INTRODUCTION

FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS:
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
As a sub-field of international relations (IR), the study of foreign policy focuses on the external behaviour of states in the global system through their authorised representatives or governments. The concept of system assumes more than the units enclosed by a boundary, it also presupposes that there is an interaction between the units. The official relations that take place between the units of the international system constitute the foreign policy.

Foreign policy analysis (FPA) is the study of those transactions, the domestic circumstances that produce them, the effect on them of the system and its structures and their influence on them. In brief, the FPA is a "bridging discipline", which connects the micro level of politics with the macro level of the international system. By concentrating on the interface between the state and state system, it represents "the continuing erosion of the distinction between domestic and foreign issues, between the socio-political and economic processes that unfold at home and those that transpire abroad."  

3 James N. Rosenau, "Introduction: New Directions and Recurrent Questions in the Comparative Study of Foreign Policy", in Hermann, Kegley and Rosenau, eds., Ibid., p. 3.
Realist Paradigm

In some respects, foreign policy analysis is firmly within the realist paradigm, for realism is based on the state-centric assumption whereby the states are the primary actors in world politics. As the states constitutes the only significant actor in international affairs, realists consider that this field is best analysed in terms of inter-state relations. The state, acting through its government is seen as 'unitary' and 'rational' actor, which pursues national interests shaped by its power, and competes with other states in an environment characterised by anarchy. Because they are in a

---


5 According to the realists, actors in world politics are defined on the basis of three main criteria: sovereignty, recognition of statehood and the control of territory and population. Other entities such as the MNCs or NGOs on the international scene cannot be seen as autonomous entities because they do not combine these three essentials for actorness. See B. Hocking and Michael Smith, World Politics (New York: Harvester wheatshenb, 1990), pp. 80-82.

6 The absence of a central authority or a higher government above states is what is meant by the anarchic environment of international politics. Empirically this characterisation is valid, as the modern state system dated from 1648 Treaty of Westphalia has been anarchic in the sense that it lacked a common government.
“self-help” system, foreign policy behaviour of a state is determined by global systemic pressures rather than ideological differences and internal pressures.

It is thus the structural constraints that will explain the behaviour of the units, not the other way around. Regardless of their internal characteristics – whether democratic or authoritarian, capitalist or socialist – pressures from international system will make similarly situated states behave alike. “A good theory of foreign policy”, a critic of neorealism writes, “should first ask what effect international system has on national behaviour, because the most generalizable characteristic of a state in international relations is its relative position in the international system.”

The position or the rank of a state is determined by its relative power resources. Stated simply, power refers to the capabilities with which states can influence each other. The relative amount of power resources that states possess will shape the magnitude and ambition of their foreign policy. As their relative power rises, states will seek more influence abroad, and as it falls, their actions and

---


7 According to the realists, the ‘self-help’ behaviour of a state is promoted by the anarchic environment in which it operates. The central claim of this theory is that anarchy forces states either to engage in internal efforts to increase their power capabilities and develop effective strategies or undertake external attempts to align or realign with other actors. Thus, basic to the anarchic system is the need for member units to rely on whatever means or arrangement/coalition they can generate in order to ensure survival and enhance security. See James E. Dougherty and Robert L.. Pfaltzgrabb, Jr. Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey (New York: Longman, 1996), p. 82.


9 Fareed Zakaria, “Realism and Domestic Politics”, pp.194. Zakaria uses the term
ambitions will be scaled down accordingly. In all, realists assume that relations between states are motivated by the pursuit of power.

Realists and Foreign Policy Analysts

Although foreign policy analysis broadly shares the realist assumption of a state-centric global political system, it diverges from realism in many other respects. Foreign policy analysts, for example, acknowledge that power relations are important, and force is a major instrument of foreign policy. But they are at the same time interested in other types of relations (economic and cultural) and other policy instruments. More importantly, the focus of realist theory lies at the system-level analysis of the nature of the system, the number of actors, and the distribution of their capabilities. In contrast, foreign policy analysts give explanatory weight to the structural attributes of the unit (size, level of industrialisation, form of government

“influence-maximising” rather than “power-maximising” behaviour of the states to suggest that states seek to expand influence as a consequence of increased resources.

10 According to K. Waltz, the explanations of the whole by explaining the behaviour of the parts (units) is reductionism. In an effort to create a parsimonious structural systemic theory in international politics, Waltz has given explanatory weight to the ‘anarchic’ nature of the system and the constraining conditions produced by the structure of the system. The term structure connotes the way in which the parts or units are arranged. The structure of the international system is anarchic because the actors/units stand in a horizontal not hierarchical relationship with each other as in domestic politics. Because of this difference, the principle by which structure of the international system is organised is anarchic. The existence of an anarchic environment causes states to attempt self-help continuously. States are thus driven by the system’s competitive imperative producing what is called “power-maximizing” behaviour. On the whole, realists believe that system affects states in much the same way that market affects firms. See, K. Waltz, Theory of International Politics, pp.7-4--. Robert Powell, “Anarchy in International Relations Theory”, pp. 324-329. Colin Elman, “Horses For Courses: why not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy?”, Security Studies vol.6, No. 1 (Autumn 1996), pp. 7-53.
etc.) without, however, completely downplaying the saliency of the external environment or the international/regional systemic factors.

**Innerpolitikers**

Over the years a good deal of foreign policy research has followed explicitly in the *Innerpolitik* tradition, which dismisses the systemic determinants, and locates the roots of foreign policy in the social and economic structures of a state. There are many variants of the *Innerpolitik* approach each favouring a different specific domestic independent variables but they all share a common assumption that foreign policy is best understood as the product of a country’s internal dynamics. To understand why a particular country is behaving in a particular way, they argue, one should open up the “black box” of the state to examine the preferences and configurations of key domestic actors.

**Combination of Systemic and Domestic Determinants**

The *Innerpolitik* theories are, however, as problematic as the system-level analysis of the structural realists. While the latter fails to explain why different states behave differently despite similar placement in the international system, unit-level explanations have difficulty accounting for why states with similar domestic systems

---

often act differently. The study of foreign policy, therefore, attempts to integrate the two levels of analysis into a coherent whole. In other words, the analysts rely on both systemic and domestic independent variables to account for different kinds of foreign policy behaviour. Systemic factors like the nature of the international political system — whether bipolar or multipolar or unipolar — and the immediate policy actions of other actors in the regional environment are as much important in the formulation of the country’s foreign policy as its internal power resources and geographic location.

Power Resources

Power is the function of the size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, and political stability and

---


competence. No single factor adequately captures the power of state,\textsuperscript{14} though analysts have emphasised only the physical component of power in order to explain the varying response of states to the external stimuli. However, power broadly defined as the aggregate of the capabilities available to the state is a decisive factor in shaping foreign policy interests. By interests we mean the goals and preferences—such as survival or self-preservation or influence—maximization abroad—which guide the country’s external policy behaviour.\textsuperscript{15}

**Geographic Position**

In addition to the above hard-power resources, the geographic position of state has been considered an important determinant of its foreign relations. For the

\textsuperscript{14} Realists, for instance, insist that states are not placed in top rank because they excel in one category of power (political or material), their rank depends on how they score on all its components. For an evaluation of Realist concept of power and capabilities, see Richard Ned Lebow, “The long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism”, *International Organization* vol. 48, No.2, (Spring 1994) pp. 249-259. For the ‘material’ definition of power, see William Curti Wolfeforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions During the Cold War* (Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 1-17; for the relational and “situationally specific” definition of power, see David A. Baldwin, *Paradoxes of Power* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989), pp. 21-26 & pp. 134-138. In contradistinction to the “hard power” or the material power resources, Joseph Nye has developed the concept of “soft power”, which refers to the state ability to attract others through cultural and ideological such as liberal democratic appeal. See Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Bound to Lead* (New York: Basic Books, 1990).

\textsuperscript{15} National interest has been defined as the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts. See Joseph Frankel, *National Interest* (London: Macmillan, 1970). The goal of ‘survival’ is given a wide variety of interpretations by different countries or countries facing different conditions. For small and weak states, survival means preserving territorial integrity and political independence but for great powers like the US, a shift in balance of power favouring its adversary the former USSR was considered a threat to its own survival. For an interesting study on the goals of foreign policy, see Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays in International Politics* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1966), Chapt. 5, pp. 67-80, and for theoretical analysis, see, Patrick J. McGowan,
geographic factors influence the actions of the decision-making elite. The significance of this influence, however, depends upon the perceptions and interpretation of geographic factors by the policy-makers. Although geographic considerations have been in the recent years tempered by modern military weaponry and advanced communication technology, state’s primary foreign policy goals of survival and security continue to be dictated by such geophysical elements as its sea frontiers and land boundaries.

Decision-Making Process

A central part of foreign policy analysis is the study of decision-making process through which inputs or determinants are transformed into foreign policy output meaning either decisions or acts on the four main issue areas: military-security, political-diplomatic, economic-developmental, and cultural status. “The key to the explanation of why the state behaves the way it does” Richard Snyder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin contend, “lies in the way decision-makers as actor define the situation. The definition of the situation is built around the projected action as well as

“Problems in the Construction of Positive Foreign Policy” in James N. Rosenau, Comparing Foreign Policy, pp. 25-43.


the reasons for the action". 18 In short, it is the decision-makers' perceptions or misperceptions of the outside world combined with their subjective assessment of relative power resources that shape the foreign policy behaviour of the state. For the authoritative acts of the official decision-makers "are, to all intents and purposes, the acts of the state. State action is the action taken by those acting in the name of the state". 19

The overall environment in which decision-makers operate is divided into the 'external' and the 'domestic', and the 'psychological environment', an umbrella term for the set of images held by decision-makers about their world. 20 The external environment comprises the global systemic structures (i.e. polarity or balance of power) and peculiarities of the regional sub-system 21 such as the geographical proximity, transstate distribution of a single ethnic population and transnational identity based on either religion or ethnicity (pan-Islamism, pan-Arabism or pan-Turkism).


19 Ibid., p. 65.


21 The concept of region is a flexible one. According to Rosenau, "its referent depending on whether geographic, cultural, religious or historical variables are used as the basis of delineation". James N. Rosenau, The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy (New York: Free Press, 1971), pp. 336. For more recent definition of regional sub-system, see Andrew Hurrell, "Regionalism in Theoretical Perspectives" in Louise Fawcett and A. Hurrell, ed., Regionalism in World Politics (Oxford, 1997), pp. 37-73.
The domestic environment includes not only such standard political phenomena as public opinion,\textsuperscript{22} but also much more fundamental categories: political culture, institutional patterns, major common value orientations, associational life and continuity of the authority structure in the system. Together they constitute the "operational environment", in which events and objects stand as they actually are or as they occur. In the psychological environment, on the contrary, events and objects depend upon how decision-makers imagine them to be. The psychological environment is divided into two main categories: the "attitudinal prism" or the psychological predisposition of the decision-makers as individuals, and 'images of the elite', which refers to the cognitive representation of reality or the distance between the perceptions the elite have of the world and its reality. "Elite image", according to Michael Brecher "is the decisive input of a foreign policy system", because "decision-makers act in accordance with their perception of reality, not in response to reality itself."\textsuperscript{23} Whereas the elite image comprises a set of closely related perceptions of the 'operational environment', the attitudional prism is partly made up of the

\textsuperscript{22} Scholars variously argue that public opinion determines foreign policy, that public opinion is irrelevant to the foreign policy process or that public opinion follows the head of the state on foreign policy matters rather than influencing decision-making. Current analyses, however, suggest that public opinion may be influential for certain types of issues (namely those directly concerned with national security), or under certain circumstances and irrelevant in others. In brief, the challenge before the foreign policy analysts is to identify the circumstances in which public opinion plays a critical role and those in which its impact is marginal. Furthermore, the role of public opinion in defining foreign policy choices needs to be understood in the context of the types of regime (democratic or authoritarian) and system of government (open or closed). For debate on the relevance of public opinion in foreign policymaking, see Ole R. Holsti, "Public opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenge to the Almond Lipmann Consensus". International Studies Quarterly, vol. 36, No. 2 (1992), pp. 439-466; for issue-specific studies, see David Skidmore and Valerie M. Hudson, The Limits of State Autonomy: Societal Groups and Foreign Policy Formulation (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1992).

\textsuperscript{23} M. Brecher, The Foreign Policy System, pp. 11-12.
idiosyncratic qualities of individual decision-makers (personality factor) and in
greater part, the influences derived from ideology, national character and historical
legacy.

Elite images together with the attitudional prism or what Ole Holsti has
labeled 'belief systems'\textsuperscript{24} of the decision-makers create a general psychological
framework for policy-making. Although the operational setting exists independent of
this psychological framework (the elite mental constructs), it can influence the
policy-making process only to the extent that it is communicated to the decision-
makers. Thus, in the analysis of foreign policy issues, there is the need for examining
the communication network of the political system, and assessing the sources,
veracity and objectivity of the flow of information about the operational system to the
governing elite. However, one should not ignore or underrate the possibility of what
the psychologists term "cognitive dissonance"\textsuperscript{25} in which any information conflicting

\textsuperscript{24} The concept of 'belief system' used by Holsti in his study of the image of the enemy was drawn on the psychological literature on cognitive dynamics based on the nature of attitudes, cognitive consistency and persuasive communications. Holsti, for instance, found that former U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles's extremely hostile image of the Soviet Union was rigid and resistant to change. This resistance to change found in Dulles's image of the Soviet Union, according to Holsti, can be explained by cognitive consistency theory, which emphasises that individuals acquire beliefs and images that are interconnected and form coherent belief system. Ole R. Holsti, "Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy: Dulles and Russia" in John C. Farrell and Asa P. Smith, ed., \textit{Image and Reality in World Politics} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 3-26; Holsti, "The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study", \textit{Journal of Conflict Resolution}, vol. 6 (1962), pp. 244-252. For an overview, see Jerel A. Rosati, "A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Foreign Policy" in Laura Neack et al., \textit{Foreign Policy Analysis}, pp. 49-59.

\textsuperscript{25} The concept of "cognitive dissonance" borrowed from a leading psychologist Leon Festinger refers to discordant relationships between preferred and actual states of affairs – between our beliefs and values, behaviour and environment as they actually are and as we think or prefer them to be. Leon Festinger, \textit{A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962). On the problem of
with the beliefs values or desires of decision-makers is rejected, and the facts distorted to fit in with pre-existing notions.

In the foreign policy analysis, it is also essential to include the study of the policy-making structures, which Snyder and his colleagues have termed as "organisational context". Stressing the importance of the organisational context of foreign policy decisions, they argue, "to ignore this context omits a range of factors which significantly influence the behaviour of decision-makers (and therefore state behaviour), including not only the critical problem of how choices are made but also the conditions under which choices are made."26 For the decision-makers do not act only in an individual capacity when they formulate foreign policies, they also act within an organisational setting. Moreover, recent case studies of U.S. policy-making in West Asia27 suggest that a link exists between decision-structures and decision-making processes, especially during crises. Indeed, Graham Allison’s classic work, *Essence of Decision* has focused on how organisational structures and politics of competing bureaucracies shape the policymaking process and direct policy outputs.28

---

26 Snyder et al. *Foreign Policy Decision-Making*, p. 87.


28 Graham Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971). At the beginning of his work, Allison has stated that "professional analysts think about problems of foreign and military policy in terms of largely implicit conceptual models that have significant consequences for the content of their thought". These conceptual lenses or models determine the analyst's
On the whole, structure of the relationships between various foreign policy organisations remains an integral part of the study of policy making.

**Advantages of Decision-Making Approach**

The decision-making approach to foreign policy analysis offers certain advantages in the way of useful concepts and constructs, which, in turn, justify the analytical framework employed in the present study (see Fig. 1). First of all, it provides for multiple levels of analysis linking global systemic factors to state structures and perceptual orientations of the decision-makers either as a group or as individuals. Unlike the innerpolitik theories of foreign policy, it does not underestimate the systemic constraints that limit the autonomy of decision-makers. No does this model assume, like the realists, that the systemic pressures and relative power resources alone determine state external behaviour. In fact, this approach is fundamentally opposed to the ‘billiard ball’ conception of international interactions –
in which foreign policy positions are seen as being primarily determined by the interplay of international forces.

Instead, the model suggests that foreign policy behaviour can be explained by conjunction of external and internal conditions.\textsuperscript{29} To understand the way states interpret and respond to their external environment, one must analyse how international systemic pressures are filtered through unit-level intervening variables such as the domestic state-structure and decision-makers’ perceptions of their situation. The composition and relative influence of the decision-making elite varies depending on the domestic state structure, that is the types of regime (consensual or authoritarian) or system of governments (open or closed).\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29} Almost an identical observation by K. Waltz, the founding father of the Neorealist school clearly shows a surge of interest in domestic politics as a supplement to systemic explanations in the broader IR literatures. See, K. Waltz, "The Emerging Structures of International Politics", \textit{International Security}, vol. 18, no. 2 (Fall 1993), p. 79. In the face of mounting criticism of being theoretically deficient in anticipating the non-violent transformation of bipolar international system and collapse of the USSR, the neorealists have begun to focus on domestic factors within the countries that may powerfully shape their role in international politics. For instance, Jack Snyder's \textit{Myth of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambitions} (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991) highlights how internal conditions within the former Soviet Union had sapped it economically and politically reducing it to a second-rank power. Likewise, Fareed Zakaria's \textit{From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), and William Curti Wohlfarth, \textit{The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions During the Cold War} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993) have underscored the need for examining the strength and structures of states relative to their societies, and the perceptions of decision-makers about their countries’ global position and their relative power. For a critique of IR theories, see Prof. John F. Gaddis, "International Relations Theory and the End of Cold War", \textit{International Security}, vol. 17, no.3, (1992-93), pp. 5-58; Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy", \textit{World Politics}, vol. 51, no.1, (October 1998), pp. 144-172.

\textsuperscript{30} In many Third World states, for example, decision-making is dominated by the executive powers around or through \textit{la monarchie présidentielle}. Because of the influence of the man at the top, weak state-society links and fragile institutions, the policy-making process is highly personalised. This category of decision unit has been described as principal decision maker, who can exercise profound normative influence on the population as a whole. (See Chapter II). For further theoretical
Second most important merit of the decision-making model is its focus on the process of foreign policy-making rather than the outputs or forms of foreign policy. In fact, decision-making has been defined as “a process which results in the selection from a socially defined, limited number of problematical, alternative projects, of one project intended to bring about the particular future state of affairs envisaged by decision-makers”. This selection process is determined by certain variables, which embrace a wide range of concepts and disciplines: psychology, sociology, economics and political science. In short, the decision-making model presents an interdisciplinary approach to understand how and why the actors (states) in international system behave as they do.

Last but not the least, analysts of foreign policy decision making are uncomfortable with the treatment of states as undifferentiated unitary-rational actors. For they disagree with the assumption that those who act in the name of the

inputs on the type of ultimate decision unit, see Margaret G. Hermann, Charles F. Hermann and Joe D. Hagan, “How Decision Units Shape Foreign Policy Behaviour” in Hermann, Kiegley and Rosenau, ed., New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy, Chapter 16.

31 Snyder et al., Foreign Policy Decision-Making, p. 90.

32 Despite the diversity and multiplicity of variables included in the decision-making model, critics have pointed out two major methodological handicaps: a) an overemphasis on decision-makers’ perceptions of the world – the psychological environment has led to the exclusion of “operational environment”, the real world; b) this research imbalance has resulted in psychological reductionism verging on monovariable (i.e. psychology) analysis. According to Korany the decision-making approach has created “a great man theory of history” for “psychological reductionism equates the most visible with the most important and substitutes the man at the top for the analysis of social dynamics”. Bahgat Korany, “Analysing Third World Foreign Policies: A Critique and a Reordered Research Agenda”, in David Wurfel and Bruce Burton, ed., The Political Economy of Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia (London: Macmillan Press, 1990), p. 27. Also see, Franklin B. Weinstein, “The uses of Foreign Policy in Indonesia: An Approach to the Analysis of Foreign Policy in the Less Developed countries”, World Politics, vol. 24, April 1972, pp. 356-380.
government – the policy-makers – are monolithic units speaking with one voice, holding one view with one set of goals. In other words, the rational actor model “presupposes that governments consist of united, purposive strategists, who in possession of full information, calculate and implement actions on the basis of how best to maximise power and security.” It not only disregards the possibility of dissent within the decisional unit, but also ignores the social dynamics, including ideological and cultural differences within the state.

The Framework For Turkish Foreign Policy Analysis

In view of the above methodological-conceptual advantages, we have chosen to base our analytical framework (Fig. 1) on the decision-making model for explaining continuity and change in Turkey's foreign policy between 1970 and 1985. The assumption on which the study has proceeded is that state foreign policy behaviour (B) is a function (F) of interaction between the actor (A) and its environment (E). In equation form it can be expressed as $B = F(AE)$.  

33 Christopher Hill and Margot Light, “Foreign Policy Analysis”, in M. Light and A.J.R. Groom, ed., International Relations: A Handbook of Current Theory (London: Lyane Publishers, 1985), p. 157. In fact, Allison in his Model I, the rational actor model, has explained the 1962 installation of Soviet Missiles in Cuba by showing how this action was reasonable given Soviet strategic objectives. According to Allison, rationality refers to consistent, value maximising choice within specified constraints. However, those who have challenged the rational actor framework argue that decision makers do not ‘maximise’ but satisfice. Decision-makers, in other words do not examine all alternatives, but decide when they find an acceptable choice, which is called “bounded rationality”. See, Herbert Simon, Models of Man (New York: Wiley, 1957) quoted in Deborat J. Gerner, “The Evolution of the Study of Foreign Policy”, Laura et al, Foreign Policy Analysis, pp. 24-25.

Methodologically, although this work is interdisciplinary, it is not limited to the mere borrowing of "foreign" concepts from other social sciences.

Instead, it tries to adapt these concepts to our analysis of Turkey's foreign policy-making (see Chapter II). Theoretically, it follows three levels-of-analysis: global systemic, domestic (societal and political) and organisational (decision-making apparatus). Finally, the study is organised in five chapters followed by a conclusion, which is essentially a postscript.

Chapter I discusses the domestic environment, which includes the historical background of contemporary Turkey, its polity and material power resources (population, economy, level of industrialisation and military capability), and the geographic location of the state. What is, however, important to note in this chapter is the space devoted to the elaboration of Turkey's imperial past and national liberation movement under the charismatic Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. For it is believed that in the case study approach, history is particularly useful in serving two prime research objectives. Firstly, it helps the analysts comprehend the uniqueness of the country's foreign policy orientations; secondly, it explains the psychological predispositions of the decision-making elites. In short, past affects the way the present is perceived, and hence, "a knowledge of the past enables us to fully understand the present."36

In Chapter II, the focus is on identifying those individuals, groups and institutions who constitute the decision-making elite, and explaining their role in the process of foreign policy-making. Chapter III is concerned with Turkey's external

35 The case study approach insists on the uniqueness of the foreign policy of each state. For details, see S. Smith, "Foreign Policy Analysis" in S. Smith, ed., International Relations: British and American Perspectives (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985), pp. 45-55.

environment in the immediate aftermath of the World War II, which to great extent explains the “Americanisation” of Turkish foreign policy during the early years of the Cold War period. Central argument in this chapter is rooted in the realist assumption that state behaviour is an adaptation to the changes in external environment.\textsuperscript{37} Thus, Turkey’s close alignment with the West following its inclusion in NATO alliance is seen as a response to the external threats represented by an ambitious neighbour, also the super-power.

However, as the international system underwent significant changes in the mid-1960s with the onset of super-powers détente and receding Soviet threat, Turkey began to diversify its external relations signalling ‘change’ in state behaviour especially after the 1974 Cyprus crisis. In the second section of the Chapter, an attempt is made to explain the concept of foreign policy change. It identifies at least two ‘sources’ of such change: a) external shock represented by the US arms embargo; b) domestic political imperatives. Also, this chapter addresses to the type of change in the post-1974 foreign policy of Turkey. Was it simply an ‘adjustment change’ or ‘programme change’ or something that would amount to overall ‘restructuring’ of foreign policy?\textsuperscript{38}

In the ensuing two chapters, an attempt is made to contextualise Turkish foreign policy change by linking it to the beginning of Turco-Arab fraternity of the

\textsuperscript{37} The idea of foreign policy as adaptive behaviour has been developed by Rosenau. For an insightful analysis, see Patrick J. McGowan, “Problems in the construction of Positive Foreign Policy Theory” in Rosenau, \textit{Comparing Foreign Policies}; pp. 25-43.

1970s in West Asia. Chapter IV investigates the history of Turkish-Arab relations to identify the unifying and not the separating elements, which could be the basis for Turkey’s involvement in the Arab Gulf region. The last Chapter is devoted exclusively to an evaluation of Turkey’s efforts towards developing closer relations with the Gulf states between 1974 and 1986 in areas ranging from security and economic to political and cultural.

In the end, the study presents an overview of Turkey’s foreign policy strategies towards West Asia in general, and the Arab Gulf region in particular since the termination of the 8 year-old war between Iran and Iraq. On the whole, for analytical convenience this study could be divided into two sections: first section deals with the dynamics of Turkish foreign policy, while the second half is more specific, exploring as well as explaining the gamut of Turkey’s relations with the Arab Gulf states.
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