent policy free from foreign influence. The pact however remained merely a non-aggression agreement due to factors derived from the Iranian fears of Russia, and of the British hesitation shown towards the pact. The British hesitation not only did frustrate the Iraqi efforts but also the Turkish endeavours.

Britain, however, later began to see the pact as a means to check the Soviet influence in the region and in 1939 even offered Turkey to convert the pact into a military alliance. But Turkey under her new President, İsmet İnönü who modified Atatürk's eastern policy, rejected the British proposal. As Ankara, at this time, concentrated all her efforts on the conclusion of the Triple Alliance with Britain and France she did not want to distract her attention elsewhere. Moreover, the new İnönü's administration, in contrast to Atatürk's approach, adopted a new policy of keeping distance from the Eastern politics and had no much confidence on the strategic value of the pact.⁸⁸

Nevertheless, the pact had its own merits far as the regional stability was concerned. It, for instance, removed many of the political problems in the region, such as border disputes among members, and thus contributed to regional security and stability.⁸⁹ Furthermore, the signatories of the pact undertook to abstain from interfering each other's affairs and pledged to consult one another on international matters concerning their common interests. The Pact's main weakness was that it imposed no obligation on the members in case of war.

This was because none of the members had enough strength to undertake commitments to one another if any major power threatened. The outbreak of the Second World War therefore not only smashed the pact itself but also broke down the order and stability of the area. During the war, every member of the pact pursued its own course. While Turkey, Afghanistan and Iran remained neutral, Iraq, as an ally of Britain, declared war on Germany. Later, in 1941, Iran was invaded by the Soviets and by Britain when she refused to expel German officials and technicians from her soil.⁹⁰

Anglo-Turkish Relations at their Zenith: The Alliance of 1939

The Kemalist reforms and principles previously explained were the dominant factors which shaped the internal as well as external policies of the new Republic. As explained before Turkey's foreign policy under Atatürk's administration was based on the maintenance of the status quo

and on the survival of the new Turkey. As Britain was a status quo power which had parallel objectives with Turkey and, after became known that it had no antagonistic aims against Turkey, Atatürk decided early to aim towards close relations with Great Britain. The removal of the Mosul issue accelerated this process. After the late 1920s the trend of Anglo-Turkish relations showed a continuous improvement and it ended with the signing of the Anglo-French-Turkish Treaty of October 1939.⁹¹

As Turkey's relations with Britain were to improve in late 1920s, Turkey's admission to the League of Nations in July 1932 further enhanced Anglo-Turkish collaboration.⁹² The Italian invasion of Abyssinia in October 1935 greatly stimulated Turkish friendliness towards Britain and her anxiety to fortify the Straits. Maintaining peace in the Mediterranean area was in the common interests of both Turkey and Britain. It was the threat to peace arising from Italian aggression and the application of sanctions that first brought Britain and Turkey into cooperation. One of the results of this cooperation was the revision of the Straits Convention at Montreux on 20 July 1936. With the signing of the convention Turkey at last obtained control of the Straits and she exchanged guarantees of mutual assistance with Britain in the event of an attack by Italy.⁹³

According to the British Ambassador to Ankara, Sir Percy Loraine, the development of warmer Anglo-Turkish relations started in 1934 and grew in 1936 and thereafter 'relations with England become the keystone of the arch of the Turkish foreign policy'.⁹⁴ Italy's invasion of Abyssinia resulted in a major change in the course of Turkish foreign policy. In contrast to his previous policies, Atatürk was now convinced that it was necessary to form a security block against any further Italian aggression.⁹⁵ In his conversation with Loraine, Atatürk made it plain that Turkey 'most earnestly' and 'definitely' desired Anglo-French cooperation under British leadership for the following reasons: first, a general Western settlement; second, preservation of an equilibrium of forces which the Turks understood and can live with; third, to make effective the chances of collective security; fourth, for the continuity of the League idea; last, for Turkey's own security.⁹⁶

In essence, Atatürk's idea was a nucleus for the future treaty of 1939. In 1936, another example of the increasing warmth of Turkish relations with Britain was shown by the remarkable welcome given to King Edward VIII on his unofficial visit to Istanbul in September 1936, and by the awarding of the contract for the Karabük steel-works to a British firm.⁹⁷

At the beginning of 1939, the political situation began to deteriorate again in Europe and the danger of war became imminent through German

aggression in Czechoslovakia and Memel and the Italian invasion of Albania in the spring of the same year. It was the cardinal interest of Turkey that no major European power should gain a dominant position in the Balkans. It was at the same time a major interest of Britain and France that Germany, Russia and Italy should not do so.⁹⁸

After the Italian occupation of Albania in April 1939 both the Turkish and British governments felt the need to frame an agreement between themselves in more explicit terms. Anglo-French guarantees of assistance to Greece and Romania if their independence were threatened by an act of aggression made it more urgent for them to secure the cooperation of Turkey. From Ankara's point of view, the Italian occupation constituted a threat to one of the main objectives of Turkish policy.⁹⁹

Under these circumstances, the Turkish and British governments, as a preliminary step, issued a joint declaration on 12 May 1939 that, in the event of an act of aggression leading to war in the Mediterranean area, they would give each other aid and assistance. A similar declaration was made by France and Turkey on 24 June. The aim of Turkey was to achieve a defensive treaty with Britain and France without impairing her friendship with the USSR. This aim was strongly manifested by the Turkish Cabinet and the Turkish Chief of Staff (TCS) in a meeting on 21 April 1939 on the line that:

We have taken the decision to inform the British government that we have reached an agreement (towards concluding an alliance) with them in principle and it has been decided that this agreement with Britain should include a clause that it shall not weaken the Turkish contacts with the Russians and to this end the Turkish Foreign Minister should be sent to Batum to carry on Turco-Russian discussions.¹⁰⁰

Moreover, Turkey had to obtain Soviet agreement before signing any treaty according to the terms of the Turco-Soviet Treaty of 1925. After the death of Atatürk in November 1938, he was succeeded by İsmet İnönü, which initially brought no change in Turkey's policy towards the western powers. In spring 1939, while Anglo-Turkish negotiations for a treaty of alliance were in progress, the British and French governments opened negotiations with the Soviet Union, with which Turkey had been on friendly since 1921. This aroused hopes in Turkey that an alliance embracing all four countries would be rapidly concluded to establish a common security front against German and Italian aggression.¹⁰¹

The Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact of 23 August 1939 was therefore a serious shock to Turkey, as it was to the Western powers. Nevertheless, the attempts to reconcile Turco-Soviet relations with an Anglo-Franco-Turco alliance continued. However, the visit of Şükrü Saraçoğlu, Turkish Foreign Minister, to Moscow was unsuccessful leading the Turkish government to sign the Triple Treaty with Britain and France on 19 October 1939 for a period of 15 years.¹⁰²

As both Turkish and British documents reveal, Turkey had pursued an agreement with the USSR to achieve a pact of mutual assistance covering fascist aggression in the Black Sea, Mediterranean and the Balkans. Moscow, however, dragged its feet, leading to protracted discussions starting from mid-1939. They finally came to a head in Moscow on 26–29 September 1939.¹⁰³

Turco-Soviet discussions however were doomed to failure when Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, reinstated the former demands, insisting on Soviet control over the Turkish Straits and a reserve clause on Germany. These demands were incompatible with the minimum Turkish strategic and security needs and hence led to the breakdown of discussions on 16 October 1939.¹⁰⁴ It was stated in the subsequent Soviet communiqué, approved by Ankara, that ‘the discussions were made in a friendly atmosphere and the Turkish and Soviet parties will meet again to discuss the international issues concerning their common interests at a future date.’¹⁰⁵ In fact, the wording implied that Moscow had not given up its demands over the Straits and would look for a suitable opportunity to bring the issue to the negotiating table again at a future date.

Recently released Soviet documents largely confirm the findings of the Turkish and British documents. According to them, during Saraçoğlu’s visit in Moscow Stalin told the latter that ‘I don’t advise the Turks to sign the treaty of the Triple Alliance’. Later, Molotov reinforced the message: ‘we have examined the draft of the planned Anglo-Turkish-Franco Alliance. It is better for you not to sign it.’¹⁰⁶ The Soviet documents also show that there were two main reasons for Moscow’s negative attitude towards the proposed Turco-Soviet Pact: because Moscow saw it as an unnecessary burden to bear and it did not want to take a commitment on behalf of Turkey since it would complicate Soviet-German relations.¹⁰⁷

Saraçoğlu, after his return to Ankara, had a hard time explaining the breakdown of Turco-Soviet discussions. A telegram to the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow warned that: ‘the return of the Foreign Minister to Ankara has created a tense situation here. The minds of politicians and people are confused.’¹⁰⁸ At no time since the development of Turco-

Soviet relations had begun in the 1920s Ankara had been more disappointed with Moscow than she was in October 1939. Suspicions about the revival of Russian expansionism now came to surface. The abortive discussions in Moscow hence became a landmark in the history of Turco-Soviet relations.

This event drew Turkey even closer to Britain. Three days after the failure of Turco-Soviet talks the Triple Alliance was signed between Turkey, Britain and France in Ankara on 19 October 1939. The origins of the Triple Alliance dated back to the Spring of 1938 at the time of the *Anschluss*. Turkey was now anxious to expand the Balkan Pact further to establish a security block against German expansion southwards. This was supported and encouraged by the USSR and France. In September 1938, coinciding with the Sudeten Crisis, the French made an attempt to sign a treaty of mutual assistance with Turkey. Turkey quickly responded with a draft Treaty. According to this: first, if one of the parties were at war the other should adopt a benevolent neutral attitude; second, if difficult circumstances arose both sides should consult each other; third, both sides should prevent the formation within their territories of organizations seeking to disturb the peace; last, the British government should be convinced to join this projected treaty of mutual assistance.¹⁰⁹

Britain initially was not receptive to the Turkish idea. In a message to his Turkish counterpart in early October the Secretary of State, Lord Halifax, stated that 'the British government is not ready to become involved in the planned discussions under the delicate circumstances surrounding Central Europe at this time.'¹¹⁰ Though Turkey made further attempts with Britain these brought no success until the Italian invasion of Albania in April 1939, which closely followed the German absorption of Czechoslovakia. Ankara then sought to pressure the British through the French.

Turkey's insistence on British participation in the Franco-Turkish talks reflected her traditional habit of pursuing a closer collaboration with Britain. On the eve of the Second World War Britain again was the country with which Turkey's political and strategic interests were the most comparable. There was also a military dimension to Turkey's insistence on British inclusion. This was the Turkish military's belief that the forthcoming war would be a long drawn out struggle in which Britain would ultimately prevail as it had more natural resources and a better geo-politic position than the Axis.¹¹¹

Britain's initial indifference towards Turkey's proposals was due its hopes of reaching an agreement with Italy in the Mediterranean. This

hope however vanished in April 1939 with the Italian invasion of Albania which led Britain to reverse its position. The open threat from Italy in the Mediterranean and from Germany in the Balkans made London realise to the full strategic importance of Turkey to its political and strategic interests. That was why the British Admiralty, on the eve of Britain's declaration of war on Germany, emphasised the importance of Turkey and concluded that: 'On no occasion does it appear to have been realised that we needed Turks more than they required us'.¹¹²

Following the rumours that Italy was about to attack the Greek Island of Corfu prompted an Anglo-French guarantee to Greece issued on 13 April 1939, with London warning Ankara of the declaration two days before it was promulgated in Parliament. Furthermore, in his talks with Aras (the former Turkish Foreign Minister and then the Turkish Ambassador to London after Atatürk's death) Halifax stated Britain and France were examining the kind of common actions to be taken against Italy if a war broke out and promised the Turkish government would be informed about the outcomes.¹¹³

As Turkish sources indicate, Turkey's response to the British proposal to be added to the guarantees of Greek independence against external aggression was somewhat cautious. The reason for Turkish concern was understandable. As she had long endeavoured to maintain her neutral attitude Turkey did not want to enter a commitment which could draw her into war. Indeed, Ankara regarded the Greek issue as a matter outside the scope of Anglo-Turkish defence discussions.¹¹⁴ London was so informed.

Ankara further explained that the issue of undertaking a commitment which provides a security guarantee to Greece was dependent on the Turkish Assembly's approval and added that 'though this is the case the Turkish government is happy to examine in detail the security issues related to common interests with the British government.'¹¹⁵

In response, London pointed out the danger posed by the Axis which could soon set off attacks on Greece, Romania and Poland. In any of these cases Britain and France were ready to give their assistance to Turkey on a reciprocal basis. Britain also sought Turkish agreement to join the Anglo-French guarantee of Romania. Ankara's response was again prudent, while conceding that 'the establishment of Axis domination in the Balkans is against Turkey's interests'.¹¹⁶ It still refused to join the guarantees of Greece and Romania fearing that this act might provoke an Axis intervention against the Turkish Straits as soon as war broke out. In such eventuality Turkey could only defend the Straits ruling out any assistance to Romania. Furthermore, this action might also incite Bulgaria

to make a move against Turkey. In her response Ankara also made the following points:

First, the Axis Powers should be let known that Turkey's main objective was to work for peace and to this end she adopted a policy sympathetic to Britain. Unless Turkey is attacked by the Axis Turkey will maintain her neutrality; second, in case of an attack to the Straits by the Axis Britain should provide all of its assistance [especially military materials and economic assistance]; third, collaboration with the Soviet Union should be sought; fourth, Britain should assist Turkey in her efforts of getting a compromise between Bulgarians and Romanians; last, these issues will be kept secret.¹¹⁷

As the Turkish documents reveal, this was a summary of Turkish position which was to remain more or less the same throughout the Second World War. This point was further clarified in an instruction sent to the Turkish Ambassador to London. It was indicated that the further steps in which Turkey would be required to take were dependent on progress on these points, especially the amount of the British military and economic assistance. As Turkey was anticipating the disruption of profitable economic relations with Germany in the case of the conclusion of the Triple Alliance she wanted Britain to fill the void.

Britain however impressed on Turkey that it had financial difficulties. Consequently, although Turkey reluctantly came to accept extending her commitment to Greece and Romania the issue of British assistance was to remain unclear when the Triple Alliance was signed in Ankara on 19 October 1939.¹¹⁸

Despite this deficiency the Tripartite Alliance was a landmark in the history of the Turkish Republic. It was a clear break in Turkish foreign policy which had so far resolutely remained neutral in the balance of power politics. Furthermore, this was an event which was to affect the future of Turkey because it established a precedent for Turkey to side strongly with the free world in the early Cold War era. With the alliance Turkey at last obtained her major strategic objective which was to search for security against the revisionist powers. The treaty in essence pledged the parties to mutual cooperation if either became involved in war in the Mediterranean area. It bound Turkey to consultation and at least benevolent neutrality in the European war and provided £43.5 million in loans to Turkey.¹¹⁹ The British Admiralty regarded the treaty as 'one of the

greatest Allied diplomatic successes since 1918, and the first signal rebuff to Germany since Herr Hitler came to power.’¹²⁰

The Second World War and Anglo-Turkish Relations (1939–45)

The Second World War began with Germany’s invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939. In fulfilment of treaty obligations, Britain and France declared war on Germany on 3 September. Concurrently, the Triple Alliance was signed with Turkey when Poland’s territories were partitioned between Germany and Russia. But the war did not spread to the Mediterranean until Germany had overrun Western Europe and Italy attacked Britain and France in June 1940. When Italy declared war on 10 June, Britain and France requested Turkey to fulfil her treaty obligations, but the Turkish government invoked Protocol/2 of the treaty which relieved them from taking any action involving potential armed conflict with the USSR, which remained Germany’s partner.

When the British and French Ambassadors asked for Turkey’s entry into the war on 11 June, she rightly responded that there was no rational reason to participate in the war as France was about to collapse. Ankara further stated that the Turkish Army had no offensive capacity to challenge the Germans due to lack of military material and indicated that Turkey’s neutrality would be more beneficial to the Allies than in case should Turkey fall dawn.¹²¹ After initial annoyance the British War Cabinet came to understand the Turkish position and decided to ask Turkey to take some minor actions against Italy.¹²²

Through 1940 and 1941 Turkey was blamed for her failure to provide any assistance to its Balkan allies when Italy attacked Greece and Germany occupied Bulgaria. The British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden met with Şükrü Saraçoğlu, the Turkish Premier at the time, in Cyprus on 18 March 1941 when he sought to enlist Turkish support for Greece. However, Turkey still felt unable to provide any military or political support due to the German threat. In early April 1941, Greece and Yugoslavia fell to Nazi attack. On 18 June, under extreme German pressure, Turkey signed a treaty of friendship with Germany. After securing her Balkan and Dardanelles flank, Germany launched an attack on Russia on 22 June.¹²³

Russia now aligned herself with Britain and they both gave assurances of the territorial integrity of Turkey on 10 August 1942, after the signature of the Anglo-Russian alliance on 26 May.¹²⁴ During this time Turkey’s main preoccupation was the German threat to the Middle East. Though this anxiety began to lessen with the decisive defeat of Rommel at El Alamein in November 1942, Turkish general policy was based on the

appeasement of Germany. In the economic sphere, Turkey benefited from both Germany and Britain by receiving military and industrial supplies and consumer goods. She also received lease-lend supplies from the USA.¹²⁵

At the end of January 1943, the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, met with the Turkish President, İnönü, at Adana and promised to send large quantities of military supplies to Turkey to enable her to withstand attack by the Axis powers. Churchill left Turkey free to decide whether to enter into the war or not. But Churchill emphasised that Turkey should be ready to take action when she was invited to do so and if she wanted to be a member of the council of victorious powers. Though British supplies began to enter into the country in the spring of the same year Turkey continued to be neutral because she thought the dispatched British material as quite insufficient.

In November 1943, Eden met with Turkish Foreign Minister, Numan Menemencioglu, in Cairo and repeated Churchill's earlier demands that Turkey should enter the war before the end of the year. Turkey responded that she accepted the proposal in principle, but postponed it in practice. It was because she had not enough military equipment and thus was not ready to enter into the war.¹²⁶ Churchill, made another attempt to induce Turkey into the war after he met with the American President, Franklin Roosevelt, in Cairo between the 4 and 7 December 1943. It was agreed that military plans and preparations should be pushed on and that Turkey should give a definite reply by 15 February 1944. The Turkish response was to send Britain a list of material that she needed urgently. However, Britain regarded the list as too excessive, and thus no agreement was reached between the two governments.¹²⁷

On 22 April 1944, under strong pressure from the British and American governments, Turkey stopped all exports of chrome to Germany. After repeated British protests against the passage down the Straits of small German naval vessels and of armed German transports, the Turkish government banned the passage of both categories of German vessels and applied a strict search on all vessels.¹²⁸

On 2 August 1944, at the request of both British and American governments, Turkey broke off economic and diplomatic relations with Germany. In October of the same year, the British government resumed the supply of military equipment and notified the Turkish government that it wanted to maintain and even to strengthen the Anglo-Turkish Alliance. On 6 January 1945, in response to British and American demands, Turkey declared war on Germany and Japan on 23 February in order to take her place in the newly established United Nations (UN) Organisation.¹²⁹

Conclusion

The British search for trade in the Mediterranean established a framework for the development of Anglo-Ottoman economic relations in the mid-sixteenth century. This eventually led to the construction of a strategic relationship which became a characteristic feature in Anglo-Ottoman relations after Russia began to threaten their interests in the Mediterranean from 1774 onwards. Preservation of Ottoman territorial integrity was crucial to the safety of the shortest British imperial route to India. Thereafter, Anglo-Ottoman strategic relations reached their climax in the form of their collaboration in the Crimean War of 1853–56 which ensured that for once the Ottoman Empire ended up on the winning side in a war with Russia.

However, two decades later, the nature of the Anglo-Ottoman relationship began to change as the policy of maintaining Ottoman territorial integrity no longer fitted British strategic interests any more because of continuous Ottoman decay. Moreover, the strategic developments which took place after the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877–78 were crucial to the change in the British attitude towards the Ottomans. Britain now guaranteed the safety of the Mediterranean route to India by obtaining the possession of Cyprus and then by occupying Egypt. There therefore remained no good reason for Britain to back a weak state such as the Ottoman Empire anymore. Afterwards, Anglo-Ottoman relations were in a state of constant decline and their rivalry intensified in the Middle East, especially in Mesopotamia. The rivalry continued even after the end of the Great War as Britain sided with Greece over Anatolia when the modern Turkish state was established.

The new Turkish Republic, under the leadership of Atatürk, adopted a rational policy formulated as ‘peace at home and peace in the world’.¹³⁰ This policy, based on the maintenance of status quo, led Turkey to steadily develop her relations with the conservative powers of Britain and France against the revisionist powers of Europe.

The resolution of the Mosul dispute in 1926 was a starting point for warmer development of Anglo-Turkish relations. Turkey saw it as more important to develop her relations with Britain for the sake of its wider security interests. Turkey’s main objective throughout the 1930s was to search for security against the emergent Italian threat to the Eastern Mediterranean and the German threat to the Balkans. Turkey planned to thwart these dangers by aligning itself with the USSR in the North and with Britain and France in the South. Ankara however was unable to

pursue this policy fully since Moscow objected to the growing Anglo-Turkish affinity from mid-1930 onwards.

The worsening political situation in Europe drew Turkey into a more active foreign policy to reinforce her security. While Atatürk wanted to develop Turkey's relations with the West he simultaneously adopted a policy of forming the Balkan and Eastern fronts under the leadership of Turkey. The former policy culminated with the signature of the Anglo-Franco-Turkish Alliance of 1939, while the latter was realised thorough the establishment of the Balkan and Sadabad pacts.

The Sadabad Pact was important for the history of the Middle Eastern politics. It was the first pact in which the initiative came from the region itself. For Turkey while the pact increased her international status as Britain began to regard her 'a leader of the Eastern nations' it established a basis for further development of Turco-Iraqi relations which was to lead to the establishment of the Baghdad Pact almost two decades later. Moreover, the Sadabad Pact was used by Turkey as a bargaining counter to show her regional strategic importance to Britain and France before and during the discussions related to the Triple Alliance.

While the Triple Alliance represented a transition from neutrality towards an alignment with the West in Turkey's foreign policy it also marked a clear break with the Soviet Union. Besides its political and strategic sides the Triple Alliance had an ideological aspect. As the ideology of the new Turkish regime aimed to identify the country as a part of Europe the conclusion of the Triple Alliance was regarded by the Turks as a crucial step towards this end.

London regarded the treaty as a crucial diplomatic success for the Allies against expansionist Germany. Turkey had a fundamental place in British strategic thinking as London maintained that a strong Turkey in close cooperation with Britain was the best way to safeguard British interests in the Middle East and Mediterranean regions. Furthermore, the Alliance established a formal link between Turkey and Britain through which their relationship was to be formulated in the years to come. It was this link which provided the forum to draw up their joint strategy in the Middle East vis-à-vis the USSR during the early Cold War period.

As far as the strategic factors were concerned, however, the Alliance proved to be as deficient during the Second World War. The documentary evidence suggests that Britain was more responsible than Turkey for the strategic failure of the pact. The British inability to provide proper military assistance and the differences of approach towards the USSR made the pact strategically inoperative. Another reason was President's İnönü's per-

sonal hesitation to embroil Turkey in the war. From other aspects however the Alliance was beneficial to both countries as it provided a framework for Anglo-Turkish diplomatic and political cooperation.

The question of Turkey's neutrality was one of the crucial issues on the Allies' agenda during the Second World War. The secondary literature suggests that Turkey's policy was resolutely based on maintaining benevolent neutrality so long as she remained unassailable. The primary evidence however does not support this view.

In fact, as early as 20 April 1939, the Turkish Cabinet concluded that 'no such three options have existed [for Turkey] as either to side with Britain or to side with the Axis or to remain neutral. Indeed there is no option of remaining neutral for Turkey. Turkey's interests lie with Britain and France in case a war breaks out...'¹³¹ Moreover, the Turkish Army's request¹³² to take part in the war on the Italian Front in late January 1945 were clear signs that Turkey had a desire to enter the war if she would have received an adequate military assistance in 1944. However, the British inability to provide modern weapons helped İnönü to keep Turkey out of war. Therefore, Turkey's inability to take part in the war was not a result of its resolute attitude but rather as a result of her inadequate readiness which was due to Britain.

The Turkish position, however, was not properly understood by her allies until the end of the Yalta Conference, at a time when the Soviet expansionist intentions became clear. They often accused Turkey for not taking part in the war. This hence initially caused some misunderstandings and setbacks in Anglo-Turkish relations in the early post-Second World War period.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE SOVIET THREAT IN ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS (1945–47)

The end of the Second World War sounded a beginning of new era in the world balance of power. As the former major powers of Germany, Italy and Japan were heavily defeated and, Britain and France had lost substantial political and economic power, the USA and the USSR emerged from the war as the two strongest powers. This led to the emergence of a bipolar system in the global balance of power when Moscow became an imminent threat to Western interests in Europe, in the Middle East and the Far East. This was the start of the so-called ‘Cold War’ period, which dominated the post-war politics.¹ Though Britain encountered with severe economic hardships, she strategically continued to sustain its great power status at least during the formative stages of the Cold War period.²

At the start of the Cold War, the Soviet Union, after dominating much of the Balkans and Eastern Europe, directed its threat to Turkey by demanding certain territories and bases in the Straits. As it had been in the past, it was Britain, which first realised this great danger not only to Turkey itself, but to all the Western interests.³ London therefore decided to render its full political and diplomatic support to Ankara. However, Britain simultaneously realised that it was unable to face the Russian danger alone, and appealed to the USA for assistance in stopping a possible Russian advance into Turkey, as the latter was the last bulwark against the communist expansion. Washington responded to London’s plea with the

promulgation of Truman Doctrine in 1947. This however meant only the transfer of the British economic role to the USA but its political and strategic role was to continue for some years to come as far as Turkey was concerned.

The Origins of the Soviet Demands for the Straits and Anglo-Turkish Relations

During the war Turkey became subject to military and political pressures by the Great Powers due to her geographical position. At this time, the main thrust of Turkish foreign policy was to remain out of the war by trying to follow a balanced policy between the Axis and the Allied Powers. Until January 1943, when Germany was seriously defeated by the Soviets at Stalingrad, the main Turkish preoccupation was the German threat to her.⁴ Then, following the Soviets' decisive victory over the German Sixth Army in January 1943 it became clear that the Germans would be forced to leave a power vacuum in the Balkans; hence, Turkey began to worry that Soviet domination would fill the gap and pose a serious threat to her.⁵

Until the beginning of 1943, Britain did not press strongly to push Turkey into the war believing that neutrality was mutually beneficial because Turkey was blocking Germany and thereby preventing its access to the oil-rich Middle East. From 1943, however, Britain came to believe that Turkish neutrality was now damaging the Allied Cause. For this reason, Churchill decided to urge Turkey to take part in the war. In fact, one of Churchill's goals in aligning Turkey was to remove all possible pretexts which the Russians might use against the interests of Britain and Turkey. Another motive behind Churchill's policy was to prevent possible Russian expansion into the Balkans with the collaboration of Turkey.⁶ Bearing these ideas in mind, Churchill met with the Turkish president at Adana on 30–31 January 1943 and made clear to him the importance and the necessity of Turkish participation into the war.⁷

As the British plans to bring Turkey into the war gained momentum, Turkey's position and the Straits question came under detailed Foreign Office examination in July 1943. The Foreign Office prepared its initial report on Turkey for the Cabinet, dated 5 July of the same year. The report indicated that though Turkey had behaved badly in the war because of her neutral position, Britain needed to defend Turkey for its own interests against Russia in the future. However, it was up to the Chiefs of Staff (COS) to decide whether it was essential to British interests in the Mediterranean that Russia should not be in control of the Dardanelles and whether it was necessary for Turkey to become a belligerent. If the COS

did not attach any particular importance to bringing Turkey into the war, then it was possible to return to the procedure which had existed before the Adana Conference and thereby it could be arranged to reduce the 'lavish British supplies of war material' to the lease-lend level.⁸

The Admiralty perspective on the Foreign Office memorandum was that, for the safety of the British Empire's sea communications through the Suez Canal, it was extremely undesirable for Russia to be in control of the Dardanelles. The Admiralty considered that any alteration to allow the passage of belligerent warships would bring Britain no advantage.⁹ Concurring with Admiralty views, the COS drew their initial conclusions for the War Cabinet on 22 September 1943. They concluded that the articles of the Montreux Convention were agreeable to them, as far as it continued, 'since it provides reasonable safeguards to the British interests in the Middle East and Mediterranean, at no greater cost than that of providing diplomatic support to Turkey...'¹⁰

Their other conclusions were: first, for the security of British interests in the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean it was most important that Russia should neither be in 'physical control' of the Straits nor be granted 'unrestricted rights of passage'; second, 'if however, insistence on either or both of these points by us is likely to result in additional claims or threats by the Russians in either directions particularly through the Caucasus towards Persia, then it might well be to our advantage to concede certain points from the Convention'; last, if Russia pressed for the revision of the Convention, a full appreciation of the British position vis-à-vis Russia in the post war period would have to be examined before deciding definitely against such a revision. The Joint Planning Staff (JPS) was instructed to undertake this task.¹¹

During the war, the Soviet government conducted different tactics to raise the Straits question in conferences and tried to convince Britain and the United States that there was a need to change the Montreux Convention for a new regime which would satisfy Moscow. Indeed, the Soviet documents show that the Soviet leaders had decided to strongly bring the Turkish issue to the attention of Britain and the USA in July 1943. This was clearly reflected in a message from Vinegradov to Molotov: 'Turkey now prevents the Allies to transport their troops and equipment to the Balkans. For this reason Turkey becomes a bad factor on the Allie's eyes. Now it is the time for the USSR to get British and American agreement to put pressures on Turkey to get her participation in the war. If Turkey rejects to enter the war, this will also be useful for us because it will establish a ground to our future claims.'¹²

As can be seen, Moscow drew up the lines of Soviet post-war strategy towards Turkey as early as mid-1943. In one-way or another, the USSR determined to establish its domination over Turkey. To realise this objective the Soviets adopted different tactics at international meetings. These tactics were, by hiding their ultimate objective, to present their case as if their only aim was to revise the Straits Convention at the outset, but by mounting pressure move to the ultimate aim of bringing Turkey into position of a satellite state.

The process started when Stalin raised the question of 'warm water ports' at the Tehran Conference on 30 November 1943, in a conversation with Churchill and Roosevelt. Stalin said that since Russia had no outlet to the warm seas, a new Straits regime should be established to help her. He asked Churchill's help, unless Britain wanted to stifle Russia. All three agreed that the Dardanelles should be free to the commerce of the world.¹³

At a later conversation, Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, said to the British Prime Minister that the Soviet Union, as a Black Sea power, had a special interest in the Dardanelles, but the Soviet government had no intention of pressing the matter at that time. In the light of the reports prepared by the COS, Churchill took a more conciliatory attitude towards Russian aspirations. Probably his tactic was to find out what the Soviets had in mind regarding the Straits. He responded to Molotov that Turkey was Britain's ally, and if she entered the war the question could be discussed in a friendly spirit. However, if she refused to enter the war, then he would notify her that Great Britain would cold shoulder Turkey and would regard the Straits question as a matter between Russia and Turkey.¹⁴

In line with the decisions taken at Tehran British and American leaders invited the Turkish President to a Conference in Cairo to talk about the issue of Turkey's participation in the war following Soviet pressure in this direction. Even before the Tehran Conference the Turkish issue had been discussed in a meeting between Molotov and Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, in Moscow on 1 November 1943. It had been agreed that a joint demand should be made to Turkey to bring her into the war. Later, President Roosevelt reluctantly approved this decision. As a result the so-called second Cairo Conference started on 4 December 1943 with the participation of İnönü, Churchill and Roosevelt. Stalin's representatives were late and thus did not take part in the conference.¹⁵

Churchill told İnönü that Turkey should fulfil her commitments in line with the terms of Anglo-Turkish Alliance. If she did so it would improve not only Turco-Soviet relations but also Turkey would benefit from siding with the victorious powers. In his opinion Germany was no longer strong enough to attack Turkey. Otherwise, Churchill warned, Turkey would be isolated and 'will be left to stay alone'.¹⁶

İnönü countered that Turkey had always inclined towards the Allies even when the Germans reached the Caucasus and El Alamein. Bearing this in mind therefore it was not acceptable to think that Turkey would be in a difficult position in the post-war period because of her neutral attitude. İnönü maintained that 'Turkey can enter the war only after she receives proper military assistance. Turkey also needs time to prepare herself for the war and during this preparation the Germans should not be provoked'.¹⁷

The next day, İnönü talked with Roosevelt who was more sympathetic to his ideas. İnönü stated that there was an 'impasse' between his and Churchill's views. The latter thought only of the air bases to be allocated to Britain on Turkish soil but he never took into account unpreparedness of the Turkish Army and that of Turkey's defence system. Only 10 per cent of the promised British military had material arrived in Turkey since the Adana talks. At this point Steinhardt, the US Ambassador to Ankara, revealed that most of the equipment promised for Turkey was diverted to the Italian Front. Roosevelt sympathised but stated that the USA had no spare military material to send Turkey because of its campaigns in the Pacific. It could however send a number of bomber planes but not for three months. Roosevelt then suggested forming a small military committee to deal with the issue.¹⁸

In the end Churchill, in his final meeting with İnönü, told him that Turkey should make her decision upon the following points by 15 February 1944. These were: first, preparations for air bases and its equipment; second, exchange of views on war plans; third, examination of the programmes related to the importation of ammunition; last, exchange of views on the political issues. If Turkey's response was positive the war plans would be carried out but if it was negative then British aid would be stopped.¹⁹

In the meantime the Soviets began making accusations to increase pressure on Turkey. On 28 July 1943, Molotov told Açıkalın that 'the Turkish-German Treaty dated 18 June 1941 was both beneficial to Turkey and Germany. Turkey signed the treaty at a time when it was pretty well known that Germany was preparing itself to attack the Soviet Union'.²⁰ In

another menacing remark Molotov even implied the use of Soviet force: 'now the international environment and its political circumstances have radically changed. Turkey was yet to adapt herself to the new circumstances especially after the Italian fall. We will soon see whether this policy is beneficial to Turkey or not.'²¹ Such behaviour only fuelled Turkey's suspicions about Soviet intentions.

Following the Cairo Conference, the second Russian attempt to achieve movement on the Straits issue came out at the meetings between Churchill, Stalin and Molotov held in Moscow between 9 and 17 October 1944. In the first discussions, Stalin put forward Russian claims for a new regime more forcibly than he had a year previously, and the British Prime Minister agreed that 'Russia had a right and moral claim'. He asked what kind of changes to Montreux Stalin had in his mind and suggested that Washington be informed. Stalin's response was that he had no particular views for the moment, but 'he would make constructive proposals in due course'.²²

After the initial meetings Eden drew up a minute for Churchill, in which he stated that there were two 'bargaining counters' for Britain to maintain her position in South Eastern Europe: the Anglo-Turkish Alliance and the Straits. Identity of interest between Britain and Turkey in the matter of the Straits was one of the pillars of the alliance and thus giving way on this issue would endanger its continuance.²³

The British COS, in their report in June 1944, had already drawn attention to long term British defence requirements against the possible Soviet threat. They stated that the Russians would emerge from the war as a principal land power in Europe and Asia. They further indicated that the Soviets could threaten the following vital British strategic interests in the post-war period: first, Middle-Eastern oil supplies in Iraq and Persia; second, British communications in the Mediterranean through Turkey; last, vital sea communications. Thus, the COS concluded that the British policy should be directed to ensure US support against such threats in the region.²⁴

In the second meeting on 17 October, Churchill continued to follow his conciliatory opening that there was a need to compromise between Russian aspirations and Turkish territorial integrity and sovereignty. He reassured Stalin that he was in favour of free access to the Mediterranean for Soviet merchant ships and warships. But Britain wanted to bring Turkey 'along by gentle steps' and not alarm her, while hoping to work in a friendly way with the Soviet Union.²⁵

Simultaneously, Eden notified the Turkish Ambassador to London in general terms about the discussions which had taken place at Moscow. When the Ambassador sought reassurance about Soviets intentions, Eden emphasised that 'no proposals of any kind had been put before us by the Russians and, of course, if and when this occurred we would consult the Turkish government, as we were indeed bound to do'.²⁶ He also tried to allay the Ambassador's fears and emphasised that the Soviets had first raised the Straits question with Britain, which meant that they realised the need for the Allies to move together in this matter, as in all else.

Anglo-Turkish Alliance at Trial:

The Critical Stage between London and Ankara

The year 1944 was critical for the relations between Turkey and the Great Powers in general and for Anglo-Turkish relations in particular. Though no agreement was reached among the 'Big Three' over Balkan strategy Turkey's neutrality complicated her relations with the USSR and to a lesser extent with the USA. Furthermore, the continuity of sharp differences between Ankara and London over the tactics related to war strategy brought about the Anglo-Turkish Alliance on the verge of breakdown.

Britain's reluctance to provide adequate military assistance and its failure to draw up a clear war plan made Ankara extremely suspicious. Turkey came to believe that Britain wanted to use her as 'a pawn to drag into the war'. Besides, the failure of British military operations in the Dodecanese and the Aegean Sea against the Germans only made Turkey more resolute in demanding proper military preparation before she could enter the war.²⁷ The Turkish suspicions can be discerned in a telegram from the Turkish Foreign Minister to the Turkish Ambassador to London: 'I had already discerned that the British insistence on us [Turkey] to enter the war without preparation of a proper defence system came out as a result of the Soviet instigation. Our intelligence indicates that an agreement had been reached towards this end between Mr. Eden and the Soviet leaders during the Moscow Conference.'²⁸

In the meantime Turkey's response to Churchill's proposals made during the Second Cairo Conference was given on 12 December 1943. It set a number of preconditions:

First, Turkey can not be aloof to a possibility of an attack coming from both the land and air. Therefore, its land and air defences should be reinforced properly; second, simultaneously, a war plan should be made between the Turkish and the British Armies; third,

the political issues related to the war should be initiated as soon as the agreement is reached on the material assistance.²⁹

The Turkish note warned that unless these vital measures were taken Turkey could not enter the war and its response would be negative.

When Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, the British Ambassador to Ankara, saw the note he was surprised and said that 'this was not good and it would make a bad effect on London'. Hugessen then delivered the official response of HMG on 18 December. It suggested sending the British Chiefs of Staff to Ankara to discuss the issues related to air bases and the Turkish requests. Menemencioğlu however responded that:

There is a serious misunderstanding between us. While we emphasise proper preparation, you [the British government] only concentrate on the date. The coming of the Army Chiefs can provoke the Germans. We can not accept a *fait accompli* to be dragged on the war. You even haven't handed over us yet a war plan...Under these circumstances we can not accept to take part in the war...We demand that a joint war plan should be prepared and the military preparation should be started with the British technicians under the Command of the Turkish General Staff.³⁰

In the end Britain agreed to send a small military committee under Lieutenant General Linnel at the beginning of January 1944. However, the British party only wanted to talk about the preparations related to air bases to be allocated to Britain whereas the Turkish party wished to discuss the list of British military equipment promised at Adana, making this a prior condition before air bases could be discussed. During the discussions contrasting views over war strategy also emerged. The British party on the one hand argued that Germany would only attack Turkey by air but not by land and, Bulgaria would not move because of the Soviet threat. It therefore claimed that Turkey would not need to such an 'excessive list of war materials'. The Turkish delegation on the other hand countered that if Turkey entered the fighting Germany's first action would be to occupy the Straits and in this event it would create a good opportunity for Soviet intervention to further their ambitions.³¹

Under these circumstances no progress was made leading to the sudden departure of the British Military Mission on 3 February 1944. This shocked the Turkish leaders. As the Turkish Foreign Minister told the American Ambassador: 'I couldn't understand the cold British attitude ta-

ken against us since the departure of the British Military Mission...’ Afterwards Britain began to adopt a policy of cooling its relations with Turkey to force the latter to come to term with the former.³² Then, London in collaboration with Washington began to put political pressures on Ankara to try to break the impasse. They eventually succeeded in forcing Turkey first to reduce chrome exports to Germany and then to break up her diplomatic and economic relationship with Berlin.³³

The pressure began when the British and American Ambassadors made representations to the Turkish Foreign Ministry on 8 February. After Ankara declared its intention to stop chrome exports to Germany on 22 April Britain then made another effort to force Turkey to cut diplomatic relations with Germany on 30 June 1944. In the British note handed over by Hugessen to Saraçoğlu, the Prime Minister who had the charge of the Foreign Ministry following Menemencioğlu’s resignation, pointed out that ‘following the opening of the Western Front the situation had entirely changed.... Now this is the moment to stop fully the German game which had sought to make a rift between Turkey and the Allies. It is therefore the time for Turkey to break off her diplomatic and economic relations with Germany.’ The British note criticised Turkey for not behaving properly while dangling the prospect that ‘Turkey should clear up her dark and complicated policy taken in the recent period in order to take up her appropriate place at the peace table’.³⁴

While making Turkey fully responsible for the deterioration in her relations with Britain, the note made no mention of the Anglo-Turkish Alliance. This led Saraçoğlu ask Hugessen the reasons for why Britain did not make its demand based on alliance. In response Hugessen stated that ‘the British government have tested the ground to see whether the Anglo-Turkish Alliance still existed or not’.³⁵ Moreover, the British requested Turkey’s broke off diplomatic relations with Germany without asking for her entry into the war surprised the Turkish leaders. The truth was that Britain at this time came to change its strategy towards Turkey. The reasons underlying this change were that: it was easier than asking for Turkish belligerency, did not necessitate military commitments and would make the same impact on the Balkans. Moscow however criticised both Ankara and London as it continued to insist on Turkey’s direct participation in the war.³⁶

In retrospect, Stalin’s message to Churchill on 17 July provided important clues over post-war Soviet intentions against Turkey:

You remember well that we, the three powers, had reached an agreement on Turkey's entry to the war against Germany in October and November 1943. Nothing came of these [attempts]....Again this year in May and June we [the Soviets] have made some attempts with the Turkish government but with no success. As for the recent incomplete Turkish measures this will bring no benefit to the Allies. Let us leave Turkey alone and not make any pressure on her. Let us abandon her along with her ambiguous strategy towards Germany. Turkey which had avoided herself to participate in the war will have no right to sit at the peace table as a result of her dubious policy.³⁷

The British communication of 30 June initially made Saraçoğlu furious. He first informed the British Embassy on the line that London should be more careful in using such words as 'dark and complicated policy' which was very unjust to describe Turkey's position. He then asked for the addition of a half sentence to the British request: worded as 'the decision to the cut off Turkey's relationship [with Germany] is sought within the frame of Anglo-Turkish Alliance'. He also wanted assurances from Britain that in case Turkey was attacked as a result of this action London would provide all assistance it could. Following the swift British approval of these requests Turkey responded on 23 July that she would carry out the British demands.³⁸ Upon this response, the British government expressed its pleasure that Turkey had acted as an ally of Britain under the terms of the Anglo-Turkish Alliance.³⁹

This indeed marked the revival of the alliance after a period of decline. It was swiftly recovered because of the emerging the Soviet danger. As the British documents reveal in concurrence with the Turkish sources one of the basic aims of Moscow was 'to isolate Turkey and destroy the Anglo-Turkish Alliance'. The Soviets, in case Turkey entered the war, aimed to occupy the Turkish Straits as 'liberators'; otherwise they planned to realise their ultimate aim by means of an aggression. This was indeed very clear when Moscow stated that the Anglo-Turkish decision contravened the previous agreements reached at Moscow and Tehran. Both Ankara and London came to recognise the Soviet threat which bound Britain and Turkey to act together. Turkey formally cut off her relations with Germany on 2 August 1944.⁴⁰

Following Turkey's severance of diplomatic relations with Germany no serious communications occurred between London and Moscow over outstanding issues concerning Turkey until the congregation of the Yalta (Crimea) Conference on 10 February 1945. One of the main items on the

agenda was the question of the Turkish Straits. During the sessions Stalin, probably bearing in mind Churchill's sensitivity, took a more flexible attitude towards Turkey than he had at the Moscow Conference.

Stalin insisted however that the Montreux Convention did not meet the problems of the current time and hence needed to be changed. He considered Russian interests in the Straits could be taken into account without infringing upon the legitimate interests of Turkey. In response, Churchill opined that while he saw the need for a new regime for the Straits, any accommodation of Soviet requirements accompanied by appropriate assurances to Turkey regarding the maintenance of her independence and integrity. In the end, it was agreed that the revision of Montreux should be discussed in London at the first meeting of foreign ministers.⁴¹

After the conference, Molotov pressed upon Selim Sarper, the Turkish Ambassador to Moscow, Soviet interpretation of the discussions which had taken place at Yalta. Molotov said that 'the Soviet leaders brought the issue of the revision of the Montreux Convention to the table and the Allies did not oppose the idea. However, we [the Soviet leaders] did not present a specific plan for the moment but we will do so at a future date.' When that transpired the Soviet government would need to hold discussions with Turkey on this subject.⁴² Sarper, acting on instructions from Ankara also talked with other Soviet leaders. Afterwards he remitted his impressions to his government:

The Soviet attitude towards us can not be said to be friendly. It may be said to be cautious or even cold....The Russians thought that Turkey emotionally had taken the side of Germany and would take the side of Britain in case Russian-British relations were broken. The Russians would probably take up the Straits issue with Turkey when the suitable time comes....It might be expected that the Russians would terminate the Turco-Soviet Treaty on 7 May 1945 six months before the end of the duration of the Treaty.⁴³

Molotov's statements in particular went beyond Eden's remarks to the Turkish Ambassador made in London in mid-October 1944, increasing Turkish suspicions over Soviet intentions. It also led Ankara consider whether London was hiding some truths from Ankara. Saraçoğlu informed the new British Ambassador, Sir Maurice Peterson, that he would be glad of any advice from his government as to the attitude he should adopt when the Soviets made a direct approach. The Ambassador responded

that this was Moscow's usual tactic and nothing to worry about. He added that HMG would prefer to wait to know exactly what the Soviets had in mind.⁴⁴

Subsequent to the conference, the British Ambassador, at Eden's request, informed the Turkish Foreign Minister, Hasan Saka, on 20 February 1945, of the decision taken at Yalta that nations at war with the Axis before 1 March would qualify to enter into association with the UN.⁴⁵ He explained the merits and advantages of this decision for Turkey. Turkey.⁴⁶ Turkey had already realised how she had become isolated internationally due to retaining her neutral position, especially by the later phase of the war, and for once acted fast by declaring war on Japan and Germany on 23 February.⁴⁷ In the British Ambassador's view this was the natural course for the Turkish statesman who had followed since the late 1930s of aligning Turkey with Britain. Britain welcomed it as strengthening her ties with Turkey towards the end of the war. On 27 February, Churchill himself, in the House of Commons, paid tribute to Turkey's accession to the UN.⁴⁸

The Beginning of the Soviets' 'War of Nerves' Against Turkey, and Britain's Reactions

At the beginning of March two different developments affected the course of Turkish foreign policy. On the one hand, Turkey and Britain became closer to each other after an uneasy period of cool relations during the last years of the war. On the other, the beginning of a troubled period ensued between the USSR and Turkey. In early March, after the Turkish declaration of war on the Axis, the Soviet Radio and press began a campaign against Turkey, accusing her of collaborating with Germany.⁴⁹

A more concrete development came with notice from Moscow on 19 March, to terminate the Turco-Russian Treaty of December 1925, which was due for renewal on 7 November 1945. The Soviet Foreign Ministry handed a note to Sarper, who was about to fly to Ankara for consultation. In the note the Soviet government based its denunciation on the grounds that fundamental changes had occurred during the war and the treaty was no longer in accordance with the new existing conditions.⁵⁰

Upon this development Sarper asked Molotov about whether the Soviet government had any specific ideas for a new treaty. Molotov responded that the Turkish government to begin with should express her readiness before talking outlines of a new treaty. Moreover, Molotov expressed his expectation that the Turkish government should appreciate about the sympathy shown by Moscow towards making a new treaty.

Then, the Turkish Ambassador stated his readiness to work hard for the development of Turco-Soviet relations.⁵¹

In his report to Ankara Sarper expressed his views on the Soviet note. He pointed out that the Russians wished to solve the Straits issue at some future date. To realise this objective they might seek for Turkey's concurrence with their objective before an international conference was convened to deal with the issue. In Sarper's opinion the Russians could not try to reach a bilateral agreement with Turkey as the issue was an international one.⁵²

Upon the Russian denunciation, the Turkish Foreign Minister asked the British Ambassador to see him on March 22. After explaining the Soviet notice to the Ambassador, Hasan Saka told the latter that since the British government had long desired for the betterment of the relations between Moscow and Ankara he 'wished to consult HMG whose advice they will [would] greatly value' before deciding on the form of reply. It was interesting that Saka's words contained a hint that Russia might have denounced the treaty within Britain's knowledge. Saka further indicated that his greatest worry was that the Russians might have a plan to revise the Montreux Convention in a bilateral understanding before a new treaty was negotiated and before it was brought to any meeting of the three powers.⁵³

Further to this Eşref Ünaydın, the Turkish Ambassador to London, and Cevat Açıkalın, then Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who was in London for a visit, made a request to see the British Foreign Secretary. During their meeting Eden pointed out that the Soviets had not yet told him anything about the terminated treaty. Only, sometime ago, did the Soviet Ambassador tell him that Moscow was waiting for to receive the new Turkish proposals. As for the issue of the Straits, Eden stated that he had nothing new to tell the Turks. However, in case the Soviets would have made a move on the issue the British Foreign Minister stated that he advised Turkey to reply that Ankara would examine any proposals which the Soviet government might make for an improved treaty. Special advice was also given to both the Turkish Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister that the question of the Montreux regime should be kept separate and if the Soviet government tried to introduce it. Turkey could reply that it could only be discussed multilaterally.⁵⁴

Meantime, the COS Sub-Committee completed their study on the Montreux Convention, which had been under examination since the end of the Yalta Conference and concluded: first, that an agreement to a revision of the Montreux Convention was contrary to British interests; sec-

ond, that the Soviet claim to a right of passage both in peace and war was however reasonable. To resist it might prejudice Anglo-Soviet relations and might cause the Russians to increase their pressure in South-East Europe; finally, the memorandum drew a conclusion that from both the political and strategic points of view it was reasonable to support a right of free of passage to the Soviets so this action might reduce their grievances and promote confidence between Britain and Russia.⁵⁵

On 4 April Turkey replied to the Soviet Ambassador on the above lines.⁵⁶ According to the British Ambassador in Ankara this denunciation did not much alarm the Turkish government due to the Soviet Ambassador's sound explanations. In his conversations with Sarper, Vinogradov left the former with the impression that he would find a suitable atmosphere for his discussions in Moscow.⁵⁷

In fact, this was an illusion as Sarper fell into a on a Soviet trap. The relatively optimistic atmosphere felt by himself soon gave way to a great bitterness when Moscow asked Ankara to accede to its unreasonable demands. In reality, the Soviet leaders played their game skilfully. Their Ambassador in Ankara had already convinced the Turks that Moscow would act reasonably if the Turks approached with a new treaty. In fact, Moscow's tactic was to prevent the reactions of Britain and the USA claiming that it had acted in response to a Turkish request and there was nothing unusual in its approach to the Turks though its demands went far beyond on any goodwill.

During the conversations with the Turkish Ambassador about the Turkish suggestion of making a new treaty, on 7 June, Molotov said that his government demanded the following from Turkey before a new treaty could be negotiated: first, the reversion of certain eastern territories (Kars, Ardahan and Artvin), which had been ceded to Turkey under the Turkish-Russian Treaty of 1921 by the Soviet Union; second, the cession of bases in the Straits; third, a revision of the Montreux Convention between Russia and Turkey; last, Molotov hinted gloomily that there was a fourth outstanding question, the settlement of which would make the other three points easier.⁵⁸ The Turkish Ambassador replied tentatively to these demands that his government was not in a position to re-open the question of the 1921 Treaty, which had been freely negotiated at the time. It could not even consider granting Russia bases in the Straits. As regards the Montreux Convention, Sarper said that it was not a matter to discuss between the two governments alone.⁵⁹

As the Soviet demands became known in Turkey they aroused great anxiety in public opinion. Şükrü Saraçoğlu, the Turkish Prime Minister, in

his meeting with the American Ambassador on 2 July, indicated that 'the Russians are testing the ground. If Britain and the USA support Turkey's position they will retreat. If the two will not render their support the result will be very bad for Turkey. You should be sure that even if the worst scenario occurs Turkey will not hesitate to take up arms.'⁶⁰

Britain's reaction was vigorous as well. The Foreign Office regarded this action as in conflict with Stalin's assurances at Yalta. It was also surprised that Molotov had proposed a Turco-Soviet agreement on the Straits while the British and American governments were still awaiting the views of the Kremlin which the latter had promised to convey at Yalta.⁶¹ It therefore firmly supported Turkey. Both Ankara and London put their differences and misunderstandings arising from the war aside and began to focus on the Soviet threat as Turkey was the last bulwark in front of a Soviet advance into the Middle East where vital British interests lay. The Soviet threat hence became a major factor which rekindled the traditional Anglo-Turkish strategic collaboration at the start of the Cold War era.

Britain at the same time sought an immediate agreement with the United States for a joint approach to Moscow on the above lines. In its telegram to Washington, the Foreign Office added that if the American government did not agree, Britain would act alone, though this would weaken the British position.⁶²

In reply to the Turkish request for advice on these unacceptable Soviet demands, the British Ambassador informed the Turkish government on 20 June that there was no need to add to the remarks which Sarper had made to Molotov. Peterson also enquired whether the Turkish government would wish for British intervention with Moscow before the projected meeting of the 'Big Three' at Potsdam in July. Ankara was pleased at this suggestion and particularly welcomed the British promise of intervention in Moscow with or without US support.⁶³

The Turkish Ambassador in Moscow met again with Molotov on 18 June, and after confirming his government's inability to accept the Soviets' proposals, he added that negotiations at Moscow had ended now and if there were to be any more discussions these would take place in Ankara. Meanwhile, the Soviet Ambassador saw the Acting Turkish Foreign Minister on 20 June and repeated Molotov's new revised proposals to him.⁶⁴

Having obtained the Turkish government's agreement to intervene at Moscow, London, on 18 June, proposed to Washington a joint approach to the Soviets. However, the State Department was not in favour of this method on the grounds that there had been a preliminary exchange of views between Russia and Turkey 'in a friendly atmosphere' and the joint

approach might damage it.⁶⁵ Therefore, the British government acted alone on July 5 when its ambassador in Moscow wrote a letter to Molotov in which he pointed out that the Soviet government's moves on the Straits and the other questions could not be regarded as merely a matter between the USSR and Turkey. He also reminded Molotov of the agreement that had been made at Yalta on the Straits issue. Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr also indicated that the whole issue would have to be discussed at the forthcoming Potsdam Conference.⁶⁶

In addition to these promises by Peterson in Ankara, Eden also assured the Turkish MFA in London, when the latter paid a visit there on 11 July, that the Turco-Russian question would be discussed at the Potsdam Conference and Turkey would in no circumstances be faced with a *fait accompli*. Eden further assured Saka that he would bear Turkish interests in mind.⁶⁷

Following the formal Soviet demands over the Straits in June, the COS reviewed their earlier decisions on 12 July. They maintained the previous view which was to support the Soviet proposal for free passage through the Straits in peace and war, although this would be detrimental to British strategic interests. At the same time the USSR had no grounds for her demands for bases in the Straits and its demands should be resisted strongly. From a strategic point of view, the COS believed that the best solution for the Straits question was to maintain the status quo. Should the Russians persist in their demands for bases then the question must be referred either to the Four Great Powers or the World Organisation (the UN) for discussions, but should not be left for bilateral discussion between Ankara and Moscow, since Moscow would in that case get its way.⁶⁸

The Potsdam Conference, the US Proposals and the Straits Question

The Potsdam Conference began with the meeting of Stalin, Truman and Churchill (later Attlee following Labour's election victory), between 12 July and 2 August 1945 to discuss the post-war world order. Besides the situations of Germany, Italy, Japan and Eastern Europe, the issues of internal waterways were also discussed at Potsdam. The question of the Turkish Straits was put on the agenda on 23 July.⁶⁹

In the discussions, Stalin indicated that if Turkey did not make territorial concessions she should not expect to have an alliance. The first discussions were however not completed and continued in next day. On 24 July, President Truman proposed that the Straits should be demili-

tarised and the freedom of the Straits should be governed and guaranteed by an international regime including the three Great Powers. However, Stalin refused to consider this suggestion and added that the question was not yet ripe and his government would resume their 'interrupted talks' with Turkey.⁷⁰

The conference ended with no solution to the Straits question. It was only agreed that 'the matter should be the subject of direct conversations between each of the three governments and the Turkish government'.⁷¹ When the results of the conference became known to the Turks they were not satisfied with them and initially were worried about the American proposal of internationalisation.⁷² However, from the British point of view, this result was a success since it brought the US government to declare its intention to join in a guarantee of the freedom of the Straits. This point was very important for Britain which had long planned to associate the USA with itself in the affairs of the Near and Middle East.⁷³

The New American Proposals and Developments in Anglo-Turkish Relations

The British Ambassador informed the Turkish Prime Minister on the above lines on 26 July and advised him that Turkey should firmly oppose any Russian approaches and respond that the Straits question must be settled on an international basis. He also stressed the importance for Turkey of having the USA associated with the regime of the Straits.⁷⁴

Saraçoğlu reacted with some perturbation to the Ambassador's remarks on internationalisation and told the Ambassador that he must await the American proposals before he declared the Turkish opinion on these new US proposals.⁷⁵ Later, on 11 August, he indicated to the Ambassador that the Turkish government now accepted in principle the internationalisation of the Straits provided that it would not impair Turkish sovereignty and as a consequence of this Russia should modify its hostile attitude to Turkey. This also was confirmed in a written Turkish note to the British Embassy on 17 August.⁷⁶ However, in the meantime, Turkey expressed its worries, in a memorandum to the US Ambassador on 20 August that the Turkish government was still awaiting information on the scope of the President's suggestion for the internationalisation of the Straits.⁷⁷

In fact, at this time, the US government had already dropped the idea of internationalisation. Even the Foreign Office did not have adequate information on this fact and the Foreign Secretary instructed the Washington Embassy, on 19 August, to find out exactly what the Americans had in

mind with regard to the Straits question.⁷⁸ The State Department responded that though its study on the issue was incomplete, it thought that the control of the Straits should be exercised within the framework of the world security organisation.⁷⁹ Actually, the department was busy preparing new proposals regarding this question.

This cavalier US attitude was regarded by Turkey as indifference towards Turkish affairs and deeply disappointed her.⁸⁰ Unlike Britain, the USA did not appear to take the matter seriously. Washington did not even respond to the Turkish memorandum of 20 August on the Straits. The US government also did not want the question to be discussed at the September meeting of the London Conference. According to the Potsdam agreement, each government should communicate their ideas on the subject to the Turkish government. But the Americans already had delayed their communication. Nor did they notify Turkey of the decision to drop the concept of an international regime. Therefore, the non-committal American attitude towards Turkish affairs made the initial US-Turkish flirtation short-lived. Turkey again laid emphasis on its association with Great Britain.

Since Yalta, Britain had showed an increasingly firm attitude in its dealing with Soviet aspirations against Turkey. Then, Turkey fully settled its reliance on Britain and her hopes had centred personally on Churchill himself and his administration owing to the Turkish feeling that he was a good friend to Turkey. These Turkish hopes were temporarily dampened with the advent to power of the newly elected Labour party in July, but were revived when the Turks realised that the new government's foreign policy under Ernest Bevin was a continuation of its predecessors' in many respects.⁸¹ This feeling was further strengthened with the arrival of HMG's warship *Ajax*, escorted by *Marne* and *Meteor*, in Istanbul on 19 September for four days visit. They were the first foreign warships to enter the Straits since the war. Their mission was to bring the Regent of Iraq from Italy to Istanbul. This was also regarded by Turkey as an Anglo-Iraqi support against Soviet imperialism.⁸²

In reality, there was little coordination between Britain and the USA over the Turkish affairs. The British Foreign Secretary came to know the new US proposals two months later in early September. Bevin was not happy with the new proposals and made a second attempt to instruct the British Ambassador to Washington, Lord Halifax, on 22 October, that he had some comments to make on the proposals before the US government communicated them to Turkey.⁸³ Concurrently, the British Foreign Office came to the conclusion that there was no hurry to make the British or

American views known to Turkey, because Britain and the USA had enough complicated questions with Russia and this issue should be left dormant for the time being.

For this reason, on 26 October Bevin asked the State Department to postpone communicating its proposals to the Turks. Since there was no evidence of any Soviet intention to resort to force, any initiative either by HMG or the US government would only provoke the Russians to an unwelcome response.⁸⁴ However, when the Turks strongly insisted upon obtaining their views, the Americans eventually conveyed their proposals to the Turkish government on 2 November, in which they included the following changes:

First, the Straits should be opened to the merchant vessels of all nations at all times; second, the Straits to be open to the transit of the warships of Black Sea powers at all times; third, save for an agreed limited tonnage in time of peace, passage through the Straits to be denied to the warships of non-Black Sea powers at all times, except with the specific consent of the Black Sea Powers or except when acting under the authority of the United Nations; and; last, certain changes to modernise the Montreux Convention such as the substitution of [the] United Nations system with that of the League of Nations and the elimination of Japan as a signatory.⁸⁵

Nevertheless, these new proposals did not satisfy the Turkish government either. It had similar objections to them as Britain did. Erkin, the Turkish Secretary-General of MFA, invited the British Ambassador to talk on the US memoranda on 5 November. Erkin explained to the latter that the Turks saw some difficulties with the proposals: first, it would be difficult for the Black Sea powers to make a decision on the entry of non-Black Sea powers' warships. Second, the American proposals would turn the Black Sea into a Russian naval base from which the Soviet Navy could easily run expeditions into the Mediterranean. The Secretary-General further pointed out that Turkey was most anxious to receive even the unofficial views of HMG.⁸⁶

The British Ambassador handed his government's memorandum to Turkey on 21 November 1945 in which it explained that the British government agreed with the US view on the necessity for the revision of the Montreux Convention, but it regarded the question as not particularly urgent. However, if a conference was called by either Turkey or Russia, HMG would be ready to take part.⁸⁷ Britain also conveyed its views to

Moscow on the same lines on 23 November.⁸⁸ The Turkish government returned no official reply either to the American or British communications, but its views were expressed by the Prime Minister on 6 December in a press conference. Ankara accepted the US proposals as a basis for negotiations and Turkey wished to see Washington taking part in the future conference as its participation was regarded as indispensable.⁸⁹

The Soviet government had not undertaken any further conversations since Potsdam. It made no official comment on the American or the British notes to the Turkish government. On 21 November 1945, the Soviet Ambassador in Ankara, Vinogradov, after reading the copy of the British note to the Turkish MFA, asked the British Ambassador whether there had been agreement between Britain and America and then pointed out that the new American proposals did not meet with essential Russian requirements.⁹⁰ In essence, as many Turkish and British documents suggest, the Soviet government was looking for the right opportunity to undermine Turkish independence. This right moment would be when they found any sign of disagreement and weakness between Britain and the USA.

Intensification of the Soviet Campaigns and Anglo-Turkish Collaboration

By October 1945, Turkish-Russian relations began to intensify with a battle of words flying between Moscow Radio and the Turkish press. Soviet Radio started its attacks on Turkey in March 1944, when Turco-British relations began to develop and afterwards increasingly continued on its assaults.⁹¹ These campaigns, accompanied by the rumours of the Russian troop concentrations near the Turkish border, alarmed the TGS. However, the efforts of British Staff Services (Intelligence) along with the Turkish government eased the fears of the Intelligence Section of the TGS.⁹² At the beginning of November, Turkey's worries about Moscow were in some respects relaxed when she learned that Molotov had dismissed the rumours of possible Soviet action against Turkey in his communication to the American Ambassador on 29 October 1945.

Concurrently, the twenty-year old Turco-Russian Treaty came to an end on 7 November without any specific incident. However, this relief did not last long. The Russian-backed separatist movements in Iranian Azerbaijan made the Turks increasingly worried. They watched these developments with the closest interest and with increasing anxiety. To the Turks the Iranian problem was a test case in which to assess the extent to which the Anglo-Americans would go to appease the Russians. They also closely

followed Russian actions, which had set off or supported the Kurdish unrest in Iran, Iraq and Syria.⁹³

Turco-Russian relations further cooled when Turkish students destroyed the offices of the pro-Soviet newspapers *Tan* and *Turquie* (French) and a bookshop owned by a Soviet national in a demonstration in Istanbul on 4 December 1945. The Soviet Ambassador protested on 8 December and claimed that it had been planned under the protection of Turkish Police.⁹⁴ This was accompanied by the assertions of two Georgian professors, claiming that some northern territories should be returned to Georgia.⁹⁵

No doubt these activities were provoked and supported by the Soviets themselves. As these incidents continued, the Turks became more worried. In order to abate this Turkish restlessness, the British Foreign Secretary informed the Turkish Ambassador in London on 31 December that Stalin had told him during the Moscow Conference, on 16 December, that there was no possibility of war with Turkey and all rumours of it were 'rubbish'.⁹⁶ Though these were British attempts to calm down Turkish worries, Turkish anxieties and the strained Turco-Soviet relations continued in this manner until the summer of 1946 when a second crisis between the two countries emerged.

Since the Yalta Conference the anxiety towards Russia had been the major factor affecting both the internal and external dimensions of Turkish policies.⁹⁷ When the propaganda war was intensified between the Turkish and Soviet media, the Turkish government stopped its press from continuing the campaign and sent one of the most bitter anti-Soviet journalists, Hüseyin C. Yalçın, on a compulsory vacation abroad. However, the Soviet propaganda, which had been conducted in a masterly fashion, showed its effects in Turkey. Some influential members of the ruling party, RPP, chief among them Tevfik R. Aras, the Former Foreign Minister, came to favour a policy of appeasement towards the USSR.⁹⁸ The Soviet propaganda claimed that in case of a serious conflict 'the USA would stay indifferent and England keep aside'.⁹⁹ It also claimed that the Anglo-Turkish Alliance was considered obsolete and Turkey had been abandoned to its fate by England.

In the Turkish view, the propaganda aimed to destroy the Turkish internal regime and to encourage its neighbours Syria, Bulgaria and the Communists in Greece to take a hostile attitude to Turkey.¹⁰⁰ The recent incidents had pushed Ankara to pursue more collaboration with London. To this end, the Turkish Foreign Minister in his memorandum made a request to Bevin to realise either of the two alternatives when he was in

London for a visit on 15 February 1946: if HMG was willing to modify the Anglo-Turkish Treaty to meet the current circumstances, his government was ready to enter into conversations with London; or if HMG thought that the present moment was not yet ripe then Turkey would be satisfied with a declaration affirming the importance and the value of the Anglo-Turkish Alliance to Britain. He further indicated that a declaration on these lines would be a great morale-booster for Turkey and would annihilate the negative effects of Soviet propaganda.¹⁰¹

In response to the Turkish request, the British Foreign Secretary, in his speech in the House of Commons on 21 February 1946, expressed the view that the Anglo-Turkish Treaty was still valid and he wished Turkey not to be converted into a satellite state, but 'to be really independent'.¹⁰² This British move resulted in very good reactions in Turkey. Even in the Turkish General Staff and in the Turkish Army, the Foreign Secretary was called 'Baba Bevin: Father Bevin' after his speech.

The Foreign Office, however, was not very sympathetic to the Turkish request. Sir Orme Sargent's reaction to the memorandum was somewhat cautious. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State thought that the Turks exaggerated their thesis that the Soviets were conducting some conspiracy to encircle Turkey by instigating Syria, Bulgaria and the Communists in Greece. He further thought that if Turkey asked for a military alliance with Britain this could not be agreed for various reasons, mainly so as not to provoke the USSR. On balance, therefore, Sargent concluded, it was better to continue with the existing treaty without revising it. This also was the general opinion in the Foreign Office.¹⁰³

In addition to this, the following additional developments were able to ease the Turkish feeling of isolation and allayed the negative impact of the harsh Russian propaganda. The first development was the successful effort of the Security Council in its handling of the Soviet-Iranian dispute; the second comprised the recent indications of the US policy which showed an apparent American interest, explained by the US Ambassador, Edwin C. Wilson, in Ankara to the Foreign Minister on 11 February.¹⁰⁴ This was followed by the statements of James F. Byrnes, the US Secretary of State, on 28 February, combined with the visit of the powerful American battleship *Missouri* to Turkey in April.¹⁰⁵ Thus, these events contributed greatly to an increased optimism in Turkey for the future.

The Formal Russian Demands and the Responses of the West

Though Moscow made clear on various occasions their demands in the Straits it was not until 7 August 1946 that they acted formally on the deci-

sion taken at Potsdam that each of the Great Powers should discuss the matter with Turkey. On this date, Moscow handed three memoranda to the Turkish, the British and the American governments. In their note to Ankara, the Soviets charged Turkey with violation of the Montreux Convention during the war for the benefit of the Axis.¹⁰⁶ They put forward five proposals; the first three of them were in line with the American proposals of November 1945. The disagreement between the negotiators occurred on the last two points, the fourth was that the new regime should be elaborated by the Black Sea powers only and the fifth was that the defence of the Straits should be organised jointly between Russia and Turkey.¹⁰⁷

In the light of extensive documentary research conducted both in Turkey and Britain, it is clear that a firm show of British support for Turkey against Soviet encroachment began with the Yalta Conference, and it increasingly continued under the Churchill administration. However, this firm attitude was slightly weakened with the advent to power of the Labour Party in July 1945. This was because, between the period of late 1945 and the beginning of 1947, the Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, and some members of his Cabinet, such as the Health Minister, Aneurin Bevan, and the Chancellor of Exchequer, Hugh Dalton, whom they adopted an anti-imperialist stance, supported the idea of withdrawing completely from the Middle East, believing that the continuation of a military presence in the area brought too much burden on the economy, which was at a precarious stage, and it also could bring about a conflict with the Soviets.¹⁰⁸

By July 1946, some members of the Cabinet Defence Committee and the Prime Minister came to think that in return for Russian consent to Britain's trusteeship for Cyrenaica (which, at the time, had gained importance as an alternative army base to Suez in case of a complete British evacuation), London was ready to give a concession to Russia in the Turkish Straits to the extent that Moscow could be allowed to close the Dardanelles as Turkey had the right to do in the event of her being attacked.¹⁰⁹ This was argued in the British government during that period. However, neither the COS nor the Foreign Office agreed with the view but strongly objected to it. The idea eventually was dropped in January 1947 owing to these strong objections.¹¹⁰

Despite the Foreign Secretary's concurrence on the necessity of maintaining the British position in the Middle East, he was affected by the opposing ideas, as was reflected in the conduct of his policy towards Turkey.¹¹¹ Though Bevin supported an independent Turkey, he nevertheless suggested that in case of necessity some concessions could be made to the

Soviets in order not to destroy completely the slight hope of conciliation, or at least to avoid a possible conflict with them. Bevin therefore modified the tough line of his predecessor with a more conciliatory attitude in his policy to the Soviet Union until the beginning of 1947, at a time when the British government completely lost any idea of collaboration or compromise with the USSR as the Cold War began.¹¹²

Interestingly enough, as the documents indicate, the position of Britain and the USA on the issue of defending Turkey was reversed in late 1945. While Washington became firmer on the issue, London appeared to weaken its former determination. They only reached the stage of full collaboration in defending Turkey against the Soviet threat in late 1946.¹¹³ Thus, this time marked the beginning of a new era in Anglo-American relations based on a determination to defend the Near East from a possible communist invasion after any signs of compromise with the Soviet Union had completely disappeared.

In the face of the formal Soviet proposals of 17 August, the American administration made a comprehensive review on the issue of Turco-Soviet relations. After a series of high level meetings between government departments, a memorandum prepared by high ranking officers of the Army and the Navy was presented to the president. This concluded that the USA should resist by all means at its disposal, if Turkey faced an act of aggression by the Soviets, and Truman was persuaded to pursue this policy.¹¹⁴

After consulting Britain, the first response came from the Americans with their note to the Soviets on 19 August 1946. After expressing their agreement with the first three principles of the Soviets, the Americans rejected the last two points. The Americans rejected the fourth principle, which ignored the other signatories of the Montreux Convention. They also expressed the view that while Turkey should continue to be primarily responsible for the defence of the Straits, any attack or threat against them would be a matter for the Security Council.¹¹⁵ The British government delivered its note to Moscow on August 21 in which it replied that London was ready to join in a conference for the revision of Montreux and had no instant comments to make on the first three proposals but followed Washington in rejecting the others. The Turkish government's note on 22 August was also on the same lines as the USA and Britain.¹¹⁶ Thus, this represented a firm and close collaboration between Turkey, Britain, and the United States for the first time since the Soviets had raised the Straits question in June 1945.

After the first official Turkish reply, the Soviets intensified their pressure by moving their army near the Turkish border. According to Turkish estimates, there were 190,000 Russian troops on the Caucasian border and 90,000 in Bulgaria. The TGS began to prepare the Army in the East against any Russian move.¹¹⁷

Contemporaneously, the Russians returned their reply to the Turkish note on 24 September in which, after repeating their five proposals, they emphasised that a settlement of this kind was necessary for Soviet security. They also warned Turkey that if she rejected the principle of joint defence and then undertook military measures in the Straits in cooperation with 'certain non-Black Sea Powers' such action would be regarded as contrary to the security of the Black Sea.¹¹⁸ The British and United States governments repeated to Moscow that they remained opposed to proposals (4) and (5) while they were ready to join in a conference with the first three proposals standing as a basis for discussion. Again, after consultation with London and Washington, Ankara followed suit in its second note to the Soviets and denied Russian charges that Britain controlled some bases and had established radar stations in the Straits.¹¹⁹

Therefore, the matter was left open to Moscow to ask for a revision of Montreux by a conference of all signatories with the exclusion of Japan and inclusion of the United States. However, at the end of October, Moscow replied to London that it considered it premature to call a conference.¹²⁰ The British Foreign Office thought this Russian policy of a war of nerves aimed to break the Anglo-Turkish Alliance and to bring Turkey into the Russian sphere of influence in the same way as Poland and Finland. It also thought that there was a strong national solidarity for a mobilisation in Turkey to meet the Russian menace though it would entail widespread economic difficulties to undertake.¹²¹

The firm British and American actions forced the Soviet government to drop its demands for the time being until a suitable opportunity should arise. Moreover, the last Russian action suggested that it would continue its 'war of nerves' and propaganda in the hope that they might crush the resistance of the Turkish government and people to their demands.

The Withdrawal of British Assistance and the Enunciation of the Truman Doctrine

After the end of the Second World War Turkey was unable to alter her war-time conditions to a normal peace-time one due to the Russian threat. Therefore, she had to keep her Army mobilized during the post war period. This was indeed a very heavy economic burden on the shoulders

of Turkey because of her poor background. She hence needed an economic assistance and this was one of the most important issues on Turkey's internal and external agendas.¹²²

Turkey therefore asked for Britain to supply the equipment on credit terms. But this was not forthcoming owing to Britain's own financial difficulties.¹²³ The COS dealt with the matter in their report to the Cabinet Defence Committee on 1 January 1947, in which they stated that Britain's first priority was to supply equipment to Western European countries. To meet Turkish requirements meant either seriously curtailing its priority supplies, along with Britain's own requirements, or increasing the British armament programme, which would upset the peace-time economy. For these reasons, the Cabinet Defence Committee concluded that it was necessary to get US assistance to Turkey and Greece.¹²⁴

Bearing in mind the British economic difficulties, Ankara simultaneously applied to the USA to receive economic and military aid. Turkey asked for \$300 million in economic aid through the Export and Import Bank but she was allocated \$25 million.¹²⁵ Turkey had not received military aid either. Though the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) regarded Turkey as strategically 'the most important military factor in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East' and recommended to providing Turkey with the necessary military equipment, no loans or grant were allocated to her to buy the proposed equipment.¹²⁶

Eventually, the issue of Turkish military needs was discussed, in a conversation on 15 October 1946, between the British Minister of Defence, A.V. Alexander, and the American Secretary of State. Alexander told Byrnes that his government wanted to bring Turkey and Greece to a position in which to make them sufficiently strong to hold a possible Soviet attack long enough for assistance to reach them from Britain and the USA.¹²⁷ Alexander further explained that Britain had tried to provide help to both countries within his country's ability and the assistance of America would be greatly valued, but the UK had already shouldered a very large burden for Greece and some expenses for Turkey, and Britain planned to reduce the expenditure in those countries as much as possible.¹²⁸ It was therefore agreed that while Washington would be responsible for providing economic assistance to Turkey, London would continue to provide military equipment to the Turks for the time being.¹²⁹

About this time, the US government came to the conclusion that the Soviets sought political and territorial expansion not for the needs of self-defence but for world domination. It began to believe that Moscow was embarking on political, ideological and economic warfare against the free

world. Stalin, following the demand of the UN Security Council that the Soviets should withdraw their troops from Iran, made a speech on 9 February 1946 and strongly condemned the Western actions, indicating that there was no way of compatibility between capitalism and communism.

George Kennan, upon the request of the State Department, described Moscow's policy in his now famous 'long telegram' of 22 February 1946, as expansionist and hostile to Western interests. Kennan therefore drew Washington into a new policy which became known as the 'containment' policy. The first test case for the new American policy was demonstrated in the Near East and Eastern Mediterranean where the Soviets were seeking political and territorial expansion. The policy first became successful in Iran where Washington forced Moscow to withdraw. The next target of the new strategy was to stop the Soviet expansion in Greece and Turkey and it eventually brought the declaration of Truman Doctrine which manifested a world-wide American commitment to resist possible Soviet expansion.¹³⁰

In the meantime, the agreement of 15 October between the British and American officials was not further pursued as the British COS and the Foreign Office decided to recommend to the Cabinet to transfer the British responsibility to the US government. The COS revised the position of Turkey on 13 November 1946 and concluded that:

It is [of] great importance to assist Turkey so that she should be encouraged to resist Russian pressure in peace and to be able to impose the maximum delay on a Russian advance in war. It is of great importance to Turkey's security and our strategic position in the Eastern Mediterranean that Greece should be prevented from coming under Russian domination in peace-time.¹³¹

They further concluded that in order to achieve these objects it would be necessary to take the following steps: first, the Turkish armed forces should be organised and trained while the limited supply of equipment should be continued and the British service representation should be strengthened in order to provide advice on the methods of achieving this objective; second, the British position should be maintained in Greece; third, American assistance was essential and the USA should bear the major share of assistance to the Turks; finally, the COS should inform the US-JCS and recommend to the Foreign Office that the question of American assistance should be raised with Washington.¹³² These recommenda-

tions were approved by Bevin on 2 January 1947 as a basis for discussing the matter with the Americans.¹³³

Upon Cabinet approval of these proposals, the Foreign Secretary sent two telegrams to the Washington Embassy to notify the US government of the recent decisions on Greece and Turkey taken on 19 February 1947. In his telegram which dealt with the situation of Greece, Bevin, after pointing out the recent intense interest of the US government in the position of Greece and Turkey against the possible threat of the Soviet Union, asked Lord Inverchapel, (British Ambassador in Washington), to inform Washington that Britain could no longer carry the burden of aid to Greece and the former should take the responsibility of providing it with appropriate economic and military aid after 31 March 1947.¹³⁴

In his second telegram which concerned Turkey, Bevin first referred to the talks of 15 October 1946 with Alexander and Byrnes and explained the COS's report on the Turkish Army in the following terms: first, the Turkish Armed Forces in their present condition would not be able to offer an effective resistance to aggression by a first-class power. Priority should be given not merely to providing modern weapons but to strengthening service representation in Turkey with a view to advising the Turks on how best to improve the organisation and the training of all three fighting services; second, after the first task was undertaken, the next would be to more or less re-equip the army. This task should be the responsibility of the USA while HMG would probably look after the needs of the Navy and Air Force provided that satisfactory financial agreements could be made.¹³⁵

Thereafter, at the beginning of 1947, the British Defence Ministry recommended the Joint Study Mission (JSM) in Washington be informed that US economic aid was very important in connection with the present size of the Turkish Army, since it estimated that Russia's aim was to force Turkey to keep large forces mobilised, and thereby to undermine her economy and to spread communism to the eastern Mediterranean. Therefore, it concluded that anything to ease this burden would be most valuable.¹³⁶

Eventually, Lord Inverchapel presented the two notes to the State Department on 24 February 1947.¹³⁷ After the communication of the British notes, the US Special Committee appointed by the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, concluded that it was necessary to take the British position in supplying aid to Greece and Turkey after pointing out the negative consequences of the position which would appear if aid was denied.¹³⁸ The American JCS had already reported on 23 August 1946 that,

'If Russia can absorb Turkey in peace, our ability to defend the Middle East in war will be virtually destroyed.'¹³⁹

These views were approved by the new Secretary of State, George Marshall, Secretary of State and the secretaries of the navy and war on 26 February. Then, on 27 February 1947, the President gave his final approval to the report.¹⁴⁰ Subsequently, President Truman, in his address to Congress on 12 March 1947, declared that the US government would provide a total of \$400 million in immediate military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey.¹⁴¹ Truman's declaration was indeed a turning point in American history. It marked a radical shift from isolationism towards bearing a major responsibility across the globe for maintaining world peace and containing communism.¹⁴²

The Truman Doctrine represented one of the first successful outcomes of the American containment policy in the borders of Greece and Turkey whose defence now became vital to the US interests. With the Doctrine, the USA not only declared its firm interest in the defence of the Near and Middle East but also in the defence of the free nations elsewhere in the globe against the threat of aggression. The American aid allocated to Turkey was \$100 million (Greece received the lion's share as it was then in the throes of a civil war). The whole amount would be spent either on US-produced war material or the construction of airfields under American supervision. The US Ambassador was to be appointed to observe the use of aid.¹⁴³

Ankara was in general pleased officially with Truman's declaration. The Doctrine marked a crucial change in Turkish foreign policy. With the declaration Turkey took a significant step in aligning herself with the West by abandoning her former neutral position as it was the case during the Second World War. It also represented a first step towards an American interest in Turkey's security. However it left certain questions unclear. For instance, the duration of aid was not made plain. More important, the Doctrine itself did not provide a binding American commitment to Turkey's security.¹⁴⁴

There also appeared some suspicion privately among the Turkish bureaucracy, parliament and in the press on the mechanics of the implementation of the American aid. The Turks especially worried about President Truman's reference to an 'American Mission'. They expressed their fear of a 'revival of capitulations' and 'Egyptianisation'. The Turkish Secretary-General Erkin frankly expressed this fear to the American Ambassador.¹⁴⁵ For these reasons, the Turks wanted to retain the British military and civil personnel to balance American specialists who would total over 200 by

the end of 1947.¹⁴⁶ Even Erkin told Kelly that the 'Turks wished to increase the number of British experts.'¹⁴⁷ However, the numbers and the costs of the instructors remained undecided between the British and Turkish governments as discussions continued on 7 August 1947 when Ankara proposed some modifications to the British suggestions of 30 January 1947.¹⁴⁸

Turkish press reactions to the implications of President Truman's speech were generally calm and centred on the amount of aid and its implications for the economy. *Cumhuriyet* (Independent) on 15 March reported the Finance Minister's remarks which pointed out that it would have been very difficult for President Truman to open a large credit 'as long as Turkey had not regularised its monetary position and adopted certain economic measures'. The paper also touched on the criticism made by one of the senators in Congress that Turkey was 'undemocratic'.¹⁴⁹

Vakit (pro-PRP) of 13 March expressed its hope that Turkey, with American help, would reach the level of the advanced states within five or ten years. However, a Turkish economist pointed out that £150 million represented no more than one-third of the Turkish budget. Thus, he suggested that 'the offer of American financial assistance would seem to have a greater moral than material value'.¹⁵⁰ *Tasvir* (Independent), was however the only paper which pointed to the fact that the aid would bring great advantages to Turkey 'subject to its being wisely administered' on 13 March.¹⁵¹

Apart from its impacts on foreign policy, the Anglo-American and Turkish collaboration had some positive effects on Turkish internal affairs. As Turkey had linked its destiny with the West, it had been inevitable that Western institutions and democratic parliamentary systems should affect the Turkish internal regime. Both the Americans and the British forced President İnönü towards full-blown democracy.¹⁵² As Kelly observed, 'the Turkish government had recently taken significant steps in respect of introducing a two-party parliamentary democracy on the British model' in the summer of 1945, which culminated in the establishment of the Democrat Party under the leadership of Celal Bayar and Fuad Köprülü in October 1946. In July 1946, the government also allowed for religious education which had long been neglected.¹⁵³

Britain, on the one hand, greatly welcomed the Truman Declaration as stability in the Near and Middle East with American cooperation had been the main aim of British policy since the end of the war.¹⁵⁴ On the other hand, the British Foreign Office was not free from anxiety over the loss of its influence to Washington because it was very sensitive to the mainte-

nance of its prestige and political influence in Turkey. In his conversation with Wilson, Kelly asked the former whether he thought of replacing the British service instructors with the Americans. Wilson replied that he wished the Americans and the British would work together to assist the Turks and to train Turkish officers.¹⁵⁵ In essence, the British Ambassador had been successful in making the Turks realise that they 'owe the Truman Aid largely to the well-timed intervention of HMG'.¹⁵⁶

In his telegram to the Foreign Office, Kelly pointed out that the main problem in Anglo-Turkish relations was to maintain the British position as the trusted ally and adviser almost entirely by diplomatic means. He considered that '...our general situation imposes the tricky duty of making bricks without straw'.¹⁵⁷ The Ambassador suggested means should be sought to counteract the effects of the British inability to supply the necessary equipment to the Turkish Army. One way was to maintain and even to increase the number of British service instructors in Turkey. He further explained in his report that the Turks had become obsessed with the British decision to withdraw from India, Burma, and Palestine.¹⁵⁸

Despite these handicaps, Kelly observed that Britain still maintained its position as the most influential ally of Turkey, as had been shown on a number of occasions: first, the president of Turkey placed the UK in first place and reaffirmed his faith in Britain in his review of foreign affairs at the opening of the Assembly on 1 November; second, Turkey still attached great value to the Anglo-Turkish Treaty.¹⁵⁹ In another telegram the Ambassador reported that according to his impressions 'the present Anglo-Turkish collaboration will be in no way reduced'.¹⁶⁰ The Turkish sources indeed concurred with Kelly's observations. In a speech to the parliament on foreign policy the Turkish Prime Minister stated that '...our relations with Britain are based on the Anglo-Turkish Alliance of 1939. Our relations have always been developed in a mutual respect, trust and understanding. As it has been in the past the Anglo-Turkish Alliance will be the fundamental base of Turkish foreign policy in the future.'¹⁶¹

Conclusion

The long aged possibility of the Soviet threat, which had started to give its signals since the mid-1930s, to Turkey came into reality in early 1945. Moscow found this moment a good opportunity to realise the traditional Russian aspirations over the Turkish Straits at a time when it saw the British position much weaker and the American position as uncertain in the Mediterranean and the Near East.¹⁶² It was the British economic weak-

ness which not only did cause to temporarily weaken the Anglo-Turkish ties but also made the US involvement in the region as indispensable.

Britain however was the only country on which Turkey relied for support against the Soviet danger at the end of the war. As the main Turkish preoccupation was to secure itself from the Soviet encroachments, the Anglo-Turkish Alliance of 1939, which was the only formal commitment to Turkey, had naturally become a main anchor of Turkish foreign policy. Though the Alliance had suffered due to the setbacks in Anglo-Turkish relations resulting from the war the Soviet threat was the main reason in bringing Turkey's vital importance to the attention of Britain. At this time, both the British Foreign Office and the COS agreed that the Straits under Turkish control were crucial to the maintenance of British interests in the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

As the both the Turkish and British documents show until the beginning of 1946 the Americans in general remained indifferent towards Turkish affairs. This was why Turkey, though she greatly desired, had not expected to receive much diplomatic support from the American government in case of emergency. As early as in December 1943, President Roosevelt had advised President İnönü that Ankara should compromise with Moscow alone and the US government would beat all concerned over differences between the Soviet Union and Turkey.¹⁶³ Since then the Turkish authorities had maintained that the Americans were not much concerned about Turkey until the beginning of 1947.¹⁶⁴

The promulgation of Truman Doctrine in March 1947 therefore was a great relief to both Turkey and Britain. Though the declaration of the Doctrine mitigated the Turkish anxiety and raised her hopes it did not, however, provide a formal commitment to Turkey's security. Britain also was pleased with the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine. With the promulgation of the doctrine Britain managed one of its most important objectives, which was to bring American support to Turkey and Greece and thereby its involvement in the Near and Middle Eastern affairs. Thus, it represented the beginning of a close Anglo-American collaboration in stopping the Russians on Turkey's borders. It also implied that Britain withdrew only from its primary economic role in Turkey but its primary political and strategic role was to be continued for some years to come.

As the emergence of the Soviet menace drove Ankara more firmly to side of the Western Bloc it also had crucial internal effects on the Turkish political system. Turkey's collaboration with the West compelled President İnönü, who controlled the Turkish internal and external affairs with his few close associates, to take a drastic change from a single party rule to

a multi-party system. The declaration of the Truman Doctrine which brought Ankara closer to Washington helped to speed up the Turkish democratization process.¹⁶⁵

This chapter has dealt in detail with the Anglo-Turkish position vis-à-vis the Soviets at the start of the Cold War. It showed that Britain firmly supported Turkey in order to safeguard its vital interests in the Middle East. Next chapters which will focus on Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East hence will provide for us further insights in order to fully grasp the reasons behind the British support given to Turkey. From Turkish aspect, as she was in need of Western support in general and the British support in particular for her security this compelled Turkey to involve in Middle Eastern affairs in order to realise this aim.

BRITAIN, TURKEY AND THE MIDDLE EAST (1945–47)

The global conflict of 1939–45 was a catalyst in international relations, bringing to the fore two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and fatally undermining Britain's standing as a world power. This systemic change was especially felt in the Middle East where Britain had narrowly prevailed against the Axis but in the process had suffered some devastating defeats by Rommel, which encouraged Arab nationalists to believe that the British military presence in the region could finally be ended.

The British Empire now lay uncertainly in the shadow of two anti-imperial superpowers. As moderate Arab nationalism gave way to an extremist agenda, Britain sought ways and means of upholding its increasingly shaky position. In this context Turkey, which had stood on the sidelines in the period of 1939–45, emerged as a significant regional player in the Middle East in the view of its geo-strategic position and influence in the region. She was uniquely placed to wield influence with three borders, (Iran, Iraq and Syria), connecting it directly with the Middle East.

During the immediate Cold War era, the situation in the Middle East was not the same as it had been before the Second World War. In the inter-war period, the Middle East was under British and French domination and the Americans had only limited commercial interests in the area. As for Turkey, Ankara in the inter-war period enjoyed the confidence of both Eastern and Western powers. While in the West it had a treaty of alliance with Britain and France, in the East, Ankara managed to set up

the pact of Sadabad through which it established certain influence in the Middle East.¹

However, this picture was greatly changed by the end of the Second World War. France lost its pre-war regional position and had to withdraw from the Levant area as a result of British help to Syria and Lebanon in achieving their independence for the sake of gaining Arab sympathies. The British strategic and political position in the Middle East was not safe either. In the face of the rising tide of Arab nationalism, the post-war economic and political decline, combined with the newly emerged Soviet threat, began to shake the British influence in this region.

In Egypt, Iraq and Palestine Arab nationalism focused on a struggle against the British presence in the region. In addition, regional rivalries between the Arab states, the social conflicts between the ruling Arab elites and the emerging middle and labouring classes added further to the instability of the Middle East. While the Levant states, including Transjordan, were occupied in obtaining their independence, the already independent states of Egypt, Iraq and Saudi Arabia were busy attempting to dominate the area with their respective plans for unity. Even the establishment of the Arab League in March 1945 could not prevent the regional rivalry between the Hashemite and Egyptian blocs. Moreover, the question of sovereignty in Palestine began to emerge as another important issue in the region between the Arabs and the West.

These all created an opportunity for the Soviet Union which began to threaten the security of the Middle and Near East by adopting direct and indirect methods. Both Britain and Turkey planned to counteract these actions in collaboration with the Arab states, in addition to the two capitals' intense endeavours to involve the USA in the security of the region.

During this period one of the major British preoccupations was to maintain her supreme position in the Middle East in the context of the defence of the Suez Canal. There appeared certain differences between the outgoing Conservative and the incoming Labour governments. While the former had attached the utmost importance to the defence of the region through the Suez Canal the latter questioned the merit of maintaining Britain's primary responsibility for defending the region.

There emerged two main views inside the Labour government on this issue as well. On the one hand, Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister, and his supporters focused on a domestic agenda of economic recovery, the nationalisation of key industries and creating a comprehensive welfare state. They advocated complete withdrawal of the British presence from the Middle East because of their anti imperialist stance and that of the

costs of the defence of this region to the weakened British economy. This to their mind would also help to remove the political difficulties aroused by the forces of Arab nationalism against the foreign presence in the region.

On the other side, Ernest Bevin, the Foreign Secretary, the Foreign Office and the COS strongly supported the maintenance of the British position in the Middle East as they saw the defence of the region as ‘a matter of life and death to the British Empire’². In their view the Middle East, as had been the case in the past, was a key area as both an offensive and defensive base in any future conflict with the Soviet Union. Besides, the maintenance of its position in the Mediterranean was vital to British influence, prestige and to her global standing as a great power.³

This matter could only be resolved at the beginning of 1947 when Attlee and his supporters conceded to the views of the COS and eventually accepted them as the basis for the new British policy in the Middle East.⁴ Simultaneously both the Foreign Office and the COS, in the face of Egyptian demands for a new treaty with Britain to be negotiated on the basis of the evacuation of British forces and unity with the Sudan, began to examine the possibility of a multilateral defence arrangement to satisfy British strategic and political needs in the region. However, when the Anglo-Egyptian discussions collapsed in late 1946, although the COS agreed to implement a phased withdrawal from Egypt in peace-time, because of the disagreement over the Egyptian demand for the ‘unity of the Nile Valley’ this idea was dropped for the time being and Britain decided to carry out its strategic and political requirements through her bilateral treaties with the Arab states.⁵

In this general context Turkey occupied a crucial place in British strategic thinking as she was seen a key bulwark against the Soviet threat to the Middle East. Britain strongly supported Turkey in her resistance to the Soviet demands and to the spread of communism. In return for its diplomatic and political support Britain expected Turkey to mediate its difficulties with the Arab states, especially with Egypt.

As for Turkey, though she was not much eager, was not indifferent either to the idea of performing a mediating role since she saw the British presence in the Middle East as crucial to her own security and that of the region against the Soviet threat. Ankara was willing to work in convincing the Arab states of the necessity of a British presence in the region in the expectation that this would lead Britain to provide additional guarantees of Turkey’s safety in combination with the USA. More importantly, this

policy suited to Turkey's objectives as she wanted to develop her relations with the Arab states in order to counter the Soviet campaigns to herself.⁶

Relations between Britain, Turkey and Iraq during the Second World War

After the outbreak of the war the only Middle Eastern country with which Turkey maintained constant contact was Iraq. This was because Turco-Iraqi relations were in a state of constant development since the signature of the Treaty of Ankara in 1926.⁷ Besides both countries were the members of the Sadabad Pact. Though the pact was inoperative in the war, it continued to provide an official bond between Turkey and Iraq for the development of their closer relationship.

Although there had been some Western efforts to make the pact active President İnönü turned down the Anglo-French requests believing that they would not add anything to Turkey's security and could only bear her additional commitments. When Britain and France proposed to convert the Sadabad Pact into a military alliance in October 1939 Turkey thus responded that the pact had only a consultative function and could not be turned into a military alliance.⁸

The first Iraqi contact during the war was undertaken by Nuri as Said, the Foreign Minister, and Naji Shawkat, the Minister of Justice, on 24 June 1940, when they visited Turkey for consultations upon the fall of France.⁹ They were received by Şükrü Saraçoğlu, the Turkish Foreign Minister, and were told that Turkey would firmly maintain its neutral position. Saraçoğlu also strongly advised them to follow Turkey's course and to maintain Iraq's loyalty to Britain.¹⁰

However, Baghdad was unable to follow this course due to a coup, which led to a new government under the premiership of Rashid Ali Gailani (who had pro-German tendencies) in April 1941. With the new government, the Regent of Iraq and his cabinet, including Nuri Pasha, had to flee the country. The coup also disrupted Anglo-Iraqi relations in May. At this time, though Turkey refused to pass German aid to the Gailani government she offered to mediate between Britain and Iraq on 4 May. In fact, Rashid Ali at this time indicated that his government was ready to fulfil Iraqi treaty obligations to Britain in return for British recognition of the existing regime.¹¹ However, Churchill and the COS immediately rejected these offers and decided to take military action. Without sufficient assistance from the Axis, Britain was able to suppress the Gailani government in less than a month and thus restored the previous regime.¹²

After the suppression of the anti-British coup, Iraq firmly aligned itself with Britain and declared war on the Axis on 17 January 1943. From

this time until the end of the war, Turkish-Iraqi relations remained quiet. During this period Nuri Pasha was to be Prime Minister of Iraq from 9 October 1941 to 3 June 1944. From then until 1958, Nuri Pasha, who held the office of Prime Minister over the greater part of this period with the support of the regent, Abdulillah, was to become largely responsible for Iraqi foreign policy which supported close ties with Britain.¹³

At the beginning of the 1940s the Arab states were busy with different preoccupations in formulating their policies for the post-war period. While the Levant states and Transjordan were preparing to gain their independence, the already independent countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Iraq were concerned with various schemes for Arab unity. The Palestine question and the rising movement for Arab Nationalism were among other issues on the Arab agenda. All these issues only contributed more confusion and complexity owing to the lack of unity, indeed the jealousy and rivalry, between the Arab states.

The initial British attitude to the Arab unity programmes was favourable, as indicated in the confidential memorandum prepared by the Foreign Office just before the outbreak of World War Two. In this memorandum, Britain acknowledged the geographical unity of Palestine, Transjordan, Lebanon and Syria, which had been artificially created after the First World War, provided that each country's proposed projects would be acceptable to the other states.¹⁴

However, the memorandum also indicated that there were certain difficulties for Britain in promoting this scheme because of the divergent interests and rivalries between Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Egypt and Turkey. It therefore concluded that Britain should not promote the scheme by itself but leave the initiative to the states of the area. This attitude was later reinforced by the British Foreign Secretary in his Mansion House speech on 29 May 1941.¹⁵

The Turkish government expressed its views on the union of Arab countries to Nuri Pasha when he was in Turkey for consultations between the two members of the Sadabad Pact in June 1940. Saraçoğlu, (Prime Minister at this time), made it clear that though Turkey had no objection to the proposed schemes, his government would insist that any such plans should be in conjunction and consultation with HMG. He also emphasised that the Turkish government had no wish to be included in any such union or federation. Saraçoğlu also expressed the view to the British Ambassador, that he did not think that any such programme would be practicable.¹⁶

Meanwhile, the British Ambassador clearly explained to the Turkish Secretary-General of the MFA his government's position that though it had no objection to such schemes for unity the first consideration should be given to supporting the French, who had always regarded such combinations as detrimental to their interests in the area. The Secretary-General entirely agreed and said that this was the exactly the position of the Turkish government.¹⁷

As regards the Arab Unity designs, the first initiative came from Amir Abdullah of Transjordan in June 1940 with the idea of Greater Syria which aimed at bringing about the unification of Transjordan, Syria and Lebanon. Nevertheless, Britain did not support the plan. Another plan was forwarded by Nuri as Said in January 1943. Nuri proposed that the League of Nations should accept the unity of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Transjordan in a single state, which would be joined to Iraq and thereby create the core of an Arab League which other Arab states would join later. In his plan, the Jews in Palestine should be given half autonomy. However, Nuri's schemes met strong resistance from Saudi Arabia, Transjordan and Egypt which all had their own plans for unification. Eventually, Britain came to the conclusion that any support given to Nuri's schemes could cause a violent reaction from the other states.¹⁸

The Arab Unity movement had reached an important stage in October 1944 when the Egyptian Prime Minister, Nahas Pasha, with the strong backing of the British representation in Cairo, organised a conference in Alexandria towards the establishment of a League of Arab States. At this conference, Egypt's proposals for the sovereign Arab states' League were approved by a majority of the member states against Nuri's and Abdullah's federation plans.¹⁹ The Arab League, as a result of this conference, came into existence in March 1945. Thus, Iraq lost the leadership of the Arab League to Egypt and this further contributed to the existing Iraqi-Egyptian rivalry. The meeting of the kings of Egypt and Saudi Arabia with the Syrian President, Shukri al Quwatli, in Syria in January 1945 represented a polarisation of the Egyptian-Saudi block against the Hashemite alliance of Iraq and Transjordan.²⁰

Upon the rejection of his designs for Arab unity in Alexandria, Nuri turned his attention to the Greater Syria and Fertile Crescent schemes, with which Egypt, he considered, had no connection. These plans would continue to be one of the dominant factors in Iraqi politics for some decades to come.²¹ Nuri's failure with the Arab League, dominated by Egypt, directed him to pursue some alternative policies to achieve his aims. He planned to strengthen Iraqi relations with their non-Arab

neighbours, especially with Turkey, in order to reinforce the inter-Arab and international position of Iraq. For this purpose he toured Jordan and the Levant states in late 1945 to examine the possibility of incorporating the ineffective Sadabad Pact within the Arab League.²²

However, Nuri's great endeavours to implement the above mentioned plans were not favoured by the Levant states. This led Nuri to temporarily drop these scenarios at the beginning of 1946 and forced him to take more practicable courses, such as pursuing close cooperation with Turkey as a first step towards this end.²³ Moreover, both countries had common political and judicial problems, such as communist infiltration, and smuggling along their common borders.²⁴ The outlines of Turkey's new regional strategy was further elaborated in İnönü's speech to the GNA on 1 November 1947. The President stated that 'our friendly relations with the entire Arab world are expanding every day in every field'.²⁵

The Development of Cordial Relations between Turkey and Iraq

Nuri, who was out of the Iraqi Cabinet between June 1944 and November 1946 and yet had a considerable influence on Iraqi politics, was planning to improve Iraq's relations with Turkey in late 1945, while the latter was preoccupied with the imminent Soviet threat to its territories. As Turkey was seeking support against this threat it was natural for her to look for collaboration with her southern neighbour, which Turkey had regarded as the closest Arab country to herself since the late 1920s. For this reason, President İnönü invited Nuri and the Regent of Iraq to travel to Turkey to discuss their relations and the possibility of a new Eastern Pact when the Iraqi leaders were in London for a visit in the summer of 1945.²⁶

Hence, Abdulillah, the Prince Regent and Nuri as Said arrived in Istanbul on 15 September 1945, for a four-day visit, on board the battle-ship HMS *Ajax*, accompanied by the destroyers *Marne* and *Meteor*. The Turkish authorities gave them a special welcome and the press drew favourable attention to their visit. These were the first warships to appear in İstanbul since the outbreak of the war at a time when Turkey was under the dark shadow of Russia, thereby demonstrating Anglo-Iraqi support for Turkey. On 18 September, the party arrived at Ankara, where it was received by President İnönü. The Soviet Embassy and its satellites' legations kept a close watch on this meeting.²⁷

Though the Iraqi visit was official, the discussions took place informally, as there was no representative of the Iraqi government, between the Regent, Nuri Pasha, and the Turkish President, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. The latter eagerly enquired what impressions the Regent

had gained about future British policy in the Middle East. The Regent replied that he had been reassured both by London and Washington that they wanted to maintain stability throughout the Middle East and would bend all their efforts to this end.²⁸

Then, Nuri Pasha suggested that the Arab League was an element which would contribute to stability in the Middle East. He expressed the hope that the League's strength and contribution could be increased by an association with the Sadabad Powers. The Turks responded that their foreign policy was entirely based on the Anglo-Turkish alliance and under the present circumstances it was doubtful if either Persia or Afghanistan would go as far as this. The Turks then enquired what the British attitude was towards his scheme. Nuri responded that while HMG had not favoured it in the past, recently it had shown sympathy. The Turks stated that while they praised the idea in principle, they nevertheless thought that the proposed scheme was too far-reaching to materialise for the moment. They also indicated that Turkey's relations with various members of the Arab League were not on the same lines. Thereupon it was agreed that Turkey and Iraq could first discuss the Middle Eastern questions bilaterally and if this plan went forward then it would be open to other members of the League to join it if they wished.²⁹

As the British Embassy was aware of the above discussions, it indicated that the main discussion was centred on the coordination and cooperation in foreign policy. The Turks maintained throughout that their policy, which was embodied in the Anglo-Turkish alliance, was fundamental to them and they would in no way diverge from it. After Nuri Pasha's comment that this was similar to his policy, he then raised economic relations.

The Turks agreed to develop Turco-Iraqi trade in every possible respect. They also agreed to provide port facilities to Iraq at İskenderun. Nuri then turned to the financial aspect, expressing a willingness to provide facilities for financial transactions. The third area of discussion was communications. Nuri expressed Iraq's desire to develop land, sea and air communications between the two countries. Nuri also informed the Turks of the idea of the Arab states having a single air transport organisation and invited the Turks to join it, but met with no positive response. The fourth point was about culture. The Turks expressed sympathy with the growth of cultural activities. The final issue was cooperation in matters of judicial collaboration. Nuri Pasha specifically pressed for a greater measure of collaboration in this field. The Turks expressed their readiness to conclude an agreement on this matter.³⁰

After these discussions it was agreed that the Regent would inform his government of the progress of the talks on his return to Iraq and if the Iraqi government wished to conclude an agreement then they would send a competent delegation to Ankara to negotiate it. The Turkish Secretary-General, Açıkalın, emphasised to Helm, the British Counsellor, that he had obtained instructions from both the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister to let him know that the Turkish government was most anxious that HMG should be informed of all the discussions which had passed.³¹

Anglo-Turkish Reactions to Iraqi Proposals

On 30 November 1945, the Iraqi Council of Ministers, after studying the Turkish-Iraqi discussions, decided that Iraq, as a member of both the Arab League and the Pact of Sadabad, should take action to achieve the aims envisaged in the discussions. For this purpose, the Council decided to establish a committee under the leadership of Nuri Pasha. He would be authorised to get in touch with the members of the Turkish government—the Arab League and the Sadabad Pact, and to travel to the capitals of those countries when necessary.³²

Concurrently, Nuri Pasha sent a draft agreement to Turkey for her consideration. Though Turkey had indicated that it had no wish to join the League, Nuri nevertheless, after mentioning that Iraq was a member of both organisations, worded the preamble of his draft to imply that Turkey wanted to join the Arab League as a member of the Sadabad Pact and associate itself with the constitution of the Middle East bloc.³³ The Turkish government was surprised at the preamble on the grounds that it had no relevance to the talks in Ankara. It also thought that it was not ready yet to found a Middle East bloc under present conditions. But the Turks did not want to discourage Nuri Pasha and prepared their counter draft. On 30 November Açıkalın gave a non-official translation of the draft to Helm.³⁴

The Turkish MFA was not happy with Nuri's ideas and, aware of the British Ambassador's evasive attitude; he told Peterson that Turkey was not enthusiastic to sign any agreement with Iraq and would take a cautious attitude in dealing with Nuri. Meanwhile, the British Counsellor, on instructions from the Ambassador, was very careful not to say anything untoward and took a non-committal attitude in his subsequent talk with the Egyptian Minister in Ankara on the Turco-Iraqi discussions, due to the Egyptian-Iraqi rivalry over the Arab leadership.³⁵ At this time, the Soviet Ambassador was keeping a close eye on the developments and asked the American Ambassador what the reasons were behind the Western efforts

to force Turkey into an alliance with the Arab States directed against the Soviet Union.³⁶

In mid-January 1946, the Turkish Minister in Baghdad informed the Regent of the Turkish government's opinion of Nuri's recent proposals and indicated that it was anxious to continue the negotiations as soon as possible. The Iraqi agenda for the negotiations was determined by the Council of Ministers with the advice of the British Ambassador in Iraq. The new Iraqi proposals, bearing in mind the Turkish reservations, were more concrete and had receded from the more ambitious political plan which had originally been proposed by Nuri Pasha in Ankara. They focused on social and economic rather than on political relations between the two countries. As the British Ambassador in Baghdad observed, the restricted agenda was due to Turkey's concerns not to provoke Russia.³⁷ The other main reason was the Iraqi government's reluctance, despite Nuri's keenness, to establish closer relations with Turkey.³⁸ The new Iraqi proposals were:

First, increase of mutual trade (e.g. dates from Iraq, timber from Turkey) and reduction of [the] customs barrier; second, improved communications, including telephones telegraphs and air services; third, cultural cooperation including [the] exchange of students; fourth, enquiry whether extradition treaty needs amendment; fifth, exploration of industrial minerals to mutual advantage, should any be found in either territory; last, setting up of a board to control the use of the waters of the Tigris and Euphrates.³⁹

At the same time, the British Ambassador to Iraq was prepared to approve these proposals, with some reservations. Subject to Foreign Office concurrence, he planned to advise Nuri that these proposals, which were aimed at promoting economic, cultural and social exchanges between the two countries, were in general an advantage to Iraq. However, he reminded the latter to avoid engaging in any discussions related to the Hatay issue or the alignment of the Sadabad Powers with the Arab League 'which might give rise to alarm or speculation among third powers' [Russia or the Egyptian bloc in the Arab League].⁴⁰

Nuri Pasha, besides negotiating a treaty with Turkey, had another plan in mind. As he indicated to the British Oriental Counsellor in Iraq on 16 January, his plan was to mediate between Turkey and Syria, which had recently obtained its independence. Owing to the Syrians' agitations on Hatay (the Sanjak of Alexandretta) Turkey did not recognise Syrian inde-

pendence and relations between the two countries remained tense. Nuri also reminded the Counsellor that 'Syrian attitude would depend on advice given by HMG'.⁴¹

On 29 January 1946, the Turkish Minister in Baghdad presented the Turkish draft to the Iraqi government. The draft treaty contained six articles of which the first five were political in character and formed a close alliance within the framework of the UN Charter.⁴² One of the main objects of Turkey was to obtain Iraqi support against the Syrian claims over Hatay. Article One, which aimed at obtaining an Iraqi agreement to the continuity of the status quo in Hatay, was worded as follows: 'each of the high contracting parties engages itself to respect the territorial integrity and frontiers of the other'.⁴³ However, the Iraqi Prime Minister expressed his aversion to the article on the grounds that it was not necessary to include this article in the treaty as far as relations with Turkey were concerned and it would only irritate Syria. This last point was also discussed in a meeting between Stonehewer Bird and Nuri Pasha and it was agreed that Nuri, in consultation with the British representative, should sound out the Syrian government in the near future.⁴⁴

After Nuri Pasha's second tour of the Levant States, including Transjordan, he arrived at Ankara with his delegation on 28 February 1946 to negotiate a formal treaty with Turkey.⁴⁵ On 3 March, Nuri met with Peterson and explained to the latter that he was very surprised by the Turkish readiness to sign an agreement with Iraq. Nuri continued that he did not wish to accept the political articles included in Article One because they were too provocative, while he regarded the remaining part as already covered by the Sadabad Pact.⁴⁶ On 6 March, Nuri Pasha secured an understanding between Turkey and Syria on condition that Turkey recognised Syrian independence and in return the Syrians should cease to raise the Hatay issue.⁴⁷

Eventually, on the insistence of Nuri (who pressed for the omission of the general reference to the frontiers on the grounds that the British Ambassador wished it because the latter thought that the reference would be provocative to Russia), the last general statement of Article One was changed to refer specifically to the Turco-Iraqi frontier as defined in the 1926 treaty.⁴⁸ Nuri Pasha also tried hard to get specific mention in Article Three of Turkish support over Palestine. Though the Turks gave a spoken agreement to provide their support on the Palestine issue, they refused to give it formally, out of regard to its possible effect on Jewish opinion. The Turks suggested that Nuri should see the US Ambassador on this issue.⁴⁹

Finally, after the prolonged negotiations, the Turco-Iraqi Treaty, based on the UN Charter, was signed in Ankara between the Turkish and Iraqi delegates on 29 March 1946.⁵⁰ The Treaty consisted of political articles in which Turkey and Iraq agreed to respect each other's independence and territorial integrity. It settled their disputes with each other or with third parties in accordance with the provisions of the UN Charter. Two Conventions and six protocols were also included in the treaty. Some important provisions of the protocols were: the creation of a Turkish institute at Baghdad, Turkish broadcasts from Baghdad and Arabic ones from Ankara (Protocol 3); new telegraph and telephone lines to be created between Ankara and Baghdad (Protocol 4); Turkey and Iraq to give the other certain port facilities at Alexandretta and Basra and each country to give the other most favoured nation treatment in respect of customs duties (Protocol 5).⁵¹

In reality, the treaty was identical with the Turkish draft which was given to the British Embassy in Ankara on 30 November 1945 except for a slight modification of Article One. No provision was included for the duration of the treaty but it might be revised every five years. Though the Eastern Department of the Foreign Office was not happy with the political articles of the treaty on the grounds that Moscow might well accuse Britain of setting up an alliance directed against the Soviets, it regarded the six protocols and the two Conventions as a good model for international cooperation and it could be used against possible Soviet charges that Britain was organising a political pact directed at Moscow.⁵² Simultaneously, as the Turco-Iraqi discussions were in progress, Vinogradov, the Soviet Ambassador made it known to the concerned parties that any conclusion of a political agreement between the two countries would be regarded as a very serious matter by Moscow.⁵³

British reservations, including the suspicions of the Egyptian-Saudi bloc accompanied by the Soviet reactions, made the Turkish and Iraqi governments reluctant to include those political agreements in the treaty. Even the two governments proposed the postponement of the treaty for further consideration.⁵⁴

However, in spite of all these difficulties regarding the political articles, Nuri exceeded the authority granted by his government and insisted on signature of the treaty. This could be attributed to a reaction to the Egyptian dominance in the Arab League and his efforts to develop some alternative schemes in the northern part (this area referred to Turkey, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan) of the Middle East. Another reason could have been his wish to collaborate with Turkey in the face of

the possible Soviet threat to Iraq. Furthermore, in his conversation with the Turkish press upon the signature of the treaty, it appeared that Nuri regarded the treaty in a wider perspective than the Sadabad Pact seeing it a model for regional blocs in the Middle East.⁵⁵ Concurrently, Nuri announced Turkey as a leader of the Middle Eastern states.⁵⁶

The treaty, from the Turkish point of view, was a success in the short run since it provided a framework to counter the Soviet encirclement of Turkey. As mentioned before, Turkey at this time believed that Russia was conducting a policy which aimed at provoking Syria, Bulgaria and the Communists in Greece against her. The treaty also would have a restraining influence on Syria to cease its campaigns over Hatay. Moreover, as Ankara wanted to develop Anglo-Turkish strategic cooperation in the Middle East this treaty would contribute towards this end by creating an additional bond with Britain. However, this objective clashed with the interests of the Arab Nationalists who had long demanded the evacuation of foreign troops from the area.

As discussed in detail in the second chapter, Britain's cautious attitude to the political articles in the treaty suited well its general policy of conciliation with the Soviet Union. However, the evasive British policy towards the northern part of the Middle East represented a reversion to Churchill's policy, since the latter had planned to establish a bloc consisting of Turkey, Iraq and the Levant states in the path of the Soviet Union in the mid-1945.⁵⁷

New Developments in Turco-Iraqi Relations after the Signing of the Treaty

On the eve of the signature of the treaty, 25 March 1946, the government of Iraq had sent a special messenger, with a written instruction to Nuri in which it indicated that Nuri must avoid signing the treaty since everybody in Baghdad, including the Regent himself, bearing in mind the Soviet reactions, and possible public reactions, were against any political agreement. The authority given to Nuri was confined to technical economic and cultural matters but not to the political issues. Nuri therefore exceeded his authority by signing a broad-based treaty.⁵⁸

Despite the opposition coming from some Iraqi circles, the initial reactions of Tawfiq Suwaidi, the Iraqi Premier, were calm as he saw no serious objection to the treaty. Also the satisfactory settlement of the Soviet-Iranian dispute greatly helped to remove the fear of a hostile Soviet reaction.⁵⁹ However, the Iraqi Cabinet was not of the same opinion and put forward some of its demands before the ratification of the treaty.

On 1 May Suwaidi expressed these demands to Nabil Batı, the Turkish Minister to Baghdad: first, a Turkish promise of support over Palestine to be included to the treaty; second, a letter to be attached to the treaty stating that there was nothing in the treaty contrary to the principles of the Arab League; last, to suspend entry into force of the first protocol. Batı however countered that his government would certainly respond negatively to the first question. For the second question he indicated that it was up to the Iraqi government to make such a declaration if it so wished. As regards the last one, he indicated that it would irritate the Turkish government if the Iraqis reverted from the protocol.⁶⁰

Thereupon, the Iraqi government sought only to obtain the first demand from Turkey. Concurring with the views of Batı, the Turkish government responded on 6 May that there was no question of annexing a letter promising Turkish support which should be included in the treaty in the Palestine question.⁶¹ Finally, the Iraqi Cabinet came to the conclusion that they would in the end resign to obtain any of these demands. But they would expect, while following this course, Turkish support on the Palestine issue in case of necessity.⁶²

However, the ratification of the treaty was prolonged due to the Iraqi Cabinet's reservations about the treaty and Turkish reluctance to meet Iraqi demands. Another factor in the stalemate was the protracted nature of the situation, due to Iraqi elections, which took place at the end of 1946. In mid-May the Turkish government informed the Iraqis that they were expecting to receive a formal communication authorising Nuri's signature of the treaty.⁶³ When the ratification was not forthcoming the Turks became furious and began to press on Ata Amin, the Iraqi Minister in Ankara, for an explanation.

Despite the initial Turco-Iraqi flirtation, the delay in ratification had an adverse effect on their relations. There was mutual dissatisfaction between the two countries. On the one hand, the Turkish Foreign Minister, when he was in London for a visit in mid-February 1946, complained over Iraqi's later inconsistent attitude to the Eastern Department of the Foreign Office.⁶⁴ On the other hand, the Iraqi Representative in Ankara confided in an official at the British Embassy that a close understanding between Turkey and Iraq was difficult because of differences in the mentalities of the two countries.⁶⁵

However, the two British ambassadors involved, Kelly and Stonehewer Bird, in opposing Amin's views, maintained that there was anxiety from both the Turkish and the Arabs sides (Iraq and Jordan) to improve relations with each other. According to Stonehewer Bird, it was natural to

the many Iraqis, Nuri Pasha, chief among them, that a treaty of friendship was necessary between the two countries since there was a considerable Turkish influence on the Iraqi ruling elite. He illustrated this by reporting that: 'many of them had easily spoken Turkish and many of them had Turkish wives'.⁶⁶ The Iraqi fear of Russia was another contributory factor in strengthening relations.

The Press reactions of the two countries were different in nature. While the Turkish press indicated its anxiety for early ratification, the Iraqi press attacked on the treaty on the grounds that it conflicted with Iraqi obligations to the Arab League and Syria.⁶⁷ Consequently, the Iraqi Chamber was able to ratify the treaty on 12 June 1947. This was followed by the Turkish ratification on 5 December 1947.⁶⁸

Turkey's Policies towards the Levant States, Syria and Lebanon

A Brief Background

After the destruction of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, two of its provinces, Syria and Lebanon, fell under French mandate on 25 April 1920. In the following decades the history of the Levant states revolved around competition between Britain and France to dominate in the area and the struggle of these states to liberate themselves from French rule.⁶⁹ The French rule also sowed the seeds of a long and tiresome battle between Turkey and Syria over the control of the province of Alexandretta (later Hatay).

In fact, as noted earlier, during this period, some of the leaders of the Levant region were in contact with Turkish Nationalists from 1918 to 1921 in order to collaborate against the French domination. However, when this project was dropped owing to Turkey's lack of political and military resources, Turkey gave way to France by signing an agreement on 20 October 1920.

According to the treaty, the Sanjak of Alexandretta should have a special regime with Turkish officials in locations inhabited by a Turkish majority, with Turkish as an official language, and be permitted to fly the Turkish flag. This was incorporated in the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and the French confirmed its validity.⁷⁰ Moreover, the Turkish National Pact of January 1920 had already declared the inclusion of the Sanjak within Turkey's boundaries.⁷¹ However, the issue was not fully settled due to the French attempts to reduce the Turkish population in the area.⁷²

This process was to continue until 1936 when France planned to turn its mandate into a treaty of alliance with Syria. When the proposed Franco-Syrian Treaty was due for signature in September 1936 the Turks

realised that the moment had arrived to find a definite solution to the Sanjak problem. The Turks presented their case to Paris on 9 October by stressing that the Sanjak, with its majority Turkish population, should be granted independence, along with Syria and Lebanon. They further argued that this result was a natural outcome of the 1921 and 1926 Treaties, and in any case the region had already been declared a Turkish territory under the provisions of the National Pact.⁷³ Upon the strong Turkish representations, France referred the issue to the League of Nations at the end of 1936.⁷⁴

On 27 January 1937 the League accepted the following principles: first, the Sanjak should be independent internally but its foreign relations were to be subject to Syria; second, Turkish should be an official language in the Sanjak; third, the Sanjak should be demilitarised and its territory should be guaranteed by Turkey and France; last, Turkey should have free facilities at Iskenderun. This solution pleased everyone as a satisfactory end to the dispute, except some Syrian Nationalists.⁷⁵ Then the Sanjak was renamed Hatay.⁷⁶ Eden earned special gratitude from all sides for his wise mediation.

However, this did not end the dispute and skirmishes began once more between the French and Turkish officials in the Sanjak. In fact, the League's method was a provisional formula, which would be valid until Syria became independent. This accord was followed by a process of diplomatic exchanges between Turkey and France with a view to easing the tension between the two countries. Then, elections took place in accordance with the League's decision. After the elections of August 1938, the Turks gained a majority in the Hatay Parliament. Thereupon, the Parliament declared independence on 2 September 1938. At this point, the city announced its intention to join Turkey in July 1939. France had already approved this decision of Hatay in order to guarantee the Franco-Turkish alliance in the face of imminent German danger, on 23 June 1939.⁷⁷ This represented a final settlement of the border dispute between Turkey and Syria. Nevertheless, its implications were to affect Turco-Syrian relations for decades to come.

At this time, the Syrians refused to accept the Franco-Turco agreement. The President of the Syrian Parliament, Nasuhi Buhari made a protest to the League, declaring that this agreement was contrary to the League's principles.⁷⁸

British Approaches towards Turco-Syrian Relations during and after the Post-War Period

The Turkish interest in demanding the incorporation of Hatay into Turkey was based on the fact that the majority of its people were Turkish. The other reason for Turkey's insistence was Ankara's security concerns. In the mid-1930s Turkey felt insecure in the face of the apparent Italian threat to the Eastern Mediterranean. For this reason, Turkey paid attention to the Sanjak area with its Turkish majority and it already had been included within the national boundaries of Turkey in 1920. Due to its political and military weakness at the time Turkey was unable to pursue her claim. From this time onwards, however, under several agreements with France, Turkey obtained the right to use the Syrian sections of the railway for security purposes.⁷⁹

After the settlement of the Sanjak question Turkey approached Britain in early 1942 to obtain support for a rectification of the Syrian border with a view to securing the control and defence of the Southern Railway. This line was the old Baghdad Railway, which linked the Turkish and Iraqi Railway systems and ran over through Aleppo. Turkey asked for British support to control the area up to Aleppo for strategic reasons. In reality, in June 1941, Britain had already suggested that Turkey should occupy Aleppo, but Ankara declined, at a critical moment in the war.⁸⁰ However, at this later date Britain rejected the Turkish proposal because it considered that the return of Aleppo to Turkey would provoke a strong Arab reaction and Britain had already bound herself to guarantee the territorial integrity of Syria in September 1941.⁸¹

Syria and the Lebanon entered the Second World War under the French Mandate. In the autumn of 1941 these countries came under the influence of the Axis Powers. The previous spring, Germany used Syria as an operational base for helping the Iraqi insurgents. Having suppressed the Iraqi uprising, British and Free French troops entered Syria and the Lebanon in June 1941. Then, the independence of the two countries was proclaimed.⁸² During this time, Turkey did not have any significant contact with the Levant states. British policy towards the Levant States was then to acquire Arab sympathy by helping them to get rid of the French, thereby facilitating their independence. Moreover, by formulating this policy, Britain aimed to satisfy the increasing demands of Arab Nationalism in general.⁸³

Upon the above developments, on 14 November 1944, Eden instructed Peterson to inform the Turkish Premier that HMG wanted Turkish approval for recognition of the independence of Syria and the Lebanon.⁸⁴

At the same time, in his conversation with Cevat Açıkalın, the Secretary-General of Turkish Foreign Ministry, the latter indicated to Peterson that there was a political obstacle to Turkish recognition due to the demand voiced by the Syrian deputies for the return of Hatay to Syria.

This demonstrated a contradiction to the note, which had been communicated by the Syrian Foreign Minister to Turkey in July. In the communication, the Syrian government had decided to approve the international agreements and treaties completed by France on behalf of Syria.⁸⁵ Açıkalın also stated that the Syrians were incited by the Soviets. Upon these remarks, the British Ambassador (though Britain wanted early Turkish recognition) responded that HMG was not in a hurry in this matter and that recognition could be granted when this problem was resolved.⁸⁶

In December 1944, the Turkish government handed two notes, through local Turkish Consuls, to the Syrian and Lebanese governments indicating that she was ready to recognise their independence on condition that they should extend to Turkey and Turkish subjects, on a most favoured nation basis, the benefits of all rights and privileges which might be granted to any other powers. The second note indicated that the Turkish government would continue to abide by the spirit of the Ankara agreement of October 1921 and the Convention of May 1926 until the conclusion of a new agreement, which would cover all Turkish relations with the two states.⁸⁷

The Foreign Ministers of the two states informed the Turkish consuls that they would accept the second note, but they had reservations concerning the first note.⁸⁸ Meanwhile, the Syrians prepared their alternative draft agreement which in its nature contradicted the Turkish notes. The Syrian drafts neither accepted the status quo regarding the Turco-Syrian frontier, nor granted most favoured nation treatment.⁸⁹ They regarded the former question as open to be solved later. This resulted in a break in Turkey's communications with the Levant states.

Therefore, despite an initial improvement, Turco-Syrian communications broke down. However, bearing in mind Britain's advice for early recognition, combined with the worsening political situation in the Balkans caused by the advances of the Soviets, which posed an obvious threat to her, Turkey worked hard to settle the question as soon as possible.⁹⁰

From November 1944 to February 1945, the initial British attitude to this question was to push Turkey rather than Syria for a settlement. This could be attributed to the relative isolation of Turkey on the international scene because of its failure to take an active part in the war, even in its last

phase, and the British preoccupation with reaching a compromise with Russia on the outstanding political issues in Europe and in the Balkans.

In addition to these factors, Britain did not want to devote its energy to the above issue.⁹¹ However, this attitude began to change in February due to the British Ambassador's determined attitude in Ankara. With an encouragement from his counsellor (A.K. Helm), he realised the importance of Anglo-Turkish friendship, and their firm support for it had a decisive influence on the Foreign Office in their formulation of British policy towards Turco-Syrian relations.⁹²

Upon the Syrian request for British intervention in the Turco-Syrian dispute, the Foreign Office instructed Peterson towards the end of January 1945 that he should warn Turkey to give way to Syria on the Hatay issue; his advice should be to accept the Syrian demand, which proposed that the Hatay question should be left open to be discussed at a later stage. This condition was the main reason for the deadlock between Turkey and Syria.⁹³ Peterson responded that he was most reluctant to act on these instructions and explained that, during his visit to Hatay on 10 January 1945, he received the most cordial demonstration of Anglo-Turkish friendship from the Turks. He further explained that any action on the above lines would be regarded by the Turks as more evidence of the strength of Soviet influence.⁹⁴

On Peterson's strong appeal, the Foreign Office changed its attitude and took a neutral position on the issue. Meanwhile, the Foreign Office instructed its Middle Eastern representatives that it would be better for Syria to drop its demand and open diplomatic relations with Turkey at an early stage. Thereafter it refused the Syrian request for British mediation.⁹⁵

At this time, the Turkish press began to respond strongly to the Syrian agitation. In his article in *Tanin* of 10 April, H. Cahit Yalçın wrote that the problem between Turkey and Syria derived not from the friendly Syrian people but their unscrupulous politicians, who were following their own interests and acting under foreign influence. He continued that the Turks had always supported the independence of these two states and reminded the people that Syria in those politicians' hands would have much to suffer.⁹⁶ On 15 May, in the local paper of Antakya, *Atayolu*, Selim Çelenk wrote on the same lines as Yalçın that though the majority of the Syrian population wanted Turkish friendship some minor groups, under foreign influence, attacked its former masters, who had ruled them for four hundred years. But Turkish patience began to wane as a result of this campaign, which could only be described as 'barking at the moon'.⁹⁷

While Turco-Syrian relations were getting tense, especially after the demonstrations at Damascus, which demanded the retrocession of Hatay on 24 March 1945, the British Legation at Beirut examined the origin of the issue and prepared a report which was widely accepted by other British Middle East representatives and the Foreign Office itself, in May 1945.⁹⁸ According to the report, the Hatay issue came into the limelight on 30 October 1944 when two Syrian deputies argued the right to claim Hatay in the Chamber while renouncing the Syrians' territorial claims over the Lebanon, Iraq and Transjordan.⁹⁹

The report continued that the Hatay campaign mainly originated from two sources: first, immigrants from Hatay, and second, parliamentary deputies who had various interests in the area. As for the first source, the report indicated that a large proportion of the immigrants from Hatay were Armenians who had always represented fertile ground for Russian propaganda. They, together with the Orthodox Greeks, kept the campaign active though the majority of Syrian people had no problems with Turks at all. The Syrian Communists also had some role in the campaign. The report further stressed the role of the Soviet Minister's activities.

For the second source, the report pointed out that several prominent politicians, such as Hasan Jebbara, the present Minister of Supply, Dr Kayali, the former Minister of Justice, and Michael Elian, the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs of the Chamber and some others owned property in the Hatay and they felt that they had lost their assets in the area.¹⁰⁰ The report hence largely justified the Turkish thesis that the Hatay campaign was conducted by a group of selfish interests together with some minor groups at the instigation of foreigners.

In the meantime, in May 1945, Turkey continued its efforts to break the deadlock with Syria; she had already made requests to the Lebanese Foreign Minister and King Ibn Saud to mediate between Ankara and Damascus in breaking this impasse.¹⁰¹ As a consequence, through Lebanon's mediation Hasan Saka, the Turkish MFA, met with his counterparts at the beginning of August in Beirut, and later in Damascus. In their discussions in Beirut no progress was made due to the insistence of Jamil Mardam (the Syrian MFA) on abiding by his government's position on the Hatay issue while his Lebanese counterpart was eager to break the impasse.¹⁰²

During the discussions, it was agreed that there was no question of Turkish recognition of the two states since Turkey had already recognised the independence of Syria and the Lebanon at the San Francisco Conference; thus the only question was an opening of diplomatic representation between the concerned parties.¹⁰³ Concurrently, both American and Brit-

ish representatives in the two states advised them that there would be an advantage in establishing diplomatic relations with Turkey and this step would contribute to the solution of the Hatay problem.¹⁰⁴

At this time, upon the report from the British Embassy in Moscow, Britain felt compelled to warn the Syrian government against pursuing its claim to recover Hatay in collaboration with the Soviets. According to the report, the Syrian Minister in Moscow asked for Soviet support on the Hatay issue. Peterson strongly reacted to these attempts and asked for Britain's intervention to stop Syria from playing with fire.¹⁰⁵

As the Turco-Syrian discussions continued with no progress the situation became tense again with a statement by the Syrian Premier, who made a strong claim for the return of Hatay on 30 August 1945. Erkin, the Deputy Secretary-General, asked Helm for British intervention to make the Syrians take a reasonable line. The former replied that Turkey could not continue to be patient. He added that Turkey was now ready not to mention the Hatay subject, in similar vein to Syria's silence on the issue.¹⁰⁶

Upon this request, the Foreign Office responded, after consulting and agreeing with Shone, the British Minister in Beirut, that there was no need for British intervention as long as the Syrians did not move on the Hatay question. However, if they wanted to raise it in the future they would appeal to the UN.¹⁰⁷ Thus, this again showed a change in the British attitude towards the question. While previously the Foreign Office had paid more attention to the views of its ambassador in Ankara, at this time it concurred with the insights of its representatives in the Levant states.

After these exhausting developments, the Turkish government eventually approved Nuri Pasha's mediation on the Hatay question when the Pasha was in Turkey for a visit in mid-September 1945.¹⁰⁸ Nuri Pasha maintained the idea that the realisation of the Fertile Crescent scheme mostly depended on good relations between Syria and Turkey. The Hatay question was the main obstacle to this. In order to overcome this problem, Nuri Pasha conducted a series of tours to Damascus and the Lebanon.¹⁰⁹

At the end of his shuttle-bus diplomacy between the states in question he finally managed to bring Turkey and the Levant States into the agreement, leaving Hatay out of account, on 6 March 1946.¹¹⁰ Then, the parties approved the recognition of one other's independence and the establishment of diplomatic relations. In return for the Pasha's good offices on the settlement of the Hatay question, Turkey granted 'free zone' facilities to Iraq at its port at İskenderun.¹¹¹

Upon the establishment of diplomatic relations between Turkey and the Levant states, things gradually began to improve. Even the Turkish Foreign Minister's statement to the Syrian newspaper, *El Cumburiyye*, caused great sympathy among the Syrian people. In his statement, at the end of October 1946, Hasan Saka expressed his views that, '...bound by ties of relationship and religion to the Arab countries, we sincerely accept their proposals for a rapprochement and alliance'. He continued that his hope was to make alliances with Syria, Egypt and Palestine similar to the Turco-Iraqi alliance already concluded.¹¹²

In fact these statements reflected the new lines of Turkey's regional approach which sought establishment of friendly relations with the Arab states especially with Iraq and Transjordan to strengthen security around her borders. The outline of Turkey's new regional strategy was repeated by İnönü in a speech to the GNA on 1 November 1947. The President stated that 'we maintained our goodwill and fraternity to our Arab neighbours. Our friendly relations with the entire Arab world are expanding every day in every field'.¹¹³

However, Turco-Syrian rapprochement did not last long as their relationship began to face many ups and downs as a result of Syrian irredentist demands on Hatay which aroused patriotic responses from the Turkish public opinion especially from 1949 onwards.¹¹⁴

British Attitude towards Turkey's Policies to Transjordan (Jordan)

As mentioned above, the two of the sons of Sherif Hussein, Feisal and Abdullah, who rebelled against the Ottomans during the Great War, were installed as King of Iraq (the former) and the Amir of Transjordan (the latter was called King from 1946 onwards). When the Turkish National Movement gained strength under Mustafa Kemal's lead towards the end of 1920, he sent messages to the local Mesopotamian leaders declaring the Sherif's sons to be the enemies of the Turks. However, this hostile atmosphere gradually began to change as both parties realised the importance of regional collaboration against any internal or international threat at the beginning of 1930's. Moreover, the two monarchs both grasped the importance of strengthening the security of their countries by establishing strong ties with Turkey.

Under these circumstances, following the visit of King Feisal of Iraq in July 1931, Amir Abdullah of Transjordan paid a visit to Turkey between 31 May and 8 June 1937. This visit represented a first step towards Turkish-Jordanian friendship.¹¹⁵ However, this step was not advanced, unlike the Turco-Iraqi relations, until the winter of 1946.

On 2 December 1946, a Turkish party under headed by Erkin, the Secretary-General of the Foreign Ministry, arrived at Amman with the purpose of conveying the Turkish President's congratulations on the occasion of the independence of Transjordan, which had recently been gained from Britain in March 1946 with a treaty (after its independence Abdullah proclaimed himself King and renamed his country Jordan in 1948) and he invited the King to visit Turkey.¹¹⁶

In the meantime, Erkin presented a draft treaty of amity, which offered a perpetual peace and friendly relations between the two countries, exchange of representatives, exchange of judicial proceedings and mutual granting to each other's subjects of most favoured nation treatment in various matters. In addition to these, there was a final clause which was interpreted by the Jordanian Premier as binding Transjordan to side with Turkey and vice versa in any dispute with a neighbouring state.¹¹⁷ The Prime Minister told Erkin that the draft should further be considered by his government and then would be discussed when King Abdullah visited Ankara.¹¹⁸

Upon the initial Turkish proposals to the Transjordan government by Erkin, Bevin instructed the British Ambassador in Ankara that HMG had strong reservations about the proposed treaty if it could be interpreted as directed against Syria. The telegram continued that HMG generally welcomed any improvement in relations between Turkey and the Arab countries. However, Bevin indicated his concern over the motives behind this sudden Turkish desire for a rapprochement with Transjordan.¹¹⁹ He further explained that the final paragraph of the draft treaty could be regarded by certain Arab countries as a Turkish combination directed against Syria. He asked the Ambassador to remind the Turkish MFA of these points by stating that it was HMG's opinion that it would be in the general Turkish interest to improve their relations with all Arab States and especially with neighbouring Syria.¹²⁰

Hence, Sir David Kelly, the new British Ambassador since May, saw Erkin and raised his government's concerns. The Secretary-General, after explaining the contents of the draft, stated that the sole intention of the last paragraph was to promote a settlement of the difficulties and not to exploit them and he felt sure that there was nothing in the proposal that could be interpreted in any other way.¹²¹

About this time, after securing Transjordan's independence, King Abdullah began to promote his 'long cherished' union scheme on 11 November 1946 by declaring that 'Greater Syria' was a pillar of Transjordan's foreign policy.¹²² This statement prompted a strong reaction from

Lebanon which stated that it was firmly opposed to this policy two days after the King's statement.¹²³ Saudi Arabia and also Syrian Parliament expressed their hostile attitude to the proposed scheme in the following months.¹²⁴

At this time, inter-Arab relations were becoming tense because of the attitudes of the anti-Hashemite states of Egypt and Saudi Arabia towards the 'Fertile Crescent' and 'Greater Syria' projects in the Arab League. At the beginning of 1946, King Abdullah proposed that Iraq should withdraw from the League in view of the obvious hostility of Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Nuri Pasha also shared the same view. Nevertheless, the constraints imposed by Britain, which saw this attempt as destructive to the League and the policies pursued by the nationalist government of Iraq, prevented this action.¹²⁵

Upon the above developments, King Abdullah also followed the same path as Nuri Pasha had taken. He decided to pursue more friendly relations with Turkey in the hope that this course might force Syria, which had quarrelled with Turkey, to accept his unification project. Coincidentally, this policy suited to Turkish interests which had long sought to find a means to constrain the improper moves of Syria.¹²⁶

As a sequel to the visit paid by Erkin to Amman, King Abdullah, accompanied by his son and Foreign Minister, arrived in Ankara on a state visit on 8 January 1947. This followed the signing of a treaty of friendship between Turkey and Transjordan on 11 January. At the time of the signing both İnönü and Abdullah referred to Turkey's friendly relations with Iraq and the Lebanon, but conspicuously neither mentioned Syria.¹²⁷

The treaty consisted of the following areas: perpetual friendship and peace; the exchange of diplomatic representatives; judicial matters; matters related to travel and residence. Disputes were to be settled by pacific means in accordance with Article 33 of the UN Charter. However, Transjordan did not agree to a Turkish proposal that each party should support the other in the event of a dispute with a neighbour. Also Turkey consented to exempt Transjordan from the application of the treaty whenever it conflicted with the obligations of the latter to the Arab League.¹²⁸ Meanwhile, after the signing of the treaty, the Soviet government was quick to accuse Britain of instigating a treaty to promote British imperialism.¹²⁹

There were also some reactions to the treaty from Syria. The Syrian government, which already had strained relations with Transjordan because of the King's claims over Syria, expressed its resentment of the treaty. It suspected that Turkey had made a deal with Transjordan on the

point that Turkey would support the King's demands over the Greater Syria project in return for Jordanians backing the former in the event of a Syrian claim for the restitution of the Hatay.¹³⁰ Also the Syrian press attacked the treaty, criticising it as an alliance which would serve British and Turkish imperialism.¹³¹

Ambivalent Relations between Britain, Turkey and Egypt

As mentioned in the first chapter, Egypt was a major Ottoman province until 1882, when it was occupied by Britain. Though this occupation virtually ended Ottoman rule, it formally continued to be under Ottoman suzerainty. However, Britain proclaimed a protectorate over Egypt shortly after its declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire on 5 November 1914.¹³² At the end of the war, under heavy nationalist pressure, Britain granted Egypt's independence in February 1922, but four reserved points meant that Britain still controlled the defence of Egypt, imperial communications, the Sudan and Egyptian foreign policy.¹³³

From this time onwards, Turco-Egyptian relations were not in a good shape owing to the mistrust between the two countries. Turkey's abolition of the Caliphate Office, its abandonment of the Arabic Letters and its secular reforms caused resentment in Egypt.¹³⁴

In 1925, this unease period relaxed with the exchange of diplomatic representatives between the two countries. However, relations continued to be cool until 1936 when King Fuad died in April of the same year. During his rule, Egyptian claims over the leadership of the Eastern world and their criticism of Turkey for turning its face against the East had been among the reasons for the coolness.¹³⁵ According to the British Foreign Office report, 'if relations with Egypt were never cordial until 1936 this was partly [due to] Atatürk's animus against King Fuad'.¹³⁶

Upon the death of Fuad, his sixteen year old son Farouk took his place, but the country was ruled by the Wafd Party, led by Mustapha Nahas.¹³⁷ This marked the beginning of an improvement in Turco-Egyptian relations starting with the signature of the Treaty of Amity on 7 April 1937. The two countries' relations further improved with a visit paid by Aras, the Turkish MFA, to Egypt when the treaty entered into force on 11 April 1938.¹³⁸ Aras received an exceptionally warm welcome in Egypt. During his visit he invited Egypt to join the Pact of Sadabad. Aras also conveyed Atatürk's invitation to King Farouk to visit Turkey in the near future. However, Egypt refused to adhere to the pact, thinking that it would bring no benefit to her, only commitments.¹³⁹

As an outcome of the visit paid by Aras, Abdul Fattah Yehia Pasha, the Egyptian Foreign Minister, accompanied by his advisers, arrived in Ankara on 19 June 1939 for a two-day visit. During this visit, possible strategic developments in the Eastern Mediterranean were discussed. It was agreed that cultural and economic relations should be developed between the two countries. It was also agreed that a group of Egyptian officers should come to Turkey for training.¹⁴⁰

In the initial stages of the Second World War, Egypt followed Turkey's path and remained neutral. Under the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, however, Cairo was obliged to provide Britain with all necessary facilities. In early 1942, Farouk, fearing for a German occupation of Cairo planned to reappoint Ali Maher who was pro-German, as Premier. Britain, however, strongly opposed the King's plan and the British forces in Cairo besieged the King's palace to force Farouk not to appoint Ali Maher. Sir Miles Lampson, the British Ambassador in Cairo, asked Farouk either to appoint Mustafa Nahas, who pledged to assist Britain or to abdicate the throne. Thus, with the employment of Nahas, Britain restored its position in Egypt, but at heavy cost to future relations. This incident had a great impact on Egyptian nationalist opinion and caused long-term damages on Anglo-Egyptian relations.¹⁴¹

At this period, Turco-Egyptian relations remained unimportant due to the war in the area. Turco-Egyptian contacts restarted in February 1945 on the issue of the declaration war against the Axis. After exchange of consultations both countries declared war on Axis towards the end of February.¹⁴²

In the beginning of 1945, the presence of 200,000 British troops, many still in Cairo and Alexandria, caused great resentment in Egypt due to the difficulties of demobilisation. Under increasing pressure from nationalist demands, Egypt asked Britain to renegotiate the 1936 Treaty in December 1945. This was the basis of Egypt's relationship with Britain, which granted her independence and it ended British military occupation on the condition that Britain had right to defend the Suez Canal zone and to maintain 10,000 troops there.¹⁴³ At this time, the Turkish preoccupation was to secure all possible support from any quarters against the ominous Soviet threat.

When the negotiations were resumed in April 1946, Egypt insisted that unless British forces were completely withdrawn from Egyptian soil no agreement was possible. This demand was also backed by Egyptian public opinion.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, the other major problem, which caused a deadlock between the two countries, came from Egyptian plans for uni-

fication with the Sudan while Britain supported the independence of this country.¹⁴⁵ However, the first Egyptian condition proved a total contradiction to British strategic and economic policies as the COS saw the Russian menace as the greatest danger to British interests in the Middle East.¹⁴⁶

At about this time, as Turkey was conducting negotiations for a treaty with Iraq, it also desired a treaty of friendship with Egypt. On 5 February 1946, Erkin proposed this to Amin Bey Fuad, the Egyptian Minister, in Ankara. However, Fuad was not sure whether to convey this message to his government when its position was not stable and asked Peterson, the British Ambassador, for advice on what to do.¹⁴⁷ The Foreign Office responded to this proposal that though it had an interest in closer relations between the two countries it left the decision up to Fuad himself whether he should approach his government or not.¹⁴⁸

Simultaneously, Egypt too began to desire an improvement in its relations with Turkey. One of the reasons for this sudden desire could be attributed to the Egyptian-Iraqi rivalry over the domination in the Middle East. As this rivalry increased, the two countries both realised that any country which enjoyed the support of Turkey, would increase the political status of its position and hence this would greatly contribute to its authority in the area. In the meantime, upon the signature by Iraq of a treaty with Turkey on May 1946, Egypt felt that it should also look to strengthen its ties with Turkey.

For these reasons Sidky Pasha, the Egyptian Premier, told Ronald Campbell, the British Ambassador, on 26 April that he wanted to sign a treaty with Turkey along the lines which Nuri Pasha had concluded.¹⁴⁹ However, these optimistic wishes and intentions soon gave way to gloom. In the beginning of May, the Egyptian Ambassador to London reported to his government that Egypt's demand for complete British withdrawal was causing Turkey 'great anxiety'. This statement belonged to Açıkalın, the former secretary-general and now Turkish Ambassador to London, who conveyed it to the Foreign Office in a memorandum.¹⁵⁰ This caused great resentment to Egypt in view of the Turco-Egyptian friendship. Amin prepared to talk with the Turkish Foreign Minister on the issue.¹⁵¹

In their talks between Amin and Saka the latter convinced the former that Turkey supported Egyptian independence along with its great interest in the security of the Middle East.¹⁵² In their talks, as Saka was eager to improve Turco-Arab relations, he made a new attempt towards this end by suggesting a treaty of alliance with Egypt.¹⁵³ In fact, Amin had no hope that the present Egyptian government would accept this request, though

he supported the development of Turco-Egyptian relations. The Egyptian Ambassador even wrote to his government that if the severe anti-Turkish press campaign was to be allowed he wished to be changed.¹⁵⁴

During this time, Egypt's insistence on complete British withdrawal as a first step towards a new treaty caused great debate among the members of the ruling British Labour party throughout spring and summer of 1946. During the discussions, in May 1946, on the issue to find a solution to Egyptian demands in the Cabinet Defence Committee, no agreement was reached, as the committee's members came up with conflicting ideas.

In the discussions Lord Alanbrooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff (CIGS), maintained that Egypt was a centre of strategic communications not only for the Middle East but for the whole Empire Defence System. Thus both in war and in peace, the regional headquarters must be located in Egypt. Also this headquarters would be the centre of the possible future regional Middle East Defence Organisation.¹⁵⁵ While General Bernard Paget, C-in-C ME and Field Marshal Alexander, Minister of Defence, and, in some respects Bevin agreed with the views of the CIGS, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister, Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, John Strachey, Under-Secretary of State for Air, and some others supported the idea of withdrawing the bases from Egypt to a British territory near to the Canal area, such as Kenya.¹⁵⁶

When Turkey came to know that the British contemplated a complete withdrawal, Saka asked for information from the British Ambassador on this issue. In their talks on 14 May, Saka stated that Turkey was anxious about the effect of an evacuation of British troops on the general strategic situation.

Acting on instructions, Kelly responded that in the current circumstances maintaining a British garrison in the Suez Canal Zone was out-of-date. He stated that HMG's decision was rather to maintain a strategic striking force in there and to find convenient bases in adjacent territories to provide reinforcements for the Canal area in case of necessity. Thus, this act would also secure the willing co-operation of Egypt. Saka responded that he was glad to hear that the British withdrawal was consistent with the full maintenance of British strategic interests in the Near East.¹⁵⁷

At the same time, Seymen, the Turkish Minister in Cairo, acting on instructions, communicated to Sidky Pasha to the effect that Turkey supported 'the removal of the last remaining obstacles in the way of Egypt's complete independence, but at the same time, the last thing she wanted was the departure of Great Britain from the Middle East'.¹⁵⁸ Both Campbell and Sir Walter Smart, the British Oriental Minister in Cairo, constantly

encouraged Seymen to make communications on the above lines to the Egyptians.¹⁵⁹ Seymen's actions, however, resulted in a violent reaction from the Egyptian government and the press. It appeared that the Turkish Minister had exceeded his instructions by pursuing these activities openly. Even the Turkish Secretary-General was disturbed by Seymen's actions. Rumours became widespread in the Egyptian and Iraqi press that Turkey wanted British troops to remain in Egypt.¹⁶⁰

The Turkish press took an intermediary attitude between Egypt and Britain on the evacuation issue. While regarding the evacuation of British troops from Egypt as a sign of goodwill by Britain towards the Arabs, it indicated that this should take into consideration the security needs of the Middle East.¹⁶¹ This was indeed the general view of the Turkish government as well.

As the Russian threat was the major concern of Turkey, the latter constantly continued to work to establish a security zone around its territory, conscious that she was encircled by hostile countries such as the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and Romania, including Greece and Syria, where it was believed that the Soviet agents were very active. Bearing in mind these considerations, Turkey made another attempt to establish closer relations with Egypt. On 17 July Erkin informed Kelly that the Turkish Minister in Cairo had made a new attempt to seek a treaty of alliance with Egypt.¹⁶²

During Seymen's communication with Sidky Pasha, the latter, however, rejected the Turkish offer by indicating that the main Egyptian preoccupation was to settle its problems with HMG and when this issue was solved Egypt could consider signing a treaty of amity with Turkey on juridical and commercial matters, but not on a military subject. The Egyptian Prime Minister then questioned the suggestions which had appeared in the Turkish press supporting the presence of British troops in Egypt. Seymen denied these charges and explained that the Turkish government had already repudiated these allegations. Sidky then proposed that in the near future he would ask for an exchange of visits between King Farouk and President İnönü to prepare the ground for a treaty.¹⁶³

In the latter part of 1946, Turco-Egyptian relations continued to drift in an ambivalent manner, with the exception of King Farouk's unofficial visit to Turkey. The King arrived in Mersin (a port city in the south) in early September. He was given a warm welcome by Turkish officials. He expressed his views to the press that Egypt and Turkey were sister nations and he wished to strengthen their relations.¹⁶⁴ This was interpreted by the Turks as a political gesture of the King at a time when Turkey was subjected to heavy Soviet pressures.¹⁶⁵ At this time, the Egyptian government was

busy in trying to reconstruct its unstable Cabinet with some revisions. It also worked hard for to come to an agreement with Britain. The agreement was finally reached in London on October 1946 between Bevin and Sidky.¹⁶⁶

According to the deal, British troops should be withdrawn from Cairo and Alexandria by 31 March 1947 and from the whole of Egypt by 1 September 1949. Nevertheless, the Sudan issue was not fully resolved. While Egypt claimed the 'unification of the Nile Valley' Britain supported the independence of the Sudan. Finally they decided to discuss the Sudan issue at a later date. However, during the discussions in the last months of 1946 no compromise was reached between the two countries and 'the stillborn Sidky-Bevin treaty was soon buried' by the beginning of 1947.¹⁶⁷

Conclusion

Strategic and security concerns played a primary role in shaping the nature of Turco-Arab relations. When the war ended, Turkey felt direct and indirect Soviet threats by various ways. For instance, Ankara perceived that Moscow tried to encircle Turkey by provoking its neighbours against her. Besides her search for Anglo-American support for its security, Turkey developed its own plans in the Middle East to complement to London's diplomatic support to Ankara against the Soviet danger.

The next major trouble which Turkey faced came from Syria. Since 1944, the Syrians had stepped up their campaign to gain back the Hatay (the Sanjak of Alexandretta). As the British report confirmed,¹⁶⁸ the campaign had been instigated by the Soviets and was conducted by some minor groups in Syria, such as the Armenians and the Greeks, who constituted a large proportion of the immigrants who had gone from Hatay to Syria. Moscow, by fomenting the Hatay issue, also planned to incite Arab opinion to isolate Turkey in the area and thereby to undermine the Turkish regime. Herein were the deep roots of the long battle between Ankara and Damascus.

To counteract the hostile Syrian campaigns and indirect Soviet destructive activities in the region, Turkey embarked on a policy of close cooperation with the Hashemite states of Iraq and Transjordan. President İnönü elaborated his policy to King Abdullah, when the latter was in Turkey for an official visit between 8 and 11 January 1947. Perceiving that her security depended on Britain, İnönü said that Turkey sought to form political alliances in the Middle East with the Arab States closest to Britain.¹⁶⁹ This, as Ankara maintained, would contribute towards an establishment of an additional bond with Britain.

Turkey's regional policies, however, were not fully in line with the British objectives. Ankara thus developed her Middle Eastern policy within the limits of constraints imposed by London and Moscow. Whitehall watched cautiously the Turkish attempts to reach a rapprochement with Iraq and Transjordan. This was because Britain thought that collaboration between Turkey and the Hashemite bloc was mainly aimed at weakening Syria. Britain rather wanted Turkey to approach the whole Arab World for conciliation. For this purpose, the key countries were Iraq, Syria and Egypt.¹⁷⁰ The last of these had a decisive importance to Britain as it was the strongest Arab country and it occupied a central place in British Middle Eastern strategy.

The general nature of Turkish policy was to focus on bilateral relations with the Arab states rather than to concentrate on regional combinations. It showed no interest at all in reviving the Pact of Sadabad or playing a leading role in the establishment of an Eastern bloc. This could be explained by Turkish fears of Soviet reactions, Britain's reluctance and the Turkish authorities' indifference towards the regional schemes.¹⁷¹ The Turkish attitude in effect represented a recession from Atatürk's broad regionalist approach to a narrow bilateral understanding which was limited to the states of Iraq and Transjordan.

Turkey regarded Iraq as the closest Arab country to her from the point of view both of geographic and traditional friendship. Then Turkey sought close cooperation with Transjordan. Turkey's regional policies however frightened Syria and made Egypt jealous. Turkey wanted to develop her relations with these two countries as well. But the clash of strategic and political interests between them made the realisation of the Turkish desire impossible.

While Ankara's political objectives in the region at some points clashed with London their strategic objectives were identical. From the security point of view, Turkey wanted Britain to retain its bases in Egypt while the Egyptians demanded complete British withdrawal from their soil. When Anglo-Egyptian negotiations resumed in early 1946 both Turkey and Egypt wished for close collaboration with each other, leading to a Treaty of Alliance. However, a few months later, in the spring and summer of 1946, relations between the countries began to deteriorate because of Turkish efforts to make the Egyptians realise that the British presence in Egypt was necessary for the security of whole Middle East.

In this period both Britain and Turkey were able to develop better relations with the Arab countries than either could do later. This, in essence, established an appropriate ground for Britain to organise a loose

regional combination between Britain, Turkey and the Arab states, apart from Egypt without much provoking Moscow. Since Britain was planning to defend the region, this period provided a good opportunity for this aim at the time when the regional states were demanding such an organisation and the Palestine question had not turned into a major international problem.

Whitehall, nevertheless, had no intention of backing such a project without Egyptian participation. This relatively quiet period, however, was to disappear from the region from 1947 onwards, due to the emergence of the Palestine problem as a major question in the politics of the Middle East. The next chapter hence will deal with the emergence of this problem in and will examine how it affected Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East.

THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE IN ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS (1947–50)

From 1947 onwards, after the Anglo-Egyptian talks collapsed because of the disagreement over the Sudan issue, the crisis in Palestine began to take up much of British attention as her difficulties in there overshadowed any other political issues in the region and the crisis began to threaten its very stability. At this time the British COS still regarded Palestine and Egypt as interconnected for the defence of the Middle East and considered Palestine as an alternative location for the British Middle Eastern Headquarters if Britain withdrew from Egypt.¹

As the post-war economic crisis began to hit the British economic and political position hard since late 1946, 'Britain began to cut its imperial coat according to its post-war cloth'.² The result was to take a decision to withdraw from India, Ceylon and Burma, and to delegate the Palestine problem to the UN in early 1947. In the meantime Britain had already agreed to transfer her primary economic role in Greece and Turkey to the USA.

These were clear signs that Britain was continuing its descent from imperial power. However, all these political and economic setbacks only strengthened the British determination to remain in the Suez base as a way of maintaining British influence and prestige in the Middle East and thereby in the world. After late 1947, with the loss of Palestine and in the face of the escalation of the Cold War in Europe, the British COS began to insist that the use of the Suez base in Egypt before and after the outbreak of war was essential to the defence of the Middle East whereas they had

been prepared to evacuate the Egyptian base in 1946 within a five-year period.³ Consequently, the Anglo-Egyptian deadlock was to continue throughout this period.

At this time Britain planned to defend the Middle East on the basis of the 'inner ring' strategy which covered Egypt, Palestine, Jordan and Lebanon. However, there was no definite plan, nor any practical steps taken to implement this strategy, due to the uncertainty about the future of the political and military position of Britain in Egypt and Palestine, and of its lack of the necessary resources. The result was for Britain to appeal to the USA for military and political support as the only viable alternative.

As a result, the Pentagon talks of October 1947 brought a consensus between Britain and the USA on the strategic and economic importance of the Middle East to Western interests and led an American promise of help to Britain in her difficulties in the region. In accordance with the talks, while Britain continued to assume the primary responsibility in the area it also was prepared to examine the possibility of implementing an American 'outer ring' strategy which was based on the defence of Turkey, Iran and Greece.⁴

During this period, Turkey's strategic importance began to increase in Western eyes because of her courageous resistance to the expansion of communism and her geo-strategic position as an obstacle to the Soviet threat in the Mediterranean and in the Middle East. Turkey was seen by the West as an important strategic location for launching air attacks on Soviet targets. The major role for Turkey, in case of a global war as a result of miscalculation or accident, was to deter the initial Soviet advances and thereby to allow time for Anglo-American forces to prepare a counter-offensive against Soviet targets from the Suez base.⁵

This period also highlighted an increasing Anglo-Turkish collaboration in the Middle East in general and in Palestine in particular as the Palestine question took centre stage in Arab politics. The long period of contradictory British policies over Palestine made it too difficult to reach a satisfactory result on the issue. While Britain struggled to find some solution to this acute problem, London found that Ankara was in an agreement with itself and was ready to render full assistance. Reciprocally, Turkey needed for British help as Ankara, after some unsuccessful efforts to obtain a formal American commitment, came to believe that she could only realise this objective through British mediation.

This chapter hence brings evidence that there was a connection between Turkey's collaboration with Britain in Middle Eastern issues and her intense efforts to reinforce her security. Especially, after 1947, Turkey

increasingly began to cooperate with Britain in the Palestine question, in order to achieve this objective.

Historical Background: The Palestine Question Up to 1945

Palestine was a former Ottoman territory which consisted of large groups of Arab majority and a small group of Jewish minority. The administration of the region remained in Arab hands, except for certain key posts which were held by the Ottomans. Both Arabs and Jews enjoyed full civil and political rights as the other inhabitants did. In the Parliamentary elections of 1908 the Arabs gained 60 seats while the Jews obtained 5 seats in the Ottoman Assembly. Nevertheless, the Ottoman government had strongly opposed to Zionist plans for the settlement of a Jewish state in Palestine since the 1880's.⁶

However, this political position in Palestine began to change with the coming of the First World War. During the war, the Arabs joined with the Allies against the Ottomans when Britain pledged them, in the case of the Sherif Hussein and Sir H. McMahon correspondence of 24 October 1915, to recognise the independence of Arab countries, including Palestine.⁷ However, towards the end of 1917, Britain gave another promise, which contradicted the above pledge, namely, the establishment of a national home to the Jews in Palestine. With this policy, Britain aimed at securing the support of both Arabs and Jews for the Allied cause.⁸ While, in the short run, this policy was successful, in the long run it proved a disaster when constant British efforts failed to compromise the expectations of both groups on the Palestine issue.

The year 1917 was a crucial moment for the future history of Palestine. It first marked the end of Turkish rule in Palestine when the Ottomans lost the campaign with Britain in the autumn. Then it witnessed the announcement of the so-called Balfour declaration, which represented the root origin of the Palestine question by Arthur Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary, on 2 November 1917. In his letter to Lord Rothschild, a well-known Zionist in Britain, Balfour stated:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of his Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet. His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object...⁹

This was the origin of a long battle, which continued all through the twentieth century between the Jews and Arabs. It was also to be turned into a major international problem which would threaten the stability of the Middle East during the Cold War era.

At the end of the Great War, Palestine was placed under British mandate by the League of Nations in 1922. The main objective of Mandate government in Palestine was to pursue the implementation of the so-called 'Balfour Declaration' issued by Britain in 1917, indicating support for 'the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people'.¹⁰ The Arabs of Palestine, however, strongly opposed to the British policy and this caused violent protestations throughout 1920s. While the Arabs wanted to achieve the independence of Palestine the Jews had expectations that they, with the help of Britain, would create a Jewish state in the same region.¹¹

According to the White Paper (of June 1922), which drew up the British Palestine policy, by restricting the level of Jewish immigration, Britain was assuring the Arabs that it had no intention of creating a Jewish rule in Palestine detrimental to the Arabs while it at the same time pledged to provide assistance to the Jews for the establishment of a homeland in the area.¹² Thus, as a mandatory power Britain assumed a contradictory stance in undertaking incompatible obligations to the Jews on the one side and to the Arabs on the other. In fact, this contradiction was the main reason for the failure of British policy as the Palestine Committee stated in its report on 8 September 1945.¹³

The regulations of 1922 served as the basis for British policy throughout the 1920s. In the 1930s, however, the Arabs further reacted to the British policies when a mass of Jewish immigration took place in Palestine from Central and Eastern Europe. The increasing level of Jewish immigration hence led a second phase of Arab rebellion in the years between 1936 and 1939. Though this rebellion did not bring any Arab military success or political concessions from Britain towards Arabs' aim of Palestine independence, it ensured the involvement of the Arab states to support the Palestinian Arabs and forced Britain to reassess its policy in favour of Arab demands.¹⁴ At this time, as global conflict was coming ever closer, the British government reversed the policy of pursuing the spirit of the Balfour declaration to one of securing Arab cooperation.¹⁵ For this reason, to reach an agreement with the Arab states on the Palestine issue Britain invited the Arabs and the Jews to a conference in London in February 1939.

The outcome of the conference was the announcement of the White Paper of May 1939, which contained the new British policy for Palestine. It stated that the British government was no longer to follow the policy of organizing a national Jewish home in Palestine. Moreover, it provided for the establishment of a Palestinian state within ten years and a strict limit of Jewish immigration into the area.¹⁶ The Arab states were satisfied with this outcome; however, neither the Palestinians nor the Jews accepted the new British policy.

In the period of the 1930s, though Turkey began to develop its relations with a number of the Middle Eastern states, which culminated with the establishment of the Sadabad Pact in 1937, Turkey adopted a non-involvement policy towards the Palestine Question. Turkey regarded the issue, as, first, an internal Arab matter and then as an issue between Britain and the Arab states.¹⁷

During the Second World War, the Arab states began to meet to strengthen their collaboration in order to prepare themselves for the post-war period. Palestine received its share of attention in these discussions, which resulted in the establishment of the Arab League as an instrument enabling the Arab states to cooperate in matters of security and welfare. The Charter of the Arab League proclaimed Palestine an independent country since its detachment from the Ottoman Empire.¹⁸ Simultaneously, the Zionist Jews, especially the American Zionists, became actively involved in the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. In 1942 the latter set up a programme of resolutions called the Biltmore Programme in the USA for the realisation of their ultimate aim. They were also prepared to fight with Britain for the achievement of their purposes after the war.¹⁹

The Beginning of the Palestine Question in Anglo-Turkish Relations (1945–47)

Unlike the inter-war period, the Palestine question began increasingly to occupy Anglo-Arab and American attention after the end of the Second World War. However, as it was still a regional issue, its effects on international politics were less significant than later. During this time, the flow of many thousands of Jewish immigrants into Palestine provoked a reaction both from the Arab states and the USA. While the Arab states put pressure on Britain for more restrictions on the level of immigration, Washington tried to remove London's restrictions.

At the end of the war, Britain continued to adhere to the principles outlined by the White Paper of 1939 in its formulation of Palestine policy. Under the terms of the White Paper, 75,000 Jewish immigrants were to be

admitted to Palestine during the five years following 1939. However, by the end of 1944, the number of immigrants admitted fell short of the prescribed quota and thus the period was extended one more year until the end of 1945.²⁰

In the summer of 1945, as the White Paper quota was expected to be exhausted by the end of November 1945, the British government undertook to work hard to formulate its new Palestine policy before the end of the year.²¹ There were then two proposals for a long-term policy. The first was a partition plan proposed by the Cabinet Committee on Palestine in September 1944. This scheme was initially favoured by the members of the committee and some of the British Middle Eastern representatives and had been accepted by the Cabinet. However, in the spring of 1945, the situation was changed. All the British Middle Eastern representatives, including three service commanders, were opposed to a partition scheme on the grounds that it would cause an angry reaction from the Arabs and thereby Britain could lose her goodwill and prestige in the Middle East, and that even the Jews would resist the plan.²²

The second proposal had been more recently prepared by Sir Edward Grigg, the Minister Resident in the Middle East, in April 1945. According to this plan, an international trusteeship, consisting of the UK, the USA, Russia, and France, should be established (over Palestine) with the responsibility of controlling the extent of Jewish immigration. This trusteeship would eventually be converted into the formulation of an independent bi-national state. However, this scheme also received some strong criticism, especially from the Foreign Secretary. His main objection was that while this scheme granted the final decision to other states, it still left Britain alone to take the responsibility for the administration of the country, and for carrying the burden of its internal security.²³

While these discussions took place among the British concerned departments, President Truman, in August 1945, asked Britain to admit 100 000 immigrants at once to Palestine. This was impossible for Britain to accept, since it would overturn the British White Paper policy. The disagreement between London and Washington over Palestine policy was to continue in the following years and began to sour relations between the two allies. Simultaneously, the Palestine question began increasingly to colour Anglo-Turkish and Arab relations.²⁴

Since the British Palestine policy was based on the implementation of the White Paper policy of 1939 in favour of the Arab states, it positively affected relations between Britain, Turkey and the Arab world. Britain, at this time, concluded that in order to secure its vital interests in the Middle

East against the Soviet threat it had to obtain the goodwill and confidence of the Arabs over the Palestine issue. As a long-term policy, Britain planned to grant gradual independence to Palestine within five years, in line with Arab demands.²⁵

As the Palestine question increasingly became a burden on Britain and damaged Anglo-American relations Churchill, on 6 July 1945, instructed the Colonial Office and the Chiefs of Staff (COS) to consider the idea of transferring British responsibility for Palestine to the USA. By 10th July the COS prepared their report which indicated that:

[Palestine] was the bottleneck of all land communications between Africa and Asia and in addition, is a main centre for air routes between the UK and the eastern parts of the British Empire. It includes one, and may possibly later include two, of the oil terminals of the Eastern Mediterranean.²⁶

Thus, from the strategic point of view, the British Palestine policy was to secure effective control of a belt of Arab territory linking the Mediterranean with the Persian Gulf.

The report went on to emphasise that the situation in Palestine was one of the major factors in the internal security of the Middle East. Thus, the repercussions of any policy unfavourable to Palestinian Arabs would be likely to spread to the whole Middle East. Finally, it drew the conclusion that transferring the mandate to the USA could cause Britain to lose its predominant position in the Middle East. Moreover, if Washington pursued an extreme pro-Zionist stance, this would lead to alienation of the Arabs and might cause the Russians to set themselves up as the champion of the Arab cause. For these reasons the Committee opposed the handing over of the mandate to the USA.²⁷

At this time, Labour's election in July 1945 did not bring any change in Britain's policy on Palestine. Ernest Bevin, the new British Foreign Minister, who most influenced Labour's Palestine policy, continued to follow the policy of his predecessor.²⁸ For his government, the only feasible course which received general consent from the concerned departments, including the COS and Cabinet Palestine Committee, was to adhere to the White Paper regulations for the short term, as the previous government had done. This was because, by following this policy, Britain planned to avert the hostility of both Arabs and Jews and considered that this was the way to prevent harsh criticism from the US government in this area.²⁹

Thus, bearing in mind these considerations, the Cabinet Palestine Committee recommended that HMG should continue to follow the White Paper policy until the promulgation of a new policy and every effort should be made to persuade the Arabs to agree to a continuation of Jewish immigration for the time being. It also recommended that Washington should be informed that HMG intended to refer the long term policy to the UN.³⁰

Hence, the White Paper arrangement continued to be the formal British policy until the end of the mandate, though some joint Anglo-American attempts were made to find a solution to the problem. However, these attempts were doomed to failure because they were not decisive steps and were accepted neither by the Arabs nor by the Jews. In the meantime, the political situation was getting worse in Palestine. From October 1945 onwards the armed Zionist organizations began to conduct their terrorist activities, attacking British officials and personnel with the aim of driving the British out of Palestine. Moreover, relations between the Palestinian Arabs and Jews were getting tense.³¹

This period represented for Turkey the beginning of her involvement in this question, in which she had so far adopted a policy of keeping distance from the Palestine issue. Turkey began to involve in the Palestine question for the first time, in the spring of 1946, during the Turco-Iraqi discussions. In the discussions, the Iraqi Premier, Tawfik Suwaidi, communicated his demand to Turkey that a pledge of Turkish support over Palestine should be included in the treaty as a condition for the ratification of the Turco-Iraqi agreement of March 1946. Turkey, since late 1945, had worked hard to conclude a treaty of friendship with Iraq in the context of its new regional policy. This was a part of Turkey's overall security policy which aimed to reinforce the safety of Turkey's borders with the Arab states against the possible Soviet encroachments. Turkey hence drew her Palestine policy in the context of her regional strategy.³²

Ankara's wish to develop Turco-Arab collaboration was emphasised in the Turkish government programme in 1946–47. The programme stated that 'We have good feelings and friendship towards our Arab neighbours. It is our greatest wish to further develop our relations with the member states of the Arab League in every field.'³³ From the Arab perspective one of the main fields for Turco-Arab cooperation was the Palestine question which began to dominate the politics of the Arab world. While Turkey was willing to cooperate with the Arab states on the Palestine issue she at the same time was cautious not to offend the Jewish quarters.

This was the case when Turkey refused to give her consent to Suwaidi's request which demanded a formal Turkish pledge on the Palestine Question as a pre-condition to the conclusion of Turco-Iraqi treaty. The Turkish delegate stated that Turkey could not include officially such a promise in the treaty. As the Jews had a strong influence in the USA and some influence in Britain, and Turkey needed the support of both countries, Ankara's concern was that such an official promise might arouse Jewish hostility to Turkey.

Nevertheless, the Turkish party rendered only a verbal promise to support the Arab case on Palestine in case of need in order not to jeopardise the conclusion of Turco-Iraqi discussions for a Treaty.³⁴ Eventually, the Iraqi government had to be satisfied with the private spoken Turkish promise of support over Palestine and the expectation of formal Turkish support in case of need.³⁵

The observations of Sir David Kelly whom the Turks had always approached for suggestions and comments on the issues regarding Arab affairs, further elaborated the nature of Turkey's Palestine policy. In his report to Atlee, he stated that Turkey saw more advantages in following a pro-Arab attitude in Palestine vis-à-vis the Zionists.³⁶ Kelly indicated that Turkey in general approved British policy in Palestine and endeavoured to reconcile the feelings of the Arabs with British policy. The Turkish apprehension was that any power vacuum left by Britain could be filled by Russian infiltration.³⁷

Kelly's observations on Turkey's Palestine policy were also shared by both Turkish and foreign press.³⁸ For instance, the Palestine's leading Hebrew daily *ha-Areẓ*, wrote that Turkey's pro-Arab stance was a 'direct result of the new Turco-British policy of increased cooperation with the Arab states motivated by Ankara's desire to protect Turkey's southern flank in the face of the Soviet threat'. Any other approach the paper concluded 'would have demolished' Turkey's successful attempts which had been made through the treaties with Iraq and Transjordan.³⁹

The Development of the Palestine Question in Anglo-Turkish Relations (1947–49)

In this period, as the Palestine problem turned into a major international issue it began to occupy a central place in Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East. This period witnessed a close and increasing Anglo-Turkish collaboration. As the available documentary evidence suggests, Turkey's involvement in the Palestine question stemmed from two main reasons: first, Turkey's need to collaborate with the Arab states (notably the Hashe-

mite states) against communist infiltrations; second, her general search for security against the Soviet threat.

During this period, Ankara, after her failure to obtain a formal American commitment to Turkey's security, came to believe that it could only realise this objective through British mediation. This naturally depended on Turkey's capacity to assist Britain in its difficulties in the Middle East. More to the point, Britain was the only Western power which had a formal commitment to Turkey through the treaty of 1939.⁴⁰

At this time two courses were open to Britain on the Palestine Question. One was its need to collaborate with the USA, which pursued a pro-Zionist policy, because of increasing British economic and military dependence on the Americans. The other was to carry on the implementation of the White Paper policy, which would satisfy the Arab demands of finally granting independence to Palestine as a unitary state. The Cabinet Palestine Committee in its report, which was endorsed by the COS, on 22 August 1945, had brought out the importance of reconciling Arab demands with British interests:

The attitude of the Arab states to any decision which may be reached is a matter of the first importance. The Middle East is a region of vital consequence to Britain and the British Empire. It forms the nodal point in the system of communications, by land, sea and air, which links Great Britain with India, Australia and the Far East; it is also the Empire's main reservoir of mineral oil...⁴¹

Therefore, though the security of these interests was largely based on the goodwill and confidence of the Middle Eastern states, this was closely related to the future of Palestine, which became a major concern at the centre of Arab politics. However, Britain had to abandon this policy by adopting the first option as its Palestine policy in order not to prejudice its cooperation with the USA.⁴²

Eventually, Britain referred the Palestine question to the UN on 14 February 1947 when it failed to obtain the agreement of the Arabs and the Jews for its long term policy, which would have given gradual independence to Palestine within five years with a further immigration of 100 000 Jews.⁴³ Simultaneously, the existing economic hardships, the fuel shortages and sterling crisis in Britain made it seem to Whitehall an ideal moment to quit Palestine.⁴⁴ Moreover, the increasing Jewish programme of terror and US pressures to grant permission to the thousands of the Jewish immigrants to Palestine also contributed to this decision.⁴⁵

The UN General Assembly set up a special committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) on 15 May 1947 to examine the Palestine question. Though the Arab states and Turkey voted against it, a majority of the Assembly voted for the establishment of this committee.⁴⁶ UNSCOP visited Palestine between 16 June and 18 July to investigate the problems of the region and to prepare its report for the UN. On 31 August UNSCOP submitted two plans: a majority and a minority plan. According to the majority plan, Palestine should be partitioned into three parts; an independent Arab state, an independent Jewish state and the city of Jerusalem to be placed under UN Trusteeship. The minority plan suggested an independent federal state, which the Arabs advocated, following a three-year transitional period, with Jerusalem nominated as capital of the federal state.⁴⁷

While these discussions were taking place in the UN, Britain declared at the UN on 26 September 1947 that it would terminate the Palestine mandate at a later date.⁴⁸ Eventually, the majority plan came before the General Assembly for a final vote on 29 November 1947. While Turkey voted with the Arab states against it, the majority vote, under strong American influence, favoured the partition plan. Britain abstained.⁴⁹

As the strategic and security concerns were the most influential factors which had shaped Turkish foreign policy so far, the Palestine problem was considered by the Turkish authorities from these two points of view. Turkey's Palestine policy was elaborated by Necmettin Sadak, the Turkish MFA, in an interview published by a Turkish daily on 17 February 1948. Sadak indicated that Turkey 'has not taken any fundamental political action regarding to the Palestine Issue. Its sole objective is to establish peace and stability in this region. Turkey voted against the partition because such a decision would open the way to violence and instability.'⁵⁰ He then emphasised that the recent developments confirmed the Turkish views.

The Turkish Palestine policy was indeed consistent with her general traditional line. As Turkey was a conservative power she supported a unitary state in Palestine for the maintenance of the status quo in the region. It was her perception that any drastic structural change in Palestine would create chaos and instability, thereby encouraging Soviet encroachments. These concerns were taken up by the Turkish editorials. Their anxieties about the contents of such reports as 'thousands of Communist agents were among the illegal Jewish immigrants coming from eastern Europe and rumours that Soviet officers were helping the Jews' were frequently printed in the Turkish press.⁵¹

Furthermore, the Soviet support for the Jewish plans during the UN discussions had already made Turkey anxious about the situation in Palestine. Turkish concerns were also shared by the officials of the British Foreign Office and echoed in the Turkish press.⁵² Numerous Turkish editorials highlighted that the Zionist leaders coming from Russia and the institutions they set up in Palestine such as Kibbutz were signs that the Jewish state 'might easily be turned into a Soviet satellite'.⁵³

These views were also shared by Turkish military authorities. Since the partition resolution, the Turkish General Staff (TGS) had expressed its apprehension about Palestine, given the possibility that Soviet troops would obtain a foothold in southern Asia Minor. In this regard the Turkish military even considered recalling men who had been demobilised in the previous autumn on account of their cost, to the military service.⁵⁴

Turkey's policy towards Palestine revolved around her desire to maintain regional security in collaboration with the Arab states against the possible communist expansion. Subjected to territorial demands by the USSR and Syria, Turkey needed regional allies to thwart these threats to bolster western support. This led Turkey to favour Arab opinion in the UN talks. As a result Turkey's support for the Arab case on Palestine in the UN discussions produced very favourable reactions from the Arab states.

The Arabs in various countries, including the Palestinians themselves, began to announce that they would prefer Turkish rule if there must be a foreign administration in Palestine.⁵⁵ Even in Syria, despite sometimes strained relations because of the Hatay issue, Turkish support for the Arab position had positive repercussions. Upon Turkish vote in favour of the Arabs in the General Assembly of the UN on 29 November, Shukri al-Quwatli, the Syrian President, sent a congratulatory message to the Turkish President to thank him for the Turkish support. Moreover, the Syrian papers paid tribute to Turkey by calling her 'the defender of Palestine'.⁵⁶ The pro-Arab stance also had positive effects on Iraqi Nationalists' views about Turkey and contributed to the exchange of ratifications of the Turco-Iraqi treaty in Baghdad on 10 May 1948.⁵⁷

However, the Turkish vote in the General Assembly did not change the result and the majority of the vote went on against the Arab wishes. While this result gave a great joy to the Jews, since it provided them with a national state, it came as a shock to the Arab World. The Arabs, in their meeting in Cairo between 8 and 17 December 1947, decided to oppose the resolution. A civil war between the Arabs and the Jews began after the adoption of the UN resolution of 29 November.⁵⁸

Under these circumstances, Bevin, on 1 January 1948, instructed Lord Inverchapel, the British Ambassador in Washington, to invite a strong American intervention urging the Jews in Palestine to restrain their terrorism and to force them to enter into accommodation with the Arabs, as the UN plan had not worked.⁵⁹ However, the State Department responded that there was no chance of extracting concessions from the Jews at the present time and some alternatives should be considered, such as suspending the partition plan and extending the trusteeship scheme to the whole of Palestine.⁶⁰

In the worsening situation in Palestine, the US government eventually took action and asked the Security Council on 19 March 1948 to suspend the partition plan and instead to establish a trusteeship system under the UN authority until the Arabs and Jews could reach an agreement. However, neither of the two groups nor Britain accepted the US plan.⁶¹ Eventually, Britain, on 2 April, brought the Palestine question before the General Assembly and then asked it to take over the responsibility of the future of Palestine.⁶²

At this juncture, Anglo-Turkish consultations began to increase as Turkey became increasingly worried about the situation in Palestine. The Turkish Foreign Minister expressed his anxiety to Kelly on 24 April that the USSR might gain ground in the area at any moment. For this reason he intended to press the Arab governments to make them realise the Soviet danger and to urge them to collaborate with Britain. The Turkish Secretary-General had already sent instructions to the Turkish representatives to convince the Arab governments of the necessity to co-operate with Britain against Soviet infiltration in the Middle East.⁶³

On the eve of the British surrender of the Palestine mandate, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution which empowered a UN mediator in Palestine to examine the Palestine issue and to promote a peaceful solution for the future of Palestine. Count Folke Bernadotte, a Swedish Ambassador, was appointed to undertake this task on 20 May 1948.⁶⁴ Britain finally terminated its mandate over Palestine on 15 May 1948. Thereafter the state of Israel was immediately proclaimed and it was swiftly recognised by Washington, followed by the USSR and its satellites. The new state of Israel therefore became a target for the Great Powers which sought to gain influence at each other's expense in the area.⁶⁵

The rapid US recognition of Israel was criticised by both the British and Turkish governments. Bevin expressed his regret on 22 May to the US Ambassador that early American recognition of Israel had destroyed the

British plans to urge the Arab states to agree to American truce proposals and it also endangered Western interests throughout Middle East.⁶⁶

Concurring with London, Ankara, after the outbreak of civil war in Palestine, made clear its view to Washington that it objected to the US Palestine policy because of its divergence from the realities in the region.⁶⁷ In mid-May 1948, in conversation with the American authorities, the Turkish Consul in Jerusalem expressed his confusion: 'I am entirely unable [to] understand the US policy. On [the] one hand, you help Greece and Turkey and on [the] other hand you undermine us from [the] rear.'⁶⁸

A week later, the Arab-Israeli war began. Sadak, during the RPP conference stated that:

Turkey was deeply distressed by the war in Palestine....We wish with all our hearts that without further bloodshed and without setting up in this region a continuous element of disorder and insecurity a lasting solution could be found and this would leave the Arabs masters of their rights.⁶⁹

After the outbreak of the hostilities on 15 May the Arabs armies faced severe setbacks against the Jewish forces because of the disunity of their command, rivalry and lack of weapons and ammunition. The war ceased on 11 June 1948 with the adoption of an armistice arranged by the Security Council. After a month, hostilities resumed and lasted for ten days when another armistice came into force on 18 July. However, this was not the end of the war; the truce was broken and the war between the Arabs and Israel was to continue until the spring of 1949.⁷⁰

At the end of the first fighting, from 11 June onwards, the Arabs went short of weapons. The British war supplies had been suspended at the beginning of the same month, while the Jews, as the British Ambassador in Baghdad complained, received war materials and reinforcements freely.⁷¹ Desperate for arms, the Arab League requested Iraq open informal talks with Turkey about her possible assistance over Palestine. For this purpose, it was reported that Naji Shawkat and Hikmet Suleiman were to be appointed to conduct the task.⁷² However, no result came from this attempt. In reality, Turkey had already refused to supply arms to Syria and Lebanon when their representatives made their requests in late December 1947 on the grounds that Turkey received arms from the USA and 'if Turkey furnished arms to the Arabs to combat a UN decision supported by the USA this would place Turkey in an impossible position.'⁷³

The Turkish attitude to the requests of the Arab states for arms should be attributed to a policy of non-intervention stance towards the Arab-Israeli conflict. Ankara, after the outbreak of the hostilities, declared that it would issue no passport valid for Palestine for men and if any person was caught leaving Turkey illegally would be punished.⁷⁴ With this decision the Turkish authorities aimed to prevent participation of any Turkish citizens in the conflict.

Meanwhile, as Arab military intervention turned into a catastrophe and severely damaged Western influence in the area, Turkey began to be seen in some Arab circles as a possible mediator to find some satisfactory solution between belligerents. For this purpose, it was reported that Prince Tallal of Transjordan planned to visit Ankara towards the end of July, to sound out the possibility of Turkey's mediation between the two sides.⁷⁵ Upon this report, Necmeddin Sadak, the Turkish Foreign Minister, expressed the view that Turkey did not want to act without having American and British consent.⁷⁶

After the first truce the UN mediator offered his proposals which sought a compromise between the Arabs and Jews for consideration, but they were rejected by both parties.⁷⁷ Consequently, Bernadotte drew up his final report and presented it to the UN Secretary-General on 16 September 1948. After suggesting the appointment of a Conciliation Commission (CC) to solve the acute problems between the Jews and Arabs, he emphasised that the definition of frontiers between the two sides should accord with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1947.⁷⁸

He further proposed that the disposition of the territory of Palestine outside the borders of the Jewish state 'should be left to the governments of the Arab states in full consultation with the Arab inhabitants of Palestine'; but he recommended that these areas could be merged with Transjordanian territory. He also suggested that the Arab refugees should be returned to their homes in Jewish-controlled territory at the earliest possible date and the UN Conciliation Commission should supervise their repatriation resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation.⁷⁹

On 28 September the General Assembly prepared a draft resolution which appointed a CC to undertake these recommendations. Initially the Americans proposed that the commission should comprise the representatives of the UK, the USA, Turkey, France and Belgium. The British Foreign Office welcomed the US proposal. It thought that British membership in the commission was inevitable, because Britain maintained the strongest influence in the Middle East and had had long experience in

Palestine. The particular British interest centred on the division of the territories of Arab Palestine. Britain wanted this area to be included in the territory of Transjordan.⁸⁰

The Foreign Office was also delighted to have Turkish participation in the commission. It thought that as Turkey was on very good terms with Transjordan, she would assist Britain in the realisation of the above plan. It further thought that the participation of both Britain and Turkey would secure Arab confidence in the commission, as both countries were known to be pro-Arab. These views were shared by the Americans as well. On the day of the selection by the General Assembly for membership of the CC on 12 December 1948, the US representatives thought that Turkey was moderately pro-Arab and its participation in the Commission might make it easier to persuade Arab opinion of the impartiality of the new committee.⁸¹

These were also the views of the Turkish governing elite at the time. As Ankara, in this period, assumed that Arab-Israeli peace was a precondition to achieving a regional cooperation against the Soviet intrigues this led Turkey to take an active role in bringing a settlement between Israel and the Arabs through CC. Moreover, the Turkish leaders, chief among them President İnönü, revealed the fact that Ankara could not refuse the requests of Britain and the USA who asked her to take part in the CC as they saw Turkey as a key regional state which could play an important role to mediate between Arabs and Jews. It was Ankara's calculation that Turkey's mediating role in the commission might also contribute to the attainment of her main goal of becoming a part of the western defence system.⁸²

The General Assembly consequently voted for the draft resolution, which proposed the establishment of the CC to take over the functions of UN Mediator on 11 December 1948. While Turkey voted in favour of the Commission, the Arab states, as well as the Soviets and their satellites, cast their votes against it. Turkey at this time departed from the Arab line because she wanted to promote a satisfactory solution acceptable to both the Arabs and Jews as soon as possible, as the stability of the Middle East became the greatest concern.⁸³

Upon the adoption of the resolution for the establishment of CC, the General Assembly, on 12 December, elected France, Turkey and the USA as members of the committee.⁸⁴ Turkey appointed H. Cahit Yalçın, a veteran journalist and strongly pro-British, as its representative on the commission at the beginning of 1949.

A week later, Sadak, in a speech to the GNA described Turkey's aims in the CC that:

Turkey fully grasped the significance of the task. She would make all the efforts within its capacity to establish a just and durable order in Palestine, which threatens to become a nest of continual and dangerous unrest in the Middle East....We sincerely wish to make the works of this commission fruitful towards this end in collaboration with America and France.⁸⁵

After Turkey's election to the CC, in his telegram to Kelly on 24 December, Bevin, concurring with the COS's views, emphasised the parallel objectives of Britain and Turkey in the Middle East. He explained that the main consideration behind the British Palestine policy was strategic. The success of British defence plans in the Middle East depended on the internal strength of the Arab countries. The British plan to meet possible foreign aggression was based on the main British eastern Mediterranean base in Egypt and its complementary communications, which lay through Palestine. As the Soviets and their satellites had sought to gain influence with the Jewish state, the telegram concluded that 'Israel could not be relied on as an ally of the West in a crisis.'⁸⁶

The report continued that it was vital that the line of communications through the Auja-Beersheba-Hebron-Jerusalem-Amman road should be in friendly hands, namely in the territory of Transjordan. Bevin, in particular, stressed that the main British object, which the Turks fully subscribed to was:

to produce a solid system of Middle East defence against aggression. We believe that this is in the interests of the Middle East States and of those powers everywhere who are determined to resist Communist pressure. In the particular case of Turkey, Arab States line her Southern frontier and a Moslem, though non-Arab, state her Eastern frontier. It is essential for the successful resistance of Turkey to Soviet pressure that the countries on her flanks should be as stable and as solidly defended as she is herself. This depends on the internal strength of these countries to which reference has been made above....⁸⁷

The report, however, concluded that the establishment of the new Jewish state had complicated and upset stability in the Middle East; there was

now an urgent need to find a settlement through CC between Arabs and Jews before it was too late.

On 25 December 1948, Kelly, acting on instructions from the Foreign Office, handed a memorandum, which contained Bevin's remarks and included the general British views with regard to the recent situation in Palestine, to the Turkish Secretary-General. The memorandum indicated that the work of CC was to be limited to create a machinery to reach a satisfactory settlement between Arabs and Jews.⁸⁸

The initial reaction of the Turkish Secretary-General was complete agreement with the British views. Only on one point did he differ with Bevin's comments. This was the latter's idea that Turkey could render its assistance by bringing Egypt into collaboration along with Transjordan and Britain.⁸⁹ However, the recent reports by Azzam Pasha, Secretary-General of the Arab League, which accused Turkey of contributing to the economic potential of the Jewish state, made the Turkish Secretary-General very pessimistic on this point.⁹⁰

A few days later Sadak told the British Ambassador that he had briefed the Turkish UN delegate to support the British line and stated that the CC was at present working well and had already set itself up in Jerusalem though the preliminary negotiations for an armistice were still in progress. Sadak further stated that in early February 1949 he had received a report from Yalçın and he wished to ask for the comments of the Secretary of State.⁹¹

The Turkish agreement over British strategic views on Palestine was further confirmed by the Turkish Ambassador in London, Cevat Açıkalın, when he saw Bevin on 11 January 1949. Açıkalın stated that his government fully shared the British view that the lines of communication of the Gaza-Auja-Beersheba-Hebron-Jerusalem-Amman road should be in Arab hands, namely between those of Egypt and Transjordan through the Negev.⁹² Nevertheless, this plan was acceptable neither to the Jews nor to the Americans. Their idea was that the greater part of the Negev should be in Jewish hands.⁹³

However, while Anglo-Turkish collaboration was reaching its zenith in the Middle East in general and on Palestine policy in particular, their relations, in Europe, were not free from anxiety.⁹⁴ As security concerns were the main factors shaping foreign policy, Turkey continued to seek security combinations in order to fortify her independence and territorial integrity against her intimidating superpower neighbour. Though Turkey had already been reassured with the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine and the beginning of American military aid, including British assurances on the

validity of the 1939 alliance at the beginning of 1947, these acts did not alleviate Turkish anxieties and she felt the need to bring the USA into a formal alliance with herself in one way or another.⁹⁵

This was because, on the one hand, the emergence of American interest in assisting Turkey against possible Soviet expansion to the south did not entail any binding commitments on the part of the USA in the event of aggression. Hence, Turkey, for its security, could not rely on the USA without having some formal commitments. On the other hand, though the Anglo-Turkish Alliance of 1939 remained her only formal security guarantee, Turkey was well aware of declining British power, as could be seen from the fact that Britain had already transferred its primary economic role in the Near East to the USA by early 1947.

In addition to this, though the 1939 alliance was still valid, it had some defects from the point of view of both its legality and its reliability. This was because it had not been updated to meet the needs of current circumstances and without US backing Britain could not provide much help against any foreign threat. For these reasons the main thrust of Turkey's foreign policy was based on joining any security organisation to which the USA would contribute. Turkey pursued this goal either by directly approaching the Americans or by seeking the British mediation for this end.

In effect, the secret UK-US military discussions through the late 1940s proved how right Turkey was in its feelings of insecurity and its long and uphill endeavour to obtain formal updated obligations from both countries as to her defence. During their military and strategic discussions Britain stressed the necessity for the defence of the Suez Canal and its adjacent areas in a war against the Soviets while the Americans argued that Western Europe should be concentrated on, leaving the defence of the Middle East to Britain. However, the British defence plans for the Middle East were limited to Egypt and only covered the areas as far as the 'Ramallah Line' in northern Tel Aviv. They did not include Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Crete and the Persian Gulf due to the lack of troops and military resources.⁹⁶

About this time, Turco-American relations began to suffer towards the end of 1947 when Washington excluded Turkey from the European Recovery Programme (ERP), popularly known as Marshall Aid, which had been promulgated by George Marshall, the US Secretary of State, on 5 June 1947. The British Foreign Office noted that Turkey's reaction to the American decision was too strong when the Turkish Ambassador in Washington vehemently complained about the decision to the State De-

partment. Also, Wilson, the US Ambassador in Ankara, bore a 'share of the Turkish fury'.⁹⁷

He reported that 'the Turks were more upset than he had ever known them since the talks about [the] Straits'.⁹⁸ Although Ankara blamed Washington, according to the British Treasury the major blame for Turkish exclusion from free Marshall Aid lay with the Turks themselves, as their representatives in Paris had presented the Turkish case inadequately. For this reason, concurring with this view, the authorities of the Democrat Party in Ankara suggested to the press that 'there should be a purge in the [Turkish] Foreign Office Service in order to obtain representation abroad less interested in wine and women and more in the welfare of Turkey'.⁹⁹

Concurrently, Turkish security anxieties began to increase by the beginning of 1948 when the Soviet press began to attack Turkey because of US involvement in Turkish affairs.¹⁰⁰ In addition to this, the Soviet note to the Persian government, in which the latter was accused of collaboration with the USA against the USSR was interpreted by the British Ambassador in Moscow as a signal of possible Soviet diplomatic displeasure with Turkey in the near future.¹⁰¹ Moreover, about this time, the US military authorities notified the TGS that, in the event of a global war, the Turks should not anticipate any help from the USA for the first ninety days and they would be expected to defend themselves until such reinforcements arrived; this further disappointed the Turkish authorities.¹⁰²

Despite all the difficulties of its relations with Washington, Turkey continued to sound out the possibility of formal US commitments to its defence as the Cold War began to escalate in Europe. The first development in this direction, which worried Ankara, was the dramatic and sinister absorption of Czechoslovakia into the Soviet bloc by a coup on 25 February 1948. The Turkish anxiety about her giant neighbour further increased on 7 November, when the new Soviet Ambassador Lavrishtchev, in a party at the Soviet Embassy, warned the Turkish Premier that 'Turkey should forsake America and that all the US arms and equipment supplied to her were of no account in comparison to Soviet armed might'. He further chillingly stated that 'the Red Army had often captured from the Germans and destroyed in a single day twice the number of tanks existing at present in the whole of Turkey'.¹⁰³

Simultaneously, the hostile Soviet attitude to Western security and the communist coup in Prague made a decisive impact on Bevin in connection with the establishment of a Western European Union, with the ultimate aim of incorporating the USA into the defence of Europe. After a series of meetings and consultations among the European states the Brussels

Treaty was signed on 17 March 1948, which represented a first step towards a European security system.¹⁰⁴ In the interim discussions, Turkey showed a deep interest in the proposed organisation. Sadak, on 26 January, told Kelly that Turkey could play a bridging role between Europe and the Middle East in the proposed arrangement.¹⁰⁵ However, Britain showed no interest in including Turkey in the organisation.¹⁰⁶

In the light of these deteriorating international relations, and her associated feelings of insecurity, Turkey made another attempt to explore the US government's intentions of possible close strategic cooperation towards the end of June 1948, when Sadak, in his interview with journalists in Ankara, suggested forming an alliance with the USA. In his comments on Sadak's proposal on 2 July, Marshall took a cool attitude towards it and stated that 'the USA was doing quite a bit to support Turkey. The USA don't [doesn't] want to [get] involved in its relations with Turkey too much'.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, the Turkish assessment of its security and international relations was not fully shared by the British Foreign Office. It thought that Turkey sometimes exaggerated the impact of international events on its security with the object of getting more material aid and moral support from Britain and the USA.¹⁰⁸

Towards the end of June 1948, the birth of a new security organisation, the Atlantic Union, occurred. When Ankara became aware of this, as she was anxious to associate herself with Washington in any defence arrangements, she immediately enquired about American intentions regarding the possibility of a Turkish association with the new establishment. The Turkish Ambassador attempted, on 21 July, to ascertain this, but without success.¹⁰⁹

Under these circumstances, Turkey repeated its approach to Britain in October 1948, proposing to put the projected Mediterranean pact into operation. The Turkish Ambassador in Paris had already raised this idea to his British counterpart in early March 1947 but with no result. The idea was to set up a pact with a number of Mediterranean states including the UK and the USA to protect peace and security in the Mediterranean.¹¹⁰ Sadak told Bevin that Turkey 'realised very well that everything which the United States had already done for Turkey had been through British mediation'.¹¹¹ However, the Foreign Office thought that the present time, with crises in Greece and in the Arab states, was not appropriate for developing the idea of the Mediterranean Pact.¹¹²

Meanwhile, as the Atlantic Pact conversations took place, the Turkish government raised the question of Turkey's place in the new establishment with the British and American ambassadors towards the end of

November 1948.¹¹³ The subsequent Anglo-American responses chimed that the new pact was restricted geographically in scope to the countries of the North Atlantic area.¹¹⁴

However, the subsequent addition of Italy was going to be included within the scope of the North Atlantic region caused great confusion and perturbation on Turkey's part since she herself was a Mediterranean country. On 12 April 1949 Sadak expressed Turkey's great anxiety to Bevin that keeping of Turkey outside of NATO spread the fear among the Turkish statesmen that '...the USA had altered its position regarding Turkey and it no longer maintained the powerful interest in the maintenance of Turkey's independence and integrity which had characterised the attitude of the US government since late 1946'.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, the negative US attitude made the Turks more determined to pursue their ultimate objective.

While Turkish-American relations were not smooth, neither were Anglo-Turkish relations free of trouble; for instance, in the issues related to European defence. The first serious blow came on 24 October 1948 when İnönü was angered by a Reuter's News Agency report, which said that the Labour Party, in its recent pamphlet, supported the view that '...Turkey at least doesn't share the cultural heritage on which Western Civilisation is based' for which reason Turkey had been treated separately in the ERP.¹¹⁶ In essence, Turkey initially was denied a major part of Marshall Aid. While Britain, in late 1947, was allocated \$5.3 billion from the programme for the first year, Turkey, in March 1948, only received \$10 million. The pamphlet, further expressed the idea that because Turkey was, both geographically and culturally, out of Europe, it had no relevance to the Western Union system.¹¹⁷

For 25 years, since the establishment of the new Turkish Republic, the Turks had chosen to identify themselves with the advanced nations of the West no matter what their cultural heritage was. Thus, the Reuter report created deep resentment among Turkish statesmen led by President İnönü.¹¹⁸ The Turkish Foreign Minister questioned the British Ambassador on the issue. This was followed by an enquiry on the part of the Turkish Ambassador in London on 17 November. The British response was that the pamphlet was an unofficial one and its contents did not represent the views of the Foreign Office.¹¹⁹ However, despite these minor setbacks in Anglo-Turkish relations on the issues related to Europe, Britain still continued to be the only power which Turkey relied on.

During this period, the British position in the Middle East was getting worse as the extreme political situation in Palestine had fuelled anti-

Western feelings in the area, especially after the UN decision on the partition of Palestine. Britain needed an ally to cope with its difficulties in the region and found Turkey was ready to co-operate. Turkey was indeed the only regional ally which Britain could expect assistance.

The British position in the region was seriously undermined by the subsequent chain of events. Britain's relations with Egypt had already been strained over the deadlock on the Sudan issue. Their relations further declined from 1947 onwards upon the refusal of Britain to withdraw its troops from the Suez Canal zone. Another shock came to Britain in late January 1948 when the Treaty of Portsmouth, which had been signed between Britain and Iraq on 15 January 1948, was not ratified by the latter. As Britain preferred a bilateral to a multilateral approach in its defence relations with the Middle Eastern states, because of its problems with Egypt and the rise of Arab nationalism, Bevin regarded the treaty as a new model for a defence alliance, which was based on partnership with the regional states.¹²⁰

Therefore, the old Anglo-Iraqi agreement of 1930 was replaced with the Portsmouth treaty. With the new treaty Britain pledged to withdraw its military presence from Iraq in peacetime but gained the right to use Iraqi airfields and communications in war. However, soon after the signing of the treaty, public riots in Iraq forced the Baghdad government to repudiate it. Even some Iraqi politicians in the government claimed that the Portsmouth treaty laid down heavier conditions than the previous one and if a new model for the revision of the treaty was to be sought this model should be along the lines of the Anglo-Turkish treaty of 1939. Therefore, the tide of Arab nationalism destroyed Bevin's new partnership model for the Middle Eastern states.¹²¹

Anti-British feelings, after the events in Egypt and Iraq, spread to Transjordan where Britain had maintained its strongest influence by subsidising the country with £3 million annually. Upon the request of King Abdullah of Transjordan in early 1948, the previous treaty in 1946 was terminated by the signing of a new one, which replaced direct British control with a joint defence board chaired by a British officer.¹²² These developments showed that British supremacy in the region was now hanging by a thread. When anti-British feelings spread throughout the region, Britain asked for Turkish help in overcoming her difficulties with the Arab states. This request was fully rendered by Turkey, which had fallen into line with Britain since the beginning of 1947.

As a result, the Turkish Secretary-General, on 2 March 1948, instructed the Turkish representatives in the Middle East to talk to the Arab gov-

ernments about the importance of British military collaboration in the region.¹²³ In reality, Turkey had already offered its good offices to Britain during Sadak's conversation with Kelly on 26 January. Sadak told Kelly that Turkey could play a crucial bridging role between the British security interests in Europe and those in the Middle East.¹²⁴ Furthermore, in reaction to the strong Arab nationalist demands against the British presence in the Middle East, the Turkish representatives, including the Turkish press and radio, strongly supported the British position in Egypt and Iraq.¹²⁵

The good deeds of Turkey on Britain's behalf, in effect, were soon to bear fruit. The time was not yet too late for a possible Anglo-Turkish-Arab collaboration over the proposed Middle Eastern defence pact. Moreover, the pro-Arab attitude of Turkey over Palestine made a good impression on the Arab states. However, the success of this collaboration would much depend on whether the opportunities were used or not.

Contemporaneously, the Eastern Department of the British Foreign Office concluded that Turkey exerted a strong influence on Iraq and Transjordan and some influence on Egypt and thus Turkish good offices could overcome some of the difficulties caused by the nationalist forces in these countries.¹²⁶ Turkish influence, at this time, was running high with the Arab states because of the pro-Arab Turkish attitude over the Palestine issue. This was true even in Syria, notwithstanding the Hatay issue. At the beginning of June 1948 the Syrian President, in an interview with the special correspondent of the Turkish paper, *Cumhuriyet*, stated that: 'at the present stage of international affairs, the Arabs and Turks have adopted a co-operative stand against a number of dangers. The fact that Turkey supports [the] Palestine case has strengthened the bonds of friendship uniting the Turks with the Arab states...'¹²⁷

Turkey's influence over the Levant states reached its peak in mid-October 1948, when Faris el Khoury, the Syrian delegate to the UN, and Riyad el Solh, the Lebanese Premier, approached Sadak in Paris with the suggestion that Turkey should play a more active role in Arab affairs. They went on to suggest that Turkey should take a leadership role among the Middle Eastern states, assuming the position of the 'political Caliphate' in the region.¹²⁸ The Turkish Foreign Minister's initial response was that Turkey's foreign stance was now turned to the West and was firmly based on the Anglo-Turkish Alliance and closer relations with the USA. Sadak further explained that Turkey could only play this role if the Arab states improved their relations with Great Britain. Turkey was particularly embarrassed by the negative attitude of Iraq and Egypt towards Britain.

The Arab leaders then requested Sadak to assist them in improving their relations with Britain.¹²⁹

Concurrently, Sadak, in his conversation with Bevin's private secretary on 22 October 1948, asked for British views on the proposed Turkish leadership role and of the role of mediation suggested by the Levant states. He indicated that Turkey would be glad to take the initiative in improving Arab relations with Britain.¹³⁰ The Foreign Office, after a comprehensive examination, rejected this proposal on the grounds that Turkey's leadership role would damage Egypt's position in a vital strategic area of the Middle East.¹³¹

Therefore, Britain blindly missed this golden opportunity, which offered some sort of Anglo-Turco-Arab collaboration at a uniquely appropriate moment for this purpose. Under these positive circumstances, it was possible that Britain might have organised a regional pact and thereby it could have solved its political difficulties with the Arab states at a time when many of them and Turkey wanted to establish some sort of defence arrangements. Such a pact could also be a useful device which might play a positive role in smoothing over the differences between Israel and the Arab states. However, Britain, with all her efforts concentrated on the establishment of the Atlantic Pact, delayed organising security arrangement in the Middle East to a later date. Thereby the favourable moment passed and was soon displaced in the region by a bitter Arab resentment and alienation towards the West when Turkey and Britain officially recognised the state of Israel, causing deep disappointment in the whole Arab world.

Recognition of Israel by Turkey and Britain and their Repercussions on the Middle East (1949–50)

As the Middle East remained vital to British interests, Britain's policy towards the region in general and Palestine in particular, from political, strategic and economic view points, was based on the collaboration and good will of the Arab States in order to preserve its position in the area. Thus, British interests necessitated a pro-Arab policy rather than favouring the Zionists, while the US government followed a pro-Zionist stance, partly due to internal considerations.¹³²

The conflicting Anglo-American policies over the Palestine issue represented the lowest point in the relations between the two governments (in the Middle East) in the early post-war period. However, in late 1948 the situation was to change as the firm British pro-Arab policy was gradually transformed in favour of a more even-handed policy towards

the Arab states and Israel for the sake of improving Anglo-American relations.¹³³

This was because, as Monroe pointed out, the issue of Palestine did not represent 'a matter of life or death' to Britain at a time when the Soviet threat to Europe was becoming imminent after the chain of events starting with the communist coup in Prague reached its peak with the siege of West Berlin in 1948–49. In addition to this, the heavy British dependence on American economic and strategic support forced London to review its Palestine policy and re-orienting it closer to the latter's policy in this critical period of the Cold War.¹³⁴

Moreover, at the beginning of 1949, the developments over the European security system, which were moving towards the establishment of the North Atlantic Pact with the participation of the USA, was the decisive factor in the evolution of the new British Palestine policy. Since Britain maintained that any pact without American participation would not bring much security, the former could not afford to retain its contradictory policy over the Palestine issue, which had already damaged relations between the two countries. In this regard, the State Department, on 12 January 1949, made it clear to the British Ambassador that Britain followed a very different policy in Palestine from that of the USA and emphasised the importance of the Middle East to the overall Anglo-American strategic position.¹³⁵

The State Department briefly explained the American position: first, it did not accept the British argument that the greater part of the Negev should be in Arab hands for strategic reasons, but rather it preferred that the area should remain in the hands of the 'friendly state of Israel'; second, it wished to ensure at all costs that Israel should be oriented towards the West and HMG's policy 'of containing the Israelis ran the risk of permanently estranging them'.¹³⁶

Therefore, bearing in mind these American reservations and including the strong criticism made by some Labour MPs and by opposition in Parliament to Bevin's Palestine policy, claiming that it did too much harm to Anglo-American relations, Bevin was forced to modify British policy towards Palestine. Thereafter, he decided to seek conciliation with Washington over the Palestine issue. Bevin communicated this desire in memoranda to the State Department on 13 and 18 January 1949. Soon after these attempts Britain announced her *de facto* recognition of Israel on 29 January 1949.¹³⁷ However, these recent actions, as one of the officials in the Eastern Department concluded, 'had sunk [British influence] very low' in the Arab countries.¹³⁸

Given the recent unstable situation in the region, Bevin began to search for ways of re-establishing stability in the Middle East and asked the COS to provide him with an up-to-date assessment on the possibility of a defence arrangement in the area.¹³⁹ The British military report harked on the importance of Turkey's role to the stability of the Middle East. In their report to the Foreign Office on 30 March 1949, the Joint Planning Staff (JPS) concluded that there had been signs of closer relations between the Arab states and Turkey and the realisation of this kind of development would be advantageous to Britain since Turkey was the strongest state of the Middle East both militarily and politically.¹⁴⁰

As Turkey closely monitored British actions in the Middle East, and her policy was based on a realistic assessment of her national interests she began to modify its policy towards Israel in the light of the changed circumstances. The new trend of Turkish policy echoed positive reactions in the Turkish Press.¹⁴¹

A chain of events rapidly changed the Turkish views towards Israel. First, the outcome of the Arab-Israeli war transformed Turkish perception of the capabilities of the Arab armies and the Arabs' political competence against Israel; consequently Turkey lost interest in having an alliance with the Arabs against communism.¹⁴² Second, by this time it also appeared that the Jewish state would be a pro-Western one as the Israeli elections of 25 January 1949 brought the moderate Mapai Party into the power. The Turkish press also voiced similar remarks and came to the conclusion that the Jewish state would be a Western and progressive one in the Middle East.¹⁴³

Additionally, by the end of January 1949 two of Turkey's major allies (the USA and the UK) had already recognised the state of Israel. As Turkey was aligned with Britain, especially in the Middle East, she could not remain indifferent towards the new British move towards Israel. Besides, Turkey thought that the influential Jewish lobby in the USA would be useful in influencing American policy in favour of Turkey at a time when moves towards the Atlantic Pact were in progress.¹⁴⁴

Sadak's interview with the Anatolian News Agency, on 8 February 1949, elaborated the new orientation of Turkish approach towards Israel. He stated that Ankara was examining the recognition of Israel and was willing to normalize trade. He pointed out that that 'the state of Israel is a fact. More than 30 states had already recognised it and the Arab representatives are conferring with the representatives of Israel'.¹⁴⁵ Soon after these statements Turkey accorded *de facto* recognition to Israel on 28 March 1949.¹⁴⁶

The Arab states strongly resented this act and charged Turkey with 'betrayal of Islam' and themselves.¹⁴⁷ The Lebanese Minister in Ankara chastised Turkey as 'the first Muslim country' to recognise Israel.¹⁴⁸ Moreover, Azzam Pasha, in conversation with a member the British Embassy in early September 1950, expressed the view that Turkey's recognition of Israel had been the main reason for the cooling of relations between the Turks and the Arabs.¹⁴⁹ These statements created some annoyance in the Turkish Press. For instance, Ömer Rıza Doğrul, an editorial in *Cumhuriyet*, emphasised that there was no relevance between the recognition of Israel and İslam, since Turkey did not mix religion with foreign policy. Turkey's act was based rather on as a result of the policy which based on 'a realistic appraisal of world developments and its own national interest'.¹⁵⁰

Even Iraq, thus far the most cordial Arab country to Turkey, became distant because of 'Turkey's toleration of Israel' and its support for the Syrian dictator, Colonel Husni al-Zaim, who became the enemy of Iraq.¹⁵¹ Zaim had been trained in the Turkish Military College, overthrew the Syrian President, Shukri al-Kuwatli, who had ruled since 1943, in a military coup on 30 March 1949, and started the Colonels' era in Syria.¹⁵²

Throughout 1948 Turkey's relations with the Levant states remained cordial. Relations between Turkey and Syria further improved after Zaim's advent to power. As the general Turkish approach towards any Syrian government was determined according to the latter's attitude over Hatay Zaim's declaration that 'the question of Alexandretta was a closed chapter' and never to be reopened made a good impression on Turkey.¹⁵³

Zaim sent warm assurances of his desire for friendly relations with Turkey. He also asked Turkey to send a military mission to Damascus and suggested training courses for Syrian officers in Turkey. However, Ankara feared provoking the Hashemite states to establish a large military mission in Damascus and only agreed to send General Kazım Orbay to carry out military inspections for the improvement of the Syrian Army.¹⁵⁴ Thus, Zaim's reign further contributed to Turco-Syrian rapprochement.

This coincided with the appearance of some alternative movements towards union between Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan. Though these collaborations had been latent from time to time since the 1920s, they were never so strong at the turn of 1948–49. The Arab failures against Israel stimulated nationalist sentiment and Arab popular demands to unite against the 'Jewish danger'. These demands began to be voiced strongly in Iraq and Syria.¹⁵⁵

While the Iraqi government was ready to carry out the plan for union, the new Syrian government under Zaim's rule strongly rebuffed these

attempts. This strained Iraqi-Syrian relations.¹⁵⁶ Though Turkey officially declared its neutrality on this issue, she privately did not want the union between the two countries to be realised.¹⁵⁷ Turkey was in favour of maintaining the status quo in the area. She tried to strengthen further her relations with Zaim's government. However, these Turkish activities made Iraq suspicious about the former's policies and led to Iraq's estrangement from Turkey.¹⁵⁸

In any event, the Turkish-Syrian flirtation did not last long due to a second coup in Syria carried out by Colonel Sami Hinnawi, who seized power and executed Zaim on 14 August 1949.¹⁵⁹ The removal of Zaim from the Syrian scene much perturbed Turkey and she began to express concern about the chances of stability being delivered by the new government in Syria.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, while this recent instability in the region combined with worsening Turco-Arab relations increased Ankara's anxiety in the Middle East, her position in Europe with regard to securing a formal Western commitment was not improving either. This made Turkey feel isolated in the international field at the beginning of the 1950s.

This was the case when the Turkish government made another attempt to press for an American security guarantee to Turkey. The Turkish Ambassador in Washington, F. Cemal Erkin, in his conversation with George McGhee, the assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, discussed the *Red Fleet* incident and asked for formal American involvement in the security of Turkey either bilaterally or through establishment of a Mediterranean Pact. At this time an article appeared in the Soviet Navy's paper, *Red Fleet*, repeating the earlier Russian claims; it pointed out that the Montreux Convention did not meet the current needs of the Black Sea powers and strongly hinted Moscow's desire to revise it.¹⁶¹

Acheson declared on 22 April that the defence of the Dardanelles should remain Turkey's responsibility. The American press was not impressed by Erkin's argument and regarded the *Red Fleet* article as a minor event with no serious effect.¹⁶² Simultaneously, Sir Noel Charles (the new British Ambassador in Turkey) and General Crocker, C-in-C MELF, in a conversation with President İnönü, reassured him that Turkey could rely on British support against the Soviets if they made such a demand.¹⁶³

Ankara also found this a positive opportunity to press for a collective defence arrangement in the Eastern Mediterranean. After the failure of the Turkish Ambassador's attempt in Washington, on 3 May Turkey presented a memorandum to the British, American and French governments urging them to consider the 'the question of Turkish security at the London Conference'.¹⁶⁴ Ankara's request in fact neatly coincided with London's

recently formulated defence plans for the Middle East. On the day when the *aide-mémoire* was presented to the Foreign Office, Açıkalın made an offer to Britain on the lines that Turkey could render assistance in convincing Egypt to participate in a defence agreement if Turkey was a part of a wider scheme which included the USA.¹⁶⁵

Though both the Foreign Office and the COS examined the Turkish offer, Britain later lost interest in it postponing her regional defence plans to a later date owing to the lack of American interest.¹⁶⁶ Therefore the tripartite meeting in London did not take account of the recent Turkish request to establish a wider defence pact and its only outcome was the tripartite declaration, which aimed to preserve peace in the Middle East and to prevent an arms race between the Arab states and Israel.¹⁶⁷

Subsequently, the Republican government's search for security was soon to end owing to a heavy defeat in the next Turkish elections. At this time, Turco-Arab relations began to further deteriorate through the extension of Turkish *de jure* recognition to Israel on 9 March 1950. Under these circumstances the Arab states had begun to pay attention to the new Turkish elections, which were due on 14 May 1950. In this first honest and free election the Turkish people ousted the long ruling Republican Party by choosing the Democrat Party. The Democrats won 408 seats in the Turkish Assembly against 69 seats for the Republicans. This, therefore, was a political revolution and represented the beginning of a new era in Turkey. As the Iraqis had shown great interest in the Democrat victory, the Egyptians and Azzam Pasha also expressed their desire to have better and friendlier relations with the new Democrat government.¹⁶⁸

Conclusion

The security and stability of the Middle East was vital to both Turkey and Britain, which began to be closely related to the future of the Palestine from 1947 onwards. Since then the Palestine question took a considerable place in Anglo-Turkish relations in the region. As Turkey's regional policy aimed at closer cooperation with the Arab states against Soviet infiltration on her southern flank, this led her adopt a pro-Arab posture in the UN discussions. Turkey, however, modified this policy by recognising the state of Israel in early 1949 as a result of her desire to court in favour with the West.

In fact, it was not until late 1948 that Turkey began to engage in the Palestine question. This was a time when concern for a Western security guarantee was uppermost in Ankara's mind. However, Turkey's exclusion from the Western defence plans, and her failure to obtain an American

commitment to her defence left Ankara to have the only alternative which was to seek for British help. Therefore, it was not surprising that Turkey paid a great attention to Britain's political steps towards Palestine.

Britain at this time confronted further difficulties in the region as a result of the UN resolution which partitioned Palestine against the wishes of the Arab countries in late 1947. London, in early 1948, therefore faced strong Arab protests, even in Iraq and Jordan, which had been friendly. It therefore needed local help in mediating with the Arab states and approached Ankara for assistance. While, especially in 1948, Turkey rendered all her help to Britain over its problems in the Middle East she received less from this collaboration, except some political and moral support, as Ankara pushed London to reaffirm the validity of the Anglo-Turkish alliance against a possible foreign aggression.

The beginning of 1949 signalled a shift in British strategy which had so far attached primary importance to the defence of the Middle East. After the unsuccessful British attempts to create a 'third force' consisting of Europe, the Middle East and Africa, Britain focused on the establishment of the Atlantic Pact under the leadership of the USA as the likelihood of a hot war in Europe was thought to have increased. This also brought a gradual transformation in British strategy, shifting her priority from the defence of the Middle East to the defence of Europe.¹⁶⁹

While the Western focus was largely directed to the events in Europe, the Western position in the Middle East was increasingly deteriorated. In this precarious situation, Britain and the USA planned to find some sort of solution to the Arab-Israeli problem through the Conciliation Commission for which Britain was not selected. Thus, Turkey's importance further increased in British eyes as she was selected in the commission with which it was hoped to find some satisfactory solution between the Arab states and Israel. However, the commission's attempts would soon fail to meet its objectives, even to a limited extent, due to the strong Arab-Israeli opposition to its suggestions.

AN ACTIVE FOREIGN POLICY: TURKEY'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE BRITISH DEFENCE PLANS AND HER ADMISSION TO NATO (1950–52)

At the beginning of the 1950s Western-Arab relations were seriously undermined as a result of the war in Palestine and this outcome not only undermined further the stability of the region but also strengthened the hand of the extreme Arab nationalists who were vigorously opposing a foreign presence in the region. The immediate result was a military coup in Syria against the corrupt civilian government which was accused of behaving badly in the Palestine war and this was to be followed by other coups and crises in Egypt, Iran, Iraq and elsewhere in the following years.

Therefore, in order to prevent further political deterioration in the Middle East the West (Britain, France and the USA) acted unanimously in putting out a tripartite declaration in May 1950. The essence of the tripartite declaration was to preserve the existing frontiers between Israel and the Arab countries and to control the supply of arms to both sides. In fact, there still remained certain differences of approach towards regional affairs among the Western powers. While Washington was critical of Anglo-French colonialist policies in the Middle East, the latter were sceptical about American intentions to supplant them in the region. Moreover, the declaration neither bound the West to formally guarantee the regional frontiers nor regulated the provision of arms supplies to the Middle East.¹

In the tripartite meeting of 1950 Britain also brought the issue of a regional defence pact to the attention of the USA. The State Department officials were told that Britain was deliberating over a Middle East defence pact to be set up on the lines of NATO including Turkey, Egypt and certain Commonwealth countries. However, the State Department was not sympathetic to the idea and responded that this plan was unworkable and untimely. It also indicated that the USA, because of its commitments in Europe and the Far East, could not extend these commitments to the Middle East.² However, Washington's initial non-committal attitude towards British multilateral defence plans was soon to change as a result of the war in Korea.

The eruption of a conflict in South East Asia resulted in a substantial shift in the US security policy, (NSC 68), which brought a broad assumption of global American responsibilities in the struggle against international communism. The NSC 68 modified to perimeter defence Kennan's strategy of defending selected vital areas along the line around the Sino-Soviet periphery. While in this strategy the security of Europe continued to occupy primary importance, the defence of the Middle East also began to take a high priority in the mind of Washington as it was believed that this region would be the next place where Moscow would instigate trouble.³

In this context the State Department began to show a keener interest in the Anglo-Egyptian dispute as it saw that the presence of Britain in the Suez base was crucial to the defence of the Middle East.⁴ On 25 July the National Security Council concluded that 'the danger of Soviet resort to war, either deliberately or by miscalculation, may have been increased by the Korean war'.⁵ As a result, an increasing possibility of Soviet aggression and Britain's inability to defend the Middle East alone convinced Washington on the need to play a more active role in the region. However, Washington still refused to commit any forces in the Middle East.

In this modified American strategy Turkey began to be seen in the European security context as the defence of Europe took the highest priority in Washington's mind. The main reasons for the US thinking were: first, that the new Turkish government in Ankara was a truly democratic regime which had come to power as a result of the first free elections and hence Turkey should be regarded as a part of Western civilisation; second, the new government's active foreign policy and its swift and wise decision to participate in the Korean war, not to mention her military accomplishments, made a great impact on American opinion of the reliability of Turkey as an ally in a global war; third, in the face of the

increasing risk of general war as a result of the Korean conflict and of uncertainty over the Suez base attributable to the political and military weakness of the Arab states, Turkey assumed a much greater strategic importance in the new American strategy as its military officials planned to use Turkish airfields in wartime to slow down Soviet advances southwards and to strike at Russia's important strategic assets.⁶

However, substantial differences between Britain and the USA emerged over the strategic role of Turkey. Unlike Washington, London saw Turkey's defence as within the responsibility of British Middle Eastern Headquarters. Britain still attached the utmost importance to the defence of the Middle East, not least to maintain its global imperial position but also in response to the defence requirements for the region as a result of the recent developments in South East Asia.

Nevertheless, the British defence strategy was not acceptable to Turkey either. Though Turkey wanted to take part in the defence of the Middle East her priority was to join NATO. Moreover, the new Democrat government in Ankara, unlike its predecessors and given its active foreign policy, did not want to play a subordinate role but a leading role in the affairs of the Middle East. This obviously clashed with the British political objectives which required Britain's leading position being maintained in the region. The clash of interests not only temporarily soured Anglo-Turkish relations but also resulted in a further shift from Turkey's reliance on Britain to reliance on the USA in the spring of 1951. Anglo-Turkish relations began to improve only after 1952 when Britain accepted the full attachment of Turkey's defence to that of Europe.

The New Democrat Government's Determination to Pursue an Active Foreign Policy

The results of the Turkish elections of 14 May 1950 signalled a significant change not only in Turkey's domestic politics but also in her foreign policy. To begin with, the outcome replaced nearly three decades of the ruling RPP by the newly elected Democrat Party. Following this victory, Celal Bayar took charge of the presidency while Adnan Menderes and Fuat Köprülü came to the office of Prime Minister and Foreign Minister respectively.

The Democrat Party had maintained rather a different emphasis in domestic policy from that of the Republican Party during the electoral campaign. Breaking with their predecessor's policies, the Democrats supported a more liberal economic policy and promised to grant more freedoms and tolerance in matters of human rights, religious practices and

other fields.⁷ After the electoral victory therefore the new government modified the former government's approach to the people as its supporters were mainly consisted of middle and lower class traders, artisans, villagers and traditional-religious people. Contrary to RPP's radical interpretation of Kemalist ideology both in social and economic planes the democrats adopted a soft line in their interpretation of the Kemalist philosophy by advocating a state-free economy and becoming more tolerant to people's values and beliefs.⁸

While the new government had fully supported the main themes of their predecessor's foreign policy, namely the determination to resist Soviet threat and the achievement of Turkey's adherence into the Western block, it differentiated from the RPP on the implementation of the agreed policy of alignment with the West. The key differences were that the new government wanted to make further efforts for firmer relations with the West on the one hand and it wished to adopt closer relations with the Arab world on the other hand.

These were especially distinguishable when the democrat leaders charged the Republican Party with incompetence in not having achieved NATO membership and with inadequate economic and social policies.⁹ Even the Democrat's semi-official paper, *Zafer*, further said of the previous governments that 'they had not [been] much concerned with such vital national matters as Turkey's inclusion in the Atlantic pact' and their insensitive attitude was the main reason for the Turkish failure to be included in NATO.¹⁰ Moreover, the democrat leaders had already criticised the former government on its neglect of their Arab neighbours.¹¹

Comparing with their predecessors, the Democrats adopted a rather different approach to the Middle East. In his first post-election press conference, Köprülü declared that his government would adopt 'a more active' foreign policy towards the Middle East.¹² He even suggested the revival of the Sadabad Pact, which had been initiated by Atatürk in the mid-1930s, on the grounds that Turkey had natural links with the Middle Eastern countries.¹³ This was followed by another statement, given by Köprülü in an interview with a newspaper correspondent in Paris on 8 June 1950, in which he pointed out:

Our foreign policy, which has inclined towards the West since the Second World War, will be more active in that direction as a result of the recent election in Turkey. I can say in general that since then there has been no change in our foreign policy. It is our wish, however, that more attention be paid to Eastern security.¹⁴

Simultaneously, the new Turkish Foreign Minister made it clear that Turkey would pursue more collaboration with the USA in the Middle East. In a statement to the American International News Service, on 19 August, Köprülü stated that 'Turkey as the strongest and ablest country of the region, possessed a crucial role for the security and stability of the Middle East and thus this necessitated more cooperation between the USA and Turkey.'¹⁵

These views on the new active trend of Turkish foreign policy were also repeated by the Prime Minister in a speech on the new government's programme to the National Assembly on 29 May. After references to Turkey's sincere attachment to the ideals of the UN, Menderes said that:

The [Turkish] government is determined to consolidate still further their political, economic and cultural relations with the United States, to whom the Turkish nation were bound by sentiments of sincere gratitude for the Truman doctrine and Marshall aid, as well as with Great Britain and France. In order to ensure the security of the Eastern Mediterranean, the importance of which for world peace is becoming daily more clear, the government felt it necessary to draw the attention of their friends and allies to this problem and, at the same time, to seek closer relations with the states of the Near East. The rapid realisation of those objectives is, in the government's view, of the utmost importance to the security of this whole region, and therefore of the world.¹⁶

These statements also indicated that the Democrat government's interest in the security of the Eastern Mediterranean was a part of their overall strategy which based on the achievement of Turkey's access into the Western defence system. This was especially apparent in the speech of the President of the Turkish Republic, at the opening of the GNA on 1 November, who fully supported the government's views on foreign policy.¹⁷

Thus, the Democrat Party was prepared to differ from its predecessors in foreign policy matters by pursuing more dynamic steps in Middle Eastern and Western directions. It wanted to play a bridging role between the Middle East and the West in order to enhance Turkey's regional status and contribute to the security and stability of the region against Soviet danger.¹⁸

Though the new government's policies did not represent a radical shift from its predecessor's line it nevertheless indicated a substantial change in

the reorientation of Turkey's foreign policy for two reasons: first, in contrast to the former party in power the leaders of the Democrat Party saw themselves as the senior regional players who were most suited to play a leading role in the region. They found this role a means of inducing the Western powers, especially the USA, to pay more attention to Turkey. Second, unlike the Republican Party, the Democrats gave more weight to Turco-American relations than to Anglo-Turkish relations or at least gave equal weight to the two relationships.¹⁹

Despite the fact that Köprülü initially declared, on 26 May, that 'the Anglo Turkish alliance formed the basis of Turkish policy',²⁰ this was to be modified over time by attributing special importance to the development of Turco-American relations. In effect the Democrat rule represented the beginning of an obvious shift from Turkish reliance on Britain to reliance on the USA.

The election of the new government in Turkey was well received by both the British Foreign Office and the US State Department.²¹ Charles' first impressions were that 'the new Prime Minister will be more co-operative and accessible than his predecessor' on international issues,²² a view echoed by the Foreign Office which concluded that 'the new Turkish government might be more ready than its predecessor to take an interest in the Arab world as a whole'.²³

Similar positive views were expressed in Washington. The Democrat Senator, Fulbright, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in his address to the Senate on 26 May praised the recent Turkish elections by stating that 'in the old world, in Turkey, the election was an event of great importance to us [the USA] and to all other people who are interested in free democratic process and the democratic form of government'.²⁴ After describing the election as 'a turning point in Turkish history' he revealed the fact that the previous prevailing single party system in Turkey was the main reason for the longstanding American indifference towards a possible Turco-American collaboration since the early years of the Turkish Republic.²⁵

Turkey's Campaign for Membership of NATO (1950–51)

The democrats had long argued that the legacy of the previous governments to the new administration was a bankrupt economy in domestic affairs and diplomatic and political isolation in external affairs.²⁶ The new ruling party therefore took lessons from the past. It already fully recognised that the failure of the previous governments, under İnönü's rule, to

pursue an active policy during the Second World War was the main reason for Turkey's international isolation.²⁷

In order to break this isolation the Democrats lost no time in approaching the US and UK governments for firmer cooperation and put pressure on them to make a formal commitment to Turkey's security. The Turkish Ambassador made enquires at the British Foreign Office on 31 May and 1 June 1950 about the outcome of the Turkish memorandum prepared by the previous government on 3 May. As power changed hands in Ankara, the new Turkish MFA instructed the Ambassador in London to establish the nature of the Western responses to the memorandum.²⁸

In response to the Turkish Ambassador's enquiry, Sir William Strang, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office made the following usual points:

First, the Turkish government has already been informed by the United States government that the USA cannot enter into any further political commitments at present. Second, it would be scarcely possible for the United States to enter into military understandings with Turkey in the absence of political commitments. Third, British military plans for the Middle East are dovetailed into those of the USA and military understandings between the United Kingdom and Turkey would have little meaning without the participation of the USA, a participation which is at present impossible because of the political commitments entailed.²⁹

Therefore, as happened in the many previous attempts, the latest attempt by the previous government met with frustration. In fact this last attempt showed that the Republican government had favoured a focus on the establishment of an eastern Mediterranean pact rather than on pursuing membership of NATO. This may have been because it had lost hope of being included in the Atlantic Pact and hence the RPP chose an alternative scheme.

Though the new Democrat government also sounded the possibility of establishing an eastern Mediterranean Pact,³⁰ its main focus was to gain NATO membership. The Democrat leaders pointed out that they saw no practical value in a Mediterranean pact unless it was formally linked to the Atlantic Pact.³¹ The new Democrat Party indeed had long ago prepared itself to take a firmer approach than its predecessor towards getting a formal American commitment which would, the Democrats believed, be the only solution against the possible Soviet aggression to Turkey.³²

Unlike their predecessors, the Democrats maintained that Turkey's success in gaining NATO membership was closely related to her active involvement in regional or international politics in collaboration with the Western powers. They even rejected the French proposal for the establishment of a Mediterranean pact, which included the USA, on the grounds that the Turkish government had already determined on joining NATO.³³

The outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June 1950 hence created a ground to the new Turkish government to pursue its main objective in the field of external affairs. Turkey saw it as a chance to display its active collaboration with UN principles and with Western policies. The crisis broke out after the attack by North Korea on the South. The Turkish government was swift in responding to the UN resolution, which called for the establishment of peace in the region by all means, including the use of force.³⁴ On 30 June Köprülü announced Turkish support for the UN resolution in the Turkish Assembly. On 25 July the government decided to send a brigade of 4500 men to Korea. Public opinion largely supported the decision. Indeed, Britain and France were criticised by the Turks for not having responded yet to the UN appeal.³⁵

The rapid Turkish decision to take part in the Korean War made a great impact on foreign opinion.³⁶ Some of the American statesmen including Senator Cain and Wadsworth, American Ambassador in Ankara, promised Köprülü that they would now work to press on Washington for Turkey's admission to NATO.³⁷

Meanwhile, the Turkish government publicly declared that it regarded this act as a means, towards securing membership of the Atlantic Pact for Turkey.³⁸ Even the Turkish press proclaimed that Turkey had secured NATO membership with its participation in the Korean War.³⁹ Moreover, the government officially made this point known to foreign missions. Köprülü, on 22 July, told Wadsworth that the Turkish response to the UN's request would 'bear witness to its sincere desire, manifested by practical action, its loyalty to the UN and to Turk[ey]-USA collaboration' and added that 'we [the Turks] wish particularly that our reply conforms with US policy and public opinion'.⁴⁰ Later, on 30 July, he made it clear to Charles that Turkey collaborated with the UN 'in the interests of world peace and of Turkey herself' and in the light of the critical world situation 'they [the Turkish government] considered that they should become members of the Atlantic Pact and he hoped that they might rely on the full support of HMG to bring this about'.⁴¹

Soon after the announcement to send troops to Korea, the Democrat government began to launch a series of diplomatic offensives to obtain

Western support for Turkey's NATO membership. On 29 July Köprülü informed Wadsworth of the Turkish view that the 'critical world situation impelled reconsideration of Turkey's place in over-all western mutual defence'.⁴² Then he laid a strong emphasis on the Turkish wish to join NATO and made it clear that Turkey would expect this 'vital matter' to be considered by the Western powers at their forthcoming tripartite meeting of foreign ministers in New York on 13 September 1950.⁴³

The next day the Turkish Foreign Minister approached the British and the French Ambassadors to urge them to support Turkey's application to join NATO.⁴⁴ A few days later President Bayar repeated the Turkish request to Charles. In these conversations the Turkish leaders stressed the precarious security position of Turkey in the light of events in Korea by making the following points:

The Truman Doctrine and declarations by Acheson are too vague in the serious situation of the world today. The fact that the United Kingdom and France are already so committed under the 1939 Treaty is not considered enough. A formal United States guarantee of help in the case of aggression is now required.⁴⁵

Contemporaneously, the British Foreign Office began to consider seriously the Turkish demand at the beginning of August and afterwards. Its initial reaction was that until the problem of Middle Eastern defence, which was now under Anglo-American examination, became clear the Turks had to be kept outside NATO since its primary interests lay in the Mediterranean region and it had no 'direct connexion with the North Atlantic area'.⁴⁶ Then the various departments of the Foreign Office embarked on a comprehensive survey to verify whether the extension of NATO membership to Turkey and Greece was advantageous or not. In their preliminary stage in early August the heads of the Western and the Southern Departments, C.A.E. Shuckburgh and A. Rumbold, concluded to begin with that granting these countries' membership of NATO would not be advantageous for three main reasons.

First, the concept of NATO was to build an Atlantic community on the basis of 'political and economic association of nations having common traditions etc'. Hence, if it was extended to Greece and Turkey and possibly other Middle Eastern states, this would destroy the concept and make it 'nothing more than a military alliance against Russia'. Second, the addition of Greece and Turkey to NATO would spread the security risks and military problems, which could jeopardise the success of the organisation.

Last, there was strong opposition from Denmark and other small member countries to the extension of the pact.⁴⁷

There were also additional points which militated against the admission of these two states:

First, we should have to give the Turks and Greeks a closer insight than they now possess into our defence plans for the area; the Turks [would] discover that we proposed to send them next to no help in the event of war...Second, no Atlantic Pact power would wish to be committed to going to war in defence of Greece if she is attacked by a northern neighbour, whether with or without the Soviet Union...⁴⁸

While these Foreign Office departments were against the extension of the pact to Turkey and Greece they were, however, well aware that there was a need to satisfy the Turkish demand by involving an American guarantee in some other ways. There were two alternatives in British minds for an American commitment to Turkey; one was the idea of an eastern Mediterranean Pact and the other was a unilateral American guarantee to Turkey parallel to the Anglo-Turkish alliance.⁴⁹ The senior Foreign Office officials, such as Sir Pierson Dixon, Michael Wright and William Strang, later confirmed these views.⁵⁰

However, the realisation of either alternative was difficult since the USA did not want to extend its commitments further. Of these two alternatives the Foreign Office preference was for a unilateral extension of the American commitment to Turkey since the negotiation of an eastern Mediterranean Pact would be a long and 'difficult business'. This was also the opinion of the British COS. Therefore the job of Bevin in the forthcoming tripartite meeting in New York in mid-September would be confined to explaining British views to Acheson without pressing him to go for one solution rather than another.⁵¹

In reality, the Foreign Office did not want Turkey's inclusion in NATO for different strategic and political reasons. It thought that Turkey would not provide a serious military contribution outside its own territory and hence there would be no advantage in having Turkey involved in the defence of the Atlantic area. Besides, Turkey had a bad record in the past. She had not carried out her commitments under the 1939 treaty during the last war. It further added that a possible neutral position on the part of Turkey in the initial stages of a future war would be advantageous to Britain. Thus, bearing in mind all these points, the Foreign Office saw a unilateral American guarantee to Turkey as the best course.⁵²

Despite their unsatisfactory results, these British deliberations showed that the Foreign Office, for the first time, seriously considered the issue of Turkish security and tried to find some satisfactory solutions. This was due to the new Democrats' successful diplomacy which had borne some fruit. Following its involvement in the Korean War, all this pressure from Turkey and its hard work clearly indicated that the Democrat government distanced itself from its predecessor by pursuing a more active foreign policy. Though it was not the first attempt, Turkey's participation in the Korean War marked the first occasion which had involved deploying her troops outside her territory since the establishment of the Turkish Republic.⁵³

Consequently, at the tripartite meeting of 13 September, the Americans rejected the British idea of a unilateral extension of the US guarantee to Turkey on the grounds that 'such a course was not practical'. Instead, Washington insisted on associating Turkey and Greece with the military planning of NATO concerned with the defence of the Mediterranean. Although the offer itself was regarded as unsatisfactory in meeting the Turkish demands nevertheless the three foreign ministers (American, British, and French) agreed to put these American suggestions before the meeting of the Atlantic Council.⁵⁴

The next day, at the meeting of the NATO Council, all the deputies accepted the American proposal without any opposition. On 16 September the decision was approved by the NATO Council.⁵⁵ Acheson agreed to communicate this decision in a *note verbale* to the Turkish government. On 19 September Acheson informed the Turkish Ambassador in Washington, F.C. Erkin, that the Council had considered seriously the Turkish request and recognised Turkey's importance but was unable to extend full membership to Turkey on the grounds that the organisation needed to be strengthened before any admission became possible. Therefore, Turkey could only be invited to associate herself with the plans of NATO concerned with the defence of the Mediterranean area.⁵⁶

Erkin, however, found this offer quite unsatisfactory. He said that he was afraid of a great Turkish public reaction. Then, he asked Acheson whether there was any possibility of doing something more or any possibility of making a unilateral US commitment. The latter responded that there was nothing to be done about changing the decision and explained that the US government was not ready for a further commitment to any country. He simply advised Erkin that it was better for Turkey to accept the offer.⁵⁷

In effect, the Council's decision was the second best alternative, which chimed well with the British policy. Since it considered Turkish involvement in any Middle East defence plans as a fundamental principal, the Turkish association in Mediterranean defence plans could be regarded as a first step towards this end. In consequence the British Foreign Office instructed Charles to persuade the Turks that this was the best decision for them, even better than gaining NATO membership.⁵⁸

In doing so, Charles, on 26 September, tried hard to convince Köprülü. He told the latter that Bevin had already sent instructions to reassure the Turkish Foreign Minister of 'Britain's intimate preoccupation with Turkey's internal and external position and of Mr. Bevin's hope that Turkey, in our mutual interest, would see her way to accept the offer of the Council'.⁵⁹

In response to the Foreign Office query, the Turkish Ambassador in London, Cevat Açıkalın, expressed the view that the Council's decision represented a substantial advance for Turkey's position, compared with many earlier unsuccessful attempts, but still found it inadequate since it did not meet many Turkish security needs.⁶⁰ The Turkish government concurred with Açıkalın's opinion. The Foreign Minister told the British Ambassador that, although the Turks were disappointed about their exclusion from the pact, they nevertheless saw the Council's offer as a first step towards full membership of NATO, for which they would continue to press.⁶¹ Then, on 3 October, Erkin informed the State Department that the Turkish government had accepted the Council's offer of participation in military planning for the Mediterranean.⁶²

The Turkish press received the news with some regret and surprise. Some papers, such as *Kudret* and *Hürriyet*, harshly criticised this outcome while others were such as *Zafer* and *Akşam* moderate in their comments. The independent, *Hürriyet*, regarded the decision of the Western powers as 'an example of their Christian prejudice against Muslim Turkey'. *Kudret* (the Nationalist Party paper) even called on Köprülü to resign because of the failure to gain membership of NATO. Many writers put the blame for Turkey's exclusion on the narrow-minded approaches of the smaller members of the Atlantic Pact.⁶³

The Democrat Government's Early Relations with the Arab States in 1950

The Democrat leaders had already indicated a greater interest in improving Turco-Arab relations long before they came to power. Though at the time the RPP had maintained relatively better relations with the Arab countries,

Köprülü began to express his ideas on Turco-Arab relations as early as the first months of 1947 and claimed even firmer collaboration between Turkey and the Arab World.⁶⁴ Shortly after he took charge of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, he informed the Arab diplomatic missions that the new regime was willing to establish cordial relations with their governments and was ready to repair the damage which had been done by previous governments.⁶⁵

As noted earlier, security matters had always occupied a central place in traditional Turkish foreign policy; thus, it was natural for the Democrat government to give primary importance to the issue of Turkey's protection in its external relations. While Turkey's major objective was to obtain Western support for its security through attaining NATO membership, she wanted to reinforce her position further by extending the security belt into the Middle East through close collaboration with the Arab states.⁶⁶

The idea of linking Turkey's contribution to regional security to membership of NATO had already been advanced by Menderes and Köprülü to Wadsworth during their talks on 21 August. They indicated to the American Ambassador that Turkey's entry to NATO 'would buttress wavering morale in the Near East and this would make easier for Turkey 'to play a positive role in the Arab countries'. For instance, Turkey could more effectively 'facilitate Anglo-Egyptian settlement [and] pursue private staff talks with Iran and Greece'.⁶⁷

Moreover, the Democrat government maintained that the achievement of Turkey's major objective depended on her ability to convince the Western powers of the importance of the Middle East to Western security and of Turkey's ability to bring the regional states into collaboration with the West.⁶⁸ In other words, the Democrat government's policies towards the Arab states were an extension of Turkey's alignment with the West.

In specific terms there were additional elements such as economic, cultural and political points in the Arab policies of the new Turkish government, beyond the question of security. First, the Democrat government believed that Turkey had long historical and cultural kinship with the states of the region and this necessitated closer relations between Turkey and the Arab states.⁶⁹ Second, the Democrats intended to enhance Turkey's international status by assuming a major role in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.⁷⁰ Third, Turkey needed further economic aid for its development and this, in the party's view, was closely tied up with its capacity to assist the Western powers in the Middle East.⁷¹

The first Turkish step towards this end was taken after the Korean War broke out. The Turkish MFA, with encouragement from the Ameri-

can Ambassador, approached the Arab representatives in Ankara to urge them to support the UN action in Korea. These efforts in fact brought some success as far as Iraq was concerned.⁷² The Iraqi government conveyed the message of its support to the UN in early July.⁷³ Köprülü, however, was much disturbed at the Egyptian attitude of neutrality towards the UN decision. In a conversation on 5 August, he expressed his regret to Bevin about it. Köprülü also said that Turkey's relations with the rest of the Arab states were making progress since 'the Arab governments now believed in Turkish sincerity and appreciated his [Köprülü's] frank speaking to their representatives in Ankara'.⁷⁴

However, this initial Turco-Arab intimacy was soon to be damaged by the competition between Turkey and Lebanon to be elected to a seat on the Security Council. Towards the end of July Turkey started its campaign to obtain the seat which was to be vacated by Egypt at the end of 1950.⁷⁵ The Democrat government's decision to seek election to the Security Council was entirely consistent with its endeavours of playing an active role in international relations and thereby increasing Turkey's international stance.

When this news became known, the Arab news agencies called on Arab opinion to oppose Turkey's nomination for membership of the Council.⁷⁶ Since the establishment of the UN, the seat reserved for the Middle East had been occupied by an Arab state. Turkey had already lost the competition for this seat to Egypt during the previous Republican regime in 1948. However, the new Turkish government was not willing to lose this seat to anyone in the forthcoming election.

Finally, after protracted competition between the Lebanon and Turkey over the election of the Middle East representative, Turkey was selected (on 7 October 1950) to membership of the Security Council for a two-year term starting 1 January 1951.⁷⁷ The Turkish leaders regarded this success as an enhancement of Turkey's prestige and an appreciation by the Western powers of her importance in world affairs.⁷⁸ The American fervent support for the Turkish candidacy in the UN proved that the Democrats' calculations were correct in thinking that their active policy would soon to be appreciated by the West.⁷⁹

Though Ankara hoped that her election would not affect Turkey's relations with the Arab states,⁸⁰ it did, however, cause a momentary setback between the two sides. The reason lay in the different approaches in their respective policies. While Turkey saw herself as the strongest candidate because of her mediator position between the Arabs and Israel in the

Palestine CC, the Arabs considered that they needed this seat in anticipation of discussions on certain aspects of the Palestine question.⁸¹

There was also additional point on Arabs' opposition to Turkey's election. As their predecessors had done the Democrats continued to adopt a balanced relationship between the Arab states and Israel. Turkey signed its first trade agreement with Israel in July 1950, short after the establishment of her diplomatic ties with Israel. This hence created additional resentment on the side of the Arab states towards Turkey. Ironically, the development of Turco-Israeli relations coincided with the increased Ankara's efforts to seek for early rapprochement with the Arab capitals. By doing this Turkey, aimed to obtain both the Arab and Israeli cooperation against the Soviet influence. This was indeed a very difficult task. The Democrats nevertheless were convinced of achieving this job for the interests of regional security in general and that of Turkey in particular.

Despite some setbacks in Turco-Arab relations, however, the new government's early policies in the region were in general successful as far as the Sadabad powers of Iraq, Afghanistan and Iran were concerned. This was clearly illustrated when the representatives of these powers responded positively to the suggestion of the Turkish President. President Bayar, in his speech at the opening of the GNA on 1 November 1950, after emphasising the need for further Turkish collaboration with these states, reminded the Turkish Deputies of the importance of the Sadabad Pact for the stability of the region.⁸² He indicated that 'Turkey wishes to establish closer relations with the Arab states and thus to contribute to the establishment of peace and security in the Near and the Middle East'. He then made a reference to the Sadabad Pact describing it as a source of regional peace and stability and indicated that its value would be better appreciated in due course.⁸³

Upon these suggestions and references the representatives of the Sadabad powers in Ankara declared their support for a possible Turkish initiative to revive the Sadabad Pact.⁸⁴ The Iranian designated Ambassador to Ankara had even proclaimed his country's idea to the British Ambassador in Tehran on 24 June, saying that there was a need for common military plans to be made between Iran and Turkey.⁸⁵

In fact, the Turkish overtures for the restoration of the long dormant Sadabad Pact constituted the roots of the Democrats' regional strategy, the 'Triangular Strategy'. In contrast to general Arab attitude the positive reactions of the Sadabad powers to the establishment of a regional pact encouraged Turkey to develop her strategy after the British defence plans were doomed into a failure in mid-1953.⁸⁶

In addition to these positive developments between Turkey and the regional states, the former's relations with Syria also began to improve. Towards the end of July, Turkey and Syria had agreed to increase their trade and then an agreement was signed between them.⁸⁷ These states further planned to increase their cooperation in combating communist activities. In early October they agreed on an exchange of information on communism.⁸⁸

British Attitude towards Turkey's Accession to NATO (1950–51)

Following Turkey's acceptance of the offer of the association with NATO in the defence of the Mediterranean there had been delay in the implementation of this offer. This was due to disagreement between Britain and the USA over the responsibility for the defence of the Mediterranean region. Therefore Turkey's role in the regional defence arrangement had to wait for the elucidation of the situation.⁸⁹

After its inclusion into NATO's defence planning in the Mediterranean area, Turkey occupied a central place in the Anglo-American debate about her strategic role. While Britain wanted to attach Turkey in its Middle East defence plans through the NATO Standing Group (the permanent NATO steering body with US, British and French membership), the Americans wanted to associate Turkey with European defence. For the British, a Middle East pact on the NATO scheme, which included Turkey, Britain and the USA would be a perfect model to attract other Middle East states and Egypt to join in.⁹⁰

From October 1950 onwards Turkey began increasingly to put pressure on the USA and Britain because of the delay in the implementation of the Western decision regarding the issue of Turkey's association with NATO. To this end Köprülü made an attempt with Wadsworth on the question.⁹¹

Simultaneously Ankara began to make queries with British Embassy by asking questions about the nature of British assistance in the event of war and the coordination of planning between Britain, Turkey and the USA.⁹² In mid-December the Turkish Foreign Minister put a formal request for Anglo-Turkish staff talks to implement the Anglo-Turkish alliance in view of the critical world situation.⁹³

This proposal, however, caused some division of opinion between the British Foreign Office and the COS on how to respond it. On the one hand, the COS saw this request as an opportunity to involve Turkey in the defence of the Middle East since they attached prime importance to making use of the 19 Turkish divisions for the defence of this region. The

COS and General Robertson thought that they should open immediate candid talks with the Turks about the present position of their allies and explain to them the 'frank truth' that Turkey would receive little help from the West if she was attacked by the Soviets.⁹⁴

On the other hand, the Foreign Office wanted to avoid giving a formal reply to Turkey until General Robertson's visit there in February 1951. The reason was that the knowledge that there was little Western assistance for Turkey would be a severe shock to the Turks and might seriously damage the budding relationship with them. So it maintained that Britain should keep this issue dark until the West became stronger.⁹⁵ However, the COS concluded that a refusal of the Turkish request might disappoint them and insisted on frank and open discussions with the Turks especially after the Anglo-American military discussions planned for late January, which would make clear the role of Turkey in the defence of the Middle East.⁹⁶ Finally, an agreement was reached about following a middle course between these two opposing views by letting the Turks know a small amount of information about the Allies' intentions and capabilities in a future war.

General Robertson eventually paid a visit to Turkey, on 21–24 February 1951, to discuss the issue of Anglo-Turkish defence coordination. His chief aim was to integrate Turkey into the defence of Middle East along with Britain.⁹⁷ The British General first visited President Bayar and they in general talked about the issues related to Middle Eastern defence. They both agreed on the necessity to do something about filling the defence gap in the Middle East in order to deter possible future Soviet aggression. The Turkish President made a strong emphasis on Turkey's determination to meet a possible Soviet assault. Bayar's explanations indeed were important for the understanding of general Turkish perceptions of the Soviet threat:

...the world now is divided to two blocs. No solution has yet to be founded in the problems between the two blocs. Some temporary measures have been taken but these do not provide for a lasting solution and would only delay the outbreak a future war. It is our idea that peace can not be obtained through an appeasement of the enemy [the Soviet Union]. We are preparing our nation both materially and spiritually against such a threat. If the world war three breaks out Turkey with her strong friends and allies will do its utmost duty to face the danger. You can trust on Turkey about this...⁹⁸

General Robertson responded that he fully agreed with Bayar's views. The British General then engaged in military conversations with Nuri Yamut, the Chief of the TGS, on 23 and 24 February and in the end both parties provisionally agreed, subject to the confirmation of the Turkish government, to establish coordination between the TGS Headquarters and the British Headquarters in the Middle East. For this purpose the TGS stated that it would 'be glad to have at Ankara [an] appropriate representative of British Headquarters in the Middle East for further coordination of plans and intelligence...'⁹⁹

They also agreed that the area bounded on the east by the Persian Gulf and on the west by Turkey in Europe formed one strategic area which included three focal points: first, Turkey; second, the oilfields of Iraq, Persia and the Persian Gulf; third, Egypt. During the discussions, however, General Robertson informed Yamut that the allies at this time lacked adequate forces to defend these areas and it should be their aim to create the necessary conditions to implement this strategy.¹⁰⁰

The British Foreign Office and military authorities initially described General Robertson's visit as 'most satisfactory' and a 'great success'.¹⁰¹ However, these over-optimistic observations were soon to be proved illusory when the Turkish government declined to approve the military agreement on the grounds that the military agreement, which embraced all states in the Middle East, was too far-reaching, extending beyond the scope of the Anglo-Turkish treaty.¹⁰² It also found that the forces which were under the command of General Robertson were not numerically sufficient for a military agreement. Therefore, Ankara concluded that Turkey would like to continue its military contacts with Britain through the British Embassy without establishing a military liaison organisation for the time being until NATO's Mediterranean planning became clear.¹⁰³

The actual truth for the repudiation of the Turkish government of the military agreement was that Ankara did not want to specifically engage in military discussions with Britain as this might weaken her strategic attempts with the USA. There was also a great deal of disagreement in the strategies of Britain and Turkey. While Turkey was primarily interested in integrating her defence into NATO Britain wanted to involve Turkey in the defence of the Middle East.¹⁰⁴

In the absence of gaining full NATO membership, Turkey wanted to collaborate with Britain in the defence of its territory but not in the defence of the entire Middle East under the Anglo-Turkish Treaty. Moreover, General Robertson's revelation that British defence plans included only the southern parts of Turkish territories, leaving the major

parts undefended, contrasted sharply with the Turkish strategy, which planned to defend the entire country. The general's other revelation that little help was possible from Britain in a major war, made the Turks more determined to seek a firm commitment from the USA since the Turks realised that there was not much to be gained by pursuing a bilateral defence understanding with Britain.

It was about this time when the Turkish Ambassador made another determined move to the State Department. Erkin stated that the Turkish government presently came to conclude that the association agreement neither had improved Turkey's safety nor filled the security gap in the eastern Mediterranean and the time came to consider the issue of Turkey's membership of NATO. Erkin added that if the USA was unable to support Turkey's membership for NATO it might take a choice of either concluding a direct alliance with Turkey or accessing to the Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1939. American response, though not entirely negative, was that it could not accept the last two options while still continued to examine the first option.¹⁰⁵

Meantime the Turkish repudiation of the military agreement came as a great shock to Britain. Charles expressed his great disappointment in his report to General Robertson and the Foreign Office.¹⁰⁶ The Turkish Ambassador in London was made aware of British resentment when he enquired about the outcome of the Anglo-Turkish military discussions with the head of the Southern department on 20 March. The Foreign Office and British military staff thought that the negative reaction of the Turkish government was due to the efforts of the American Ambassador 'whose anti-British views are well known'.¹⁰⁷

As a result, the Foreign Office decided to await the outcome of the second Anglo-American military meeting in Malta, which was due to take place on 12–13 March 1951, in the expectation that it might solve the issue of Turkey's role in relation to Middle East defence.¹⁰⁸ The British COS however was not happy from the outcome since Admiral Carney, the US Sixth Fleet Commander and designated Commander of NATO's Southern Flank, continued to argue that Turkey should be included under his command as the USA was supplying money and equipment for the Turkish Forces.¹⁰⁹

The British COS therefore concluded that the talks with Admiral Carney in Malta had not been fruitful and it was not possible to make plans with Turkey until Anglo-American differences were removed.¹¹⁰ For this reason Lord Tedder, Chief of the British Military Group, who was appointed to take charge of military discussions with the US authorities,

was informed that the Turkish issue was related both to the Mediterranean and the Middle East and the latter occupied a higher priority. Without Turkish collaboration, both Turkey and the Middle East could easily fall to a Soviet attack. Thus, Tedder would try to convince the USA that Turkey needed to be considered primarily within the orbit of the Middle East for planning purposes.¹¹¹

At the same time, the delay in implementing NATO's decision to associate Turkey and Greece in Mediterranean defence planning made Turkish opinion increasingly restive in view of the critical stage of relations between the USSR and the West and the general situation in Iran and in the Middle East. The Turks maintained that their quick response to the aggression in Korea exposed them to a Soviet attack and for this reason Köprülü, on 2 April 1951, made a renewed appeal in the Turkish Parliament for the full admission of Turkey into NATO.¹¹² Also, Açıkalın continued his frequent enquiries at the Foreign Office on the progress of Turkish association with NATO.¹¹³

The general nature of the British response was that a supreme Allied Command, Mediterranean, which was a prerequisite of the association of Turkey with NATO planning, had not yet been established and that the Standing Group in Washington had not yet finished studying to find a way of fitting Turkey into Mediterranean defence plans.¹¹⁴ At this time, from early April 1951 onwards, numerous press reports in the USA and statements by high ranking US officials on the lines that Britain and France were holding the Americans back from making Turkey a member of NATO, were greatly disturbing Turkish public opinion.¹¹⁵

When these reports became known to the Turkish press it began to mount bitter attacks against the UK, accusing her of being interested only in her own security.¹¹⁶ Charles considered the resulting articles as 'the worst press' attacks on Britain since 1939. Charles also reminded Herbert Morrison, who had succeeded Bevin as the new Foreign Secretary due to the latter's ill health, that if HMG would not modify its position of opposing Turkey's entry into NATO before this became officially known to the Turks, 'incalculable harm' would be done to Anglo-Turkish relations.¹¹⁷ This was because the USA had already supported Turkish admission into the Atlantic Pact, to which Britain and France remained opposed.¹¹⁸

Around this time the Americans, under strong Turkish representations, had already made up their minds to extend membership of the Atlantic Pact to Greece and Turkey despite British and French objections.¹¹⁹ Sir Oliver Franks, the British Ambassador in Washington, explain-

ed the reasons for this American decision as a result of the fact that 'Turkish stock now stands high in this country [the USA] because of the fine showing of the Turkish Brigade in Korea and of the size of the Turkish armed forces'.¹²⁰

The new American security policy, called NSC 109, and approved by the President on 23 May 1951, strongly recommended the inclusion of Turkey in NATO.¹²¹ This followed the submission of an American memorandum to the British and the French governments on 15 May, which requested their support for the accession of Turkey and Greece into NATO when the question was raised in the Council of Deputies.¹²² Franks, after reporting the American proposal, warned the Foreign Office that Britain should avoid opposing it since this could incur widespread criticism in the USA and thus force Britain to accept it under American pressure.¹²³

The Foreign Office and COS immediately began to examine what the British attitude to the American proposal should be. The COS concluded that 'the military advantages of including Greece and Turkey in the NATO outweigh the disadvantages' because the extension of NATO to Turkey would 'commit the USA to assist in the defence of Turkey and so tend to involve her in the defence of the Middle East'.¹²⁴

The preliminary Foreign Office conclusion was that while it maintained its previous reservations against Turkish membership of NATO (i.e. the extension of the Atlantic Pact would destroy its cultural, political and military character), it decided to modify the British attitude for certain reasons: first, there had been a serious hole in Middle East defence plans because of the American 'aloofness' from the area and this defence gap could be filled if Britain secured American commitments in the Middle East in return for British agreement to the Turkish-Greek membership of NATO; second, the Turkish armed forces would be a considerable addition to NATO strength and Turkey, where a considerable neutralist opinion existed, should be definitely be directed to support the Western side in a major war.¹²⁵

In actual fact, the main British objective was somehow to bring Turkey under the Middle East Command (MEC) and thereby its ultimate aim was to elicit American involvement in the area as the US government had already shown a keen interest in Turkish defence. Thus, the chief British worry was that the Americans might fit Turkey entirely into the defence plans of Eisenhower's European Command (SACEUR) in NATO and this would lead Britain to lose both American and Turkish support, which now became essential in any defence plans in the Middle East. For this

reason, the Foreign Office planned to utilize its support of Greco-Turkish NATO membership 'as a bargaining counter' in British negotiations with the Americans over the NATO Commands in the Mediterranean and Middle East.¹²⁶

Following the Anglo-American military discussions which took place in Washington in October 1950, the parties failed to reach an agreement on command arrangements in the Mediterranean and the Middle East until late 1951. The main dispute centred on command responsibility in the Mediterranean. The Americans, on the one hand, suggested the appointment of a British Supreme Allied Commander in the Middle East (SACME) instead of a British Supreme Commander in the Mediterranean and the presence of British Naval Command in the Eastern Mediterranean under SACME.¹²⁷ On the other hand, the British claimed the unity of the Mediterranean Command, including Turkey and Greece and the US Sixth Fleet, under British auspices.¹²⁸

By the end of May 1951 Britain and the USA had narrowed the area of their disagreement to two distinct points; the dilution of Admiral Carney's power over the Western Mediterranean, under the aegis of Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), and the inclusion of Greece in the Middle East Command.¹²⁹ To the Americans, the 'Mediterranean is nothing more than an extension of the Atlantic and the southern flank of Europe'.¹³⁰ They also insisted on the inclusion of Greece under the SHAPE.

Under American influence Britain eventually came to accept Turkey's membership of NATO but with certain conditions. This was a British offer of a 'package deal' to Turkey. In his communication to Köprülü on 3 July Morrison stated that the UK's support for Turkish membership of NATO was conditional on Turkey's participation in the MEC plans. In his response to Morrison's message, on 7 July, Köprülü made it clear that Turkey would not accept any condition on her entry into NATO but at the same time she was ready to take part in the MEC plans. Köprülü also informed the State Department of this view and the latter expressed its sympathy with it.¹³¹

Two weeks later Köprülü publicly announced the Turkish government's acceptance of British proposal indicating that:

We are convinced that the defence of the Middle East is vital for the defence of Europe for strategic and economic reasons. Therefore when Turkey enters the NATO she will be ready to make negotia-

tions with the concerned parties in order to deal effectively with the task she assumed and to undertake the necessary measures.¹³²

On 14 July, the British government also informed the Americans of their military proposals and a broad agreement was achieved between the two parties except on the issue of the Turkish role in the Middle East. A compromise was reached on the command scheme in the Mediterranean. Both parties agreed to the establishment of two major Allied naval commands in the Mediterranean, one American subordinated to SHAPE and the other British subordinated to SACME; these two naval commands would be linked through an arrangement at a later stage.¹³³

Though a broad Anglo-American understanding was reached on the defence matters there was still disagreement on their approaches to Turkey. On the one hand, the British government was pressing its 'package deal' idea. On the other hand, the USA was insisting that NATO membership should be extended to Turkey without any strings.¹³⁴

This disagreement remained to be solved among the allies for more than a month until the end of August 1951. On 24 August Açıkalın, acting on instructions from the Turkish Foreign Minister sought from the Foreign Office the current British position on Turkey's entry into NATO. Sir Pierson Dixon responded to the Turkish Ambassador that the North Atlantic Council would approve the Turkish accession to the treaty in principle in its next meeting (in Ottawa), and that between the Ottawa and the Rome meetings of the Council, there would be discussions with Turkey on the details of her participation in the MEC. Then a formal invitation to Turkey could be issued in Rome. However, this plan was rejected by the Turkish MFA and he immediately instructed Açıkalın that it would not be possible to hold talks with the western powers about the MEC until Turkey was fully admitted to NATO.

On 28 August Açıkalın delivered this message to Sir William Strang at the Foreign Office.¹³⁵ The Turkish view had already been announced by the State Department in the tripartite talks in Washington on 27 August. The British Foreign Office, therefore, concluded that 'the latest stiffening of the Turkish attitude is due to American influence'.¹³⁶ Under these circumstances, Morrison, with no room left to manoeuvre, instructed Charles, on 3 September, to inform Köprülü that HMG had now come round to supporting Turkey's entry to the Atlantic Treaty without conditions and on an equal footing. In response to this communication, the Turkish Foreign Office, on 12 September, expressed its satisfaction with the recent

British attitude and its general agreement about the Western plans on the process of MEC discussions.¹³⁷

Though Britain seemed to be in favour of full Turkish membership of NATO this was, in fact, a tactic which aimed to bring about Turkish participation in tripartite Western proposals before presenting them to Egypt on 12 October. Britain continued her attempts to convince the USA of the need for tying the Turkish defence in with its Middle East Command until the beginning of 1952.

While British plans to involve Turkey and the USA in the contemplated MEC were in progress, Britain, after some unsuccessful attempts, was preparing to make a fresh attempt to settle her problems with Egypt. Britain renewed this attempt towards the end of March 1951. At this time, the COS proposed a 'phased withdrawal' of British forces from Egypt, to last until 1956, after which the Suez base would be run by 3500 civilians. It also proposed to defend the base by an integrated Anglo-Egyptian defence system, requiring 10,000 RAF (Royal Air Force) personnel in Egypt.¹³⁸ The Cabinet, on 5 April, approved these proposals and decided to reopen negotiations with Egypt on the lines that the COS had suggested.¹³⁹

When the British proposals were presented to the Egyptian government on 11 April, however, it was not persuaded and two weeks later flatly rejected them, seeking instead complete British evacuation from the Canal Zone and unification of Egypt with the Sudan.¹⁴⁰ This outcome therefore let Britain believe that the command idea would be the only solution which might be acceptable to Egypt.

The new Command plans for the Middle East were under way in July 1951 and Morrison prepared to approach the Egyptian government with the new defence plans by proposing that Egypt should join the contemplated command as a founder member in return for providing base facilities. This was because the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Salahu'd-din Pasha, towards the end of the month, had already declared that the Egypt would not collaborate with Britain until complete evacuation of its forces from the former's territory and Egypt was ready to abrogate the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 if no progress was made.¹⁴¹

Britain continued to hope that the MEC was the only alternative for future negotiations with Egypt and asked for American support in this regard.¹⁴² In reality Britain had already suggested that Egypt should defend the Canal Zone on a multilateral basis in conversations between Bevin and Salahu'd-din in December 1950, but allied to the difficulties over the association of Greece and Turkey with the Mediterranean section of NATO, this scheme was not realised.¹⁴³

Morrison, on 15 August, wrote to Dean Acheson, the US Secretary of State, that it was necessary for Britain to maintain a main base in Egypt for the security of 'all freedom-loving nations' since Egypt 'never will be able to defend herself against aggression by a major power'.¹⁴⁴ He emphasised that though Egypt had flatly rejected the previous British proposals the contemplated MEC would provide an opportunity to make a new approach to Egypt. If Britain had to leave Egypt not only would this upset the MEC but it would also have an immense effect on Turkey. Morrison then concluded that Britain needed American support for a firm line of approach to Egypt.¹⁴⁵

The State Department, in communication with the Secretary of Defence, George Marshall, expressed its support for the British position in Egypt and asked the Defence Department for a reassessment of 'the maintenance of the present British troop strength and bases in Egypt both under present conditions and conditions of war'.¹⁴⁶

Morrison met with Acheson in Washington on 10 September 1951. After he had gone over the new British ideas and asked for US support, the latter stated that the US government had already recognised the need for British forces to remain in Egypt. Acheson further stated that the procedure of the MEC plans should be so palatable to the Egyptians that it would be difficult for them to reject the proposals.¹⁴⁷ Then, four days later, in a tripartite meeting with French participation, Morrison put forward his proposal that at the following meeting in Ottawa Turkey and Greece should be invited to join NATO and thereafter Turkey should be approached regarding MEC. As soon as the Turkish approval was received, an approach would be made to Egypt to invite her to join the command organisation. Both Acheson and Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, endorsed the suggestion.¹⁴⁸

Following this meeting, the NATO Council convened on 15–20 September in Ottawa to discuss the issue of Greco-Turkish association with Western defence and other issues related to Middle East defence and the politico-economic problems of the Atlantic Pact.¹⁴⁹ The question of Greco-Turkish association with the Atlantic Pact was put on the agenda on 17 September. Before this date there occurred a number of private meetings between the Americans, the British and the French to solve their differences among themselves.

In the evening of the same day, Acheson opened the discussion by indicating that both Greece and Turkey were democratic countries, despite the latter's having joined the ranks of democratic civilisation belatedly, and on this score, therefore, there should be no problem with their inclusion

into the pact from the social and cultural points of view.¹⁵⁰ From the military point of view, Acheson continued to state that both countries were of great importance to the southern flank of European defence since they could muster approximately 750,000 trained military personnel determined to resist any aggression. In the end Acheson concluded that it was necessary to extend membership of the pact to Greece and Turkey.¹⁵¹

Morrison then followed suit. After repeating Acheson's points the former said that HMG backed the rapid association of Greece and Turkey with the defence of the West. However, he said that there were some problems in the mind of HMG about the integration of these two countries into the NATO command structure. According to Morrison, the problem of Greek defence was a problem of European defence and thus she should belong to Eisenhower's command but the case of Turkey, where major parts of its territories lay in Asia, was different. He continued that there was a necessity to establish a defence organisation in the Middle East which 'without Turkey would be as absurd as to plan the defence of Western Europe without France.'¹⁵² Therefore, Morrison concluded that:

The UK would play its full part in bringing about the establishment of this Middle East defence organisation and we [Britain] felt sure that we would have the approval of other NATO countries in taking steps towards setting up a Middle East Command.¹⁵³

Consequently, the Atlantic Council, in its meeting on 20 September, admitted Turkey's entry into the treaty, subject to approval by the national parliaments of its members and thereafter an invitation should be sent to Turkey as soon as possible.¹⁵⁴ Britain, in essence, was, to a great extent, successful in its plans to convince NATO members of the importance of the MEC and to obtain Turco-American involvement in Middle Eastern defence under British auspices. She was, however, unable to bring Turkey's defence exclusively under the command of SACME which would be responsible to NATO as far as Turkish territories were concerned.

The British COS also were not happy with this last point. In their plan Turkey under SACME should be responsible to the Middle East Standing Group. They thought this would create serious problems, as it would involve NATO in Middle Eastern affairs.¹⁵⁵ They feared that this situation would in the end lead to Turkey's being drawn out of the orbit of SACME into that of SHAPE. But the Foreign Office thought that they already obtained assurances from the Turks and Americans on their full partici-

pation in the defence of the Middle East and hence there was nothing much to fear from Turkey's position.¹⁵⁶

Turkey's Involvement in Middle Eastern Defence Plans and Her Full Integration with NATO (1951–52)

Since the end of the Second World War some sort of defence pact for the Middle East had been an objective of British policy against a possible Soviet threat. Britain was determined to make this a reality in the period between 1950 and 1953. In order to realise this objective Britain needed to obtain American and Turkish assistance. The eruption of the war in South Asia provided Britain for an opportunity to involve the USA in the Middle East while Turkey was ready to render assistance to Britain in return for British support for her membership of NATO. Eventually Britain succeeded in involving Turkey and the USA in her defence plans in return for British agreement to lift her opposition to the Greco-Turkish entry to the NATO.

The year 1950 was crucial for the future of British Middle Eastern policies. The growth of British political and strategic problems in the Middle East pushed London to find some other means to solve its regional problems. The constant rising tide of Arab nationalism, the protracted Anglo-Egyptian dispute over the Suez Base, the inter-Arab regional rivalry between the Hashemite and Egyptian blocs and the Arab-Israeli dispute not only hit the British position hard but also resulted in a further escalation of instability in the Middle East.

While its dispute with Egypt was to continue, Britain also faced problems with Iraq, though they were not as difficult as in Egypt; Iraq had long demanded the renewal of the Anglo-Iraqi treaty by asking the return of British controlled air bases. Only in Jordan did Britain have a better political position. At his time the outbreak of the Korean War further increased Britain's anxiety about maintaining her political and economic position in the Middle East, in general, and her strategic position in Suez, in particular.¹⁵⁷

The eruption of the South East Asian conflict also brought the issue of the defence of the Middle East more seriously to the attention of the USA. During the early stage of the war, President Truman emphasised to his assistant, George Elsey, that 'if we just stand by, they'll [the Soviets] move into Iran and they'll take over the whole Middle East'.¹⁵⁸ This was in fact a clear indication that the USA was willing for the first time to accept some responsibility for the security of the Middle East. Hitherto Washington had regarded the defence of the Middle East as primarily a British res-

possibility and was not willing to accept any part of it.¹⁵⁹ As a result of this war the US government adopted a new security policy, which was called NSC 68, proposing a course of American action on an international level to defend the free world against the perceived Communist danger.¹⁶⁰

As a result, American policy-makers came to the conclusion that the USA in conjunction with the UK had to play a more active role in the Middle East to prevent possible Soviet aggression.¹⁶¹ Though believing that the area was still a British charge and recognising the political difficulties in a regional arrangement in the Middle East, the State Department had begun to see the importance of such a step to its security. The State Department also thought that a multilateral approach to regional defence might solve the Anglo-Egyptian dispute since it envisaged that the presence of Britain at Suez was crucial to the defence of the Middle East.¹⁶²

Therefore, on 10 September 1951, the British and American governments reached an agreement for the establishment of an inter-allied defence command in which Egypt would be a full partner. The plan was to set up a defence barrier with the participation of Britain, France, the USA, Egypt, Turkey and some of the Commonwealth states against the possible Soviet expansion to the Middle East. It, at the same time, represented a collective attempt by Britain to maintain its dominant position in the Middle East. According to the plan, the Middle East Command would be based on the existing British base in Suez. Britain expected that with the envisaged participation of Egypt and other states the long lasting Anglo-Egyptian dispute on the Suez Canal could be settled in the context of a multilateral defence pact.¹⁶³

Britain attributed great importance to Turkey's participation in the proposed Command because of her geo-strategic location, military potential and assumed prestige in the Arab world. These factors were deliberated in terms of functioning the command organization and that of persuading Egypt to join the organization.¹⁶⁴ Morrison therefore, on 20 September, sent a message to the Turkish MFA to inform him of the decision taken by the Atlantic Council and invited him to talk about the MEC plans. He proposed to send Field Marshal Sir William Slim, CIGS, to Turkey to explain British ideas on the new arrangement. Morrison also informed Köprülü that Britain also intended to invite Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Egypt to join in the planned MEC.¹⁶⁵

On 4 October, in response to Morrison's message, Köprülü expressed his gratitude for the British support given at Ottawa to Turkish accession to NATO. Then he made it clear that Turkey would enter the Atlantic Pact on an equal footing with the other members and its defence should

come under this pact. Köprülü welcomed an exchange of views among the western powers and the meeting of their representatives in Ankara on condition that this should not prolong the procedures of Turkey's admission into NATO.¹⁶⁶ Turkey, in fact, was very sensitive about her involvement in the British defence organization because it thought that this might cause a delay to full Turkish integration with NATO.

This had already been clearly reflected in a Turkish memo to the American Ambassador on 27 September. After expressing Turkey's enthusiasm to settle the problems in front of Turkey's full integration into NATO the note then made point to the issue of the Middle East defence:

Needless to say, the adoption of measures to prevent the groundless concern which the forthcoming contacts have been arousing in some NATO states from delaying Turkey's full integration in NATO is in the general interests. The government of the Republic has never refrained from stating its belief in the need for Egypt to participate on the basis of equality in the negotiations on the Middle East defence which naturally relate to her own security.¹⁶⁷

The disagreement however continued among the Western powers on the establishment of the Middle East Standing Group (MESG) which would be the highest authority dealing with the defence of the Middle East except apart from the defence of Turkey's territories. In the case of the latter, SACME would be responsible to NATO. The USA did not want Turkish representation in the MESG because this might detach Turkey from NATO and turn her to the Middle East, which they did not wish but which the British most wanted to happen.

The French were opposed because they did not want to see 'the inner circle of Great Powers' widened by the admission of anyone else. The British were ready to extend the membership of the MESG but they would firmly oppose it if Turkey claimed membership of the NATO Standing Group.¹⁶⁸ This issue was held over for further consideration in the forthcoming meeting in Paris.¹⁶⁹

As these Western plans clearly show that there was still a possibility of assigning Turkish forces to the Middle Eastern theatre under MESG even after Turkey was admitted to join NATO. They also show how right the Turks were in their suspicions of being drawn into the orbit of MEC and against this possibility their long insistence on the integration of Turkey into NATO under SHAPE.

At the Paris meeting held on 9 October 1951 involving the leading military officials of USA, Britain and France, the Western chiefs agreed that Turkey should come under SACME rather than SHAPE, as General Eisenhower suggested.¹⁷⁰ They also reached an understanding that Turkey's possible bid for membership of MESG should be resisted. Finally, they agreed to send their representatives to Ankara to hold discussions with the Turks on 12 October.¹⁷¹

At this time the escalated crisis in Anglo-Egyptian relations impelled Britain and the USA to concentrate their efforts on the Suez problem and implementation of the MEC plan and this hence caused a further delay in their dealing with the issue of Turkey's integration with NATO. Simultaneously, the British Ambassador in Egypt warned the Foreign Office on 3 October that Egypt's only interest in the contemplated MEC was to abrogate the 1936 Treaty and for this reason it was necessary to put the MEC proposals to the Egyptian government without delay.¹⁷² The British government was, however, unable to present the new proposals immediately to Egypt owing to the need to consult with its allies and the need to obtain Turkish participation in a tripartite Western initiation.¹⁷³

The Turkish Foreign Ministry however had some reservations on the merits of the MEC plan. Turkey wanted that Egypt should be invited to participate in the pact on equal footing and asserted that Egypt should not be confronted with a *fait accompli* and it should be let fully take part in the negotiation process. In spite of these reservations, however, the Foreign Relations Committee of the GNA on 27 September recommended the Turkish government to support the British plan which might solve the long lasting Suez problem thorough a multilateral pact on the condition that the right moment and the appropriate approach should be found before making a move to Egypt.¹⁷⁴

The Turkish attitude, though it had certain concerns, to go along with the MEC project was indeed consistent with her general policy of seeking accommodation with the West. Turkey reluctantly involved in the MEC project because she wanted to achieve its full integration with NATO with the support of Britain and the USA.

Four days before the American, British, and French military chiefs arrived in Turkey, Egypt had announced its decision to unilaterally abrogate the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 and the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium of 1899 on the Sudan on 8 October.¹⁷⁵ Upon this development Morrison, in a letter to Acheson, sought the US support and stated that Britain determined to go ahead with the MEC plans. He further stated that Britain would stand on her rights and hold the Suez base under the

1936 treaty and Sudan under the 1899 Condominium agreement until a satisfactory agreement was reached with Egypt on the new proposals. Morrison also indicated that, in case of Egyptian rejection of the proposals, MEC should be set up without Egypt, with its headquarters potentially in Cyprus.¹⁷⁶ Acheson agreed with these ideas.

Under these circumstances Turkey joined the three Western powers to invite the Egyptian government to join MEC on 13 October 1951.¹⁷⁷ On this date they called on Egypt to join MEC as a founder member on a basis of equality and partnership with the other founder members. According to the MEC proposals, the British forces which were not allocated to the command organisation would be withdrawn from Egyptian soil. The British base in the Suez Canal area would be turned into an allied base within the MEC, with full Egyptian participation in running it in peace and war. The proposals also offered the setting up of an air defence organisation responsible jointly to the Egyptian government and to the MEC.¹⁷⁸

As it had been expected, Cairo flatly rejected the proposals since they did not meet the Egyptian desire for the complete evacuation of foreign troops from the Suez base. Cairo continued to stick to her demands for complete British withdrawal and the unity of Egypt and Sudan under the Egyptian Crown. Two days after the delivery of the proposals the Egyptian Parliament, on 15 October, enacted the abrogation bill to repudiate the 1936 treaty and 1899 agreement.¹⁷⁹

The Egyptian rejection indeed did not much privately bother Ankara. This was because Egyptian participation in the MEC would have made it very difficult for Turkey to insist on allocation of her forces under NATO's command since the backbone of the MEC project was based on Turkish military contribution. Such a situation would have at least caused a further delay to the assignment of Turkish forces with NATO which continued to remain a matter of great urgency to Ankara.¹⁸⁰ Moreover, Britain had not adequately consulted Turkey as the former only asked the latter's participation in the joint western action to Egypt. Thus, Turkey almost had faced a *fait accompli* just as Egypt did. These points made Turkey reluctant to participate in the MEC though she had undertaken a commitment to do so.

As it was agreed in Paris the Western military delegation among them General Bradley, chairman of the joint COS of the USA, Field Marshal Slim, General Lecheres of France, arrived at Ankara on 12 October to hold talks with Turkish military and civil authorities about the MEC plans. However, the Egyptian refusal of the Western proposals changed the to-

pic of the discussions. Turkey found this occasion as an opportunity to press her case for bringing Turkey's defence under the Command of SHAPE. The visiting generals however did not agree with the Turks. They rather insisted that Turkey should take its place both in the MEC and SHAPE and the liaison between the two arrangements should be established through Turkey's membership of NATO and the Middle East Military Committee.¹⁸¹

At this juncture disagreement occurred between the Western generals and Turkish authorities and it was decided that Turkey should report her views to the NATO Standing Group and the place of Turkey between NATO and MEC should further be examined.¹⁸² As a result while this issue was to be solved among the allies at a later date, Turkey joined the three powers on presenting MEC proposals to Egypt.

The Egyptian negative response to the MEC proposals however made the British and American governments quite uncomfortable and they immediately responded to the Egyptian action. London regarded the repudiation as invalid and contrary to the provisions of the UN Charter and declared it would stand on the treaty and agreement. Washington expressed its 'great regret'.¹⁸³

In his communication with the COS on 29 October, Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary again under Churchill's new government as a result of the general elections of 25 October, suggested tough measures to maintain the British position in Egypt. Field Marshal Slim, however, took a more conciliatory attitude and said that the British object in Egypt was 'surely not simply to maintain our position in the Canal Zone but rather to try and reach a satisfactory settlement and prevent the dispute dragging on indefinitely...' The British COS hence determined to set up MEC with 'whole hearted American support' only as an alternative for the defence of the Middle East.¹⁸⁴ This policy was to be pursued, mainly by Britain, through 1952–53.

Acheson, on 16 and 19 October, sent a general message to American Middle East missions that the four powers would continue to go ahead with the MEC despite the Egyptian rejection and they should be prepared to make a quadripartite approach to other states in the area without delay before Egypt provoked these states against the MEC at the Arab League meeting. He also indicated that Washington would continue to support the British position as the Egyptian action was illegal.¹⁸⁵

Under these circumstances, the four sponsoring powers, on 6 November 1951, set up the principles upon which the MEC was based in the hope of 'developing pro-MEC sentiments in the Arab states and Israel'.¹⁸⁶

Turkey joined this attempt with some reservations. In the discussions with his counterparts in Paris in early November, Köprülü commented that the sponsoring powers should take into account the feelings of the Arabs and suggested further attempts to sound them out before issuing the text of the declaration. He added that this text should be prepared to seem as flexible as possible and it should reassure the Arabs over their fears of Israel. Four days later, upon American insistence, the sponsoring powers publicly announced these principles.¹⁸⁷

This declaration, however, could not be seen to have the effect on the Arab capitals that the sponsoring powers had wished. One of the main problems was Israel's connection with MEC with which no Arab states wanted to collaborate militarily. Moreover, the Arab states had already lent their support to Egypt in its struggle over the Suez zone at their Arab League meeting in September and October 1951. Though the joint western declaration was the first major step towards a collective Middle East defence system, it had some significant defections which made this a 'still-born' project. This was because the USA and France were not committing any forces to the command and Britain lacked adequate forces. Turkey, as a major contributor, was still reluctant to take part in the command before she entered fully into NATO on an equal footing with other members.¹⁸⁸

Though Turkey was reluctant to take part in the MEC plan she continued to support the British defence proposals because of the commitment she undertook to the project and her genuine concern about the security gap in the Middle East. Even Turkey strongly defended the project against the Soviet criticism and made a joint attempt with the other founders of the project, denying the Soviet charges on 24 November.¹⁸⁹

Turkey simultaneously made numerous public declarations to support the MEC project. One of the most important was made by the Prime Minister of Turkey in an interview with a Canadian correspondent on 27 November. Menderes' comments indeed provided brief but crucial insights into the philosophy of the Democrat government on the Middle East and the way in which they approached to the Arab states. The Turkish Premier stated that:

Any country desiring to maintain its independence and to [sic] progress must join and cooperate with the community of democratic nations. Some countries in the Middle East are hesitating about this...Some believe it would be possible to remain neutral, others believe that some Western democracies have imperialistic aims and therefore consider taking a stand against them. I am convinced it is

possible to lead these countries to the right path by means of a firm but patient and understanding policy. This is not an easy task because there are deep-rooted misunderstandings and a confused and exited atmosphere still prevails in the Middle East. However, important results can be obtained by patience and determination.¹⁹⁰

Contemporaneously, as Turkey continued to be reluctant to allocate her forces under the Command of the Middle Eastern theatre the British COS began to re-examine the issue of fitting her into the command organisation. In their meeting on 29 October the JPS reported that Britain should secure Turkey's full collaboration with the Western powers in defence and she must contribute to the defence of the Middle East. They also emphasised that Britain should preserve her position in this region under SACME, which would be British.¹⁹¹

In the discussions the COS indicated that Turkey was insisting on coming under Eisenhower's command because she thought this was a way in which she would receive American economic and military aid and in any other case this aid might be cut. At the end of their discussions the COS agreed to focus on the two among the four possibilities in the event of British failure to obtain American support and Turkish acceptance of an Eastern Mediterranean Command: this was either the establishment of a separate Turkish Command coming directly under the Standing Group or a division of Turkey's defence between SACEUR and SACME as the best option.¹⁹² The last possibility, in effect, was put forward by the Foreign Office in its earlier discussions with the COS. This plan suggested the inclusion of Turkey's European territories under Eisenhower's Command while her Asiatic lands came under SACME.¹⁹³

These points were discussed with the Americans on 14 November when General Bradley met with the British COS in London. The former proposed the establishment of an Aegean Command which Turkey and Greece would join under SHAPE and the establishment of a separate MEC, linking the two commands at a later date. The COS, however, proposed to set up the two commands simultaneously.¹⁹⁴ This matter was further discussed in a tripartite meeting between the representatives of the USA, the UK and France in Rome on 27 November during the NATO Council meeting.

In fact, the British COS had not yet fully grasped the reasons behind Turkey's long insistence in tying her forces with the defence of Europe under SHAPE. Though the Turks expected to receive American economic and military aid this was not the main reason for Turkey's insistence. As

the search for security against the Soviet threat was primary objective of Turkey's foreign policy she aimed to realise this by obtaining a formal American commitment to her security and this was only possible with the integration of Turkish forces into the European defence system under NATO. Whereas, in case Turkish forces were assigned to SACME this would have in no way to met with Turkey's strategic and security needs even to a minimum extent since both the USA and the UK had no intention to commit any forces to the defence of the Middle East.

The protracted British insistence on the assignment of Turkish forces to the MEC plan produced criticism and reactions on the part of Turkish statesman and press.¹⁹⁵ The Turkish President in a speech to GNA on 1 November made it clear that Turkey would fully take part in the Middle East defence organization only after she took her place in the Atlantic Pact on equal terms with the other members.¹⁹⁶ These views also repeated by Köprülü during his speech at the GNA on 19 December.¹⁹⁷

Eventually during the NATO Council meeting in Rome it was agreed that Greece and Turkey should join either an Aegean Command or Eastern Command under SHAPE. Then this command would be linked with the MEC, which would be set up outside NATO at a later stage. Later, Britain, France and the USA came to a conclusion that the details of the MEC arrangement would be discussed at the next Council meeting in Lisbon in February 1952.¹⁹⁸

By the beginning of 1952 Britain began to favour full Turkish integration with NATO in return for her utmost assistance in the Middle Eastern defence arrangement. Sir Knox Helm, the new British Ambassador, who replaced Charles in late 1951, reported to the Foreign Office that Turkey would not accept any option other than to be incorporated in a European Command.¹⁹⁹ The British Foreign Office, under American insistence, came also to the same conclusion and informed Ankara that it agreed with the Turkish idea that Turkey's air and land forces should be included in the defence arrangement under Admiral Carney's Command.²⁰⁰ This was further confirmed by the British and US governments in the bipartite talks which took place in Washington on 8 January 1952.²⁰¹

Under these circumstances, therefore, Turkey, after her long and successful struggle, together with the crucial American backing, formally joined NATO and attended the Lisbon meeting of the Atlantic Council on 20–25 February as a full-fledged member.²⁰² During the meeting the air and land forces of both Turkey and Greece were attached to SHAPE through a new Southern Europe Command. However in the continued absence of an agreement between Washington and London on the Medi-

terranean Command of NATO the naval forces of both countries were left to remain under their command for the time being.²⁰³

The realization of Turkey's ultimate objective through NATO was a great joy to Democrat administration. The Democrat leaders saw this as an evidence for the confirmation of their great diplomatic skill on foreign policy comparing to the policies of their predecessors. They also thought that this would further enhance their domestic and external prestige. This in fact constituted a great significance in the history of Turkish Republic. While it provided a full western protection for Turkey against her giant enemy, the USSR, it at the same time was interpreted by Ankara as the final confirmation of Turkey's association with the Western community which Turkey had long endeavoured for since its establishment by Kemal Atatürk.²⁰⁴

However, Turkey's participation in the MEC proposals and her entry to NATO were strongly criticised by Moscow. In its note to Turkey on 3 November 1951 the Soviet government stated that it regarded this action as a hostile approach to the USSR and Turkey should take its responsibility for this antagonistic action. On 24 November the Soviets rendered another note to Turkey charging her to help the imperialist powers. Turkey refused the Soviet charges stating that they were entirely baseless. The Turkish government further stated that it had no any hostile intentions and only was interested in her legitimate right of self defence.²⁰⁵

Throughout 1952 the Soviet government continued to make its usual accusations against Turkey by articles and interviews in Soviet Radio and Media. Stalin also personally joined these attacks. In a Communist Party's Congress in October 1952 he said that NATO was an imperialistic bloc directed against the USSR and it was going to be destroyed by the Soviet government. He even threatened Turkey by stating that 'we will crush those states which had set up NATO and those which joined in'. Since the Soviet propagandas began to affect the public opinion, President Bayar together with the Commander of NATO, visited eastern parts of Turkey to erase their negative impacts and to raise the morale of Turkish officials and people.²⁰⁶

The Impact of Turkey's Involvement in the MEC on Turco-Arab Relations

As noted earlier, the Democrat government's early relations with the Arab states were at the stage of rapprochement, and were steadily improving. This was to continue more or less the same until Turkey's participation in the MEC project in late 1951. At his time the difficulty faced by Turkey

was to develop her relations with the Arab states on the one hand and with Israel on the other hand.

Turkey's wish to develop her relations with both the Arab states and Israel was manifested on numerous occasions. For instance, the Turkish President, in his speech at the opening of GNA on 1 November 1950 expressed the Turkish desire to cultivate the friendship of the Arab states while he, at the same time, made references to Turco-Israeli relationship and indicated that this relationship was becoming even closer under the Democrat Party's administration.²⁰⁷

However, the growing Turco-Israeli trade relations and the visit of Moshe Dayan, the former Israeli COS, to Turkey in late 1950 were heavily criticised by Arab circles, which charged Turkey with wishing to make a military alliance with Israel against themselves. These critics eventually impelled the Turkish MFA to make a declaration on 27 January on the line that this visit had been a private one and involved no negotiations with any of Turkish officials.²⁰⁸

Turkey's wish to develop her relations with both Israel and the Arab world stemmed from a number of reasons: first, a genuine desire to establish good relations with her neighbours.²⁰⁹ Second, Turkey's membership in the UN Palestine CC required her to make contacts with both the Arab states and Israel.²¹⁰ Last, the Democrats' idea that Turkey had a crucial bridging role to play between the Middle East and the West directed Ankara to take an active role in convincing the Arab states to align with the West. This was especially the case when Turkey acted on behalf of the West to bring the Arab states into the MEC project.

These focal points were clearly reflected in Köprülü's speech to the GNA on 24 February:

Our relations with the Moslem and Arab countries have been developing in a clear way ever since the Democrat Party came to power. When we came to power there was no clear policy to be pursued towards these states. There was negligence in our relations with them because of the fear that an open pursuit of a policy of friendship dictated by mutual interests would detach us from Europe which we belong. This policy caused suspicions and alienation on the part of the Arab states against us. For geographical and cultural reasons we belong to both to Europe and the Middle East. In fact, Europe and the Middle East are not two distinct entities. Each is the continuation of the other and the both are complementary. We are showing this by our policies and statements.²¹¹

There was therefore an appropriate ground for the development of Turco-Arab relations in the first half of 1951. Turkey first approached to Egypt to improve their relationship as the latter claimed a leading position in the Arab world.²¹² In April Salah ud-din Pasha indicated Egyptian readiness to consider any Turkish proposals for closer relations.²¹³ These efforts established a ground for future Turkish attempts to convince Egypt of the merits of the MEC project.

Another Arab country which sought good relations with Turkey was Jordan. In May 1951 King Abdullah visited Turkey, the first Arab leader to do so since the Democrat Party's advent to power. After wishing for further improvement in Turco-Arab relations, the King stated that Turkey should take a leading role in dealing with the security issues related to the Middle East.²¹⁴

In order to further develop Turco-Arab relations and undertake mediation between the West and Arab states regarding the Middle Eastern defence projects, the Turkish Foreign Ministry decided to invite Azzam Pasha, Secretary-General of the Arab League to Turkey in early April 1951, but he did not come until 14–17 June 1951 due to illness.²¹⁵ There was widespread interest in this visit in both Western and Arab quarters as the MEC plans were under consideration at this time.

When this news was published, the British Foreign Office instructed its mission in Ankara to remind Köprülü to use his good offices in convincing the Egyptians of the need to maintain a British base in Suez. According to British reports Selim Sarper, the head of the Turkish delegation in New York, had already begun to mediate on the Anglo-Egyptian dispute with the Egyptian MFA, as Köprülü had promised Morrison.²¹⁶

In the discussions, however, the Turks were hesitant to express their support for the British on the Suez issue to Azzam Pasha as he later told British officials in Cairo.²¹⁷ The discussions took place in a friendly atmosphere, though the Turkish officials declined to accept Azzam's suggestion of the establishment of an Islamic bloc which would be independent of both of the Soviets and the West, by emphasising that there was no question of Turkey adopting a neutral stance.²¹⁸ This visit, nevertheless, produced a friendly atmosphere with both the Turkish and Egyptian press expressing the will to establish closer relations between Turkey and the Arab states.²¹⁹

According to Turkish sources, Azzam's visit was not entirely successful as far as Turkish opinion was concerned. During the discussions Turkish leaders tried hard to convince Azzam of the need for a settlement between Egypt and Britain over the Suez issue. The Turkish leaders also

told Azzam that the Arabs had to realize that it was not Israel but the Soviet Union which posed a threat to the security of the Middle East and thus they had to cooperate with the West against this danger.

Azzam Pasha, however, responded that 'the Arabs could not make common cause with the West until the satisfaction of their national demands in Palestine and the Suez Canal Zone'. He asked for Turkey 'to give greater support to her Arab brothers in these issues.'²²⁰ With the visit of Azzam Pasha, Ankara therefore once again realized that the Arab world and especially the Egyptian bloc, consisting of Syria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt had a very different agenda from Turkey. This helped the Turks to take the initiative with the moderate Arab states to formulate a defence strategy at a time when the British Middle Eastern projects ended with a fiasco in mid-1953.

As Azzam's visit brought Turco-Egyptian differences to the surface one divergence of this kind emerged on the international scene on 16 August 1951 when Britain introduced the draft of a joint Western resolution before the Security Council against the Egyptian restrictions on the passage of ships carrying cargo to Israel through the Suez Canal.²¹¹ Egypt, which declared as contraband a broad list of cargo such as petroleum and a specific list of merchandise, began to detain these items if they were found aboard ships to be destined for Israel.²²²

Involved in the dispute were not only Britain and Israel but also all maritime powers whose shipping was interfered with, some of whom were members of the Security Council. Egypt claimed that a state of war still existed with Israel though an armistice had been signed between the two parties, and hence Egypt was exercising her rights of war by imposing restrictions for the purpose of securing her defence against Israel.²²³ British shipping increasingly began to suffer because of the Egyptian interference and London decided to take the matter up after some unsuccessful Israeli attempts at the UN.

Prior to the joint resolution in the Security Council, Turkey took a somewhat hesitant attitude in the dispute between Egypt and Britain. Answering a request from Charles, the Turkish Foreign Ministry responded that it did not wish to bring this question before the Council and thus create a new cause of tension in the Middle East between the Arab states and the West. She wished the matter to be settled outside the UN. Turkey wanted to give Egypt more time to reconsider her attitude and called on Cairo to come forward with some constructive proposals.²²⁴

However, under active Israeli lobbying, Britain did not want to prolong the voting process in the Council.²²⁵ She needed seven votes to pass

the resolution in the Security Council. While six votes were secure, the remaining vote could be obtained either from Turkey or Yugoslavia, but neither country's voting intentions were clear. Thus Britain first turned to Turkey for support and began to pressure her. The Foreign Office, on 13 August, made it clear to Açıkalın that Britain needed seven votes for her resolution and the Turkish government had hitherto been reluctant to respond to the UK delegation in New York. Britain had supported Turkey over matters related to NATO and she now expected help from the latter over the question of the Suez Canal tankers.²²⁶ Ankara thus reluctantly became involved in the dispute in order not to jeopardise her position in NATO.

Consequently, when the discussions took place in the Security Council, Britain asserted that the maintenance of restrictions by Egypt was 'unjustified and unreasonable' in view of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt.²²⁷ In this state of affairs the Council convened to vote on the resolution on 1 September 1951 and all members except China, India and the USSR either abstained or voted in favour of the resolution.²²⁸

This in effect damaged the general trend of Turco-Arab relations as Azzam Pasha had indicated clearly in a statement on 18 August when Turkey reluctantly began to favour the British resolution. Azzam emphasised that 'Egypt and the Arab states had not expected Turkey to take such an unjust attitude since recently she had announced her pressing desire to reinforce fraternal and brotherly relations with the Arab and Islamic Countries.'²²⁹ After this event, the second and major blow came to Turco-Arab relations when Turkey participated to present quadripartite MEC proposals to Egypt on 12 October 1951.

The Turkish participation in the MEC plans was harshly and violently criticised by the Arab world. The Egyptian magazine, *Roḡ-al-Yusuf*, published a caricature of the Turkish President as a dog on a western strap while a Lebanese paper, *Haqaf*, declared that the Arabs had lost faith in Turkey, Britain and America as a result of their recent actions.²³⁰

This was followed by violent demonstrations in Egypt and Syria. The Turkish flag was burnt in the streets of Aleppo. The Turkish media responded to its Arab counterparts in the same manner. They reminded the Egyptians of their military failures against the small state of Israel and of the continued British presence in the Suez zone by remarking that 'the British are there. Try to kick them out and see what happens to you.' The Turkish media also responded forthrightly to the burning of the Turkish flag. One editorial insisted: 'we can crush these insects'; while others reminded the Syrians not to test Turkey's patient.²³¹ These examples once

more showed the degree of vulnerability in the state of Turco-Arab relations. While some time ago the Turks and Arabs had sung the song of friendship and brotherhood they, a few months later, took a hostile attitude to each other.

Turkey, in fact, had worked hard to find a compromise solution for the problems between the Arabs and the West. She had tried to persuade Britain to take into account Egyptian national needs and did not want the West to go too fast with MEC proposals at a time when conditions were not yet ripe. Turkey, however, lacked enough room to manoeuvre because of her need of support from the West in gaining full membership of NATO.

Ankara therefore had unwillingly been pushed to participate in the MEC proposals before making any suggestions or even a proper examination of them. Thus, this was the beginning of the end of Turkey's good relations with the radical Arab states, namely Egypt and Syria. Turkey then turned her face toward the moderate states of Iraq and Jordan to sue for a possible Turco-Arab collaboration and to this end, in late November, invited Nuri al-Said Pasha, the Iraqi Premier, to visit Turkey for an exchange of views on regional and international matters after the recent visit of King Abdullah of Jordan.²³²

Conclusion

The year 1950 was important for Anglo-Turkish relations because the events of this period substantially affected the nature of their relationship in the Middle East. For Britain the outbreak of the Korean War created a great opportunity to involve both the USA and Turkey in its defence plans in the Middle East. This was because neither Washington nor Ankara had so far seriously engaged in the defence of the region. This war also was important for Turkey's future relations with the West. The outbreak of the conflict in south Asia not only erased Turkey's image of unreliability, a view which came to emerge as a result of Turkey's neutral stance during the Second World War, from the Western mind but also created a ground for Turkey to develop her relationship with the USA.

Turkey's involvement in the MEC project constituted another turning point in Anglo-Turkish relations since the conclusion of the Triple Alliance. This was because, from 1939 onwards, Britain became a main factor in Turkey's foreign policy until mid-1951 when Ankara decided to shift its allegiance from the UK to the USA.

There were a number of reasons for this drastic change: first, it was a revelation that Turkey came to learn the 'frank truth', during Anglo-

Turkish military discussions in early 1951, that there was almost no help possible to her in case of a serious conflict under the provisions of the Triple Alliance. Shocked thereafter the Turks became more insistent in demanding Turkey's full integration into NATO through American help as the search for security was the primary goal of Turkish strategy. Second, when it became known in April 1951 that the Americans supported full Turkish membership of NATO but the British were opposed this had a traumatising adverse effect on Turkish mind. As Charles reported to London: 'from that moment British shares began to sink in Turkey'.²³³ This was indeed the lowest level in Anglo-Turkish relations since the Democrats came to power in 1950 and the state of affairs continued until Britain openly announced her decision to back Turkey's inclusion in the southern flank of NATO under Admiral Carney's command in early 1952.²³⁴

The third reason was that Ankara and London differed in their tactics towards the Arab states regarding the regional defence planning though they had a common objective which aimed to defend the Middle East against the Soviet threat. While Britain, motivated by a desire to maintain its prestige and global standing, was in a hurry to solve the Suez problem through a multilateral pact Turkey wished to adopt a step by step approach leaving enough space to take into account the needs of region in general and those of Egypt in particular. Though this was the case Turkey undertook her promise rendered to Britain and thus approached the Arab states with regard the MEC.

Turkey's collaboration with Britain in the MEC plans therefore had an adverse affect on Turco-Arab relations. This applied especially to the states of Syria and Egypt and did not for instance affect Turkey's relations with the Hashemite states of Iraq and Jordan. These Turkish experiences eventually helped Ankara to develop its late strategy which was based on Turkey's collaboration with the members of the dormant Sadabad Pact.

THE FALL OF THE BRITISH REGIONAL DEFENCE PLANS AND THE RISE OF TURKISH ‘TRIANGULAR STRATEGY’ (1952–53)

After a year and a half of hard work the previous British MEC project proved to be abortive, due to its repudiation by the Arabs at the instigation of Egypt. Thus, the year 1952 marked the beginning of another British attempt to implement a defence project in the Middle East, which became known as the Middle East Defence Organisation (MEDO) in the spring of 1952. The MEDO project was vainly pursued by the West for another year and a half, with eventual Arab rejection, until mid-1953.

At this time, the development of a new concept of, what the author of the present book called as, the ‘Triangular Strategy’ formulated by the Turkish leaders, chief of them Adnan Menderes, the Prime Minister of Turkey was the first sign which marked the end of British defence plans and the coming of a new one. This was the emergence of the American ‘Northern Tier’ scheme, devised by John Foster Dulles, the new American Secretary of State. Thereafter the Turkish and American strategies were converged and eventually turned into the Baghdad Pact of 1955.¹

This period also highlighted an obvious shift of British global strategy and of her defence plans in the Middle East. In the new revised strategy produced in June 1952 the COS, in conformity with the Foreign Office, planned to reduce the cost of British overseas obligations. The new strategy tried to regulate British defence policy on the basis of her increasingly

weak economic position and by taking account of the new developments in nuclear weapons. This strategy based on nuclear weapons and strategic air power decreased the importance of conventional bases such as Suez. In this period the Middle East further lost its priority to Asia (after Europe) in British thinking as the fighting of the cold war based on nuclear deterrence became a main line of British strategy.² Nonetheless, Britain continued to attach great importance to its position in Egypt as a means of maintaining her prestige and status as a great power.

In the face of the new developments in British global strategy and the protracted Anglo-Egyptian dispute over the Suez base, the British regional defence plans began to focus on an Iraqi-Levant strategy by late 1952. While this strategy, compared with the inner ring concept, had the advantage of halting initial Soviet offences with limited forces, it also had obvious disadvantages. The new strategy necessitated the construction of extensive peacetime military facilities and airfields in Iraq and Jordan which would take many years to complete. Also, bearing in mind British lack of manpower, the military forces of Iraq and Jordan were not considered powerful enough to implement this strategy. Therefore, the Suez base was still regarded as a better option in the British defence plans for the Middle East.³

The other viable option was British reliance on Turkey. The British military was increasingly inclined to favour this option.⁴ The Anglo-Turkish talks of October 1952 were crucial for Britain in sliding away from Egypt and towards closer collaboration with Turkey and Iraq. This in fact marked the emergence of Turkish Triangular Strategy.

At this time Turkey not only began to take her most energetic steps in the Middle East in the context of convincing the Arab states of the need to establish a defence organization against a possible Soviet threat but also began to influence British Middle Eastern strategy. These Turkish efforts and the Iraqi eagerness to join the Turkish defence attempts, combined with the recent British failure to secure an agreement with Egypt over the Suez base resulted in a radical shift in British defence strategy in the Middle East.

Turkey, for the first time, occupied by mid-1953 a major role in the evolution of British strategy. Under Turkey's influence, Britain altered its Egyptian-based strategy in favour of Anglo-Turkish-Iraqi triangular defence cooperation. The decision towards implementing the new 'Triangular Strategy' was taken by Ankara and London in Turkey in late April 1953.⁵ Later, Baghdad agreed to join Anglo-Turkish defence plans in the summer of 1953.

From the MEC Plan to MEDO Project (January–May 1952)

After the failure of the four powers' proposals, which had announced the establishment of the MEC to secure Arab co-operation with the defence efforts of the West in late 1951, Britain considered modifying the command proposals in a new form at the beginning of 1952. There were additional reasons for the new British move: first, Egypt's rejection of the four power proposals; second, Turkey's refusal to become territorially a part of the MEC.⁶

In the light of Egyptian reluctance to have the headquarters and base of the command on its territory, Britain thought that it would be impracticable to establish a full operational command there. Thus, she began to consider, subject to the agreement of the USA and France, setting up a planning organisation as a nucleus of the Command in Cyprus without allocating any forces to it. She planned to put this project into operation after the NATO meeting in Lisbon in February 1952 by convening the seven sponsoring powers for a conference in London. This organisation could later be turned into a fully-fledged operational command if it proved attractive to Egypt and the Arab states in the course of time.⁷

The Turkish refusal to be included in the MEC arrangement was another factor in Britain's change of plan. The COS, in their meeting on 3 January 1952, continued to insist on the simultaneous establishment of an Aegean command in which Turkey and Greece would be included under SACEUR and a Middle East Command and thereafter the two would be firmly linked.⁸ This proposal however was rejected by the US government during Churchill's visit to Washington in early January. The Americans made it clear that both Turkey and Greece had declared their preference for Admiral Carney's command and they could not agree with any other British alternatives.⁹ The Americans also advised Britain to approach Egypt to settle its dispute and indicated that the MEC project could be set up by March or April 1952 after Turkey and Greece had firmly integrated into NATO.¹⁰

The Americans believed that the settlement of the Anglo-Egyptian dispute was essential for the establishment of the MEC and without Egypt's participation no Arab states would join the MEC. They also maintained that only American economic and military aid to the Middle Eastern states would induce them to participate in the proposed defence organisation. These were, in essence, clear indications that the Americans had begun to consider taking more responsibility in Middle Eastern affairs for establishing a successful defence organisation.¹¹

Since there was no longer any chance of getting Turkey's defence within the orbit of the MEC, the Foreign Office contemplated the establishment of an MEC entirely independent of NATO with the support of the seven sponsoring powers. The British Foreign Office therefore warned the COS that their insistence on this matter would only delay the setting up of the MEC. In its memorandum to the COS, on 11 January 1952, after explaining the primary aims of the British MEC proposals,¹² it emphasised the support which was promised by the USA and Turkey, and pointed to the danger that Turco-American support could be lost if the command arrangements were further delayed.¹³ The Foreign Office further thought that the Arab states were awaiting concrete evidence of British defence plans and any longer delay in realising these plans would cause the loss of British prestige in the Middle East. Also, the setting up of the MEC could induce the Arab states to join it.¹⁴

Britain, however, bearing in mind the American reservations, had to delay this plan for the time being with a view to first solving its problems with Egypt. For this purpose the Foreign Office, on 21 January, prepared another plan, modifying the four-power proposals so as to make them more palatable to Egypt.¹⁵ The Foreign Secretary, after further preparation, presented the procedure of the new policy for negotiations with Egypt to the Cabinet on 11 February 1952. He proposed to make the MEC a key part of an overall agreement with Egypt, which would comprise the future of the Suez base and the position of the British troops there. Once Egypt agreed to participate in the MEC, the discussions would begin with the other sponsoring powers.¹⁶

Meanwhile, the Wafd Party, hostile to Britain, was succeeded in government on 28 January 1952 by the Royalist party under Ali Maher, who convinced the Cabinet that he was anxious to reach a peaceful settlement with Britain.¹⁷ Though the Egyptian Premier's initial indications and contacts with Britain encouraged the British Cabinet to hope for a possible settlement with Egypt¹⁸ it did not last long due to Maher's resignation on 1 March 1952 in protest at King Farouk's frequent intervention in the government's affairs.¹⁹ Then a period of political unrest began in Egyptian domestic affairs between the Palace and successive governments, which would end in a military coup led by the Free Officers on 23 July 1952.²⁰ Given the existing political situation in Egypt, Britain, in mid-March, decided to postpone negotiations to a later date.²¹

Simultaneously, the US government, on 16 April 1952, was prepared to put new proposals forward for an effective defence organisation. On that day the State-Defence Working Group on the MEC recommended to

Washington that the MEC should be established as soon as possible as a planning and coordinating organisation with its headquarters in Cyprus and a British officer should be appointed as Supreme Allied Commander Middle East.

The liaison between SACME and the interested Arab states would be maintained by a Middle East Defence Liaison Organisation (MEDLO). The Defence Working Group further suggested that a new name, MEDO, was necessary for the MEC to make it sound more pleasant to the Arabs. Thereafter these two names, together with the name of Middle East Command Organisation (MECO), began to be used interchangeably by both the British and the Americans, and MEDO would become predominant in the course of time.²²

The State Department, in its meeting on 24 April, approved the Working Group's suggestions. But it commented that establishing the MECO without Arab participation might be a dangerous and destructive course as this might give the impression that the organisation was an alliance of the West against the Arabs.²³ While the Americans decided upon an early establishment of MEDO the Foreign Office, conversely, informed the State Department on 29 April that Britain had to further postpone the conference of the seven sponsoring powers in London until the Anglo-Egyptian situation became clearer.²⁴

The Foreign Office, in its memorandum, also suggested that it wanted to invite Egypt and Iraq to such a meeting when it was convened. While the State Department, in its response to Britain on 20 May, concurred with the postponement of the London meeting, it did not fully agree with the ideas in the British memorandum. The Americans objected to inviting to the proposed meeting of Egypt and Iraq alone among all the Arab states. They also suggested coordinating the views of the sponsoring powers and then consulting the Arab states when MECO was in the planning stage.²⁵ Thus, by the end of May, the two allies, because of their differences of opinion, were unable even to convene a single meeting to discuss the new concept of MEDO with the other sponsoring powers.

The Stalemate in Anglo-Turkish Relations (January–May 1952)

As discussed in the previous chapter, Anglo-Turkish relations began to be increasingly strained in the spring of 1951 when the Turks came to know that the British were holding up full Turkish membership of NATO because they wanted to impose the condition of Turkey's compliance with Middle East defence plans. This not only damaged Anglo-Turkish relations but also discredited the MEC in Turkish public opinion. This was

clearly demonstrated in the discussions which took place in the Turkish Assembly on 19 December 1951 after Köprülü had delivered a speech on Turkish foreign affairs.²⁶

After his speech, the main opposition party asked for assurances from the Foreign Minister that there was no connection between Turkish membership of NATO and her participation in the MEC. Köprülü made it clear that Turkey would fully cooperate with Britain only after she had become a fully-fledged member of NATO. He also emphasised that Turkey's relations with Britain and France should be based on mutual co-operation and confidence on equal terms.²⁷

Thus, there emerged a strong Turkish suspicion about Britain's intentions in the Middle East and this was the main reason for Turkey's cool attitude towards British defence attempts in the region. Churchill, who had the best knowledge of the Turkish character and habits, confirmed this point to President Truman during the Washington discussions on 7 January 1952, saying that 'the Turks would be more likely to participate wholeheartedly [in MEC] if they were directly under General Eisenhower's command within NATO'.²⁸

At this time however a Reuter report from London which indicated that Churchill would press for the inclusion of Turkish forces in the MEC in his forthcoming talks with President Truman in Washington produced great reactions not only from the Turkish government but from the media.²⁹

For instance, the former MFA Sadak writing in *Akşam* stated that 'the Middle East Command project envisages Turkey's defence with those states hostile to the UK. Let us not to be left alone with a few thousands of British troops in Egypt and let us not surrender ourselves to a dead project called Middle East Command'.³⁰

On the day Churchill-Truman talks started in Washington on 7 January the Turkish Foreign Minister in his statement in the GNA made a strong emphasis on the Turkish views with regard to NATO:

We are explaining our view on this manner thorough all possible means and at every opportunity. Let me briefly state our attitude once more: the Middle East Command project and the position we will occupy in NATO are totally separate issues. As we are to enter to the North Atlantic Treaty in equal rights with the other members, our position within the pact could not be different from theirs. Thus, in joining the treaty, it is impossible for us to admit any particular arrangement, which would result in us having one foot within

the body borders of the treaty and the other in the Middle East and it is incomprehensible that such an illogical proposal could be put to us...

We have started at preliminary negotiations in Washington on the determination of our military position in NATO. In any case, it is neither understandable nor possible for any arrangement to be imposed upon us without having our consent.³¹

Simultaneously the Turkish Foreign Ministry instructed its representative in Washington to remind the Americans of the Turkish position with regard to NATO once again. The American Secretary of State and his assistant responded that the US government was well aware of the view of Turkish government and they had agreed with the full integration of Turkish troops into NATO.³²

During these discussions in Washington as the Reuter had reported, the British military authorities, who were still insisting on attaching Turkey's defence to the British Middle Eastern Command, also lost hope of bringing the Americans round to their point of view when the latter, as the Turkish government had long expected, rejected the British proposals. Only then did Britain agree that Turkey should be a member of NATO without attaching any conditions. Thereafter Anglo-Turkish relations shifted from a period of unease to a stage of stalemate, each looking for a way forward.³³

Another factor which impeded Anglo-Turkish understanding was the British failure to consult the Turks in advance about the MEC plans and their decision to present these plans to the latter as a *fait accompli*. Both Helm and McGhee, the new American Ambassador at Ankara, warned their respective governments on this point.³⁴

In this state of affairs, the first attempt to break the impasse came from the Turkish President, when he went to London for the funeral of King George VI in early February. He met with Eden on 16 February for an exchange of views on Anglo-Turkish relations. Bayar, after emphasising the need for the closest collaboration between the two countries, admitted that there had been difficult times in Anglo-Turkish relations through misunderstandings and mismanagement. But he added that these were things of the past and at the moment there remained no divergences between the two countries.³⁵

On Bayar's return to Turkey, Britain, at the last moment, informed the Turkish Foreign Office of its new plan of resuming the negotiations with

Egypt. In the memorandum, Britain also indicated its intention to take some concrete actions with the MEC and asked the Turks for their views on this subject. Towards the end of February Nuri Birgi, the Assistant Secretary-General of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, explained to Helm that, at the moment, the Turkish government preferred to defer its detailed written reply to the British memorandum until the Egyptian situation became clear.

He also said that the Turkish Foreign Ministry would like to make the comment that Turkey agreed about the proposed negotiations with Egypt and indeed strongly recommended that Britain should reach an agreement with the moderate Maher government before the Wafdist government returned to power. Birgi further commented that if Egypt, during this interval period, still refused to cooperate with the West then the sponsoring powers could meet and discuss the next step in setting the MEC.³⁶

Concurrently, in mid-March some negative views about Turkey began to be circulated among some of the higher officials in London. One of them, Admiral McGregor, the First Sea Lord, declared, in an official meeting on 25 March, that the idea of making progress with the MEC after full Turkish incorporation in NATO had proved an illusion. He accused Turkey of behaving selfishly and being interested only in her own defence and in obtaining American economic and military aid.³⁷ Some of the senior officials, such as Robert (Bob) Dixon at the Foreign Office, joined this criticism by stating that Turkey, as a partner, would be a liability to Britain rather than an asset because of Arab suspicions of Turkey.³⁸

These views were also confirmed by British Middle Eastern representatives.³⁹ Helm, however, objected to these ideas believing that Turkey was the core of any Middle Eastern defence plans and if properly approached she would render practical assistance to Britain. He even suggested full co-operation and consultation with Turkey in all aspects of policy related to the Middle East.⁴⁰

Therefore, by the end of March it was clear that traces of mutual suspicion on Anglo-Turkish relations were still remaining. The first move to clean up the poison, which had remained from the previous year, came with a step taken by Field Marshal Montgomery, a British Deputy Commander for SHAPE, in a three-day visit to Turkey on 13 May 1952.⁴¹

Montgomery carried out talks with Turkish military and civilian authorities, including the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. According to Helm's report, the visit ended with complete success and satisfaction to both sides. In these talks Montgomery expressed the view that the Turkish

Army, Navy and the Air Force should be strengthened rapidly in order to defend Thrace.

Conversely the Americans, especially General Arnold, Head of the American Mission in Turkey, indicated that Thrace was not tenable and hence the Turkish defence line should be in the Anatolian mountains. The Turks, who believed in the defensibility of Thrace, were greatly satisfied with the Marshal's remarks. According to Helm, the Marshal had eliminated the Turkish suspicions that their defence was being included with that of the Middle East by Britain and fully convinced the Turks that the Marshal's approach to Turkish defence was entirely the SHAPE approach.⁴²

The New British Attempts to Revive MEDO (May–October 1952)

By the beginning of June 1952 no change had been noticed in the Egyptian position about Egypt's possible involvement in the Western defence programme since the Anglo-American agreement of May to defer a meeting in London about MEC. At this time, Eden, in his memorandum to the COS, expressed the idea of going ahead with MEDO as a way to greater American commitment in Middle Eastern affairs. The COS, on 5 June, concurred with the idea since they considered that there was little chance of persuading Egypt to join MEDO.⁴³

Then, on 16 June, both the Secretary of State and the COS agreed to communicate the British views on MEDO to the American government, and obtain its concurrence to the British memorandum before submitting it to the other sponsoring powers.⁴⁴

Two days later Britain handed over a draft of the memorandum on MEDO to the State Department. It stated that Britain now agreed with the new name of MEDO instead of MEC and said that the British would go ahead with MEDO without delay. This new organisation was to be as flexible as possible and no forces were to be allocated it in peace time. The memorandum also suggested that a preliminary secret exchange of views on the policy among the sponsoring powers should be conducted before the proposed London conference. The Arab states could be invited to attend on an equal basis but their position in the organisation should depend on the contributions they had to make.⁴⁵

Though the State Department agreed with many points in the British memorandum, there emerged a fundamental difference on the structure of the organisation and over the type of approach to be made to the Arabs. The Department disagreed that Arab participation should be subject to certain conditions. It also objected to the British idea of setting up MEDO straightaway before taking into account the views of the Arab states in the

area. The Department preferred a rather slower approach to the Arabs to allow them to make up their minds on the need to establish MEDO. If no Arab states joined then the whole scheme should be revised. The Americans further opposed the idea of the establishment of a Middle East Steering Group, which excluded Turkish membership, among Britain, France and the USA.⁴⁶

In the meantime, in order to eliminate the Anglo-American differences, Eden, on 26 June, met with Acheson in London. In the discussions Eden recommended going ahead with MEDO without the Arabs; the British Chiefs of Missions had recently suggested pursuing this course since no Arab states were willing to join in the Western defence plans. Acheson, however, said that the US government preferred a looser and more flexible organisation than Britain had so far suggested and emphasised that the Arabs should be attached to the organisation from the beginning since the Americans believed that the Arabs' participation was necessary for the defence of the entire area. Acheson, also opposing the French idea, made it clear that Turkey deserved directorial standing in MEDO since she was the only country in the region which could substantially contribute to its defence. In the end, Eden agreed with the general points made by Acheson.⁴⁷

Thereafter, with these points in mind, the British Foreign Office revised its earlier proposals and on 27 June communicated them to the State Department. The Foreign Office indicated that it accepted the American idea of informing the Arab states about the Western powers' intention of establishing MEDO. If the Arabs' reactions to the idea were 'shy rather than hostile' the MEDO would be set up without more ado.⁴⁸ However, if the Arabs took a hostile attitude to MEDO then the sponsoring powers should go ahead with it without them as the COS had strongly recommended.⁴⁹

Though the Americans agreed with Britain on the general outline of the MEDO scheme, the State Department, on 25 July, raised further objections to the British plans. These were: first, an objection to the British idea of the establishment of a 'Standing Group' inside the Middle East which could divide Western from Middle East representatives and hence the coordination between MEDO and NATO should be done by those powers which belonged to both organisations; second, an objection to the idea of going ahead with MEDO if the Arabs' responses were unfavourable to it.⁵⁰

Under these circumstances, Britain, seeing that further informal exchanges would result in more delay to the establishment of MEDO, de-

cided to inform the three sponsoring powers in writing of the contents of the latest British thinking on MEDO. These ideas were the same as the British proposals of 27 June. After informing the Turks, on 11 August, Britain handed over its memorandum to the US and French governments.⁵¹ The American response of 6 September, while expressing its satisfaction with British proposals in general terms, still admitted certain reservations. The Americans were willing to participate in the planning stages of MEDO and to supply some arms and training assistance to the Middle Eastern states without committing any forces to the defence of the region.⁵²

The Americans, however, still disagreed with going ahead with MEDO without Arab participation. They also proposed to delay the setting up of MEDO until they could obtain Arab reactions to the Western proposals.⁵³ In addition, Acheson was told that the new military regime in Egypt was willing to join MEDO in return for American economic and military aid. The new revolutionary regime, which came to power as a result of the coup on 23 July, began to keep Anglo-American opinion busy until the end of May 1953 with the hope that the new military regime might be attracted to join their defence plans.⁵⁴

In the subsequent discussions between the Foreign Office and the American Embassy in London, in early September, the Foreign Office prepared to meet the US demands.⁵⁵ Therefore, by the end of September 1952, the continuity of disagreement between the two allies on the structure of MEDO and on the tactics to be adopted towards the Arabs further delayed the setting up of MEDO.

The Steady Improvement in Anglo-Turkish Relations (May–October 1952)

The visit of Field Marshal Montgomery to Turkey in mid-May 1952 signalled the beginning of a gradual improvement in Anglo-Turkish relations. This was followed by Anglo-Turkish consultations about British plans to set up MEDO. In his talks with Helm on 17 May, Köprülü emphasised the need for a strong Turkey to defend the Middle East properly, as some Americans had recently declared.⁵⁶ Helm's response was that, despite sharing Köprülü's idea, he attached particular importance to the security of the Suez Canal both as a base and as a means of communication for the defence of the region.⁵⁷

Then, the Turkish Foreign Minister expressed his agreement on the need to hold the Canal but added that every positive effort should be made to secure Egypt's cooperation with the West by implying that with-

out such a course the establishment of a defence organisation would not be possible. This in fact represented, as the British Ambassador was surprised to learn, a reversal in the mind of Köprülü, who only a short while ago, had supported the British idea of going ahead with the MEDO without Egypt. This was a clear indication that the Americans had immense influence on the mind of the Turkish MFA if not on the Turkish government on issues related to the Middle East.⁵⁸

The British government made another move to bring Britain into the confidence of Turkey by inviting the Turkish Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister to have consultations about the defence of the Middle East. On 12 June the Turkish Foreign Office announced that this visit would take place on 7 July.⁵⁹ As the British Foreign Office official indicated that the talks would concentrate on Turkey's role in the defence of the Mediterranean but the visit was later postponed until the autumn due to Eden's illness.⁶⁰ While the British attempts to achieve close collaboration with the Turks were in progress, the Turkish government expressed its appreciation for the British action in providing advance information about MEDO plans. The Turkish Ambassador in London communicated these views to the Foreign Office on 1 July.⁶¹

Köprülü's ideas about the MEDO became clearer as further talks took place the following day between himself, Helm, McGhee and Nash, the US Under-Secretary for Defence, who was in Turkey for a visit. In these talks the Turkish MFA strongly advocated a chain of preliminary consultations between the four powers before taking any steps towards the setting up of MEDO. This was to be followed by a second stage of bringing the remaining three Commonwealth states into line and in a third stage the Arab states should be approached. Köprülü also maintained that Ankara should be a centre for diplomatic consultations about the Middle East. He then emphasised as usual on the need for a strong Turkey both economically and militarily for the success of any regional defence plans.⁶²

While Helm, in the discussions, maintained the British idea of going ahead with MEDO, together with the seven sponsoring powers but without the Arabs, McGhee and Nash reiterated the American idea that the Arabs first should adopt the Western line and then the defence pact should be set up.⁶³

At this time, as Helm was glad to indicate in his telegram, Köprülü tended to be more in favour of the British than the American ideas.⁶⁴ Thus, this proved that the more British approaches were made to Turkey the more Turkish favour would be shown to Britain, though the US influence in Turkish governing circles still remained dominant. This was clearly

demonstrated in a conversation between Açıkalın and Helm, which took place on 11 July. Açıkalın, who had long supported the idea of 'setting up shop' (establishing MEDO) without the Arabs, now, under American influence, reverted to his former ideas, and came to support the American idea of ensuring Arab collaboration to begin with and then planning the next step according to Arab reactions.⁶⁵

The British Foreign Office, however, greeted Köprülü's proposals with some reservations. While finding it worthwhile to consider the idea of sounding out the Arab states individually, it objected to Köprülü's second idea of arranging four power consultations, calling it an unnecessary step which would further delay the setting up of MEDO. Furthermore, this idea, which suggested the exclusion of the three Commonwealth countries from the discussions, would make them resentful towards Britain.⁶⁶ Therefore, by the end of June 1952, some sort of Anglo-Turkish understanding saw the light for the first time since the British defence proposals were put forward in the autumn of 1951.

In this state of affairs Britain, on 9 August 1952, handed over the final draft of its memorandum on MEDO to Turkey before submitting copies to the American and French governments.⁶⁷ The contents of the memorandum were the same as the version handed to the Americans six weeks before. Britain now sought Turkish views about the proposals.⁶⁸

The preliminary Turkish reactions were revealed by Açıkalın in a conversation with Helm on 12 August. Though the Turkish Secretary-General expressed his personal conviction that he was more in line with the British idea, he pointed out the difficulty of going ahead with MEDO if the Americans remained firmly opposed. Açıkalın, as Helm reported, also indicated that he was not very sure about the ideas of Köprülü, who was not 'inclined to do anything contrary to American wishes'.⁶⁹

Meanwhile, Helm was much annoyed by the attitude of the American Embassy, which had informed the Turks of some crucial differences between the US and UK governments on the MEDO plans. The British Foreign Office and its mission in Ankara, in contrast, thought that there was no disagreement between the two countries over the latest MEDO proposals which had been prepared 'word for word' with the American officials during Mr Acheson's last visit to London.⁷⁰

Two weeks later, Köprülü began to express his tentative views about the British memorandum, by saying that he regretted the Anglo-American difference of approach to the MEDO tactics and that it would be better to wait until the two reached an agreement.⁷¹ Helm, in his report, explained that the cause of Köprülü's coolness was the result of American influence.

This report also deeply annoyed some of the British officials in London, who commented that the reason for the Americans' sabotaging of the MEDO plans was due to a reluctance to identify the USA with Britain in the Middle East. In his later telegram, Helm reported the impressions he had from the officials at the American Embassy:

There are powerful American elements, whether in the USA or elsewhere who do not want to see the establishment of a Middle East Organisation under other than American control. As they themselves cannot in present circumstances contribute forces to such [an] organisation they could not expect to have control of it and therefore they are not enthusiastic...⁷³

This was followed by an official Turkish reply to the British memorandum on 24 September. The nature of the Turkish communication was a modified version of Köprülü's previous ideas and represented an attempt to find a middle way in the gap between the USA and the UK. The Turkish memorandum, after expressing agreement with the functions of MEDO, as suggested by Britain, proposed that the final structure of MEDO should be left until the Arab states were sounded out. It paid particular attention to consulting the Arab states about the forms and conventions of MEDO but recommended not presenting them to the Arabs as a *fait accompli* as the Americans had proposed.⁷⁴ The memorandum also suggested İskenderun (Alexandria) in southern Turkey, as the seat of MEDO instead of Cyprus, the British suggestion.⁷⁵ The British COS, however, were not in favour of this idea.⁷⁶

The Turkish memorandum also reminded Britain of the new positive developments in Egypt and advised her not to miss this opportunity of attracting MEDO to Egypt. Then it concluded that:

[The] Turkish government therefore thought that the four principal sponsors should first consider the attitude towards any possible line of approach to the Arab states and if so try to work out a formula. If this step were taken and if the Arab states refused then [the] plans of the sponsors must go without them.⁷⁷

Thus, by September 1952 no complete agreement had yet been reached among the sponsoring powers, especially between the UK, the USA and Turkey. Turkey, to a certain extent, however, came closer to the British line but still hesitated to follow a policy contrary to the US position.

**The Climax of Anglo-Turkish Cooperation:
The London Talks and Afterwards (October 1952)**

In the early days of October 1952 Britain received the comments of all seven sponsoring powers, which raised two main problems: first, the relationship of MEDO to the NATO Standing Group; second, the method and timing of the approach to the Arab States.⁷⁸ Britain, bearing in mind these differences of method, was prepared to freeze its actions until it should reach some sort of agreement among the sponsoring powers.⁷⁹ This British position, however, was greatly changed after the visit paid by the Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister as guests of British government on 13–18 October.⁸⁰

The timing of the visit enhanced its significance at a time when Britain was at the stage of making a final decision about whether to go ahead with MEDO or abandon the project altogether. This was because, in the face of American hesitations and the lack of Arab interest, Britain began to lose hope of establishing an effective defence organisation in the Middle East. The Foreign Office's aim was to obtain full Turkish support to Britain for the future of MEDO.⁸¹ As a consequence, the outcome of a complete Anglo-Turkish agreement in Middle Eastern affairs represented a new era in Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East.

The conversations between the Secretary of State, the Minister of Defence, the CIGS and others on the British side, and Menderes, Köprülü, Açıkalın and the officials of the Turkish Embassy, on the Turkish side, started on 14 October. In the discussions, after reviewing the state of world affairs in general, Eden said that he was reviving the issue of Middle East defence and had come to the conclusion that if the defence of the region could not rely on Egypt some link should be established between Turkey and Britain in the area. Menderes responded that any danger of a vacuum in the Nile Valley should not be overlooked. He felt that it was urgently necessary to make defence plans for the area at the same time as securing American support for it. Then the parties agreed to discuss the question of Middle East defence in detail at a later date.⁸²

The Turkish leaders indicated that if Cyprus was to be the headquarters of the MEDO then it was necessary to bring the Arab states in the planned defence organization since without their collaboration it would not be possible to make contingency plans which require the use of Arab territories. Therefore the Turkish party concluded that while the Arabs had to be persuaded to join MEDO the ideal state should be Turkey to operate this effort.⁸³

At the third meeting, Menderes said that his method was to approach not all the Arab states but only the most promising, such as Iraq, with regard to the MEDO proposals. Menderes then suggested that Turkey should pursue her informal soundings, which had already begun with Iraq. In his view Iraq was the Arab country most seriously concerned with the Middle Eastern defence plans in view of her exposure to the Soviet danger. If these Turkish soundings were successful further piecemeal approaches should be made to other Arab states. At worst, if no Arab states were willing to join Britain and Turkey, they should take the initiative in setting up MEDO with the other sponsoring powers.⁸⁴ In the end Eden:

...entirely agreed [with these plans] and hoped that this visit would open a new and even more intimate chapter in the history of the [*sic*] Anglo-Turkish relations. He accepted the procedure proposed by M. Menderes and agreed to work out the practical details.⁸⁵

He also undertook to recommend these new plans to the US government. The outcome of the London talks thus was a complete success to Britain as well as to Turkey which was now prepared to take a leading role in the defence of the Middle East.⁸⁶ As Helm reported, Turkish public opinion and the Press showed great sympathy with the outcome of the London talks.⁸⁷

Following the London talks Menderes in a press conference stated that there was a 'complete agreement' between Britain and Turkey on the Middle Eastern defence. He said that there was a defence gap in the region and this should be filled as soon as possible. After expressing his government's readiness to take even more active role in the organization of regional defence Menderes stated that it was an error to consider the Middle East defence as a primarily British concern. On the contrary, he said, this issue was of greater concern to Turkey and other regional states than Britain though the Turkish government recognized the British interest and welcomed for its involvement.⁸⁸

The Turkish government's zeal to play a leading role in the regional defence planning was reiterated by *Zafer*, semi official paper of the government, a little after the return of Turkish delegation to Turkey. The paper made emphasis on 'the seizure of the initiative to secure a speedy establishment of a Middle East defence organization' and stated that 'there is no doubt that the Arab states will welcome the fact that Turkey will take over the planning of Middle East defence'.⁸⁹ Few days later President Bayar concurred with these comments indicating that 'we hope that the

states of the Middle East with which we have historical and cultural ties will join on joint defence on equal footing'.⁹⁰

The recent official and public statements, especially since the beginning of 1952, had been made in various occasions by Bayar, Menderes and Köprülü were clear indication that the Turkish government have, for some time, prepared her for a position to assume a leading role in the defence plans for the Middle East regardless of Egyptian attitude. The Turkish leaders have long given a voice to an opinion of playing a major role in the defence of the region and they made some tentative attempts to fulfil it either through the revival of Sadabad Pact or with some alternative project.

However the issue of Turkey's integration with NATO prevented her to develop its ideas in a more concrete form. Once Turkey managed to fully enter NATO she had already undertook a commitment to support the British regional defence plans which continued to render a central place to Egypt. Though Ankara was to support the British defence schemes because of her commitments she assumed it nevertheless was not happy for the British strategy which placed a central role to Cairo.

The results of London talks therefore gave Turkey an opportunity to develop her own strategy by starting to work with Iraq. Though Turkey's new plan was not supported by Washington which continued to concentrate on Egypt, and thus it has not yet to take its concrete form it nevertheless established a ground to Turkey's future strategy which would attract the attention of John Foster Dulles, Acheson's successor. As a result and in line with the conclusions of London talks while Britain and the USA continued to focus on Egypt with regard to MEDO Turkey was to concentrate on Iraq at the beginning of 1953.

American Reactions to the Anglo-Turkish Agreement and the New Developments (October–December 1952)

After the complete Anglo-Turkish agreement over the tactics to be adopted to secure Arab cooperation, the Foreign Office, on 21 October, informed the American Embassy about the outcome of the Anglo-Turkish discussions.⁹¹ A few days later Eden instructed his ambassador in Washington to let the Americans know that Britain and Turkey had now agreed to set up a defence organisation no matter what the Arab reactions might be and expressed the hope that the Americans would concur with the conclusions of the London talks.⁹²

The initial State Department reactions to the British communication, however, were negative. It still remained convinced that the sponsoring

powers must either approach all the Arab states simultaneously or make an exclusive approach to Egypt as she was the key in the Middle East defence efforts.⁹³ It endorsed the reports of its Eastern Missions, which believed that the Arab states would not be willing to join a Western defence organisation 'prior [to the] settlement [of] outstanding issues between [the] UK and Egypt'.⁹⁴

Moreover, the American Ambassador in Baghdad, in his report to the State Department on 24 October, objected to the Turkish approach to Iraq by explaining that the standing of Turkey in Baghdad was very low and hence it was inadvisable to support the Turkish proposal.⁹⁵ The State Department, on 28 October, informed the British Foreign Office of these views and proposed that the joint Anglo-American embassies should approach Iraq and Egypt.⁹⁶

Eden, in response to these American suggestions, stated that he could not agree with them. He further stated that he accepted the Menderes proposals 'as offering the best hope of making some progress on MEDO' and hence concluded that he could not re-open the conclusions reached with the Turks. He also indicated, as various reports had proven to him, that Egypt would not join MEDO unless Britain completely evacuated her territory.⁹⁷ In the meantime, Helm had already advised the Foreign Office not to give way to the American pressure against the London agreement because this would cause serious offence to the Turks who were firmly behind it.⁹⁸

This was followed by an American *aide mémoire* of 5 November handed over to the British Embassy in Washington. In the memorandum Acheson, after fully examining the text of Anglo-Turkish agreement, concluded that 'Egypt not Iraq is the key to this question and no other Arab state would be willing to consider participation in the Middle East Defence Organisation until the present difficulties between Egypt and the United Kingdom are settled.'⁹⁹ Acheson also urged Britain to resume negotiations with Egypt in which the United States would be willing to take an active part by encouraging Egypt, through economic and military assistance, to cooperate with the West. Then he suggested making an approach to the other Arab states with regard to MEDO since the talks with Egypt, as the Americans believed, would create a good atmosphere in which to make this approach.¹⁰⁰

Having been at a crossroads between the different Turkish and American plans, Britain initially decided to accept both and to pursue them simultaneously.¹⁰¹ Concurrently, Turkey informed Britain that she had deferred her planned approaches to Iraq until after the elections, which were

due in mid-January 1953. Also, the continued public uprisings in Baghdad discouraged the Turkish government from continuing its soundings with the Iraqi government.¹⁰² The Turkish Foreign Ministry, after its initial surprise at the negative American reactions to the Turkish plans, came later to agree to the British idea of a parallel action to be made to both Egypt and Iraq with regard to setting up a defence organisation.¹⁰³

Under these circumstances, Britain reviewed its Middle Eastern policy and modified it to meet current conditions, as explained in a message to its Middle Eastern Missions on 8 November:

We agree with the State Department that the Egyptian attitude is the key factor and that an approach to Egypt regarding MEDO is unlikely to produce any positive result unless it is accompanied by proposals for a settlement of the Suez Canal question. We welcome the US expression of interest in negotiations with Egypt with a view to facilitating an Anglo-Egyptian agreement and we will produce proposals for a settlement for discussion with the Americans as soon as possible... As far as Turkish soundings in Iraq are concerned, the Turkish government have told us that they now decided to defer any specific approach until after [the] Iraqi elections.¹⁰⁴

Britain, with this line, began to increasingly concentrate on Egypt with regard to its ultimate regional defence project and hence distanced herself from the London agreement. This policy was to continue until early spring of 1953 at a time when Britain lost hope of Egypt and began to concentrate on Turkish defence project between Turkey, Iraq and itself.

Turkish Attempts to Persuade the Arab States to Join MEDO (October–December 1952)

Even before Menderes had promised Eden to help Britain in overcoming its difficulties with Egypt during the London talks, the Turkish government had already taken action to approach Egypt in this regard. On 13 October Fuat Hulusi Tugay, the Turkish Ambassador in Cairo, acting on instructions from the Foreign Ministry, conducted lengthy conversations with both the Egyptian President and the Foreign Minister. Tugay to begin with met with the latter and invited Egypt to join MEDO. The Egyptian Foreign Minister responded that there was no possibility of Egypt's discussing the proposal before Britain evacuated Egypt. Then the Minister suggested that Tugay should talk with Neguib if he wanted to talk further about this subject.¹⁰⁵

Thereafter Tugay met with Neguib and repeated the same proposal. The General, after admitting the advantages of Egyptian participation in the organisation said that they could not join MEDO until Britain had withdrawn from Egyptian soil. Then Neguib complained about the British treatment of Egypt as a 'colony' and her outstanding £300 million debt to Egypt incurred during the last war. Nevertheless, in the end, Neguib indicated that Egypt would consider the defence problem of the Middle East. This convinced Turkish Foreign Ministry circles that Egypt was still leaving the door half open with regard to its participation in MEDO.¹⁰⁶

At the beginning of November, though Turkey was delaying her plan for a unilateral approach to Iraq until after the elections took place, she decided to continue her efforts to persuade the Arabs to participate in MEDO. In this regard Turkey made another attempt to encourage Egypt to join the defence organisation. On this occasion, the Egyptian President was intolerant towards the Turkish attempt. Neguib, on 6 February, made it unmistakably clear to the Turkish Ambassador that there was no chance of Egypt or any of the Arab states taking part in a defence system of which Turkey was a member.¹⁰⁷

This came as a shock not only to Turkey but also to Britain. When the British Ambassador in Cairo reported it, he went so far as to suggest the exclusion of Turkey from MEDO in order to meet Egypt's requirements. This caused some confusion and speculation in the Foreign Office, which was contemplating a modification of MEDO to woo Neguib to join it.¹⁰⁸ However, the general Foreign Office reaction, as its Ankara mission had strongly advocated, was that, '... without them [the Turks] to set up MEDO is unthinkable but in order to persuade the Egyptians to reverse their ideas both we and the Americans will have to show firmness with the Egyptians, smoke out the reasons for their objections.'¹⁰⁹

Turkey, therefore, lost hope of getting Egypt aligned with the Western defence efforts as Nuri Birgi, the Assistant Secretary-General of the Foreign Ministry, hinted to Helm.¹¹⁰ She then turned her attention to the other regional states. Köprülü continued to meet with Arab ambassadors in an attempt to attract them to the idea of MEDO. Turkey also began to prepare to approach Iran on the issue but Britain instructed Helm to dissuade Turkey from pursuing this initiative in the belief that Iran would reject it and this might have an adverse effect on other states of the region.¹¹¹

At this time Köprülü, in a speech to GNA, provided a detailed explanation about the reasons for Turkey's policy of promoting Arab participation in Middle East defence. After indicating that the Turkish government had tried to establish close and active relations with the Arab states, Köp-

rülü hinted that this policy was frustrated by the Soviet Union. To this end he stated that:

The anxiety surrounding the world and the prevailing sensitivity in the Middle East leads to some misunderstandings....There are those who want to provoke disagreements between us and these sister states and their seditious campaigns have been effective in this regard. These propagandists not only did use every opportunity to deepen existing misunderstandings but also tried to create new ones. However this has not made us angry or anxious or put us into despair. We are pursuing our frank and sincere policy with patience and determination.¹¹²

The Turkish MFA saw Arab participation in the Middle East defence plans as the only way to thwart the Soviet threat:

The existence of a dangerous world situation adds to these general and permanent factors and this thus necessitates very close relations between us. In fact we are all exposed to the same great danger and this makes it urgent and necessary to develop a close cooperation between us. I strongly hope that the sincere and enduring works we have made will eventually lead to a reciprocal understanding and that this will eventually bring a close and active friendship between ourselves and the Arab states. The setting up of the Middle East Defence Organization, which has been recently mentioned by the press should be seen as a result of the deliberations I have explained.¹¹³

Köprülü's comments in fact reflected the Turkish government's general desire to fill the dangerous security gap in the Middle East in cooperation with the regional states. Ankara therefore continued to sound out the Arab states in this regard. After failure with Egypt, Turkey approached Syria.

Turkey's initial contacts with Colonel Adib Shishakli, President of Syria, were more successful. In a conversation with the Turkish Ambassador he expressed his sympathy with MEDO and stated that Iraq should not be singled out for prior treatment before Syria.¹¹⁴ Shishakli, however, in a later conversation with the Turkish Ambassador, diverged from his earlier views and stated that Syria would only cooperate if the West satisfied the Arab nationalist aspirations on the Palestine and Suez base issues.¹¹⁵

Turkish contacts with the Arab states once again showed that there had been a certain divergence of approach to the Middle Eastern issues between the two parties. This was indeed widened at a time when Turkey demonstrated her opposition to the independence of Tunisia and Morocco (the Maghreb Question) at the UN during the late 1952. The issue of Tunisian independence was put on the agenda of the political committee of the UN in December with the support of the Arabs and seven Asian states.

The Arab-Asian draft resolution called for negotiations between the representatives of the Tunisian people and France to establish a commission to deal with the implementation of the right of self-determination. The Turkish delegate voted against the draft indicating that direct UN intervention would only delay the settlement. He then, voted for an alternative draft which expressed confidence in France's treatment of the Tunisian question, which was approved by the Committee and adopted by the General Assembly. Two days later Turkey adopted a similar approach when casting her vote in favour of France against the nationalists of Morocco during the UN session.¹¹⁶

In fact, Turkish voting in the UN reflected her desire to align herself firmly with the West against the USSR. Turkey believed that communism could gain some ground in the Maghreb countries of Tunisia and Morocco if a united Western front were not established. There was also a danger that the UN engagement in the Maghreb Question would also bring Soviet involvement in the issue and this would have further complicated the stability in the Middle East. Therefore, in order to maintain the existing situation Ankara rendered her support to France during the UN voting.¹¹⁷ Whatever the underlying Turkish intentions were, however, their stance was in a sharp contrast to the Arab position which supported independence movements of the Maghreb countries.

Therefore, by the end of 1952, it became clear that there was no much chance for the Turkish attempts in convincing the Arab states of the advantages of participating in the Western defence scheme. This failure, however, once more proved the accuracy of earlier Turkish justifications announced during the London talks about the necessity for a piecemeal approach to the regional states, such as Iraq, which was the Arab state most exposed to the Soviet threat.

Eisenhower Administration and the Emergence of the 'Northern Tier' Scheme (January–July 1953)

The new British policy towards Egypt was further examined during Anglo-American talks held in London between 31 December and 7 January and MEDO took a central place in the new British proposals. As a result a broad-ranging agreement was reached between the two sides.¹¹⁸ This policy was also approved by the new Eisenhower administration, which took office on 20 January 1953. Churchill, in a personal message to the new President, asked for his cooperation in a joint Anglo-American approach to the Egyptian government.¹¹⁹ Eisenhower, however, accepted Churchill's suggestions with some reservations and indicated that he would make no final decision until he had consulted John Foster Dulles, his Secretary of State.¹²⁰

Concurrently, General Neguib invited Britain to solve the Sudan question, which had been one of the major obstacles to Anglo-Egyptian agreement since 1946. An agreement was finally reached between the two parties on 12 February 1953 with the help of American mediation. According to the agreement an international commission would be established to govern Sudan for a three-year transitional period and thereafter it would be independent.¹²¹ This agreement raised British hopes of reaching a final settlement with Egypt on other vital issues such as the Suez base and Egyptian participation in MEDO.¹²²

In mid-March this optimism was somewhat modified, due to Egyptian insistence on unconditional British withdrawal from her soil. The Egyptian government also rejected the suggestion of American participation in the proposed discussions indicating that this was an inclusive issue between Britain and Egypt and Washington had nothing to do with it.¹²³ However, the British Cabinet, for its part, based its entire plans on US participation in discussions with Egypt and it was not prepared to consider the evacuation of the Suez base separately from the MEDO plans. Meanwhile, Eisenhower made it clear that unless the Egyptian government wished it, the US government would not join the discussions.¹²⁴

Thus, a fresh deadlock became inevitable between London and Cairo. Finally, after considerable efforts by both sides, negotiations resumed on 27 April and ended on 6 May, still with no result. While the Egyptians insisted on unconditional British withdrawal, Britain refused to comply before discussing the issue of the security of the Suez Canal. This further increased the tension between Cairo and London and the American attempts to mediate between the two sides eventually failed.¹²⁵

This deteriorating situation in Egypt and the cold attitude on the Arabs' part to the British defence proposals had already convinced Dulles that establishing MEDO was not feasible and the USA should take its own line in solving the question of Middle Eastern defence. At the beginning of May he even expressed the idea that Washington might not join MEDO even if London solved its problems with Cairo.¹²⁶

As the new US government was more determined to halt communist infiltration to the South, it had already begun to modify its foreign and strategic policies in the region in the light of the developments on atomic weapons, which reduced the importance of the Suez base.¹²⁷ Thus, it began to attach more importance to such 'Northern Tier' states as Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq and Syria for setting up a collective Middle Eastern defence because they were closer to the Soviet Union and thus more aware of the communist threat.¹²⁸

The same line was also taken by British strategists who thought that 'the Canal Zone, though as a base it was still valuable, was no longer indispensable'.¹²⁹ They thought that it would be dangerous to station 80,000 troops in this base, which was within striking distance of the Soviet nuclear arsenal. The Global Strategy Paper, prepared by the British COS in the spring of 1952, began to examine the possibilities of reducing the cost of British defence by relying on cheaper alternatives such as atomic weaponry. This policy thus would reduce the strategic importance of the British overseas bases.¹³⁰

Bearing in mind these considerations, the COS, on 27 August 1954, even concluded that 'the Canal Zone base with a hostile Egypt might become in war a liability rather than an asset'.¹³¹ Although the military planners had reached these conclusions the British government, for reasons partly of prestige and partly of internal politics reasons, still would not consider evacuating Egypt without reaching a satisfactory agreement over the Suez Zone.¹³²

At this time in early 1953, in the absence of an agreement over the Suez base and in accordance with the guidelines reflected in the recent Defence White Paper, the COS established an ad hoc Committee to review Middle Eastern strategy and named it a 'Radical Review'. According to the strategy, the COS were preparing to reduce British forces and hence military expenditure, focusing instead on strengthening air forces in the region, and planned to establish mobile forces which would be stationed either in Cyprus or in Britain. The purpose of adopting the 'mobile concept' was to reduce the forces in the Middle East in peacetime and to deploy them rapidly in case of emergency. The Radical Review also began

to examine a new 'forward strategy', which focused on holding the Russians as far to the North and East as possible in order to protect the frontier between Iraq and Iran and also to reinforce the Turkish southern flank.¹³³

While the recent British defence strategies were in progress the Americans were also searching for new defence alternatives in the Middle East. For this purpose Dulles launched an extensive series of visits to the capitals of several Middle Eastern countries between 9 and 29 May 1953 to survey the problems of the area at first hand and to reappraise USA policy accordingly.¹³⁴

On his return to Washington, at the National Security Meeting on 1 June, Dulles made a lengthy speech giving an account of the outcome of his tour. He said that solving the Anglo-Egyptian problem would not be easy and it would take years to find a result satisfactory to both sides. Dulles therefore suggested dropping the idea of making Egypt a centre of any Middle Eastern defence plans. He had also, he said, observed that the prestige of the Western powers was very low in the region and the USA had already suffered from being linked with British and French imperialism. He went on to say that the Israeli and the Suez Canal questions were barriers in the way of collaboration between the Arabs and the West.¹³⁵

Dulles then developed his idea that a new defence line should be built on the 'Northern Tier' states which acknowledged the communist danger and would be more willing to join the Western defence efforts. Though Dulles named these states as Turkey, Iraq, Syria and Pakistan, he indicated that Iran should also be added to the defence to cover the missing link in the northern line.¹³⁶

Dulles, in his televised address to the nation on the evening of 1 June about his observations during the tour, gave a clear outline for his future defence plans which suggested abandoning the MEDO project and instead focusing on the Northern Tier countries for the setting up of collective defence plans in the region. He also emphasised that this proposed pact should not be imposed by the West but rather be a product of the region itself. This new approach, with some modifications later on, was approved by the President on 11 July and hence became official American policy, under the designation NSC-155/1.¹³⁷ With the new policy, Washington was prepared to take increased responsibility in the area in organising the defence of the Middle East against the communist threat.¹³⁸

While this new line in essence was a re-formulation of former American outer-ring strategy it represented, at the same time, a significant shift on the part of US regional policy¹³⁹ which was now prepared to follow its

own course independently of Britain on the defence issues in the region.¹⁴⁰ The new line signalled a change from the previous US strategy, based on Egypt, to a new Turkish-based strategy. Turkey now gained more importance in US regional strategic and political thinking.¹⁴¹ Turkey welcomed this policy since it fully suited to her own strategy which would provide further security against her giant neighbour.

By mid-July 1953, Dulles had become more precise in his idea of a Northern Tier scheme. In his talks with Lord Salisbury, the acting British Secretary of State due to Eden's illness, held between 9 and 15 July in Washington, Dulles said that the Arab states¹⁴² in the southern part of the Middle East were not preoccupied with the Soviet threat; rather they were concerned about Israel and French colonialism. Though Syria was slightly forthcoming toward the West, the Levant states were in general paying 'lip-service' to the defence efforts in order to obtain economic aid. The only countries concerned with the Soviet danger, therefore, were, as Dulles pointed out, Turkey, Iraq, Pakistan and Persia. Dulles further indicated that these countries, with American military assistance, would come together in establishing a bulwark in front of the Soviets in part of the northern area of the Middle East. Dulles then indicated that there was no hope in pursuing MEDO.¹⁴³

Turkey's Initiatives with Iraq: The Emergence of Turkish 'Triangular Strategy' (January–July 1953)

Turkey's first bilateral intimate contacts with the Iraqis with regard to Middle Eastern defence came during the London talks of October 1952 when Abdulillah, the Regent of Iraq, was in London for a visit. In the talks between Menderes and Abdulillah, the latter had indicated the readiness of Iraq to discuss Middle East defence with the Turks but advised the former in this regard that the Turks should wait until the Iraqi elections took place.¹⁴⁴ This convinced the Turkish leaders, especially Menderes, that Iraq, which acknowledged the Soviet danger, should, like Turkey, be a starting point in the Turkish Middle Eastern defence plans and indeed the London talks and the Turco-Iraqi conversations formed the roots of Turkish strategy, the 'Triangular Strategy', which eventually was transformed into the Baghdad Pact of 1955.

Moreover, as the Turkish Military Attaché to Baghdad confirmed in his memoirs, the Turkish Premier began to develop an intimate personal friendship with the Regent of Iraq and this was an important factor for the establishment of mutual confidence between Iraq and Turkey, as the former had previously been suspicious about Turkish irredentism, believ-

ing that Turkey might one day take the opportunity to recover territories in northern Iraq which it had lost during the First World War.¹⁴⁵ Turkey, to begin with, showed her goodwill towards Iraq by preparing to raise the status of its Mission to the level of an embassy.¹⁴⁶

At this time the progress of Turkish strategy and the approaches of the Arab states to Turkish defence efforts in the Middle East was elaborated and analyzed in detail in a report prepared by the Turkish Foreign Ministry. After noting the negative attitudes of Egypt, Lebanon and Syria to Turkish defence efforts, the report pointed out that the Palestinian issue and Western support for Israel was the main obstacle to Arab co-operation with the West. However, as regards Iraq, the report conversely was optimistic. The report revealed the fact that the Iraqi leaders were sympathetic to regional defence and Iraq would be the most probable Arab candidate to join Turkish defence efforts. The report indicated that:

The Prince regent's declaration in London to our Prime Minister that he supported Iraqi participation in a Middle East defence organization; Nuri Said Pasha's statement to our representative in Baghdad that he would strive for this goal if he were re-elected and the statement of the [Iraqi] foreign minister, Fadhel Jamali, to our *charge d'affaires* (13 January 1953) that the prince regent, Nuri Said Pasha and he were in favour of cooperation with the Western powers ...and that if they were to remain in power after the elections then they would exert greater effort in this matter all indicate the suitability of Iraq as a target for the initiative decided upon in London if Nuri Said [Pasha] came to power.¹⁴⁷

The report however noted that there were some problems regarding Iraq's cooperation with Britain on the issue of regional defence. Jamali was reported to have told the Turkish representative to Baghdad that Iraq and the other Arab states were unhappy with the West in general and with the British policies in particular. Jamali continued his line that if the United Kingdom was prepared to hand over the two air bases at Habbaniya and Shaiba to Iraqi administration and settled its dispute with Egypt then Baghdad would be in a better position to win public opinion for Iraqi co-operation with the West.¹⁴⁸

In short, the report clearly indicated the Turkish government's expectation that Iraq was likely to cooperate with Turkey in the latter's defence strategy in the region though it had some reluctance to make contacts with Britain on the same issue. However, Ankara first had to await the results

of Iraqi elections which were due to take place in early January 1953. While Turkey was preparing for her future strategy at the same time she continued to support the MEDO project.

This was because Turkey wanted to maintain her solidarity with the policies of her major allies, which continued to concentrate on Egypt in the MEDO plan, and therefore avoided acting unilaterally to realise her strategy. Ironically, while supporting the MEDO plan Turkey had no confidence in Cairo concerning the establishment of a defence scheme and in any case did not want any country to play a leading role in any regional security organization other than herself. Turkey also made these views clear to Iraqi leaders when the Turkish representative to Baghdad made contacts with the Iraqi Foreign Minister at the end of February 1953.

Having received positive signals from Iraq Turkey's expectations on the success of her regional strategy was further enhanced with the new developments in February 1953. In mid-January Köprülü paid a visit to Belgrade to bring this country into Balkan defence cooperation. A month later an agreement about the establishment of a Balkan pact was signed on 28 February 1953 between the states of Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia.¹⁴⁹

This pact was promoted by Ankara as a first step towards increasing the security of neighbour states against the USSR. The Turkish leaders claiming the responsibility for it presented the agreement as an indication of Turkey's policy to set up a barrier to Soviet expansionism and as a pioneering security attempt towards the establishment of a new one, namely the Middle East defence pact.¹⁵⁰ The Turkish Prime Minister for instance stated that the agreement was 'an example of Turkey's greater interest in the security and welfare of her neighbours'. Similarly Menderes pronounced that 'geographical proximity and sharing a common fate' had the effect of stimulating better relations between Turkey and the Middle Eastern states and Turkey was working with 'great patience and sincerity' to establish a joint defence system with the regional states.¹⁵¹

Simultaneously the Turkish industrious efforts in the Balkans and the Middle East began to have positive echoes in the Iraqi media and in the minds of its politicians. Turkey's intense and successful efforts in the Balkans to construct a defence pact were closely watched by the Arab press. The Iraqi paper, *Al-Shab*, after praising Turkish activities in the Balkans, described the contacts between Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia as the most important event of 1952. According to the paper's editorial, the Arab political leaders saw these efforts as a first step towards a wider Middle Eastern defence pact.¹⁵² At this time, Ahmet Umar, the Turkish Minister

in Baghdad, began to make contact with the Iraqi leaders about the issue of Middle East defence.

The Iraqi Foreign Minister, in his conversations with Umar, on 13 January, after expressing his satisfaction with the favourable Turkish attitude towards Palestine¹⁵³ stated that the Regent, Nuri Pasha, and he were all in favour of Iraqi cooperation with the West. But then he indicated that the Anglo-Egyptian dispute and the Israeli question were barriers to improved Arab relations to this goal. Jemali also revealed that his government wished to come to some arrangement about putting the two British airbases under Iraqi control. Thereafter, Açıkalın informed Helm of the contents of the telegram, during his usual exchange of information with him.¹⁵⁴

The Foreign Office, commenting on this telegram, indicated that informal Turkish soundings of Iraq would be useful but should not prejudice the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations and instructed Helm to let the Turks see that there was no need for them to get involved in the question of British bases in Iraq.¹⁵⁵ Meanwhile, in late January, the Iraqi elections resulted in a sweeping victory for the supporters of Nuri Pasha, who took the post of Defence Minister. The Foreign Office in London regarded the new government in Baghdad as a firm and pro-British one. These views were also shared by Ankara.¹⁵⁶

While Turkey was prepared to increase her contacts with the Arab states for possible Turco-Arab defence cooperation, Köprülü, in his speech on 23 February in the National Assembly, restated Turkish determination to further improve relations with her Arab neighbours. In his speech, after dealing with Turkey's policies in Europe and in the Far East, he turned to the Middle East:

As for Turco-Arab relations I wish to say that these relations are improving day by day. Despite the subversive activities of those who do not wish such improved relations, Turkey is determined to maintain close collaboration with the Arab states. Our close relations with Iraq are growing day by day. We should lose no opportunity of improving Turco-Iraqi cooperation in every aspect. Turkey and Iraq have now raised their Missions to the level of Embassies as an indication of the improvement between the two countries. Also steps will be taken towards improving Turkey's relations with Syria, Saudi Arabia and Jordan.¹⁵⁷

Köprülü continued his speech by indicating the importance of exchange visits to Arab countries by politicians, journalists, scholars and students in order to develop a better understanding between Turks and Arabs. He then pointed out the communist danger to which all the states of the region were equally exposed, and to the unrealistic desire for neutrality. Köprülü expressed Turkey's determination to work for the creation of a system of defence in the Middle East, which was of vital importance for her own defence.¹⁵⁸

The British Foreign Office, observing Köprülü's speech, commented on the recent Turkish efforts to establish close political ties with many countries such as Iran, the Arab states, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Italy, Yugoslavia, etc., but omitting the communist bloc. After praising the Turkish leaders, especially Menderes, for this hard work the Foreign Office said that it regarded this as a task 'beyond human powers'.¹⁵⁹

In the light of these developments Turkey began to concentrate her energies on Iraq to persuade her to join the Western efforts by the end of February. Umar, acting on instructions from the Turkish Foreign Ministry, approached Taufik Suwaidi, the new Iraqi MFA with a memorandum to inform him of Turkey's ideas on Middle East defence. It started with the thesis that the situation in the region was threatening and Turkey and Iraq were in the greatest danger as they were closest to the Soviet Union. The situation in Iran constituted a vacuum, which increased the danger of the threat.¹⁶⁰ The implication was clear:

It is therefore in the interests of all of us to coordinate the defence of the Middle East as soon as possible. The most efficacious way of doing so will be to create a system of collective security for the Middle East with the participation of the countries in the area. The interest in this matter evinced by far-sighted Iraqi statesmen and also the request for information made by the Iraqi Minister for Foreign Affairs shows us that the question of principle has already been resolved.¹⁶¹

Then, the memorandum explained the structure of the proposed MEDO and advocated the establishment of a planning body in which all the interested governments would be represented on a basis of equality. Towards the end of the memorandum, the Turkish Foreign Minister emphasised the intense efforts by Turkey to defend the MEDO idea and proposed immediate Turco-Iraqi cooperation on the defence issue, stating that:

In face of the danger mentioned above, Iraq and Turkey are from the geographical point of view the two countries, which are vitally interested in the earliest possible creation of the MEDO. Turkey has been most active in showing its vital interest. Now we see that Iraq, too, is interested and on the basis of our mutual concern we are very happy to submit the question to her for her consideration.¹⁶²

After presenting the memorandum, Umar continued to explain Turkish ideas orally to Suwaidi. The latter, to begin with, remarked in reply that even Britain had so far not explained the nature of MEDO to his government in such clear and plain words as Turkey. He then said that Iraq would have to await the outcome of the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations before taking any decision. If Egypt joined MEDO Iraq would follow the same course. However, if Egypt remained opposed then Iraq, he said, would make a separate arrangement with the Western powers.

But Suwaidi indicated that this course would not be an easy one and the Palestine question was still a major obstacle obstructing Iraqi co-operation with the West. He then suggested that Arab-Western cooperation could be achieved through the Arab League. To this Umar responded that Turkey was opposed to any defence proposal having Egypt as a centre. He also indicated the Turkish belief that Turkey should take a leading role in the region and said that she was more qualified for this role than 'Egypt, which was primarily an African country rather than a Middle Eastern one'.¹⁶³

This conversation shows, once again, the degree of policy differences between the Republican and the Democrat governments of Turkey towards the Middle East. In 1948, under the former administration, Sadak, then the Turkish Foreign Minister, refused to take a leading role in the region on the grounds that Turkey had no such policy at a time when the Levant states, which were still in shock as a result of defeat from the Palestine war and of the military incompetence of Egypt, had approached Turkey to take such a role.

This was indeed the new political vision of the Democrat government, which had made a great impact on the major change of the British perception of Turkey. The comments of the British Foreign Office, which con-curred with the recent Turkish ideas about Egypt, demonstrates the change of the British attitude.¹⁶⁴ In 1948, for instance, Britain, in examining the suggestions of the Levant States for Turkey, had avoided making any attempt to undermine the Egyptian leadership position in the Middle East whereas by late-1952 it began to consider that Turkey was the most

suitable country in the region to take a leading role in organising the defence of the area.

Though the Turkish views with regard to regional defence were welcomed by London they did not please Washinton.¹⁶⁵ After the Turkish views were reported by Berry (American Ambassador) to Washington, the State Department commented that Egypt still had primary importance, as it had Britain's principal base in its territory, in the Middle East. It planned to recommend London to oppose this kind of Turkish selective action, which eliminated Egypt in the Arab capitals with regard to the Middle East defence.¹⁶⁶

Concurrently, the government of Iraq, after examining the Turkish proposals in mid-March, communicated its views to Turkey and to the Western Ambassadors as well. In its communication to Turkey on 6 April Iraq indicated its readiness for a possible defence pact in the Middle East against the Soviet threat. The Iraqi memorandum indicated that:

Irak [sic] considers the defence of her independence as a natural duty which takes precedence of all else. This duty and the responsibilities imposed by it must be confined to the Irakian [sic] frontiers. As to her undertaking beyond this any other obligation, this is only possible in proportion as the provisions of the defence pact now in force between the Arab states would authorize it.

Pending the provision of the necessary means by the common defence organization of Arab states and the adjustment of their problems, and pending the clarification of the situation arising from the difficulties between certain Arab states and Western powers, Iraq deems it her duty to fulfil now and without delay her obligations with regard to her own defence.

She has therefore drawn up the necessary plans on matters related to the increase of such defensive capacity as army equipment and ammunition, and to the attainment of this object. With a view to obtaining her requirements and building up her defence, she will request as much aid from the United States of America and Great Britain as authorized under articles of 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter.¹⁶⁷

The report continued to state that Iraq wanted to close up the existing defence gap on the Ravandiz, Halepce, Hanikin and Basra front which re-

quired Iranian cooperation. The report however made emphasis on Iraqi determination to build up its own defence indicating that '...no matter what may result from an approach to Iran and whatever efforts Turkey may make in collaboration with Iran in order to close up the gap between Russia, [and] Turkey and Irak [sic], Irak [sic] will continue, within the above said framework and by various means, to strengthen her army and to build her own defence.'¹⁶⁸

In short, the Iraqi memorandum made it clear that the government in Baghdad was firm to reinforce her security against the USSR with the help of the Western powers. It pointed out that Baghdad was ready to collaborate with Ankara and Tehran to fill the defence gap in the north. The memorandum was also significant in showing Iraq's desire to strengthen her defence even at the cost of risking its relations with the Arab states which had long opposed to western defence attempts.

The Iraqi determination pleased the Turkish government and greatly raised its hopes of making a joint attempt with Baghdad towards establishing a regional defence pact. This was especially the case when Köprülü praised the Iraqi decision to prepare itself against any threat from the north during his stay in Baghdad on 4 May. Köprülü further told his counterpart that 'Turkey and Iraq might in the future be able to build on the convergence of their policies in order to strengthen Middle East defence'.¹⁶⁹

The Iraqi government in the meantime made communications with the American and British ambassadors and explained them Iraq's position on the issue of regional defence. In his respective communications with Berry and Troutbeck (the British Ambassador) Suwaidi, to begin with, said that the Turks had made the Iraqis realise the danger of how very vulnerable their country was to a Soviet attack through Iran. For this reason, he continued, Iraq was ready to improve the conditions of its armed forces and ready to discuss the defence issue with the UK and US governments. The Iraqi Foreign Minister, however, stated that while his government was grateful for Turkey's encouragement to the problem of defence, they did not want to sign a bilateral agreement with Turkey.¹⁷⁰

In giving an account to the British Ambassador about the nature of the Iraqi reply to the Turkish notes, Umar went on to say to Troutbeck that while the Iraqi response was not wholly negative to the Turkish suggestions it was still not satisfactory. The Iraqis showed their keenness to rebuild their armed forces with the help of the UK and the USA but they ignored the Turkish suggestion of doing something to fill the defence vacuum, which stemmed from the weakness of Iran.¹⁷¹

By the end of March 1953, it therefore appeared that though the initial Turkish actions towards Iraq did not bring a concrete result it at least stimulated the Iraqi leaders to consider the Soviet threat and thus to seek Anglo-American assistance to prepare themselves against this danger.

Simultaneously, Turkey also made fresh approaches in February to the Levant states on MEDO but gained no serious results. The Syrians, in talks with the Turkish Minister in Damascus, made it clear that the Arabs should be informed at the preliminary stage about the nature of the Western defence proposals and they would not accept any fait accompli imposed on them. They also indicated that the proposals should be formulated to address the feelings of their people.¹⁷²

At this time the renewal of Turco-Syrian tension over the Hatay issue left no room to Ankara to make further contacts with Damascus. The Syrian press with the support of its government began to make a violent campaign demanding the return of Hatay to Syria. This indeed produced very strong reactions not only from the Turkish government but also from the media. The Turkish President paid a visit to the city and declared Turkey's determination to preserve her territorial integrity. Only few months later the tension began to calm down.¹⁷³

Turco-Lebanese contacts appeared to be more successful. In conversation with the visiting Lebanese Press delegation, the Turkish leaders, Köprülü and Koraltan, the President of the Grand National Assembly, even went so far as to suggest forming a federation between the Arab states and Turkey to confront the communist threat.¹⁷⁴

This suggestion certainly did not imply a literal meaning, only a closer Turco-Arab cooperation on the economic and security plane. This suggestion was also interesting in that it recalled Atatürk's plan, which proposed 'Turco-Arab federation' with the northern Arab states to establish a common front against the possible imperialistic designs in the Middle East in the formative period of the new Turkish Republic. While Atatürk was able to realise this project only little more than a decade later in 1937 with the establishment of the Sadabad Pact, the Democrat leaders put their plans into practice within two years with the establishment of the Baghdad Pact in 1955.

As no noticeable development had been recorded on the issue of regional defence by the end of March, the Turkish leaders, especially the Prime Minister, began to be depressed at the lack of progress. Menderes, in talking to Birgi, who informed Helm about this conversation, expressed his worries over whether the Western powers should wait indefinitely for the Arab states or whether a new formula in connection with defence

matters ought not to be found. Birgi, commenting on Menderes' ideas, pointed to the fact that the past months of protracted effort in approaching the Arab states had not been entirely wasted since the Arab countries could now not make any complaint if the Western powers went ahead without them and therefore they began to recognise the need for some kind of defence system in the Middle East.¹⁷⁵

The Turkish Foreign Minister in addition expressed his dissatisfaction about the lack of progress in defence matters. In a conversation with Helm, Köprülü expressed the idea that demagoguery dominated all the Arab States, which hampered the positive Turkish efforts directed at fostering cooperation between them. He even went on to say that the situation was far worse than in October 1952. Köprülü also indicated that Turkey would not renew her soundings in Iraq until his planned visit in May to Baghdad for the coronation of King Faisal.¹⁷⁶

In the British Foreign Office, Lord Hood, head of the Western Department, having been informed about the latest Turkish plans and thinking, commented that he entirely agreed with the Turkish evaluation on the recent position of MEDO. He further expressed the idea that Britain now faced an obvious dilemma about the plans for MEDO. On the one hand, while the Arab states would not move unless Egypt did so, the latter showed no sign of willingness to join in the proposed defence scheme. On the other hand, Britain could not go ahead without the Arabs because the Americans still remained opposed to setting up shop without the Arabs.

The only option, therefore, as he concluded, was to 'put the MEDO plan into cold storage' and to focus on solving the Anglo-Arab problems thorough bilateral discussions. As for the defence of the area, as Lord Hood concluded, something needed to be done by establishing some form of cooperation between the British MEHQ, the TGS and the Southern Sector of NATO, which had already set up its headquarters in İzmir in western Turkey under General Wyman.¹⁷⁷ However, the Foreign Office as a whole did not share these ideas. The general opinion there was still inclined to pursue an understanding with Egypt and hence it concluded that further Turkish actions towards Iraq should be discouraged until the Egyptian situation became clear.¹⁷⁸

After Turkey had frozen her activities in wooing the Arab states to MEDO at the end of March, Köprülü decided to approach the Arab states one more time as he would have had a good opportunity to do this during his coronation visit in Baghdad at the beginning of May 1953. Just prior to Köprülü's visit, Nedim Veysel İlkin was appointed to Baghdad as the first Turkish Ambassador. During his visit, Köprülü conducted a series of con-

versations with all the Arab representatives and told them what he thought about the general situation in the Middle East.¹⁷⁹

Köprülü, giving an account of his talks to Helm on 11 May, said that he had pointed out to the Arab leaders that they were too preoccupied with Israel, and had reminded them that they could not build their front to confront more threatening Russian danger by themselves without Western help. They therefore should choose between the Soviet and the Western front. Then, Köprülü indicated to the Ambassador that the Arab leaders had counteracted these arguments by stating that their sympathies were tied in with the West but the Western powers were not helping the Arab states. The Arab leaders also expressed their concerns that their public opinion would not allow them to take further action to collaborate with the West.¹⁸⁰

The Iraqis had especially expressed their anxiety to the Turkish Foreign Minister that if they were to be more forthcoming to the Western defence efforts the Arab League would strongly attack them. Köprülü told the Iraqis that if they wanted Western military assistance they should prepare the ground for it. The Turkish Foreign Minister then indicated to Helm that while some of the Iraqi and Lebanese leaders were likely to cooperate over regional defence they were incapable of putting these desires into action. He then expressed his dissatisfaction over the negative Arab reactions and concluded that since there was no hope of getting Arab cooperation the MEDO concept had to be put into cold storage.¹⁸¹

The high officials at the Turkish Foreign Ministry also shared Köprülü's pessimism about the prospects of Anglo-Egyptian talks and the future of the MEDO. In his conversation with Helm, on 14 May, Birgi expressed his full agreement with Köprülü's Baghdad conclusions. Contrary to his previous stance, he even showed his reluctance to go ahead with MEDO without the Arabs.

Instead of MEDO Birgi advocated the establishment of a liaison for the defence of the region between the British MEHQ, Turkey and NATO's Headquarters in İzmir; the latter could be formed as the nucleus of the new defence organisation. Thereafter the individual Arab states would join it if they wished to do so. In fact, at this time, the military discussions on the defence of the Middle East had already begun to take some steps between TGS, the British MEHQ and the Southern Sector of NATO. They decided to organise a conference, the Emerald Green Conference in İzmir, to further discuss the possibilities of defence cooperation for the region.¹⁸²

As the Turks had lost hope of setting up the British MEDO plans and their initial approaches to Iraq were not fully satisfactory, they decided to wait and see what steps the new US Secretary of State would take about the future defence of the Middle East. During his historical tour in the region, Dulles visited Turkey on 26 May. To begin with, Dulles held conversations with the Turkish Prime Minister. In their talks, after the former's explanation of the reasons for a tour of the region, Menderes began to express his ideas about the Russian threat and the issues related to Arab states and regional defence. About the former subject the Turkish Premier complained that there was still no united front among the free world against the communist menace and he proposed to pursue a tough line towards it. He next pointed to the Suez question and indicated that this was not merely an Egyptian question but it had a cardinal importance for the security of the free nations. The West should find a satisfactory solution to this problem and should not leave Britain to carry the burden alone.¹⁸³

Turning to the question of Middle East defence and of the Arab attitude towards it, Menderes repeated the same views which had recently been advanced by the Turkish Foreign Ministry. He said that it was the Turkish government's conclusion that there remained no hope of bringing the Arab states into the MEDO plans and hinted that these plans should be abandoned altogether at this time.

The Premier then emphasised that Turkey should be the 'backbone' of the new defence efforts as it was the strongest and ablest country which was most interested in the defence of the area. He further emphasised that Turkey would continue in her efforts to approach the states of the area, including Pakistan, to co-operate in the defence of the Middle East, as in the case of the Balkan Pact, which she had worked hard to organise. Menderes, towards the end of his talk, pointed to the enormous economic and industrial developments in Turkey achieved by the Democrat government and sought further American military and economic assistance to support this great progress. He concluded that Turkey needed this development in order to discharge her duty of playing a bridging role between the West and the Middle East as she was the 'guardian of civilization and element of security in this part of the world'.¹⁸⁴

In response to Menderes' remarks, Dulles said that he fully agreed with the Turkish Premier on the issues related to Russia and the Suez Canal problem. Thereafter, referring to the problem of MEDO, the Secretary of State expressed his concurrence with the idea that Turkey should be a 'backbone' in any defence organisation in the area, but added that there

should be flesh around the backbone. Dulles pointed out that, though all the Arab states were not equally interested in a collective defence organisation, the northern part of the Arab countries, such as Iraq, which realised the Soviet danger, might be encouraged to join the defence efforts outside the MEDO scheme. Though Menderes had distinct doubts, Dulles also mentioned the possibility of attracting the Levant states to the Middle East defence.¹⁸⁵

It was, in fact, remarkable that Dulles' remarks about Iraq and other northern countries which bordered the Soviet Union and were more willing to cooperate in a regional defence, should match so closely with the earlier ideas of Menderes, announced during the London talks in October 1952. The Turkish Premier had however not insisted much in encouraging Iraq to join the MEDO since he lost his previous enthusiasm on the merits and feasibility of this organization. The only difference between the two views was that the Turkish Premier went on to suggest that if the Arab reactions were negative to these defence approaches then MEDO should be set up without Arabs in the last resort. Dulles, however, never thought to exclude any states of the region from the defence efforts.¹⁸⁶

In addition to conversations with the Americans, the Turkish delegation also presented a memorandum to the latter which contained a wide range of information about the recent Turkish political and strategic thinking in the Middle East. The Turkish Foreign Ministry prepared this memorandum and it was approved by the Turkish Cabinet on 20 May in a meeting presided over by President Bayar.¹⁸⁷ In brief, the memorandum strongly emphasised the need for covering the defence gap in the Middle East and urged the Western powers to set up a defence organisation despite Arab intransigence.¹⁸⁸ The main theme of the memorandum was its suggestion to abandon the MEDO project altogether and find a new defence scheme, in which Turkey would play a leading role. More to the point, in his remarks to Dulles, Menderes stressed the line that Turkey would continue to work with the Arab states and with Pakistan for the setting up of a defence organisation.

The memorandum also emphasised the dual approach: that while Turkey made a collective approach she at the same time pursued individual contacts with the Arab states regarding regional defence. It then repeated the Turkish thesis that there was no use in going ahead with Egypt with regard to MEDO:

Originally Egypt was approached on her own but later the initiative was extended to all Arab states on grounds of equality. Similarly in-

dividual exploratory contacts were made while the collective initiative was being pursued.... It is obvious that the Arab states are reluctant to join a Middle East defence organization. Those in power in Egypt have not only rejected any link between the [Suez] Canal [base] issue and Middle East defence but also clearly expressed their unwillingness to adhere to the above-mentioned organization through diplomatic channels as well in public statements.¹⁸⁹

The memorandum wanted to bring the regional defence issue urgently to American attention before the latter lost interest in it as the Turks most feared might happen. It also aimed at showing the Turkish determination to fill the defence gap in the region to the new American administration. The Turks repeated this fear when they commented on Dulles' speech on Middle East defence on 1 June, which was reported to the State Department by the American Ambassador. In the telegram, the Ambassador stated that the Turks interpreted Dulles' conclusions to mean that as if the Americans would wait indefinitely to set up a defence organisation until the Arab states participated and hence this would cause a further delay in filling the security gap in the region.¹⁹⁰

The Turkish fear about the lack of American interest in the security of the Middle East was soon to give way to mutual confidence and cooperation between the two countries when the former began to realise the seriousness of the new American defence plans which aimed to secure the participation of the Northern Tier countries rather than the participation of the southern Arab states. The recent Turco-American conversations resulted in reaching at least an understanding between Menderes and Dulles on approaching Iraq and Pakistan as an initiative towards setting in motion the new defence scheme.

Menderes, long before Dulles, had already begun to work with this idea. The Turkish Premier was however unable to put this plan into practice partly because of British reluctance and partly due to the cautious Iraqi response to the Turkish approaches. Nevertheless, as he had found a strong supporter for his plans, the Turkish Premier would soon resume his efforts to urge Iraqi leaders towards a regional defence establishment.

This marked the beginning of a new era in Western defence efforts in the Middle East. Turkey had already lost hope over the feasibility of the British defence plans, which still insisted on Egypt as the nucleus of a defence organisation, though both countries had reached an agreement in London to put Egypt aside and to start with Iraq and other possible countries eager for the conclusion of a new defence pact.

The changes in the British attitude towards the London agreement stemmed from three main factors: first, Britain was dissuaded from following this agreement by the former American administration, as the latter believed that the new revolutionary regime under Neguib would be favourably inclined towards the Western defence proposals;¹⁹¹ second, the satisfactory solution of the Sudan problem raised high hopes in British political and military circles that this might be a first step towards solving the Suez question; third, the British Middle Eastern Missions, especially in Cairo and in Baghdad, which had considerable influence in the Foreign Office, had generally reported negatively about Turkey by underestimating her capacity to influence the regional states towards a possible defence organisation. Under these conditions, the British Foreign Office increasingly distanced itself from the Anglo-Turkish agreement in favour of an Egyptian-based strategy and this led Turkey to temporarily freeze her activities in the region at the end of March 1953.

Two months later, Dulles' willingness to support the defence efforts in the Northern Tier marked the beginning of an American initiative to assist Turkey in organizing Middle East defence. This was clearly explained by the State Department to the British Mission in Washington on 17 June. In the discussions, Jernegan, the Assistant Secretary of State, explained to Beeley, an official of the British Embassy, that the State Department had decided to put MEDO on the shelf for the time being because of its unfeasibility. Their new plan was to work individually with those states which were most open to the Soviet threat such as Iraq, Syria and Pakistan.¹⁹²

The impact of the recent Turkish thinking on the American view of Middle Eastern defence was clearly reflected in Açıkalın's contact with Helm on 30 May. In the conversation, Açıkalın mentioned about the recent Turco-American talks and said that the Turks had made their views clear to Dulles and they had had some effect on him. Helm then remarked that 'the Americans were still hankering after playing with the Arabs and that they seemed to fear the political organisation without Arab support'.¹⁹³

In response to this remark, Açıkalın, who had so far been a strong supporter of the 'set up the shop' theory, as Helm described it in his report, said that the Americans were right in their arguments from the legal and political points of view. In explaining these points, he said that if the Western powers should go ahead without the Arabs the latter would appeal to the UN on the grounds that certain powers were disposing of

their sovereignty and their future and hence this would put the Western powers into a difficult position.¹⁹⁴

Açıklan continued that the Turkish Foreign Office considered the issue from a military and strategic point of view. As Turkey was at the centre of any regional defence plans, a good deal of military and strategic contacts had already begun between the TGS, British MEHQ, and the Southern Sector of NATO which had met recently in a conference in İzmir, to discuss further the defence of the Middle East. At the end of his talk, the Secretary-General concluded that though there was no chance of influencing the Americans from the legal stand point they could be persuaded from the military and strategic angles.¹⁹⁵

The Emerald Green Conference took its place at İzmir on 22 May 1953 between British, Turkish and American military and civilian authorities. It was agreed that British troops were to be deployed to the forward north-east area to protect the passes between Iraq and Iran and to reinforce the Turkish southern flank. In order to carry out these plans it was necessary for Britain to acquire a stockpile of supplies in the Mardin area (a city in South-eastern Turkey) in peace and it was also necessary to use a greater part of Aleppo-Mosul railway in war.

It was also agreed that Turkey and Britain should sign a bilateral agreement to realise these plans. While the Turkish government immediately approved these plans, she also prepared to approach Iraq for permission to use the Mosul railway. Though General Wyman initially agreed to establish a strategic link between the Southern Sector of NATO and the British MEHQ he later became reluctant to set up this link, explaining that time was not yet ripe for this project. The American refusal hence caused a further delay to the implementation of Anglo-Turkish defence agreement until late 1954.¹⁹⁶

The Emerald Green Conference therefore constituted an important point on the evolution of Turkish strategy in the Middle East. The conclusion of an agreement between Turkey and Britain during the conference, in fact, represented a return to Anglo-Turkish position of October 1952 at a time when implementation of Turkey's strategy which aimed to triangular cooperation between Britain, Iraq and herself had been accepted by the both countries.

Contemporaneously Turkish general views regarding the regional defence began to chime with those of the State Department which revealed a similar opinion to officials of the British Embassy in Washington. In giving an account of its latest thinking about the defence issue, on 17 June, the former indicated to the latter that the State Department was planning

to conduct secret military discussions between the USA, the UK and Turkey for the defence of the region. Jernegan further indicated to Beeley that it was also the view of the State Department that the sponsoring powers at the same time should make their contacts separately with such states as Iraq and Syria, which appeared to be more willing to cooperate in the defence of the area.¹⁹⁷

On learning of these recent American ideas, the Foreign Office commented that Britain should push for the early establishment of the 'Secret Planning Organisation' with the support of Turkey and France since this would involve the USA more deeply in the defence of the Middle East.¹⁹⁸

The British COS, however, opposed to this view. In their meeting on 23 June, Sir John Harding, the CIGS expressed the idea that, until the Arab states developed a consciousness of a common threat, it would not be possible to establish an effective defence organisation. Moreover, there was, in his opinion, little point in setting up a military group since only Britain and Turkey had forces in the area and Britain was planning to reduce its forces. Faced with this situation, the American suggestion of the establishment of a planning group for the defence of the region would certainly prove abortive. Thus, under the present uncertainty over the outcome of the Anglo-Egyptian discussions and of the future of the British defence efforts, the CIGS concluded that 'the planning Group would have nothing to plan with and nothing to plan for'.¹⁹⁹

Harding further stated that a political and military framework should be found, to break the present impasse on the defence efforts in the area. The COS therefore concluded by suggesting to the Prime Minister that Britain should at first try to secure American agreement on the political framework for regional defence which could be followed by military planning between Turkey, Britain and the USA. If the US government would not agree to a political agreement then Britain would, in the last resort, seek military planning between the British and the US COS and between General Wyman and the British MEHQ.²⁰⁰

It therefore became clear by the end of June that the three major allies, namely Turkey, Britain and the USA, had reached some sort of understanding on the implementation of military plans towards regional defence. Iraq, as Turkey had long maintained, became a focus of these plans as a starting point towards the planning of a regional defence organisation. At this time, in the absence of a fully developed American strategy and in the face of the failure of MEDO plans the Turkish Triangular Strategy remained the only viable alternative. The American Northern Tier

strategy, only began to take shape some months later, after the beginning of 1954.

Turkey, though maintaining its contacts with Iraq, was unable to implement her strategy alone because of the continued disagreement between Washington and London over the tactics to be adopted with regard to regional defence. While the British COS continued to insist on the need for a political framework for a defence structure the American military authorities remained opposed to it. This signalled that Britain was, at least initially, prepared to keep a distance from the new American initiatives and would adopt a wait and see policy for the time being.²⁰¹ It also marked the beginning of a close Turco-American cooperation as the two countries' understanding on the defence issues came increasingly closer to each other. As Turkish Triangular Strategy has constituted a nucleus for the new American project it established a basis for Turco-American contacts for the defence of the Middle East.

Simultaneously, the Turks continued to exchange information with Britain on the issues related to regional security and defence in various occasions. One of these kinds was the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II for which the Turkish leaders paid a visit to London. During the visit the Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister had a talk with Churchill on 1 June as the latter noted that 'they [the Turks] are very friendly to us and we must keep very friendly to them. I think a complete agreement exists between us at the present time'.²⁰²

During the conversations, Menderes repeated his initial misperceptions about the recent Dulles speech on the Middle East by saying that this would do harm in the region.²⁰³ Both parties then discussed the recent Soviet note of 30 May, which declared Moscow's intention to renounce all the previous Soviet territorial claims in the eastern part of Turkey and of its demands on the Turkish Straits.²⁰⁴

Menderes sought Churchill's views on this surprising Soviet move. Churchill initially said that 'it showed how wise Turkey had been to join the NATO front'. Then the British Premier commented that this Soviet action was either part of a plan to divide Turkey from her allies or part of a new Soviet policy to seek a *détente* towards the West. But Churchill concluded that whatever course Soviet policy might take, the allies should hold firmly together and should not relax their vigilance. The Turkish Prime Minister fully agreed with Churchill's points.²⁰⁵ Both Prime Ministers also agreed to make plans for the early entry of British submarines into the Black Sea on the outbreak of war, and on mining arrangements in

the Turkish Straits. For the purpose Admiral Mountbatten, First Lord of the Admiralty, was soon to be sent to Turkey to examine these plans.²⁰⁶

Contemporaneously, Turkey was prepared to resume her contacts with Iraq for possible regional defence cooperation as this had already previously been planned between London and Ankara. This was also a part of the new American defence plans and the American remarks in the recent talks encouraged Menderes to resume his approaches to Iraq.

The Turco-Iraqi contacts were renewed when the two parties were in London at the beginning of June. In the conversations between Nuri Pasha and Menderes, the latter told the former that Turkey was planning to get closer with Iraq on the defence of the area. In response to the Turkish Premier, Nuri Pasha repeated his earlier ideas that Turkey should first get the Persians (Iranians) to take a practical interest in common defence. Menderes responded that there was nothing that could be done for Iran in the present circumstances but Turkey wished to make some joint defence arrangements with Iraq. To this Nuri replied that the time was premature to discuss the matter at present but he would like to discuss it at a later stage.²⁰⁷

After mentioning this conversation to Bromley, an official of the British Embassy in Baghdad, Nuri stated that Iraq would like to see the outcome of the Anglo-Egyptian discussions before deciding their attitude on the defence issue. If these negotiations continued to remain deadlocked, then Iraq would consider making some defence arrangement between Britain, Turkey and any other state which wished to join.²⁰⁸ Nuri in reality had expressed a similar idea to Eden during his stay in London, when he revealed that he was considering forming some sort of a defence pact against the Soviet threat between Turkey, Iraq and Iran.²⁰⁹ It therefore became clear that by the beginning of June 1953 there appeared strong collaborative tendencies between Turkey and Iraq, which constituted a basis for the establishment of a Turco-Iraqi pact.

These Turco-Iraqi predispositions towards a regional defence pact combined with the recent American thinking, which was favoured by the Turkish planners, soon bore fruit through the signature of the Turco-Pakistani agreement in April 1954 as an important step towards collective defence. This was followed by the signing of the Turco-Iraqi agreement of January 1955, which would soon be turned into the Baghdad pact with Britain's participation and thereafter, by the inclusion of Iran and Pakistan.

Conclusion

The year 1952 was a starting point for the development of Anglo-Turkish strategic relations in the Middle East. Unlike the previous year which had witnessed a period of uneasy relations, the relations between Ankara and London began to rekindle gradually after Turkey's full integration into NATO. There were, however, reciprocal suspicions on both sides. On the one hand, Britain was suspicious of the Turkish promise of assistance to Britain, believing that as soon as Turkey was admitted to NATO she would distance herself from the region. On the other hand, Turkey thought that Britain was still hankering after attaching Turkey's defence to that of the Middle East. From a Turkish point of view, her entry into NATO and the question of Middle East defence were entirely different matters and should not be mixed. Turkey wanted to attach herself to the system of a European defence organisation in order to feel more secure and receive greater American economic and military assistance.

These mutual suspicions between the two countries were to continue until mid-May 1952. At this time, with the visit of Field Marshal Montgomery to Ankara the ice between the two countries began to thaw. Montgomery convinced the Turks that their country's defence was entirely tied up with that of Europe. Then Turkey began to show interest in MEDO and consultations began between the two countries on regional defence.

There were additional reasons for increasing Turkish interest in Middle Eastern affairs. As the Democrat government, especially the Prime Minister, was planning to increase Turkey's international prestige he thought this could best be done through taking a leading part in the defence efforts in the region. More importantly, though Turkey had secured its safety through her access to NATO she needed additional security as the region continued to remain defenceless. Since the Americans had not yet developed their strategy for the defence of the region and rendered their support for the British plans, Turkey continued to collaborate with Britain, which had been primarily responsible for the defence of the Middle East. The Turks also hoped that Anglo-Turkish cooperation might bring further American commitment in the area.

This was the main British objective as well and indeed London had long been planning to bring about further American commitment to the defence of the area since she was not capable of defending it alone. Thus, by this time, both the Turkish and the British strategic and political objectives were much more in line than they had been the year before. Moreover, besides providing additional security to Turkey, these Turkish efforts

would also be a source of additional American military and economic aid if Washington became fully involved in the defence of the region.

Anglo-Turkish strategic understanding further improved when the Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister met with their British counterparts in London in mid-October when both parties reached full agreement on the strategy to be adopted in the Middle East. The London agreement, in fact, represented the highest point for Anglo-Turkish relations since the Triple Alliance was signed in late 1939. According to the agreement, as Menderes proposed, the parties would follow a piece-meal approach to the Arab states and should focus on Iraq, which was the only Arab country aware of the Soviet danger, in bringing her into the defence line.

Therefore, the London agreement, while signalling the failure of the British Egypt-based strategy it marked the beginning Turkish initiatives with Iraq with regard to regional defence. At the same time it established a framework for the development of the Turkish Triangular Strategy. Though an agreement was reached between London and Ankara in late May 1953 over the implementation of Turkish strategy this was soon disrupted because of the continued disagreement between the American and British military authorities over the political framework of this strategy.

Anglo-American rivalry over Turkey was also another reason for the negative US attitude. As was the case a year earlier, the Americans were carefully monitoring the collaboration between Turkey and Britain since they did not want to lose their dominant position in Turkey. If London and Ankara continued their bilateral cooperation, the Americans might not gain control over the situation and would not be able to get the Turks on their side. This eventually led to begin with the emergence of American Northern Tier scheme and then to eventual abandonment of MEDO in mid-July 1953.

From late 1953 onwards, therefore, Turkey undertook a dual role in the Western defence plans in the Middle East. While continuing her bilateral military contacts with Britain, Turkey, at the same time developed its own strategy in collaboration with the USA. The American defence project, in essence, represented a new broader political form of the Turkish Triangular Strategy based on Anglo-Turco-Iraqi triangular collaboration. The triangular scheme was therefore to become the core of the Northern Tier and later of the Baghdad Pact.

CONCLUSION: A GENERAL EVALUATION OF ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS

The year 1945 marked the beginning of a new era in the development of Anglo-Turkish relations. This was because the emergence of Soviet demands over Turkish territories, at this time, not only posed a great threat to Turkey but also to Britain as it possessed vital economic and strategic interests in the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean. Since then therefore the Soviet threat became a major factor in Anglo-Turkish relations. How the Soviet threat systematically affected the relationship between Britain and Turkey in the Middle East is the main theme of this book and it can only be understood through extensive use of British and Turkish primary sources.

This book has argued that Anglo-Turkish relations were determined to a greater extent by wider strategic and security considerations and the Cold War atmosphere as the fundamental interests of the two countries were under threat. Indeed, securing these interests was a matter of life and death to the two countries during this period. Though this atmosphere re-kindled the traditional Anglo-Turkish friendship of the past, crucial differences made themselves felt, which distinguished the past from the Cold War era in the relations between the two countries. The key difference was that Britain was in no position, either alone or with the aid of European allies, to rebut the renewed threat from Moscow. Only the USA could fulfil this role. Thus pursuing an American involvement in the defence of the Near and Middle East remained one of the major objectives in Anglo-Turkish policies during the start of the Cold War period.

In the early period of the Cold War the Soviets began to put pressure on Turkey and Iran and directly or indirectly supported the communist movements in Syria, Iraq and Greece. In the case of Turkey, Moscow demanded the cession of some of its eastern territories and of bases in the Turkish Straits. In Iran it continued to occupy the northern part and create trouble there by provoking separatist and communist movements. The Kremlin tried to achieve its aims towards Turkey through heavy diplomatic and political pressure, by opening an intense propaganda war and by a concentration of troop movements in Bulgaria and in the Caucasus near the Turkish borders.¹

The findings herein support Bullock's remark that Moscow at this time was looking for the right opportunity to expand, by direct or indirect means, its influence in the Near East and the Middle East. Moscow's initial post-war policy was based on the idea that Britain's position was much weakened and the USA had no clear policy in the Middle East and Mediterranean. Furthermore it calculated that Britain could not much count on American support as Washington disliked the colonialist nature of the British position in these regions.² In its hostile propaganda against Turkey, the Soviet media was claiming that in case of a serious conflict 'the USA would stay indifferent and England [would] keep aside'.³

Therefore, Moscow's initial post-war policy was based on exploitation of the possible differences between London and Washington. The Kremlin tried to measure the Western reactions to its diplomatic and political pressures and its subversive activities in the northern tier nations. If Anglo-American reactions were weak or slow then Moscow could realise its aims through all possible means, even including the use of force, which greatly perturbed the Turkish government as the consulted primary Turkish sources reveal. But the Turks made it clear to both Moscow and the Western capitals that they would prefer to fight rather than to surrender themselves to the Red Army either alone or with the help of their allies in case of such an attack.

The Turks maintained that they were uniquely placed to judge the habits of the Russians and the nature of their tactics and policies. Thirteen major wars between the Turks and Russians over the past three centuries not only provided a vast store of experiences about Russian foreign policy but also had created deep Turkish hostility towards Tsarist Russia and its successor, the Soviet Union. The latter's repeated attempts to achieve movement on the Turkish Straits from the mid-1930s had further increased Turkish suspicions of Moscow's intentions. Its demands in mid-1945 therefore fully exposed the Kremlin's ultimate intentions. It was therefore

not difficult for the vast majority of the Turks to see communism as a new form of the traditional Russian Tsarist expansionist policy and strongly reject it. Turkey hence became more concerned about the strategic and security aspects of the Cold War rather than its ideological side.⁴

As the documentary evidence shows, the Soviet factor was a major influence both on the external and internal policies of Turkey in this period. President İnönü described the year 1945 as 'the darkest days of the Turkish Republic since its establishment'. He further indicated that this was the main reason for Turkey to join 'the Democratic Front'.⁵

Concurring with the Turkish views, the British Ambassador in Ankara reported in late July 1945 that: 'it is no exaggeration to say that in every sphere of Turkey's activities – internal as well as external and over the whole range of commerce and industry – the dominating factor at the moment is the uneasy state of Russo-Turkish relations.'⁶ Peterson continued:

The attitude of Turkey towards these demands is firstly, that nothing will induce her to concede to Russia military bases in the Straits. The Turkish Prime Minister has repeatedly told me that Turkey would fight rather than make these concessions which she would regard as tantamount to the surrender of her independence. Monsieur Saracoglu [the Turkish Premier] indeed went so far as to say in conversation on July 26 that Turkey would fight even if Great Britain and America were to support Russian demands for such bases. I do not think that he is bluffing or that such words may be classed as mere historionics.⁷

The British Ambassador concluded that 'so long as HMG continue to support Turkey, the latter country will continue to represent a valuable bulwark against Soviet penetration to the south and into the Mediterranean area'. This was the general British view as well.

The initial Western reaction to the Soviet danger, however, was not unified, as elaborated in the second chapter in the light of extensive use of British, Turkish and American archival records. London and Washington pursued different approaches to Moscow. They both initially hoped to reach a compromise with the Soviets. Only painful experiences in Turkey, Iran and Greece convinced the two capitals that a solid line of action and collaboration was needed to thwart the Soviet danger to their interests and to the interests of the free nations.

While President Roosevelt was satisfied with the conclusions reached at Yalta Churchill was convinced that there was no way of coming to an

agreement with Moscow. As the Yalta conclusions convinced the British Conservative government about the aggressive intentions of the Soviets in their move south, it decided to take a firm line with Turkey against Moscow. Meanwhile London began to seek a joint approach with Washington towards the Turkish question as it had already admitted its inability to confront the Soviets alone.⁸

Although the outgoing Churchill government increasingly began to take a firmer line against the Soviet attitude towards Turkey the incoming Attlee government did not initially pursue its predecessor's line. The Conservatives' firm line was soon relaxed by the Labour Party, which came to power in July 1945. Despite the fact that the new government in London followed its predecessor's general path in its foreign policy, it was nevertheless constrained by advocates of appeasement with Moscow; and thus unable to follow a determined line in support of Turkey against the Soviets until late 1946.

Both the COS and Foreign Office, nevertheless, maintained their earlier view of the importance of Turkey's independence and territorial integrity to British strategic and economic interests in the Middle East. These two British departments (the COS and Foreign Office) exercised a major impact on the formulation of British policy towards Turkey and they mostly remained in agreement over the matters related to this country during the period of this study.

Paradoxically, the US government began to show an interest in Turkey's security at a time when the firmness of the British attitude had slightly weakened. Edwin C. Wilson, the US Ambassador in Ankara, assured the Turkish Foreign Minister that Washington regarded the issue not as a matter between Moscow and Ankara but in the wider context of 'world peace and security' in which the US government had a deeper interest.⁹ The increasing American interest was continued by the positive statements of the US Secretary of State, combined with the visit of the most powerful American battleship, *Missouri*, to Turkey in April 1946.

Though American interest in Turkey's security increased, it still remained to establish firm Anglo-American co-operation as the Labour government was seeking conciliation with Moscow on the Straits issue. The lack of such concert continued to encourage Moscow to pursue its ambitions over Turkey. This was evident when the Kremlin formally demanded, on 7 August 1946, that a new regime over the Straits should be concluded by which their defences should be jointly organised between the USSR and Turkey.

This last Soviet move however persuaded London and Washington to take a solid line against Moscow when it became evident that the Soviet Union's aggressive campaigns against Turkey and other free nations of the world had not ended, and it was to continue in various forms of ideological, political and economic warfare as the Cold War was about to begin.¹⁰ Thus, the West, under American leadership, had to respond to defend not only Western interests but also the interests of Turkey and the Free World and the values of liberty, freedom and democracy.¹¹ Under these circumstances both London and Washington rejected the Soviet demands, and this resulted in Moscow's dropping them for the time being.

There were additional crucial reasons for the failure of the Soviet attempts regarding Turkey. Besides its territorial demands, the Soviet government, since early 1945, had embarked on a 'war of nerves' against Turkey in the hope that these campaigns might cause an internal uprising, eventually forcing her to yield to Moscow's pressures. This idea however proved to be as an illusion because there was no such communist support in Turkey as in the case of Greece, Syria or elsewhere. This can be attributed to the nationalist character of Turkey and to the traditions, customs and beliefs of the Turkish people, which posed a sharp contrast to communist doctrines.¹²

Moreover, Turkish public opinion, in general, regarded communism as a new form of Russian imperialist ideology. Therefore it helped Moscow to stop its heavy campaigns after the realisation that there was no much point to the communist propaganda effort. Afterwards, Moscow tried to break Turkey's alignment with the West claiming that the Turks and Soviets could re-establish their traditional friendship once again and there was not much benefit in the Turkish pursuit of cooperation with the USA and further Turkish attempts towards this end would in the end harm Turkish interests. However as the Turks completely lost their trust in the Russians the former paid no attention to the latter's overtures.¹³

The firm Anglo-American co-operation eventually bore its first and most successful fruit with the Declaration of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947. The previous month London, after facing severe economic hardships at home, asked Washington to take over its responsibilities in Greece and Turkey. This was the beginning of an American interest in the defence of the 'outer ring' of the Middle East as part of the containment policy. It was also a crucial step towards Turkey's alignment with the West after her long period of pursuing a neutral policy. Britain was thus successful in bringing about American interest in the defence of Turkey and Greece by early 1947. This was also the first step towards ensuring Ameri-

can involvement in the defence of the Middle East, which remained the ultimate British goal during the early stages of the Cold War.

While Washington responded to London's pleas with the declaration of the Truman Doctrine and took over the British financial responsibilities in Greece and Turkey it declined to accept any military and strategic commitment to the defence of the Middle East. Despite the Truman Doctrine's promise of American financial and military aid to Turkey, Washington refused to extend Ankara its formal security guarantee until the spring of 1951, regarding her defence as falling under the aegis of British Middle Eastern strategy.

From the Turkish perspective, although the Truman Doctrine opened a new page in the history of Turco-American relations, and was a great relief to the Turkish feeling of insecurity, it still did not provide a binding commitment. The Anglo-Turkish Alliance of 1939 therefore remained the only formal commitment to Turkey's safety. Despite the fact that this alliance did not meet the post-war circumstances and was to a certain extent weakened by Turkish neutrality, it remained the only security guarantee on which Ankara could rely. This alliance still had a great political and moral importance to Turkey despite its weakened military value. This is why Britain continued to maintain its primary political position in Turkey; it only transferred its chief economic role to the USA. This Anglo-American position was to continue until the spring of 1951 at a time when the latter's influence became dominant in Turkey.

In this period while the British position began to decline in the northern tier, its status in the Middle East was not safe either. The immediate post-war decade witnessed the long British struggle to retain its pre-war domination in this region. However, this task proved to be the hardest one due to the new circumstances of the post-war period. The rising tide of Arab nationalism, post-war British economic and political weakness and the newly emerging Soviet threat together began to strike at the British position in the region. Furthermore, the regional rivalry between the Egyptian-Saudi and the Hashemite blocs, the deterioration of the situation in Palestine and the social and political conflicts between the Arab ruling elite, the 'old gang', and the emerging middle and poor classes further increased the regional instability.¹⁴

These all created, as the West and Turkey sadly observed, a fertile ground for the spread of communism and hence an opportunity for the expansion of Soviet influence. Therefore, the West in general and the UK in particular thought that any power vacuum left by Britain could be filled by the Soviets and hence they saw the British presence in the region as

necessary. However, this clashed with the interests of the rising tide of Arab nationalism. Under its impact many Arab states did not share the Western perceptions of interests and threats and were not much concerned about East-West conflict. Rather they wanted to pursue their own agenda, such as the removal of the Western presence from the region, the issue of Arab unity and the issue of the Palestine question.

Though the Second World War greatly weakened the British economic and political position in general, Britain was still the dominant political and military power in the Middle East. Britain's efforts to maintain its dominant position in this region stemmed from two main considerations. First, economic: Britain held most of the shares of the petroleum in Iraq, Iran and in the Trucial sheikhdoms which bordered the Persian Gulf. Second, strategic and political: the area was a focal point of land, sea and air communications between Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia which could safeguard the routes linking British imperial possessions. Apart from its paramount importance in defence, this region was an ideal base to mount a retaliatory air or land attack against the USSR in war.

In August 1945, the British COS encapsulated the region's crucial importance to Britain:

...The Middle East is a region of vital consequence to Britain and the British Empire. It forms the nodal point in the system of communications, by land, sea and air, which links Great Britain with India, Australia and the Far East; it also the Empire's main reservoir of mineral oil.¹⁵

The region was not only vital to Britain itself but was also essential to the British Empire and to her global standing as a Great Power. This area hence became one of the main battlefields of the Cold War among the Great Powers because of its strategic importance as a critical junction of communications and its oil resources. So vital in fact that the defence of the Middle East was regarded as equal to the defence of Britain in the views of both the British COS and the Foreign Office in this period.¹⁶

It was under these circumstances that Britain found Turkey to be the only regional country which received its overtures 'gladly' in the Middle East. This was because the interests of both countries bound them to do so. As early as April 1945 Churchill informed the COS that:

...The changes in the Russian attitude and atmosphere since Yalta are grave. Besides, except for the unhappy lapse of the last war, we

have always been friends with Turkey. She has many services to bestow both in the Levant and Iraq.¹⁷

Turkey at this time saw Britain as the only Western country which had a formal commitment to Turkish security. Ankara felt that Turkey's independence and territorial integrity were in great danger in view of the heavy Soviet pressure and she could only rely on Britain for help as the USA initially remained indifferent towards Turkey's security. Therefore the Anglo-Turkish alliance became the main instrument of her foreign policy until the change of government in Ankara in May 1950.

As can be observed from this study, Turkey's Middle Eastern policy was an extension of her alignment with the West in general, and with Britain in particular within the broader security context in the period 1945–50. Within this general context this book identifies two distinct periods concerning the nature of Anglo-Turkish strategic and political relations in the Middle East. These are the period 1945–50 and the post-1950 period. While in the first period Turkey played a minor role in the Middle East in collaboration with Britain, in the second period, especially from mid-1952 onwards, she began to play a major role in the region affecting the British regional strategy.

The first period can also be divided into two sub periods as far as the nature of Anglo-Turkish relations is concerned. These are the periods of 1945–47 and 1947–50. Though in the first period both Britain and Turkey fully agreed to reinforce regional security against the Soviet threat there were tactical differences over how to realise it.

As the third chapter shows, Turkish regional policy in the 1945–47 period was based on seeking additional security against the Soviets' seditious fifth column activities around her borders. Turkey believed that Moscow was trying to undermine its independence through indirect as well as direct methods. In the Turkish view Moscow conducted its subversion through its satellites in the Balkans and provocations in Greece, Iraq, Iran and Syria. Moscow had already shown its support for Kurdish separatists in Iraq in mid-1945, and continued to carry out these subversive activities by instigating uprisings in northern Iran. It also extended its support to the communist activities in Greece and Syria. Moreover, unlike the existing literature this study has shown that Turkey began to involve herself in regional politics not only in the post-1950 era but also during the post-1945 period.

Syria, at this time, was the most important player in Turkey's Middle Eastern policy. This was because it was the first country which had made

territorial demands on Turkey even before the USSR did the same. Damascus claimed the return of the province of Hatay in early 1945 when Moscow began to conduct a heavy propaganda campaign against Turkey. Whether this was a mere coincidence or a timely planned action Turkey believed that Syria was acting under Soviet instigations. Ankara, therefore, planned to counteract these destructive activities by looking for collaboration with the Hashemite states of Iraq and Jordan.

The Soviet threat therefore not only directed Turkey to seek an alignment with the Western bloc but also impelled her to become involved in Middle Eastern politics for the first time since President İnönü came to power in 1938. It was the same security reasons which had driven Turkey to set up the Pact of Sadabad against the threat posed by the revisionist powers of Europe during the Atatürk era. The key difference however was that while Atatürk adopted a broad regional approach İnönü could only pursue a narrow line of policy in the region.

As a result Turkey concluded a treaty of amity with Iraq in late March 1946 and with Transjordan in early 1947. Turkey's wish to collaborate with the Hashemite states was based on versatile calculations. As both Iraq and Jordan had long-held ambitions to create a union with Syria under the Hashemite Crown it was thought that Turkey's collaboration with these states would constrain Syria to take hostile action against her. Furthermore, as the Hashemite states were the closest countries to Britain, it was considered that Turkey's collaboration with these states would further contribute to the development of Anglo-Turkish relations.

More importantly, since Iraq faced a serious ethnic uprising and was uncomfortable about the communist movements within itself the treaty made Turco-Iraqi collaboration against such ethnic uprisings and the communist threat much easier. Therefore, from the Turkish point of view, Turkey's cooperation with the Hashemite states represented a successful attempt to break the chain of communist encirclement around Turkey's borders.

Though Turkey in this period was in a relatively better position to adopt a regional policy free from British influence in comparison with the later period, she nevertheless faced certain constraints from London. This was because Britain was not happy about Turco-Hashemite political and strategic collaboration. Although Anglo-Turkish strategic objectives in the Middle East were identical, their political objectives and methods showed certain diversity.

Whitehall wanted Ankara to develop Turkey's relations with all regional states, especially with Egypt, Iraq and Syria. London saw Ankara's

exclusive approach to the Hashemite states as a further step towards regional rivalry and instability as the Turco-Hashemite cooperation received strong criticism from Egypt and Syria. Egypt was of cardinal strategic and political importance to British regional interests and it was regarded as a leader of the Arab world by London at the time. Britain was also planning to gain the sympathies of Syria and Lebanon in order to satisfy the forces of Arab nationalism, which began to hit the British position across the region. However, Turkey's relations with both Egypt and Syria were not satisfactory due to fundamental differences in the national interests of these countries.

While Ankara regarded the British presence in Egypt as insurance for the security of the region against the Soviet threat, Cairo perceived it as colonialism. When Turkey tried hard to convince Egyptians of the necessity for a continued British military presence in the Suez base in late 1946, it greatly strained Turco-Egyptian relations as the latter demanded the replacement of Turkish Ambassador in Cairo.

There were additional factors which made Britain uncomfortable with regard to Turkey's regional policies. The Labour government tried to persuade Ankara not to sign political treaties with Iraq and Jordan in the face of its anxiety not to provoke Moscow. For Britain the ideal treaty for the regional states was one which contained cultural and commercial items but not political objects. Britain's further concern was that Turkey's political engagements with the Arab states might have encouraged the latter to request new treaties with Britain along the lines of Anglo-Turkish Alliance. This would be most unwelcome to London which did not want to lose its privileges under the existing treaties with the Arab states. It also was not happy about the terms of the Anglo-Turkish Alliance since it had failed to bring Turkey into the war during 1939–45.

Despite the fact that Britain and Turkey had a relatively limited co-operation in Middle Eastern affairs in the 1945–47 period this would change when the Palestine question turned into a major international issue in the period 1947–50, as examined and analysed in the fourth chapter. There were several reasons which explain this collaboration. For Britain, it was in greater need of Turkey's help as she was the only regional country ready to cooperate at a time when the Palestine question further destabilised the British position in the Middle East. In need of further security from the West, Ankara thought that it could realise this aim thorough British mediation. More to the point, keeping the Soviet influence out of the region as much as possible was the basic principle in Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East. Therefore the mutual need for each other's

help necessitated full Anglo-Turkish cooperation in the region in which the Palestine question occupied a central place in the 1947–50 period.

As Britain and Turkey were very apprehensive about any Soviet advances towards the Middle East, both countries needed the support of the Arab states in order to bloc Soviet encroachments. This led Britain and especially Turkey to favour the Arab case during the UN discussions in early 1947. It was the same calculation which encouraged Turkey to take part in the Palestine Conciliation Commission in late 1948.

Anglo-Turkish co-operation on the Palestine question continued through CC which was set up to find a solution to the problems between the Arab states and Israel. Turkey was selected for the commission to restore the balance against the 'pro-Jewish US position' as Britain wished. Moreover, as the Western position was further weakened as a result of the establishment of the state of Israel and the subsequent war which resulted in the heavy defeat of the Arab armies, Turkey's importance began to increase as she was regarded the only regional country which could mediate between the Arab states, Israel and the West. That was why Turkey was elected to the CC and her membership was generally well received by the Arab states and the West but reluctantly by Israel. The CC however was not very successful in its mission in the face of strong Arab-Israeli opposition to the commission's suggestions.

Turkey's position however was to substantially change from early 1949 onwards when Israel's Western orientation became clear and it was recognised by Britain. Turkey altered her previous pro-Arab posture and adopted a more balanced stance between the Arab states and Israel by granting *de facto* recognition to the latter. Turkey's need for American support and her desire to coordinate policies with the West, combined with Israeli orientation towards the West, were influential in the change of Ankara's posture towards Tel-Aviv.

This period also witnessed the emergence of defence combinations in Europe when the Cold War was intensified there through a series of events. These Western security attempts eventually ended with the establishment of the Atlantic Pact in April 1949. In spite of their full cooperation in the Middle East the relations between Britain and Turkey in Europe were not adequate. This was because Ankara was able to obtain neither the support of the US nor Britain and hence she was left out of NATO.

The Washington talks of late 1947 demonstrated how right Ankara had been to seek for security, as Turkey's Western allies were shown to be not yet ready to provide sufficient assistance in a major war. As the pro-

gress of the Cold War further intensified Turkey's anxiety, she made repeated attempts to secure a formal American security commitment to herself either bilaterally or through US participation in the proposed Mediterranean pact. Then, Ankara asked to join the Atlantic Pact.

When Ankara's repeated attempts with Washington failed to obtain this objective, Turkish leaders sought to realise this aim through British support. Turkey's wish to join European security organisations through British mediation was one of the chief reasons for her full support of Britain's regional policy. Moreover, as the documentary evidence shows, the long ruling Republican Party in Ankara, as a result of long historical tradition, was more comfortable working with the British than the Americans on political and defence issues. Turkey however was unable to get what she had long wanted from Britain. This was due to differences of view about Turkey's cultural and geographical place between the civilisations.

In British eyes Turkey, both geographically and culturally, was out of Europe and a non-Arab Middle Eastern country. Turkey was a good model to the regional countries with its stability, higher economic, political and social standards and most importantly its determined resistance to the threat of communism. In British thinking, in the 1945–50 period, Turkey had to play a bridging and mediating but not a leading role in the political disputes between Western and Eastern nations. Strategically she was earmarked to play a defensive role (and later as an offensive base in the US strategy) between the Western and Communist worlds in the Middle East and the Mediterranean. If Turkish allegiance was lost in one way or another then Western interests in general and British Middle Eastern interests in particular would be in great danger. Thus, Turkey was much more important to British strategic and political interests in the Middle East rather than Europe.

The British views, however, were in sharp contrast to the Turkish opinion. In the latter's thought though Turkey was geographically part of the Middle East both politically and economically she belonged to Europe. Since its establishment in 1923 the Turkish Republic had decided to identify itself with the West and carried out an extensive reform programme to achieve her modernization. By 1949, Turkey was a member of OECD and the Council of Europe, and was endeavouring to achieve membership of NATO. The difficulty however was that the ruling Republican government in Ankara was unable to shift the Western negative opinion because of its passive diplomacy. This was only achieved by the Republican's successor, the Democrat government, when it came to power in the post-1950 period.

Therefore, the year 1950 marked a new era in Turkey's foreign policy as well as in Anglo-Turkish relations as emphasised in chapters five and six. It represented an active and energetic period in Turkish external relations for the new Democrat government, which came to power in May of the same year. The new government in Ankara, apart from the Soviet threat, pursued much broader political and economic objectives than its predecessor in its relations with the Western powers. While its primary objective was to secure Turkey's entry into NATO and rapid industrialisation of the country, the Democrat government simultaneously planned to play an active role in Middle Eastern affairs in order to increase Turkey's international standing and to receive further Western military and economic aid. Moreover, the Democrat Party's programme of liberal economic, social policies, its tolerance on the questions of human and religious rights, and its sincere manifestations of pursuing closer relations with the regional states were cordially welcomed by both the West and the Arab states.

This period also represented a new chapter in Anglo-Turkish relations. While Turkey's importance began to further increase in British eyes ironically London's influence started to decline in Ankara. In the modern period of Anglo-Turkish relations, Britain, for the first time, lost its position as a key ally of Turkey to the USA in early 1951. This was because substantial differences came to occur in the defence policies between Britain and Turkey though their main objective, to prevent possible Soviet expansion, remained the same.

While Britain wished to tie Turkey's defence with that of the Middle East the latter wanted to be a part of a European defence system thorough the Atlantic Pact. Another reason behind this drastic change was that Ankara had now found another suitor, Washington, to cooperate with and so she was able to pursue a more independent line vis-à-vis London. As a result while Turkey sought American collaboration on the strategic and political issues related to Europe she continued to carry on her strategic cooperation with both Britain and the USA in the Middle East.

The outbreak of the Korean War was a catalyst which determined the nature of Anglo-Turkish-American relations. For Turkey, it was a first test case for the new government's active foreign policy. Turkey's immediate response to the US pleas and the Turkish army's involvement influenced Anglo-American opinion to value Turkey as an ally in the Western struggle against the USSR. The USA had already begun to have a high regard for Turkey as a result of its first free elections and the rising standards of its democracy, economy and human and religious rights.

This was the first success in the chain of great Democrat accomplishments in Ankara. Turkey's swift participation in the fighting in Korea annihilated the long years of doubt in the Anglo-American mind about the reliability of Turkey siding with the West in a major war.¹⁸ As the Korean War also increased Turkey's concern at becoming the next target of Soviet aggression she regarded her participation in the war as a crucial first step towards entry into NATO. Furthermore, Ankara's firm attitude in the Korean conflict opened a new phase in the development of Turco-American relations by bringing the two countries much closer than before.

For the United States, the start of the Korean War brought the importance of Middle Eastern security more closely into focus. So far Washington regarded the regional issues as Britain's responsibility and recently declined to accept the British idea of creating a regional defence pact in the Middle East in a tripartite meeting in May 1950. However the outbreak of the conflict in South East Asia convinced the American policy-makers that 'the danger of Soviet resort to war, either deliberately or by miscalculation, may have been increased by the Korean war' and the Middle East would be the next target where Moscow could make trouble.¹⁹

For Britain, while this war increased its anxiety over possible Soviet aggression in the Middle East, at the same time, it saw the conflict as an opportunity to involve both the USA and Turkey in the defence of the region.

From early 1950 onwards Britain pushed for a regional defence pact as an alternative way to resolve its differences with Egypt. In the face of the steady rise of Arab nationalism, the protracted dispute with Egypt over the Suez base, the Arab-Israeli problem and its growing economic decline, Britain was forced to look for ways to secure firm support from its allies, namely, the USA and Turkey. The conflict in South East Asia therefore united the three allies to take all necessary actions to prevent any Soviet expansion toward the Middle East through British multilateral defence attempts in the Middle East in the period between 1950 and 1953.

Although the three allies had the common goal of containing the spread of communism, there remained crucial differences in the tactics its implementation between Turkey, the USA and Britain. On the one hand, the USA saw Turkey's defence within the European context, as the security of the European continent took the highest priority in the American strategic mind.

There were apparent reasons for the American view: first, Washington now regarded Turkey as falling in the ranks of Western civilisation as a result of the recent free and open elections; second, Turkey proved her

reliability as an ally of the West during the Korean war; third, in the face of the increasing possibility of a major war, and that of the uncertain Western position in the Middle East and especially of the Suez base, Turkey gained more importance in American strategic thinking as the most coveted Western ally. More to the point, in the new American strategy, the military planners had it in mind to use Turkish airfields in wartime to slow down Soviet advances towards the south and to strike at Moscow's important strategic assets.²⁰

Britain on the other hand regarded Turkey's defence as falling within the responsibility of the British Middle Eastern Headquarters. Britain still continued to attach great importance to the defence of the Middle East for the sake of preserving its international prestige and influence. Although it gave priority to the security of Europe as a result of the escalation of political tension in Europe and her involvement in the establishment of NATO, Britain regarded its presence in the Middle East as vital to protect her strategic, economic and political interests. As noted above because of her declining economic and political position Britain needed allies such the USA and Turkey to deal with her political and strategic problems in the Middle East.

Since the USA, though it rendered diplomatic support, was still refusing to commit any forces to the defence of the Middle East, Britain attached cardinal importance to the control of Turkey's defence if any British regional defence plans were to succeed. In the face of its lack of adequate resources and of the uncertainty over the Arab states under the impact of nationalism Britain thought that Turkey's nineteen divisions, which had been trained and equipped by the US since 1947, would be a great asset to her.

The British plans therefore were not satisfactory either to the USA or to Turkey. The latter obviously shared the American strategy that her defence should be fully integrated with NATO. Although the Democrat government in Ankara repeatedly indicated Turkey's readiness to be involved in Middle Eastern affairs their first priority, for political and strategic reasons, was to secure Turkey's integration with NATO. Politically, Turkey's entry into NATO would mean Turkey's acceptance as a European nation. Since its inception, Westernisation had been the mainstream of the ideology of the new Turkish Republic as the only means of modernising the country. Strategically it would bring a binding American commitment to the security of Turkey which had been a driving goal of Turkish foreign policy since 1945.

Furthermore, Turkey was well aware of Britain's declining world position and after the outbreak of the Korean War began to insist more strongly on the extension of an American commitment to Turkey's security. Ankara was further determined to achieve her aim when she learned in early 1951, that very little British help would be possible in case of a global war. Furthermore, a few months later, when Turkey became aware of the persistent British opposition to her full membership of NATO this caused deep resentment and resulted in a drastic change in her foreign policy leading Ankara to shift its traditional allegiance from Britain to the USA. Thereafter, Anglo-Turkish relations began to improve only after 1952, when Britain fully supported Turkey's integration with NATO.

In late 1951 Turkey was able to achieve membership of NATO with American help and through her promise of involvement in British defence plans in the Middle East. In return London lifted its opposition to Turkey's entry into the Atlantic Pact. The replacement of Labour with a Conservative government did not bring a change on British policy towards Turkey. The latter was even more enthusiastic about going ahead with the regional defence plans than the former. Turkey thereafter began to fully involve itself in the British defence initiatives in the Middle East.

There were further sound reasons for Ankara's strategic cooperation with London in the Middle East. First, the Democrat leaders believed that Britain, despite its weakness, was still the only Western country committed to the defence of the Middle East. Any security pact in the region would therefore provide additional safety to Turkey. Second, the Democrat government wanted to increase Turkey's international standing by pursuing an active foreign policy in collaboration with Britain in the region. Third, and most important, Turkey needed extensive Western aid since the Democrats' top domestic priority was to encompass the rapid industrialisation of the country. This largely depended on Turkey's ability to involve the USA in the defence of the region and convincing Washington of the importance of Turkey to upholding Western interests in the Middle East.

Under these circumstances, in late 1951, Turkey together with the USA, fully supported the British idea of setting up a Middle East Command project which aimed to replace the British military presence at Suez with the establishment of a multilateral pact involving Arab participation. The Arab states, however, refused to participate at the instigation of Egypt, which continued to demand the complete withdrawal of the British military presence from its soil. After the failure of the plan Britain put forward a new MEDO scheme. The MEDO project was devised as a planning organisation with the aim of coordinating military consultations for the

defence of the Middle East. Yet again it faced strong opposition from the Arab states despite the full support given to it by USA and Turkey.

Turkey, especially after securing membership of NATO, worked hard to convince the Arab states of the merits of a defence organization against the possible Soviet threat. In fact, surrounded by the USSR to the east and by Bulgaria to the west, it would suit Turkey if her southern borders were secured thorough such a defence organisation. But the Arabs had a very different agenda. They were either preoccupied with the termination of the British military presence in the region or with the threat from Israel. Though Iraq and Jordan to some extent were receptive to the Turkish ideas they did not dare to join the MEC or later MEDO in the face of the fierce Egyptian opposition and the demands of Arab nationalism.

Turkey's intense efforts in convincing the Arab states of the need for a regional defence organization were not entirely unsuccessful. It at least helped Ankara to develop its strategy in a more practical manner. This was indeed evident from the results of the London talks in late 1952. In them the Turkish Premier suggested that Iraq should be a focus of the new defence project in the Middle East. Britain fully agreed with the Turkish idea of first approaching Iraq, as it was the Arab country which was most concerned about the Soviet danger, and if this seemed successful then other regional states should be approached at a later stage. Turkey, for the first time, therefore, directed Britain to focus on Iraq away from Egypt as a first step towards a regional defence pact.

Turkey's focus on Iraq was in no way a coincidence. It was rather a deliberate attempt based on the long years of experiences accumulated between the two countries. As early as in late 1945 the Iraqi leaders had expressed their readiness to collaborate with Turkey against the Soviet instigations as Baghdad had long suffered from the separatist and communist activities and it was believed that the Kremlin was behind these troubles. The potential danger of Soviet aggression and the rising tide of communism therefore were among the basic reasons which brought about the signing of the Turco-Iraqi treaty of 1946.

Furthermore Iraq had always been the closest Arab country to Turkey. This originated from geographical, historical and cultural factors. Geographically the two countries had a common border and Iraq was an extension of Asia Minor, linking Turkey to the Gulf and to the rest of Asia. Historically, as two allies in the Pact of Sadabad, they were able to develop solid relations. Culturally, Turkey maintained its cultural heritage in Iraq, as many of the governing elite in Baghdad could either speak Turkish or had family ties with the Turks. There was also a considerable number of

Turkish minorities in northern Iraq. The Cold War environment was a crucial factor which further contributed to the development of Turco-Iraqi relations.

The Sadabad Pact was to be a model to the Democrat government in Ankara though its predecessor had paid no attention to it. Soon after their advent to power the Democrat leaders began to praise the arrangement for its contribution to regional security and its existing members expressed their readiness to revive the dormant pact. These all established a solid ground for the development of Turkish 'Triangular Strategy'.

This strategy was based on triangular cooperation between Britain, Turkey and Iraq. It covered the defence of Turkey's eastern and southern territories and of the mountain passes between Iran and Iraq. An agreement to implement the new triangular strategy was signed between Britain and Turkey during a military conference in İzmir in May 1953. A month later Iraq expressed its readiness to examine the political framework of the new strategy.

Turkey's strategy was in fact forerunner of the American Northern Tier scheme and it began to be fully operational only after Eisenhower administration did show a keen interest in the defence of the Middle East. Thereafter the Triangular Strategy converged with the American defence project in early 1954 and took its final shape in the formation of the Baghdad Pact in 1955.

This book, besides its major contribution to the development of Anglo-Turkish relations in the Middle East, provides a new level of understanding to the Cold War historiography through exploring the emergence of Turkish Triangular Strategy. The results show that the Cold War had a multi-dimensional character and its development could not be confined to the deeds of the superpowers. The regional powers like Turkey played their role as well. What the archival materials reveal is how and to what extent Turkey contributed to the development of the Cold War in the Middle East.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Introduction

- 1 On the traditional school, see George F. Kennan, *Memoirs* (London: Hutchinson, 1968); Dean Acheson, *Present At the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: Norton, 1969); Herbert Feis, *From Trust to Terror: the Onset of the Cold War, 1945–50* (New York: Norton, 1950). For the revisionist views see William A. Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (New York: Dell, 1962); Joyce and Gabriel Kolko, *The Limits of Power: The World and the United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1954* (London: Harper & Row, 1972).
- 2 The post-Revisionist works include John Lewis Gaddis, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); *idem*, ‘The Emerging Post-Revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War’, *Diplomatic History*, Vol.7, 1983; Melvyn P. Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: the United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917–1953* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1994). Recently there emerged new views on Cold War history. For these views see, Odd Arne Westad (ed.), *Reviewing The Cold War: Approaches, Interpretations, Theory* (London: Frank Cass, 2000).
- 3 See, for instance, the development of Turkish ‘Triangular Strategy’ in Chapter 6.
- 4 For the text of Democrat Party’s programme which presented to the Turkish Grand National Assembly on 29 May 1950 see, Kazım Öztürk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümetleri ve Programları* (İstanbul, 1968), pp.363–65; Eyres to Younger, 7 June 1950, FO 371/78942; See also Fuat Köprülü’s, the Democrat’s Foreign Minister, statement on foreign policy appeared on the Turkish newspaper, *Cumhuriyet*, on 28 May 1950; For an account of the public support given to the Democrat government for its participation in the Korean War; see Tahsin Yazıcı, *Kore Birinci Türk Tugayında Hatıralarım*, (İstanbul: Ülkü Basımevi, 1963), *passim*.
- 5 This also was testified by Celal Bayar, who was the last Premier of Atatürk and the third President of Turkey, in his memoirs stating that, ‘İnönü was not only a former President of Turkey but also a statesman who had completely taken the domestic and foreign policy of the country in his hands for 12 years from 1938 to 1950’. See, Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, p.95.
- 6 See Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, p.98.
- 7 Bayar, in his memoirs, further indicated that Köprülü also joined the decision-making process when, for instance, the crucial decision taken regarding to

- Turkey's participation in the Atlantic Pact. See Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.97–98, 114–15. See also, İsmet Bozdağ, *Menderes, Menderes* (İstanbul, 1997), *passim*.
- 8 For further information on Turkish foreign policy making process see, Kemal H Karpas (ed.), *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950–1974*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975); Metin Tamkoç, *The Warrior Diplomats: Guardians of National Security and Modernization of Turkey* (USA, 1976); Cem Eroğlu, *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi* (Ankara, 1990).
 - 9 Philip Robins, *Turkey and the Middle East* (The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1991), p.1.
 - 10 Bruce R. Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East: Great Power Conflict and Diplomacy in Iran, Turkey and Greece* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994). Though Kuniholm's book to some extent examines Turkey's position in the 1945–47 period it suffers from the lack of the use of primary British and Turkish sources. See other works: Ali Kemal Meram, *Belgelerle, Türk İngiliz İlişkileri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınları, 1969); A. Ferenc Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus: the Foreign Policy of Turkey* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971); Karpas, *Turkey's Foreign Policy*; Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (London: Routledge, 1993); Hüseyin Bağcı, *Demokrat Parti Dönemi Dış Politikası* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yay., 1990); Clement H. Dodd (ed.), *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects* (London: The Eothen Press, 1992); Eric J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London 1993); Ekavi Athanassopoulou, *Turkey-Anglo-American Security Interests 1945–1952: The First Enlargement of NATO* (London: Frank Cass, 1999). It is also worth mentioning here the two theses undertaken by Bülent Ali Rıza and Ara Sanjian. While Rıza's thesis provides some important insights into Turkey's policies with the Arab states and of her involvement in the Western defence initiatives in the 1950–53 period, it however suffers from the lack of the consultation of British documents. Sanjian's thesis, which was published as a book later, starts where I stopped. It focuses on Turkey's relations with the Arab states in the period 1954–1958. See Bülent Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation in Middle East Defence Projects and Its Impacts on Turco-Arab Relations, May 1950–June 1953' (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, St Antony's College, the University of Oxford, 1982); Ara Garabed Krikor Sanjian, 'Turkey and Her Arab Neighbours 1954–1958' (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of London, 1996).
 - 11 Ömer E. Kürkcüoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Arap Ortadoğusuna Karşı Politikası, 1945–1970* (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1972); Mahmut Bali Aykan, 'The Palestinian Question in Turkish Foreign Policy From the 1950s to the 1990s', *Int. J. of Middle East Studies*, vol.25, 1993; William Hale, *The Political and Economic Development of Modern Turkey* (London: Croom Helm, 1981); *Idem*, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774–2000* (London: Frank Cass, 2000). See also the second book of Philip Robins, *Suits and Uniform: Turkish Foreign Policy Since the Cold War* (London: Hurst & Company, 2003).
 - 12 William Roger Louis, *The British Empire in the Middle East 1945–1951: Arab Nationalism, The United States and Post-war Imperialism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); John Young (ed.), *The Foreign Policy of Churchill's Peacetime Administration* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984); Ritchie Ovendale, 'Britain and the End of the Palestine Mandate, 1945–48' in Aldrich and Hopkins (eds.),

- Intelligence Defence and Diplomacy: British Policy in the Post-war World*, (London: Frank Cass, 1994); Daniel Silverfab, *The Twilight of British Ascendancy in the Middle East: A Case Study of Iraq, 1941–1951* (London: Macmillan Press, 1994); Peter L. Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945–1956: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1991); David R. Devereux, *The Formulation of British Defence Policy Towards the Middle East, 1948–1956* (London: Macmillan Press, 1990); Melvyn P. Leffler, 'Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO 1945–1952', *The Journal of American History*, Vol.71, no.4, 1985; Michael J. Cohen, *Fighting World War Three from the Middle East: Allied Contingency Plans, 1945–1954* (London: Frank Cass, 1997).
- 13 This term refers to a Turkish strategic concept coined by the present author of the book in the light of the findings of an extensive research conducted both in Britain and Turkey.
- 14 Though there have been a number of studies focused on the formation of the Baghdad Pact these works either neglected the Turkish dimension or lacked the background to the formation of the Baghdad Pact. These include: Ara Sanjian, 'The Formulation of the Baghdad Pact', *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.33 No.2, April 1997; Ayesha Jalal, 'Towards the Baghdad Pact: South Asia and Middle East Defence in the Cold War, 1947–1955', *The International History Review*, vol. XI, August 1989; Fahir Armaoğlu, 'Orta Doğu Komutanlığından Bağdat Paktına' *Belleten*, vol.59, no.227, April 1995.
- 15 These three volumes were published under the title: *Türk Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl (Fifty Years in Turkey's Foreign Policy)* and cover the years 1923–46. The two volumes published by the Turkish Ministry of Culture are related to Turkey's foreign policy during Atatürk's rule in the years between 1918–38. For further information see the bibliography.
- 16 These include: Kemal Girgin, *TC Hükümeti Programlarında Dış Politikamız: 70 Yılın Panoraması, 1923–1993* (Turkey's Foreign Policy in Turkish government Programmes: the Panorama of 70 Years, 1923–1993) (Ank., 1993); Kazım Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisini Açış Nutukları* (The Speeches of the Turkish Presidents at the Opening of the Turkish Grand National Assembly) (İstanbul, 1969).
- 17 Some of the Turkish papers consulted are: *Cumhuriyet*, *Son Posta*, *Ulus*, *Vatan*, *Vakit*, *Zafer*.
- 18 Some of the memoirs of Turkish statesman are: Mehmet Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında Türkiye'nin Nato'ya Girişi: III. Cumhurbaşkanı Celal Bayar'ın Hatıraları ve Belgeler* (Turkey's Entry to NATO Against the Soviet Threat: Memories of the third President Celal Bayar and Official Documents) (Ankara, 2000); Bozdağ, *Menderes*; Memduh Tezel, *Moskova'dan Geliyorum: Moskova Büyükelçiliği Eski Basın Ataşesi* (I am coming from Moscow: The Former Press Attache in Moscow) (Ankara, 1950); Feridun Cemal Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl: Anılar-Yorumlar, Vol I–II* (34 Years at the Turkish Foreign Ministry: Memoirs and Commentaries) (Ankara: TTK, 1980); Mahmut Dikerdem, *Ortadoğuda Devrim Yılları* (Years of Revolution in the Middle East) (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1977); Bekir Tünay, *Menderes Devri Anıları: Gördüklerim, Bildiklerim, Duyduklarım* (The Memoirs Related to Menderes' Era: My Views, My Hearings and My Knowledges) (İstanbul: Nilüfer Matbaacılık Tesisleri, no date).

Chapter One

- 1 Meram, *Belgelerle Türk-İngiliz*, p.7; William Hale, 'Introduction: The Historical Background' in W. Hale and A. İhsan Bağış (eds.), *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations* (North Humberside: The Eothen Press, 1984), pp.1–4.
- 2 Meram, *Belgelerle Türk-İngiliz*, pp.40–42; George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp.33–38.
- 3 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, p.295, ADM 234/88; Hale, 'Introduction', pp.3–4; Robert Rhodes James, *Gallipoli* (London: Pimlico, 1999), p4.
- 4 Meram, *Belgelerle Türk-İngiliz*, pp.149–63.
- 5 Osman Okyar, 'Turco-British Relations in the Inter-War Period: Fethi Okyar's Mission to London' in Hale and Bağış (eds.) *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations* (North Humberside: The Eothen Press, 1984), pp.65–67; Lenczowski, *The Middle East*, pp.38–41; Kemal H. Karpat, 'Turkish and Arab Israeli Relations' in K.H. Karpat (ed.) *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950–1974* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1975), pp.108–10.
- 6 Elie Kedourie, *England and the Middle East: The Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914–1921*, (USA: Westview Press, 1987), pp.20–22; Okyar, 'Turco-British Relations' pp.67–68.
- 7 Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, pp.20–22; Okyar, 'Turco-British Relations', p.65.
- 8 Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, 'The construction of the Bagdad Railway and Its Impact on Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1902–1913' *OTAM* Vol.16, p.111.
- 9 Salih Sadawi, 'An Ottoman Report on the Kuwaiti Situation In 1918', *Studies On Turkish-Arab Relations*, Annual 4, 1989, p.121.
- 10 Sadawi, *ibid.*, p. 122.
- 11 Bilgin, 'The Construction of', pp.109–30.
- 12 Tripp, *A History of Iraq*, pp.20–22.
- 13 Foreign Office Handbook, February 1919, p.26, FO 373/5/2.
- 14 Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: I. Meşrutiyet ve İstibdat Devirleri, (1876–1907)*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), p.15.
- 15 In his memoirs Abdülhamit stated that Germany was less dangerous than Britain, France and Russia. This was because she only had commercial interests and was not seeking political or territorial gains in the Near East. See Sultan Abdülhamit, *Siyasi Hatıratım* (İstanbul: Dergah Yay., 1987), pp.115, 137, 153.
- 16 Foreign Office Handbook, January 1919, pp.71–72, FO 373/5/6; Sir Harry Luke, *The Old Turkey & the New: From Byzantium to Ankara* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1955), pp.126–45. The Young Turks were a group of reformers who demanded the building of a constitutional system and the transformation of the Empire into a modern state. They formed a secret political organisation in Geneva in 1891, known as the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP).
- 17 The report on the Young Turks activities indicates that there were 4,800 branches of the Committee with 135,000 members in 1909 and 183,000 members in 1910. Most of these branches were in Europe as part of the Empire. There were very few in Syria and Asia Minor and none in Arabia, Yemen, Mesopotamia and Tripoli. See the report: HM's Consul Basra to M. Marling HM's Chargé d'Affaires, Constantinople, 24 December 1910, FO 602/52.
- 18 Foreign Office Handbook, February 1919, p.39, FO 373/5/7.

- 19 Joseph Heller, *British Policy towards the Ottoman Empire, 1908–1914* (London: Frank Cass, 1983), pp.10–13; Feroz Ahmad, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yay., 1985), pp.130–39, 157, (translated into Turkish from English by Fatmagül Berktaş).
- 20 Heller, *British Policy*, p.23; Ahmad, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, p.139.
- 21 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, pp. 297, 304, ADM 234/88; Luke, *the Old Turkey*, p 138; Fahir Armaoğlu, *19.Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789–1914)* (Ankara: TTK, 2003), pp. 662–95.
- 22 Ibid., Ahmad, *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, pp.154–156.
- 23 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, pp. 302–304, ADM 234/88.
- 24 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, pp.334–335, ADM 234/88; Hugh Poulton, *Top Hat, Grey Wolf and Crescent: Turkish Nationalism and the Turkish Republic* (London: Hurst & Company, 1997), pp. 72–74, 84–86.
- 25 HM's Consul Basra to Charles M. Marling, HM's Chargé d'Affaires, Constantinople, 24 December 1910, FO 602/52; FO 373/5/7, pp.39–40; Poulton, *Top Hat, Grey Wolf*, pp.84–86.
- 26 British Consulate Basra to Sir Gerard Lowther, HM's Ambassador at Constantinople, 9 September 1911; British Consulate Basra to Lowther, 27 March 1912, FO 602/52.
- 27 HM's Consul Basra to Marling, Constantinople, 24 December, 1910, FO 602/52; Foreign Office Handbook, p.54, FO 373/3/6; FO 373/5/6, pp.71–72.
- 28 See the report, Constantinople to Sir E. Grey, 4 January 1911, FO 602/52.
- 29 Foreign Office Handbook, March 1919, p.12, FO 373/4/24, p.16.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Foreign Office Handbook, March 1919, FO 373/4/24, p.16.
- 33 Foreign Office Handbook, April 1919, FO 373/4/26, pp.27–28.
- 34 Foreign Office to HC for Egypt, Ramleh, 1 September 1917, FO 141/430. For a brief account of Sherif's revolt see the file, WO 106/6104.
- 35 Uçarol, *Siyasi Tarih*, pp.398–99; Kedourie, *England and the Middle East*, pp.40, 65–66. See also, HC for Egypt to Foreign Office, 25 December 1917, FO 141/430. Cemal Pasha in his letter to Hussein mentioned about the Sykes-Picot agreement of October 1916, disclosed by the Bolshevik Russians in November 1917.
- 36 Arbur, Cairo to Bassett, Jeddah, 24 December 1917, FO 141/430; HC Egypt to Balfour, 25 December 1917, FO 141/430.
- 37 Telegrams to Feisal, (from Hussein), sent by Bassett through the British Agency at Jeddah, 22 December 1917; HC for Egypt to Foreign Office, 25 December 1917, FO 141/430.
- 38 HC for Egypt to Sir Mark Sykes, Foreign Office, 13 March, 1918, FO 141/430.
- 39 Balfour, London to Brigadier General Clayton GHQ, 14 April 1918, FO 141/430.
- 40 HC for Egypt, Cairo to Foreign Office, 8 April 1918, FO 141/430.
- 41 Foreign Office Handbook, FO 373/4/26, p.28; FO 373/4/24, pp.16–17; Arbur, Cairo to Bassett, Jeddah, 15 August 1918, FO 141/430.
- 42 HC for Egypt, Cairo to Foreign Office, 10 December 1918, FO 141/430.
- 43 Mim Kemal Öke, *Musul Meselesi Kronolojisi, (1918–1926)* (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı Yay., 1987), pp.10–13.

- 44 Uçarol, *Siyasi Tarih*, p.386; Ahmad, *The Making of*, p.46. See also, Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, p.306. This episode is regarded as one of the most disastrous of the war from the British perspective.
- 45 M.A. Dahham, 'Turkish-Iraqi Relations: Tension and Prospects for Positive Developments', *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, Annual 10, 1998, p.88.
- 46 Seha L. Meray ve Osman Okay, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Çöküş Belgeleri, Mondros Bırakılması* (Ankara, 1977), pp.1–5; British Legation, Berne to Foreign Office, 11 March 1918, Weekly Memorandum concerning conditions on Turkey, FO 141/430; Admiralty Handbook, ADM 234/88, p.307.
- 47 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, pp.307–308. If Turkey could have managed to hold Mesopotamia against the British forces the Turks might not have had to sign the Mudros Armistice. Even in March 1918, British high ranking military and political officials thought that it was possible to make some kind of arrangement with Turkey. In their view they could share the control of Mesopotamia together with the Turks. See account of a meeting held at the Residency, HC for Egypt, 31 March 1918, FO 141/430.
- 48 Selahattin Tansel, *Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya Kadar*, Vol.I, (Ankara, 1973), p.27; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, pp.308–309.
- 49 Salahi R. Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika*, Vol.II (Ankara: TTK.1987), pp.53–55.
- 50 See the Report by GSI, Army of the Black Sea, Constantinople on Turkish 'National Movement', 20 October 1920, WO 32/5733; G.H. Bennett, *The British Foreign Policy During the Curzon Period, 1919–24* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1995), p.77.
- 51 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, pp.311; Luke, *The Old Turkey*, pp.159–160. See also the report by GSI, WO 32/5733.
- 52 Bennett, *The British Foreign Policy*, pp.77–78; Tansel, *Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya*, p.32.
- 53 Bennett, *The British Foreign Policy*, pp.77–78.
- 54 Lord Balfour (acting Foreign Secretary) in his talk with M. Schanzer, Italian Foreign Minister, on 28 June 1922 admitted that the treaty of Sévres was a great scandal at the time and stated that there was now a strong public opinion which was in favour of the Turks rather than the Greeks in both Britain and Italy. See the British Foreign Secretary's notes of conversation at the Foreign Office, 28 June 1922, FO 286/832.
- 55 Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, 'Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu Politikası, 1923–1938' in *Irak Dosyası*, A. Ahmetbeyoğlu and others (eds.), p.5; Hamza Eroğlu, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi* (İstanbul, 1982), pp.199–200; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, p.313.
- 56 The severity of Sévres was equal to that of the Mudros Treaty.
- 57 *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi*, (Henceforth quoted as TBMMZC) Vol.III, p.1238; Seha L. Meray, *Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar-Belgeler*, Vol.I, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yay., 1993), p.9.
- 58 Ahmad, *The Making of*, p.54.
- 59 Eroğlu, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*, *passim*; Ahmad, *The Making of*, pp.52–53; William L. Cleveland, *A History of Modern Middle East* (Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1994), pp.168–71.
- 60 Lieutenant J.L. Martin, Special Intelligence Bureau, Cairo to Arab Bureau, 3 June 1918, FO 141/430. See also Salahi Ramadan Sonyel, *Turkish Diplomacy*,

- 1918–1923: *Mustafa Kemal and the Turkish National Movement* (London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1975), p.22.
- 61 Kemal Pasha maintained his contact with Imam Yehia of Yemen who was known to oppose Sherif Hussein. It was reported that when the Sherif offered to establish good relations with the Imam, he responded, ‘Traitor and Deceiver of the Faithful, you are not Moslem(s); otherwise you would not go against Mustafa Kemal’. See the report: GHQ, General Staff, Cairo, to Major Tweedy, The Residency, Cairo, 22 January 1923, FO 141/430.
- 62 HC, Jerusalem to HC Cairo, 17 January 1921, FO 141/430; Sonyel, *Turkish Diplomacy*, p.23.
- 63 Troopers, London to Baghdad, very secret, 21 January 1921, FO 141/430; Sonyel, *Turkish Diplomacy*, p.23.
- 64 Palmer, Damascus to Lord Curzon, London, 10 November 1920, FO 141/430.
- 65 Baghdad to HC for Egypt, Cairo, 2 June 1921, FO 141/430.
- 66 HC Egypt to Curzon of Kedleston, 16 March 1923, FO 141/430.
- 67 Meray, *Lozan Barış Konferansı*, Vol.I; HC, Egypt to Major Tweedy, The Residency, Cairo, 10 February 1923; HC Egypt to Curzon of Kedleston, 16 March 1923, FO 141/430.
- 68 Eroğlu, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*, pp.199–200; Mim Kemal Öke, *Türk-İngiliz İlişkilerinde Musul ve Kürdistan Sorunu, 1918–1926* (Ankara, 1992), pp.98–104; Ergün Aybars, ‘Milli Mücadelede İngiliz Basını’ *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi* (Thereafter quoted as *AAMD*) Vol.VII, 1990. no.19, pp. 69–70; Report on Turkey by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 69 *Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: Montreux ve Savaş öncesi Yıllar, 1935–1939* (Hereafter quoted as *TDP Montreux ve Savaş öncesi Yıllar*) (Ankara: TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1973), pp. 73–122; Fahir Armaoğlu, 20. *Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi, (1914–1980)*, p.328. Report on Turkey by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316. Also there were two more points which had constrained Anglo-Turkish relations in the past. First was the issue of Christian minorities in Turkey. The problem was resolved with an agreement which provided for an exchange of population between Greece and Turkey, and installed minority clauses into the Treaty. The second point was the issue of a political Caliphate as the Foreign Office report indicated: ‘HMG have been considerably embarrassed in the past in India and other Moslem dependencies by the existence of a politico-religious Caliphate agitation. Cordiality in Anglo-Turkish relations cuts at the base of the political aspect of this movement.’ See document, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, 5 March 1926, CO 730/106/17. See also, Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, ‘Lozan Konferansında Ermeni Meselesi: İtilaf Devletlerinin Diplomatik Manevraları ve Türkiye’nin Karşı Siyaseti’, *Belleten*, no.254, 2005, *passim*.
- 70 Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Under-Secretary of State for Colonies, memorandum by Sir R. Lindsay, 5 March 1926, CO 730/106/17.
- 71 See the above report. Concurring with the views of the British Ambassador, the Cabinet instructed the Foreign Office on 18 December 1925 that in order to ease the forthcoming blow which was the cession of Mosul to Iraq, the Foreign Office should offer some concessions to the Turks with a view to averting a break in Anglo-Turkish relations. See William Stivers, *Supremacy and Oil: Iraq*,

- Turkey, and the Anglo-American World Order, 1918–1930* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982), p.167.
- 72 *Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: Cumhuriyetin İlk On Yılı ve Balkan Paktı (1923–1934)* (Hereafter quoted as *TDP Cumhuriyetin İlk On Yılı ve Balkan Paktı*) (Ankara: TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1973), pp.4–5; *TDP Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.5–6.
- 73 Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, ‘Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye’nin Balkan Diplomasisi, (1923–1930)’, *AAMD*, Vol.XX, no.60, 2004.
- 74 *Atatürk’ün Milli Dış Politikası: Cumhuriyet Dönemine Ait 100 Belge, (1923–1938)* (Thereafter quoted as *AMDP*, Vol.II, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yay., 1992), pp.48, 256–261; *TDP, Cumhuriyetin İlk On yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.308–359, 362.
- 75 *TDP, Cumhuriyetin İlk On yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.151–56, 367; Armaoğlu, 20. *Yüzyıl*, p.340.
- 76 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.151–156; Bilgin, ‘Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye’nin Ortadoğu’, pp.22–28.
- 77 Ihsan Gürkan, ‘Turkish Iraqi Relations: The Cold War and Its Aftermath’, in Ismail Soysal (ed.) *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, (İstanbul: İsis Ltd, 1994–95), Annual 9, p.29. See also, Report on Turkey by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 78 Translation of an article in the Beirut newspaper, *Al-Ahrar*, on 9 February 1929 on Turkish policy in Arabia, FO 141/430.
- 79 Armaoğlu, 20. *Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi*, p.340; Report on Turkey by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 80 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.151–56; Cleveland, *A History of*, p.194
- 81 Ismail Soysal, ‘1937 Sadabad Pact’, *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, Annual 3, 1988, p.132.
- 82 Soysal, ‘1937 Sadabad Pact’, p.134.
- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Abdülhat Akşin, *Atatürk’ün Dış Politika İlkeleri ve Diplomasisi* (Ankara: TTK, 1991), pp.200–201; James Morgan, Istanbul to Viscount Halifax, 25 June 1938, FO 371/21836.
- 85 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.151; Seymour to Eden, 4 August 1937, WO 201/1049.
- 86 Stonehewer-Bird, Saudi Arabia, to War Cabinet, 16 August 1940, FO 371/24548.
- 87 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.151; British Legation, Tehran to Anthony Eden, 22 January 1938, FO 371/21836; Soysal ‘1937 Sadabad Pact’, pp.138–39; Seymour to Eden, 4 August 1937, WO 201/1049.
- 88 Bilgin, ‘Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye’nin Orta Doğu’, pp.22–28.
- 89 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.155–156. See also D. Cameron Watt, ‘The Saadabad Pact of 8 July 1937’, in Uriel Dann (ed.), *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939* (New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988).
- 90 Soysal, ‘Sadabad Pact’, pp.148–49; Extracts from the *Daily Telegraph* and *Morning Post*, 2 January 1940, FO 371/24548.
- 91 *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.14, 187; *TDP, Cumhuriyetin İlk On yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.355, 358; Ali Karaosmanoğlu, ‘Turkey and the Southern Flank: Domestic and External Contexts’, in J. Chipman (ed.), *Nato’s Southern Allies: Internal and External Challenges*, (London: Routledge, 1988), p.294.

- 92 Report by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316; Lyudmila Zhivkova, *Anglo-Turkish Relations 1933–1939* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1976), p.38.
- 93 TDP, *Cumhuriyetin İlk On yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.360–363; Foreign Office memo on the Scope and Effects of the Anglo-Turkish Treaty, 10 December, 1939, FO 195/2685; Report by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 94 Loraine to Eden, 8 May 1936, FO 954/28.
- 95 TDP, *Cumhuriyetin İlk On yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.360–363; Loraine, to Eden, 8 May 1936, FO 954/28. See also Aryeh Shmuelevitz, ‘Atatürk’s Policy toward the Great Powers: Principles and Guidelines’ in Uriel Dann (ed.) *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939* (New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988), p.313.
- 96 However, Atatürk also made it clear that if Anglo-French estrangement occurred and there arose Franco-Italian collaboration then Turkey would orient herself towards Germany on the continent and towards England in the Mediterranean. If England became uninterested there then Turkey would turn back to Germany and herself to promote Russo-German reconciliation. See memorandum by Sir Percy Loraine to Eden, 12 April 1936, FO 954/28. For these views see also Turkish sources, TDP, *Cumhuriyetin İlk On Yılı Ve Balkan Paktı*, pp.360–61; TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.10–15, 187.
- 97 AMDP, Vol.II, p.131; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, p.329 ADM 234/88.
- 98 Report on Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1939, by Foreign Office, 10 December 1939, FO 195/22685; TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.187–188.
- 99 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.192–193; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, p.330, ADM 234/88.
- 100 Records of the Turkish Cabinet Conclusions, 23.04.1939, TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p. 217.
- 101 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.187–88.
- 102 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.187–215; Report on Turkey by the Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, p.331.
- 103 From Saraçoğlu to İnönü, 29 September 1939, TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.230–31.
- 104 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.240–43.
- 105 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.245.
- 106 Boris Potskhveriya, ‘The Soviet Archival Documents Related to Turco-Soviet Relations’, Unpublished Proceedings of the XIVth Turkish Congress of History, (Ankara, 2002), pp.1–2.
- 107 Potskhveriya, ‘The Soviet Archival Documents’, p.1.
- 108 Ankara to Moscow, no date, TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.245.
- 109 The summary of the draft treaty prepared by the Turkish government, TDP *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.188.
- 110 Halifax to Aras, no date, TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.188–189.
- 111 The meeting of Turkish Cabinet and the COS under the leadership of President İnönü, 20 April 1939, TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.196.
- 112 Admiralty views on Anglo-Turkish relations, 30 August, 1939, ADM 1/10211.
- 113 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.191.
- 114 TDP, *Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.205.

- 115 Records of the Turkish Cabinet Conclusions, 12 April, 1939, *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.191.
- 116 *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.193–94.
- 117 *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.193–94.
- 118 See the Turkish verbal communication on 25 April; the British verbal communication on 2 May, Turkish verbal communication on 10 May 1939, *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.194–201.
- 119 *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.187–215; Report on Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1939, 10 December 1939, FO 195/2685; Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, ADM 234/88, p.331. From the Turkish point of view, Protocol/2, which was to be regarded as an integral part of the Anglo-French-Turkish treaty, was one of the most important points of the treaty which indicates that the obligations assumed by Turkey under the treaty should not compel her to take any action which would involve her being drawn into the war with Russia. However, Article 2 bound Turkey to give all possible assistance to Britain and France if they were involved in war as a consequence of their guarantees to Greece and Romania.
- 120 Memorandum by Admiralty, 30 August 1939, ADM 1/10211; *TDP, Monterux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.211–15.
- 121 Records of an interview with the British and French Ambassadors at Turkish Foreign Ministry, 11.06.1940, *Türkiye Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: (1939–1946)*, (Hereafter quoted as *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı*) (Ankara: TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1973), pp.8–9.
- 122 Sir Dwellwyn Woodward, British Foreign Policy in the Second World War, Vol.I, p.246. These were such actions as to demand the return of Turkish Ambassador, to expel the Italian Ambassador, the break of diplomatic relations with Italy. But Turkey saw these suggestions as unnecessary actions and hence rejected them.
- 123 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.100–18.
- 124 Admiralty Handbook, April 1942, pp.332–333 ADM 234/88.
- 125 Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 126 See the Turkish documents related to Cairo Talks, *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.150–77. See also, Knatchbull-Hugessen to Sir Orme Sargent, Foreign Office, 19 December 1943, FO 800/896.
- 127 The Turkish documents related to the Second Cairo talks, *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.187–19; Foreign Office to Moscow, 9 February 1943, FO 800/896; Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 128 According to British perceptions Numan Menemencioğlu who had been behind the policy of strict neutrality, resigned because of his mistaken calculations. See Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 129 Hollis to Dixon, 15 July 1944, FO 800/896; Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 130 See Foreign Policy of Turkey in İnönü's Government Programme for the year 1924 in Kemal Girgin, *TC Hükümetleri Programlarında Dış politikamız: (70 Yılın Panoraması, 1923–1993)* (TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1993), p.12.
- 131 Turkish Cabinet Conclusions, 20 April 1939, *TDP, Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.197.

- 132 For details, see, Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations in the Middle East: British Perceptions, 1945–53' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, The University of Birmingham, 2001), Chapter II.

Chapter Two

- 1 In general there have been many arguments among historians on the date of the origins of the Cold War. Some historians such as Michael J. Cohen traces its origin back to August 1944; while others date it back even as early as the Munich agreement of September 1938. The present author, however, in the light of the extensive use of primary documents prefers to date the discussions of the Tehran Conference in November 1943 when the Soviets made up their mind vis-à-vis Turkey and raised the issue of the revision of the Montreux Convention for the first time in an international Conference as the originating point of the Cold War in the Near East. See these historians: Cohen, *Fighting World War Three*, p.1; C.M. Woodhouse, *British Foreign Policy Since the Second World War* (London: Hutchinson, 1961), p.13; Stuart Croft, *The End of Superpower: the British Foreign Office Conceptions of a Changing World, 1945–51* (England: Dartmouth Publishing Company Ltd., 1993), p.20; Kent, *British Imperial Strategy, passim*; Kuniholm, *The Origins of*, p.69.
- 2 Croft, *The End of Superpower*, pp. 15–16; Kent, *British Imperial Strategy*, pp.x–xi.
- 3 For the new argument that Britain was a leading player in starting the Cold War, see Kent, *British Imperial Strategy, passim*.
- 4 Record of the Interview between Numan Menemencioğlu and Anthony Eden, November 1942, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.iv–v, 179; Report by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 5 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.136, 235–37; Cemil Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi: 1938–1945* (Ankara: Yurt yayınları, 1986), Vol.1, p.697; Vol.2, pp.148, 155–56; Report by Foreign Office, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 6 Prime Minister to General Ismay for the COS Committee, 3 April 1945, CAB 120/72; Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef*, Vol.2, pp.167–68; Martin Gilbert, *Winston S. Churchill: Road to Victory 1941–1945* (London: Heinemann, 1986), p.1278.
- 7 Report by Foreign Office on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.136–38.
- 8 Report on the Straits of Istanbul by Foreign Office, 28 November 1944, FO 371/44188. In case of emergency, the Foreign Office developed two alternatives to bring Turkey into the war: either by finding some means of precipitating a German attack on Turkey or by means of an ultimatum. The ultimatum would be: a) the slowing up or cessation of supplies of arms; b) the withholding of the civilian supplies that could be obtained only with difficulty from other sources; c) the threat of abandonment of political support to Turkey, which she relied on against Russia.
- 9 Report by R.K. Dickson, 15 August 1943, ADM 116/4884.
- 10 Report by the COS Committee on Turkey and the Dardanelles, 22 September 1943, CAB 119/126.
- 11 Chiefs of Staff conclusions on Turkey and the Dardanelles, 22 September 1943, CAB 119/126.
- 12 Potskhveriya, 'The Soviet Archival Documents', pp.2–3.

- 13 Report by the Secretary of the COS Committee, on the Montreux Convention: Annex 2, 7 July 1945, CAB 119/126. See also, Selim Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An 'Active' Neutrality* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp.156–59, pp.176–80; Weisband, *Turkish Foreign Policy*, pp.295–318.
- 14 Report by Secretary of the COS Committee on the Montreux Convention, Annex 3, 7 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 15 Records of the Second Cairo Talks, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.184–185, 187–219.
- 16 Turkish Records related to the Second Cairo Talks, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.188–89.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid., pp.198–99.
- 19 Ibid., pp.202–203.
- 20 Potskhveriya, 'The Soviet Archival Documents', p.3; Açıklan, Moscow to Ankara, 28 June 1943, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.148.
- 21 Potskhveriya, 'The Soviet Archival Documents', p.3; Açıklan, Moscow to Ankara, 4 August 1943, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.149–50.
- 22 Report by Secretary of the COS Committee on the Montreux Convention, Annex 3, 7 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 23 The same report, Annex 4. During discussions, Stalin pointed that he disliked the limitations on Russia's right to send warships through the Straits in time of war and Turkey's power to make a decision to open them or not in case of any threat.
- 24 COS (44) 527 (0) (PHP), War Cabinet, COS Committee, 15 June 1944; JIC (44) 467 (0), (Final), War Cabinet, Joint Intelligence Sub-Committee, 18 December 1944, CAB 119/126.
- 25 Report by Secretary of the COS Committee on the Montreux Convention, Annex 4, 7 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 26 Ibid., Annex 5; Foreign Office to Angora, 27 February 1945, CAB 119/126. In fact Eden gave assurances to the Turkish government that he would never discuss matters affecting Turkey with a third power without prior consultation. According to Churchill, however, strict Turkish neutrality prevented Britain from doing so. See report by Secretary of the COS Committee on Montreux Convention, Annex (4, 5, 6), 7 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 27 For Turkish suspicions see, Sir Knatchbull-Hugessen, Ankara to Foreign Office, 19 December 1943, FO 800/896. See also Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, *Diplomat in Peace and War* (London: John Murray, 1949), p.198.
- 28 Ankara to London, 12 December 1943, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.206.
- 29 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.205.
- 30 Record of Communication between the Turkish MFA and the British Ambassador, 18 December 1943, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.206–207.
- 31 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.210–11. See also, Foreign Office to Moscow, 9 February 1944, FO 800/896.
- 32 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.225–26; FRUS, The Near East, South Asia, Africa, The Far East, Vol.V, 1944, pp.818–19.
- 33 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.218–19.

- 34 Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.225–226; *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi*, (hereafter TBMM), (The Records of the Turkish Grand National Assembly), 1943–46, Dönem 7, 02-08-1944, pp.3–11.
- 35 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.226.
- 36 L.C. Hollis to P.J.Dixon, 15 July 1944, FO 800/896; Foreign Office report on Turkey, 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 37 Potskhveriya, 'The Soviet Archival Documents', p.4.
- 38 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.229–30.
- 39 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp 229–230; FRUS, The Near East, South Asia, Africa, The Far East, Vol.V, 1944, p.884.
- 40 Knatchbull-Hugessen, Ankara to Sargent, FO, 19 December 1943, FO 800/896; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.232–38.
- 41 COS (44) 527 (0) (PHP), War Cabinet, COS Committee, 15 June 1944; JIC (44) 467 (0), (Final), War Cabinet, Joint Intelligence Sub-Committee, 18 December 1944, CAB 119/126., Annex 6; FRUS, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945, p.804.
- 42 Sarper to Ankara, 24 February 1945, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.244–245; Sir Maurice Peterson, Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 February 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 43 Report by Sarper to Ankara, no date, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.246–47.
- 44 Peterson, Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 February 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 45 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.243; The British Embassy, Ankara to Eden, 24 February 1945, FO 195/2487; Peterson to Eden, 9 March 1945, FO 371/48764; COS 48th meeting, 21 February 1945, AIR 9/471; Feridun Cemal Erkin, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi* (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968), pp.244–245; Kamuran Gürün, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri, 1920–1953* (Ankara: TTK Basimevi, 1991), pp.275–76.
- 46 COS Secretary's minute, 21 February 1945, AIR 9/471.
- 47 TBMM *Tutanak Dergisi*, 1943–46, Dönem 7, 23.02.1945, pp.126–30.
- 48 Ankara to Eden, 26 February 1945, FO 371/48764; Foreign Office to Ankara, 28 February 1945, FO 371/48764; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297. In his speech, Churchill stated though Turkey did not actively participate in the war, she nevertheless had aided Britain in various ways.
- 49 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.240; Tezel, *Moskovadan Geliyorum*, pp.229–32.
- 50 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.250; Peterson to Foreign Office, 22 March 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Ankara to Foreign Office, 8 April 1945, FO 371/48773; *Ayın Tarihi*, March 1945, no.136, p.52.
- 51 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.250–51.
- 52 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.251.
- 53 Peterson to Foreign Office, 22 March 1945, FO195/2487/401; Angora to Foreign Office, 8 April 1945, FO 371/48773; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.252.
- 54 Ünaydın to Ankara, March 1945, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.252–53; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey, 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.

- 55 COS 45) 220 (0) PHP: The Montreux Convention, Staff Study, 6 April 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 56 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.254; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey, 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.
- 57 Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey, 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.254.
- 58 Records of Conversations between Molotov and Sarper, 7 June 1945, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.263–268; Foreign Office to various HMG's representatives, 14 June 1945, FO 371/48773. According to Turkish and British documents this dark fourth point could be either the Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1939 or connected with the Turkish internal regime.
- 59 Records of Conversations between Molotov and Sarper 7 June 1945, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.263–66; Foreign Office to various HMG's representatives, 14 June 1945, FO 371/48773.
- 60 Record of Conversation between Saraçoğlu and Wilson, 2 July 1945; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.275.
- 61 Foreign Office to Washington, Istanbul, 17 June 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Foreign Office to Moscow, 5 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Foreign Office to Washington, Istanbul, 17 June 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Record of a meeting between Sümer and Peterson, 18 June 1945; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.269; Peterson to Bevin, 1 February 1946, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, FO 371/59297.
- 64 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.271; Istanbul to FO, 21 June 1945, FO 371/48773; Peterson to Foreign Office, 21 June 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 65 FRUS, 1945, Vol.I, pp.1027–1029; Peterson to Foreign Office, 28 June 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 66 Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; Record of Conversation between Peterson and Açıkalın, 6 July 1945, TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.276.
- 67 Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.276. In London, Eden pointed out that the Turkish government should be calmed down and expressed his hope that they would not over dramatize or exaggerate the events.
- 68 COS (45) 459(0), Offices of the Cabinet and Minister of Defence, 12 July 1945, FO 371/48699; JP (45) 170 (Final), COS Committee Joint Planning Staff JPS, 11 July 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 69 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.278; Robert J. Donovan, *Conflict and Crisis: the Presidency of Harry Truman 1945–1948* (New York: Norton Company, 1977), pp.80–85; Foreign Office to Peterson, 25 July 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 70 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.278–79; Foreign Office Memoranda on the Straits by McDermott, 16 November 1945, FO 371/48699; Foreign Office to Istanbul, 25 July 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297. At Potsdam Stalin insisted on previous Soviet demands which were to gain bases in the Straits. However, this was rejected by both Britain and the United States. See also Llewellyn Woodward, *British Foreign Policy in the Second World War*, Vol.IV (London: HMSO, 1975) pp.208–210; Deringil *Turkish Foreign Policy*, p.180.

- 71 Foreign Office Memoranda on the Straits by McDermott, 16 November, 1945, FO 371/48699; *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter *FRUS*), 1945, Vol.VIII, *The Near East and Africa* (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 1236–1237; A. Suat Bilge, *Güç Komşuluk: Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 1920–1962* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1992), p.293.
- 72 Ibid., p.1239; Peterson, Istanbul to Foreign Office, 26 July 1945, FO 195/2487/401. Hüseyin Ragıp Baydur, the Turkish ambassador to Washington, paid a visit to the State Department and complained about the American ‘indifferent attitude’. See, Baydur’s report from Washington, *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.281.
- 73 Foreign Office to Peterson, Istanbul, 25 July 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 74 Peterson to Foreign Office 26 July 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Peterson to Foreign Office, 13 August 1945, FO 195/2487/40; Peterson to Bevin, review of events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; Peterson to Foreign Office, 18 August 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 77 Ibid.; US Embassy to Sargent, Foreign Office, 3 November 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 78 Foreign Office to Washington 19 August 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Foreign Office Memoranda on the Straits by Mc Dermott, 16 November 1945, FO 371/48765.
- 79 Washington to London, 21 August 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 80 Kelly to Bevin, 3 July 1946, FO 371/59234.
- 81 Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.
- 82 Ibid.; Helm to Bevin, 20 September 1945, FO 371/45315.
- 83 Foreign Office to Washington, repeated to Angora, 22 October 1945, FO 195/2487/40; Halifax to Foreign Office, 24 October 1945, CAB 119/126.
- 84 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.283; Foreign Office to Washington, 26 October 1945, CAB 119/126; Foreign Office Memorandum by McDermott, 16 November 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 85 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.283; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.
- 86 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.283: Angora to Foreign Office, 5 November 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 87 Foreign Office memorandum by McDermott, 15 December 1945, FO 371/48699; *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.285.
- 88 The British Embassy Moscow, Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr to V.M. Molotov, People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs, 23 November 1945, FO 195/2487/401.
- 89 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.285; Peterson to Foreign Office, 6 December 1945, FO 195/2787/401.
- 90 Peterson to Foreign Office 21 November 1945, FO 195/2487/401; Memorandum by McDermott, 15 December 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 91 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p 283; Peterson to Foreign Office, 13 March 1925, FO 371/48773.
- 92 *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p .270; Peterson to Foreign Office, 26 October 1945, FO 371/48699; C.R. Price to Sir Alexander Cadogan, 14 November 1945,

- Air 20/4975; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.
- 93 Ibid.; Fahir Armaoğlu, *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi: 1914–1995* (İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, no date), p.424. See also Silverfab, *The Twilight of British*, pp.39–53.
- 94 Angora to Foreign Office, 8 December 1945, FO 371/48710. Even, the Soviet Consul-General claimed £20,000 as compensation for the losses of the owner of the shop.
- 95 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p 283; Peterson to Bevin, review of events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; Armaoğlu, *20 Yüzyıl*, p.427; *Daily Telegraph*, 7 May 1946; *New York Times*, 8 March 1946.
- 96 Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297.
- 97 Peterson to Bevin 12 April 1945, FO 371/592/32.
- 98 Ibid. Dr Aras had been known as the last Atatürk's Foreign Minister. Upon the heavy Soviet propaganda he and his associates supported an early agreement with the Soviets. However, their movement came to an end after the student riots in Istanbul in December 1945. Then Aras resigned from the RPP.
- 99 Açıkalın to Bevin, 25 February 1946, FO 371/59232.
- 100 Ibid.
- 101 Ankara to Bevin, 18 April 1946, FO 371/59232; Foreign Office to Ankara, 15 February 1946, FO 800/507.
- 102 For Bevin's speech and the positive Turkish reactions to it see, *Ayın Tarihi*, February 1946, no.147; Foreign Office to Angora, 22 February 1946, FO 371/59232. In fact it appeared in his speech that Bevin was not very firm as Churchill and Eden had been in the matters between Russia and Turkey. Bevin even thought of some concessions which the two countries could consider, if they wanted; for instance, the issue of the revision of the Montreux Convention between themselves without including Britain with a reservation that Britain had an interest in the international aspect of the Straits, while the latter recognised the issue as an international matter including Britain. Bevin also emphasised the necessity of good relations between Turkey, Russia and Britain. Thus, his idea appeared to be to follow a conciliatory attitude between Russia and Turkey while some minor concessions could be considered without impairing Turkish independence.
- 103 Foreign Office Minute for the Secretary of State by Sir Orme Sargent, 6 March 1946, FO 371/59232.
- 104 Mr Goe, US Embassy, London to Michael Williams, Foreign Office, 11 February 1946, FO 371/59232. Ambassador Wilson explained to Saka that questions between Turkey and the Soviets extended beyond Turkish territory 'into the sphere of world peace and security' in which the US government had the deepest interest. He also advised the latter that Turkey should be firm and calm and avoid provocation. See also Gasiorowski, 'US Foreign Policy', p.53.
- 105 Peterson to Bevin, 12 April 1946, FO 371/ 59232; Christopher Buckley in *Daily Telegraph*, 29 April 1946.
- 106 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.283, 285–86; For Turkish Press' reactions to the Soviet note see, *Ayın Tarihi*, August 1945, no.153; Kamuran Gürün, *Diş İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası* (Ankara: SBF Yay., 1983), pp.163–64; Report by Foreign Office, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550. In this report, the Foreign

- Office believed that the Soviet accusations of Turkish partiality to the Germans were not wholly unjustifiable. But Britain and America had not as much to complain about as the Soviets had.
- 107 Report by Foreign Office, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550.
- 108 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.3–5. This point is examined in detail in the following chapters of this book.
- 109 Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 22, 19 July 1946, CAB 131/1.
- 110 Memorandum by S. Williams on assistance to Greece and Turkey, 20 December, 1946, FO 371/66965.
- 111 Ibid.
- 112 Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 22, 19 July 1946, CAB 131/1. At this time Britain came to the conclusion that the Soviet Russia was the greatest danger to the UK's interests.
- 113 Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs to Canada, Australia, and others, 21 February 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 114 *FRUS*, 1946, Vol.VII, p.849.
- 115 Report by Foreign Office, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550; *FRUS*, 1946, Vol.VII, pp.847–848.
- 116 For the Turkish note see, *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.286–94; *Aynı Tarihi*, no.153, August 1946, pp.76–83. See also Report by Foreign Office, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550; *FRUS*, 1946, Vol.VII, pp.847–48. Foreign Office to Paris, 19 August, 1946, CAB 119/126.
- 117 Kamuran Gürün, *Türk-Soviet İlişkileri: 1920–1953* (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1991), p.306; The British sources indicated that there were approximately 200,000 Russian troops in Bulgaria; 175,000 in South Caucasus; and 35,000 on the Turco-Persian border. See Foreign Office report by Mr. Williams, 15 December 1945, FO 371/48699.
- 118 For the Soviet note see *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.294–301. For the 'Turkish Press' reactions to the Soviet note see, *Aynı Tarihi*, no.154, September 1946. See also, Report by Foreign Office, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550.
- 119 For the Second Turkish note see, *TDP, İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, pp.301–15; *Aynı Tarihi*, no.155, October 1946.
- 120 Ibid; George S. Harris, *Troubled Alliance: Turkish-American Problems in Historical Perspective, 1945–1971* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1972), p.22.
- 121 Foreign Office Report, 6 January 1947, FO 371/96550.
- 122 See the speech of Recep Peker, then the Prime Minister of Turkey, to the Turkish Press, *Aynı Tarihi*, no.155, October 1946, pp.57–58.
- 123 Foreign Office to Paris, 9 October 1946; Report by Air Ministry, Appendix E, 16 July 1946, CAB 120/712; Sargent to Açıkalın, 29 March 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 124 From 1938 to late 1946 British loans to Turkey amounted to £80 million. See Foreign Office minute by R.P. Pinsent, 13 March 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 125 *FRUS*, 1946, Vol.VII, pp. 906–909; Mehmet Gönlübol and others, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası, 1919–1973* (Ankara: SBF Yayınları, 1982), p.212.
- 126 Ibid, pp. 857–58.
- 127 Interview between A.V. Alexander and Mr Byrnes, 15 October 1946, AIR 20/11455. See also the files; CAB 131/4, FO 371/66965.

- 128 Ibid.
- 129 Ibid, *FRUS*, 1946, Vol.VII, pp. 913–17.
- 130 John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982) pp.18–25; Gaddis, *We Now Know*, pp.20, 31, 37–38; Cohen, *Fighting World War Three*, p.2.
- 131 COS (46) 277 (0), Memorandum by the COS on Turkey and Greece, Annex 4, 13 November 1946, AIR 20/11455; DO (47) 4, Memorandum by the Foreign Secretary, 2 January 1947, CAB 21/1964.
- 132 Ibid.
- 133 DO (47) 4, Cabinet Defence Committee, memorandum prepared by Secretary of State for FA, 2 January 1947, CAB 21/1964.
- 134 Foreign Office to Washington, 19 February 1947, FO 371/66965.
- 135 Ibid.
- 136 Ministry of Defence to JSM, Washington, FO 371/67306. In the beginning of 1947 the strength of the Turkish Armed Forces, excluding the Navy and Air Force, was 430,000 men and the British Ambassador suggested this was too large and too difficult to organise. He also suggested that to maintain this huge army was also a waste of time and money and it needed to be reduced to about 300,000 men supported by a suitable Air Force. See Kelly to Foreign Office, 17 March 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 137 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, p.35.
- 138 Ibid., pp.45–56.
- 139 Quoted in Mc Ghee, *The US-Turkish-NATO*, p.18.
- 140 McGhee, *The US-Turkish-NATO*, pp.19, 63.
- 141 Ibid., p.23. See for the details of evolving American economic and military assistance to Greece and Turkey: *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, The Near East and Africa, pp.35–124, 134, 138, 175, 525.
- 142 Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The US Crusade against the Soviet Union 1945–56* (Manchester University Press, 1999), pp.6–9; D.Cameron Watt, *Succeeding John Bull: America in Britain's Place, 1900–1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp.12, 100–101.
- 143 Kelly to Foreign Office, 9 April 1947, FO 371/67306; Kelly to Foreign Office, 25 June 1947, FO 371/67308.
- 144 Harris, *Troubled Alliance*, pp.27–29.
- 145 Kelly to Foreign Office, 9 April 1947, FO 371/67306; Kelly to Foreign Office 25 June 1947, FO 371/67308. The American Ambassador assured the Turkish Foreign Office that there was no question of establishing an American control over Turkish affairs. See *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, p.138.
- 146 Kelly to Foreign Office, 9 April 1947, FO 371/67306; Kelly to Foreign Office 25 June 1947, FO 371/67308.
- 147 Kelly to Foreign Office, 9 April 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 148 Foreign Office to Ankara, 25 July 1947, FO 371/67308; Admiralty to Naval Attaché, Ankara, 14 April 1958, ADM 1/27055.
- 149 *Cumhuriyet* (the Turkish daily), 15 March 1947.
- 150 *Vakit*, (the Turkish daily), 13 March 1947.
- 151 *Tasvir*, (the Turkish daily), 13 March 1947.

- 152 Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef*, Vol.II, pp.546–560; Helm to Bevin, 24 August 1945, FO 371/48765. Besides external factors, there were also internal factors which pushed the President towards multi-party democracy. Even the President himself thought the establishment of the Democrat party as to be a 'safety valve' for the regime. See: Peterson to Foreign Office, 7 December 1945, FO 371/48710.
- 153 Kelly to Bevin, 3 July 1946, FO 371/59234; Kelly to Foreign Office, Annual Report on Turkey, 15 January 1948, FO 371/72540; Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef*, Vol.II, pp.546–560.
- 154 London Press, 15 March 1947, Overseas Press Services, FO 371/ 67306.
- 155 Sir D. Kelly to Foreign Office, 17 March 1947, FO 371/67306; Angora to Foreign Office, 31 May 1947, FO 371/67308.
- 156 Kelly to Foreign Office, Annual report for 1947, 15 January 1948, FO 371/72540.
- 157 Ibid.
- 158 Ibid.
- 159 Ibid.
- 160 Kelly to Foreign Office, 17 March 1947, FO 371/67306.
- 161 See the main lines of foreign policy in the Turkish Government's Programme for the year 1947, Girgin, *Dış Politikamız*, p.22.
- 162 FRUS, The Conferences of Berlin: The Potsdam Conference, 1945, Vol.I, p.1071; Alan Bullock, *Ernest Bevin: Foreign Secretary 1945–1951* (New York: WW Norton & Company, 1983) pp. 39–40, 133.
- 163 Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den Sonraki*, p.10. As the American documents indicate Washington in June 1945 saw the issue of the Turkish Straits within the sphere of Anglo-Russian rivalry and hence did not envisage a direct American involvement in the question at this time. See, FRUS Conferences of Berlin 1945, Vol.I, p.1071.
- 164 TDP, *Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp.274–283; Kelly to Bevin, 18 May 1946, FO 371/59233. Memduh Tezel, the Turkish diplomat in Moscow during this period also confirmed these views in his memoirs. See Tezel, *Moskovadan Geliyorum*, p.250.
- 165 See Celal Bayar's, who was Turkish Premier in 1937 and then President of Turkey during 1950–60 period, interviews and memories collected in Saray's book, *Türkiye'nin NATO'ya Girişi*, pp.92–95. See also for President İnönü's views, Bozdağ, *Menderes*, pp.53–54.

Chapter Three

- 1 Report by Foreign Office, 10 December 1939, FO 195/2685.
- 2 Kent, *Egypt and the Defence of*, Part I, p.xliv.
- 3 Kent, *British Imperial Strategy*, pp.212–213; Louis, *The British Empire*, *passim*.
- 4 Aldrich and Zametica, 'The Rise and Decline of', pp.236–253. Attlee and his colleagues thought that the developments in atomic weapons and air power had made the Mediterranean route valueless. They therefore came to support the idea that the defence of the British Empire was possible through the UN Organisation combined with a firm American atomic support behind it to deter any aggression. The British Middle Eastern strategy therefore only became clear and firm when Prime Minister Attlee, upon the threat of resignation by the CIGS,

reluctantly endorsed the COS paper entitled 'Future Defence Policy' on 13 January 1947. As the paper indicated, the UK defence was based on three main principles: first, the development of UK defence as an offensive base; second, preservation of sea communications; last, securing the Middle East as a both defensive and offensive base against the USSR, in which the Egyptian base occupied a central place. This paper (DO (47) 44) continued to remain British strategic policy in the Middle East until the summer of 1950.

5 See Chapter 5 for details.

6 TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.269; Kelly to Foreign Office, 26 April 1948, FO 195/2619.

7 *Düstur*, III. Tertip, Vol.7, p.2733.

8 TDP, *Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, pp. 151–156; Soysal, '1937 Sadabad Pact', pp.147–148; S.H. Longrigg, *Iraq 1900 to 1950: A Political, Social and Economic History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), p.328.

9 Lord Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said: A Study in Arab Leadership* (London: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1959), p.176.

10 Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, p.176.

11 TDP, *Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar*, p.75; Edith and E.F. Penrose, *Iraq: International Relations and National Development* (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1978), pp.104–105.

12 H.G. Balfour-Paul, 'Iraq: The Fertile Crescent Dimension' in T. Niblock (ed.), *Iraq: The Contemporary State* (London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1982), pp. 14–15; Lord Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, pp.180–83.

13 Niblock, *Iraq: The Contemporary*, p.4.

14 War Cabinet to Sir B. Newton, Baghdad, 4 August 1940, FO 371/24548; Balfour-Paul, 'Iraq', pp.13–16.

15 Ibid.

16 Sir H. Knatchbull Hugessen to War Cabinet, 19 July 1940; 21 July 1940, FO 371/24548.

17 Knatchbull-Hugessen to War Cabinet, 24 July 1940, FO 371/24548.

18 Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den*, pp.72–73; Balfour-Paul, 'Iraq', p.18.

19 Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945'den*, pp.72–74; Penrose, *Iraq*, pp.117–118; Elie Kedourie, *The Chatham House Version and other Middle Eastern Studies* (USA: University Press of New England, 1984), pp.218–220.

20 Michael Eppel, 'Iraqi Politics and Regional Policies' *Middle Eastern Studies*, 1992, vol. 28, no.1, p.109.

21 Penrose, *Iraq*, p.117.

22 Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, p.199.

23 British Consulate, Damascus to British Legation, Beirut, 8 February 1946, FO 371/52879.

24 In the summer of 1945 Iraq faced the greatest Kurdish rebellion ever led by Mullah Mustafa Barzani and suppressed it only with the help of other rival tribes. Then Barzani fled to Russia and it was rumoured that he would soon return with the support of Moscow. See report by Research Dept., on Russian Policy towards Kurdish Nationalism, 13 September 1950; Longrigg, *Iraq, 1900 to 1950*, p.337; Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, p.201.

25 See the text of the President's speech, *Aym Tarihi*, no.168, November 1947, pp.33–37.

- 26 Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, p.210; Gerald De Gaury, *Three Kings in Baghdad: 1921–1958* (London: Hutchinson Ltd., 1961), p.131.
- 27 See the Turkish reactions to the visit *Ayn Tarihi*, no 142, September 1945, pp.64–82. See also, A.K. Helm, Istanbul to Bevin, 20 September 1945, FO 195/2488/644.
- 28 Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 September 1945, FO 195/2488/689.
- 29 Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 September 1945, FO 195/2488/689. Majid Khadduri, *Independent Iraq 1932–1958: A Study in Iraqi Politics* (London, 1960), p.346.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 September 1945, FO 195/2488/689.
- 32 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 30 November, 1945, FO 195/2488.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Peterson to Foreign Office, 30 November 1945, FO 195/2488/689; Peterson to Bevin, 4 December, 1945, FO 195/2488.
- 35 Peterson to Foreign Office, 30 November 1945, FO 195/2488/689.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Stonehewer Bird, Baghdad to Foreign Office, 17 January 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 38 Eppel 'Iraqi politics', pp.114–115.
- 39 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 17 January 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 40 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 16 January, 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Stonehewer Bird, Baghdad to Foreign Office, 30 January 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Stonehewer Bird to Foreign Office, 30 January 1946, FO 371/52408
- 45 Damascus to British Legation Beirut, 8 February, 1946 FO 371/52879; Peterson to Foreign Office, 22 January, 1946, FO 371/52408; Birdwood, *Nuri As-Said*, p.210; Kürkçüoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Arap Orta Doğusuna*, p.16.
- 46 Ankara to Foreign Office, 3 March 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 47 Peterson to Foreign Office, 22 January 1946, FO 371/52408; Avedis K. Sanjian 'The Sanjak of Alexandretta (Hatay): Its impact on Turkish-Syrian Relations (1939–1956)', *The Middle East Journal*, Vol X, 1956, p.383.
- 48 Helm to Bevin, 19 March 1946, FO 371/ 52408.
- 49 Helm to Foreign Office, 15 March 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 50 *Düstur*, III. Tertip, Vol.28, p.1501; Ankara to Foreign Office, 7 April 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 51 *Düstur*, III. Tertip, Vol.28, p.1501–1536; Foreign Office minutes by Eastern Department, 17 April 1946, FO 371/52409. The two Conventions were Extradition and Judicial Assistance Conventions.
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 Helm to Bevin, 19 March 1946, FO 371/ 52408.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Ankara to Foreign Office, 23 March 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 56 Eppel, 'Iraqi Politics', p.115.
- 57 Prime Minister to General Ismay, 3 April 1945, CAB 120/712.
- 58 Helm to Foreign Office, 1 April 1946, FO 371 52409; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 8 April 1946, FO 371/52408.
- 59 Ibid.

- 60 Stonehewer Bird to Foreign Office, 2 May 1946, FO 371/52409. The first protocol dealt with the control of the upper waters of the Tigris and Euphrates and envisaged the construction of dams and observation posts. The Iraqi government was to bear the major share of the all cost.
- 61 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 6 May 1946, FO 371/52409.
- 62 Stonehewer Bird to Foreign Office, 20 May 1946, FO 371/52409. Meantime the Iraqi government prepared to remind Turkey of its grievances over the activities of a Turkish ship which owned by the government and carried illegal Jewish immigrants to Palestine.
- 63 Stonehewer Bird to Foreign Office, 20 May 1946, FO 371/52409.
- 64 Stonehewer Bird to Baxter, Eastern Dept., 14 March 1947, FO 371/67304.
- 65 Ibid.
- 66 Stonehewer Bird, Baghdad to Kelly, Ankara, 3 February 1946, FO 371/61673.
- 67 Ankara to Foreign Office, 23 March 1946, FO 371/52408; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 4 June 1947, FO 371/67304.
- 68 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 11 June 1947; 1 July 1947, Eyres, Ankara to Bevin, 12 September 1947, FO 371/67304. The Iraqi Chamber ratified the treaty by 88 to 13. See also, Hakkı Arif Ayyıldız, *Irak* (İstanbul, 1950), p.13.
- 69 Cleveland, *A History of the Modern*, p.202; İsmail Soysal, 'Seventy Years of Turkish-Arab Relations and an Analysis of Turkish-Iraqi Relations (1920–1990)' *Studies On Turkish Arab Relations* (İstanbul: İsis Ltd., 1991), Annual 6, p.29.
- 70 Report by Foreign Office Research Department, 5 September 1946, FO 371/52878.
- 71 Ibid.,
- 72 Soysal, 'Seventy Years of', p.30.
- 73 Ibid., p.31.
- 74 Report by Foreign Office Research Department, 5 September 1946, FO 371/52878.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Armaoğlu, *20.Yüzyıl*, p.349.
- 77 Ibid., p.351.
- 78 Soysal, 'Seventy Years of', p.37.
- 79 Edmond to Clutton, 3 June 1944, FO 371/44188.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Edmond to Clutton, 3 June 1944, FO 371/44188.
- 82 Cleveland, *A History of the*, pp.212–213.
- 83 Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den*, pp.75–76, 83. Abdülhat Akşin was the first Turkish Minister appointed to Syria in 1946. İsmail Soysal was the Turkish Charge d'Affaires to Syria during the period 1953–55. They both produced books and articles on Turco-Arap relations.
- 84 Peterson to Eden, 25 November 1944, FO 226/292.
- 85 Soysal, 'Seventy Years of', p.37.
- 86 Peterson to Eden, 25 November 1944, FO 226/292.
- 87 HM Minister Beirut to Foreign Office 3 January 1945, FO 226/292. These privileges such as opening Turkish schools, teaching in one Turkish language and the right of access to the Mixed Courts were identical to those given to the Americans under the 1924 agreement.
- 88 Ibid.

- 89 British Consulate Damascus to British Legation Beirut, 12 January 1945, FO 226/292.
- 90 Minutes by British Minister in Beirut, 25 January 1945, FO 226/292.
- 91 Foreign Office to Damascus, 29 January 1945; Foreign Office to Damascus, 2 February 1945, FO 226/292.
- 92 Minute by A.K. Helm, 1 January 1945, FO 195/2487/172.
- 93 Foreign Office to Damascus, 2 February, 1945, FO 226/292.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 Foreign Office to Damascus, 29 January 1945; Foreign Office to Beirut, 8 February 1945, FO 226/292.
- 96 *Tanin*, 10 April 1945.
- 97 *Atayolu*, 15 May 1945.
- 98 British Legation, Beirut to Eden, 19 May 1945, FO 226/292.
- 99 British Legation, Beirut to Eden, 19 May 1945, FO 226/292.
- 100 Ibid. According to the report, the Syrian government in general did not want to raise the Hatay issue into a crisis but it was nevertheless adversely affected by the agitation.
- 101 Minute by HM Minister, Beirut, 25 January 1945; Peterson to Beirut, 9 May 1945, FO 226/292.
- 102 Acting Consul, Damascus to Beirut, 8 August 1945; Istanbul to Beirut, 13 August, 1945, FO 226/292.
- 103 Minute by HM Minister in Damascus, 8 August 1945; FO 226/292.
- 104 Acting Consul, Damascus to Beirut, 8 August, 1945, FO 226/292.
- 105 Foreign Office to Beirut, 23 July 1945; Peterson to Foreign Office, 27 July 1945; Foreign Office to Moscow, 14 August 1945, FO 195/2487/172.
- 106 Helm to Foreign Office, 4 September 1945, FO 195/2487/172.
- 107 Foreign Office to Istanbul, 19 September 1945, FO 195/2487/172.
- 108 Ankara to Foreign Office, 19 September 1945; Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 September 1945, FO 195/2487/172.
- 109 Stonehewer Bird to Kelly, Ankara, 3 February 1947, FO 371/61673.
- 110 Beirut to Foreign Office, 6 October 1945, FO 195/2487/172; Report by Foreign Office Research Department, 5 September 1946, FO 371/52878.
- 111 Stonehewer Bird to Kelly, 3 February 1947, FO 371/61673.
- 112 Ankara to Bevin, 30 October 1946, FO 371/52878.
- 113 See the text of the President's speech, *Aym Tarihi*, no.168, November 1947, pp.33–37.
- 114 The later developments in Turco-Syrian relations will be dealt in Chapter Four.
- 115 Soysal, 'Seventy Years of', p.47.
- 116 Sir A. Kirkbride to Foreign Office, 3 December 1946, FO 371/52936.
- 117 Cunningham to S of S for Colonies, 10 December 1946, FO 371/52936
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Foreign Office to Ankara, 20 December 1946, FO 371/52936.
- 120 Ibid. Even Washington regarded Turkish efforts of collaboration with the Hashemite states as hasty attempts which could damage the stability of the Middle East, and suspected the motivations behind these attempts. See *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.748–50.
- 121 Ibid.

- 122 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.742–748, 752, 758; Patrick Seale, *The Struggle for Syria: A Study of Post-War Arab Politics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), p.13.
- 123 British Legation Amman to Bevin, 5 December 1946, FO 371/52936.
- 124 *Ibid.*; *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.738–740, 742–45.
- 125 Jerusalem to Cairo, 14 January 1946; Baghdad to Cairo, 1 February, 1946, FO 141/1084; Eppel, 'Iraqi Policies', pp.110–13.
- 126 Foreign Office to Ankara, 20 December 1946, FO 371/52936.
- 127 Weekly Political Summary by Foreign Office, 15 January 1947, FO 370/1432.
- 128 *Ibid.*
- 129 *Ibid.*
- 130 Weekly Political Summary by Foreign Office, 15 January 1947, FO 370/1432.
- 131 *Ayn Taribi*, no.158, Ocak 1947, p.81.
- 132 Peter L. Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain and Egypt, 1945–1956: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), pp.9–10.
- 133 *Ibid.*
- 134 Soysal, 'Seventy Years of', p.38.
- 135 Office of the Minister Resident, Cairo to Sir Walter Smart, Cairo, 26 March 1946, FO 141/1084.
- 136 Report by Foreign Office, Research Dept., 24 July 1946, FO 371/59316.
- 137 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, pp.10–11.
- 138 Annual Report on Egypt for 1938 prepared by Sir Miles Lampson to Viscount Halifax, 30 May 1939, FO 371/23366.
- 139 Cairo to Halifax, 24 February 1938, FO 371/21836.
- 140 Ankara to Halifax, 22 June 1939, FO 371/23366.
- 141 COS Secretary's minute, 21 February 1945, AIR 9/471; Martin Kolinsky, *Britain's War in the Middle East: Strategy and Diplomacy, 1936–1942* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999), pp. 177–178; Cleveland, *A History of the*, pp.190–191.
- 142 COS Secretary's minute, 21 February 1945, AIR 9/471
- 143 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.6.
- 144 Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 14, 24 April 1946, CAB 131/1. Egypt maintained the idea that there was no danger from the west and the danger from the east was remote. It regarded the UN Organisation as the guarantor which can protect Egypt from aggression. While Egypt wanted British assistance in case of emergency, it demanded British Forces to be located outside the Egypt in such adjacent territories as Libya or Palestine.
- 145 Weekly political summary by Foreign Office, 22 January 1947, FO 370/1432.
- 146 Weekly political summary by Foreign Office, 22 January 1947, FO 370/1432, Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 22, 19 July 1946. CAB 131/1.
- 147 Cairo to Foreign Office, 5 February 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 148 Foreign Office to Cairo, 3 March 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 149 Campbell to Foreign Office, 26 April 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 150 Ankara to Cairo, 2 May 1946, FO 141/1122; Foreign Office minute by Orme Sargent, 14 May 1946, FO 371/59233.
- 151 Ankara to Cairo, 2 May 1946, FO 141/1122; Foreign Office minute by Orme Sargent, 14 May 1946, FO 371/59233.
- 152 Kelly to Foreign Office, 6 May 1946; Kelly to Foreign Office, 14 May 1946, FO 371/53421.

- 153 Ibid.
- 154 Kelly to Foreign Office, 6 May 1946, FO 371/53421; Ankara to Cairo, 11 June 1946, FO 141/1122. As a matter of fact the Egyptian government removed Amin Bey Fuad from his job in Turkey in November 1946. See Kelly to Atlee, 25 November 1966, FO 141/1122.
- 155 Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46), 17, 27 May 1946, CAB 131/1; Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 18 June 1946, CAB 131/3.
- 156 Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 8, 18 March 1946; Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46), 17, 27 May 1946; Cabinet Defence Committee, DO (46) 22, 19 July 1946, CAB 131/1.
- 157 Kelly to Foreign Office, 14 May 1946, FO 371/53421.
- 158 Ronald Campbell to Bevin, 4 June 1946, FO 371/53421.
- 159 Ibid; Minute by Ronald Campbell, 5 June 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 160 Ankara to Foreign Office, 6 May 1946, FO 371/53421; Kelly to Foreign Office, 7 June 1946, FO 371/53421; Ankara to Cairo, 11 June 1946; FO 141/1122. See articles in *Akbar el Yom* and *Musanwar* of 1 June 1946. Both the Egyptian Foreign Ministry and its press reacted strongly to the actions of Seymen who openly supported the British military presence in Egypt. After the strong Egyptian reactions the Turkish government responded to it by replacing Seymen with a new Turkish Minister, Nizameddin Ayaşlı, on 6 November 1946. See British Embassy, Ankara to Attlee, Foreign Office, 6 November 1946, FO 371/53421.
- 161 See the articles by F.R. Atay in *Ulus* of 14 May; Hüseyin C. Yalçın in *Tanin* of 10 May; Sabit in *Tasvir* of 15 May 1946. See also, Kelly to Foreign Office, 15 May 1946, FO 371/53421; Ankara to Foreign Office, 22 May 1946, FO 371/59256.
- 162 Kelly to Foreign Office, 17 July 1946, FO 371/53421; Campbell, Cairo to Butler, Foreign Office, 17 April 1947, FO 141/1194.
- 163 Kelly to Foreign Office, 17 July 1946, FO 371/53421.
- 164 Campbell to Foreign Office, 14 September 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 165 Ibid.
- 166 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, p.34.
- 167 Ibid., pp.34–35.
- 168 British Legation, Beirut to Eden, 19 May 1945, FO 226/292.
- 169 British Legation, Amman to C.W. Baxter, Foreign Office, FO 371/67304.
- 170 Foreign Office to Ankara, 20 December 1946, FO 371/52936.
- 171 Minute by J.G. Ward, Southern Department, 12 December 1945; Paris to Bevin, 10 October 1945, FO 371/48765.

Chapter Four

- 1 John Kent, *Egypt and the Defence of Middle East: Part I, 1945–1949* (London, 1998), p.xlviii.
- 2 Kent, *British Imperial Strategy*, p.133.
- 3 Scott Lucas, *Divided We Stand: Britain, the US and the Suez Crisis* (London, Sydney, Auckland and Toronto, 1991), pp.7–8; Kent, *British Imperial Strategy*, pp.132–34.
- 4 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.488–626; Lucas, *Divided We Stand*, pp.7–8; Kent, *Egypt and the Defence of*, pp. l–lii.

- 5 Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations', *passim*; Leffler, 'Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War', pp. 814–19; Aldrich and Zametica, 'The Rise and Decline', *passim*.
- 6 Kemal H. Karpat, 'Turkish and Arab-Israeli Relations' in *idem* (ed.) *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950–1974* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), pp.112–114; Henry Cattán, *The Palestine Question* (USA: Croom Helm Ltd., 1988), pp.7–8, 28; Michael Cohen, *Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945–1948* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982), p.3.
- 7 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 22 July 1948, FO 371/68374; McMahon to the Sherif of Mecca, 24 October 1915, AIR 1/2413; Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, p.10.
- 8 Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–1999* (London: John Murray Publishers, 2000), pp.72, 77.
- 9 Michael Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution of the Arab-Zionist Conflict* (California: University of California Press, 1987), pp.143–144; Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, p.10; Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den*, pp.78–79.
- 10 Cohen, *The Origins and the Evolution*, pp.143–44; Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, p.10.
- 11 Baghdad to Foreign Office, Translation of memorandum handed to HM Ambassador in Iraq by the Iraqi MFA, 22 May 1948, FO 371/68374; Cohen, *The Palestine Question*, pp.4–5.
- 12 Baghdad to Foreign Office, translation of an Iraqi memorandum, 22 May 1948, FO 371/68374; Baghdad, to Foreign Office, Conversation between Sir H. Mack and M. Mehdi Kubba, 6 March 1948, FO 624/128.
- 13 CP (45) 156, Palestine Committee, Report by the Lord President of the Council, 8 September 1945, CAB 119/148.
- 14 Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, p.28; Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution*, pp.89–92.
- 15 Cohen, *The origins and Evolution*, pp.92–93.
- 16 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, Report by the Lord of President of the Council, CAB 119/148; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 22 May 1948, FO 371/68374; George Kirk, *The Middle East in the War* (Oxford University Press, 1952), p.10.
- 17 Karpat, 'Turkish and Arab-Israeli', p.114; Knatchbull-Hugessen, Ankara to War cabinet, 19 July 1940, FO 371/24548.
- 18 *Ibid.*; Cohen, *Palestine*, p.8.
- 19 Kirk, *The Middle East*, p.13; Cleveland, *A History of*, pp.242–243.
- 20 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, Cabinet Palestine Committee, Report by the Lord President of the Council, CAB 119/148.
- 21 COS (45) 395 (0), Joint Colonial and Foreign Office Memorandum on Palestine, 13 June 1945, CAB 119/148.
- 22 COS (45) 395 (0), Joint Colonial and Foreign Office Memorandum on Palestine, 13 June 1945, CAB 119/148.
- 23 JP (45) 167 (Final), 10 July 1945; copy of minute from Prime Minister to the Colonial Secretary and the COS Committee, 6 July 1945, CAB 84/73.
- 24 Louis, *The British Empire*, pp.386–95.
- 25 Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations', Ch.4.
- 26 JP (45) 167 (Final), 10 July 1945, CAB 84/73.
- 27 *Ibid.*

- 28 Minute from the Prime Minister to the Colonial Secretary and the COS Committee, 6 July 1945, CAB 84/73; Cohen, *Palestine*, pp.16–17.
- 29 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, Report by Cabinet Palestine Committee; Report on Palestine Policy by Foreign Office, CAB 119/148; JP (45) 167 (Final), 10 July 1945, Report by the Joint Planning Staff on Palestine, CAB 84/73.
- 30 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, Report by Cabinet Palestine Committee; Foreign Office to Colonel Oliver Stanley, Colonial Office, 26 July 1945, Report on Palestine Policy by Foreign Office, CAB 119/148; JP (45) 167 (Final), 10 July 1945, Report by the Joint Planning Staff on Palestine, CAB 84/73.
- 31 DO (47) 83, 5 November 1947, Cabinet Defence Committee Palestine, CAB 131/4; Foreign Office Minute, 14 October 1948, FO 371/68382; Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution*, pp.118–19, 124.
- 32 Further information see, Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin, 'British Attitude towards Turkey's Policies in the Middle East, (1945–47)', *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*, no.33, 2000, pp.257–70.
- 33 Girgin, *TC Hükümetleri Programlarında*, p.24.
- 34 Ankara to Foreign Office, 15 March 1946, FO 371/52408; Cairo to Foreign Office, 20 November 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 35 Stonehewer Bird to Foreign Office, 2 May 1946, FO 371/52409; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 20 May 1946, FO 371/52409.
- 36 Ankara to Attlee, 25 November 1946, FO 141/1122.
- 37 Kelly to Foreign Office, Annual Report on Turkey for the year 1947, 15 January 1948, FO 371/72540.
- 38 See Falih Rıfkı Atay's (the editorial of *Ulus*, semi official paper of the ruling RPP) comments on Ankara's desire for Turco-Arab rapprochement, appeared on *Ulus*, 15 May 1947.
- 39 Quoted from Emanuel Gruen, 'Turkey, Israel and the Palestine Question, 1948–1960: A Study in the Diplomacy of Ambivalence', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Colombia University, 1970), pp.25–26.
- 40 Charles to McNeil, Annual Review for Turkey for 1949, FO 371/87933.
- 41 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, CAB 119/148.
- 42 ME (0), 14, 24 April 1947, CAB 134/500; Foreign Office minute by Mr Wright, 30 October 1949, FO 371/75080; Confidential report by Foreign Office on the re-establishment of the British position in the Middle East, 8 March, 1952, FO 371/98251.
- 43 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp. 1005–1006, 1067–68; Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution*, p.120.
- 44 Wm. Roger Louis, 'Britain and the Middle East After 1945' in L. Carl Brown (ed.) *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and Outside Powers* (London & New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2001), p.26.
- 45 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.1000–1005; Cattani, *The Palestine Question*, p.30. One of such acts of terrorism occurred when Jewish terrorists blew up the King David Hotel, one of the British Army Headquarters, killing 91 persons. See Ovendale, 'Britain and the End of', p.137.
- 46 *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, p.1085. During the vote Afghanistan, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Turkey opposed the report of the committee.

- 47 Baghdad to Foreign Office, Translation of memorandum handed to HM Ambassador by the Iraqi MFA, 22 May, 1948, FO 371/68374; *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.1107–1131, 1143.
- 48 Elizabeth Monroe, 'Mr Bevin's Arab Policy' in Albert Hourani (ed.) *St Anthony's Papers*, no.11, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961), p.32.
- 49 Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution*, pp.126–27; *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, p.1291. The majority plan was advocated by the representatives of Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, the Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay. The minority plan was supported by India, Iran and Yugoslavia. While both the USA and USSR played leading roles in obtaining a vote favourable to partition, as the American documents reveal, without the US pressures in the UN discussions 'the necessary two-thirds majority in the General Assembly could not have been obtained'. See *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, p.548.
- 50 See Sadak's statements, *En Son Dakika*, 17 February 1948.
- 51 Gruen rightly indicates that these reports were based on British, Turkish and Arab sources. See, *idem*, 'Turkey, Israel and the Palestine Question', p.40.
- 52 For the reactions of Turkish Press see, *Ayın Tarihi*, no.170, January 1948. A number of British and American documents confirming the Turkish concerns pointed out that the USSR was trying to obtain a footing in Palestine through gaining the Jewish sympathy. See the reports, Kelly to Foreign Office, 22 December 1948; Foreign Office to Ankara, 24 December 1948; Ankara to Foreign Office, 25 December 1948, FO 371/68603; *FRUS*, 1947, Vol.V, pp.1231–33, 1243–44, 1266, 1291.
- 53 See views of these editorials: *Ulus*, 13 January 1948; *Cumhuriyet* 21 March 1948; *Tasvir* 22 and 30 April 1948; *Türkiye*, 20 April 1948; *Vatan* 22 May 1948.
- 54 Kelly to Foreign Office, 15 January 1948, Annual Report on Turkey for the year 1947, FO 371/72540.
- 55 See statements of Arab Leaders appeared on Turkish press: Nuri Said Pasha, *Ayın Tarihi*, no.172, March 1948; Azzam Pasha, *Tasvir*, 25 April 1948; King Abdallah, *Cumhuriyet* 31 May 1948. See also British sources, British Middle East Office, (BMEO) to M.R. Wright, 10 April 1948, FO 371/68382.
- 56 See statement of Shukri al Quwwatli: *Cumhuriyet*, 2 June 1948. See also, Kürkçüoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Arap Ortadoğusuna*, p.23; Abdülahat Akşin, 'Türkler ve Araplar' *Orta Doğu*, no.34, February 1965, pp.2–4.
- 57 Baghdad to Foreign Office 11 June 1947; 1 July 1947, FO 371/67304; Henry Mack, Baghdad to Bevin, 8 June 1948, FO 371/68483.
- 58 Report by Foreign Office Research Department on Palestine question, 14 October 1948, FO 371/68382.
- 59 Foreign Office to Washington, 1 January 1948, FO 371/68402.
- 60 Washington, Lord Inverchapel to Foreign Office, 5 January 1948, FO 371/68402.
- 61 Cattani, *The Palestine Question*, pp.42–43; Louis, *The British Empire in the Middle East*, pp.511–13.
- 62 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, p.961.
- 63 Kelly, Ankara to Foreign Office, 13 March 1948; Mack to Foreign Office, 10 April 1948; Ankara to Foreign Office, 24 April 1948, FO 371/68385. See also Turkish sources, *Istanbul*, 13 February 1948; *En Son Dakika*, 17 February 1948.
- 64 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.979–82, 994–95, 1135.

- 65 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.551, 806, 1001–1002, 1182–83, 1206; Cohen, *The Origins and Evolution*, p.132.
- 66 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1034–36; See the Turkish Press reactions against the American decision. *Ayın Tarihi*, no.174, May 1948, pp. 22–134.
- 67 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, p.579.
- 68 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, p.1030. Later, this view was further confirmed on 25 June when the Turkish MFA expressed his disappointment to Kelly that Washington's actions would further complicate matters in the Middle East. See, Kelly to Foreign Office, 25 June 1948, FO 195/2614.
- 69 See for Sadak's statement, *Ulus*, 24 May 1948.
- 70 Conversation between the British Ambassador and Iraqi PM, 29 December 1948; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 30 December 1948, FO 624/126; Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, pp.54–57. According to Cattán, the number of Arab Armies which consisted of men from Egypt, Syria, Transjordan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia were 20, 000 while the Jewish army totalled 60,000–80,000. Confirming Cattán Lord Tedder from the Air Ministry indicated that the Jews were numerically superior by four to one and they were better armed. See *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1049, 1200; Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den*, pp.84–87.
- 71 Secretary of State to Mr Goodrich, MP, 15 June 1948, FO 371/68666; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 10 December 1948, FO 624/126. In fact, British intelligence sources had already established in their report that though the USA had banned arms exports to the Middle East, the Jews continued to receive American arms in secret. See Palestine to Foreign Office, 2 January 1948, FO 371/68635.
- 72 See the daily Turkish papers: *Tasvir* 14 May 1948; *Son Havadis*, 1 June 1948; *Cumhuriyet* 10 January 1949. See also the British sources: Minutes by the British Embassy, Ankara, 21 June 1948, FO 195/2614.
- 73 *Tasvir* 14 May 1948; *Son Havadis*, 1 June 1948; *Cumhuriyet* 10 January 1949. See other sources: *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, p.1315; Kelly to Bevin, Turkey: Annual review for 1948, 12 January 1949, FO 424/289.
- 74 *Ulus*, 11 June and 1 November 1948.
- 75 British Embassy, Istanbul to British Embassy, Ankara, 30 July 1948, FO 195/2614.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1159–62, 1401; Cattán, *The Palestine Question*, p.81.
- 78 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1403–1406; From UNGA, Paris (UKDEL) to Foreign Office, 28 September 1948, FO 371/68590.
- 79 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1403–1406; From UNGA, Paris (UKDEL) to Foreign Office, 28 September 1948, FO 371/68590.
- 80 From UNGA, Paris, (UKDEL) to Foreign Office, 28 September 1948; Foreign Office to UNGA, (UKDEL), Paris, 29 September 1948, FO 371/68590.
- 81 Foreign Office to UNGA, (UKDEL), Paris, 29 September 1948, FO 371/68590; *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1663–64, 1676–79.
- 82 Gruen, 'Turkey, Israel and the Palestine Question', pp.76–77.
- 83 Foreign Office to UNGA, Paris, (UKDEL), 29 December 1948, FO 371/68590; *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1663–64, 1686–87.
- 84 *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1663–64. The committee of General Assembly analysed the attitudes of the members of the commission as follows: for the

USA, as pro-Israel; Turkey was to be pro-Arab; France was to be neutral in general and slightly pro-Israel in particular.

85 See for Sadak's statement in *Ulus, Cumhuriyet*, 21 December 1948.

86 Foreign Office to Ankara, 24 December 1948, FO 371/68603; General John T. Crocker, GHQ MELF to the Viscount of Montgomery of Alamein, CIGS, 24 June 1948, WO 216/686.

87 Foreign Office to Ankara, 24 December 1948, FO 371/68603; General John T. Crocker, GHQ MELF, to the Viscount of Montgomery of Alamein, CIGS, 24 June 1948, WO 216/686. Bevin had already explained the same views to the US Chargé d'Affaires four days earlier on 20 December 1948. See *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1680–1685.

88 Foreign Office Memorandum handed by Sir David Kelly to the Turkish Secretary-General, 25 December 1948, FO 195/2614; Ankara to Foreign Office, 25 December 1948, FO 371/68603; Foreign Office minute, Brief for S of S, 12 February 1949, FO 371/78668. The memorandum also emphasised that any recommendation for a settlement which favoured one side, and especially if it favoured the Jewish side, would prolong the state of chaos and suspense in the Middle East. The Foreign Office particularly stressed that if Turkey could reconcile the differences between Egypt and Transjordan, this would be 'of the utmost value'.

89 Ankara to Foreign Office, 25 December 1948, FO 371/68603.

90 Ibid. Syrian and Lebanese accusations of Turkey for selling cereal goods to Jews see, *Yeni Sabah*, 11 May 1948, *Vatan*, 13 May 1948.

91 Minute by the Foreign Office: Brief for S of S's discussion with Turkish Foreign Minister, 12 February 1949, FO 371/78668. Though the Palestine CC initially produced some good work, it was however unable to achieve the settlement of the vital issue of Palestine Refugees because of the Israeli obstructions, and hence it lost its importance. See Akşin, *Türkiye'nin 1945 den*, p.87; Cattan, *The Palestine Question*, pp.82–84.

92 Bevin to Kelly, 11 January 1949, FO 424/289.

93 Ibid.; *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.V, part 2, pp.1428–1429, 1669, 1680–1683.

94 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 31 January 1949, FO 371/78668.

95 Kelly to Foreign Office, 15 January 1948, FO 371/72540.

96 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.19–24. According to the British COS report of March 1949, the Allies defence plans for Turkey were: while they, in the short run, still did not plan to deploy forces to Turkey, in the long run they planned to defend only the southern parts of Turkey up to the Taurus mountains. See, JP (49) 29 (final), 30 March 1949, Report by JPS on the strategic requirements in the Middle East, Annex, DEFE 4/20.

97 Minute by the European Recovery Department of the Foreign Office, 25 February 1948, FO 371/72541.

98 Ibid.

99 From Smith Somerville, Treasury to G.A. Wallinger, 28 February 1948, FO 371/72541.

100 British Embassy Moscow to FO, 6 February 1948; British Embassy Moscow to FO, 26 February 1948, FO 371/72544; Kelly to Bevin, 12 January 1949, FO 424/289; Kelly to Wallinger, (Southern Dept), FO, 12 March 1948, FO 371/72544.

- 101 Ibid.
- 102 Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 February 1948, FO 371/72537.
- 103 Kelly to Bateman, 9 November 1948, FO 371/72544; Minute by Western Department, 24 November 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 104 Croft, *The End of*, pp.112, 114–116.
- 105 Kelly to Foreign Office, 26 January 1948, FO 371/72543.
- 106 Foreign Office to Ankara, 15 September 1948, FO 371/72541.
- 107 British Embassy, Washington to Southern Department, 7 July 1948, FO 371/72541.
- 108 Minute by R.A. Sykes, 23 March 1948; Wallinger to Lieutenant-Colonel Haddan, Ministry of Defence, 30 March 1948, FO 371/72544.
- 109 Croft, *The End of*, p.116; Harris, *Troubled Alliance*, p.35; *FRUS*, 1948, Vol.III, p.197.
- 110 Foreign Office to Ankara, Extract from *Manchester Guardian* of 19 February 1949, 21 February 1949, FO 371/78668; Athanassopoulou, *Turkey-Anglo-American*, pp.67–69; Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp. 43–44.
- 111 Athanassopoulou, *Turkey-Anglo-American*, p.112.
- 112 Minute by Western Department, 24 November 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 113 Kelly to Foreign Office, 24 November 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 114 Kelly to Foreign Office, 28 December 1948, FO 371/72535; Foreign Office minute by E.H. Peck, 10 January 1949, FO 371/78668.
- 115 Memorandum of Conversation between the Turkish MFA and the USA S of S, 12 April 1949, FO 371/78670.
- 116 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 23 October 1948; Foreign Office to Ankara, 26 October 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 117 Ibid.; Minute by Mr. Wallinger and C.T. Crowe, European Recovery Dept., Foreign Office, 25 February 1948; Foreign Office to Ankara, 26 October 1948, FO 371/72541; Harris, *Troubled Alliance*, pp.32–33.
- 118 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 24 October 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 119 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 24 October 1948, FO 371/72535; Foreign Office to Ankara, 26 October 1948; From C.P. Mayhew to Mr. Bateman, Foreign Office, 17 November 1948, FO 371/72535.
- 120 Minute by Chargé d’Affaires, British Embassy, Baghdad, 21 January 1948, FO 624/128; Peter L Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945–1956: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War* (The Univ of North Carolina Press, 1991), p.59; Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.33–34.
- 121 Prince Regent to Bevin, 22 January 1948, FO 624/128; BMEO to Bernard Burrows, 17 February 1948, FO 371/68385; conversation between Sir H. Mack and S. Mustafa al Umari, Baghdad, 12 February 1948; conversation between Sir H. Mack and M. Mahdi Kubba, Baghdad, 6 March 1948, FO 624/128.
- 122 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.36. After the treaty Transjordan was renamed Jordan.
- 123 Foreign Office minute by Mr Burrows, Eastern Dept., 17 March 1948, FO 371/68385.
- 124 Kelly to Foreign Office, 26 January 1948, FO 371/72534.
- 125 Foreign Office minute by Mr Burrows, 17 March 1948; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 24 April 1948, FO 371/68385.
- 126 Ibid.

- 127 See the Syrian President's statements printed in *Cumhuriyet*, 31 May 1948. See also, Kelly to Eastern Dept., FO 371/68431.
- 128 Note for S of S by F.K. Roberts, 27 October 1948, FO 800/507; Foreign Office to Ankara, 29 October 1948, FO 371/72535; Chadwick to Mayhew, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, 17 November 1948, FO 371/68431. The Arab leaders further told Sadak that after the establishment of the state of Israel, the Arabs 'were looking back regretfully to the past when they lived under the protection of the Ottoman Empire'. See Charles to Wright, 16 January 1950 FO 195/2636.
- 129 Ibid.
- 130 Note for S of S by F.K. Roberts, 27 October 1948, FO 800/507; Kelly to Foreign Office, 9 October 1948, FO 371/78668.
- 131 Chadwick to Mayhew, 17 November 1948; Foreign Office to Kelly, 20 December 1948, FO 371/68431.
- 132 Lord Inverchapel to Foreign Office, 5 January 1948, FO 371/68402; British Embassy, Jedda to Eastern Dept., 4 April 1948, FO 371/68382; Washington to Foreign Office, 1 October 1948, FO 371/68590. The fervent US pro-Zionist stance was not only criticised by HMG but was also criticised by some American Middle Eastern representatives. The latter, towards the end of May 1948, began to openly condemn Washington's Zionist policy, which ignored American oil and economic interests in the Arab world, by emphasising that it was a result of the 'selfish purposes of Mr Truman's electoral campaign'. See the British report, Beirut to Foreign Office, 28 May 1948, FO 371/68374.
- 133 *FRUS*, 1949, Vol.VI, *The Near East, South Asia, and Africa*, pp.36, 674; Monroe, 'Mr. Bevin's Arab Policy', pp.22–23, 27, 45–46; General Crocker to the CIGS, 24 June 1948, WO 216/686.
- 134 Monroe, 'Mr. Bevin's Arab Policy', pp.22–23, 27, 45–46; Albert Hourani 'The Decline of the West in the Middle East-II', *International Affairs*, Vol.29, no.2, April 1953, pp.166–67.
- 135 Minute by Mr Beith, 22 March 1949, FO 371/75054.
- 136 Ibid. Britain, in the face of the strong American-Israeli combination was eventually forced to relinquish its insistence that Negev should be in the Arab hands which would connect Egypt with Transjordan.
- 137 *FRUS*, 1949, Vol.VI, pp. 658–661, 672–676, 711.
- 138 Minute by Furlonge, 20 April 1950, FO 371/82182; Ritchie Owendale, 'Britain and the End of the Palestine Mandate, 1945–1948' in *Intelligence Defence and Diplomacy: British Policy in the Post-war World*, (ed.) by Aldrich and Hopkins (London: Frank Cass, 1994), pp.144–145. This was a great shock to the Arab leaders; they even declared that 'the Arabs would prefer to become a Russian Republic rather than Judaized by the Anglo-Saxon countries'. See Charles to Foreign Office, 24 April 1950, FO 195/2636.
- 139 Report for the Ministry of Defence, and Foreign Office by the Joint Planning Staff, JPS, 30 March 1949, DEFE 4/20.
- 140 Report for the Ministry of Defence, and Foreign Office by the Joint Planning Staff, JPS, 30 March 1949, DEFE 4/20.
- 141 See Ertem Harzem, *Son Posta*, 19 October 1948; A.K. Kiliç, *Vatan*, 9 January 1949; Kelly to Foreign Office, 15 January 1948, FO 371/72540.
- 142 Kelly to Foreign Office, 11 November 1948, FO 371/68431.

- 143 See the Turkish sources: *Vatan*, 25 January 1949; *Yeni Sabah*, 26 January 1949; *Ulus*, 30 March 1949; *Ayin Tarihi*, no.184, March 1949. See also, *FRUS*, 1949, Vol.VI, p.702.
- 144 See the article by Ahmet Şükrü Esmer, an editorial of *Ulus*, 2 April 1948. See also *FRUS*, 1949, Vol.VI, p.702; *Vatan*, 25 January 1949; *Yeni Sabah*, 26 January 1949.
- 145 *Ayin Tarihi*, no 183, February 1949, p.176. See also *Ulus*, 9 February 1949.
- 146 Kürkcüoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Arab Ortadoğusuna*, p.32; See also, *Ayin Tarihi*, no.184, March 1949.
- 147 See the criticism made by a member of the Egyptian Parliament which appeared on *Cumhuriyet*, 18 May 1949.
- 148 Statement by Ibrahim Bey el Ahdab, *Ulus*, 30 March 1949.
- 149 Sir R Stevenson to Attlee, 14 September 1950, FO 424/290.
- 150 *Cumhuriyet*, 18 May 1949.
- 151 Longrigg, *Iraq 1900 to 1950*, p.358; Beirut to Foreign Office, 23 April 1949, FO 371/75058.
- 152 Seale, *The Struggle for Syria*, p.44; Ismail Soysal 'Turkish-Syrian Relations (1946–1999)', *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, (Istanbul: Isis Ltd., 1998/1999) Annual-10, p.102.
- 153 British Embassy, Cairo to M.R. Wright, Foreign Office, FO 371/75548; *Yeni Sabah*, *Cumhuriyet*, 6 April 1949. Following Zaim's friendly approaches to Turkey the Turkish press began to make positive comments about Zaim. See, *Vatan*, *Cumhuriyet*, 2 July 1949.
- 154 *Hürriyet*, 18 August 1949; *Tasvir*, 23 August 1949; *Cumhuriyet*, 25 August 1949. See also British sources: Bevin to Mr Man, Damascus, 16 August 1949; BBC Monitoring, 19 August 1949, FO 371/75548.
- 155 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 1 April 1949, FO 371/75550; Foreign Office minute by L.G. Thirkell, Eastern Dept., 30 April 1949, FO 371/75058; Mack to Foreign Office, 14 May 1949, FO 371/75550.
- 156 Minute by Thirkell, Eastern Dept., 30 April 1949, FO 371/75058; Seale, *The Struggle for Syria*, pp.56–57.
- 157 Record of Conversation between the Turkish Ambassador and the British Ambassador in Paris, 14 November 1949, FO 371/75059.
- 158 Beirut to Foreign Office, 23 April 1949, FO 371/75058.
- 159 Haifa to Foreign Office, 15 August 1949; Man, Damascus to Foreign Office, 22 August 1949, FO 371/75543. In fact, as the British documents suggest, there was some foreign involvement in these coups for instance, French, American, some Arab countries and, to some extent, British involvement. See Baghdad to Foreign Office, 31 October 1949; Campbell, Cairo to Foreign Office, 26 October 1949, FO 371/75555; Damascus to Foreign Office, 10 June 1949, FO 371/75550.
- 160 *Tasvir*, 16 August 1949; *Vatan*, 17 August 1949; Foreign Office minute by Thirkell, 16 September 1949, FO 371/75548.
- 161 Kelly, Moscow to Foreign Office, 22 April 1950, FO 371/87989.
- 162 Ibid.; *The New York Times*, 22 April 1950; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.III, p.80.
- 163 Charles to Younger, 3 May 1950, FO 195/2636; Washington to Southern Dept., 21 July 1950, FO 371/87989; Foreign Office minute by Mr Bateman, 9 May 1950, FO 371/87948.

- 164 Foreign Office minute by Mr. Bateman, 9 May 1950, FO 371/87948; Younger to Charles, 3 May 1950, FO 424/290.
- 165 Conversation between the S of S and the Turkish MFA in Paris on 5 April 1950, FO 371/81917; Younger to Charles, 3 May 1950, FO 424/290; Minute by Bateman, 9 May 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 166 Ministry of Defence to Foreign Office, 11 May 1950, FO 371/87975; Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.46.
- 167 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.46.
- 168 Longrigg *Iraq, 1900 to 1950*, p.358; Stevenson, Alexandria to Attlee, 14 September 1950, FO 424/290.
- 169 John Kent, John Young, 'The 'Western Union' concept and British defence policy, 1947–8' in Aldrich and Hopkins (eds.) *British Intelligence*, pp.168–169, 172–173; Stuart Croft, *The End of Superpower: British Foreign Office Conceptions of a Changing World, 1945–51* (England, USA: Dartmouth Publishing Company Ltd., 1993), *passim*.

Chapter Five

- 1 Luc as, *Divided We Stand*, pp.9–10; Louis, *The British Empire*, pp.583–590.
- 2 Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations', Ch.5.
- 3 Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, pp.89–94; Melvyn P. Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917–1953* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), *passim*.
- 4 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.275–278, 305.
- 5 *FRUS* 1950, Vol.V, pp.188–192; *FRUS* 1950, Vol.I, pp.367–369.
- 6 *FRUS* 1951, Vol.III, pp.466–473; Leffler, 'Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War', pp.819–823; *idem*, *The Specter of Communism*, pp.114–15.
- 7 Feroz Ahmad, *The Turkish Experiment in Democracy 1950–1975* (London: C Hurst & Company, 1977), pp.40–42; Cem Çakmak '1950' li Seçimler ve Demokrat Parti' *Tarih ve Toplum* (Istanbul: İletişim Yay., Mayıs 1988) Vol.9, no 53, pp.24, 29; Cem Eroğlu, *Demokrat Parti: Tarihi ve İdeolojisi* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990), p.13. The Democrat leaders heavily criticised the policies of the Republican Party as failing to move Turkey forward during its long years in power. See *Ayın Tarihi*, no.201, August 1950; Ankara to Foreign Office, 9 June 1950, Political Summary, no.8, FO 371/87935.
- 8 Ahmad, *The Turkish Experiment*, p.19; Richard Tapper, 'Introduction' in *idem* (ed.), *Islam in Modern Turkey* (London: IB Tauris, 1991), p.9.
- 9 See Celal Bayar's speech, *Cumhuriyet*, 1 May 1950; Feridun Cemal Erkin, *Dış İşlerinde 34 Yıl*, Vol.2 (Ankara: TTK, 1987), pp.148–53.
- 10 See article by Mümtaz Faik Fenik, *Zafer*, reprinted in *Ayın Tarihi*, no. 201, August 1950, p.71.
- 11 Hüseyin Bağcı, *Demokrat Parti Dönemi Dış Politikası* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990), pp.44–45.
- 12 See Köprülü's statements, *Cumhuriyet*, 28 May 1950.
- 13 *Ibid*. See also, Eyres, Ankara to Younger, Foreign Office, a statement by the Turkish Foreign Minister, 7 June 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 14 Foreign Office minute by the Southern Dept., 22 June 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 15 See Köprülü's statements printed in *Ayın Tarihi*, August 1950, no.201, pp.24–27.

- 16 For the text of Democrat Party's programme presented to the TGNA on 29 May 1950, see, Girgin, *TC Hükümetleri Programlarında*, pp.26–27. See also, Eyres to Younger, 7 June 1950, FO 371/78942.
- 17 For the statement see, Öztürk *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, pp.438–445.
- 18 See the Turkish Prime Minister's interview with a *Daily Mail* correspondent, in Charles to Foreign Office, 9 June 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 19 For Bayar's speech at GNA on 1 November 1950 see, Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, pp.438–45. Moreover the British Ambassador in Ankara reported that the Republican government, even in their last moments, in 1950, had continued to rely on Britain as Turkey's major ally rather than relying on the Americans. See Charles to McNeil, 4 January 1950, FO 424/290.
- 20 Charles to Younger, 26 May 1950, FO 424/290.
- 21 British Embassy, Washington to the Southern Dept., 2 June 1950, FO 371/87940.
- 22 Charles to Bevin, 26 May 1950, FO 371/87940.
- 23 Record of meeting in Sir W. Strang's room, the Foreign Office, 1 June 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 24 British Embassy, Washington to Southern Dept., 16 June 1950, FO 371/87940.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 For these charges see the Article by Mümtaz Faik Fenik in *Zafer*, (semi official paper of the Democrat government), reprinted in *Ayn Tarihi*, no. 201, August 1950, pp.71–73. See also, Charles to McNeil, 4 January 1950, FO 424/290.
- 27 In fact, the Democrats accused İnönü of having failed to take part in the Second World War. See, Aydemir, *İkinci Adam*, Vol.II, p.135; John M. Vander Lippe, 'Forgotten Brigade of the Forgotten War: Turkey's Participation in the Korean War' *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.36, no.1, Jan. 2000, p.94.
- 28 See Celal Bayar's interviews with Mehmet Saray: Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.95–97. See also, Foreign Office to Ankara, 9 June 1950, FO 195/2636; Foreign Office minute by Sir William Strang, 1 June 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 29 Foreign Office to Ankara, 9 June 1950, FO 195/2636; Foreign Office minute by Sir William Strang, 1 June 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 30 See Bayar's interviews with Mehmet Saray: Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.95–97. See also the British source, Charles to Foreign Office, 26 May 1950, FO 195/2636.
- 31 *Cumhuriyet*, 8 June 1950; Foreign Office minute by Strang, 31 May 1950, FO 371/ 87942. See also Menderes's interview with the *Daily Mail* correspondent quoted in the following despatch: Charles to Foreign Office, 9 June 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 32 See Bayar's interviews with Saray: Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.95–97.
- 33 Foreign Office to Charles, 12 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 34 In fact, Turkey was second only to the US in supporting the UN resolution. The Democrat government began to publicly defend this decision by indicating that this was Turkey's commitment to the UN. See TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, 1950–54, Dönem 9, 11.12.1950, p.138.
- 35 A private appeal had been launched for volunteers to South Korea and there was a great response from the Turkish people for the appeal. See memoirs of the Commander of Turkish Army in Korea, Tahsin Yazıcı, *Kore Birinci Türk*,

- pp.28–41, 59–60. See also, Ankara to Foreign Office, 6 July 1950, Political Summary, no.10, FO 371/87935.
- 36 Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, pp.200–201. See also, Minute by British Embassy, 3 August 1950, FO 195/2635; Harris, *Troubled Alliance*, p.40; Bernard Lewis, 'Democracy in Turkey' *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol.X, no.1, 1959, p.5.
- 37 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 30 July 1950, FO 371/87948; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.1312, 1316.
- 38 Ankara to Foreign Office, 17 August 1950, Political Summary no.13, FO 371/87935; Charles to Foreign Office, 4 September 1950, FO 195/2637; Charles to Foreign Office, 7 December 1950, FO 371/87942. See also Bayar's interviews with Saray. Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.95–97.
- 39 Ankara to Foreign Office, 31 August 1950, political summary no.14, FO 371/87935.
- 40 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.1281–1285.
- 41 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 30 July 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 42 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.1285–1289.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 30 July 1950, FO 371/87948; Ankara to Foreign Office, 17 August 1950, Political Summary no.13, FO 371/87935.
- 45 Ankara to Foreign Office, 17 August 1950, Political Summary no.13, FO 371/87935.
- 46 Foreign Office to Strasbourg, 2 August 1950; New York to Foreign Office, 17 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 47 Foreign Office minutes by Rumbold and Shuckburgh, 3 August 1950, FO 371/87949.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ibid.; Foreign Office to Charles, 11 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 50 Foreign Office minute by M. Wright, 4 August 1950, FO 371/87949. Sir Pier-son Dixon was the private Secretary of Ernest Bevin while Strang and Wright held the post of Permanent Under-Secretary and Assistant Under-Secretary for Middle Eastern Affairs respectively.
- 51 Foreign Office to Charles, 11 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 52 Ibid.
- 53 However, the first attempt to commit troops outside Turkey was made by President İnönü during the last phase of the Second World War. For details see, Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations', Chapter Two. In fact, this point was explored for the first time by the present author of this book.
- 54 Foreign Office to Charles, 19 September 1950, FO 195/2637; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.III, pp. 1217–1218, 128–1285.
- 55 New York to Foreign Office, 17 September 1950, FO 195/2637; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.III, pp.1284–1285.
- 56 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.1316, 1320–21; Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, pp.176–177.
- 57 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.1316, 1320–21; Foreign Office to Charles, 21 September 1950, FO 195/2637; Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, pp.177–78.
- 58 Foreign Office to Charles, 21 September 1950; Charles to Foreign Office, 26 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 59 Charles to Foreign Office, 26 September 1950, FO 195/2637.
- 60 Foreign Office to Charles, 21 September 1950, FO 195/2637.

- 61 Charles to Foreign Office, 28 September 1950, FO 371/87935.
- 62 Washington to Foreign Office, 3 October 1950, FO 371/87951.
- 63 See for the accounts of these papers reprinted in *Ayn Tarihi*, no.202, September 1950. See also, British Embassy, Istanbul to Clement Attlee, 22 September 1950, FO 371/87951; Charles to Foreign Office, 28 September 1950, FO 371/87935.
- 64 See his articles in *Kuvvet* on 22 January 1947 and 20 June 1947 cited from, Bülent Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.38; Mahmut Dikerdem, *Ortadoğuda Devrim Yılları* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1977), p.15; See also Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 for general Turco-Arab relations throughout 1947.
- 65 Dikerdem, *Ortadoğuda*, p.15.
- 66 JIC (ME) (50) 6 (Final), 30 June 1950, the report despatched by BMEO, Cairo to Millard, Ankara, 2 September 1950, FO 195/2652.
- 67 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, The Near East, South Asia and Africa, pp.1296–1299.
- 68 Charles to Younger, 26 May 1950, FO 424/290; Record of S of S's Conversation with the Turkish MFA at Strasbourg on 5 August 1950, FO 371/87942; Stevenson to Attlee, 14 September 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 69 For the outlines of Democrat government's foreign policy for the years 1950–51, see Girgin, *TC Hükümetleri Programlarında*, p.27. See also, Foreign Office report on Turkey's foreign policy, 3 June 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 70 Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, pp.438–45; Girgin, *TC Hükümetleri Programlarında*, p.27; British Legation, Damascus, to Bevin, 10 October, 1950, FO 371/87951.
- 71 Ankara to Foreign Office, 14 November 1950, Political Summary no.19, FO 371/87935.
- 72 Charles to Bevin, 15 August 1950, FO 424/290; Baghdad to K.G. Younger MP, 15 July 1950, FO 371/82411.
- 73 Baghdad to Younger, 15 July 1950; Bagdad to Furlonge, Eastern Dept., 18 July 1950, FO 371/82411.
- 74 Record of S of S's Conversation with the Turkish MFA at Strasbourg on 5 August 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 75 Summary of World Broadcasts by BBC cited by the Foreign Office, 1 August 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 *Ayn Tarihi*, no 203, October 1950, p.68; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, p.1325.
- 78 Charles to Foreign Office, 12 October 1950, Political Summary no.17, FO 371/87935.
- 79 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.II, The United Nations, The Western Hemisphere, pp.127–28.
- 80 Charles to Foreign Office, 12 October 1950, Political Summary no.17, FO 371/87935.
- 81 Stevenson to Attlee, 14 September 1950, Montagu-Pollock to Bevin, 10 October 1950, FO 424/290.
- 82 Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanları'nın*, pp.442–43; British Embassy, Ankara to Bevin, 6 November 1950, FO 371/87942.
- 83 For Bayar's statements see, Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanları'nın*, pp.442–43
- 84 Charles to Foreign Office, 14 November 1950, Political Summary no.19, FO 371/87935.
- 85 F.M. Shepherd, Tehran to Furlonge, 3 July 1950, FO 195/2636.

- 86 The merits and evolution of the 'Triangular Strategy' will be examined in detail in Chapter Six.
- 87 Summary of BBC World Broadcasts collected by the Foreign Office, 1 August 1950, FO 371/87948.
- 88 British Legation, Damascus to Bevin, 10 October 1950, FO 371/87951.
- 89 Foreign Office minute by N.J.A. Cheetham, 1 March 1951, FO 371/95284.
- 90 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.47.
- 91 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, The Near East, South Asia and Africa, pp.1337–1338.
- 92 British Embassy, Ankara to Andrew Noble, Foreign Office, 4 November 1950, FO 195/2638.
- 93 See Köprülü's statement to the GNA on 24 February 1951 quoted by *Zafer*, 25 February 1951. See also the British sources: Ankara to Sir A. Noble, Foreign Office, 7 December 1950; Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 8 January 1951; Foreign Office to Brigadier R.W. Ewbank, Ministry of Defence, 11 January 1951, FO 371/95283.
- 94 Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 8 and 17 January 1951, FO 371/95283.
- 95 *Ibid.*; GHQ-MELF to War Office, 15 January 1951, contained in FO 371/95283.
- 96 Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 8 and 17 January 1951, FO 371/95283; GHQ-MELF to War Office, 15 January 1951, FO 371/95283.
- 97 War Office to GHQ MELF, 8 January 1951, FO 371/95283; JP (51) 22 (Final), Brief for General Robertson on his visit to Turkey, Annex, 9 February 1951, contained in the Foreign Office file, FO 371/95284. See also Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, p.107.
- 98 Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, p.110.
- 99 Charles to Foreign Office, 26 February 1951, FO 371/95284. See also Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.107–113
- 100 Record of discussion held in Turkish General Staff Headquarters in Ankara on 23 and 24 February 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 101 Ankara to Foreign Office, 26 February 1951; Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 27 February 1951, FO 371/95284.
- 102 *Ibid.*
- 103 Ankara to Foreign Office, 8 March 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 104 From C-in-C GHQ-MELF to Sir Nevil Brownjohn, VCIGS, War Office, 20 April 1951, WO 216/733.
- 105 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.I, National Security Affairs-Foreign Economic Policy, pp.76–82.
- 106 Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 12 March 1951, Charles to Robertson, 13 March 1951; From C-in-C Mediterranean to Ministry of Defence, London, 13 March 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 107 Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 12 March 1951; From C-in-C Mediterranean to Ministry of Defence, London, 13 March 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 108 Foreign Office minute by Talbot de Malahide, 12 March 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 109 JP (51) 88, 10 May 1951, DEFE 4/42.
- 110 *Ibid.*
- 111 *Ibid.*

- 112 For Köprülü's statement see, *Aynı Tarihi*, no.209, April 1951. See also, Foreign Office minute by Sir Pierson Dixon, 26 April 1951, FO 371/96540.
- 113 Foreign Office to Ankara, 21 February 1951, FO 371/95284; minute by Ernest Davies, 28 February 1951; Foreign Office minute by William Strang, 28 March 1951, FO 371/95285.
- 114 Ibid.
- 115 For the Turkish reactions see, *Aynı Tarihi*, no.209, April 1951. See also, Charles to Foreign Office, 17 April 1951, FO 371/96542.
- 116 For the Turkish accusations see *Zafer*, 15 June 1951. See also Charles to Herbert Morrison, 1 May 1951, FO 371/96540.
- 117 Ankara to Foreign Office, 24 May 1951, FO 371/95286.
- 118 Charles to Herbert Morrison, 1 May 1951, FO 371/96540.
- 119 Sir Oliver Franks, Washington to Foreign Office, 21 April 1951; Foreign Office Memoranda, 15 May 1951, FO 371/96540; Memorandum on Turkey, Greece and NATO, by Foreign Office, 4 May 1951, PREM 8/1379.
- 120 Franks to Foreign Office, 16 May 1951, FO 371/96540.
- 121 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.1148–1151. In the draft of their statement, the NSC Staff stated that 'Turkey is the strongest anti-Communist country on the periphery of the USSR and the only one in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East area capable of offering substantial resistance to Soviet aggression. It can and does contribute to the security interests of the USA, and therefore it continues to be in the interest of the USA that Turkey remains an ally of the free world in the struggle against international communism.' See the same reference. See also Leffler, 'Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War', pp. 821–23.
- 122 Foreign Office Brief by Sir Pierson Dixon for the Minister of State, 19 May 1951, FO 371/96542.
- 123 Sir Oliver Franks to Foreign Office, 16 May 1951, FO 371/96540.
- 124 CP (51) 132, 17 May 1951, CAB 129/45; CP (51) 130 and CP (51) 132, 17 May 1951, enclosed in the Foreign Office Brief, 19 May 1951, FO 371/96542.
- 125 CP (51) 130 and CP (51) 132, 17 May 1951, enclosed in the Foreign Office Brief, 19 May 1951, FO 371/96542; Memorandum on Turkey, Greece and NATO, by the Foreign Office, 4 May 1951, PREM 8/1379.
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Foreign Office Brief by Sir Pierson Dixon, 19 May 1951, FO371/96542; Foreign Office minute by W.J. Sloss, 30 May 1951, FO 371/96478.
- 128 Ibid.
- 129 Ibid.; Sir O. Franks, Washington to Foreign Office, 26 May 1951, FO 371/96478; COS (51) 193, 25 June 1951, DEFE 4/44.
- 130 Washington to Foreign Office, 26 May 1951, FO 371/96478.
- 131 Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, pp.326–28; Statement by Köprülü to the GNA 20 July 1951 quoted by *Zafer*, 21 July 1951. See also *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.III, pp.554–58.
- 132 Statement by Köprülü to the GNA 20 July 1951 quoted by *Zafer*, 21 July 1951.
- 133 Brief for S of S for his talks with Mr. Acheson, by Dawbarn, 3 September 1951, FO 371/96495; *FRUS* 1951, Vol.III, 559–64.
- 134 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.III, pp.558–62.
- 135 Foreign Office to Ankara, 29 August 1951, FO 371/96550.
- 136 Foreign Office minute by Sir Pierson Dixon, 29 August 1951, FO 371/96550.

- 137 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 13 September 1951, FO 371/96550; Morrison to Charles, 5 September 1951, FO 371/96550; Dawbarn to Southern Dept., 3 September 1951, FO 371/96550.
- 138 CP (51) 95, 30 March 1951, CAB 129/45.
- 139 CM (51) 24, 5 April 1951, CAB 128/19.
- 140 Louis, *The British Empire*, pp.722–23; *Middle Eastern Affairs*, January 1951, Vol.II, no.1, Benjamin Shwadran (ed.), (New York: Council for Middle Eastern Affairs, 1951), [Hereafter quoted as *Middle Eastern Affairs*], pp.196, 257–58.
- 141 CP (51) 214, 27 July 1951, CAB 129/46.
- 142 Brief for S of S for his talks with Mr. Acheson, by S.Y. Dawbarn, 3 September 1951, FO 371/96495.
- 143 *Survey of International Affairs 1951*, Peter Calvocoressi (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), [Hereafter quoted as *Survey of International Affairs*], pp.278–79.
- 144 FRUS, 1951, Vol.V, pp. 372–376.
- 145 Ibid., pp.372–376.
- 146 FRUS, 1951, Vol.V, pp.376–78.
- 147 FRUS, 1951, Vol.V, pp.1231–34.
- 148 Ibid., pp.1291–93; Washington Talks, 10–14 September 1951, PREM 8/1431.
- 149 FRUS, 1951, Vol.III, pp.641–42, 670–71.
- 150 Ottawa, UKDEL to Foreign Office, 18 September 1951, FO 371/96551.
- 151 Ibid.
- 152 Ottawa, UKDEL to Foreign Office, 18 September 1951, FO 371/96551.
- 153 Ibid.
- 154 Ottawa to Foreign Office, 20 September 1951, FO 371/96551. After Ankara's acceptance of membership the NATO, Moscow in its note to Ankara on 3 November 1951 warned the latter that the USSR could not remain indifferent towards Turkey's entry into the 'aggressive Atlantic bloc and permitting Turkish territory to be used for setting up foreign military bases at the frontier of the Soviet Union.' Turkey in its response on 12 November 1951 stated that the spirit of the Atlantic Pact was based on the UN Charter and hence it did not have aggressive aims. Turkey joined the pact not for aggressive purposes but to secure its national security in case of foreign threat. See *Documents on International Affairs*, 1951, Denise Folliot (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), pp. 68–69.
- 155 Foreign Office to UKDEL, Ottawa, 19 September 1951, FO 371/96551.
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Bilgin, 'Anglo-Turkish Relations', Ch.5; Devereux, *The Formulation of, passim*.
- 158 Quoted in Robert J. Donovan, *Tumultuous Years: The Presidency of Harry S Truman 1949–1953* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company 1982), p.241; Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, p.93.
- 159 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, pp.93–94.
- 160 Donovan, *Tumultuous Years*, pp.158–161; Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, p.99.
- 161 Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, p.99.
- 162 FRUS, 1950, Vol.V, pp.275–78, 305.
- 163 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.57–61.
- 164 For the Turkish Foreign Ministry resume see, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.72.

- 165 Ottawa to Foreign Office, 20 September 1951, FO 371/96551.
- 166 Foreign Office to Ankara, 4 October 1951, FO 371/96493. See also, Egypt and Middle East Command, 4 October 1951, CAB 130/71.
- 167 Quoted from Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.75.
- 168 Foreign Office to Washington, 4 October 1951; Foreign Office to British Embassy, Paris, 4 October 1951, FO 371/96493.
- 169 Foreign Office to Paris, 6 October 1951, FO 371/96494.
- 170 E.M. Rose to Lt. Colonel C.H.P. Harrington, 24 October 1951, WO 216/795.
- 171 British Embassy, Paris to Foreign Office, 9 October 1951, FO 371/96495.
- 172 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.59–60.
- 173 *Survey of International Affairs*, 1951, p.279; *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, p.202–3, 391.
- 174 Report by Foreign Relations Committee of Turkish Grand National Assembly, quoted from, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation' pp. 78–79.
- 175 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, p.1391; J.A. Hail, *Britain's Foreign Policy in Egypt and Sudan 1947–1956*, (Lebanon: Ithaca Press, 1996), pp.72–73; *Survey of International Affairs*, 1951, pp.281–82.
- 176 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.206, 398–401.
- 177 *Ayn Tarihi*, no. 215, October 1951; *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V p.226.
- 178 See, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.215, October 1951. See also, *Documents on International Affairs*, 1951, pp.425–27; *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.209–11; *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 1951, Vol.II, no.1, pp.367–69, 373, 412.
- 179 Paul L Hanna 'The Anglo-Egyptian Negotiations, 1950–1952', *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol.III, no.1, January 1952, pp.226–28.
- 180 Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.91.
- 181 Ankara to Foreign Office, 13 October 1951, FO 371/96494.
- 182 Ibid. During the meeting, Charles reported once again to the Foreign Office on the negative attitude taken by the American Ambassador and the members of the American Military Mission in Ankara by accusing them of sabotaging the British attempts to involve Turkey in the defence of the Middle East. See the following documents: Ankara to Foreign Office, 14 October 1951, FO 371/96494; Charles to Foreign Office, 14 October 1951, FO 371/96495. See also *Ayn Tarihi*, no.215, October 1951.
- 183 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.226–27.
- 184 COS (51)172, 29 October 1951, DEFE 4/48.
- 185 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.227–28, 234–35.
- 186 *FRUS*, 1951, Vol V, pp.238–39, 243–45.
- 187 See Köprülü's statement, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.216, November 1951, pp.35–37. See also *FRUS*, 1951, Vol.V, pp.243–45. The basic sections of the declaration were: first, the task of the MEC at the outset will be primarily one of planning and providing the Middle East states on their request with assistance in the form of advice and training; second, the Supreme Allied Commander Middle East will command forces at his disposal and will develop plans for the operations of all forces in time of war or in case of emergency but in time of peace no forces would be placed under the SACME; third, all states joining in this enterprise will be individually associated with the Command on the basis of equality through a Middle East Defence Liaison Organisation; last, the Sponsoring states planned to evolve the MEC in the course of time thorough mutual understanding in enabling it to cover appropriately the defence of the entire Middle East. See,

- FRUS 1951, Vol.V, pp.243–45; *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol.II, pp.415–16; *Documents on International Affairs*, 1951, pp.427–29.
- 188 After the quadripartite declaration Moscow on 24 November 1951 sent a note to the four powers' capitals charging them with aggressive methods by organising the regional states against the USSR. In their responses to Moscow, both Washington and London denied the Soviet charges by emphasising that it was a voluntary organisation which aimed at defending the Middle East against outside aggression. See *Documents on International Affairs*, 1951, pp.432–36. See also for the exchange of notes between Turkey and USSR printed in *Ayn Tarihi*, December 1951, no.217, pp.89–91.
- 189 For the Soviet note and the Turkish response see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.217, December 1951, pp.88–91.
- 190 Quoted from Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.101.
- 191 COS (51) 172, 29 October 1951, DEFE 4/48.
- 192 Ibid.
- 193 COS (51) 169, 23 October 1951; COS, (51) 177, 5 November 1951; DEFE 4/48.
- 194 COS (51) 185, 14 November 1951; DEFE 4/49; FRUS, 1951, Vol.III, pp.725–726; Foreign Office to Ankara, 31 December 1951, FO 195/2679.
- 195 For press reactions see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.216, November 1951.
- 196 For Bayar's statement see, Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, p.477.
- 197 For Köprülü's statement see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.217, December 1951.
- 198 COS (52) 11, Report on Mediterranean and MEC Arrangements by the COS Committee, 3 January 1952, DEFE 5/36; FRUS, 1951, Vol.III, pp.725–30; FO to Ankara, 31 December 1951, FO 195/2679. In the NATO Council meeting in Rome the British delegate still continued to resist to the allocation of Turkish forces to SHAPE. This further disappointed the Turkish leaders. See *Ayn Tarihi*, no.216, November 1951, pp.136–42.
- 199 Ankara to Foreign Office, 21 January 1952, FO 195/2679. See also TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, 1950–54, Dönem 9, 19.12.1951, p.230.
- 200 Brief for Lisbon Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, prepared by the Foreign Office, 19 February 1952, FO 371/102291.
- 201 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part I, pp.171–78; Foreign Office to Ankara, 11 February 1952, FO 195/2679.
- 202 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.219, February 1952, pp.224–27.
- 203 Brief for Lisbon Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, prepared by the Foreign Office, 19 February 1952, FO 371/102291.
- 204 For Turkish press reactions see, *Zafer*, *Cumhuriyet*, 18 February 1952, *Ulus*, 20 February 1952. For Köprülü's statement in the GNA reprinted in, *Zafer* 19 February 1952. See also *Ayn Tarihi*, no.219, February 1952.
- 205 Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında*, pp.135–37.
- 206 Ibid.
- 207 See, Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, pp.438–45.
- 208 Ankara to Eastern Dept., 10 April 1951, FO 371/91203. See also, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.206, January 1951, pp.69–70.
- 209 See the earlier statements made by Menderes and Köprülü quoted at the beginning of this Chapter.

- 210 For Bayar's references to Turkey's role in the UN Palestine CC see, Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, p.443. Bayar stated that Turkey would make her utmost efforts to settle the problem in the satisfaction of both Arab states and Israel.
- 211 See, *Zafer*, 25 February 1951.
- 212 See, *Middle East Mirror*, Vol.II, no.48, 14 April 1951, p.7.
- 213 *Middle East Mirror*, Vol.II, no.49, 21 April 1951, p.20.
- 214 See, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.210, May 1951, pp.90–91.
- 215 Ankara to Eastern Dept., 10 April 1951, FO 371/91203.
- 216 Ibid.; Foreign Office to Ankara, 24 April 1951, FO 371/91203.
- 217 BMEQ, Cairo to Eastern Dept., 24 July 1951, FO 371/91203. Azzam Pasha also told Sir Thomas Rapp, the head of BMEQ, that, though he got the impression that the Turks in general disliked the Jews and sympathised with the Arabs, their feelings had to be subordinated to the political necessity of conciliating Western, particularly American, opinion by maintaining relations with Israel.
- 218 David Scott Fox, Ankara to Morrison, 19 June 1951, FO 371/91203.
- 219 British Embassy, Alexandria to Eastern Dept., 5 July 1951, FO 371/91203.
- 220 Quoted from Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.61.
- 221 UKDEL to UN, New York to Foreign Office, 16 August 1951, FO 371/90198. The countries which prepared the resolution were the US, the UK and France. See also *Zafer*, 14 September 1951.
- 222 New York to Foreign Office, 10 July 1951, FO 371/90195.
- 223 UKDEL to the UN, New York to Foreign Office, 16 July 1951, FO 371/90195. Fawzi Bey, the Egyptian Delegate to the UN, also claimed that the tankers which sailed through the Suez Canal to Haifa would strengthen Israel.
- 224 Ankara to African Dept., 16 August 1951, FO 371/90198.
- 225 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 15 August 1951, FO 371/90198.
- 226 Minute by G.W. Furlonge, 13 August 1951, FO 371/90198.
- 227 New York to Foreign Office, 16 August 1951, FO 371/90198.
- 228 New York to Foreign Office, 20 August 1951, FO 371/90198. See also *Zafer*, 14 September 1951.
- 229 BBC Monitoring, 18 August 1951, contained in the Foreign Office files, FO 371/90198.
- 230 Dikerdem, *Ortadoğuda Devrim*, p.25. See also British reports, Ankara to Southern Dept., 26 November 1951, FO 371/95276; Beirut to Foreign Office, 9 October 1951, FO 371/96494;
- 231 See an article by Mümtaz Faik Fenik, *Zafer*, 20 November 1951. See also British report, Ankara to Southern Dept., 26 November 1951, FO 371/95276.
- 232 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.210, May 1951, pp.90–91; Ankara to Foreign Office, 12 December 1951, FO 371/91635.
- 233 Charles to Morrison, 16 October 1951, FO 371/96495.
- 234 Ibid.

Chapter Six

- 1 As the scope of this book stops at the point where Britain formally put its MEDO plans on the shelf during the Washington talks on 11–14 July, 1953 the author does not intend to examine the formation of the Baghdad Pact.

- 2 Kent, *Egypt and the Defence of*, pp. lxviii–lxxx; Cohen, *Fighting World War Three*, pp.208–309; David R. Devereux, ‘The Middle East and Africa in British Global Strategy, 1952–1956’ in Aldrich and Hopkins, (eds.), *Intelligence Defence and Diplomacy*, pp.169–72.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Record of Anglo-Turkish Conversations, 14 and 16 October 1952, PREM 11/569; Foreign Office Report, 16 October 1952, FO 371/101860; Cohen, *Fighting World War Three*, p.304.
- 5 Ankara to Viscount Hood, 30 May 1953, FO 371/108003; COS (54) 92, 27 August 1954, Middle East Planning: Strategic Considerations, DEFE 4/72.
- 6 Foreign Office minute by H.A. Dudgeon, 11 February 1952, FO 371/98272.
- 7 Ibid.; Foreign Office to Washington, 27 January 1952, FO 371/102291.
- 8 COS (52) 11, Mediterranean and MEC Arrangements, 3 January 1952, DEFE 5/36.
- 9 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part.1, pp.171–74.
- 10 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part.1, pp.173–74.
- 11 Ibid., pp.197–99.
- 12 These primary British aims were: first, to engage the USA and Turkey in the defence of the Middle East; second, to solve the Anglo-Egyptian dispute. See, COS (52) 34, 11 January 1952, Memorandum by the Foreign Office on the MEC, DEFE 5/36.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ministry of Defence, London to BJSM, Washington, 28 January 1952, FO 371/102291.
- 15 COS (52) 51, copy of letter from the Foreign Office to Secretary, Chiefs of Staff Committee, 21 January 1952, DEFE 5/36; C (52) 11, Memorandum by Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 21 January 1952, CAB 129/49.
- 16 C (52) 32, Memorandum by the Secretary of State, 11 February 1952, CAB 129/49.
- 17 C (52) 43, Memorandum by the Secretary of State, 17 February 1952, CAB 129/49; Hail, *Britain’s Foreign Policy*, pp.83–86.
- 18 *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol.III, No.1, January 1952, p.97.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Hail, *Britain’s Foreign Policy*, pp.86–92.
- 21 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, p.67.
- 22 Ibid., pp.213–218, 251.
- 23 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 2, pp.218–21.
- 24 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 2, pp.226–28, 234–36.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 See for the account of full speech given by Köprülü at TGNA on 19 December 1951 appeared on *Ayın Tarihi*, no.217, December 1951, pp.79–88. See also, Ankara to Eden, 27 December 1951, FO 371/101853.
- 27 For Köprülü’s speech see, *Ayın Tarihi*, no.217, December 1951, pp.79–88.
- 28 FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, p.172.
- 29 For these reactions see *Ayın Tarihi*, no.218, January 1952; *Zafer*, 3 January 1952.
- 30 Necmettin Sadak, *Akşam*, 4 January 1952.
- 31 For the statement see *Ayın Tarihi*, no.218, January 1952, pp.43–44.
- 32 Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, Vol.II, part II, pp.344–45.

- 33 From Allied Powers Europe Deputy Supreme Commander to Field Marshall Slim, CIGS, 23 January 1952, WO 216/498; *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.171–74.
- 34 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.184–85.
- 35 Foreign Office to Helm, 16 February 1952, FO 371/101861.
- 36 Helm to Foreign Office, 11 February 1952, FO 371/102450; Report prepared by Helm, 15 May 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 37 BMEQ to Helm, 14 April 1952, FO 195/2678/60557.
- 38 Ankara to Foreign Office, 7 March 1952, FO 195/2678/60557.
- 39 Ibid.; Foreign Office to Ankara, 24 March 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 40 Ankara to Foreign Office, 7 March 1952, FO 195/2678/60557.
- 41 Ankara to Foreign Office, 14 May 1952, FO 195/2680; Report by Helm, 17 May 1952, FO 195/2681; Embassy minute by David Scott Fox, 20 May 1951, FO 195/2680; Minute by Embassy, 11 July 1952, FO 195/2686. See also Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidî Karşısında*, p.113.
- 42 Ankara to Foreign Office, 15 May 1952, FO 195/2680. On Montgomery's visit see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.222, May 1952, pp.17–18. In his memoirs Bayar indicated that the Marshall also visited himself and he was very much satisfied in his talks with Montgomery. Bayar even stated that the Marshall played a key role in the positive change of British attitude towards Turkey entry to NATO. See, Saray, *Sovyet Tehdidî Karşısında*, p.113.
- 43 COS (52) 77, 5 June 1952, DEFE 4/54.
- 44 COS, (52) 87, 16 June 1952, DEFE 4/54.
- 45 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, p.247; From N.C.D. Brownjohn to Sir James Bowker, 14 June 1952, WO 216/536.
- 46 COS (52) 89, 23 June 1952, DEFE 4/54; *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.247–48.
- 47 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.249–51. The entire discussions and results of the CRME are contained in the file: FO 195/2681.
- 48 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.251–54, 268; Minute by Sir Pierson Dixon, 1 July 1952, FO 195/2681; CRO to the various British High Commissioners, 8 July 1952, contained in FO 371/102454; Foreign Office to Alexandria, 22 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 49 Foreign Office to Alexandria, 22 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 50 Washington to Foreign Office, 25 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 51 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.271–77; Ankara to Foreign Office, 8 August 1952, FO 195/2681; Washington to Foreign Office, 6 September 1952, FO 371/102457.
- 52 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.271–74.
- 53 Ibid.; Foreign Office to Washington, 9 September 1952, FO 371/102457.
- 54 Extract from *New York Times*, contained in the Foreign Office file: Foreign Office to Helm, Ankara, 7 August 1952, FO 195/2681; Minute by N.H.C. Bruce, 16 September 1952, FO 371/102458; Curson, CRO to Curle, Foreign Office, 24 November 1952, FO 371/102462; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, pp.566–67.
- 55 Foreign Office to Washington, 9 September 1952, FO 371/102457.
- 56 Minute by Helm, 17 May 1952, FO 195/2681; *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, part 1, pp.244–45.

- 57 Minute by Helm, 17 May 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 58 Ibid. Köprülü told Helm that these were his personal views and he was sure that the Turkish government also shared them.
- 59 *Ayn Tarihi*, no. 223, June–1952, p.29; Visit of Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Turkey, 5 November 1952, PREM 11/298.
- 60 See *Ayn Tarihi*, no.223, June 1952, pp.123–124.
- 61 Minute by Sir Pierson Dixon, 1 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 62 Helm to Dixon, 3 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Helm to Dixon, 3 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 65 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 12 July 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 66 Minute by J.C. Petrie, 20 July 1952, FO 371/102454.
- 67 British Embassy in Turkey to Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ankara, 9 August 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Helm to the Viscount Hood, 13 August 1952, FO 371/102456.
- 70 Foreign Office to Helm, 27 August 1952; Foreign Office to Ankara, 28 August 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 71 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 25 August 1952, FO 371/102457.
- 72 Foreign Office Minute, 27 August 1952, FO 371/102457.
- 73 Istanbul to Foreign Office, 2 September 1952, FO 195/2681.
- 74 Ankara to Foreign Office, 24 September 1952; Minute by Curle, 26 September 1952, FO 371/102458; COS (52) 143, 9 October 1952, DEFE 4/57. See also 'Turkish Documents which provide for the same account in, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', pp.168–71.
- 75 COS (52) 558, 9 October 1952, DEFE 5/42. See also the accounts of Turkish Documents in, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', pp.168–71.
- 76 Minute by Curle, 4 November 1952, FO 371/102460. See also the accounts of Turkish Documents in, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', pp.168–71.
- 77 Ankara to Foreign Office, 24 September 1952, FO 371/102458. See also the accounts of Turkish Documents in, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', pp.168–71.
- 78 Minute by Dixon, 11 October 1952, FO 371/102459. While the first problem was confined to the USA and France the second one was a common disagreement among all the sponsoring powers.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 *Ayn Tarihi*, October 1952, no.227, pp.91–100.
- 81 Minute by Pierson Dixon, 17 October 1952, FO 371/102460.
- 82 Record of Anglo-Turkish Conversations, 14 and 16 October 1952, PREM 11/569; Foreign Office Report, 16 October 1952, FO 371/101860. In the second set of discussions on 16 October, Eden said that there had been some difficulties about reaching an agreement over the tactics of approaching the Arabs. The question was whether the Arabs should be invited before the setting up of the shop or after the opening of the shop (MEDO). Menderes responded that there was a 'middle course'. The sponsoring powers should send publicity circulars to the customers before the setting up of the shop. The Arabs should therefore become not only customers but also shareholders. He explained that only Turkey and Britain took seriously the matter in hand and they should persuade the USA to assume firmer commitments. Menderes then suggested

- that Turkey and Britain should work with the Arab states individually. Eden said that he liked this idea and would talk further about it.
- 83 Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.176. See also, Record of Anglo-Turkish Conversations, 14 and 16 October 1952, PREM 11/569; Foreign Office Report, 16 October 1952, FO 371/101860.
- 84 Record of Meeting with the Turkish Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister on 18 October 1952, Foreign Office to Ankara, 19 October 1952, FO 371/101860; Visit of Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Turkey, part-II Egypt and MEDO, 5 November 1952, PREM 11/298. The Turkish documents are in full conformity with the British accounts. For Turkish accounts see, Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', pp.176–77.
- 85 Record of Meeting with the Turkish Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister on 18 October 1952, FO 371/101860.
- 86 *The Observer*, 19 October 1952; Foreign Office to Athens, 23 October 1952, Ankara to Foreign Office, 23 October 1952, FO 371/101860.
- 87 Ankara to Eden, 21 October 1952, FO 371/101860.
- 88 For these remarks see, *Ulus* 19 October 1952; *Ayn Tarihi*, no.227, October 1952, pp.97–99.
- 89 *Zafer*, 25 October 1952.
- 90 Öztürk, *Cumhurbaşkanlarının*, pp.517–18.
- 91 Foreign Office to Washington 21 October 1952, FO 371/102460.
- 92 Foreign Office to Washington, 25 October 1952, FO 371/102460; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.296–97. Also similar demarches were made by Köprülü to the US Ambassador in Ankara. See *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.301–305.
- 93 Washington to Viscount Hood, 25 October 1952, FO 371/102461; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.310–11.
- 94 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.310–11.
- 95 *Ibid.*, p.300; Baghdad to Foreign Office, 1 November 1952, FO 371/102461.
- 96 Foreign Office to Washington, 3 November 1952, FO 371/102461.
- 97 *Ibid.*
- 98 Ankara to Foreign Office, 3 November 1952, FO 371/102461.
- 99 CRO to Various UK High Commissioners, 8 November 1952, FO 371/102461; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp. 311–13.
- 100 *Ibid.*
- 101 Minute by J.C. Petrie, 17 November 1952, FO 371/102462.
- 102 Helm to Foreign Office, 21 November 1952, FO 371/102462. See also *Ayn Tarihi*, November 1952, no.228, pp. 300–305 for an account of the Public uprising in Baghdad.
- 103 Helm to Foreign Office, 3 November 1952, FO 371/102461; Helm to Foreign Office, 20 February 1953, FO 371/102462.
- 104 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, p.314.
- 105 Minute by Dixon, Annex A, 5 November 1952, FO 371/102462.
- 106 *Ibid.*
- 107 Cairo to Foreign Office, 7 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 108 Minute by J.C. Petrie, 12 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 109 Ankara to Foreign Office, 10 February 1953; Foreign Office Minute, 20 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 110 Ankara to Foreign Office, 13 April 1953, FO 371/108002.

- 111 Ankara to Foreign Office, 21 November 1952; Foreign Office to Ankara, 3 December 1952, FO 371/102462.
- 112 For Köprülü's statement see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.228, November 1952, pp.118–21.
- 113 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.228, November 1952, pp.118–21.
- 114 Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 November 1952, FO 371/102462.
- 115 Bülent Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.191.
- 116 Mehmet Gönlübol, *Turkish Participation in the United Nations, 1945–1954*, (Ankara, 1963), pp.24–27. See also Ankara to Foreign Office, 23 February 1953, FO 371/107556; *Documents on International Relations*, 1952, pp.391–426.
- 117 Ibid.
- 118 C (53) 17 Revise, 14 January 1953, CAB 129/58; CC (53) 12, 17 February 1953, CAB 128/26; Minute by J.C. Petrie, 30 January 1953, FO 371/108001; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.1995–1997. The Anglo-American agreement was: 'first, a phased withdrawal of British armed forces from Egyptian territory; second, the maintenance of a Canal Zone base in peace with a view to its immediate use in the event of war; third, an arrangement for the air defence of Egypt; fourth, the participation of Egypt in a Middle East defence organisation; last, a programme of military and economic assistance by the United Kingdom and United States to Egypt'.
- 119 CC (53) 13, 19 February 1953, CAB 128/26; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.1989–1991; Dwight D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953–1956* (London: Heinemann, 1963), pp.151–52; Sir Anthony Eden, *Memoirs, Full Circle* (London, 1960) p.248.
- 120 CC (53) 15, 26 February 1953, CAB 128/26; Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, p.152.
- 121 *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 1953, Vol.IV, no.1, pp. 99–105; *Survey of International Affairs*, 1953, pp.160–61; Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, pp.159–60; Hail, *Britain's Foreign Policy* pp.101–7.
- 122 Foreign Office to Helm, 20 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 123 CC (53) 20, 17 March 1953, CAB 128/26; *Survey of International Affairs*, 1953, p.164.
- 124 CC (53) 20, 17 March 1953, CAB 128/26; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.2008–2012.
- 125 *Survey of International Affairs*, 1953, pp.165–67. *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp 373–75.
- 126 Deverux, *The Formulation of*, p.71.
- 127 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, pp.156–159; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.364–69.
- 128 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, p.384.
- 129 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, p.157.
- 130 Deverux, 'The Middle East and Africa', pp.169–170. See also DCC (53) 46 Defence of the Middle East, 23 February 1953, DEFE 11/187.
- 131 COS (54) 92, 27 August 1954, Global Defence Planning: Present Day Position, Annex 1, DEFE 4/72.
- 132 Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain*, pp.160–61; Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, pp.157–159; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, p.1994, 1996.
- 133 RR (Ad Hoc) (53) 2, 9 February 1953, Radical Review-Mobile Concept for British Forces in the Middle East, DEFE 11/87.

- 134 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.1–167. These capitals were: Cairo, Tel Aviv, Amman, Damascus, Beirut Baghdad, Riyadh, Karachi, New Delhi, Ankara, Athens, Tripoli.
- 135 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.379–86.
- 136 *Ibid.*, pp.384, 395.
- 137 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.394–404.
- 138 *Ibid.*
- 139 Scott Lucas and Ray Takeyh. ‘Alliance and Balance: the Anglo-American Relationship and Egyptian Nationalism, 1950–1957’ *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 7, no.3, 1996, pp.639–40.
- 140 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.149–50.
- 141 John C. Campbell, *Defence of The Middle East: Problems of American Policy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p.50.
- 142 These countries that Dulles named were: Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia.
- 143 Visit of Salisbury, Acting S of S for Foreign Affairs, to Washington, between 9–15 July 1953, PREM 11/425. Salisbury agreed with Dulles about the impracticability of MEDO and said that he would further consider the new American strategic concept in the Middle Eastern defence. Thus, this marked formally the end of the British Middle Eastern defence plans (with its eventual failure).
- 144 Helm to Foreign Office, 3 November 1952, FO 371/102461; Minute by Dixon, 5 November 1952; Foreign Office to Baghdad, 17 November 1952, FO 371/102462; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.296–300. See also Erkin, *Dışişlerinde 34 Yıl*, p.379.
- 145 Tünay, *Menderes Devri*, p.187 and ff.; Mouayad Ibrahim K. Al-Windawi, ‘Anglo-Iraqi Relations 1945–1958’ (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Reading, 1989), p.216. Tünay was the first Turkish Military Attaché who was appointed to Iraq after the Turkish Mission in Baghdad was raised to the level of Embassy in early 1953.
- 146 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 12 February 1952, FO 371/102462; Tünay, *Menderes Devri*, pp.110–13.
- 147 Turkish State Archives, quoted from Ali Rıza, ‘Turkish Participation’, p.208.
- 148 Ali Rıza, ‘Turkish Participation’, p.209.
- 149 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.231, February 1953, pp.103, 285–88.
- 150 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.231, February 1953, pp.103, 285–288. See also BBC Monitoring, 19 January 1953, contained in, FO 371/108001; *Documents on International Affairs*, 1953, pp.271–73. For full text of the Pact see, *Ayn Tarihi*, no.249, August 1954, pp.85–89.
- 151 *Ayn Tarihi*, no.231, February 1953, p.103.
- 152 BBC Monitoring, 19 January 1953, contained in FO 371/108001.
- 153 Turkey made it clear in the UN that Israel should obey the previous UN resolutions before any direct negotiations were resumed between the Arabs and Israel. Turkey thus rejected the proposal, which called upon the latter two parties to negotiate the Palestine problem. See Minute by A.C. Maby, 10 March 1953, FO 371/107551.
- 154 Ankara to Foreign Office, 20 January 1953, contained in DEFE 11/87; Ankara to Foreign Office, 23 February 1953, FO 371/107556.

- 155 Foreign Office to Ankara, 20 February 1953; Minute by Petrie, 21 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 156 Foreign Office to Ankara, 20 February 1953, FO 371/108001.
- 157 *Ayn Tarihi*, February 1953, no.231, pp.152–54: See also British source, Helm to Eden, 26 February 1953, FO 371/107551.
- 158 Ibid.
- 159 Minute by A.C. Maby, 10 March 1953, FO 371/107551.
- 160 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.348–49; Iraq to Foreign Office, 13 March 1953, FO 371/108002; Troutbeck to Eden, 22 March 1953, FO 371/104236.
- 161 Troutbeck to Eden, Translation of Memorandum on Middle East Defence presented to the Iraqi MFA by the Turkish Minister at Baghdad, 2 April 1953, FO 371/104236.
- 162 Ibid.
- 163 Ibid.
- 164 Minute by Lord Hood, 28 May 1953, FO 371/108002.
- 165 Troutbeck to Foreign Office, 28 March 1953, FO 371/104236.
- 166 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp. 352–354. See the State Department's reactions to the Turkish actions in the footnotes of the pages.
- 167 Turkish State Archives, quoted from Ali Rıza 'Turkish Participation', p.227.
- 168 Ibid.
- 169 Ali Rıza, 'Turkish Participation', p.228.
- 170 Troutbeck to Eden, 22 March 1953, FO 371/104236; *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.354–55. Troutbeck, in his report, explained the Iraqi fears of being tied up too closely with Turkey due to the former's suspicions about possible Turkish designs on Iraqi territories. However, the Foreign Office regarded these suspicions as without foundation.
- 171 Baghdad to Foreign Office, 28 March 1953, FO 371/104236.
- 172 Ankara to Foreign Office, 31 March 1953, FO 371/108002.
- 173 See *Ayn Tarihi*, no.233, April 1953, p.33; *Middle East Mirror*, Vol.IV, no.42, pp.6–7.
- 174 Ankara to Foreign Office, 31 March 1953, FO 371/107556. Initially the Arab states were alarmed by these Turkish remarks as they understood them literally. But, when Köprülü explained what he meant was a close Turco-Arab collaboration in every field, this received wide public support in Iraq, Syria and the Lebanon. See Foreign Office Brief, Annex C, 10 April 1953, FO 371/107556. See also *Middle East Mirror*, Vol.IV, no.42, p.6.
- 175 Ankara to Foreign Office, 31 March 1953, FO 371/108002.
- 176 Helm to Foreign Office, 31 March 1953, FO 371/108002.
- 177 Minute by Lord Hood, 8 April 1953, Ankara to Foreign Office, 31 March 1953, FO 371/108002.
- 178 Foreign Office Brief, Annex E, 10 April 1953, FO 371/107556.
- 179 Ankara to G. W. Harrison, 11 May 1953, FO 371/107556; Tünay, *Menderes Devri*, pp.130–32.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Ankara to Harrison, 11 May 1953, FO 371/107556.
- 182 Ankara to Viscount Hood, 15 May 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 183 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.137–140; Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 May 1953, FO 371/107553.

- 184 *FRUS* 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp. pp.141–42; Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 May 1953, FO 371/107553.
- 185 *Ibid.*
- 186 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.143–54.
- 187 Ali Rıza, ‘Turkish Participation’, p.238. See also, Ankara to Viscount Hood, 4 June 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 188 Ankara to Viscount Hood, 4 June 1953, FO 371/108003. The same memorandum was also given later to the British and the French Ambassadors.
- 189 Turkish State Archives quoted from Ali Rıza, ‘Turkish Participation’, p.240.
- 190 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, p.391; Ankara to Foreign Office, 28 May 1953, contained, PREM 11/568.
- 191 See Lucas, *Divided We Stand*, pp. 14–17; See also Lucas and Takeyh ‘Alliance and Balance’, p.634.
- 192 *FRUS*, 1952–54, Vol.IX, pp.389–90.
- 193 Ankara to Viscount Hood, 30 May 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 194 *Ibid.*
- 195 Ankara to the Viscount Hood, 30 May 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 196 Ankara to the Viscount Hood, 30 May 1953, FO 371/108003; Helm to Foreign Office, 2 September 1953, and 9 September 1953, FO 371/108003; Prime Minister’s minute prepared by Strang, 10 June 1953, PREM 11/568; COS (54) 100, 22 September 1954, Middle East Defence Strategy, DEFE 4/72.
- 197 Copy of a letter from Beeley of HM’s Embassy Washington to Sir James Bowker, 17 June 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 198 Minute by J.N.O.Curle, 29 June 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 199 COS (53) 77, 23 June 1953, DEFE 4/63; Hood to Helm, 9 July 1953, FO 371/108003.
- 200 *Ibid.*
- 201 Devereux, *The Formulation of*, pp.71–72. Britain began to show its interest in the northern tier defence scheme in the spring of 1954 after Turco-Pakistani and American-Iraqi agreements had been signed. With these agreements the USA extended its military assistance to Iraq and Pakistan in return for the two countries’ collaboration on a collective defence in the region. The Foreign Office thought that these steps were useful towards a Middle East defence and eventually might be turned into a defence organisation depending on the attitudes of Iraq, Iran and the West. See minute by Falla, 22 June 1954, FO 371/110828.
- 202 Note by the Prime Minister on his meeting with the Turkish Prime and Foreign Minister, 6 June 1953, PREM 11/568.
- 203 *Ibid.*
- 204 Foreign Office to Washington, Prime Minister’s Personal telegram, 4 June 1953, PREM 11/568.
- 205 *Ibid.*
- 206 Prime Minister’s minute, prepared by Sir William Strang, 10 June 1953, PREM 11/568.
- 207 Baghdad to Eastern Department, 16 June 1953, FO 371/104238.
- 208 *Ibid.*
- 209 Al-Windawi, ‘Anglo-Iraqi Relations’, pp.195–96.

Conclusion

- 1 Peterson to Foreign Office, 26 October 1945, FO 371/48699; C.R. Price to Sir Alexander Cadogan, 14 November 1945, AIR 20/4975; Peterson to Bevin, Review of Events in Turkey in 1945, 1 February 1946, FO 371/59297; Kamuran Gürün, *Dış İlişkiler ve Türk Politikası: 1939'dan Günümüze Kadar* (Ankara: SBF Yay., 1983), p.163; *idem*, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri: 1920–1953* (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1991) p.306; Tezel, *Moskova'dan Geliyorum*, p.229.
- 2 Alan Bullock, *Ernest Bevin: Foreign Secretary 1945–1951* (New York: W W Norton & Company, 1983), pp.39–40, 133; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.274.
- 3 Cevat Açıkalın, Turkish Ambassador in London to Bevin, 25 February 1946, FO 371/59232; TDP, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları*, p.240.
- 4 Zeki Kuneralp, *Sadece Diplomat: Hatırat* (İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1981), p.96. See also some of the comments by Turkish columnists about the nature of traditional Russian and Soviet imperialism against Turkey. Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, *Tanin* 30 June 1945; Nadir Nadi, *Cumhuriyet*, 13 Temmuz 1945; Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Tanin*, 8 Temmuz 1945, reprinted in *Ayn Tarihi* June 1945, no.139 and July 1945, no.140.
- 5 Bozdağ, *Menderes*, p.53.
- 6 Peterson to Bevin, Top Secret, 28 July 1945, FO 195/2487/88; Sir David Kelly, *The Ruling Few: or the Human Background to Diplomacy* (London: Hollis & Charter, 1952), pp. 327, 330. See the comments of Turkish columnists about the Soviets' hostile attitude towards Turkey: Ziyat Ebuzziya, *Tasvir*, 28 June 1945; Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, *Tanin*, 29 June 1945; Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Vatan*, 12 July 1945; Asim Us, *Vakit*, 4 September 1947 reprinted in *Ayn Tarihi*, no.139, June 1945; no.140, July 1945 and no 166, September 1947.
- 7 Peterson to Bevin, Top Secret, 28 July 1945, FO 195/2487/88.
- 8 As early as in June 1944 the British COS came to the conclusion that the Soviets would emerge from the war as the strongest land power in Europe and Asia and hence London should seek US support to thwart a possible Russian threat to the vital British interests in these areas. See COS (44) 527 (0) (PHP), War Cabinet, COS Committee, 15 June 1944, CAB 119/126. Even, as late as on 10 October 1953, Churchill, in his speech at the Conservative Party's Annual Conference, described the capacity of the Soviet Armies in Europe, excluding their satellites, as '...four times as strong as all the western allies put together'. See Avon Papers, 1949–53, AP 13/3 /27F-29H, (13/3/25-26), the Library of the University of Birmingham.
- 9 Mr Goe, US Embassy, London, to Michael Williams, Foreign Office, 11 February 1946, FO 371/59232.
- 10 The author of this book shares some of the traditional orthodox views that the Soviet expansionist designs bore major responsibility for the start of the Cold War in the Near East.
- 11 Lucas, *Freedom's War*, *passim*.
- 12 For Kemal Atatürk's ideas on the incompatibility of communism with Turkish nationalism see, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesi*, 10 September 1927.
- 13 Tezel, *Moskovadan Geliyorum*, pp.229–49.
- 14 Memorandum on the future of the Anglo-Iraqi treaty and Arab Nationalist Movement, 4 July 1948, FO 371/68585.
- 15 CP (45) 156, 8 September 1945, Cabinet Palestine Committee, CAB 119/148.

- 16 L.S. Amery to Field Marshal Sir William Slim, CIGS, 23 June 1950, WO 216/711; Kent, *British Imperial Strategy*, pp.212–13; Louis, *The British Empire*, *passim*.
- 17 Prime Minister to General Ismay for COS Committee, 3 April 1945, CAB 120/712.
- 18 See for the Democrat party's opinion about the negative consequences of Turkey's neutral position in the Second World War, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İkinci Adam*, Vol.II, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1991), p.135.
- 19 *FRUS*, 1950, Vol.V, pp.188–92; *FRUS*, 1950, Vol I, pp.367–69.
- 20 *FRUS* 1951, Vol.III, pp.466–73; Leffler, 'Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War', pp.819–23; *idem*, *The Specter of Communism*, pp. 114–15.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

I. Unpublished Official Documents

Foreign Office Files: FO-141, FO-195, FO-226, FO-286, FO-370, FO-371, FO-373, FO-406, FO-424, FO-602, FO-624, FO-816, FO-881.

Cabinet Files: CAB-21, CAB-84, CAB-104, CAB-119, CAB-120, CAB-121, CAB-122, CAB-128, CAB-129, CAB-130, CAB-131, CAB-134.

Defence Ministry Files: DEFE-4, DEFE-5, DEFE-6, DEFE-11.

Prime Minister's Office Files: PREM-3, PREM-4, PREM-8, PREM-11.

War Office Files: WO-32, WO-106, WO-158, WO-201, WO-208, WO-216.

Air Ministry Files: AIR-1, AIR-2, AIR-8, AIR-9, AIR 20.

Admiralty Files: ADM-1, ADM-116, ADM-199, ADM-234.

Colonial Office Files: CO-323, CO-730.

Ministry of Information Files: INF-1, INF-2, INF-4, INF-12.

Government Code and Cypher School Files: HW1.

II. Private Papers

Eden Papers (1935–1946): Sir Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon: FO 954 Files.

Eden Papers (1921–1960); Sir Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon: The University of Birmingham.

Loraine Papers (1836–1973): Sir Percy Lyham Loraine: FO 1011 Files.

Sargent Papers: Sir Orme Garton Sargent: FO 800 Files.

Bevin papers: Ernest Bevin: FO 800 Files.

Morrison Papers: Herbert Morrison: FO 800 Files.

Cadogan Papers (1943–1944): Sir Alexander Cadogan: FO 800/896 File.

The Papers of the Chiefs of the Imperial General Staff (1935–1964): WO 216 Files.

Slessor Papers, (1938–1952): Marshal Sir John Slessor: AIR 75/102 File.

III. Published Documents and Records

1. Turkish Official Publications

I-*Türk Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: Cumhuriyetin İlk On Yılı ve Balkan Paktı, 1923-1934* (Fifty Years in Turkey's Foreign Policy: The First Ten Years of the Republic and the Balkan Pact, 1923–1934), (TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1974) (The Foreign Ministry of Turkish Republic, General Directorate of Research and Political Planning, 1974).

II-*Türk Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: Montreux ve Savaş Öncesi Yıllar, 1935–1939* (Fifty Years in Turkey's Foreign Policy: Montreux and the Years before the War 1935–1939), (TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1974) (The Foreign Ministry of Turkish Republic, General Directorate of Research and Political Planning, 1974).

III-*Türk Dış Politikasında 50 Yıl: İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılları, 1939–1946* (Fifty Years in Turkey's Foreign Policy: The Years Related to the Second World War 1939–1946), (TC Dışişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Siyaset Planlama Genel Müdürlüğü, 1974) (The Foreign Ministry of Turkish Republic, General Directorate of Research and Political Planning, 1974).

IV-*Atatürk'ün Milli Dış Politikası: Cumhuriyet Dönemine Ait 100 Belge, 1918–1923*, Vol.I, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yay., 1992). *Atatürk's Foreign Policy: Documents Related to the Period of the Republic, 1918–1923*, Vol.I, (Ankara: The Ministry of Culture Publications, 1992).

V-*Atatürk'ün Milli Dış Politikası: Cumhuriyet Dönemine Ait 100 Belge, 1923–1938*, Vol.II, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yay., 1992). *Atatürk's Foreign Policy: Documents Related to the Period of the Republic, 1923–1938*, Vol.II, (Ankara: The Ministry of Culture Publications, 1992).

VI-Seha L. Meray, *Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar-Belgeler*, C.I–VII, (İstanbul, 1993). *Lausanne Peace Conference: Reports and Documents*, Vols.I–VII, (İstanbul, 1993).

VII-*Ayın Tarihi* (The Monthly Record published by the Press and Tourism Department of the Prime Minister's Office), (TC Başbakanlık Basın Yayın ve Turizm Genel Müdürlüğü), 1945–1953.

VIII-*Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi* (Records of the Turkish Grand National Assembly): Dönem 7, 1943–46; Dönem 8, 1946–50; Dönem 9, 1950–54.

2. Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)

FRUS 1945, Vol.VIII, *The Near East and Africa* (Washington, 1969); FRUS, 1946, Vol.VII, *The Near East and Africa* (Washington, 1969); FRUS

1948, Vol.III, *Western Europe* (Washington, 1974); FRUS, 1948, Vol.V, Parts 1-2, *The Near East, South Asia and Africa* (Washington, 1976); FRUS, 1949, Vol.VI, *The Near East, South Asia and Africa* (Washington, 1977); FRUS, 1950, Vol.III, *Western Europe* (Washington, 1977); FRUS 1950, Vol.V, *The Near East, South Asia and Africa* (Washington, 1978); FRUS, 1951, III, Parts 1-2, *European Security and the German Question* (Washington, 1981); FRUS, 1952–54, Vol.IX, Parts 1-2, *The Near East and Middle East* (Washington, 1986).

3. Royal Institute of International Affairs

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Documents on International Affairs*, 1951 (Oxford University Press, 1954).

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Documents on International Affairs*, 1952 (Oxford University Press, 1955).

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Documents on International Affairs*, 1953 (Oxford University Press, 1956).

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Survey of International Affairs*, 1951 (Oxford University Press, 1954).

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Survey of International Affairs*, 1952 (Oxford University Press, 1955).

Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Survey of International Affairs*, 1953 (Oxford University Press, 1956).

Secondary Sources

I. Memoirs and Diaries

Sultan Abdülhamit, *Siyasi Hatıratım*. Edited by Dergah Yayınları. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1987.

Acheson, Dean. *Present At the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. New York: Norton, 1969.

Barutçu, Ahmet F. *Siyasi Anılar, 1939–1954*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1977.

Churchill, Winston S. *Memoirs of the Second World War*. Volumes I–VI. New York: Bonanza Books, 1978.

Dikerdem, Mahmut. *Ortadoğuda Devrim Yılları*. İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1977.

Eden, Anthony. *Memoirs: Full Circle*. London: Cassell, 1960.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953–1956*. London: Heinemann, 1963.

Erkin, Feridun C. *Dış İşlerinde 34 Yıl*. Vol.II. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1987.

- Gallman, Waldemar J. *Iraq Under General Nuri: My Recollections of Nuri al Said, 1954–1958*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1964.
- Knatchbull-Hugessen, Sir Hughe. *Diplomat in Peace and War*. London: John Murray, 1949.
- Kelly, Sir David. *The Ruling Few: or The Human Background to Diplomacy*. London: Hollis & Carter, 1952.
- Kuneralp, Zeki. *Sadece Diplomat*. İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası, 1981.
- Macmillan, Harold. *Tides of Fortune, 1945–1955*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- Tezel, Memduh. *Moskovadan Geliyorum*. Ankara: Berkalp Kitabevi, 1950.
- Tünay, Bekir. *Menderes Devri Anıları: Gördüklerim, Bildiklerim, Duyduklarım*. İstanbul: Nilüfer Matbaacılık Tesisleri, no date.
- Yazıcı, Tahsin. *Kore Birinci Türk Tugayında Hatıralarım*. İstanbul: Ülkü Basımevi, 1963.

II. Books

- Ahmad, Feroz. *İttihatçilikten Kemalizme*. Translated by Fatmagül Berktaş. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1985.
- _____. *The Making of Modern Turkey*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Akşin, Abdülhat. *Türkiye'nin 1945 den Sonraki Dış Politika Gelişmeleri, Ortadoğu Meseleleri*. İstanbul: B. Kervan Matbaası, 1959.
- Aldrich, Richard J., ed. *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War, 1945–1951*. London & New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Amikam, Nachmani. *Israel, Turkey and Greece: Uneasy Relations in the East Mediterranean*. London: Frank Cass, 1987.
- Armaoğlu, Fahir. *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi: 1914–1995*. Two Vols. İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi, no date.
- Athanasopoulou, Ekavi. *Turkey-Anglo-American Security Interests 1945–1952: The First Enlargement of NATO*. London: Frank Cass, 1999.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. *İkinci Adam, 1938–1950*. Two Vols. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1991.
- _____. *Menderes'in Dramı*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1969.
- Bağcı, Hüseyin. *Demokrat Parti Dönemi Dış Politikası*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1990.
- Bağış, Ali İhsan and William Hale, ed. *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations*. North Humberside: The Eothen Press, 1984.
- Baylis, John. *Anglo-American Defence Relations, 1939–1984*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Benett, G.H. *The British Foreign Policy During the Curzon Period, 1901–24*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

- Bilge, A. Suat. *Güç Komşuluk: Türkiye-Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri, 1920–1964*. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1992.
- Birand, Mehmet A and others. *Demirkırat: Bir Demokrasinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999.
- Birdwood, Lord. *Nuri As-Said: A Study in Arab Leadership*. London: Casell & Company, 1959.
- Brown, L. Carl, ed. *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and Outside Powers*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2001.
- Bull H, and Louis R. *The Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations since 1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Bullock, Alan. *Ernest Bevin: Foreign Secretary 1945–1951*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1983.
- Bozdağ, İsmet. *Menderes Menderes*. İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1997.
- Campbell, John C. *Defense of the Middle East: Problems of American Policy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.
- Cattan, Henry. *The Palestine Question*. USA: Croom Helm Limited, 1988.
- Cleveland, William L. *A History of the Modern Middle East*. Boulder, San Fransisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1994.
- Cohen, Michael J. *The Origins and Evolution of the Arab-Zionist Conflict*. California: University of California Press, 1987.
- _____. *Fighting World War Three from the Middle East: Allied Contingency Plans, 1945–1954*. London: Frank Cass, 1997.
- _____. *Palestine and the Great Powers*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Croft, Stuart. *The End of Superpower: British Foreign Office Conceptions of a Changing World, 1945–51*. England & USA: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1993.
- Dann, Uriel, ed. *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939*. London: Holmes & Meier, 1998.
- Deighton, Ann, ed. *Britain and the First Cold War*. London: Macmillan, 1990.
- Deringil, Selim. *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An 'Active' Neutrality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Devereux, David R. *The Formulation of British Defence Policy towards the Middle East, 1948–1956*. London: Macmillan Press, 1990.
- Dikerdem, Mahmut. *Üçüncü Dünyadan*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1977.
- Dockrill, Michael. *British Defence Since 1945*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Dodd, Clement H. *The Crisis of Turkish Democracy*. North Humberside:: The Eothen Press, 1983.

- Dodd, Clement H., ed. *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects*. London: The Eothen Press, 1992.
- Donovan, Robert J. *Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry Truman 1945–1948*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1977.
- _____. *Tumultuous Years: The Presidency of Harry S Truman 1949–1953*. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1982.
- Earle, Edward Mead. *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Baghdad Railway: A Study in Imperialism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.
- Erkin, Feridun Cemal. *Türk-Soviet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*. Ankara: Başnur Matbabası, 1968.
- Eroğlu, Hamza. *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*. İstanbul, 1982.
- Evans, F. Stephen. *The Slow Rapprochement: Britain and Turkey in the Age of Kemal Atatürk, 1919–1938*. Beverley: The Eothen Press, 1982.
- Fraser, T.G. *The Middle East, 1914–1979*. Southampton: The Camelot Press Ltd., 1980.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- _____. *We Know Now: Rethinking Cold War History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Gaury, Gerald De. *Three Kings In Baghdad: 1921–1958*. London: Hutchinson Limited, 1961.
- Gilbert, Martin. *Winston S. Churchill: Road to Victory 1941–1945*. London: Heinemann, 1986.
- Gönlübol, Mehmet, Haluk Ulman and others. *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası 1919–1990*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1993.
- Gürün, Kamuran. *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri: 1920–1953*. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1991.
- Hahn, Peter L. *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945–1956: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Hale, William. *The Political and Economic Development of Modern Turkey*. London: Croom Helm, 1981.
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. London and New York: Oxford University press, 1995.
- Harris, George S. *Troubled Alliance: Turkish-American Problems in Historical Perspective, 1945–1971*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1972.
- Hassouna, Hussein A. *The League of Arab States and Regional Disputes: A Study of Middle East Conflicts*. New York: Oceana Publications, 1975.

- Heikal, Mohamed. *The Sphinx and the Commissar: The Rise and Fall of Soviet Influence in the Middle East*. London, 1978.
- Heller, Joseph. *British Policy towards the Ottoman Empire, 1908–1914*. London: Frank Cass, 1983.
- Hopkins, Richard R. Aldrich and Michael F., ed. *Intelligence, Defence and Diplomacy*. Great Britain: Frank Cass, 1994.
- James, Robert Rhodes. *Gallipoli*. London: Pimlico, 1999.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *The United States and NATO: The Formative Years*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1984.
- Karpat, Kemal and Contributors, ed. *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950–1974*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- Kedourie, Elie. *The Chatham House Version and other Middle Eastern Studies*. USA: University Press of New England, 1984.
- _____. *England and the Middle East: The Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914–1921*. USA: Westview Press, 1987.
- Kennan, George F. *Memoirs*. London: Hutchinson, 1968.
- Kent, John. *British Imperial Strategy and the Origins of the Cold War 1944–1949*. Leicester, London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1993.
- Khadduri, Majid. *Independent Iraq*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Kirk, George. *The Middle East in the War*. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Koçak, Cemil. *Türkiye’de Milli Şef Dönemi 1938–1945*. II Vols. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1986.
- Kuniholm, Bruce R. *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East: Great Power Conflict and Diplomacy in Iran, Turkey and Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer E. *Türkiye’nin Arap Ortadoğusuna Karşı Politikası, 1945–1970*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1972.
- Kurşun, Zekeriya. *Yol Ayrımında Türk-Arap İlişkileri*. Istanbul: İrfan Yayıncılık, 1992.
- Leffler, Melvyn. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Specter of Communism: the United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917–1953*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1994.
- Lenczowski, George. *The Middle East in World Affairs*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Lesch, David W., ed. *The Middle East and the United States: A Historical and Political Reassessment*. USA: Westview Press, 1999.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

- Lewis, Geoffrey. *Modern Turkey*. London: Benn Limited, 1974.
- Longrigg, S.H. *Iraq 1900 to 1950: A Political, Social and Economic History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Louis, Wm. Roger and Robert A. Fernea, ed. *The Iraqi Revolution of 1958: The Old Social Classes Revisited*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 1991.
- Louis, Wm. Roger. *The British Empire in the Middle East, 1945–1951: Arab Nationalism, The United States, and Postwar Imperialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Lucas, Scott. *Freedom's War: The US Crusade against the Soviet Union 1945–56*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Divided We Stand: Britain, the US and the Suez Crisis*. London, Sydney, Aucland and Toronto, 1991.
- Luke, Sir Harry. *The Old Turkey and the New: From Byzantium to Ankara*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1955.
- Marr, Phebe. *The Modern History of Iraq*. London, 1985.
- Macfie, A.L. *The Eastern Question, 1774–1923*. Harlow: Longman, 1996.
- _____. *The Straits Question, 1908–1936*. Thessaloniki: Inst. for Balkan Studies, 1993.
- McGhee, George. *The US-Turkish-NATO Middle East Connection: How Truman Doctrine and Turkey's NATO Entry Contained the Soviets*. London: Macmillan Press Limited, 1990.
- Meram, Ali Kemal. *Belgelerle, Türk İngiliz İlişkileri Tarihi*. İstanbul: Kıtış Yayınları, 1969.
- Meray, Seha L. *Lozan Barış Konferansı: Tutanaklar, Belgeler*. İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993.
- Monroe, Elizabeth. *Britain's Moment in the Middle East 1914–1971*. London: Charlotte & Windus, 1981.
- Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–1999*. London: John Murray Publishers Limited, 2000.
- Niblock, Tim, ed. *Iraq: The Contemporary State*. London: Croom Helm Limited, 1982.
- Northedge, F.S. *Descent from Power: British Foreign Policy, 1945–1973*. London: George & Unwin Ltd., 1974.
- Ovendale, Ritchie. *The Foreign Policy of the British Labour Governments, 1945–1951*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984.
- Öke, Mim Kemal. *Musul Meselesi Kronolijisi (1918–1926)*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayınları, 1987.
- Öztürk, Kazım. *Cumhurbaşkanlarının Türkiye Büyük Meclisini Açış Nutukları*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1969.
- _____. *T.C. Hükümetleri ve Programları*. İstanbul: Ak Yayınları, 1968.

- Paterson, Thomas G. *On Every Front: the Making of the Cold War*. New York: Norton, 1979.
- Penrose, Edith and E.F. *Iraq: International Relations and National Development*. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1978.
- Podeh, Elie. *The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World: The Struggle over the Baghdad Pact*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Ramazani, Rouhollah K. *The Northern Tier: Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1966.
- Reynolds, David. *Britannia Overruled: British Policy and World power in the Twentieth Century*. London: Longman, 1991.
- Robins, Philip. *Turkey and the Middle East*. London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1991.
- Rubin, Barry. *The Arab States and the Palestine Conflict*. USA: Syracuse University Press, 1981.
- Rubinstein, Alvin Z. *Soviet Policy towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan: The Dynamics of Influence*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.
- Rustow, Dankwarth A. *Turkey: America's Forgotten Ally*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1987.
- Ryan, David, ed. *The United States and Decolonisation: Power and Freedom*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Saray, Mehmet. *Sovyet Tehdidi Karşısında Türkiye'nin Nato'ya Girişi: III. Cumhurbaşkanı Celal Bayar'ın Hatıraları ve Belgeler*. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 2000.
- Seal, Patrick. *The Struggle for Syria: A Study of Postwar Arab Politics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Sever, Ayşegül. *Soğuk Savaş Kuşatmasında Türkiye, Batı ve Ortadoğu 1945–1958*. İstanbul: Boyut Yayınları, 1997.
- Silverfab, Daniel. *The Twilight of British Ascendancy in the Middle East: A Case Study of Iraq, 1941–1951*. London: Macmillan Press, 1994.
- Stivers, William. *Supremacy and Oil: Iraq, Turkey and the Anglo-American World Order, 1918–1930*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Sonyel, Ramazan Salahi. *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika*, Vol.II. Ankara: TTK, 1987.
- Tamkoç, Metin. *The Warrior Diplomats*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1976.
- Taşhan, Seyfi and Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu, ed. *Middle East, Turkey and the Atlantic Alliance*. Ankara: Foreign Policy Institute, 1987.
- Tibi, Bessam. *Arap Milliyetçiliği*. Translated by Taşkın Temiz. İstanbul: Yöneliş Yayınları, 1998.

- Tripp, Charles. *A History of Iraq*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Uçarol, Rıfat. *Siyasi Tarih*. İstanbul: Filiz Kitabevi, 1985.
- Vali, A. Ferenc. *Bridge Across the Bosphorus: the Foreign Policy of Turkey*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Watt, D. Cameron. *Succeeding John Bull: America in Britain's Place 1900–1975*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Weisband, Edward. *Turkish Foreign Policy (1943–45): Small State Diplomacy and Great Power Politics*. USA: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Westad, Odd Arne, ed. *Reviewing the Cold War: Approaches, Interpretations, Theory*. London: Frank Cass, 2000.
- Williams, Ann. *Britain and France in the Middle East and North Africa, 1914–1967*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968.
- Williams, William A. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: Dell, 1962.
- Woodhouse, C. M. *British Foreign Policy Since the Second World War*. London: Hutchinson, 1961.
- Yapp, Malcolm E. *The Near East Since the First World War*. London: Longman, 1991.
- Young, John, ed. *The Foreign Policy of Churchill's Peacetime Administration*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984.
- Zametica, John. *British Officials and British Foreign Policy, 1945–1950*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990.
- Zhivkova, Lyudmila. *Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1933–1939*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1976.
- Zurcher, Eric J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1993.

III. Articles

- Açıkalın, Cevat. "Turkey's international Relations" *International Affairs*, 23, no. 4 (1947).
- Adamthwaite, Anthony. "Britain and the World" *International Affairs*, 61 (1985).
- _____. "Introduction: The Foreign Office and Policy-making" in *The Foreign Policy of Churchill's Peacetime Administration*, edited by John Young. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1988.
- Akşın, Abdülahat. "Orta-Doğu Birliği Türkler ve Araplar" *Ortadoğu*, 2, no. 22 (1964).
- _____. "Türkler ve Araplar" *Ortadoğu*, 4, no. 34 (1965).
- Armaoğlu, Fahir. "Ortadoğu Komutanlığından Bağdad Paktına" *Belleten*, 59, no. 227 (1995).

- Ashton, Nigel J. "The Hijacking of a Pact: the Formulation of the Baghdad Pact and Anglo-American Tensions in the Middle East 1955–1958." *Review of International Studies*, 19, no. 2 (1993).
- Aykan, Mahmut Bali. "The Palestinian Question in Turkish Foreign Policy from the 1950s to the 1990s" *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 25 (1993).
- Balfour-Paul, H.G. "Iraq: The Fertile Crescent Dimension" in *Iraq: The Contemporary State*, edited by Tim Niblock. London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1982.
- Bilgin, Mustafa Sıtkı. "Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu Politikası (1923–1938)" in *Irak Dosyası* edited by A. Ahmetbeyoğlu ve diğerleri. İstanbul: TATAV, 2003.
- _____. "The Construction of the Baghdad Railway and Its Impact on Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1902–1913." *OTAM*, no.16 (2004).
- _____. "The Issue of Turkey's Participation in the Second World War and Its Impact on Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1943–1945" in *XIVth Turkish Congress of History*, Vol.III, Ankara (2005).
- _____. "Lozan Konferansında Ermeni Meselesi: İtilaf Devletlerinin Diplomatik Manevraları ve Türkiye'nin Karşı Siyaseti." *Belleten*, LXIX, no.254 (2005).
- _____. "Atatürk Döneminde Türkiye'nin Balkan Politikası (1923–1930)" *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, XX, no. 60 (2004).
- Bustani, Emile. "The Arab World and Britain" *International Affairs*, 35, no. 4 (1959).
- Çakmak, Cem. "1950'li Seçimler ve Demokrat Parti" *Tarih ve Toplum* 9, no. 53 (1988).
- Deighton, Ann. "Britain and the Failure of Collective Defence in the Middle East" in *Britain and the First Cold War*, edited by *idem*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.
- Deverux, David R. "The Middle East and Africa in British Global Strategy" in *Intelligence, Defence and Diplomacy*, edited by Richard J. Aldrich and Michael F. Hopkins. London: Frank Cass, 1994.
- Eppel, Michael. "Iraqi Politics and Regional Policies" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 28, no. 1 (1992).
- Fetter, Henry D. "Cold War History." *The Times Literary Supplement*, 23 March 2001.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. "The Emerging Post-revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War" *Diplomatic History*, 7 (1983).
- _____. "Was the Truman Doctrine A Real Turning Point?" *Foreign Affairs*, 52, no. 1 (1974).

Gasiorowski, Mark. "US Foreign Policy towards Iran During the Mussadiq Era" in *The Middle East and the United States: A Historical and Political Reassessment*, edited by David W. Lesch. USA: Westview Press, 1999.

Gilead, Baruch. "Turkish-Egyptian Relations, 1952–1957" *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 10, no. 11 (1959).

Gruen, George E. "Evolution of Turkish Foreign Policy" *Orbis*, 24, no. 2 (1980).

Gürkan, Ihsan. "Turkish-Iraqi Relations: The Cold War and Its Aftermath" in *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, edited by İsmail Soysal. Istanbul: Isis Ltd., 1996.

Hanna, Paul L. "The Anglo-Egyptian Negotiations, 1950–52." *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 3, no. 1 (1952).

Harris, George. "Turkey's Foreign Policy: Independent or Reactive" in *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and Outside Powers*, edited by L. Carl Brown. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Hirschfeld, Yair P. "The Northern Tier in European Politics during the 1920s and 1930s: Prelude to Cold War" in *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939*, edited by Uriel Dann. New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988.

Hourani, Albert. "The Decline of the West in the Middle East II" *International Affairs*, 29, no. 2 (1953).

Hyman, Anthony. "Turkestan and pan-Turkism revisited" *Central Asian Survey*, 16, no. 3 (1997).

İnalcık, Halil. "Recession of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of the Saudi State" in *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, edited by İsmail Soysal. İstanbul: İsis Ltd., 1988.

Jalal, Ayesha. "Towards the Baghdad Pact: South Asia and Middle East Defence in the Cold War, 1947–1955" *The International History Review*, 11, no. 3 (1989).

Jamali, Mohammad Fadhel. "Iraq Under General Nuri" *Middle East Forum*, 40, no. 7, (1964).

Karasapan, Celal Tevfik. "Güney Komşumuz Suriye" *Ortadoğu*, 2, no. 15 (1963).

_____. "Komşumuz Iraq" *Ortadoğu*, 1, no. 1 (1961).

Karpat, Kemal H. "Turkish and Arab-Israeli Relations" in *Turkey's Foreign Policy in Transition, 1950–1974*, edited by *idem*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Kedourie, Elie. "Great Britain, the Other Powers and the Middle East before and after World War I" in *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939*, edited by Uriel Dann. London: Holmes & Meier, 1998.

- Leffler, Melvyn P. "Strategy, Diplomacy and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO 1945–1952" *The Journal of American History*, 71, no. 4 (1985).
- Lippe, John M. Vander. "The Forgotten Brigade of the Forgotten War: Turkey's Participation in the Korean War" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 36, no. 1, (2000).
- Louis, Wm. Roger. "Britain and the Middle East After 1945" in *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and Outside Powers*, edited by L. Carl Brown. London & New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2001.
- Lucas, Scott. "The Limits of Ideology: US Foreign Policy and Arab Nationalism in the Early Cold War" in *The United States and Decolonisation*, edited by David Ryan. London, 2000.
- Lucas, Scott and Ray Takeyh. "Alliance and Balance: the Anglo-American Relationship and Egyptian Nationalism, 1950–1957" *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 7, no. 3, (1996).
- Macfie, A. L. "The Turkish Straits in the Second World War, 1939–45" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 25, no. 2 (1989).
- Monroe, Elizabeth. "Mr Bevin's Arab Policy" in *St Anthony's Papers*, edited by Albert Hourani. London: Chatto & Windus, 1961.
- Okyar, Osman. "Turco-British Relations in the Inter-war Period: Fethi Okyar's Mission to London" in *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations*, edited by William Hale and A. İhsan Bağış. North Humberside: The Eothen Press, 1984.
- Ovendale, Ritchie. "Britain and the End of the Palestine Mandate, 1945–1948" in *Intelligence Defence and Diplomacy: British Policy in the Post-war World*, edited by Richard J. Aldrich and Michael F. Hopkins. London: Frank Cass, 1994.
- Polk, William R. "A Decade of Discovery: America in the Middle East, 1947–1958" in *St Anthony Papers*, edited by Albert Hourani. London: Chatto & Windus, 1961.
- Raleigh, J.S. "Middle East Politics: The Past Ten Years" *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 10, no. 1 (1959).
- Reid, Brian Holden. "The Northern Tier and the Baghdad Pact" in *The Foreign Policy of Churchill's Peacetime Administration*, edited by John W. Young. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1988.
- Sanjian, Ara. "The Formulation of the Baghdad Pact" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 33, no. 2 (1997).

Sanjian, Avedis K. "The Sanjak of Alexandretta (Hatay): Its Impact on Turco-Syrian Relations, 1939–1956" *The Middle East Journal*, 10, no. 3 (1956).

Sever, Ayşegül. "The Complaint Ally?: Turkey and the West in the Middle East 1954–58" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34, no. 2 (1998).

Shmuelewitz, Aryeh. "Atatürk's Policy toward the Great Powers: Principles and Guidelines" in *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939*, edited by Uriel Dann. New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988.

Soysal, Ismail. "1937 Sadabad Pact" in *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, edited by *idem*. Istanbul: Isis Ltd., 1988.

_____. "Seventy Years of Turkish-Arab Relations and an analysis of Turkish-Iraqi Relations" in *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations*, edited by *idem*. Istanbul: Isis Ltd., 1991.

_____. "Turkish-Syrian Relations (1946–1999)" in *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, edited by *idem*. Istanbul: Isis Ltd., 1998.

Watt, D. Cameron. "The Saadabat Pact of July 8 1937" in *The Great Powers in the Middle East 1919–1939*, edited by Uriel Dann. New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988.

Young, John and John Kent. "The Western Union' Concept and British Defence Policy, 1947–1948" in *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War, 1945–51*, edited by Richard J. Aldrich. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Zametica, John and Richard J. Aldrich. "The Rise and Decline of a Strategic Concept: the Middle East, 1945–1951" in *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War, 1945–1951*, edited by Richard J. Aldrich. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

IV. Periodicals

Bellefen

Central Asian Survey

Diplomatic History

Diplomacy & Statecraft

Foreign Affairs

International Affairs

International Journal of Middle East Studies

Middle Eastern Affairs

Middle East Forum

Middle East Studies

Orbis

Ortadoğru (Middle East)

Review of International Affairs
Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations
Tarih ve Toplum (History and Society)
Turkish Review of Middle East Studies
The Journal of American History
The Middle East Journal

V. Newspapers

Published in Turkish

Cumhuriyet
Son Posta
Ulus
Vatan
Vakit
Yeni Sabah
Zafer

Published in English

The Manchester Guardian
The Daily Mail
The Daily Telegraph
The Economist
The New York Times
The Observer
The Times

INDEX

- Abdul Fattah Yehia Pasha:
(Egyptian Foreign
Minister) 100
- Abdulillah, Prince (Regent of
Iraq): 79, 81, 205
- Abdullah (King of Jordan):
21, 80, 96–98, 104, 129,
175, 178
- Azzam Pasha (Secretary of
Arab League): 124, 134,
136, 175–177
- Abdülhamit II (the Ottoman
Sultan): 13, 15–17, 19
- Acheson, Dean (US Secretary
of State): 69, 135, 146,
147–148, 162–163, 167–
169, 189–190, 192, 196–
197
- Açıkalin, Cevat: 46, 54, 83,
92, 101, 124, 136, 149,
157, 160, 177, 192, 194,
208, 219–220
- Adana Conference (the
Second): 38, 43, 44, 46, 49
- Afghanistan: 28–30, 82, 152
- Alanbrooke, Lord: 102
- Alexander, A.V. (British
Defence Minister): 67, 69,
102
- Ali Maher (Egyptian
Premier): 100, 183
- Anglo-American relations: 8–
9, 65, 71–73, 108, 113,
116, 128, 131–132, 146,
153–154, 156, 159–160,
178, 188–189, 192, 196–
198, 202, 225, 229, 230,
238–239,
- Anglo-Egyptian relations: 7,
100, 102, 101–103, 104,
105, 107–108, 139, 150,
161–162, 165, 167, 175
- Anglo-Iraqi relations: 28, 59,
81, 78, 129, 164
- Anglo-Ottoman relations: 12,
14, 15, 19–22
- Anglo-Turkish Alliance: 9,
17, 38, 46–51, 62, 66, 72–
73, 82, 125, 130, 137, 147,
153, 231, 233, 235
- Arab League: 76, 80–84, 86,
88, 89, 98, 111, 114, 120,

- 124, 169, 170, 175, 210, 215
- Arab Nationalism: 19, 75–77, 79, 91, 129, 164, 231–232, 235, 239, 242
- Arab-Israeli relations: 120–122, 133, 137, 164, 236, 239
- Aras, T. Rüştü (Turkish Foreign Minister): 35, 62, 99–100
- Arnold, General: 188
- Atatürk, M. Kemal, (President of Turkey): 3, 8, 25, 28, 30–31, 32, 35, 39–40, 99, 105, 141, 173, 213, 234
- Atlantic Council: 148, 160, 163, 165, 172
- Atlantic Pact: 127, 131–133, 137, 141, 144–145, 147, 149, 157–158, 162, 165, 172, 236–238, 241. *See also* NATO.
- Attlee, Clement: (British Prime Minister) 2, 57, 64, 76, 77, 102, 229
- Baghdad Pact: 6, 40, 180, 205, 213, 223, 225, 243
- Balfour, Arthur (British Foreign Minister): 109
- Balfour Declaration: 109–110
- Balkan Pact: 27, 34, 207, 216
- Balkan Wars: 17, 19
- Barett, General: 22
- Batı, Nebil: 88
- Bayar, Celal (Turkish President): 3, 71, 140, 146, 152, 154–155, 173, 186, 195–196, 217
- Bernadotte, Count Folke: 119, 121
- Bevin, Ernest (British Foreign Secretary): 7, 59–60, 62–65, 69, 77, 97, 102, 104, 113, 119, 123–124, 126–129, 131, 132–133, 147, 149, 151, 157, 161
- Biltmore Programme: 111
- Birgi, M. Nuri: 187, 199, 213–214, 215
- Bradley, General Omar: 168, 171
- Bulgaria: 17, 35, 37, 49, 62, 63, 66, 87, 103, 227, 242
- Byrnes, James (US Secretary of State): 63, 67, 69
- Cabinet Palestine Committee: 113–114, 116
- Cain, Senator Harry: 145
- Cairo Conference (the second): 45, 47–48
- Campbell, Ronald: 101–102
- Carney, Admiral: 156, 159, 172, 179, 182
- Conciliation Commission: 121–124, 137, 152, 174, 236
- Cemal Pasha: 19–21
- Charles, Sir Noel 135, 143, 145–146, 149, 156, 157, 160, 172, 176, 179
- Churchill, Winston (British Prime Minister): 2, 38, 43, 45–48, 50, 52–53, 57, 59, 64, 78, 87, 113, 169, 182, 185, 202, 222, 228, 232

- Clark-Kerr, Sir Archibald: 57
- Cold War, the: 1–2, 4, 6, 36, 40, 42, 56, 65, 74, 75, 107, 110, 126, 132, 226–232, 236–237, 243
- Conservative Party (British): 2, 13, 76, 229, 241
- Containment policy: 68, 70, 230
- Crimean War (of 1853–56): 12, 39
- Crocker, General: 135
- Committee of Union and Progress (CUP): 16–19
- Curzon, Lord (British Foreign Secretary): 23
- Cyprus: 13–14, 16, 37, 39, 125, 168, 182, 184, 193–194, 203
- Dardanelles: 18, 22, 37, 43–45, 64, 135.
- Dayan, General Moshe: 174
- Defence White Paper: 203
- Democrat Party (of Turkey): 3–4, 9, 71, 126, 136, 140, 142–144, 174–175, 238
- Dixon, Sir Pierson: 147, 160
- Dulles, J. Foster (US Secretary of State): 180, 196, 202–205, 216–219, 222
- Eden, Sir Anthony (British Foreign Secretary): 7, 37–38, 45, 47–48, 52–54, 57, 90–91, 169, 186, 188–189, 191, 194–198, 205, 223
- Edward VIII, King: 31
- Egypt: 1, 12–14, 16, 20–21, 39, 76–77, 79–80, 96, 98–108, 123–125, 129–139, 151, 153, 155, 161–162, 164–170, 175–185, 187–188, 190–191, 193–194, 196–200, 202–211, 214, 217–218, 225, 234–235, 239, 241–242
- Eisenhower, General Dwight (US President): 158, 163, 167, 171, 185, 202–205, 243
- Elizabeth II, Queen: 222
- Emerald Green Conference: 215, 220
- Enver Pasha: 17–19, 22
- Erkin, F. Cemal: 60, 70–71, 95, 97–98, 101, 103, 135, 148–149, 156
- Fahrettin Pasha: 21
- Faris el Khoury: 130
- Farouk (King of Egypt): 99–100, 103, 183
- Feisal (King of Iraq): 21, 25, 28, 96
- Fertile Crescent: 80, 95, 98
- Fevzi Pasha: 25
- First World War: 8, 16, 19, 79, 109, 206. *See also* Great War.
- France: 12–15, 19, 28, 30, 32–35, 37, 39–42, 75–76, 78, 89–92, 112, 121–123, 138, 142, 145–146, 157, 163, 165, 167–168, 170–172, 182, 185, 189, 201, 221
- Franks, Sir Oliver: 157–158

- Fuad (King of Egypt): 99
 Fulbright, Senator: 143
- General Assembly (UN):
 117–119, 121–122, 201
- George VI, King: 186
- Germany: 13–15, 18, 22, 27,
 30, 32–38, 40, 42–43, 46,
 49–53, 57, 91
- Gladstone, William (British
 Prime Minister): 13, 23
- Global Strategy Paper: 203
- Goltz, General von der: 18
- Great War, the: 11–26, 39,
 96, 110. *See also* First
 World War.
- Greater Syria: 80, 97–99. *See*
 also Syria.
- Greece: 17, 22, 27, 32, 35–37,
 39, 62–63, 67–70, 73, 87,
 103, 107–108, 120, 125,
 127, 146–148, 150, 157–
 159, 161–163, 171–172,
 182, 207, 227–228, 230–
 231, 233
- Grey, Sir Edward (British
 Foreign Minister): 16–17
- Grigg, Sir Edward: 112
- Halifax, Lord (British Foreign
 Secretary): 34–35, 59
- Harding, Sir John: 221
- Hashemite Bloc: 76, 80, 98,
 104–105, 134, 164, 179,
 231, 234–235
- Hatay (Question of
 Alexandretta): 84–85, 87,
 89, 90–96, 99, 104, 118,
 130, 134, 213, 234
- Helm, Sir Knox: 83, 95, 172,
 186–193, 195, 197, 199,
 208, 213–215, 219
- Hinnavi, Colonel Sami: 135
- Hood, Lord: 214
- Hugessen, Sir Hughe
 Knatchbull: 49–50
- Hussein, Seherif (of Mecca):
 20, 25, 96, 109
- Ibn Saud (King of Saudi
 Arabia): 28–29, 94
- Inverchapel, Lord: 69, 119
- Iran: 28–30, 61–63, 68, 87,
 108, 150, 152, 157, 164,
 199, 203, 204, 209, 211–
 212, 220, 223
- Iraq: 6, 9, 19, 25–26, 28–30,
 40, 47, 59, 76, 79–89, 95,
 96, 98, 101, 104–105, 114–
 115, 118, 120, 129, 130,
 133–134, 136, 137, 138–
 139, 151, 152, 179, 181,
 184, 195–196, 205–223
- Israel: 119–120, 123, 131–
 135, 151–152, 174, 177,
 184, 204–206, 208
- Italy: 17, 26–27, 29–35, 37,
 57, 128, 209
- İlkin, Nedim Veysel (first
 Turkish Ambassador to
 Baghdad): 214
- Inner ring (strategy): 108, 181
- İnönü, İsmet (President of
 Turkey): 8, 9, 30, 38, 40–
 41, 45–46, 71, 73–74, 78,
 81, 88, 96, 98, 103, 104,
 122, 128, 228
- İsmet Pasha: *See* İnönü,
 İsmet.

- Japan: 38, 42, 53, 57, 60, 66
 Jemali, Fadhel (Iraqi Foreign Minister): 206, 208
 Jordan: 79, 80, 96, 97–98, 105, 108, 121–122, 121, 123, 124, 129, 130, 137, 175, 178–179, 181, 208, 234, 235

 Kelly, Sir David (British Ambassador to Ankara): 71–72, 88, 97, 102–103, 115, 119, 123–124, 127, 130
 Kemal Pasha: *See* Atatürk.
 Kennan, George: 68, 139
 Korean War: 9, 139, 145, 148, 150, 164, 178, 238–241
 Köprülü, Fuat (Turkish Foreign Minister): 3–4, 140, 141, 142–143, 145–146, 149–151, 153, 157, 159–160, 165–166, 170, 172, 174, 175, 185, 190–192, 193, 194, 196, 199–200, 207, 208–209, 212, 214–215
 Kuwait: 14, 19

 Labour Party (British): 2–3, 57, 59, 64, 76, 102, 113, 128, 132, 229, 235, 241
 Law, A. Bonar (British Prime Minister): 23
 Lawrence, T.E.: 21
 League of Nations: 27–28, 31, 60, 80, 90, 110
 Lebanon: 76, 79–80, 86, 89–91, 94–95, 98, 108, 120, 134, 151, 206, 235

 Liberal Party (British): 13
 Lloyd George (British Prime Minister): 23
 London Conference: 24, 59, 135, 188
 London Talks (of 1953): 194–196, 198, 201, 205, 217
 Loraine, Sir Percy: 31

 Maghreb Question: 201
 Marshall, George (US Secretary of State): 125, 127–128, 162
 Marshall Aid: 70, 125, 146
 McGhee, George (US Ambassador to Ankara): 135, 186, 191
 McGregor, Admiral: 187
 McMahan, Sir Henry: 109
 MEC (Middle East Command): 158, 156, 159, 159, 161–163, 166–167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172–175, 177, 178–179, 180
 Mediterranean Pact: 127, 135, 144–147, 237
 MEDO (Middle East Defence Organisation): 180–184, 188–189, 190–195, 196–197, 198–199, 200–201, 203–204, 207
 Menderes, Adnan (Turkish Premier): 3–4, 142, 150, 155–156, 170–171, 180, 194–198, 205–214, 216–217, 219, 222–225
 Menemencioğlu, Numan (Turkish Foreign Minister): 38, 49–50

- Mesopotamia: 14–15, 19–22, 25–26, 39, 96
 Missouri: 63, 229
 Molotov, Vyacheslav (Soviet Foreign Minister): 33, 44–47, 52–57, 61
 Montgomery, Field Marshal: 187, 190, 224
 Montreux Convention: 31, 47, 52–55, 60, 64–66, 135
 Morrison, Herbert (British Foreign Minister): 157, 159–163, 165, 167–168, 175
 Moscow Conference: 48, 52, 62
 Mosul: 14, 24–26, 28, 31, 39, 220, 251
 Mountbatten, Admiral: 223
 Mudros Treaty: 21–22, 25–26, 250
 Mussolini, Benito: 27

 Nahas Pasha (Egyptian Premier): 80, 99–100
 National Pact (Turkish): 23–24, 26, 89–90
 NATO: 140, 145–147, 149–150, 153–154, 157–161, 159, 163–169, 171–172, 173. *See also* Atlantic Pact.
 Negev: 124, 132, 276
 Neguib (General, President of Egypt): 198–199, 202, 219
 Northern Tier (Strategy): 1, 6, 9, 180, 202–205, 218–221, 225, 227, 231, 243, 295

 Nuri Pasha Es-Said (Iraqi Premier): 78, 79, 81–85, 89, 95, 98, 101, 208, 223

 Ottoman Empire: 12–22, 25–26, 39, 89, 99, 109, 111
 Outer ring (strategy): 108, 204, 230

 Paget, General Bernard: 108
 Pakistan: 203–205, 209, 216–219, 223, 295
 Palestine Question: 20, 22, 26, 76, 79, 80, 85, 88, 96, 106, 109–124, 128–132, 134–135, 137–138, 174, 200, 208, 210
 Pentagon talks (of 1947): 108
 Peterson, Sir Maurice (British Ambassador to Ankara): 52, 56–57, 83, 85, 91–92, 95, 101, 118
 political Caliphate: 130–131
 Portsmouth Treaty: 129
 Potsdam Conference: 56

 Quwatli, Shukri al (Syrian President): 80, 118

 Republican People's Party (RPP of Turkey): 2–4, 6, 24, 136, 140–144, 151, 210, 237, 278–279
 Riyad el Solh (Lebanese Premier): 130
 Robertson, General: 154–156
 Romania: 27, 32, 35–36, 103, 254
 Rommel, General: 37, 75

- Roosevelt, Franklin (US President): 38, 45–46, 73, 228
- Rumbold, Sir Anthony: 146
- Russia: 12, 13, 15, 17, 22. *See also* Soviet Union.
- SACEUR (Supreme Allied Commander Europe): 158, 171, 182
- SACME (Supreme Allied Commander Middle East): 159–160, 163, 166–167, 171–172, 184, 285
- Sadabad Pact: 27, 40, 28, 29–30, 78–76, 79, 81–82, 83, 85, 87, 99, 105, 141, 152, 179, 196, 213, 234, 242, 243
- Sadak, Necmettin (Turkish Foreign Minister): 117, 120–124, 127–128, 130–131, 185, 210
- Saka, Hasan (Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Turkey): 53–54, 57, 94, 96, 101–102, 260
- Salahu'd-din Pasha (Egyptian Foreign Minister): 161
- Salisbury, Lord: 205, 293
- Saraçoğlu, Şükrü (Foreign and Prime Minister of Turkey): 33, 37, 50–52, 55, 58, 78–79, 228
- Sargent, Sir Orme: 63
- Sarper, Selim: 52–56, 175
- Saudi Arabia: 29, 76, 79–80, 86, 98, 176, 208, 231
- Second World War: 1, 12, 30, 34, 36–37, 40–42, 66, 70, 75–76, 78, 91, 100, 111, 144, 164, 178, 232
- Security Council (UN): 63, 65, 68, 119–120, 139, 151, 176–177
- SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe): 159–160, 163, 166–167, 169, 171–172, 188, 286
- Shawkat, Naji: 78, 120
- Shishakli, Colonel Adib: 200
- Shuckburgh, C.A.E.: 146
- Sidky Pasha (Egyptian Premier): 101–104
- Slim, Field Marshal: 165, 168–169
- Soviet Union: 2–3, 8–9, 30–34, 36, 40, 41, 42–43, 44–45, 46, 47–52, 53, 55, 56–57, 59, 60, 61–62, 65–66, 67–69, 76–77, 81, 83–87, 98, 92, 94–95, 100, 103, 104–105, 108, 114–115, 117–119, 122, 126, 135, 140, 144, 147, 152, 154–155, 170, 173, 175, 181, 199–200, 205, 207, 222
- Stalin, Joseph: 33, 45, 47, 50, 52, 56–58, 62, 68, 173, 256, 258
- Stonehewer Bird, Sir H.: 85, 88
- Straits Question: *See* Dardanelles.
- Strang, Sir William: 144, 147, 160
- Sudan Question: 77, 99, 101, 104, 107, 129, 161, 167–168, 202, 219

- Suez Question: 44, 64, 100, 125, 129, 139–140, 161, 164–165, 167–168, 170, 175–179, 181, 183, 190, 198, 200, 202–203, 216, 235, 241
- Suleiman, Hikmat: (Iraqi Premier)
- Suwaidi, Taufik (Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Iraq): 87–88, 114–115, 209–212
- Syria: 19–20, 25, 62–63, 76, 79–80, 84–90, 91–99, 103–105, 118, 120, 130, 134–135, 138, 153, 176, 179, 200, 203–206, 208, 213, 219, 221, 227, 230, 233–235, 248. *See also* Greater Syria.
- Tallal, Prince (of Transjordan): 121
- Tehran Conference: 45, 255
- Turkish General Staff: 49, 63, 118
- Townshend, General: 22
- Treaty: of Ankara (1926) 70; of Berlin (1878) 12, 16; of Brussels, 126; of Lausanne (1923) 81; of Paris (1856) 12; of Sévres (1920) 22
- Triangular Strategy: 1, 6, 9, 152, 180–181, 205–223, 225, 243
- Tripartite meeting (of 1950): 136, 139
- Triple Alliance (of 1939): 30, 33–34, 36–37, 40, 178–179, 225
- Troutbeck, John M.: 212
- Truman, Harry (US President): 57, 65, 70–71, 112, 164, 185
- Truman Doctrine: 8, 43, 66, 68, 70, 73–74, 124, 142, 146, 230, 231
- Tugay, F. Hulusi: 198–199
- Turco-American relations: 125, 143, 163, 183, 218–219, 222, 231, 239
- Turco-Arab relations: 18, 25, 101, 104, 114, 131, 135–136, 149–152, 173–179, 208, 213, 294
- Turco-Iraqi Treaty (of 1946): 86, 115, 118, 242
- Turco-Russian Treaty (of 1925): 53, 61
- Turco-Soviet relations: 32–34, 46, 52, 54, 56, 62
- Turkey's: defence 46, 140, 163, 169, 171, 183, 185–186, 224, 238–240; foreign policy 3–4, 7, 9, 26, 30, 40, 125, 143, 172, 178, 238
- Turkish Grand National Assembly: 24
- Turkish-German Treaty (of 1941): 46–47
- Umar, Ahmet: 207–210, 212
- United Nations (UN): 38, 53, 57, 68, 107, 116–122, 136–137, 145, 151, 211
- United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNCCOP): 117

- USA: 2, 15, 42, 44, 45, 48, 58, 59, 59–61, 62, 65, 67–69, 70–73, 76, 108, 111–112, 113, 116–117, 121–122, 125–128, 127, 131–133, 137, 138, 139, 140–143, 145, 147, 155–158, 160–161, 164–167, 171–172, 178, 189, 193, 196, 203–204, 221, 225
- Vahid ed-din (the last Ottoman Sultan): 22
- Wadsworth, George: 145–146, 150, 153
- Wafd Party: 99, 183, 187
- Washington discussions (of January 1952): 185
- White Paper (of June 1922 and May 1939): 110–116
- Wilson, Edwin: 63, 72, 126, 229
- Wright, Michael: 147
- Wyman, General: 214, 220–221
- Yalçın, Hüseyin Cahit: 62, 93, 122, 124
- Yalta Conference: 41, 51–57, 59, 62, 64, 228–229, 232
- Yamut, General Nuri: 155
- Young Turks: 16, 18–19, 22, 248
- Yugoslavia: 27, 37, 177, 207, 209, 272
- Zaim, Colonel Husni al: 134–135, 277
- Zionist activities: 109, 111–114, 118