



Türkiye's Evolving Role in the New Era of the International Relations

Kemal Gökçay¹ and Jelang Ramadhan²

¹ Atatürk University, Yakutiye 25030, Türkiye

² Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta 10430, Indonesia
kgokcay@hotmail.com

Abstract. Türkiye has always been an important actor in the region since its emergence in 1923. Ankara has faced tumultuous periods, adapting rapidly with regional and global situations, despite the good and bad results in foreign policy achievement. The constant changes in domestic and regional politics forced Ankara to being bold and construct its foreign policy to spread the influence, justify the middle-powermanship, and ensure the state survival. In order to dig deep down, qualitative method is being used to design the research. Whilst, the paper contributes to develop constructivism theory, the literature study will be the main phase of collecting data and conjugate the data and the analysis into certain thought. The analysis of Türkiye's role in international system will be focused on periods between 2000 until 2020 where rapid changes occurred. Despite, Ankara's traditional foreign policy is Westernism and keeping the *Status Quo*, and its West/USA/EU relations have followed a fluctuating course. Ankara is making attempts to solve chronic problems with neighboring countries, emphasizing people-oriented and socio-cultural policies where it have been intensively implemented in a wide geography extending from the near land basin to the near continental basin.

Keywords: Türkiye, International System, Constructivism, Middle-power State.

1 Introduction

When the International System (IS) is considered starting from the 16th century, it can be said that each century flows faster than the previous one. So much so that, even in the first 20 years of the 21st century, there has been and continues to be experienced faster change/transformation than ever before compared to previous centuries. Türkiye's role in the IS has changed significantly in this century. Türkiye, a state that is recently celebrated its centennial (100 years-old), has experienced very important developments in the post-2000 period, although most of its history dates back to the pre-2000 period. During the period since the founding of the Republic in 1923 until the

end of the Cold War, especially in the early periods, Türkiye, which adopted a security approach within the framework of the security and survival of the state, had to deal with some problems both in domestic politics and regional issues.

With the end of the Cold War, the ending of bipolar system gave way to the unipolar system and the structure of the IS changed greatly. Although Türkiye tried to go beyond the lines of Westernism and *status quo*, which are called its traditional foreign policy during this period, it could not get the desired result. Türkiye when entered the 21st century through a very painful process, has made a great progress in a short time and has become an important regional actor in the IS and has set global goals. In this regard, it has determined and tried to implement both regional and global policies. In the first 10 years of this century, Türkiye has experienced a more active period than ever before in its 80-year history, has implemented a new multifaceted policy, starting from its immediate surroundings and extending to regions such as Africa and South America. In the post-2010 period, it was observed that there was a move away from the previous period in line with the regional and global conjuncture.

In this study, Türkiye's place in the IS in the 2000s will be discussed. While analyzing Türkiye's IS, the theory of constructivism, which emerged as a reaction to classical theories such as realism and idealism that analyze by focusing on material elements, and includes socio-cultural factors in international relations analysis, will be used. Following the theoretical framework, the historical background will be briefly discussed. This period will be examined in three periods: the period between 1923-1945, the period between 1945-1990 and the period between 1990-2000. In the last section, from the perspective of theory, the 2000s will be examined in two periods: the period between 2000-2010 and the period between 2010-2020.

2 Theoretical Framework

Classical theories such as realism and idealism, which form the basis of International Relations theories and left their mark on a long period, but it could not predict the end of the Cold War and were subjected to great criticism. These criticisms also stemmed from the fact that theories confined the IS to a narrow framework and explained it with material elements such as power, interest and security. In this context, it was inevitable that classical theories, which analyzed the IS as a bipolar (loosely bipolar) system for almost half a century, would be criticized with the end of the Cold War. While the structure of the IS has changed after 1990, it would be against the nature of things for old theories to retain their fame. It is not a coincidence that the theory of Constructivism emerged in such a process.

Constructivism, which was brought to the agenda in the late 1980s and early 1990s by thinkers such as Nicholas Onuf, Alexander Wendt, Emanuel Adler, Friedrich Kratochwil, John Gerard Ruggie and Peter Katzenstein, is a "social theory of international politics" that emphasizes the social structure of the world. Constructivism emphasizes the social structure of actors in world affairs, contrary to neorealists' claim that international politics is shaped by the rational choice behavior/decisions of egoistic

actors who pursue their interests by making utilitarian calculations to maximize their interests and minimize their losses.ⁱ

Constructivism first entered the international relations literature with the work titled *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, published by Nicholas Onuf towards the end of the Cold War. In this work, Nicholas Onuf put forward the basic propositions of constructivism.ⁱⁱ Language has a decisive position here. The basis of Onuf's argument is speech acts. According to him, social relations are always structured through language and thus establish their own reality. This situation reveals a process in which intersubjective relationships mutually construct each other. Accordingly, the social construction process takes place through speech and the rules that are derivative of speech. 'Talking means doing' says Onuf, because people build their world by talking.ⁱⁱⁱ In short, according to Nicholas Onuf, "Constructivism is a method of studying social relations."^{iv}

Alexander Wendt was one of the names who made the greatest contribution to the theory of constructivism. Along with Nicholas Onuf, Alexander Wendt classifies the Constructivist approach, whose importance began to increase towards the end of the Cold War, into three main currents: Modernist current, Postmodernist current and Feminist current. According to Wendt, although there are differences between these movements, they all agree that Neorealism and Neoliberalism do not pay enough attention to the social structures of the active actors in world politics and are undersocialized.^v Like Onuf, Wendt also argues that it is insufficient to include only material elements in IS analysis and that social structures should be included in system analysis. Wendt puts behaviors at the center of constructivism. According to him, intersubjective meaning must be investigated in order to understand the impact of identity or norms.^{vi}

Constructivists such as Onuf, Koslowski, and Kratochwil believe that social institutions and structures are nothing more than "man-made institutions" and sustain "both the IS and the state in terms of normatively constituted practices." Constructivists are practically interested in culture, identity, norms and accept the idea that 'the interests of actors are not fixed but change and emerge from the social context'.^{vii} When we look at the studies on this subject in the last quarter century, multiculturalism,^{viii} post-materialism,^{ix} nationalism in post-modern societies,^x clash of civilizations,^{xi} colonialism,^{xii} and the emergence of issues such as the rise of egalitarianism^{xiii} reveals the importance of constructivism theory.

In summary, constructivism theory emerged by the end of the Cold War, in the changing global conjuncture, as a reaction to the classical positivist understanding that explains the IS with material elements, and while making system analysis, socio-cultural factors (such as identity, culture, discourse, language and behavior) are also included in the analysis. demonstrated that it should be included. Proponents of constructionist theory also believe that social norms shape and change foreign policy. One of the most important elements to look at when analyzing a state's role in the IS is its foreign policy. At this point, the innovative efforts in Türkiye's foreign policy after 1990, the foreign policy it implemented especially in the post-2000 period, and its socio-culturally focused new approach can be considered as the transition from theory to practice of the analysis elements put forward by the constructivist theory. In this

context, in order to better understand the elements put forward by the theory, after a brief look at Türkiye's place in the IS in the pre-2000 period, a comparative analysis will be made by considering the post-2000 period within the framework of constructivism.

3 General Overview Before 2000s

3.1 1923 – 1945 Period

This period was the year when the state struggled with some fundamental problems to establish and maintain its existence. The Mosul problem with England, the capitulations with France, the population exchange with Greece, and the Straits problem with Russia were among the main problems of this period. Considering the international environment of the period, the unenforceable strictness of the Versailles, the main peace treaty that ended the First World War, could not make the peace permanent, and immediately after the war, the struggle between the victorious England and France and the defeated Germany began again. In addition, the great world economic crisis that broke out in 1929 worsened the economies of the states battered by the war. While these developments would gradually lead Europe to the Second World War, they would no longer be a 'Centre' world system and would place Europe in a secondary position after the USA and the USSR at the end of the Second World War.^{xiv}

In such an international environment, Türkiye made good use of the conditions of the period and achieved relative autonomy. In the revisionist-status quo struggle, both sides tried to get closer to Türkiye, which has great geostrategic importance. In addition, the Russian threat decreased in this period (except for the straits issue), and the Soviets, which tried to recover after 1917, became an important actor in Türkiye's balance policy. Türkiye has made great economic sacrifices while carrying out this balance policy. Ankara implemented this policy while paying off a large debt to the public, as well as facing a major world economic crisis.

Undoubtedly, the biggest event of this period was the Second World War, which started in 1939 and ended in 1945, that had a tremendous impact not only on Türkiye, but also on the entire world politics. Although Türkiye was subjected to intense pressure from both Germany and the allies, especially England, throughout the war, Ankara managed to stay away from this war, which would last for about 6 years. Türkiye's main goal throughout the war was to pursue a balance policy without shifting towards adventurism, not emphasizing allegiance to a single side, and trying to stay out of the war as much as possible.^{xv} When considered as a Medium-Sized-Power State and considering the international environment of the period, it can be seen that Türkiye analyzed the IS well and tried to provide maximum benefit rather than its influence in the IS. Ankara has achieved the objectives to a great extent. In particular, survival of state amidst the crisis and global uncertainties.

3.2 1945 – 1990 Period

The event that left its mark on this period is the bipolar structure of the IS. Debates such as the balance of power and the multipolar system that occurred in the Europe-centered world system have remained in history, and the center of world politics and the IS has moved beyond the borders of Europe. In the bipolar system that would be effective throughout the Cold War, the world was largely clustered under Eastern (USSR) and Western (USA) blocks. Nonetheless, it never turned into a hot conflict during this period, the world was constantly worried about a nuclear war in the bipolar system.

Türkiye saw the Soviets as the biggest threat during this period. Positioning itself in the Western bloc, Türkiye joined NATO to ensure its security. Hence Ankara did not participate in World War II. Türkiye whose economy was devastated, needed economic assistance from the ADB and US Aid (where Washington granted Greece approximately 300 million dollars and Türkiye 100 million dollars), known as the Truman Doctrine, was essentially due to Türkiye being in the Soviet Union's Containment Policy. Britain's warning, followed by the USA's understanding of the Soviets' intentions after the Potsdam and Yalta Conferences, were the factors that determined the US-Türkiye relations throughout the Cold War.^{xvi}

While the blocks were clearly separated and the parties were clear in the bipolar system, Türkiye was able to maintain its balance policy by making good use of the conjuncture of the period and its strategic position. Despite, Ankara is in the Western bloc, it had problems with the West from time to time and tried to maintain this balance with the Soviet Union when it felt that the Soviet threat was decreasing. At the beginning of the crises with the West; Issues such as the Juhnson letter, the Cyprus crisis, the Poppy crisis, the Greece (Aegean Sea) crisis are coming true. This period was also a period when military coups and PKK (Party of Kurdistan Worker) terrorist incidents took place within Türkiye.

After 1980, especially during the Özal period after the coup, and as a result of the oil crisis, Türkiye tried to balance the decreasing trade volume with the European Community to the Islamic states. However, these relations, which remained in the commercial dimension, could not transition to the political dimension. Relations with the European Community, which had deteriorated after the 1980 coup, gained momentum again between 1984 and 1986 with Özal's initiatives, and in 1987, Türkiye officially applied for full membership to the EC.

Nevertheless, Türkiye experienced crises from time to time in the IS dominated by the Cold War, it remained within the Western-centric system and tried to ensure its security and develop its economy. During this period, Türkiye largely remained on the axis of Westernism and *status quo*, which is its classical foreign policy, due to the structure of the IS and the risks posed by Türkiye's geopolitical position, rather than Türkiye's role in the IS. As a developing state that is considered in the Middle-Power State category, Ankara followed policies in line with the characteristics of the international system of the period.

3.3 1990 – 2000 Period

This period was the period when the Soviet Union collapsed, the Cold War ended, the bipolar system came to an end, and a new unipolar IS came into being under the hegemony of the USA. In the early 1990s, a new era entered in which classical realist and idealist theories were criticized in terms of theory, and theses such as the end of history on a global scale were put forward. Brzezinski expressed this new period as follows; 'the collapse of its rival left the United States in a unique position. Washington became the world's first and truly global power. The US global supremacy is in some respects reminiscent of ancient empires, yet it is not based on more limited regional activities' (Brzezinski, 1997: 26).^{xvii} The idea that only the Western liberal and capitalist system would dominate the world, gained by the West and Western values, which aroused global excitement right after the Cold War. Subsequently, it gave way to regional disputes and conflicts again. In short, there was no end to history and a clash of civilizations had emerged.

For Türkiye, the end of the Cold War not only eliminated the Soviet threat, but also created a gap in the geography from which the Soviets withdrew. Under these conditions, Türkiye began to be interested in Central Asia. However, this was a sudden and very rapid trend for Ankara. Socio-cultural factors, which are the criteria of constructivism theory, are also seen in Türkiye's interest in Central Asia. Türkiye's argument regarding its interest in the region; It was that they had historical, cultural, social, religious and linguistic common ties with the societies in this geography. In line with this goal, the Turkish Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA) was established in 1992. The founding purpose of TIKA was to help the development of developing countries, particularly the countries where the Turkish language is spoken and the countries neighboring Türkiye, and to cooperate with these countries in economic, commercial, technical, social, cultural and educational fields.

However, Türkiye's Central Asia policy was not a completely independent/autonomous policy. In the international conjuncture of the period, the USA/West supported Türkiye. Fearing that Iran-backed political Islam would fill the gap in the Caucasus and Central Asia with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US and Western states instead supported Türkiye, which represents a pro-Western Muslim, but secular and democratic structure.^{xviii}

The period between 1990 and 2000 can be considered as a period in which Türkiye went beyond its traditional foreign policy and experimented with multifaceted policies. However, this new political experiment was not as successful as desired. The conditions in Türkiye as well as the impact of the global and regional conjuncture were effective in this. Actually, Türkiye's economy was not at a level that would allow it to implement this new policy. The years when PKK terrorist incidents were most intense also coincide with this period. Türkiye has experienced serious problems with neighboring countries and has come to the brink of war with some of them. In addition, the lack of political stability and weak coalition governments in the 90s also had an impact on these policies.

4 Türkiye's Role in the International System around 2000s

The 2000s started with the negative legacy of the 90s for Türkiye. Its fragile and weak economy fell into a worse situation with the 2001 economic crisis following the 1999 earthquake. Relations with the European Union continued with ups and downs, chronic crises with neighboring countries could not be resolved, and the PKK terrorism problem could not be ended. After the September 11 attacks, a new era began that would profoundly affect/change the international system not only in Türkiye or the Middle East but all over the world. With the AKP (Justice and Development Party) government, which lasted almost 20 years uninterruptedly in 2002, the weak coalition periods of the 90s ended and political stability was achieved. Shortly after, the 1 March warrant regarding the US invasion of Iraq followed by the incident of putting a sack over the head of a Turkish soldier.

Despite all the negativities listed above, a serious change/transformation has occurred in both domestic and foreign policy of Türkiye in a short time. As a reflection of this, Ankara's role in the IS has also changed. In this context, the next issue will be to examine Türkiye's role in the international system from the perspective of constructivism theory. In the light of the criteria advocated by the theory, the period between 2000 and 2010 constitutes the application area of constructivism, so to speak, while the period after 2010 reveals that it has departed from the constructivist theory line. While discussing the period after 2000, the subject will be examined through practices within the scope of constructivism theory rather than a broad analysis.

4.1 2000 – 2010 Period

The sudden and rapid developments that took place on both a national and global scale at the very beginning of the 21st century concerned Türkiye closely, and regional events brought about a new era in which Türkiye would inevitably be directly affected. The September 11 attacks, which will deeply affect the IS, and the subsequent invasion of Iraq, which will be directly related to Türkiye, the March 1 mandate, and then the sack incident will also affect Türkiye-US relations in the long term.

Ankara entered this century with major crises, will soon stand on a very different position. The multifaceted policy, which was an 'experiment' after the Cold War, will be implemented more concretely in this period. Ankara has entered into a rapid transformation, revealing that it cannot continue its traditional foreign policy in the 21st century and maintain an introverted attitude with a security-concerned approach. In this period, discussions about 'axis shift' were frequently experienced, and a new political understanding was put into practice as 'near land basin' and 'near continental basin', which can be summarized as 'zero problems with neighbors', in which Ahmet Davutoğlu put forward his strategy and implemented it personally.

It would be self-contradictory for a country that constantly experiences problems with its neighboring countries to develop people-oriented socio-cultural relations in different geographies. For this purpose, the problems with neighboring countries were tried to be minimized. In Davutoğlu's words, "What needs to be done in order to overcome these tensions with neighboring countries is to remove the relations with

these countries from the long and difficult process between regimes and bureaucrats and expand them to a wider ground where inter-communal relations are intensified and economic and cultural elements are dominant.”^{xix} Davutoğlu exemplifies the new form of relationship, in which economic and socio-cultural elements are at the forefront by resolving the problems with neighboring countries, with the problems between Germany and France and the subsequent economy-based integration process.

In line with the above thought, Greece, Armenia and Syria come to the fore in the good relations with neighboring countries. Historical problems with these three states have sometimes reached the point of war. Relations based on cooperation and dialogue with Greece, which started in 1999, gained momentum in this period. Various mechanisms such as political consultations and the High-Level Cooperation Council (HDIK) have been developed to resolve the problems between the two countries through dialogue.

There were three problems in relations with Armenia. These; Armenian claims regarding the events of 1915, Nagorno-Karabakh (and its seven regions) and the issue of opening border gates. An important step was taken for the normalization of relations when the secret negotiations, which started in August 2007 under the mediation of Switzerland, were initialed between the two countries on 31 August 2009. During this process, first President Abdullah Gül went to Armenia for the Armenia-Türkiye national matches within the scope of the World Cup matches, and then Armenian President Serzh Sargsyan came to Türkiye.^{xx} These developments, which went down in history as football diplomacy, brought about a *détente* between the two countries, and relations gained momentum with protocols aimed at normalizing relations.

Relations with Syria, where war talks took place in 1998, have become much more advanced. With the change of power in the two countries at the beginning of the 2000s, the normalization process began between the two countries. Relations intensified on the basis of mutual visits and common history, culture and social characteristics, and eventually, Türkiye-Syria High Level Strategic Cooperation Council Ministerial Meetings were held with a large participation that could be considered a ‘joint ministerial council’.^{xxi} In these meetings, many agreements were signed in economic, commercial, cultural and social fields.

Good-faith relations with neighboring countries were not limited to the immediate land basin, but expanded from the Balkan to the Caucasus, from Central Asia to Africa and South America. As a reflection of this, in Africa, where Ankara had approximately 10 representatives until the 2000s, this number has increased to over 40 with the new era. In addition to the diplomatic representation of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, relations have been established at the social level with social and cultural institutions such as the Red Crescent, TİKA and Yunus Emre Institute. While YEE has more than 50 centers in over 40 countries, TİKA is spread over 5 continents and operates in 140 countries with 56 coordinators in 50 countries.

Türkiye (through TİKA) made a significant contribution to the reconstruction of the Historical Mostar Bridge, which was destroyed during the Bosnian War and became a symbol in the Balkan.^{xxii} While Somalia stands out as an exemplary country in Africa, support has been provided in various infrastructure, transportation, health, education and agriculture areas throughout the continent.

While Ankara, on the one hand, carries out people-oriented and socio-cultural focused policies on a regional scale, on the other hand, it has tried to carry the same political approach to a global scale with the 'Alliance of Civilizations' project. The joint initiative launched between Türkiye and Spain as a counter-argument to Samuel P. Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' thesis was also accepted and supported by the UN. It has been observed that Türkiye's mediation activities have increased as a reflection of the policy followed in this period. Some of those; Israel-Syria (2003), Georgia-Acarya (2003), Israel-Palestine (2005), Pakistan-Israel (2005), International Atomic Energy-Iran (2006), EU-Iran (2007), Israel-Hamas (2006), Israel-Lebanon (2006), United Kingdom-Iran (2007), Afghanistan-Pakistan (2007), Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina (2009), Croatia-Bosnia and Herzegovina (2009), and the Philippines-Moro Islamic Liberation Front (2009).^{xxiii}

The most important reflection of the people-oriented and socio-cultural based policies implemented during this period was Türkiye's election as a temporary member of the UNSC (United Nations Security Council) in 2009. Türkiye, which was a candidate for temporary membership of the UNSC after 48 years, was elected as a temporary member of the UNSC for the 2009-2010 period by receiving a high 151 votes in the first round of the election, which required a two-thirds majority (128 votes) in a two-stage election in which 192 votes were cast.^{xxiv}

In the context of constructivism theory, the general feature of the period between 2000 and 2010 was that Ankara adopted a new people-oriented approach and increased its role in the international system with a multifaceted and multidimensional policy based on dialogue and cooperation, prioritizing socio-cultural characteristics. The same things will not be the case for the period after 2010.

4.2 2010 – 2020 Period

The reason why the previous chapters were discussed as specific periods was that there were radical or partial changes in the structure of the IS with both global and regional developments. Periods such as the period before 1945, the Cold War, and the period after 1990 were periods when radical changes were experienced in the international system. What made it necessary to consider the period after 2010 separately was undoubtedly the popular movements that took place in Arab societies, called the Arab Spring, which turned into stalemate in the following period.

While the analysis of Türkiye's place in the IS in terms of constructivism, which is the subject of this study, reflects a period between 2000 and 2010 when theory largely overlapped with practice, this line was moved away in the post-2010 period. The biggest factor in this is the Arab Spring and the events that followed. In particular, the war in Syria directly affected Türkiye, the terrorist threat originating from Syria emerged, Syrians escaping from the war began to come to Türkiye, and Syria policy deeply affected Türkiye's relations with global actors such as the USA and Russia, and regional actors such as Iran.

Following the events in Syria, Türkiye announced that it would impose sanctions on Syria on November 30, 2011. Subsequently, the High Level Strategic Cooperation Council mechanism was suspended. Türkiye withdrew its Ambassador to Damascus

and all embassy staff on March 26, 2012, and declared the Syrian Ambassador as *persona non grata*. The most critical threshold in Türkiye-Syria relations during this period was Syria shooting down a Turkish reconnaissance plane in the Eastern Mediterranean without any warning.^{xxv} Diplomatic relations with Syria were cut off, and in the ongoing process, Türkiye's military operations were carried out in the northern region of the country.

Although Syria always remained in the center throughout this period, other developments caused Türkiye to move away from the policy it implemented in the previous period. The PKK terrorism problem increased again during this period, the good relations that were tried to be developed with neighboring countries returned to pre-2000 levels, there were crises in relations with the EU and the USA, and there was a military coup attempt in 2016. All these developments have caused Türkiye to prioritize its security policy again.

Ankara's increasing influence in the international system thanks to its people-oriented and socio-culturally based foreign policy, and as a reflection of this, its election to the UNSC provisional membership in 2009 with a high number of votes will not be repeated for the 2015-2016 period. UNSC provisional membership is important in terms of reflecting the policy practices carried out in both periods to the outcome. Türkiye, which was elected with a record number of votes in the first round for membership in 2009, made it to the second round against Spain, with which it competed for the 2015-2016 period, but was not elected with 73 votes.^{xxvi}

During this period, Türkiye moved away from people-oriented and socio-cultural policies was not a political choice, but a result of the global and especially regional conjuncture. It is the nature of things for a state that feels a security threat to adopt a security-oriented policy. However, Ankara continued this approach, albeit at a rhetorical level, but in practice there was a significant decrease compared to the previous period. Finally, by providing medical supplies to many countries during the COVID-19 global pandemic period, Türkiye has demonstrated an example of humanitarian diplomacy

5 Türkiye's Role in the International System around 2000s

Until the 2000s, middle-power and developing Türkiye's place/role as an actor in the international system was quite limited. During the period from its establishment until the 2000s, under the influence of the international conjuncture. Ankara followed a security-oriented and closed policy, experienced serious crises with neighboring countries, sometimes reaching the point of war. Türkiye's traditional foreign policy is Westernism and *Status Quo*, and its West/USA/EU relations have followed a fluctuating course.

The relationship that was tried to be established with the Central Asian states, which could be considered as a multifaceted foreign policy experiment after the Cold War, could not be at the desired level. However, the policy approach followed in this period can be seen as a trial in terms of constructivism theory. A new policy - hence not successful - emphasizes socio-cultural factors like identity, culture, common history, discourse, language, behavior, and with a human-oriented approach, with an understanding that centers on the social structure outside the hard power, soft power or smart power line, the attempt has been made.

While reforms were made in domestic policy in the first period of the 2000s, a versatile and more active path was followed in foreign policy. Within the framework of the theory of constructivism, a different path from the classical approach was followed with a socio-cultural and people-oriented foreign policy. The period between 2000 and 2010 was like an application of the theory in the context of constructivism theory. While making attempts to solve chronic problems with neighboring countries, people-oriented and socio-cultural policies have been intensively implemented in a wide geography extending from the near land basin to the near continental basin. As a positive result of this political approach, which will be explained in the context of constructivism theory, Türkiye's role and influence in the IS increased in this period.

Regional developments after 2010 also affected Ankara's new foreign policy and caused it to reflect its old security reflexes. The Arab Spring events that started after 2010 and this threat to the Turkish border, along with Syria, have also determined Türkiye's priorities. Although it tried to maintain its human-oriented and socio-cultural policy at the discourse level, it could not fully realize this in practice

Acknowledgments. We acknowledge the contribution and support of our institutions during the research was being held. Authors declare that no fund received to run the research project for this article.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. Aksoy, M., Çemrek, M.: Türk Dış Politikasında Kimlik Sorunsalı, In: Türkiye'nin Değişen Dış Politikası. Yenigün, C., Ertan, E. (eds.) Nobel Yayın, Ankara (2010)
2. Arı, Tayyar: Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Dış Politika. Alfa Yayın, İstanbul (2004)
3. Bal, İdris: Türk Dış Politikasında Süreklilik ve Değişim, In: Türkiye'nin Değişen Dış Politikası. Yenigün, C., Ertan, E. (eds.) Nobel Yayın, Ankara : (2010)
4. Bayar, Murat: Türk Dış Politikası Analizinde İnşa Kuramı Ve Kültür: Kerkük Referandumu Örneği. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* Spring (29), 125-140 (2018)
5. Brzezinski, Zbigniew: 'Büyük Satranç Tahtası: Amerika'nın Küresel Üstünlüğü Ve Bunun Jeostratejik Gereklikleri', In: Yelda Türedi (trans.), İnkılab Kitabevi, İstanbul (1997)
6. Çakmak, Haydar: Türk Dış Politikasında 41 Kriz 1924-2012, Kripto Yayın, Ankara (2012)
7. Çalış, Şaban H., Dağı, İhsan D., Gözen, R.: Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik. Liberte Yayınları, Ankara (2001)
8. Gözen, R.: Türk Dış Politikasında Değişim Var mı?. In: Türkiye'nin Değişen Dış Politikası. Yenigün, C., Ertan, E. (eds.), Nobel Yayın, Ankara (2010)
9. Hale, William: Türk Dış Politikası 1774-2000. In: Demir, P.: (trans.), Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, İstanbul (2003)
10. İşyar, Ömer G.: Suriye Krizi ve Türk Dış Politikası: Uluslararası Politikanın Çözümlememeyen Düğümü. Sayda Yayınları, Bursa (2018)
11. İşyar, Ömer G.: Devletler ve Davranışları: Dış Politika. Dora Yayın, Bursa (2019)
12. Karpas, K.: Türk Dış Politikası Tarihi. Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul (2012)
13. Keyman, F., Aydın, S.: European Integration and the Transformation of Turkish Democracy EU-Türkiye Working Paper August(2), (2004)
14. Keyman, F., Koyuncu, B.: Globalization, alternative modernities and the political economy of Türkiye. *Review of International Political Economy*, **12**(1), 105-128 (2005)
15. Mumcu, C.: Suriye Krizi (1998), Türk Dış Politikasında 41 Kriz 1924-2012. In Çakmak, H. (ed.), Kripto Yayınları, Ankara (2012)
16. Palan, R.: A World of their making: an evaluation of the constructivist critique in International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, **26**(1), 575-598 (2000)
17. Pirinççi, F., Demirtaş, T.: Türk Dış Politikasında İnsani Diplomasi: Suriye Krizi Örneği. Türk Dış Politikası Yıllığı 2014, In: Duran, B., İnata, K., Balci, A. (eds.), SETA, Ankara (2015)
18. TİKA Homepage, <https://www.tika.gov.tr/tr/sayfa/hakkimizda-14649>, last accessed 2021/08/01.
19. Cumhuriyet Homepage, Türkiye, BMGK Geçici Üyesi Oldu, <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/amp/haber/turkiye-bmgk-gecici-uyesi-oldu-16350>, last accessed 2021/11/01
20. Dışişleri Bakanlığı Homepage, <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkiye-yunanistan-siyasi-iliskileri.tr.mfa>, last accessed 2021/10/01

-
- ⁱ Behraves, Maysam: Constructivism: An Introduction. *E-International Relations*, p. 2. (2011)
- ⁱⁱ Onuf, N. G.: *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. Routledge, London (1989)
- ⁱⁱⁱ Bayar, Murat: 'Türk Dış Politikası Analizinde İnşa Kuramı Ve Kültür: Kerkük Referandumu Örneği'. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Spring (29), p. 130. (2018) pp. 125-140
- ^{iv} Arı, Önder., Kıran, A.: *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Sosyal İnşacılık*. Ekev Akademi Dergisi, **15** (46), p. 50. (2011)
- ^v Arı, Önder., Kıran, A.: *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Sosyal İnşacılık*. Ekev Akademi Dergisi, **15** (46), p. 56. (2011)
- ^{vi} Bayar, Murat: 'Türk Dış Politikası Analizinde İnşa Kuramı Ve Kültür: Kerkük Referandumu Örneği', *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Spring (29), p. 129. (2018)
- ^{vii} Palan, Ronen: A World of their making: an evaluation of the constructivist critique in International Relations. *Review of International Studies* (26). p. 576. (2000). pp. 575-598
- ^{viii} Kymlicka, Will: *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (1995)
- ^{ix} Inglehart, R., Abramson, P. R.: Measuring Postmaterialism. *American Political Science Review*. **93** (3), pp. 665-677 (1999)
- ^x Fukuyama, Francis: *Trust: The Social Virtues and The Creation of Prosperity*. The Free Press, New York (1995)
- ^{xi} Huntington, Samuel: *The Clash of Civilization and The Remaking of World Order*. Simon & Schuster, New York (1996)
- ^{xii} Taylor, C.: The Politics of Recognition. In Gutmann A. (ed.) *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, pp. 25-74. Princeton University Press, Princeton (1992)
- ^{xiii} Said, Edward: *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, New York (1994)
- ^{xiv} Oran, Baskın: *Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* 1919-1980, p. 242. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul (2006)
- ^{xv} Aydın, Mustafa 1939-1945: Savaş Kaosunda Türkiye, Görelî Özerklik-2, In: Baskın Oran (ed.), *'Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* 1919-1980', p. 475. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul (2006)
- ^{xvi} Alkan, M. Nail: Truman Doktrini Krizi., In: Çakmak, Haydar (ed.) *Türk Dış Politikasında Kriz 1924-2012*, pp. 72-73. Kripto Yayınları, Ankara (2012)
- ^{xvii} Brzezinski, Zbigniew: 'Büyük Satranç Tahtası: Amerika'nın Küresel Üstünlüğü Ve Bunun Jeostratejik Gereklikleri', In: Yelda Türedi (trans.), *İnkılab Kitabevi*, İstanbul (1997)

^{xviii} Aydın, Mustafa: *Kafkasya ve Orta Asya ile İlişkiler*, 'Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar' 1980-2001. In: Oran, Baskın (ed.) p. 383. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul (2005)

^{xix} Davutoğlu, Ahmet: *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu*, p. 144. Küre Yayınları, İstanbul (2009)

^{xx} Özdal, Barış 'Türkiye-Ermenistan İlişkileri ve Güney Kafkasya', In: Yenigün, Cüneyt, Efeğil, Ertan (eds.) pp. 303-307. 'Türkiye'nin Değişen Dış Politikası' Nobel Yayın, Ankara (2010)

^{xxi} Arı, Tayyar: *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Savaş, Siyaset ve Diplomasi*. Alfa Akademi, Bursa (2017)

^{xxii} Hürriyet, <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/dunya/mostar-koprusu-acildi-243496> (2004), Last Accessed on 2021/01/10

^{xxiii} Kiraz, Sami: 'Uluslararası Arabuluculuğa Dair Değişen Yaklaşımlar ve Türkiye'nin Arabuluculuğun Dönüşümündeki Rolünün İncelenmesi'. *Akdeniz İİBF Dergisi*. **20** (2) p. 233 (2020) pp. 227-238

^{xxiv} Cumhuriyet, <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/amp/haber/turkiye-bmgk-gecici-uyesi-oldu-16350> (2008), Last accessed on 2021/01/11

^{xxv} Arı, Tayyar: *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu: Irak, İran, ABD, Petrol, Filistin Sorunu ve Arap Baharı*, pp. 493-494. Alfa Akademi, Bursa (2017)

^{xxvi} BBC, https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2014/10/141016_turkiye_bm (2014). Last accessed on 2021/01/12

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

