Friends No More?: The Rise of Anti-American Nationalism in Turkey

Ioannis N. Grigoriadis

➡ For additional information about this article
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/370887

Friends No More? The Rise of Anti-American Nationalism in Turkey

Ioannis N. Grigoriadis

This article examines the rise of anti-American nationalism in Turkey. While Turkish public opinion has developed strong views against a set of foreign policies furthered by the United States, recent findings allude to the development of an emerging anti-US bias in large segments of Turkish society. The deterioration of the US image in Turkey could be considered a result of the recent US involvement in the Middle East, as well as socio-political shifts inherent to Turkey's democratization process.

Since December 2004, when the European Council gave Turkey a date for the start of its EU accession negotiations, a significant rise in manifestations of nationalist feeling has been documented in Turkey. A slowdown in the democratization reform process, a sharp drop in public support for Turkey's EU membership, an increase in attacks against liberal intellectuals and minorities, and the striking commercial success of nationalist books and movies have attested to this nationalist upsurge. One of the most interesting facets of this phenomenon is that it is distinctly anti-American in character. While anti-Americanism has been a feature of several European and Middle Eastern nationalisms, until recently Turkey comprised an interesting exception. Yet recent global opinion surveys[1] classified Turkey among the countries where the United States enjoyed the least favorability.

This study sets out from the analytical framework provided by Peter Katzenstein and Robert Keohane in their edited volume *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics* to examine why anti-American nationalism recently has emerged in Turkey and to evaluate its features. Following their classification of anti-Americanisms into liberal, social, sovereign-nationalist, and radical types, it is argued that the Turkish version of anti-Americanism falls into the sovereign-nationalist type. The — until recently — absence of strong anti-Americanism could be attributed to a set of intrinsic features of the Turkish political system which no longer hold true.[2] While Turkish public opinion has developed strong views against a set of foreign policies furthered by the United States, recent findings allude to the development of an emerging anti-US bias in large segments of Turkish society. This could presage the establishment of anti-Americanism as

Dr. Ioannis N. Grigoriadis is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science, Bilkent University. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 13th Middle Eastern Studies Association (MESA) Annual Meeting in Montreal on November 20, 2007.

1. Polling data and analyses were taken from Emre Erdogan, "The Missing Element: Turkish Public Opinion toward the US," *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (2005) and The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *America's Image Slips, but Allies Share U.S. Concerns over Iran, Hamas* (Washington, DC; Pew Research Center, 2006), pp. 258-59.

2. Recurrent military coups, for example, hampered the growth of a strong leftist movement in Turkey through the closure of leftist parties, persecution of leftist political leaders, and the imposition of a 10% threshold for the entry of political parties into the Parliament.

a permanent feature of Turkish political discourse. The deterioration of the US image in Turkey could be considered a result of the recent US political and military involvement in the Middle East and the perceived clash of US and Turkish national interests in the region. The rise of anti-Americanism also could be attributed to socio-political shifts inherent to Turkey's democratization process. While the United States has set support for democratization among its primary global strategic targets, it needs to be aware that democratization could complicate US relations with affected states, especially so long as the United States seems indifferent to the sharp decline of its global image. The election of Barack Obama has mitigated the trend but has not reversed it. Unless the Obama Administration delivers solutions on the conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Israel/Palestine, the US image may suffer a new slump.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF US-TURKEY RELATIONS

As Turkey had remained neutral until the very last days of the Second World War, it risked isolation as the post-war security map of Europe was drawn. The situation became more pressing when a victorious Soviet Union made explicit demands for territorial concessions, including joint military control of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits and recovery of the Kars and Ardahan provinces which were ceded by the Soviet Union to Turkey in 1921. Turkey had no option but to join the Western camp. The articulation of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, in which the United States stated that deterring Communist subversion in Greece and Turkey was a primary US strategic concern, was vital against Stalin's blunt invasion threats. The buildup of the Cold War resulted in Turkey becoming a frontline country positioned against the strategic underbelly of the Soviet Union. Turkey's participation in the Korean War and accession to NATO in 1952 solidified a close strategic relationship between the United States and Turkey. This is not to say that turbulence in that relationship did not occur. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, Turkey felt exposed, as negotiations which involved the withdrawal of US nuclear missiles from its territory were concluded in its absence. The 1963-4 Cyprus crisis, in which President Lyndon Johnson warned Turkey that the United States would not guarantee Turkey's security if a war erupted after a Turkish invasion of Cyprus, marked a low point in US-Turkey relations. Cyprus continued to be the crux of US-Turkey tensions in the 1970s. Relations further deteriorated in the aftermath of the 1974 Turkish invasion of the island when the United States imposed an arms embargo against Turkey — by far the most important sanction against Turkey's Cyprus operation. The relationship experienced further turbulence when the United States demanded the discontinuation of Turkey's traditional opium cultivation in central Anatolia as a part of its global antinarcotics campaign.[3] The rise of the radical left in Turkey in the 1970s only made relations more difficult. The situation sharply changed after the September 1980 military coup. Among the main objectives of junta leader Kenan Evren was the restoration of a close strategic relationship with the United States. The same firm support for US policies in the region was among the main tenets of the policy of the Turgut Özal governments throughout the 1980s.

The fundamental change in global politics brought about by the end of the Cold

---

3. See William Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000* (London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2002), pp. 153-54.

War led to the reconsideration of the US-Turkey strategic relationship. As the new political environment was becoming multipolar and complex, new opportunities for cooperation arose. On the other hand, it also became possible that US-Turkey strategic interests would diverge.[4] The post-Soviet republics of the Caucasus and Central Asia, many of which had cultural links with Turkey, provided an area where US-Turkish strategic cooperation could thrive. As all these states wished to escape from Russian influence, Turkey provided a model of a secular democratic state enjoying strong links with the West. In the Middle East, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 provided the chance for closer strategic cooperation between Turkey and the US. Turkey took a leading position among the states allied with the United States in their campaign against the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Nonetheless, despite Turkey's participation in the war, it turned out to be among the losers in the post-war political setup. Heavy losses were inflicted upon the Turkish economy due to the interruption of the operation of the Kirkuk-Yumurtalık pipeline, as well as the freezing of a very lucrative bilateral trade between Iraq and Turkey. The security situation in southeastern Turkey also deteriorated. The establishment of a no-fly zone in northern Iraq for the protection of Iraqi Kurds and the rehabilitation of thousands of refugees who had fled into Turkey gradually led to the development of a *de facto* Kurdish political entity in northern Iraq. The power vacuum created in northern Iraq and continuous conflict between rival Iraqi Kurdish factions allowed the separatist Kurdish Workers Party (*Partiya Karkaren Kurdistan*, PKK) to find a safe haven and intensify its operations against Turkey. The expansion of PKK operations were stalled only in October 1998 when a Turkish ultimatum forced Syria to expel PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan, who was eventually captured in Kenya in February 1999. Coordinated military operations succeeded in minimizing the threat of the PKK, while a set of liberalization reforms regarding Kurdish minority rights reduced local support for PKK activities.

EVALUATING TURKISH ANTI-AMERICANISM

Before one explores the question of anti-Americanism in Turkey, it is useful to examine the term "anti-Americanism" itself. According to Katzenstein and Keohane, anti-Americanism is "a psychological tendency to hold negative views of the United States and of American society in general."[5] When one discusses anti-Americanism, it is imperative to distinguish between opinions, distrust, bias, and prejudice. The prevalence of anti-US opinions — for instance, opposition to specific foreign policies of the United States — is not tantamount to anti-Americanism. One of the basic findings of the book is the distinction between two different types of opposition to the United States. This can be coincidental and related to the policies of a specific administration. It also can be more deeply engrained and related to the set of liberal democratic values characterizing Western political systems, of which the United States is the most celebrated example. In other words, one needs to distinguish between opposition to

4. See Ian O. Lesser, *Beyond Suspicion: Rethinking US-Turkish Relations* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2007) and Ali Karaosmanoglu, "Problematic Alliance," *Today's Zaman*, December 3, 2007.

5. Robert O. Keohane and Peter J. Katzenstein, "Varieties of Anti-Americanism: A Framework for Analysis," in Peter J. Katzenstein and Robert O. Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2007), p. 12.

what the United States *does*, i.e., US policies on issues such as the Israel-Palestine dispute, the Global War on Terror, the occupation of Iraq, and climate change; and what the United States *is*, namely the values which have come to be represented by the United States.[6] Clearly worldwide opposition to the policies of the George W. Bush Administration has dealt a heavy blow to the US image, and Turkey is no exception to that trend. When these opinions become engrained into distrust against the United States and lead to the formation of bias, then it is possible to talk about the emergence of anti-Americanism. Katzenstein and Keohane delineate four types of anti-Americanism: liberal, social, sovereign-nationalist, and radical.[7] In liberal anti-Americanism, the United States is disliked for not being able to live up to its own founding principles. When the United States, which was allegedly founded as the pinnacle of political and economic liberalism, came to the point of supporting totalitarian regimes in several regions, this was understood by liberals as hypocrisy and treasonous to the very principles which undergird the United States. Social anti-Americanism derives its strength from opposition to the dominant US social model. The absence of a welfare state willing to heal extreme inequalities and provide a basic standard of decent living to all its citizens — in the state which controls the biggest part of the world's wealth — is scandalous to those who support a more equitable distribution of resources. Sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism develops under circumstances of US involvement in regional disputes, which creates the — justified or not — fear that national sovereignty may become compromised. This creates a nationalist backlash which also is expressed in terms of a rising anti-American social movement. Finally, radical anti-Americanism refers to the complete vilification of the United States and its political, cultural, and social paradigm. The United States becomes essentialized as the "evil" and thus deserves analogous treatment. Such anti-Americanism is dominant in al-Qaʿida and other Islamist fundamentalist groups which have declared a global war against the United States and whatever is understood as its representatives.

A distinct anti-American character is the main feature of the recent rise of nationalism in Turkey. It would be wrong to argue that anti-Americanism was previously unknown in Turkish society. It reached a peak in the 1970s, when the popularity of leftist opposition to US foreign policy in the Middle East and the developing world combined with the stationing of US troops on Turkish territory. Kemalist nationalism and its primary representative, the Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*, CHP) often employed — under the leadership of Bülent Ecevit — anti-Western and anti-American rhetoric in the 1960s and 1970s. Islamist anti-Americanism was also by no means unknown in Turkish politics. Parties such as the National Order Party (*Milli Nizam Partisi*, MNP) adopted an anti-American political agenda, made common cause with the Palestinians, and objected to US intervention in Middle East politics. Israel was despised as the agent of US interests in the region and the oppressor of millions of Turkey's Muslim brethren in the Middle East. However, the September 1980 coup removed all those political forces which could support the establishment of anti-Americanism in Turkish public discourse.

———

6. Keohane and Katzenstein, "Varieties of Anti-Americanism: A Framework for Analysis," p. 10.
7. Keohane and Katzenstein, "Varieties of Anti-Americanism: A Framework for Analysis," pp. 28-34.

HOW TURKEY CEASED TO BE AN EXCEPTION

Anti-Americanism in Turkey failed — until recently — to produce an enduring effect on Turkish politics. Unlike other Mediterranean countries where a legacy of anti-Americanism grew out of historical reasons and had a persistent negative effect on their relations with the United States, such a trend did not appear in Turkey's case.[8] With regard to Spain, a long historical rivalry in Latin America and the Pacific, along with US support for the authoritarian Franco regime in the aftermath of World War II, created a legacy of anti-Americanism. In the case of Greece, US involvement in the civil war (1946-9) and firm US support for the 1967-74 military regime created a strong popular predisposition against the United States. Despite the rise of the Turkish left in the 1960s and 1970s, such a legacy of persistent anti-Americanism did not find fertile ground. This was probably because the United States also had strong allies within Turkey who wielded clout disproportionate to their numbers, as Turkey's influential military and bureaucratic elites maintained a clear pro-US position. They prioritized Turkey's strategic alliance with the United States and saw it as the strongest security guarantee for the country as well as its best link to the West. This became more pronounced after the September 1980 military coup, which dealt a heavy blow against the Turkish left and political Islam, and meant that opposition to US policies and the improvement of US-Turkey relations would be dispersed and politically ineffective. As Turkey's democratic consolidation remained unfinished, elites could afford to dismiss public opinion. The US-Turkey strategic alliance developed to the point of Turkey forming a regional alliance with Israel in the 1990s, despite the opposition of a large segment of the Turkish public, spearheaded by supporters of the Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*), which won a plurality of votes in 1995. This reaction was not considered more important than the strategic benefits which this alliance would garner Turkey — mainly the consolidation of the US-Turkey alliance, access to military technology, intelligence, and training, improved economic relations, and a strengthening of its strategic position *vis-à-vis* Greece, Syria, Iraq, and Armenia.

US policies in the Middle East were not always popular within Turkish public opinion. Many Turks felt sympathy for the Palestinians and opposed what they saw as an overtly pro-Israeli US stance in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Nonetheless, this did not seriously affect the formation of Turkish regional strategy and policymaking. Strategic alliance and cooperation between the United States and Turkey meant that Turkey would support US strategic priorities in the Middle East, even when this came to the point of forging a strategic alliance with Israel and thus alienating the Arab states and Iran. This equilibrium was disturbed by what followed the terror attacks of September 11, 2001. The relapse of violence in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the rise of the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*, AKP) to power in 2002, and the US invasion of Iraq in 2003[9] brought this alliance under considerable pressure. As the interests of US foreign policy shifted towards the Middle East, it became increasingly clear that the strategic and tactical aims of both states could diverge in some of

8. Doug McAdam, "Legacies of Anti-Americanism: A Sociological Perspective," in Katzenstein and Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, pp. 258-59.

9. For more information on this, see William Hale, *Turkey, the US and Iraq* (London: Saqi, 2007), pp. 101-16.

the region's conflicts. The situation became further complicated with the occupation of Iraq by the United States and its allies. The expansion of the Kurdish-controlled zone in northern Iraq and the subsequent creation of a Kurdish federal entity there facilitated the re-emergence of the PKK as a significant security threat for Turkey.

A milestone in the deterioration of US-Turkey relations was the refusal of the Turkish Parliament on March 1, 2003 to allow US troops the use of Turkish territory in preparation for their invasion of Iraq.[10] As the United States was preparing an invasion of Iraq in early 2003, it became clear that the chances of a swift victory over Saddam Husayn's armed forces would drastically increase if a second front was opened on the Turkish-Iraqi border. This led to a formal US request for the deployment of US military forces within Turkish territory. Many in Turkey felt that the country would have to pay the price of US adventurism in the Middle East for a second time — the first being in 1991. While Turkish public opinion was firmly against the US invasion of Iraq,[11] the AKP government, led by Abdullah Gül, decided to support the US request, trying to trade agreement for a generous US military and monetary aid package. As time was pressing, a major logistics operation was already on its way when the Turkish Parliament voted on March 1, 2003 on a bill permitting the use of Turkish territory by US troops. Despite the wide parliamentary majority which the AKP enjoyed in the Parliament, the bill failed to collect the necessary majority of votes and was thus rejected. About 90 AKP delegates took advantage of the secret character of the vote to express their opposition to the bill and US policies in the region in general. They apparently included in their ranks delegates as high-ranking as the Speaker of Parliament Bülent Arınç and Deputy Prime Minister Ertugrul Yalçınbayır.[12] The blow against US war planning and prestige was heavy. The US troops ready to deploy on Turkish territory had to abandon their operations after weeks of preparations, and the planning of the US invasion of Iraq was upset. The war followed suit without a second front in the north. It was only due to the unexpectedly weak resistance of Iraqi troops and the relatively easy victory of US forces on the battlegrounds of southern Iraq that the issue received less attention. This refusal of the Turkish Parliament has been considered a case where anti-Americanism produced tangible effects which harmed US interests. While Keohane and Katzenstein argue that anti-Americanism has failed to produce strong global effects on US diplomacy, they add that the March 1, 2003 vote showed how anti-Americanism can be consequential in specific conjunctures.[13]

Such a change of Turkish policy could not go unattended in the United States. In fact, it alienated Turkey from many of its longstanding allies within US policymaking circles. Prominent Neoconservative figures and think tanks which had traditionally supported Turkish positions and constituted a key part of the US Turkish lobby felt betrayed and exposed by Turkey's decision.[14] What made the situation even harder to accept was

---

10. For more information on this event, see Murat Yetkin, *Tezkere: Irak Krizi'nin Gerçek Öyküsü* [*The Permit: The Real Story of the Iraq Crisis*] (Istanbul: Remzi, 2004).

11. See William Hale, *Turkey, the US and Iraq* (London: Middle East Issues, 2005).

12. Philip Robins, "Confusion at Home, Confusion Abroad: Turkey between Copenhagen and Iraq," *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 3 (2003), pp. 563-65.

13. Robert O. Keohane and Peter J. Katzenstein, "The Political Consequences of Anti-Americanism" in Katzenstein and Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, pp. 293-94.

14. See "Can the U.S.-Turkish Relationship Be Repaired," American Enterprise Institute, March 23, 2005, http://www.aei.org/event/1034.

that opposition to the US campaign did not emanate solely from the AKP government, but also from the Turkish military and bureaucratic elites, old and trusted partners of the United States. While the AKP government had formally endorsed the bill, the military failed to take an open position in favor of US operations. At the critical meeting of the National Security Council (*Milli Güvenlik Kurulu*, MGK), on February 28, 2003, just a few days before the March 1, 2003 voting, no clear support for the US request was expressed. In the words of the then-US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz:

> [M]any of the institutions in Turkey that we think of as the traditional strong support … were not as forceful in leading in that direction. ... particularly the military. I think for whatever reason they did not play the strong leadership role on that issue that we would have expected.[15]

Turkey's refusal to join the US "coalition of the willing" had a major consequence. The absence of Turkish troops meant that the leverage Turkey had to influence developments in post-war Iraq was limited. In contrast, Iraqi Kurds gained increasing significance due to their role as the most stable and trustworthy ally of the United States in Iraq. In addition, the proclamation of the new Iraqi Constitution turned the country into a federal state with a predominantly Kurdish Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) in the north. The growing relative significance of the Iraqi Kurds as key regional allies of the United States also meant that US-Turkey interests found a new point of contention. While Turkey initially had opposed any plans for Kurdish autonomy in Iraq, it later moderated its stance to conform with post-war reality. On the one hand, it accepted the prospect of a federal system, while stressing its full opposition to any partition plan. On the other hand, it included support for Turcomans in its Iraq agenda.[16] By assuming the role of the guardian of Iraq's Turcoman minority, Ankara hoped to gain additional leverage in domestic Iraqi politics. This became evident when Turkey openly took sides in the domestic Iraqi dispute over the future status of the city of Kirkuk. However, playing the Turcoman card yielded little to Turkish foreign policy, as many of the Turcomans — particularly those who were Shi'ites — remained indifferent to Turkish sponsorship. Ankara's involvement in Kirkuk became an additional thorn in US-Turkey talks over Iraq.[17]

The Kirkuk province, in which the second biggest oilfield in the world is located, was claimed by the Iraqi Kurds who pointed at Saddam's intensive and violent efforts to alter the demographic balance of the city in favor of Sunni Arabs. In the aftermath of the 2003 war, Kurds started repopulating it, allegedly in an effort to restore the previous

---

15. Mehmet Ali Birand and Cengiz Çandar, "Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz Interview," *CNN Türk*, May 5, 2003.

16. The Iraqi Turcomans, a Turkic-speaking ethnic group living in northern Iraq, form a sizeable minority in that part of the country, and especially in the oil-rich city of Kirkuk. During Iraq's postwar institutional reconstruction, they have unsuccessfully attempted to limit Kurdish political powers by means of constitutional veto rights in the federal state of northern Iraq. For more on the Turcoman question see Henri Barkey, "Preventing Conflict over Kurdistan," *Carnegie Report*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (February 2009), pp. 16-17.

17. On this, see Michael Rubin, "A Comedy of Errors: American-Turkish Diplomacy and the Iraq War" (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 2005), pp. 3-4.

demographic balance.[18] Consequently they claimed it for the Iraqi Kurdistan Regional Government. Controlling oil-rich Kirkuk was thought to be a crucial lifeline for the Kurdish federal entity, and potentially could financially support an independent Kurdish state. Turkey vehemently objected to these plans, fearing that such a development would destabilize Turkey's Kurdish-inhabited southeastern and eastern provinces. Instead, it championed the rights of Kirkuk's sizable Turcoman minority. While the future status of Kirkuk was set to be decided by a referendum, Turkey objected to any measure which could lead to the incorporation of Kirkuk into the KRG.

An event whose details still remain unclear triggered a major crisis in US-Turkey relations and further fueled anti-Americanism. On July 4, 2003, US soldiers arrested 11 Turkish special forces officers in the northern Iraqi city of Sulaymaniya, who were suspected of planning the assassination of a local Kurdish politician.[19] The arrested Turkish officers were hooded and led away from their headquarters for questioning. When this news became public, the media and popular reaction was unprecedented. Such treatment was deemed disgraceful and a national insult coming from a traditional ally.[20] The fact that the victim of the insult was the Turkish army made things even worse for US-Turkey relations. The military has traditionally enjoyed high popularity and esteem in Turkish public opinion, and it also was among the most pro-US actors in Turkish domestic politics. The Sulaymaniya incident alienated even some of the most loyal supporters of the US-Turkish strategic alliance. It was added to claims that the United States was considering partition plans of Iraq and the establishment of a fully independent Kurdish state in the north of the country, or even a large-scale redrawing of the map of the Middle East which would entail territorial losses for Turkey. These added fuel to existing nationalist conspiracy theories and further aroused anti-US feelings in Turkey, which for the first time appeared significantly among secularist elites. This shift was clearly documented in opinion surveys.[21]

According to the 2006 Pew Global Attitudes Survey, the number of Turks who had a favorable view of the United States fell from 32% in 2004 to 23% in 2005 and to a mere 17% in 2006. The corresponding numbers were 27% in Pakistan, 36% in Indonesia and Egypt, and 38% in Jordan.[22] Support for the US-led War on Terror fell from 37% in 2004 to 17% in 2005, and 14% in 2006.[23] At 3%, Turkey recorded the lowest level of confidence in President George W. Bush among the 15 countries of the

---

18. This view was not shared by Sunni Arabs and Turks who argued that Iraqi Kurds were not only restoring Kurdish refugees from Kirkuk to their hometown but also were moving in Kurdish settlers in an attempt to tilt the demographic balance in their favor.

19. Aram Rafaat, "U.S.-Kurdish Relations in Post-Invasion Iraq," *Middle East Review of International Affairs* (MERIA), Vol. 11, No. 4 (2007), p. 81.

20. For the Turkish media reaction, see Sedat Ergin,"*Dostlugu Dinlendirme Zamanı*" ["Time to Put the Friendship to Rest"], *Hürriyet*, July 8, 2003, http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=157797.

21. For a study of public opinion attitudes *vis-à-vis* the United States until 2004, see Erdogan, "The Missing Element: Turkish Public Opinion toward the US."

22. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *America's Image Slips, but Allies Share U.S. Concerns over Iran, Hamas*, pp. 258-59.

23. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *America's Image Slips, but Allies Share U.S. Concerns over Iran, Hamas*, p. 13.

survey.[24] In 2007, the results of the same survey were even more telling. The number of Turks who had a favorable view of the United States fell to a tiny 9%, the lowest among all states and considerably less than even the Palestinians, of whom 13% expressed a favorable view of the United States.[25] Eighty-one percent of Turks expressed their dislike of US ideas about democracy, while 83% expressed their opposition to US "ways of doing business" in international affairs.[26] Twenty-two percent expressed positive views of US movies, music, and television, 37% for US science and technology, but only 4% for the spread of US ideas.[27]

The situation slightly improved in the following years. The election of Barack Obama to the US presidency was a primary reason for that. As in most countries, Turkish public opinion favored Obama, who was seen as a harbinger of change in US foreign policy, particularly in the Middle East. His decision to visit Ankara in early April 2009 made Turkey the first Muslim country that he visited. This was well received in Turkey. In his address to the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Obama took the opportunity to send a message to the Muslim world. He argued that

> The United States is not and will never be at war with Islam. In fact, our partnership with the Muslim world is critical not just in rolling back the violent ideologies that people of all faiths reject but also to strengthen opportunity for its people. ... America's relationship with the Muslim community, the Muslim world, cannot be based just on the opposition to terrorism. We seek broader engagement based on mutual interest and mutual respect.[28]

Nonetheless, the visit proved to be of little avail regarding the restoration of the US image in Turkey. According to the 2009 Pew Global Attitudes Survey, the number of Turks with a favorable view of the United States rose to 14% in 2009 — up from 12% in 2008.[29] These were still the worst ratings for the United States among all surveyed countries. According to the same survey, 40% of Turks saw the United States as an enemy while only 18% saw it as a friend.[30] Mistrust of US foreign policy remained strong. Only 19% of Turks expressed the view that Obama would be fair in the Middle East, while 52% argued the opposite.[31] Although 33% of Turks expressed confidence in President Obama — compared to only 2% for President Bush in 2008 — 52% showed little or no confidence in Obama.[32] These findings seem to confirm that anti-American-

---

24. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *America's Image Slips, but Allies Share U.S. Concerns over Iran, Hamas*, p. 11.

25. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Global Unease with Major World Powers* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, 2007), p. 3.

26. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Global Unease with Major World Powers*, p. 5.

27. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Global Unease with Major World Powers*, p. 6.

28. Robert Tait, "Barack Obama Woos Muslims from Secular Turkey," *The Guardian*, July 4, 2009.

29. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Most Muslim Publics not so Easily Moved: Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, 2009), p. 37.

30. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Most Muslim Publics not so Easily Moved: Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image*, p. 18.

31. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Most Muslim Publics not so Easily Moved: Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image*, p. 37.

32. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, *Most Muslim Publics not so Easily Moved: Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image*, p. 31.

ism in Turkey is not ephemeral, but tends to establish its position[33] and is becoming an important component of contemporary Turkish nationalism.

ANTI-AMERICANISM IN MEDIA AND POPULAR CULTURE

The rise of anti-Americanism in Turkish society also can be documented in the media and popular culture. Beyond the legitimate reaction to US wrongdoings in Iraq, wide publicity was given to unfounded claims or conspiracy theories regarding the US role in the Middle East and the actions of US troops in the region. The Abu Ghraib prison scandal of 2003 was presented as evidence of the evil character of the US occupation and of the United States itself. Accusations that US soldiers were harvesting organs from Iraqi prisoners and insurgents and selling them abroad found a following in Turkey.[34] Scathing attacks against the United States during the bloody operations for the recapture of the city of Fallujah in November 2004 were followed by the publication of official statements in which US operations were called genocide and compared to the Holocaust.[35] The alleged role of Israel in post-war Iraq also stirred the ire of the Turkish press. Widespread claims appeared that Israel was actively involved in northern Iraq[36] to support Iraqi Kurds and the creation of a Kurdish state as an Israeli client between Turkey, Iran, and the Arab world. This often resulted in the coupling of anti-American and anti-Semitic feelings in parts of Turkish society. These attacks were not only limited to the Islamist media. Anti-Americanism was crossing political and ideological lines.[37]

In the field of popular culture, books and films in which Turkey came into direct — and successful — military confrontation with the United States met with unprecedented commercial success.[38] The fictional book *Metal Storm* (*Metal Fırtına*), narrated a war between Turkey and the United States in the near future.[39] According to the plot, the United States invades Turkey from Iraq. Operation "Metal Storm" results in the

---

33. Mehmet Ali Birand, "*Toplum, Israil ve ABD Düsmanı Oluyor*" ["Society Becomes an Enemy of Israel and the United States"], *Posta*, July 7, 2006.

34. Istanbul Ofisi, "*ABD Askeri Organ Satıyor*" ["The US Army Sells Organs"], *Yeni Safak*, December 28, 2004.

35. AKP Delegate and President of the Parliament's Human Rights Committee Mehmet Elkatmıs argued that "The United States is committing crimes of genocide and terror in Iraq. Such genocide did not take place even in the era of Pharaohs, Hitler, or Mussolini." See Serkan Demirtas, "*ABD'yle Irak Gerilimi*" ["Iraq Tension with the United States"], *Radikal*, November 26, 2004.

36. See for example Yavuz Çekirge, "*Israil'in B-Planı*" ["Israel's Plan B"], *Hürriyet*, December 9, 2007 and Istanbul Ofisi, "*Israil Irak'a Yerlesiyor*" ["Israel Is Being Established in Iraq"], *Yeni Safak*, November 18, 2003.

37. Robert L. Pollock, "The Sick Man of Europe-Again," *Wall Street Journal*, February 16, 2005. Pollock writes: "It's not much better in the secular press. The mainstream Hurriyet has accused Israeli hit squads of assassinating Turkish security personnel in Mosul, and the U.S. of starting an occupation of Indonesia under the guise of humanitarian assistance. At Sabah, a columnist last fall accused the U.S. ambassador to Turkey, Eric Edelman, of letting his 'ethnic origins' — guess what, he's Jewish — determine his behavior. Mr. Edelman is indeed the all-too-rare foreign-service officer who takes seriously his obligation to defend America's image and interests abroad. The intellectual climate in which he's operating has gone so mad that he actually felt compelled to organize a conference call with scientists from the U.S. Geological Survey to explain that secret U.S. nuclear testing did not cause the recent tsunami."

38. Ioannis N. Grigoriadis, "Upsurge Amidst Political Uncertainty: Nationalism in Post-2004 Turkey," *SWP Research Paper 2006*, No. 11 (2006), pp. 13-14.

39. See Orkun Uçar and Burak Turna, *Metal Fırtına* [*Metal Storm*] (Istanbul: Timas, 2004).

occupation of Turkey's large cities. In a second phase, Operation "Sèvres,"[40] Turkey's archenemies — Greece, Armenia, and the Kurds — plan the partition of the country. The Turks then forge a global anti-US alliance with China, Russia, and Germany, while a Turkish agent detonates a nuclear device in Washington, DC. This brings the occupation to an end, and Turkey triumphs.[41] The book, which ran to ten editions and sold about 500,000 copies in the first 18 months of its publication in late 2004, was a prominent example of a best-selling book characterized by rampant anti-Americanism. The authors skillfully capitalized on emerging anti-American feelings and existing phobias in Turkish society. They created a nationalist epic, in which Turkey defeats new — the United States and the Kurds — and old enemies — Armenia and Greece — to triumphantly reclaim its independence. The commercial success of the book led to the publication of a sequel, which also was well-received by the public.[42]

The commercial success of a movie based on a popular TV series was an additional manifestation of rising anti-Americanism in Turkey. *The Valley of Wolves: Iraq* (*Kurtlar Vadisi: Irak*) was, at the time of its release, the most expensive production in the history of Turkish cinema and eventually became its biggest commercial success as well. It featured the adventures of Polat Alemdar, a Turkish intelligence agent who operates in Iraq, defending justice, restoring Turkish honor, and avenging American atrocities in Iraq. The movie combines nationalist, Orientalist, and Occidentalist stereotypes.[43] Alongside anti-American and anti-Semitic tones, the movie depicts the Iraqis as backward, cowardly, overtly religious, and clearly inferior to Turks. The only groups that enjoy a positive portrayal are the Turcomans, Turkey's alleged ethnic brethren in Iraq, and those Kurds who collaborated with Turks. Positive critiques of the film were found not only in the nationalist media but also came from high-ranking ministers and MPs.[44] The spectacular commercial success and popular appeal of a book and a movie replete with nationalistic and anti-American messages comprised a clear signal of the growing popular anti-American nationalism in Turkey.

REASONS FOR THE RISE OF TURKISH ANTI-AMERICANISM

The rise of Turkish anti-Americanism could be explained as a result of US military involvement in Iraq, the gradual reconfiguration of the US-Turkey strategic relationship since the end of the Cold War, and Turkey's democratization process. The resurgence of

---

40. The operation took its name from the abortive 1920 treaty which outlined the partition of the Ottoman Empire.

41. Ted Widmer, "Death to the Crusade," *New York Times*, September 18, 2005.

42. See Orkun Uçar, *Metal Fırtına 2-Kayıp Naas* [*Metal Storm 2-The Missing Corpse*] (Istanbul: Timas, 2005).

43. Also, see Cem Özdemir, "'*Tal der Wölfe': Ein Film, der Rassistische Einstellungen Bedient*" ["'Valley of Wolves:' A Film which Serves Racist Views"], *Der Spiegel*, February 16, 2006.

44. When the movie was released in Western Europe and the United States, it caused an uproar. In February 2006, the President of the State of Bavaria, Edmund Stoiber, made an appeal to German cinema operators not to "broadcast that racist and anti-Western hate film" and was seconded in this effort by the Jewish Central Council in Germany. US military personnel in Europe were told to avoid the cinemas where the movie was broadcast. See SZ Redaktion, "*Stoiber Kritisiert, Tal der Wölfe:' 'Rassistischer und Anti-Westlicher Hassfilm*'" ["Stoiber Criticizes 'The Valley of Wolves:' 'Racist and Anti-Western Hate-Film'"], *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, February 19, 2006.

the PKK issue in the aftermath of the 2003 US invasion of Iraq is a major reason for the deterioration of the US image in Turkey and the growing distrust between the two countries. As a result of the 2003 invasion, the PKK posed a considerable threat to Turkey's security for the first time since 1999 — when the leader of the PKK, Abdullah Öcalan, was captured and the PKK announced an operational ceasefire. Indeed, the circumstances which arose in US-occupied Iraq proved very fruitful for the recuperation of the PKK.[45] With the toleration of the Kurdish leader and President of the KRG in Iraq Massud Barzani, the PKK was able to develop facilities such as the Kandil Mountain camp and gain access to crucial war supplies. Lifting its self-proclaimed ceasefire in 2004, the PKK was then able to frequently penetrate the rugged Turkish-Iraqi border and operate within Turkish territory while maintaining a base safely in Iraq. Significant improvements in Turkey's minority rights policies and the parliamentary representation of the Kurdish minority through the Democratic Society Party (*Demokratik Toplum Partisi*, DTP) did not deter the PKK from escalating its operations. The rise in the number of PKK attacks in eastern and southeastern Turkey, matched by bombings in Turkey's major cities and tourist resorts, can be paralleled with the situation in the mid-1990s. However, Turkey's reaction was much more moderate than in the 1990s. It demanded prompt action from the Iraqi government and the US military forces stationed in Iraq to disband the PKK bases in northern Iraq, which were used to launch attacks into Turkish territory and the elimination of which would quash PKK operational capacity. Nonetheless, both the Iraqi central authorities and the US troops proved either unable or unwilling to take harsh measures against the PKK. This put the Erdogan government under severe domestic pressure to authorize military operations within Iraq in order to eliminate the PKK threat. Such operations eventually did take place in late 2007; Erdogan, however, was fully aware that such operations — if prolonged — would have a deleterious effect on Turkey's international image and threaten the already fragile EU accession negotiations. Besides, the difficulty of dealing a decisive blow against an elusive organization such as the PKK, and the possibility of Turkey's engagement in a protracted military operation with the eventuality of major casualties, were well known. A Turkish invasion of northern Iraq possibly could lead to a direct confrontation between US and Turkish forces — something unprecedented and even unthinkable until recently. The resumption of PKK operations brought all those who wished for a peaceful, liberal solution to Turkey's Kurdish question under pressure and promoted the opinions of those favoring a military solution.[46]

The failure of US security forces in Iraq to neutralize the PKK threat had serious consequences for US-Turkey relations. It seemed as if the United States treasured its alliance with Iraqi Kurds and was not willing to disturb Iraq's delicate domestic political balance in order to seriously deal with the PKK presence in northern Iraq. The Kurdish alliance appeared too dear to dispense with, despite the fact that it led to a serious increase of hostilities and casualties. Meanwhile, in view of the significant deterioration of US-Iran relations, it also was suspected that the PKK was trying to prove itself useful

45. Heinz Kramer, *Unruhen im Türkischen Kurdengebiet: Herausforderungen für die Türkei und die EU* [*Unrests in Turkey's Kurdish Provinces: Challenges for Turkey and the European Union*], SWP Aktuell 20 (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2006), p. 3.

46. Ümit Fırat, "*Uzmanlar PKK'nın Yeni Dönem Stratejisini Tartısıyor 3/Bölgede Derin Isbirligi mi?*" ["Experts Debate the New Strategy of the PKK 3/Is There Deep Cooperation in the Region?"], *Zaman*, October 4, 2007.

to the United States by acting as a liaison to its fellow Iranian Kurdish organization the Party for a Free Life in Kurdistan (*Partiya Jiyana Azad a Kurdistané*, PJAK).

PJAK maintained a level of operational capacity inside Iranian territory,[47] and speculation existed as to whether the United States supported its activities. The visit of the PJAK leader Abdul Rahman Haji Ahmadi to Washington, DC in August 2007 only amplified the relevant speculation.[48] US-Turkey cooperation against the PKK has improved since 2007, and US military intelligence is said to have facilitated Turkish air raids against PKK bases in northern Iraq. The drastic improvement of relations between Turkey and the KRG, highlighted by the October 2009 visit of Turkey's Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu to Irbil,[49] also has put the PKK under additional pressure. The PKK's continued launching of operations into Turkey from northern Iraq has remained, however, a thorn in US-Turkey relations.

The rise of Turkish anti-Americanism also can be linked to the gradual reconfiguration of US-Turkey strategic relations since the end of the Cold War.[50] The automatic alignment of the Cold War years ceased to exist, and the commonality of strategic interests between the two countries was no longer a given but a desideratum. The United States and Turkey poorly coordinated their policies and often came to support contradictory objectives. Lack of agreement became clear in the Caucasus and Central Asia regions. The prospect of US-Turkey strategic cooperation in these regions faded, as the newly established republics — with the possible exception of Azerbaijan — made clear that they were not willing to recognize Turkey in the role of a "big brother." Instead, they furthered direct links with the United States and the West, circumventing Turkey and making any US-Turkey strategic cooperation redundant. The US-Turkey-Israel strategic alliance also did not fulfill initial expectations. The build-up of a special Turkish-Israeli defense and strategic relationship was among the US policy priorities in the Middle East during the 1990s.[51] Opposition to the threat of militant Islam, Arab nationalism, and firm Western and pro-US orientations characterized both states. However, the rise of the post-Islamist AKP to power in November 2002 — a milestone in Turkish domestic politics — triggered a new Turkish interest in the Middle East which was marked by a different approach.[52] Due to its Islamist political origins and its increased sensitivity to Turkish public opinion's foreign policy views, the AKP government took a more balanced stance on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Turkey was no longer an unequivocal supporter of Israeli policies in the region. On the contrary, the AKP government made unprecedented openings to the Palestinian Authority, and

47. Rajan Menon and S. Enders Wimbush, "The US and Turkey: End of an Alliance?" *Survival*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (2007), p. 140.

48. Robin Wright, "U.S. Starts a Push for Tighter Sanctions on Iran," *Washington Post*, September 13, 2007.

49. Bülent Kenes, "*Kuzey Irak'la Bir Ilk: Davutoglu, Irbil'de Barzani Ile Görüstü*" ["A First Time in Northern Iraq: Davutoglu Met with Barzani in Irbil"], *Zaman*, October 31, 2009.

50. On this, also see Graham E. Fuller, "Our Fraying Alliance with Turkey," *Los Angeles Times*, October 19, 2007 and Ömer Taspınar, "Understanding Turkish Anti-Americanism," *Today's Zaman*, April 16, 2007.

51. Efraim Inbar, "Regional Implications of the Israeli-Turkish Strategic Partnership," *Middle East Review of International Affairs* (MERIA), Vol. 5, No. 2 (2001), p. 60.

52. On this, see F. Stephen Larrabee, "Turkey Rediscovers the Middle East," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 4 (2007).

more controversially to the Hamas-controlled government which was elected in January 2005. While the Hamas government faced a serious legitimacy crisis, as Western governments refused to recognize it unless it recognized Israel's existence, the AKP government took a different position. Moved by its Islamic sensitivity and wishing to step up Turkey's role in the dispute, the AKP government engaged the Hamas government. The visit of a Hamas delegation to Ankara in February 2005 alienated Israel, which — at that time — was campaigning internationally against the recognition of a Hamas government. Furthermore, it irritated the US Jewish lobby, a traditional supporter of Turkish positions in Washington, DC policy circles.

In the aftermath of the new AKP initiatives, major Jewish associations, such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), announced a change in their stance on the Armenian genocide, supporting the Armenian position. While this reversal seems to have emanated from intra-ADL deliberations and pressure from regional offices,[53] it is likely that the Turkish engagement with Hamas has facilitated this shift.[54]

Although the Armenian issue has not contributed to the decline of US-Turkey relations, it maintains the potential to cause a serious deterioration.[55] While the Armenian diaspora has succeeded in securing resolutions in the legislatures of several states recognizing the Armenian genocide, this has not been the case with the US Congress. Cognizant of the extreme sensitivity with which the Armenian issue was being dealt with in Turkey, US administrations have preferred not to raise the issue. On several occasions, resolution drafts were blocked by Presidents who pointed to the disastrous effect such a resolution would have on US-Turkey relations. Nonetheless, during the extreme polarization of domestic US politics during George W. Bush's second term, the Democrat-controlled Congress, led by Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi from California, created conditions favorable to the approval of the Armenian resolution.[56] The approval of the resolution draft of the Foreign Affairs Committee on October 10, 2007 sent shockwaves throughout Turkey and deteriorated US-Turkey relations even further. Although the voting at the plenary of the US Congress was postponed for 2008, it seemed quite possible that a new, serious crisis was looming because of the Armenian question.[57]

Barack Obama's election raised concerns in Turkey because Senator Obama was among those who had endorsed the genocide resolution. Yet in his message to the Armenian American community on April 24, 2009, Obama avoided the use of the term "genocide" and referred to the 1915 events as "great catastrophe" (*meds yeghern* in Armenian).[58]

53. Keith O'Brien, "Anti-Defamation League Reverses Course, Recognizes Armenian Genocide," *Boston Globe*, August 21, 2007.

54. See Anti-Defamation League (ADL), "ADL Statement on the Armenian Genocide," August 21, 2007, http://www.adl.org/PresRele/Mise_00/5114_00.htm.

55. Ömer Taspınar, "The Perfect Storm," *Today's Zaman*, October 15, 2007.

56. The Armenian lobby has historically maintained closer relations with the Democratic Party, while California is the US state with the largest concentration of Armenian population and influence.

57. On this, also see Ömer Taspınar, "Time to Bargain with Washington," *Today's Zaman*, October 8, 2007.

58. White House, "Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day," April 24, 2009, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Statement-of-President-Barack-Obama-on-Armenian-Remembrance-Day.

In view of Armenian-Turkish *rapprochement* efforts, which led to the signing on October 10, 2009 of a historic accord on the normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations,[59] a policy shift would be unlikely in the short run. The United States would refrain from any initiative which could obstruct the re-opening of the Turkish-Armenian border and a resolution of the Nagorno Karabagh dispute. Yet nothing precluded the Armenian lobby from pressing the issue again, following a failure of bilateral negotiations.

Ironically, Turkey's democratization process has proved to be a major destabilizing factor for US-Turkey relations.[60] The September 1980 coup shut down all pre-1980 political parties, including those which spearheaded opposition to US policies and anti-Americanism. The deep social transformation that Turkey underwent in the 1980s, also due to the economic liberalization program implemented by Prime Minister Turgut Özal, paved the way for the rise of an Islamist economic and social counter-elite and the widening of Turkish political space.[61] With the exception of the Turkish left, Turkey's peripheral political forces, marginalized due to successive military coups, found the opportunity to organize and grow. Parallel to the growth of an Islamic civil society, Turkish political Islam was on the rise. The emergence of the Islamist Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*, RP*)* as a major political actor reintroduced anti-Americanism to the Turkish political scene. Meanwhile, the conditions of relative political freedom and the post-Cold War multipolar and volatile international environment allowed for the flourishing of Turkish nationalism. Finally, Turkey's quest for EU membership led to a set of political reforms which allowed for the growth of Turkish civil society, both secular and Islamic. This meant that even elements of liberal and social anti-Americanism could be discerned in Turkish society. The rise to power of the Turkish political periphery materialized in 2002 with the AKP, a party of Islamist political origins but one which was committed to democratic reform and Turkey's EU accession. Turkey's democratic consolidation process meant that the government needed to be more responsive to public opinion on foreign policy issues. This affected Turkey's Middle East policy. In the past, Turkish citizens, Islamist and leftist, had been concerned about the plight of Palestinians; however, this did not inform foreign policy planning. This remained a privilege of the bureaucratic elite, which claimed to be the authentic interpreter of the Turkish national interest. While it was possible for Turkish governments to dismiss public opinion sympathies for the Palestinians and plan Turkey's strategic alliance with Israel and the United States in the 1990s, this became impossible in the 2000s. Meanwhile, the shift of US foreign policy towards unilateralism diminished the country's soft power potential and sharply detracted from its global public image. Turkish public opinion, sharing the attitude of many other nations' public opinions, expressed its clear opposition to US policies in Iraq. While the election of Barack Obama somewhat palliated anti-US feelings in Turkish public opinion, US policies in the Middle East, especially regarding the Palestinian question, continue to cause strong disaffection. This was one of the prime determinants of the government's circumspect position. In addition, the improvement of EU-Turkey relations and the prospect of Turkey's European

59. Robert Tait, "Turkey and Armenia Sign Landmark Accord... Eventually," *Guardian*, October 11, 2009.

60. On this also see Ian O. Lesser, "Turkey, the United States and the Delusion of Geopolitics," *Survival*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (2006), p. 85.

61. Nilüfer Göle, "Secularism and Islamism in Turkey: The Making of Elites and Counter-Elites," *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Winter 1997), pp. 53-57.

integration provided an alternative Western vision. The role of the United States as the primary anchor of Turkey's Western orientation was correspondingly questioned. The European Union appeared more loyal to Western political values than the United States. In fact, the critique of US policies in Iraq was often made with reference to Western political values and coincided with European critiques. Turkey no longer had to side fully with the United States to prove itself Western.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite a long and enduring alliance between the United States and Turkey, Turkey now ranks among the countries where the United States enjoys its least popularity. Given that Turkish public opinion used to be favorable to the United States, this dramatically illustrates the sharp shift of public opinion against the United States. The rise of a Turkish sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism is distinguished from simple opposition to President George W. Bush's Middle East policy. The election of Barack Obama has mitigated but not reversed the trend. Qualitative evidence from recent surveys hints at the fact that opposition to US policies is pervasive and may have turned into endemic bias and distrust against the United States. Although the shift of public opinion against the United States is not tantamount to a wholesale rejection of the US political and cultural model,[62] it still has the potential to harm bilateral relations and US interests. This was amply demonstrated in the Turkish Parliament's vote of March 1, 2003.

More importantly, anti-Americanism has become more pronounced as a result of Turkey's democratization process. The shrinking clout of the military and bureaucratic elites made Turkey a less reliable ally for the United States. While promoting democratization, the United States needs to be more interested in its public image and the way in which its policies are globally perceived. Improving the US global public image will be facilitated by a more multilateral approach to international affairs and a renewed interest in developing US soft power. Otherwise, it runs the risk of rising anti-Americanism in cases where elites can no longer fully control foreign policy, and public opinion increasingly becomes a determinant of foreign policy planning. In the foreseeable future, US-Turkey relations may not reach the level of closeness which characterized them in the Cold War era. This does not, however, underrate their significance. Both countries may continue to disagree on a number of issues while maintaining an alliance, which is a key for stability in southeastern Europe, the Caucasus, and the Middle East.

---

62. This is the case in many states of the Arab Middle East. On this, see Marc Lynch, "Anti-Americanisms in the Arab World," in Katzenstein and Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*. On the polyvalence of the United States, see Robert O. Keohane and Peter J. Katzenstein, "Conclusion: Anti-Americanisms and the Polyvalence of America," in Katzenstein and Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, pp. 311-15.