

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University
Faculty of Humanities
Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology

Beka Makaradze

**„Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States
in the post-Cold War Period (2002-2020)“**

Annotation

Batumi - 2022

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University
Faculty of Humanities
Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology

Beka Makaradze

**„Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States
in the post-Cold War Period (2002-2020)“**

Specialty: History

(Dissertation submitted in partial Fulfillment of the requirements for PhD degree of History)

Annotation

Batumi - 2022

Dissertation has been performed in the Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology, Faculty of Humanitarian Science of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University.

Scientific advisors:

Revaz Diasamidze

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Associate Professor at Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Giorgi Sanikidze

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Professor at Ilia Chavchavadze State University

Foreign expert:

Shahin Mustafayev

Academician at the National Academy of Azerbaijanian Sciences

Experts:

Sulkhan Kuprashvili

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Professor at Akaki Tsereteli State University

Otar Gogolishvili

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Professor at Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Irakli Gorgiladze

Doctor of Historical Sciences,

Associate Professor at Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

The defense of the thesis will be held at 13:00 on 9 July, 2022 at the meeting of the dissertation council of the Faculty of Humanitarian Sciences of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University.

Address: Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, 32/35 Ninoshvili Str., room №37.

The dissertation work is available in the library of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, as well as on the university website - www.bsu.edu.ge.

Secretary of the Dissertation Council:

Professor Maya Kikvadze

The importance and relevance of the research topic. At the end of XX and the beginning of XI century, Turkish-American relations attracted the attention of the international community.

The term "cold war" referred to the main content of international relations in the second half of XX century, from the period after World War II to the 1990s. The term denoted a sharp political and ideological confrontation between the two systems - the United States and other leading Western states, on the one hand, and the former Soviet Union and its allies, on the other hand. In 1945, after the defeat of Nazi Germany, the USSR and the USA were the two superpowers of the world.

During the Cold War, the United States was able to become the savior of the Western world, Western civilization and democratic values. At the same time, it became clear that the US were trying to gain economic and political influence throughout the non-Communist world.

There are three different views on the causes and content of the Cold War. According to the first opinion, which was accepted in Western scientific and political circles, the main culprit in unleashing the "cold war" was the Soviet Union and its communist regime, which sought to repaint the whole world "red", and the United States were forced to confront the threat of Soviet expansionism and save Western values; according to the second (Soviet) point of view, the Cold War was caused by the US desire for world domination and the intention to destroy communism; from the third point of view, the destruction of Germany created a power vacuum in Europe, which two superpowers (USA and USSR) tried to fill. Ultimately, the Cold War was a conflict between two superpowers in a bipolar world.

The "transformation course", launched and implemented in the Soviet Union in 1985, was a turning point in the history of the Cold War and international relations in general. The reduction of strategic weapons and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan changed the international situation for the better, while the fall of the Berlin Wall, the overthrow of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from there, and especially the collapse of the Soviet Union, put an end to the bipolar international system. By 1992, when the Soviet Union had ceased to exist as a state and the communist regime had collapsed across Europe, the Cold War was a thing of the past.

Since the end of the Cold War, relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States have been centered on security. The foreign policy of the two countries had either common or very different goals. At the same time, there were periods of ups and downs in economic relations. It was the goal of achieving security that led to cooperation between the two countries. On the one hand, there was the leader of one of the two poles of the Cold War era - the United States, and on the other - Turkey, a country with significant influence in the region, but greatly dependent on the United States.

The relevance of this research topic is due to the above mentioned factors.

Goals and objectives of the study. Based on the topic of the study, this work provides an opportunity to fully present the relationship between the Republic of Turkey and the United States from the period after the end of the Cold War to 2020. In addition, the dissertation will provide the interested reader with the opportunity, based on recent historical experience, to draw reasonable conclusions to determine the vectors of future relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States.

The main purpose of this study is to analyze relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States at a certain stage of the period after the end of the Cold War, and in particular, to study various aspects of their foreign policy relations in regard to the regions of the Middle East and the South Caucasus.

The purpose of the work is also to assess and show the foreign policy views of the authorities of the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the near future on various important issues that are still relevant for both Turkey and the United States. It is especially interesting that Ankara is pursuing a policy independent of the United States in the Middle East and South Caucasus, and it is trying to adapt to the role of the so-called "independent player".

The purpose of the dissertation is also to analyze the political moves taken by the Republic of Turkey and the United States government on various important issues and to develop assumptions about the future that may be of interest to students or researchers interested in studying the national security of Georgia. One of the main tasks of the work is also to provide advisory assistance to researchers interested in relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States.

To achieve our goals, we have limited ourselves in the process of research to the following questions:

1. Brief history of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States during the Cold War;
2. Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States after the Cold War in the 1990s;
3. Analysis of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America in 2002-2020;
4. Discussion of key aspects of the foreign policy of the current governments of the Republic of Turkey and the United States.

Object of study. The dissertation research presents relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the period after the end of the Cold War (2002-2020). The study comprehensively analyzes the foreign policy steps of the governments of Turkey and the United States, evaluates their results and makes predictions about the consequences of foreign policy steps already taken.

The state of study of the topic. Despite the relevance of the topic, relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the period after the Cold War (2002-2020) have not been comprehensively and fundamentally studied in Georgian historiography. Of course,

it should be noted the lack of complex textbooks and monographs, what creates a problem for all researchers interested in this topic.

Scientific novelty of the article. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the fact that for the first time this issue has comprehensively been studied in an academic context, where relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the period after the end of the Cold War (2002-2020) are discussed, analyzed and evaluated.

The dissertation comprehensively examines a number of important key issues in relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States, such as US-Turkish relations and their political interests in the Middle East, Russia and the South Caucasus.

The paper deals with a thorough analysis of relations between Turkey and the United States in 2002-2020, which allowed us to show their relationship from the period after the end of the Cold War to the present.

While preparing the research work, we used the latest sources and scientific literature in English and Turkish, which is also an innovation in terms of research in the academic field.

In addition to the above, the paper attempts to study the historical, political and legal aspects of this topic, taking into account internal and external factors that have a direct impact on the formation of the main directions of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States.

The practical significance of the article. The practical significance of the article lies in the fact that the materials, conclusions, recommendations, proposals and individual assessments contained in it can be used by historians, orientalists, as well as representatives of international relations and other areas of the scientific community who are interested in relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America. In addition, the work can be used in the teaching of relevant disciplines in higher educational institutions.

Methodological and theoretical bases. When working on the article, we have used the research methods tested in the modern scientific field, corresponding to the essence and characteristics of the object of study, goals and objectives. The object of research is complex, which necessitated the use of historical, comparative, descriptive and evaluative research methods based on analysis and synthesis. Theoretical and empirical material was also used.

Due to the complexity of the research topic, its versatility, diversity and numerous sources, the research question posed by us was examined as part of the study. Accordingly, books, monographs, other publications, as well as electronic materials on relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States were processed and analyzed.

In the process of research we have also used the materials from the Central Library of the Istanbul University of the Republic of Turkey, which present the latest works of Turkish, European and American scientists on relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States during the Cold War.

Scientific significance of the research topic. The study of the research topic is especially relevant, its main significance is that the analysis of the current aspects of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States will allow the Georgian government to pursue

a policy that will help our country acquire an advantageous position in relations with a neighboring country.

The scientific significance of the study is determined by the materials, conclusions, suggestions and recommendations that can be used in further study of the problems raised in the paper and in the conduct of scientific research, as well as in the educational process in educational institutions by specialists in the relevant field.

Chronological framework of the study. This article chronologically covers one of the stages of the period after the Cold War, i.e. 2002-2020, which was mainly due to the fact that during this period, relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America gained much more importance for a number of reasons and attracted the attention of the world community.

Scope and structure of work. The dissertation involves 150 printed pages and consists of an introduction, four chapters, nine subsections, a conclusion and a list of references.

History of the study of the issue. Regulatory materials and official documents were used and analyzed while working on the dissertation; a review of the Georgian, Turkish, English and Russian scientific literature was made, including articles, other works, materials available on the Internet, studies/research results on the topic. Collections, reports and reference books occupy a special place in the study of individual issues of the problem under study.

Part of the material was found in the collections of the Library of Oriental Studies of the National Parliamentary Library of Georgia and in the Central Library of Istanbul University.

Well-known Turkish scientists, relying on primary sources, have devoted interesting works to the study of the problems of Turkish foreign policy. First of all, it is worth mentioning the collection of works "Foreign Policy of Turkey in 2001-2012" compiled by Ali Dayoglu, Baskin Orani, Funda Keskin Ata, Ilhan Uzel, Kudret Özesay and others, where part III presents a thorough analysis of the Turkish-American relations in above mentioned period, as well as documentation on this issue and its analysis. It should also be noted that these works were first used in Georgian historiography.

It is also worth mentioning the scientific work of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey (2014-2016) and the Minister of Foreign Affairs (2009-2014) Professor Ahmet Davutoglu - "Strategic depth - issues of Turkish international relations" (2014), where the author in a new way outlines the course of Turkey's foreign policy in the post-Cold War period and clarifies what kind of foreign policy Turkey wants to pursue in the 21st century. Aspects of Turkish foreign policy towards the United States, the European Union, the Russian Federation, the countries of the South Caucasus and the Middle East are analyzed and comprehensively discussed.

It is very interesting to consider the work of the Turkologist Maya Manchkhavili "Turkish Foreign Policy in 1990-2008", translated from Turkish, which examines the various works of twenty scientists from thirty-four universities, explains the new foundations of

Turkish policy, and shows the tasks facing Turkish foreign policy. This paper also discusses Turkey's foreign policy priorities and relations with the United States.

Turkish scholar Nasul Uslu gives an interesting explanation of the situation in Turkey after the end of the Cold War. In his book "A General Portrait of Turkish-American Relations from 1947 to the Present", the author notes that "the uncertain situation that arose after the collapse of the Eastern Block was alarming from the point of view of Turkey's security." "The crisis in the Persian Gulf, the ethnic and religious conflict in Yugoslavia, the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in the Caucasus and the war in Chechnya, unrest in the Middle East, the Balkans and the Caucasus in general forced the Republic of Turkey to start taking security measures". According to the author, in such an uncertain and multifaceted situation, Turkey could play the role of a "world gendarme" with the "help" of the United States.

Professor Hassan Koni notes in his work "Turkey's New Hegemony" that after the end of the Cold War, Turkey automatically became the most important power in the region. Such an increase of Turkish influence in the region was also facilitated by the fact that Turkey, which met American interests, had a strong position in the Middle East region. Thus, Turkey's strategic alliance with the United States has made Turkey a major power in the region.

It is interesting to examine a work called "The Grand Chessboard" written by Zbigniew Brzezinski, an American political scientist and statesman of Polish origin. The author tells how in the late XX century, after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States and non-Eurasian states became sole leaders in the Eurasian states. According to the writer, with whom we agree, Turkey, despite a number of problems, is considered an important geopolitical center in the region along with Iran, as it stabilizes the Black Sea region, controls the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, and balances positions of Russia in the South Caucasus.

Today, the Republic of Turkey is an ally of the United States and the only Muslim state of the North Atlantic Alliance that officially opposes Islamic fundamentalism and is the direct defender of NATO's southern flank. Thus, according to Brzezinski, destabilization in the Republic of Turkey will destabilize the entire region and help the "Russian Empire" regain control over the South Caucasus.

An interesting research of US foreign policy belongs to the American scientist B. Gentleson - "American foreign policy - the dynamics of choice - in the 21st century", where the author examines the history of US foreign policy and American-Turkish relations at the present stage in the context of primary sources and rich scientific literature. This work has helped us a lot in completion of our dissertation work.

R. Olson also addresses the topical issues of the foreign policy of the modern Republic of Turkey in his work "Turkey's Relations with Syria, Israel and Russia", dedicated to Turkish-Israeli-American political relations and military, political and economic cooperation.

Worthy of mention is the work "The Ankara-Washington Line" by Professor T. Korkmazi, where the author pays special attention to relations between the United States and the Republic of Turkey from the second half of XX century to the beginning of XI century. He correctly describes the role played by the US in the military coup d'état occurred in the Republic Turkey on May 27, 1960 and September 12, 1980. Of particular interest to us is the part of the work where the author thoroughly discusses the split that arose between the United States and Turkey after the famous terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Also noteworthy is the work of Professor Graham Fuller "The New State of Turkey" on the foreign and domestic policy of Turkey. Chapter XVI, devoted to Turkish-American relations, is of particular interest and importance to us. The paper deals with such issues as: 1. The growing influence of political, economic, military and strategic actions of Washington on the Middle East policy; 2. The conflict between the positions of the United States and the Republic of Turkey regarding problems in the Middle East and Turkey's concern about the loss of influence in this region; 3. Problems of unwanted regional conflicts, etc.

The study of the history of Turkey was also conducted by Eric Jan Zürcher, a well-known European scientist and professor at Leiden University. In his work "Turkey: Modern History" he gives an in-depth overview of the problems facing Turkey in the late XX and early XXI centuries. The author analyzes in detail the key issues of both domestic and foreign policy. He pays special attention to Turkish-American relations.

It is also worth mentioning the monograph of Professor Bernard Lewis "The Origin of Modern Turkey". The author focuses on the most important issues of domestic and foreign policy of Turkey.

The studies of Georgian scientists regarding the problems of the foreign policy of modern Turkey deserve attention as well. In particular, in his work "History of Turkey" (1299-2000), Professor M. Svanidze, a well-known Georgian Turkologist, based on primary sources and documents, provides interesting materials and views on Turkish foreign policy.

Eliso Machitidze, a Georgian orientalist, is the author of interesting scientific works on Turkish-American relations in the modern period. Among them, we would like to highlight "From the history of US-Turkish relations"; "Turkey and the United States in the 1980s"; "Golden Age in the History of US-Turkish Relations". Based on sources and documents, the author provides us with a lot of interesting material that is very important and relevant for our research.

An interesting paper "History of the Middle East and its relations with the South Caucasus" (XIX - beginning of the XXI century) belongs to a group of authors (Alasania G., Gelovani N., Sanikidze G.), who describe modern Turkey and point to its special place in foreign policy.

Also noteworthy is the work of the academic doctor of historical sciences, Zurab Batia, - "Turkish Armed Forces", where the researcher provides interesting information about the Turkish Armed Forces, based on various sources and literature, and pays special attention to Turkey's cooperation with the United States and NATO.

Z. Batiashvili also has an interesting study titled "Tensions Between the US and Turkey - Expected Threats and Challenges for Georgia", in which the author analyzes relations between Turkey and the US in 2016-2018 and shows that both sides perceive the relations with other countries in different ways, as well as the importance and place of their countries in international relations.

An cognitive report on the Turkish foreign policy - "Turkey at the end of XX century and the beginning of XI century" was made by the academic doctor of historical sciences Maia Manchkhvashvili, where she noted that in today's geopolitical realities, Turkey has become a regional leader. A special place in the monograph belongs to Turkish-American relations at the present stage.

Interesting scientific works belong to another researcher-historian, Professor Emzari Makaradze: "Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the post-Cold War period"; "Relations between Turkey and the United States in 2002-2017"; "American-Turkish relations during the administration of George W. Bush (1989-1993)"; "Key aspects of Turkish-American relations at the present stage"; "Major Problems of Turkey and the United States Today". The study focuses on Turkish-American political relations from the post-Cold War period to the present. Also of interest is the textbook published by Professor Emzar Makaradze in 2019 - "History of Turkey 1918-2018". – Lecture Notes, where a special place is given to Turkish-American relations after the failed coup of 2016 in Turkey.

In 2019, Academic Doctor Lasha Khozrevanidze published an interesting monograph "Aspects of Turkish Foreign Policy", which examines Turkey's foreign policy towards the United States from 1980 to 2018.

The book of Professor R. Gachechiladze - "The Middle East: Space, People and Politics" also deserves attention. In one of the chapters of this work, the author discusses the policy of modern Republic of Turkey and shows how Ankara managed to turn from a geopolitical player into a regional leader. The author examines in detail the important problems of the Republic of Turkey, such as, the Kurds in regional geopolitics and the island of Cyprus divided in half. He focuses on how the US-led military campaign in Iraq has negatively affected the region.

It is worth mentioning the work of the researcher S. Bakuradze - "The main directions of Turkey's foreign policy in the post-Cold War period". The author pays special attention to Turkey's foreign policy in the post-Cold War period, the main task of which was to increase its influence in neighboring countries.

Famous Russian scholars have also devoted some interesting works on the modern history of Turkey in the historiography of the former USSR: G. Starchenkov, "Modern Turkey"; N. Kireev, "History of Turkey - XX century"; M. Gasratyan, S. Oreshkova and U. Petrosyan "Essays on the history of Turkey", in which a special place is given to the history of Turkish-American relations at different stages.

Despite such intensive work on the subject, historians have not yet made a comprehensive analysis of Turkish-American relations in the post-Cold War period.

In this dissertation, we have tried to analyze and present our vision of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America in the post-Cold War period (2002-2020).

Approbation of the dissertation. The work was successfully tested at the Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University on February 23, 2022. Separate parts of the work were published as articles in scientific journals.

Work structure. The work consists of an introduction, four chapters, nine paragraphs and a conclusion. It is accompanied by a list of sources used and scientific literature.

The introduction discusses the relevance of the topic, the goals and objectives of the study, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the article, scientific novelty.

Chapter I. Brief historical overview of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States during the Cold War.

Active military, economic and political relations between Turkey and the United States began shortly after the end of World War II. The intention of the Soviet Union to establish military control over the straits and gain "influence" in the territories of the eastern regions of Turkey met with sharp resistance from the United States. This was facilitated by the Truman Doctrine of 1947 and the Marshall Plan, through which the United States provided Turkey with large financial assistance, which in 1947 amounted to \$100 million. Most of it was spent on the development of the military sphere in the country.

In May 1951, the United States recommended Turkey to join the North Atlantic military-political bloc (NATO), and in October 1951, a protocol on Turkey's entry into NATO was signed in London. On February 18, 1952, at a meeting of the Turkish Majlis, the treaty on joining NATO was ratified. Since joining NATO, Turkey has been an active participant in the military blocs initiated by the US and Great Britain - the Baghdad Pact (February 24, 1955) and its successor Sento (military-political union in the Middle East) (February 1959, March). Turkey has taken part in all rallies organized by Western countries in the Middle East. In the 1950s and 70s, US aid to Turkey amounted to \$2,885.5 million, of which \$1,878.3 million went to military needs, and the rest went to the development of the economy, the construction of roads, airfields and ports, which were of great strategic importance. US military aid to Turkey increased dramatically in the 1980s. It is noteworthy that in 1980-1985 US aid amounted to \$2.6 billion.

Geopolitical shifts after World War II replaced the de facto neutrality of Turkish foreign policy with a pro-Western course. A rapid Turkish-American rapprochement began, which throughout the Cold War was conditioned by the threat of impending aggression from the Soviet Union.

Since 1980, there have been significant changes in Turkish-American relations. Current political developments in both Turkey and the US have made relations between the two countries more diverse. True, they were based on elements of relationships that existed in previous periods, but the new form was still significantly different from the previous one.

The role of the United States for Turkey in the new political approach during this period is most noticeable. Turkey's neighborhood with the Middle East has become an impetus for new changes in US foreign policy. Western countries viewed Turkey as a country bordering the West and the Middle East, and discussed plans related to it in the light of the West's attitude towards the Middle East. Moreover, with the exception of one or two cases, Turkey preferred not to interfere in the ongoing processes in the Middle East. That is why its activation in the Middle East region in the 1980s and its obvious intervention in the processes taking place there, can be seen as a turning point in Turkey's foreign policy.

Relations between Turkey and the United States have long been influenced by disagreements between Turkey and Greece (problems in the Aegean and Cyprus), as well as instability in trade and economic relations with the United States, and controversial issues in the military sphere. Based on all of the above, Turkish-American relations in the 1980s were accompanied by serious problems, and therefore this period, as we have already mentioned, became a test for relations between the two countries.

In the 1980s, the US sought to use Turkey's "Islamic factor" in its Middle East policy to its advantage, paving the way for American interests in the Middle East.

The United States attached great importance to Turkish-Israeli relations because the success of US policy in the Middle East depended on the cooperation of these strategic partners. Turkey, for its part, sought to use the support of the Jewish lobby in the US Congress.

Thus, during the Cold War, Turkish-American relations are characterized by both ups and downs.

It is noteworthy that Turkey often pursued a more active and effective policy than before, and sought to gain some advantage on certain issues, but, as mentioned earlier, did not receive the support that it expected from the United States, and therefore could not achieve the set goal.

In the 1980s, despite minor differences, the Republic of Turkey automatically became one of the most important strongholds of the United States and a powerful force in the Middle East. Therefore, in the 1980s, Turkey's foreign policy was mainly focused on an alliance with the United States.

Chapter II. Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the 1990s.

In the 1990s, after the end of the Cold War, relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States were largely determined by security considerations. The foreign policy of the two countries from time to time had both common and sometimes sharply different goals. At the same time, there were periods of ups and downs in economic relations. It was the security policy that determined the cooperation between the two countries. On the one hand, there was the leader of one of the two poles of the Cold War - the United States, and on the other hand - Turkey, an important but too dependent on the US country in the region.

Radical changes in Turkish-American relations took place in a completely different context - during the Persian Gulf War (1990-1991), when Turkey was given the opportunity to prove its real benefit to the United States, Ankara made the most of its chances and opened its military bases troops of the anti-Iraq coalition and blocked the Kirkuk-Yumurtalik direction of the Iraq-Turkey oil pipeline. In addition, it deployed a large contingent of its troops on the Iraqi-Turkish border, which led to the mobilization of part of the army of S. Hussein in this area.

Ankara's loyalty during the Gulf War, the collapse of the USSR, and Turkey's geographical proximity to the troubled regions of Eurasia forced the Bush Administration to reconsider the proposal of Turkish President T. Ozali to use Turkey as a bridge between "West and East". Just a year later, the idea of the Turkish president appeared before American Republican strategists in an entirely new perspective. They insisted on strengthening Turkey's strategic role in Central Asia and the Middle East, which would help the US resolve four issues at once. In particular, **firstly**, it has been suggested that a strong Turkey is successfully resisting a possible Russian expansion to the south. The Bush administration feared that the return of the Kremlin as a strong player in the rich countries of Central Asia would pose a threat to the energy security of the US and Europe. The example of Turkey as an Islamic and at the same time secular, economically stable state was to become a model for the development of the southern republics of the former USSR, and at the same time it was to play the role of a kind of civilized "bridge" between cultures. All this would bring the countries of Central Asia closer to the West. **Secondly**, geographic and ethnic proximity to the countries of Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan are of Turkish origin) would allow Turkey to establish basic "democratic values" in the former Soviet republics. Experts of the US Republican administration believed that the formation of markets and the establishment of a stable political system in the region would strengthen US influence and allow large transnational corporations to penetrate into Central Asia. **Thirdly**, American strategists were seriously concerned about the danger of the spread of Islamic fundamentalism, which was already gaining momentum in Sudan, Egypt, Algeria, and especially in Iran. "It is clear that Iran is an important player in the region, but at the same time it is becoming clear that we need Turkish, not Iranian, influence there," reports the Boston Globe. Washington expected that the democratic system established in Muslim Turkey could become an ideological counterbalance to the radical influence of Iran in the countries of Central Asia, where the Muslim population predominated. And, finally, **fourthly**, the connection with Turkey was in the interests of the US military-industrial complex. The military-industrial complex has traditionally been represented in Congress by the Republican faction. The lobbyists of the complex hoped that in the 1990s Ankara would still be one of the regular buyers of American weapons.

In early 1992, the Bush Administration decided to make adjustments to its policy towards Turkey. The concern of American strategists was caused by the defeat of the Motherland Party of President T. Ozali in the parliamentary elections, and the victory of the right-wing

conservative party of S. Demirel "The Right Way", which received the majority of votes. However, Washington's fears dissipated as soon as Prime Minister S. Demirel hinted that he supported a joint Turkish-American foreign policy strategy. "Turkey is ready to take care of the Turkic-speaking republics," Demirel said after meeting with the leaders of the Central Asian republics of the CIS at the World Economic Forum in Davos.

On February 15, 1992, S. Demirel paid an official visit to Washington, where he confirmed Turkey's interest in developing relations with the United States, but he also said that he did not consider himself an "American poodle", thereby indicating that this role was played by President T. Ozal. This position of the Turkish Prime Minister created some tension in relations between the two countries, although it did not have a serious impact on the overall situation.

In the 1990s, Turkey took part in all rallies organized by Western states in the Middle East. It was part of the 1990-1991 coalition formed to push Iraqi occupying forces out of Kuwait. In the 1990s, Turkey repeatedly deployed troops in northern Iraq to eliminate the bases of the rebel Kurdistan Workers' Party. In 1998, strong pressure from Turkey forced the Syrian leadership to refuse political asylum to Turkish Kurdish rebel leader A. Ocalan and expel him from the country.

Turkish scholar Nasul Uslu gives an interesting explanation of the situation in Turkey after the end of the Cold War in his work "From 1947 to the present. General portrait of Turkish-American relations", where he said that "the atmosphere of uncertainty, following the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, has raised concerns about Turkey's security". The crisis in the Persian Gulf, the ethnic and religious conflict in Yugoslavia, the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in the Caucasus and the Chechen war, unrest in the Middle East, the Balkans and the South Caucasus in general forced the Republic of Turkey to start taking "security measures". According to the author, in such an uncertain and confusing situation, Turkey could play the role of "world gendarme" with the "help" of the United States.

Interesting conclusions are given by Zbigniew Brzezinski, according to which, after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, Turkey began to play an important geopolitical role. At that time, the focus of Turkish-American relations was on regional threats near and around Turkey, proximity to energy-rich areas, and geopolitical position.

In the 1990s, the end of the Cold War and the expulsion from the political arena of the main threat to Turkey - the Soviet Union - gave Ankara the opportunity to act independently in the region, what became more active at the beginning of the 21st century.

Chapter III. Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States in 2002-2020.

3.1. Political ideologists of Turkish-American relations at the present stage.

At the end of XX century and the beginning of XI century, an important element of the foreign policy of the Republic of Turkey was a stable relationship with the United States.

The guarantees offered and provided by the United States have become of decisive importance for Turkey in both domestic and foreign policy.

As part of the new international order created after the end of the Cold War, Turkey chose a new course in relations with the United States, as there was no longer such a dangerous power as the Soviet Union. In the process of globalization, ensuring a balanced economic and political partnership with the US and the European Union has become a prerequisite for remaining competitive. Therefore, in order to get closer to the West, Turkey was faced with the need to transform its internal and external systems in parallel with its global values.

Although there have been occasional uncertainties and tensions in Turkish-American relations, anyway, they have always remained stable. The main reason for this fact, in many cases, was common mutual interests. Both countries play a vital role in resolving key global and regional issues, as well as in balancing global forces. In other words, the main feature of external relations between these two countries determines not only the specifics of relations between them, but also the events that often occur in different regions of the world. Therefore, the development of a common foreign policy of both countries with the development of an appropriate policy in line with current processes in the world will have a direct impact on their relations. In general, a strong Turkish-American partnership, based on a common regional or global vision and policy, requires great effort and vigilance, because relations between the two countries will not be successful and productive in this or that process, unless other states, other forces are involved.

Today, the Turkish ruling power is trying to pursue its own, independent domestic and foreign policy, taking into account the interests of Turkey, which does not share the values, goals and spirit of its international partners. Turkey is a member of the North Atlantic Alliance, which greatly contributes to its security and stability, but recently Turkey has become a vocal critic of NATO. In this context, it is difficult to predict how long such Turkish policy will last.

If Turkey wants to become a "world-class economy" and a liberal democracy, it will have to forge ties with the United States, which will require it to partially change its foreign policy priorities and distance itself from the Muslim world.

Finally, relations between Turkey and the West have always been volatile. In the past, Turkey also had different positions with the West, but afterwards good relations were established. Maybe in the future the disagreements between the West and Turkey will stop and there will be no misunderstanding between them.

3.2. Reasons for the deterioration of Turkish-American relations in 2002-2020.

At the beginning of XI century, the Turkish political elite, represented by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the Justice and Development Party, declared their regional hegemony and expressed their desire to become an independent player in the world political arena, and not a state pursuing the interests of the West.

After the Justice and Development Party came to power in 2002, along with an increase in the degree of consolidation of power, the number of facts testifying to the authoritarian tendencies of Erdoğan and his entourage towards the West increased in direct proportion.

In parallel with this process, the rhetoric intensified, especially after the failed coup on July 15, 2016.

R. T. Erdoğan's extremely grown ambitions and unpredictability were evidenced by his statement, in which he did not shy away from exposing Turkey's hegemonic aspirations. In particular, he said that he supported the revision of the agreements signed by Turkey after the First World War, which specified the current borders of Turkey.

President R. T. Erdogan also claims the territories of Mosul, Kirkuk and northern Iraq, which are now part of Iraqi Kurdistan, as well as the Dodecanese islands belonging to Greece and a certain section of the Turkish-Syrian border. Erdogan's statement confirms not only Turkey's inadequate desire for individual regional hegemony in the face of an unbridled and modern international system, but also his willingness to implement the neo-Ottoman ideology contrary to the principles of international law, which, given the right opportunity, can turn into action. Erdogan's rhetoric naturally causes concern in the US and threatens its interests in the region.

An important factor in the aggravation of relations between Turkey and the United States is also a significant improvement in Russian-Turkish tensions after the coup attempt. This was supposedly aided by timely information provided by Russian intelligence in preventing a coup attempt on Erdogan. Over the next two years, these countries went even closer: Turkey made a deal with Russia to buy the Russian S-400 anti-aircraft missile system, after which the NATO command announced that Turkey would be limited access to the air defense systems of Alliance member countries, and the United States would stop supplying Turkey with F-35 type jet aircraft.

In addition, Moscow planned to implement a 20 billion project in Turkey - the construction of the first nuclear power plant, which probably proves that Russia and Turkey have long-term partnership plans. In addition, the Syrian peace summit in Astana on February 18, 2017 revealed the prospects for a rapprochement between Russia, Turkey and Iran, which was of particular concern to the US, as the continued partnership between these countries would be a real challenge for America. Currently, the main "line of tension" in US-Turkish relations was Turkey's possible partnership with Iran and especially with Russia.

Recently, the issue of the possible closure of the Incirlik base has become topical, as Ankara constantly points out or directly threatens to take this step at every crisis that occurs in relations between the two countries. It is noteworthy that due to the inadequate behavior of Turkey, the Incirlik base was already abandoned by German troops - they moved to another NATO military base in Jordan. As for the United States, in the 2017 budget, the Ministry of Defense still had the financial costs necessary for the possible redeployment of the base from Incirlik to Jordan. It is noteworthy that due to the inadequate behavior of Turkey,

the Incirlik base was already abandoned by German troops - they moved to another NATO military base in Jordan. The strategic and political significance of this action will probably be taken into account at a non-public level, but the fact is that, despite the constant speculation about the closure of the base by Ankara, the United States is in no hurry to withdraw its military units from this strategically important base.

The culmination of the Turkish-American confrontation was the recognition of the Armenian Genocide by President Joe Biden.

The recognition of the Armenian Genocide by US President Joe Biden showed that Turkey's distancing from the West had its "price", and that Washington managed to overcome the "political rubicon" in relations with Ankara.

Recep Tayyip Erdogan's rather tough actions have caused alarm in the US political elite. In this situation, the need to start thinking about an alternative reality in America began to grow. Naturally, no one in the United States perceived Turkey as an enemy, although it was clear that the level of trust in it had significantly decreased. Western media were increasingly calling for Turkey's exclusion from the Western alliance, again due to its defense cooperation with the Russian Federation. However, it is clear that such appeals were more of a political nature and in fact required more effective steps.

As already mentioned, Donald Trump's attitude towards Turkey and Erdogan in particular was relatively loyal. Therefore, until the end of his presidency, he refrained from imposing sanctions against Turkey because of its cooperation with Russia. However, some researchers believe that such loyalty will be replaced by tougher measures under the new administration, and that President Joe Biden will no longer block sanctions.

For his part, Recep Tayyip Erdogan had his own opinion on this issue. According to him, the decision to purchase defense equipment would remain unchanged, regardless of what retaliatory measures might follow. However, the retaliatory measures did not drag on, and in 2019 the United States officially suspended the program for the supply of F-35 fighters to Turkey, according to which Ankara was supposed to purchase 100 units of fighters from the United States. This turned out to be a serious blow to the country's defense capability, since these fighters have great combat potential.

It is definitely worth noting the chain of events that took place over the last years. We are talking about the process of normalization of relations between the Arab States and Israel, which can be safely attributed to the administration of Donald Trump. These events have two sides. One side is its content. The Arab states, which have had strained relations with Israel for decades, began to think about the future perspectives. However, we believe that the other side of the issue is more important, as behind it lies a new vision of security. The growing role of Turkey has given the United States much thought. Erdogan's actions have called into question the credibility of Turkey in the near future. He decided to flaunt his own political or military power, which could upset the balance of power in the Middle East in the future. The United States realized that in the Middle East, along with Saudi

Arabia and Iran, a new power could freely emerge in the face of Turkey, which wanted to increase its influence. That is why it seems to us that one of the reasons for the formation of the Jewish-Arab coalitions is to take action against a new potential threat. We can say that in this way Donald Trump killed two birds with one stone. He started the process of normalization, which itself is a great progress and achievement, and at the same time laid the foundation for a new coalition, which in the future may act as a new guarantor of the balance of power.

On June 14, 2021, within the framework of the NATO summit, there was held a meeting between US President Joe Biden and Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan, on which the Turkish side had high hopes to solve, if not all the problems between the two countries, then at least some of them. The presidents' talks lasted an hour and a half (during this time both one-on-one meetings and meetings of delegations were held) and touched upon a number of issues. Despite such lengthy meetings, it seems that the parties have not been able to make progress. None of the pre-existing problems in bilateral relations have been resolved.

Obviously, the main issue was the question of the Russian S-400 anti-aircraft systems, the acquisition of which led to US sanctions against Turkey. Biden was unable to convince Erdogan to stop buying Russian weapons.

Thus, the main problem remained unresolved, which means that the US sanctions were continued (and still blocking the delivery of F-35 fighters to Turkey).

In general, Turkey tried to present the meeting in Brussels with the most positive dynamics, because its economy needed US goodwill and positive signals to attract investors.

However, it seems that Ankara's efforts were not enough to achieve the goal. Moreover, on the second day of the meeting, the Turkish lira depreciated even more, by about 1%, and the price of 1 US dollar became 8.55 lira.

Chapter IV. Foreign Policy Issues of the Republic of Turkey and the United States in the period after the end of the Cold War until the 1920s.

4.1. Turkey's new foreign policy after the end of the Cold War.

At the beginning of XI century, a new political era began in 2002 with the arrival of Recep Tayyip Erdogan and the Islamic Justice and Development Party (AKP) at the head of the Republic of Turkey, which was gradually followed by changes in both foreign and domestic policy of the country.

The main ideologist of modern Turkey's foreign policy is one of the founders of the Justice and Development Party and Erdogan's ally, former Foreign Minister and Prime Minister Professor Ahmet Davutoglu, who outlined the strategic priorities of Turkey's foreign policy in his pioneering work "Strategic Depth".

In his doctrine, Ahmet Davutolu argues that Turkey has "strategic depth" that allows it to pursue an independent foreign policy and claims to be the leading state in the region.

As we know, the Republic of Turkey is located at the crossroads of Europe and Asia. According to the doctrine, precisely because of its geographical position and historical ties, it has a desire to influence all these regions (the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the Black Sea), what is considered the core of neo-Ottoman ideology.

Neo-Ottomanism implies a shift of the Turkish political vector from west to east. Since the beginning of XI century, neo-Ottomanism as an ideology has become a responsible force in the political life of Turkey.

According to the ideology of neo-Ottomanism, the Republic of Turkey must get rid of the subordination of the United States, which will allow it to put itself on a par with such states as Britain, France, Russia and China.

Neo-Ottomanism is the main ideological direction of the new foreign policy of the Republic of Turkey. One of the arguments used by Erdogan and his party in moving from a parliamentary to a presidential model is the fact that the country needs a government that is almost as strong and centralized as the Ottoman Empire. At the same time, the president himself and his entourage constantly emphasize that the Turks are the "heirs of the Ottomans" and that the country must return to its former glory and strengthen its political, economic and cultural influence in the former territories of the Ottoman Empire.

Thus, neo-Ottomanism is part of the official ideology of the Justice and Development Party and the basis of the country's new identity, shaped by the political elite over the years. Although there is no direct indication of Turkish regional hegemony in the "strategic depths", most analysts, especially in the West, believe that the expansion of spheres of influence mentioned in the doctrine is, in fact, nothing more than the restoration of Turkey's monopoly hegemony in the region, but this time by means adapted to the modern era, in particular through the use of political, economic and cultural expansion and other "soft power" tools.

The change in Turkey's foreign policy in the post-Cold War period is related to the ruling elite's perception of Turkey's international and regional role as distinct from the previous one and therefore a new Turkish identity. However, the deterioration of Turkish-American relations is mainly due to the change in Turkey's foreign policy priorities, and other reasons (disagreements on the Kurdish issue, the consequences of the 2016 coup attempt, authoritarian methods of government introduced by the Turkish ruling party, active re-Islamization of the country, etc.) are only additional secondary factors. The hypothesis that the change in the country's foreign policy is mainly caused by different perceptions of Turkey's role by the political elite is explained by the theory of structuralism, according to which the actions of a state actor are determined by his own ideas and not by objective social reality. A change in these ideas, therefore, will lead to a change in the actions of the state, including foreign policy.

4.2. Relations between Turkey and the United States and the Armenian issue.

After the end of the Cold War, the issue of recognition the Armenian Genocide is considered one of the causes of tension between Turkey and the US. On April 24, 1915, mass arrests of representatives of the Armenian intelligentsia began in Constantinople. Their list included people of different political persuasions and professions: writers, actors, singers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, journalists, businessmen, policemen, religious figures. The main factor by which they were related to each other was nationality and social status. Arrests of prominent Armenian figures continued with short breaks until the end of May. According to the estimates of the Armenian side, more than 1.5 million Armenians were killed in 1915-1918. The rest fled to Mesopotamia, Lebanon and Syria through the desert, many of them died of starvation and disease. More than a million Armenian refugees were scattered around the world.

At one time, the US Congress Committee on Foreign Relations adopted a resolution condemning the Ottoman Armenian genocide at the beginning of XX century, but under the influence of the presidential administration, this resolution was removed from the agenda of the congress. Nevertheless, official Ankara reacted sharply to the committee's decision and immediately called its ambassador from the United States for consultations. It is noteworthy that Turkey took a similar step in 2007, when the Congress Committee approved the so-called "Armenian Resolution" (attempts to adopt a resolution on the genocide were made in 1974 and 1985, but to no avail). True, shortly after that, the ambassador was returned to Washington, but relations between the two countries cooled significantly, and the US rating in Turkey fell sharply, which was confirmed by public opinion polls conducted to identify the foreign policy sympathies of the population of this country. In particular, at the end of January 2001, the Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet* published the results of a poll conducted by Ankara University sociologists, according to which only 9.9% of respondents believed that rapprochement with the United States should be given priority.

The periodic raising of the issue of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide by the US was intended to "intimidate" Ankara. In response, the current Turkish Foreign Minister A. Davutoglu said after a meeting with First Deputy Secretary of State James Steinborg in Munich: "Let no one think that Turkey is afraid to take steps it does not believe in". According to him, the resolution adopted by the Congress Committee did not meet the interests of Turkey, Armenia, or the United States, and instead of progress, it brought only harm.

Almost every US president made a pre-election promise to the Armenian lobby to recognize the genocide. However, after becoming president, they took into account Turkey's attitude to this issue and refrained from recognizing it.

Biden's predecessors feared worsening relations with Turkey and avoided openly using the word "genocide." As a rule, American leaders used the Armenian term "Meds Yeghern", which means "the greatest evil."

And J. Biden, who had not had a very warm relationship with R.T. Erdogan since he was vice president, broke all previous taboos and took the next step. In the issue of recognition of the genocide, one should also take into account the fact that the US political elite (both Democrats and Republicans) are very concerned about the recent actions of Turkey, which is striving to pursue a foreign policy in the region that is as independent as possible from Washington. It is in this context that the Americans are considering the purchase of the Russian S-400 type air defense systems by Turkey, which, of course, led to the development of relatively light, but psychologically significant American sanctions.

Choosing the right moment to recognize the genocide, Washington probably took into account the fact that Turkey was currently facing serious economic difficulties (socio-economic problems caused by the lockdown due to the covid pandemic, the outflow of Western investment from the country, the devaluation of the national currency, rising unemployment, shrinking foreign exchange reserves, etc.) and could not afford to take effective steps against the United States, which would primarily harm Ankara and its economy.

The US recognition of the Armenian Genocide was also support for pro-Western Armenian Prime Minister Nikol Pashinyan, whom Russia has long sought to overthrow. Naturally, the Turkish side strongly protested against such a decision by Washington.

Responding to Washington's recognition of the Armenian genocide, Turkish Foreign Minister Mevlut Cavusohlu said that Ankara "condemns this statement based solely on populism". In an official statement, the minister said that the US is "distorting" "historical facts" and that the recognition of the genocide would never be accepted in the minds of the Turkish people. It also inflicted deep wounds on people whose mutual trust and friendship were undermined. The ministry urged the US to correct "this grave mistake".

The recognition of the events, happened 106 years ago, as genocide by the President of the United States was clearly a political step that had its own goals and objectives. This, in turn, caused an ambiguous reaction in the international arena and made Turkey's position in the new realities more interesting.

The recognition of the Armenian Genocide by US President Joe Biden showed that Turkey's distancing from the West has its "price" and that Washington managed to overcome the "political rubicon" in relations with Ankara.

Washington's example could be followed by its allies of relatively smaller size and importance, what in turn could create additional discomfort for Ankara in the international arena.

With this recognition, Washington supported the pro-Western forces (primarily Pashinyan and his political party) in the upcoming parliamentary elections in Armenia, where the main battle was to unfold between pro-Russian and pro-Western forces.

4.3. Turkey-US relations and the Israel problem.

At the turn of XI century, Turkey was in second place in terms of proximity to Israel after the United States. Despite the traditional alliance, relations between the two countries have now cooled considerably.

Recently, Turkish-American relations are experiencing a serious crisis, one of the reasons for which are various aspects of Turkey's approach to Israel and Iran. It can be said that bilateral relations between the two US allies - Turkey and Israel - were complicated at that time due to the situation of the Palestinians living in Gaza.

The beginning of the deterioration of relations between these parties was the anti-terrorist operation "Cast Lead", launched by Israel in December 2008 in the Gaza Strip. Turkey sharply criticized this operation, and Erdogan recognized it as a "serious crime against humanity" and severed ties with the Israeli prime minister. The next incident occurred in 2009 at the World Economic Forum in Davos (Switzerland), where Erdogan sharply criticized Israeli President Shimon Peres, calling him a liar and a murderer for an excessively strict military operation in the Gaza Strip. He ended his conversation with Shimon Peres with the following words: "You know perfectly well how to kill people!"

Tensions between Turkey and Israel reached a peak on May 31, 2010, when Israel, citing the need for defense, attacked the Turkish-flagged Mavi Marmara ship carrying humanitarian aid to Palestine.

Tensions with Israel have also affected Turkish-American relations. In 2010, President Obama said doubting Turkey's credible strategic partnership would have a negative impact on US-Turkish relations, especially military aid, which included disagreements over the sale of drones.

Every negative step taken by Turkey towards Israel had a direct impact on Turkish-American relations. Increasingly, outrageous speeches were heard in the US Congress, in the press and some public organizations. The Jewish lobby, which had supported Turkey for many years, could change its attitude. This situation put the US administration in a difficult position.

Thus, the US administration was trying to meaningfully build relations with Ankara and soften relations with Israel. At the same time, the following arguments were given: "Severing relations with Israel will significantly increase tension in the region. This situation does not suit either Turkey or America. We need to soften the relationship."

4.4. Relations between Turkey and the United States and the issue of Iran.

The third source of tension between the US and Turkey was the issue of Iran. Washington believed that diplomatic means of deterring Iran had already been exhausted. This did not stop Turkey, which sought to maintain good relations with Iran and resolve all issues peacefully. According to Erdogan, "diplomacy, diplomacy and only diplomacy can solve the Iranian problem."

The US was extremely annoyed even by Turkey's partial support for Iran's nuclear program. It can be said that at that moment Ankara became a diplomatic ally of Tehran's

Islamic dictatorship. Turkey and Iran were trying to revive the Obama administration's 2009 nuclear fuel swap plan.

It is clear that Turkey, being a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council, caused outrage in the West with its refusal to impose additional sanctions against Iran in March 2010.

It is noteworthy that during the visit of Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan to Iran in 2010, where he accused the West of "acting with double standards" and treating Iran unfairly, it was said that "the rumors about Iran's military nuclear program are unfounded and may not correspond to reality". It must be said that such a position of Turkey was unexpected for the West.

Turkey was very active in the negotiations with Iran in the 5+1 format held on February 26, 2013 in Kazakhstan, which included the US, France, Russia, China, the UK and Germany. The problem was resolved peacefully and Iran was partially exempted from sanctions.

However, the sanctions against Iran were imposed by the US. According to Iranian media, the so-called *blacklist* included nine companies from South Africa, Hong Kong and China, as well as three Iranian individuals that the US government accused of "significant transactions" in Iranian petrochemicals.

Against the background of the coronavirus pandemic, China and Russia called on the United States to lift sanctions against Iran.

Ankara's current course allows Iran to be more resistant to economic pressure and strengthen its influence in the region, which in the future, from a strategic point of view, may become Turkey's most erroneous calculation. However, the rivalry between Sunni Turkey and Shiite Iran, due to the current situation in the Middle East, may become more bitter and open.

4.5. Kurdish issue in Turkish-American relations.

At the end of XX century, the issue of the Kurds repeatedly came into the spotlight of Turkey and the United States.

The revolutionary wave that began in the Arab world in the 10s of XI century (*the Arab Spring*) also swept Syria in 2011. The regime of Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad has responded to peaceful public protests with disproportionate force, as his main goal was to maintain power. The protest motive of one part of the Syrian people was that the Sunni majority was under the rule of the Alawite minority. The protesters opposed this and demanded the protection of human rights and the introduction of democratic government in the country. Assad opened fire on them and made it clear to everyone that regime change in Syria would not happen like in other Arab countries. A similar step by the government led to the fact that part of the Syrian army went over to the side of the opposition and announced that it was starting a fight to overthrow the Assad regime. However, the opposition to Assad was unsuccessful and led to the penetration of foreign radical militants into Syria. They declared their support for the opposition and began to fight against the government of the country.

Then this radical group split in two and emerged as the so-called Islamic State, while the other part continued to cooperate with al-Qaeda.

The majority of Kurds are Sunnis, who, along with representatives of other ethnic groups and faiths, seek to establish a sharply egalitarian (equal) system of government. Kurdish fighters are considered among the best soldiers, effectively fighting terrorist organizations. They are directly supported by Iraqi, Kurdish combat units, the so-called Peshmerga fighters on the ground and by US aircraft from the air. The Turkish authorities consider the Kurdish People's Defense Units (YPG) to be part of the Syrian terrorist organization Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) operating on its territory (the Turks consider it a terrorist organization), and unofficially fight against it, although in 2018 (January 24 - March 24) Turkey launched a large-scale military operation against the Kurds - "Palm Branch". Despite warming relations between Syria and Turkey before the start of the Civil war, followed by the expulsion of Kurdish leader Abdullah Jalal from Syria, Turkey supported Assad's resignation after protests in the country (2011).

The main problem of the direct confrontation between the United States and Turkey in the Syrian conflict was the presence of Kurdish military units, namely the PKK, operating in Syria. For years, the US and Turkey have been members of a Western coalition fighting the regime of Bashar al-Assad and driven by a common goal. The situation has changed significantly in recent times.

The US and Turkey have made fighting and eliminating the Islamic State terrorist organization a priority, rather than seeking to replace the Assad government. This was one of the reasons for the tension in their relationship, which was caused by ideological differences and conflicts of interest between them. Although Turkey was a member of the US coalition against the Islamic State, it has repeatedly criticized Washington for supporting the SDF. At the same time, she tried to prevent the alliance from subjugating the northern border of Syria.

For Turkey, the Kurds and the possible crises arising from them were a step towards maintaining a strong state and destabilizing territorial integrity, so it considered US assistance to the Kurds unacceptable. Turkey sought to withdraw the Kurdish People's Defense Forces as far as possible from its borders and create a large buffer zone between the Kurds living in Turkey and the separatist Syrian Kurdish rebels, as it considered them a threat to the Turkish state. In addition, 3.5 million Syrian refugees live in the border region of Turkey, some of which Ankara intends to resettle in the area liberated from the Kurds. However, the contribution of Kurdish military formations to the fight against terrorism and the defeat of the Islamic State deserves attention.

The Kurds have become significantly more active and, in addition to politics, they have formed a fairly powerful military force against the Islamic State. It is noteworthy that the Syrian Kurdish Armed Forces, "People's Self-Defense Forces", is one of the most organized, trained and motivated organization in the Syrian conflict, which to this day is actively fighting against the Islamic State. During this transitional period, it is also necessary to take

into account the rather difficult position of Turkey. On the one hand, Ankara established good bilateral relations with both Russia and Iran, but the growth of their positions and influence in the region did not particularly suit her. On the other hand, the Kurdish issue, which was particularly painful for Turkey, casted a shadow over Ankara's partnership with the United States, as Washington worked closely with the Kurds in both Iraq and Syria. To rectify the situation, the United States decided to take on the role of a mediator and help both sides to reach a compromise solution. Against the backdrop of a general consensus, a decision was made to create a safe buffer zone in northeastern Syria. The Kurds were supposed to disband military bases and withdraw heavy artillery and weapons from the border zone. A joint coordinating group was to be established to ensure stability and patrol the area.

Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan urged the United States not to renew the terms of the agreement in time, otherwise they would take appropriate tough measures and start hostilities against the Kurds. In a rather fragile and tense reality, US President Donald Trump made an unexpected decision for everyone to withdraw American troops from Syria, which, of course, caused discontent both in the US House of Representatives and among partner countries and politicians. In their opinion, the US decision was to make concessions to Turkey. The Kurdish side was very disappointed, and for them Trump's decision meant a stab in the back, because the Kurds were the main support of the United States in the fight against Aisi and in their defeat; and when the United States had to play the role of an intermediary between them and Turkey, it turned out that they were out of the game. Following the development of a similar scenario and sharp criticism from international experts, Trump issued a statement in which he threatened Turkey if it violated US interests and undermined their authority. However, Turkey was not going to change its policy and continued to act in a way that annoyed the US.

In general, it should be noted that at one time in Turkey, the mention of the Kurds was even forbidden at the official level: first they were called "mountain Turks", and then "Eastern Turks".

On August 3, 2002, the Grand National Assembly (Parliament) of Turkey made a historic decision: to soften the ban on teaching in Kurdish and on broadcasting on radio and television, thereby effectively recognizing the existence of the Kurdish language and, therefore, the Kurdish people themselves on Turkish territory.

In 2009, Turkish state television launched a 24-hour TV channel in Kurdish. Since 2010, Kurdish-Turkish marriage certificates have been issued in Kurdish-majority southeastern Anatolia, with settlements and road directions in two languages. This indicated the liberal position of the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) at that time, but Ankara would not allow Kurdish territorial autonomy in their country.

In the Syrian Arab Republic, the Kurds did not loudly claim territorial autonomy. Their demands did not go beyond the establishment of de facto civil equality and the elimination of ethnic discrimination, and in Syria it was forbidden even to speak the Kurdish language.

Demonstrations by Kurds in support of political empowerment were already on the agenda during the 2011 protests in Syria. Damascus granted citizenship to an estimated 100,000 Kurds, something it had not given them before.

Since 2012, the Kurds have established a de facto autonomy in northeastern Syria, known as Rojava, although this has not been recognized by Damascus, which is involved in a civil war.

In the geopolitical calculations of the early XI century, the issue of the Iraqi Kurds received more attention than other problems. The Kurds have formed a de facto autonomous entity in the area. In September 2002, without the permission of Baghdad, even the regional parliament was restored there. The rival Kurdish factions reconciled and demanded formal autonomy, which caused unease in Ankara, where it was well understood that "autonomization" was almost always the first stage of "sovereignization". Ankara was and is afraid that the creation of an official Kurdish autonomy in Iraq would become a contagious example for millions of Kurds living in the eastern regions of Turkey. Iran has similar concerns.

At the turn of XI century, the US military command considered it necessary to have an internal ally in preparation for the war in Iraq. In this sense, America's natural ally in the fight against Saddam Hussein's regime was the Kurdish minority living in northern Iraq, which was constantly harassed by Baghdad and had serious reasons for extremely negative attitude towards the ruling regime and, therefore, it was the most pro-American among ethno-confessional communities. However, the Kurdish alliance with the United States was not as simple as it seemed at first glance. The terms of such an alliance could not be limited to the decision of only two parties. The Republic of Turkey, one of the oldest US allies in the region, for which the "Kurdish problem", as already mentioned, was a very painful topic, began to take an active part in this issue.

On September 25, 2017, a referendum was held in Iraqi Kurdistan. The bulletin contained only one question: "Do you want Kurdistan and Kurdish areas outside the region to become an independent state?" About 72% of the population of Kurdistan and adjacent territories controlled by the government took part in the referendum. 86% of the referendum participants supported the creation of an independent state of Kurdistan.

It is also noteworthy that support for independence in a referendum did not mean an automatic declaration of independence - according to the rules of the referendum. This gave the leadership of Iraqi Kurdistan the right to announce the creation of an independent Kurdish state in the future. The leaders of Iraqi Kurdistan also stressed that they do not intend to declare independence at this stage.

The fact is that in the future they would consider the results of the referendum as a new stage in the beginning of negotiations, which should have been followed by the creation of a Kurdish state.

The holding of the referendum also raised a number of issues, such as: the borders of the Kurdish state; the attitude of the neighboring countries of the region towards the creation of

a Kurdish state; the position of the West regarding the creation of a Kurdish state; the question of relations between the Kurds and their own religious minorities, etc.

The Iraqi Kurds' desire for independence has a long history. Already in 1946, the Democratic Party of Kurdistan was formed. There was no unity in the party from the very beginning. On the one hand, there was Mullah Mustafa Barzani (father of the current president of the region, Masud Barzani), who was supported by the tribes, and on the other, there was the left wing of Ibrahim Ahmad and Jalal Talabani (the latter was President of Iraq from 2005 to 2014), relying mainly on urban layers. Later, Talabani's supporters united in the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, which, together with the Kurdistan Democratic Party, is today the main political force in Kurdistan. The confrontation between the two parties for a long time prevented the Kurds from pursuing a unified policy aimed at achieving independence.

Recently, however, these contradictions have been overcome, and the differences between Barzani and Talabani have faded into the background. It is noteworthy that Jalal Talabani died shortly after the referendum (October 3), and Barzani and the Kurdistan Democratic Party honored his merits and memory.

The degree of Kurdish independence increased even more after the international intervention in Iraq and the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime (2003). Since this period, this region of the Persian Gulf has even acquired some signs of an independent state. Diplomatic missions of various countries were opened in the capital of the region, Erbil, and international relations of the region were strengthened. The leadership of the region soon took control of the surrounding territories (including energy-rich Kirkuk). The Kurds have become unconditional allies of the West. The Kurdish military unit, the Peshmerga, has proven to be one of the most effective forces in the fight against the Islamic State.

In the conditions of such de facto independence of the region, it is natural that the central government of Iraq was looking for ways to preserve the unity of the country. This goal was served by the election of Jalal Talabani as president (he was elected president of Iraq three times). A referendum on independence in Kurdistan was planned repeatedly, but this was prevented by both external and internal factors. After overcoming internal opposition, finally, on September 25, 2017, this referendum took place.

The attitude of both the central government of Iraq and the countries of the region towards the holding of a referendum and the creation of a new state was sharply negative. Iraqi Prime Minister Haidar Abadi called the referendum illegal and unconstitutional and was also supported by the Iraqi parliament. Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) officials said the result gave them a mandate to start talks with Baghdad, but Iraqi Prime Minister Haidar Abadi demanded an annulment of the referendum results.

Within a month of the referendum, Iraqi government forces occupied the disputed areas settled by the Kurds. The loss of Kirkuk and its oil revenue was the biggest blow to Kurdistan.

Control of Kirkuk, where 10% of Iraq's oil and natural gas resources are concentrated, is of particular importance to the three ethnic groups living there - Kurds, Arabs and Turkmens, but especially to the Kurds who consider it their Jerusalem.

Energy control is critical to Iraqi Kurdistan, but the conflict with the central government cannot be reduced to economics alone.

The only country that unconditionally supports the independence of Kurdistan and officially recognizes the results of the referendum is Israel. Naturally, it is in Israel's interests to create a new problem for the Islamic world that opposes it.

Thus, the creation of an independent state of Kurdistan in any case will require the support of neighboring states. One of its main partners can be considered Israel, which is still silent, although there is no doubt that official Jerusalem will support the creation of an independent state of Kurdistan. A clear expression of this was the statement by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu that Israeli supports Kurdistan's aspirations to become independent.

Political and economic cooperation with Israel is based not only on goodwill, but also on mutual benefit. Israel, for its part, will receive additional supplies of oil from the Kurds at a fairly favorable price and will have a strong military partner in the event of a possible confrontation with Iran. Kurdistan, on the other hand, is reducing the risk of isolation by allying with Israel and acquiring a strong trade and military partner.

The Islamic Republic of Iran takes a firm position regarding the establishment of an independent state of Kurdistan. Iran supports the territorial integrity of Iraq and seeks to mediate differences between Erbil and Baghdad. The resistance of the Iranian government is mainly due to two factors: firstly, the independence of Kurdistan in Iraq can have a similar effect on the Kurds living in Iran, and secondly, these are geopolitical levers - US-backed Kurdish independence would significantly reduce Iran's influence in the region.

An important obstacle to the independence of Kurdistan may be Turkey, where the Kurds are the largest minority. Since 2003, Turkey has actively sought to reduce Kurdish aspirations for independence in Iraq. Today, Turkey has significant economic ties with Kurdistan. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has a good relationship with Barzani, whose party does not support the PKK. However, the appearance on the territory of Iraq of a new sovereign state greatly increases the chances that this may lead to a split between them.

Kurdistan has no access to the sea, it borders on Iran, Iraq, Syria, Turkey and all of them are against its formation as an independent state. All neighboring states are skeptical about the creation of a calm and stable state in such a hostile environment.

4.6. Relations between Turkey and the United States and the problem of Russia.

The beginning of XI century is characterized by changes in the two leading states: in Russia Vladimir Putin came to the head, and in the USA - George Bush. These two leaders, compared with the previous government, clearly advocated a stronger response to terrorism and radical movements and saw them as an international threat.

In the early 2000s, Turkey's domestic politics was not very stable. In the late summer of 2001, Turkey was approaching the peak of its economic and political crisis. The government was forced to implement a series of economic reforms, but as a result, the Turkish lira fell further and depreciated, at the same time, the country's crime rate soared and the rating of the ruling party plummeted.

It was in this situation that the Islam-oriented "Justice and Development Party" came to power in Turkey on November 3, 2002; it won a landslide victory in democratic elections and led the country in a new direction in both domestic and foreign policy.

Relations between Turkey and Russia in 2004-2005 can be considered a turning point. In December 2004, Vladimir Putin visited Turkey. At the first stage, the process of rapprochement manifested itself in trade relations between Russia and Turkey. Thanks to the low cost of exports, Turkey was able to gain a foothold in the post-Soviet space, primarily in Russia.

Developed trade relations between the two countries in a short time grew into serious political cooperation. In March 2006, the coincidence of Turkish and Russian interests in the Black Sea equator became obvious. Turkey did not allow the North Atlantic Alliance to conduct anti-terrorist naval maneuvers in the Black Sea as part of Operation Active Measures. Ankara said that the Black Sea Fleet can carry out such activities on its own.

This position of Turkey, as expected, was actively supported by Russia. A little later, in December 2006, Russia officially joined the project initiated by Turkey called "Black Sea Harmony".

This initiative was similar to the Operation Active Measures mentioned above, except that it did not involve NATO member states and their partners as a whole, but only the Black Sea countries, where an important role, as expected, belonged to Turkey and partly Russia. In general, since the 2000s, Russian-Turkish political moves have been outlined in certain contours, where, through a consistent coordinated policy, they have sought to completely exclude and block the intervention of a third powerful force in their zone of interests.

The Russian-Turkish political mood was well manifested during the Georgian-Russian war in August 2008, when we once again witnessed the political closeness of the two countries. Although the Republic of Turkey helped us with both humanitarian and political statements at the beginning of the war, in fact, it was still on the side of Russia. Although it was not in Turkey's interests to continue this war and, moreover, to further strengthen Russia's position. However, it tried not to allow a negative attitude towards its policy from Russia.

During the Russian-Georgian war in August 2008, Turkish authorities banned two US-made military humanitarian ships from entering the strait, citing the forgotten Montreux Agreement of 1936, which stipulated that the size of American ships did not meet the standards established by the Convention. Later, the United States had to send relatively small

ships to Georgia. Another interesting step taken by Turkey during the August 2008 war was that Turkey, as one of the strongest political players in the South Caucasus, was naturally interested in resolving conflicts in the region and it actively sought the ways to solve them. That is why, on August 11, 2008, it came up with the idea of the Caucasian Platform regional security project. The initiative was first announced by then Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan during a meeting with President Dmitry Medvedev in Moscow in August 2008. The main goal of Erdogan's initiative was to ensure stability, security and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. In this regard, it should be noted that this document by Erdogan was not the first Turkish initiative aimed at strengthening stability and security in the region.

It was preceded by the "Caucasian Stability Pact", announced by the then President of Turkey Suleyman Demirel in 2000, according to which the "3 + 3 + 2" formula was to include three countries of the South Caucasus (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan), three countries bordering the South Caucasus (Russia, Turkey and Iran), and the European Union and the USA. However, despite the very promising idea of cooperation, no specific plan of this pact was presented to the leaders of any country, and it was not finally implemented.

However, good relations between Russia and Turkey have changed since 2015. Relations between the two countries reached an impasse after a Turkish fighter jet shot down a Russian Su-24 bomber in Syria on November 24, 2015. Then, Russia introduced a number of trade and economic sanctions against Turkey. As a result, both Turkey and Russia suffered greatly. It should also be noted that economic sanctions and a catastrophic drop in the flow of Russian tourists have caused more damage to the Turkish economy than to Russia. According to various sources, only in the tourism sector, Turkey's economic losses reached 9-12 billion dollars. Turkey's construction and agricultural sectors have also been hit hard by the ban on the import of Turkish agricultural products into Russia and the restrictions placed on Turkish construction companies.

On June 27, 2016, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan sent a letter to his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin expressing regret over the Russian Su-24 bomber shot down by Turkey on November 24, 2015, and also expressed condolences to the family and apologized for the incident.

This fact, in the light of tense relations between Russia and Turkey over the past seven months, has become a prerequisite for the resumption of cooperation between the two countries.

As is known, the Russian side demanded an official apology from Turkey. In addition, Moscow's demands included compensation for damages and punishment of those responsible. For now, Ankara has refrained from compensating. The fighter pilot was likely convicted for other reasons as well, including his role in the July 16 military coup attempt.

In addition to its narrow economic interests, Ankara has actively cooperated with Moscow in relations with the West. Erdogan's government, often criticized by the West for

gross violations of human rights and ignorance of other democratic principles, considered the possibility of deepening relations with Russia as an alternative development scenario.

Russia's support for the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and its involvement in the ongoing hostilities in Syria have greatly strengthened the regime's position. The Sunni rebels, backed in turn by Turkey, retreated. In addition, there has been a tendency to strengthen the positions of the Syrian Kurds. For Turkey, which, on the one hand, sought to establish Sunni rule in Syria and strengthen its loyalist forces in Ankara, and, on the other hand, to weaken the Kurdish forces as much as possible, Russia's actions posed a direct threat to vital interests. It is for these reasons that Ankara for some time abandoned the strategy of balancing relations with Russia and set a course for cooperation with the West, primarily, with the United States.

Since Turkey could not independently resist Russian military actions in Syria, Ankara sought to speed up a ground military operation against ISIS in western Syria and Iraq, allowing it to actually control all of central and southern Syria, and thus, Moscow practically could not keep the Assad regime in the long term perspective. However, Ankara's strategy did not work. The United States decided to negotiate with Moscow on Syria, which at that time was not strategically necessary in Washington. Moreover, since the escalation of the Syrian conflict, the United States has sought to increase its influence on the Kurds and actively helped them both militarily and humanitarially. Washington itself even forced Ankara to suspend military operations against the Kurds. In particular, in February 2016, with the support of the Russian Air Force and Assad's government forces, Syrian Kurds attacked the positions of rebel fighters fighting Assad, east of Arfin. In response, the Turkish government opened artillery fire on Kurdish positions. The parties ceased hostilities only after a direct demand from the United States.

We emphasize that for Turkey, the creation of at least a federal unit of Syrian Kurdistan led by the Democratic Union Party (the Syrian wing of the Kurdish Workers' Party, recognized as a terrorist organization in Turkey) on the southern border would be a serious blow to its interests. In this case, land access to the Sunni Arab world would be blocked for Ankara and, most importantly, a real threat to the territorial integrity of the country would be created, since the majority of Kurds living in Turkey live in close proximity to the Syrian Kurds. In the Kurdish-populated areas of Turkey, a civil war was actually raging, the scale of clashes between the forces of the PKK and units of the Turkish army were growing.

Armed clashes also engulfed Kurdish cities, what was rare until recently.

Erdogan's expectations did not come true in terms of building relations with the West either. An example is the agreement on refugees with the European Union. Under the agreement, Ankara assumed responsibility for stopping the flow of refugees from Turkey to Greece, in exchange, the EU owed Turkey 3 billion US dollars. In addition, the decision to introduce a visa-free regime for Turkish citizens, planned for June 2016, has not been implemented.

Western criticism of Turkey for neglecting democratic values was intensified again after a relative easing and peaked after the failed military coup in Turkey on July 16 after Erdogan announced punitive measures and introduced the death penalty. However, it should also be noted that Western leaders, commenting on the attempted military coup, condemned the idea of forcibly changing the legally elected government and supported Erdogan's government.

It is also noteworthy that the army is considered the main supporter of secularism in Turkey, and at the moment, in the West. Considering the nationalist position of the army, Erdogan's tendency to Islamize the country is unacceptable for it. The threat of Islamization of a NATO member state is quite painfully perceived in the West as well. For their part, the Turkish military is aware that in a region where the wave of Islamization, after the so-called "Arab Spring" and its consequences, has reached its peak, it will be difficult to maintain secularism and nationalist positions. And at the moment, the only real power in the region that can contain this process is Washington. It is the United States that has the largest military-strategic access to the region (compared to Russia, for example). The leading Arab countries of the region are strategic partners of the United States and are most subject to Washington's influence. Stopping the Islamization of a NATO member state is in the direct interests of the West.

As a result, the Erdogan government found itself in a situation where, on the one hand, strained relations with Russia could not bring significant dividends in either direction, and on the other hand, the confrontation with the West also reached its peak.

Although Erdogan's letter to Putin chronologically precedes the date of the military coup attempt, there is still talk of a connection between the two events. As a rule, the preparation of a military coup takes quite a long time, especially in a country like Turkey, which government is accused of monopolizing power, limiting freedom of speech and trying to establish total control; so, organizing a military coup in such a state requires a lot of time and resources. Judging by the rapid pace of the suppression of the uprising itself, it is clear that the authorities had information about the upcoming event. Consequently, the outcome was clear - an inevitable confrontation with the West. Faced with the threat of complete political isolation, Erdogan decided to renew relations with Moscow. The decision of the Turkish government was probably influenced by economic factors. By 2014, the trade turnover between the countries amounted to 40 billion US dollars, and this figure was planned to double by 2020, but at this stage, the trade turnover between the countries was reduced to a minimum (23.4 billion in 2015, 18 - 19 billion in 2016).

Moscow tried to use Erdogan's strategy to turn Turkey into an energy hub. There were many obstacles in the way of the implementation of the Blue Stream project. In addition to being a technically complex project, it was also costly to implement. Most importantly, Blue Stream allowed Russia to compete for gas supplies to EU-initiated alternative gas pipelines in

Southeast Europe. Also of interest was the issue of energy resources in the Caspian Sea, where the interests of Turkey and the West were contrary to the interests of Russia.

Opinions on the development of Russian-Turkish relations are different. Distancing Turkey from its Western partners is Moscow's longtime dream, but analysts believe that any Russian-Turkish alliance will inevitably fall apart, given historical and regional interests, including competition. "Unfortunately, Ankara believes that it can use Russia and America against each other. However, this will not work". "The Russians will sooner or later finally clear Idlib, full of thousands of terrorists, and this will be the first and most important moment in the confrontation between Russia and Turkey."

As tensions rise between Turkey and the United States over Ankara's purchase of Russian missiles, Ankara will turn to NATO because it believes NATO has a better position on arms purchases.

In conclusion, we can say that Russia has become for Turkey an alternative to the West and the European Union. And only time can tell us what the union of these two historical rivals and their "friendly relations" will bring to the region, and how this will change the situation on the international arena.

4.7. Relations between Turkey and the United States at the present stage and Georgia.

At the beginning of XI century, the deterioration of relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States and the beginning of the so-called "economic sanctions" have had a significant impact on Turkey, whose economic plight has had a direct impact on neighboring Georgia as well. It is known that today Turkey is one of the largest trading partners of Georgia, therefore, economic shocks in Turkey have a direct impact on Georgia. Moreover, there was the covid-19 pandemic in the world, which closed the borders between countries, and all this was reflected in the policies of neighboring countries.

When it comes to security and geopolitics, Turkey primarily relies on its own vision: the interests of the state are the highest and fundamental value, and the government must be in constant search for benefits that will be aimed at protecting national interests.

It can be said that the deterioration of the situation between the Republic of Turkey and the United States since the beginning of XI century is the result of the activities of the President of Turkey and his ruling Justice and Development Party. The strengthening of the power of the President over the past 20 years, judiciously reinforced by the constitutional referendum on April 16, 2017, the radical increase in both internal and external threats to Turkey, the lack of common goals with Western partners in a number of areas have led the Turkish government to seek to strengthen its state independence and sovereignty.

Today, the ruling power of the country is trying to pursue an independent domestic and foreign policy, that takes into account only the interests of Turkey and does not share the values, goals and spirit of its international partners. Turkey is a member of the North Atlantic Alliance, which strengthens its security and stability. The EU is the main trading partner of the country, on which the economic development of Turkey largely depends. In

this context, no one knows how strong the shift of Turkey's political vector to the East will be, which is difficult to imagine as a guarantee of its stability, since the Kurdistan issue remains one of the main problems.

Relations with the West are important for Turkey, and that is why it is a member of NATO, but at the same time, Turkey sees itself as one of the geopolitical centers that should create a certain reality around itself.

It no longer perceives itself as part of an alien reality, as it was in the Western space during the Cold War. Turkey wants to be an independent player in its region, so it faces opposition from the European Union and the United States.

Turkey may not have anything directly against the West, it's just that their interests intersected here. Therefore, the fact that Turkey sees itself as a regional leader means that Ankara, despite possible confrontations, will not give up its regional interests in relations with the West and other influential players.

A breakdown in US-Turkish relations could be detrimental to Georgia's foreign and security policy. In this case, most likely, Turkey will deviate towards the Russian axis, which will lead to an increase in Russia's influence on Turkey, as well as a proportional increase in Russia's leverage in Georgia. Therefore, it seems to us that the improvement of Turkey-US and Turkey-NATO relations is very important for Georgia. From a strategic point of view, Georgia is not as important in the US Middle East policy as Turkey. However, complications and tensions with Turkey could make Georgia a more reliable partner for the US.

It is true that Georgia does not border Syria, Iraq and Iran like Turkey does, but Georgia is an important factor for the US against Russia. In this regard, Turkey is different from Georgia, because Turkey cooperates with Russia to some extent. The US can consider Georgia as a more reliable partner, because we know that Georgia will not "turn" to Russia in the near future.

The question is whether Russia is taking advantage of the strained relationship between Turkey and the US? Obviously, it is. Putin usually views diplomacy in the context of a zero-sum game. This means that if America loses, it will be a victory for Russia. Turkey was a special partner of the United States during the Cold War. Today, this is no longer the case, and there is even active debate about whether Turkey should be a member of NATO. This fact, of course, suits Putin very much.

In the face of constant confrontation with the West, Turkey and its President R. T. Erdogan have a feeling that it is equal to Russia in foreign policy and has the same weight in the international arena.

But in fact, Putin has much more power in the world political arena than R. T. Erdogan and Russia is a much more powerful country than Turkey.

At the same time, the confrontation between the two NATO member countries (Turkey and the United States) is not in the interests of another state - Georgia. How can the

confrontation between Ankara and Washington turn out for Georgia? How will our country cope with the current situation?

At the present stage, according to its own requirements, Turkey has become more aggressive towards neighboring, relatively small countries. Georgia should do what it has done so far with great success: using its close relationship with Washington, it should show Turkey and Russia that its partnership with the US will not satisfy some of their demands.

In the future, problems may arise both with NATO's activities in the Black Sea, and with the already complicated and protracted process of Georgia's accession to NATO. Consequently, this contradiction may have a negative impact on Georgia's external security.

To what extent is it possible for Georgia, in light of the strained relations between Turkey and the US, to play a buffer role for the US in the Black Sea region?

Despite tensions between Turkey and the US, Georgia should play a buffer role for the US in the Black Sea region, which Turkey has been doing for years. Despite tensions between Turkey and the US, there is no expectation from the US side that any damage can be done to bilateral relations with Georgia. It is expected that if tensions between Turkey and the US continue, the US will introduce new types of economic and military sanctions against Turkey.

Turkey, which wants to become a country with a "world-class economy" and a state with a liberal democracy, will inevitably have to strengthen ties with the United States, which in part requires a clearer definition and clarification of its foreign policy priorities.

It can be said that due to the overall security aspects of the Black Sea region, Turkey controls the Black and Mediterranean Seas to some extent and balances Russia in the South Caucasus. As we know, 1.2 million barrels of oil are transported through the Bosphorus every day. In light of recent US-Iranian relations, Turkey's support for relations with Iran is of paramount importance to the United States.

Turkey also has its own interests in relation to the US. It prioritizes strategic partnerships and projects within NATO. Another important factor for Ankara is the role of the US mediator in relations with the European Union in order to integrate it into the organization.

Thus, it can be said that for Georgia at this stage the danger, that Russia and Turkey will make a deal at the expense of US interests, is less likely, but does not exclude the possibility that this may happen in the future. Such a possibility may arise if Turkey does not become a member of NATO and openly goes against the interests of the United States and the West as a whole. In this case, much will depend on the international situation created for this stage and, above all, on the position of the United States.

If the crisis deepens, some sanctions are likely to be imposed on Turkey, thus, creating even more problems for Turkey, which is already in a difficult economic situation. This, in turn, will cause complications in the Georgian economy, since Turkey is our number one trading partner and tens of thousands of Georgian citizens work in this country.

Georgia is aware that geopolitical realities are strong enough and will not change in the near future. Georgia needs to stock up on strategic patience until a “window” of opportunity appears, which means a simultaneous change in the geopolitical context and the harmony of political will. If the diplomatic confrontation between the two NATO member countries moves to the battlefield, this will have a negative impact not only on the Middle East, but also on Georgia. And in this scenario, distancing from the United States will be a natural consequence of Turkey's rapprochement with Russia.

Conclusion

At the end of XX century and in the 10s of XI century, Turkish-American relations were characterized by ups and downs. Relations with the United States did not develop in accordance with Turkey's expectations. The reason for this was the issues of Armenia, Syria, Israel, Iran, Kurds, which were and still are the most important and sensitive problems for Ankara.

Since the 1980s, important new features have emerged in Turkish-American relations. The ongoing processes both in Turkey and the United States, as well as changes in the system of international relations, have given a very interesting form to the relations between the two countries. True, it was based on elements of relations from previous periods, but the new form of cooperation differed significantly from the previous one.

It is noteworthy that Turkey often pursued a more active and effective policy and sought to gain some advantage on certain issues, but, as a rule, did not receive the expected support from the United States and therefore did not achieve its goal.

In the 1990s, the end of the Cold War and the withdrawal from the political map of Turkey's main threat - the Soviet Union - gave Ankara the opportunity to act independently in the region, what became more active at the beginning of XI century.

Changes in cooperation between Turkey and the United States may also be the result of the activities of individuals.

It is safe to say that Recep Tayyip Erdogan's first warning to the United States was a minor incident in 2003, the essence of which was as follows: in 2003, when the United States decided to invade Iraq, Turkey and, in particular, Prime Minister Erdogan did not allow the United States use the Incirlik air base as a springboard.

At that time, this move was seen as a rather harsh response from a strategic partner, but today, 18 years later, when we follow the actions of President Erdogan on a daily basis, the reason for such actions becomes quite clear. Therefore, it can be said that the ice of changes in relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States has been broken since that time. Since then, the Incirlik Air Base has been the subject of controversy on several occasions. In 2014, R. T. Erdogan refused to take part in the attacks against the then-existing terrorist organization ISIS in the United States.

We should also mention the factor that, in our opinion, had the most significant impact on Turkish-American relations. We are talking about the attempted military coup in Turkey in 2016, which opened a wide arena for action for Recep Tayyip Erdogan. We can say that after a rather tough suppression of the military coup attempt, R. T. Erdogan also went on the attack. In particular, his government officials openly accused the US of patronizing alleged rebel leader Fethullah Gülen. The Turkish side asked the US to arrest Gülen and extradite him, but they refused. Because of this, Turkey used propaganda methods to prove the presence of an American footprint in the military coup attempt.

Some researchers explained the growing distrust between Turkey and the United States by the peculiarities of Barack Obama's foreign policy. Obama's bilateral vision was not very popular in the Republic of Turkey because, given his democratic and liberal values, he supported the Kurdish process of self-determination. Therefore, according to some researchers, the current situation is the result of the passive policy of Barack Obama.

It was with these factors in mind that Donald Trump at the time was a savior for both sides. First of all, as a Republican nominee, a conservative man, he made some pretty clear and tough statements from the start. Consequently, the American political elite also hoped that Donald Trump would take a hard line to Turkish issues and, in particular, relations with Erdogan. Scholars wrote extensively that Donald Trump should have begun to take concrete steps to do what Obama failed and act on the principle of restoring the balance of power.

However, as it turned out, Donald Trump was quite loyal to authoritarian leaders, and with his coming to power, the hopes of political scientists did not materialize, what Recep Tayyip Erdogan took advantage of and decided to purchase S-400 anti-aircraft missile systems in Russia. This action not only contradicted the standards of NATO membership, but also turned out to be politically and diplomatically unacceptable: being a member of the largest military bloc NATO, Turkey bought defense weapons from Russia! Of course, all this caused discontent among the US political elite, and the House of Representatives repeatedly tried to start the process of imposing sanctions against Turkey, however, all their attempts were ignored by President Donald Trump.

There were many other actions that had cast a shadow over the relationship between Turkey and the US. These reasons include political issues as well as economic moves and acts human rights protection, although we believe that the most important of these is Turkey's growing role in the Middle East region. President Trump's main course of action in recent years has been to pull US troops out of the Middle East and let it develop on its own.

Consequently, we have received data that shows the real possibility that the contingent of tens of thousands of American troops in the region will be significantly reduced. Recep Tayyip Erdogan himself decided to think about filling the gap resulting from these actions. That was the reason why Turkey became especially active in the Middle East. In parallel, it got involved in several conflicts in Syria and Libya. Moreover, in Syria, it reached an agreement with Russia, according to which the two states would carry out joint patrols in

the province of Idlib. The latter circumstance further exacerbated the situation between the United States and Turkey.

However, the United States did not ignore such actions of Turkey and, despite Trump's loyal attitude, took retaliatory measures.

It can be said that the rather tough steps of Recep Tayyip Erdogan have become an alarming signal for the US political elite. Given the current situation, America needs to start thinking about an alternate reality. Of course, no one in the US perceives Turkey as an enemy, although it is clear that the level of trust has decreased significantly. The Western media are increasingly calling for Turkey's exclusion from the Western alliance, again linked to its defense cooperation with the Russian Federation. However, we all know perfectly well that such appeals were more of a political nature and in fact required much more resolute, effective steps.

As already mentioned, Donald Trump's attitude towards Turkey and Erdogan in particular was relatively loyal. Therefore, until the end of his presidency, he refrained from imposing sanctions against Turkey due to cooperation with Russia.

However, some analysts believe that such loyalty will be replaced by more drastic measures under the new administration, and that President Joe Biden will no longer block sanctions. For his part, Recep Tayyip Erdogan has his own opinion on this issue. He says he will leave the decision to purchase defense equipment unchanged, no matter what retaliatory measures may follow. However, the reciprocal steps were not long in coming, and in 2019 the US officially suspended its F-35 fighter program with Turkey, according to which Turkey was to purchase 100 units of fighters from the US. This was a serious blow to the country's defense capability, as these aircraft had great combat potential.

It is impossible not to mention the events that have taken place in recent years; we mean the normalization of relations between the Arab states and Israel, which can be safely attributed to the administration of Donald Trump. These events have two sides. One side is its content. The Arab states, which have had strained relations with Israel for decades, have begun to think about the future perspectives. However, it seems to us that the other side of the issue is more important, as beyond it there lies a new vision of security. The growing role of Turkey has given the United States something to think about. The actions of R.T. Erdogan called into question the credibility of Turkey in the long term. He decided to pay attention to Turkey's own political or military power, which in the future could upset the balance of power in the Middle East. The US realized that in the Middle East, along with Saudi Arabia and Iran, a new power could easily emerge in the face of Turkey, which wanted to increase its influence. That is why we believe that one of the reasons for establishing Jewish-Arab relations was to take actions against a new potential threat. We can say that in this way Donald Trump caught two birds with one stone. He began the process of normalizing the situation in this region, which in itself was a great progress and achievement, and at the same

time laid the foundation for a new coalition, which in the future could act as a new guarantor of the balance of power.

How can the US-Turkish relations be assessed in the light of the above? Of course, these relationships are vital for both sides. Although there are disagreements between them on some issues, it can be said that Turkey is still a stronghold of the United States in the Middle East region, although it is extremely unstable due to its voluntary or involuntary involvement in various conflicts of neighboring states.

The current state of Turkish-American relations is radically different from what it was during the Cold War period. At a time when the two countries were soon able to find a common language due to the Soviet threat, being under the "umbrella" of Washington was extremely important for the Turkish government. At the present stage, there is no longer such a unifying threat for Turkey, and a leader of a different political type is at the head of the country. Today's policy of Turkey, in contrast to the previous period, is more focused on the interests of the country.

The current leaders of Turkey and the US have very different positions and views on the issue of foreign policy. They differently perceive the place and role of their countries in international relations.

Over the past years, a number of problems have accumulated in US-Turkish relations, the solution of which has been delayed in time.

The aftermath of the crisis has shown that Turkish-American tensions are long-term and should not be expected to end quickly.

Even in the context of sharply aggravated relations, neither the functioning of NATO military bases in Turkey nor Turkey's withdrawal from NATO have been on the agenda, which is a positive development and gives hope that in the future there are still chances of establishing good relations between these countries. However, for the sake of insurance, the US is actively working on a contingency plan; and if, nevertheless, Turkish-American relations reach an impasse, then the American "Plan No. 2" will be launched, according to which US military bases will be located in Romania, Jordan and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Turkey has repeatedly threatened to deprive the US of access to the Incirlik base. Unfortunately, what Erdogan used as a negotiating tactic with the United States has now become a national sentiment. Turkey has over a million troops and is the second largest military force in NATO after the United States.

Never before in the history of Turkish-American relations has there been such a tense situation. In the early stages of Erdogan's rule, Washington did not believe that he would alienate Turkey from the United States, but today there are doubts about this issue. There is also an opinion that Turkey is so important to the US that they are forced to comply with Erdogan's demands, but there is a growing number of people who believe that if Erdogan gets what he wants, he will simply put forward new demands.

Turkey is a country of national ideology, and its President R. T. Erdogan has no difficulty in uniting the nation in this direction, especially when he controls the entire media environment in the country. He wants to show the United States that their different positions and dependence on foreign affairs are dictated by the Turkish people, thereby strengthening the spirit of a free, independent foreign policy among the Turkish population.

Parallel to the distancing of Ankara from Washington, the degree of Turkey's dependence on Russia is increasing.

To the question, how beneficial is the tense relationship between Turkey and the United States for Russia? - the answer is obvious - it suits Russia. Putin usually views diplomacy as a zero-sum game. Turkey was a special partner of the US 15 years ago. Today, this is no longer the case, and there is even an active discussion about whether Turkey should be a member of NATO, what, of course, is very appealing to Putin.

In the context of constant confrontation with the West, Turkey believes that in foreign policy it is equal to Putin and has the same weight in the international arena as Russia, but this is not the case and Russia has much more weight and power in the world political arena than Erdogan, besides, it is a much stronger country than Turkey.

At the same time, a confrontation between two NATO member countries (Turkey and the United States) is not in Georgia's interests. Turkey and the US are Georgia's partner countries. The United States is a strategic partner of Georgia, and Turkey is one of its largest trading partners. Questions arise about how the confrontation between Ankara and Washington will affect Georgia and how our country can cope with the current situation. The answer is this: being at the center of the confrontation between two strong countries, where Turkey, although relatively small, has become a more aggressive state in relation to other countries with its own demands, Georgia must do what it has done so far with great success: using her close relationship with Washington, it should make it clear to Turkey and Russia that, due to its partnership with the United States, it will not meet some of their demands.

In the future, problems may arise both with NATO's activities in the Black Sea, and with the already complicated and protracted process of Georgia's accession to NATO. Consequently, this contradiction may have a negative impact on Georgia's external security.

To what extent can Georgia play a buffer role for the US in the Black Sea region in light of strained Turkish-American relations, what Turkey has been doing for years? At this stage, it is difficult to determine whether the US Congress is ready to deepen military ties with Georgia and irritate Russia, although the US is expected to increase Georgia's diplomatic involvement, both military and economic. It should also be noted that no country in the South Caucasus has such a reputation and support from the United States as Georgia.

Despite US tensions with Turkey, the US is not expected to do any harm with Georgia.

If tensions between Turkey and the United States continue, new US economic and military sanctions against Turkey are expected.

Turkey, which wants to become a "world-class economy" and a state with a liberal democracy, will inevitably have to strengthen ties with the US, which in part requires it to clearly define and clarify its foreign policy priorities.

Turkey largely controls the Black and Mediterranean Seas and balances Russia in the Caucasus. 1.2 million barrels of oil are transported through the Bosphorus daily. Turkey's support is significant in light of recent US-Iranian relations.

Turkey has its own interests in relation to the US. For it, the priority is existing projects within the framework of the strategic partnership and NATO. This refers to the strengthening of military units, the presence of US military bases on its own territory, which creates security guarantees, etc. Another important factor is the role of the US as an intermediary with the EU in order to integrate Turkey into this organization.

The Republic of Turkey will never give up its desire to pursue the most independent foreign policy. Therefore, in all likelihood, it will continue to slowly move in this direction.

All this can lead to further tightening of economic sanctions by the United States.

In the 10s of XI century, the dynamics of the development of events shows that these problems and difficulties in Turkish-Western relations will persist for some time.

Despite the misunderstandings in the relationship, it is unlikely that Turkey will completely distance itself from the US anytime soon.

The fact is that Turkey cannot become a strategic ally of Russia, since these two countries have completely different and often opposing long-term interests. A real rapprochement between Russia and Turkey will be possible only if Turkey refuses to join NATO.

Relations between Turkey and the United States are facing a major challenge. It is clear that neither side wants to aggravate the current situation and both seek to defuse tensions. However, it is also clear that more effort is needed to achieve the desired result. It is hard to imagine that the strategic partnership that has developed between them will be broken, and friendship will be replaced by enmity. However, the fact is that the tension does not subside. Both sides consider alternatives and formulate their own agenda. The national interests of the parties and the peculiarities of foreign policy differ from each other on a number of issues, although the pursuit of international security should be the calling of all states. It is interesting to observe the development of events under the new US administration. Both Turkey and the United States have their own strong position in the international system, so these two countries will always be of great importance to each other, and the expression of the interdependence in cooperation is more favorable and beneficial for everyone.

Scientific papers published by Beka Makaradze:

1. B. Makaradze, The Issues of Democratization in Relations between Turkey and the USA in the Post-War Period. *Historia I Polityka*. N36 (41). s. 153-162. <https://apcz.umk.pl/HiP/article/view/36140>. DOI.org/10.12775 /HiP. 2021.019. ISSN: 1899-5160. eISSN: 2391-7652. ERIH PLUS;
2. B. Makaradze, E. Makaradze, Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States at the Present Stage and Their Impact on Georgia. *Historia I Polityka*. N38 (45). s. 65-70. <https://apcz.umk.pl/HiP/article/view/36517>. Doi.org/10.12775/HiP.2021.034.ISSN: 1899-5160. eISSN: 2391-7652.ERIH PLUS. (co-author);
3. Makaradze B., Makaradze E. Relations between Turkey and the United States at the present stage and Georgia. *International scientific journal of history, archeology, ethnology*. V. 2021. გვ. 314-322. <http://www.sciencejournals.ge/index.php/HAE/article/view/145>. ISSN 2449-285X. ERIH PLUS. (თანავტორი);
4. B. Makaradze "Political analysis of Turkish-American relations at the present stage." *International scientific journal "Messenger of Oriental Studies"*; v. IV. 2021. გვ.20-36. <https://openjournals.ge/index.php/hos/article/view/2837>. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.48614/hos.4.2021.20-36>. ISSN 2587-490X. Google Scholar;
5. B. Makaradze, Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States during the Cold War. *International Scientific Journal "Messenger of Oriental Studies"*. V III. 2020. გვ. 60-77. <https://openjournals.ge/index.php/hos/article/view/3032>. ISSN 2587-490X. Google Scholar;
6. B. Makaradze, Contemporary Challenges of Turkish-Georgian Relations. *International Scientific Journal "Messenger of Oriental Studies"*. V. II. 2019. გვ. 94-102. <https://openjournals.ge/index.php/hos/article/view/2780>. ISSN 2587-490X. Google Scholar;
7. B. Makaradze, "Turkish-American Relations in the Post-Cold War Period" (2000-2017). Monograph. Dani Publishing House 2018. Editor: Assoc. Professor Revaz Diasamidze; Reviewers: Assoc. Professors Manuchar Loria and Irakli Gorgiladze. <https://openjournals.ge/index.php/hos/article/view/2765>. ISBN 978-9941-9642-3-7.
8. B. Makaradze, E. Makaradze, The Relations between the Republic of Turkey and the United States of America at the Present Stage. *Journal of International Relations and Foreign Policy* June 2018, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 1-6 Copyright © The Author(s). All Rights Reserved. Published by American Research Institute for Policy Development <http://jirfp.com/vol-6-no-1-june-2018-abstract-1-jirfp>. DOI:10.15640/jirfp.v6n1a1. ISSN: 2333-5866 (Print), 2333-5874 (Online) (თანავტორი);
9. B. Makaradze, The main problems of Turkish-American relations in the late twentieth and early twentieth centuries // *International scientific journal Bulletin of Oriental Studies*. V. I. 2018. გვ. 56-72. <https://openjournals.ge/index.php/hos/article/view/2807>. ISSN 2587-490X. Google Scholar.