

# BÜYÜK BİR KORUYUCU İÇİN ARAYIŞIN BAŞLANGICI: TÜRKİYE'NİN AMERİKAN İTTİFAKI İÇİN BİRLEŞMİŞ MİLLETLER'E (BM) ÜYELİĞİ\*

Gürol BABA \*

## ÖZET

*İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın sonunda Birleşmiş Milletler (BM) üyeliği Türkiye için önemli bir endişeydi. Savaşa katılmayan bir devlet olarak Türkiye savaş dönemi planlarında ve savaş sonrası düzenin kuralları üzerinde söz sahibi olamamıştı. Bunun ötesinde Nisan 1943'te Kursk muharebelerinden sonra savaşı kesin olarak kazanacağı belli olunca Sovyetler Birliği de Türkiye için potansiyel bir tehdit haline geldi. Bu duruma bağlı olarak Ankara kendisini koruyacak bir güvenlik yapılanması aramaya başladı. Türkiye söz konusu güvenlik yapılanmasını öncelikle uluslararası bunun yeterince etkin olamayacağını anlayınca ise bölgesel bir çerçevede aradı. Uluslararası çerçevedeki arayışta 1945'e gelindiğinde Ankara'nın karşısına çıkan tek güvenlik şeması BM idi. Ancak BM içinde büyük güçlerin ayrıcalıklı durumu, ki bu güçlerden biri de Sovyetler Birliği idi, Türkiye'nin BM teşkilatının uluslararası barışı sağlama kabiliyetine olan inancını zayıflattı. Zayıflayan bu inanç Ankara'yı uluslararası alandan daha bölgesel alanda bir güvenlik yapılanması düşünmeye itti. Türkiye'nin bu yapılanmadan beklentisi, üzerindeki Sovyet tehdidini etkin bir şekilde karşılamasıydı. Bunu sağlayacak olan da Amerikan ittifakı idi. İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında Amerika ile, ne savaş sonrası oluşabilecek Sovyet tehdidi ne de bir Amerikan ittifakı olasılığı üzerinde, ciddi bir iletişim kurma şansına sahip olamamış Ankara'ya, BM kuruluş aşaması Washington'a yaklaşmak için en uygun platformu sunacaktı. Bu makale Türkiye'nin BM'nin kuruluş aşamasında temel endişesi ve amacının BM üyeliği değil ama Amerika'nın dostluğunu kazanmak olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Bu iddiayı savunurken de şu sorulara odaklanmaktadır: neden İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın sonunda Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin dostluğu Türkiye için neredeyse hayati bir öge olmuştur ve BM'nin kurucu konferansı olan 1945 San Francisco Konferansı'nda Türkiye bu dostluğu elde etmek için neler yapmıştır?*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Birleşmiş Milletler, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, Türkiye, San Fransisko Konferansı, İkinci Dünya Savaşı

\* Bu makale Dr. Gürol Baba'nın Avustralya National University tarafından 2010 yılında Doktora derecesi verilmiş THE WAVY CROSS: Australia, Turkey and the US 1945-1975 adlı çalışmasının bir bölümüdür.

\* Arş. Gör., Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Biga İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi



# BEGINNING THE SEARCH FOR A ‘GREAT PROTECTOR’: TURKEY’S UN MEMBERSHIP FOR THE US ALLIANCE\*

---

Gürol BABA \*\*

## ABSTRACT

*United Nations (UN) membership was a significant concern for Turkey at the end of the Second World War (WWII). As a non-belligerent in WWII, Turkey did not have a say in war-time plans and the post-war order. When the USSR became a potential threat after Kursk, April 1943, and Soviet victory a genuine likelihood, Ankara began to look for a security scheme that was first international and then regional. By 1945 the only international security scheme in prospect was the UN. Ultimately the privileged position of the great powers within the UN, one of them the USSR, weakened Turkey’s belief in the organization’s capacity to maintain international peace. Turkey’s lowered expectations of the UN as an international security organization led Ankara to focus more on regional security to counter the Soviet threat, and the only effective counter to this threat was a US alliance. Unable to make contact with the US during the war, either to convey the Soviet threat or seek an alliance, the UN became the most suitable platform for Turkey to approach the US. This article will argue that Turkey’s foremost concern during the formation of the UN was securing US friendship rather than UN membership, and focuses on the following questions: why was US friendship primordial for Turkey in the last years of WWII and how did Turkey capitalise on this friendship at the founding conference of the UN in San Francisco in 1945?*

**Key Words:** *the United Nations, the United States, Turkey, the San Francisco Conference, the Second World War*

---

\* This article is a chapter of Dr. Gürol Baba’s PhD dissertation THE WAVY CROSS: Australia, Turkey and the US 1945-1975, awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Australian National University in 2010.

\*\* Res. Asst. Ph.D., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Biga Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences



### ***Turkey during the Preliminary Efforts of the formation of the UN***

Turkey's policies during WWII and during the formation of the UN relied mainly on the legacy of Ataturk's foreign policy.<sup>1</sup> In terms of security, Ataturk's principal idea was to establish good relations with Turkey's neighbours to create a zone of peace around Turkey.<sup>2</sup> It was not an isolationist policy. Ataturk also viewed the collective will of international organizations as pivotal for lasting peace, and believed that world citizens should 'be educated in such a way as to root out feelings of envy, covetousness and revenge'.<sup>3</sup> In short Ataturk believed that international organizations could contribute to world peace.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, the central tenet of Turkish foreign policy was the maintenance of regional and international stability and peace. This view underpinned Turkey's non-belligerence in WWII.<sup>5</sup> Although Turkey did not enter the war, it closely followed international developments which might result in an international or regional security arrangement.

During the war Turkey's policy of non-belligerence was based on a wait and see approach with Ankara observing which bloc was ascendant in order to decide which to support. To manage this policy, Ankara bought time by arguing that Turkey was not capable of defending itself in case of an attack.<sup>6</sup> In this way it aimed to preserve its closeness to both the Axis and the Allies, signing a Treaty of Mutual Assistance with France and Britain on 19 October 1939<sup>7</sup> and a Non-aggression Pact with Germany on 18 June 1941.<sup>8</sup> The policy had one important shortcoming: it meant that Turkey could have no say in any wartime international or regional security proposal for post-war peace. Throughout WWII, the most significant of these proposals was about the UN. The UN was an Allied proposal and Turkey did not want to antagonize the Germans by supporting it.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Turkey's foreign policy (specifically its non-belligerence) during WWII see: NAA, 186768 - A989 - 1943/970/50, War. Turkish entry into War; W. Hale, Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000; S. Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War. For a brief review of Ataturk's foreign policy see: B. Oran (ed), Turk Dis Politikasi 1919-1980, Vol 1, 239-370.

<sup>2</sup> The steps for the formation of a zone of stability and peace in Turkey's neighborhood were mainly via regional arrangements: the Friendship and Neutrality Agreement with the USSR (1925), the Balkan Entente (1934), the Sadaabad Pact (1938). For details see: B. Oran (ed), Turk Dis Politikasi 1919-1980, Vol 1, 314-370.

<sup>3</sup> E. Z. Karal, Ataturk'ten Dusunceler, 130-31.

<sup>4</sup> Turkey became a member of the League of Nations in 1935. See: B. Oran (ed), Turk Dis Politikasi 1919-1980, Vol 1, 312.

<sup>5</sup> In terms of Turkey's non-belligerence during WWII see: NAA, 186768 - A989 - 1943/970/50, War. Turkish entry into War; W. Hale, Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000; S. Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War.

<sup>6</sup> S. Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War, 184.

<sup>7</sup> For the full text of this treaty see: British and Foreign State Papers, Vol CLI, 213.

<sup>8</sup> For the full text of this pact see: New York Times 19 June 1941 in <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1941/410618a.html> accessed on 14.12.2010.

The first major step towards the formation of the UN was the Atlantic Charter<sup>9</sup>, put forward by the United States (US) President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill on 14 August 1941, which established a vision for post-WWII world. The Atlantic Charter attracted the attention of the Turkish press, especially in terms of the drift of the US into the war. A Turkish journalist noted that the US was 'slowly entering the war' and the Americans would enter the war with their own 'principles for defence'.<sup>10</sup> US belligerence was an important issue for Turkey. The US had the potential to be an important actor in European defence, which would be very significant for Turkey's security.

On the other hand there was a change in the pressures WWII had put on Turkey. Turkey was relieved from the imminent threat of war by its Non-aggression Pact with Germany on 18 June 1941<sup>11</sup>, but another anxiety emerged from the German invasion of the the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) on 22 June 1941. Arising from the Hitler-Molotov talks in November 1940 Turkey worried about a possible secret Russo-German bargain on the Straits in favour of the USSR.<sup>12</sup> After Germany attacked Russia, Turkey became anxious about a similar bargain between Russia, Britain and the US. The British Ambassador to Turkey, Sir Hugh Knatchbull Hugessen, mentioned on 25 June that '[t]here are signs that Turkey fears that we may engage ourselves too closely with Russia'.<sup>13</sup> Turkey 'now began to fear that Britain would become too close to the Soviets'.<sup>14</sup> Turkish threat perception shifted from Germany to the USSR.

Ankara was particularly anxious about the USSR's aspirations on the Straits.<sup>15</sup> It worried that the USSR might convince the US and Britain about its demands on this strategic waterway. The concern was not without merit. In 1944 a Dominions Office telegram stated that in order to improve 'Turco-Soviet Relations', the US and Britain might suggest to the Turkish Government that it 'should make a spontaneous declaration that they welcome the liberation of the Aegean as a means of opening up a new supply route to Russia through the Straits'.<sup>16</sup> A telegram from Roosevelt to Churchill further suggested that the Straits would be a subject of Allied bargaining. Roosevelt stated, '[a]lternatively we could

---

<sup>9</sup> The Atlantic Charter was not a treaty between the US and Britain, or a final or formal expression of peace aims. It was an affirmation "of certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world." (<http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/history> accessed on 12.12.2010) See also: J. Stone, *The Atlantic Charter: New Worlds for Old*; D. Brinkley & D. R. Crowther, *The Atlantic Charter*; H. V. Morton, *Atlantic Meeting : an account of Mr. Churchill's voyage in H.M.S. Prince of Wales...*

<sup>10</sup> Ulus 16 August 1941.

<sup>11</sup> S. Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War*, 120-22.

<sup>12</sup> M. Gonlubol (ed), *Olaylarla Turk Dis Politikasi 1919-1995*, 149-150.

<sup>13</sup> FO 371/N3197/78/38 in S. Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War*, 123.

<sup>14</sup> S. Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War*, 123.

<sup>15</sup> T. Ataov, *Turkish Foreign Policy 1939-1945*, 98.

<sup>16</sup> NAA, 1351823 - A 3300 - 265K, Circular Telegram from Dominions Office to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, 22 November 1944.

ask Turkey to waive the Montreux Treaty for the passage [of the Straits] ... This I expect the Russians would like. But I am not so sure about the Turks.'<sup>17</sup> Turkey's anxiety about possible Soviet demands became concrete when the USSR declared on 19 March 1945 that it did not intend to renew the 1925 Russo-Turkish Treaty of Friendship.<sup>18</sup> This suggested that the Straits might be a bargaining point between the great powers at the end of WWII. Since Turkey was not strong enough to be an equal partner in these negotiations, it would need the support of at least one other great power.

During the war Turkey's main concern for its external security thus became the Russian threat. Turkey knew that it could not cope with this threat on its own and that it could be countered in two ways. An international security scheme was an option but Ankara did not hold high hopes about this. This is illustrated by a Turkish press comment early in 1942, suggesting that the declaration of a new international organization (the UN Declaration<sup>19</sup>) was not important, since most signatories were Latin American states or governments in exile, and the Declaration was Allied propaganda.<sup>20</sup> Such an attitude diverted Turkey's interest from preparatory work on the UN.

The other way for Turkey to counter the Russian threat was to secure US friendship. For this it needed an international platform to approach the US, as it was not a belligerent in WWII and did not have the opportunity to convey its threat perceptions. The UN Declaration was a possible platform for this.

The next step in the formation of the UN was the Moscow Conference in October 1943.<sup>21</sup> At the end of the Conference the US, British, Soviet Union and Chinese representatives announced the Declaration of Four Nations on General Security which mentioned the establishment of 'a general international organization based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security'.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> FRUS, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 10-1, President Roosevelt to Prime Minister Churchill, 22 October 1944. On the Montreux Treaty see: R. DeLuca, Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits: the Montreux Conference and Convention of 1936.

<sup>18</sup> NAA, 190032 - A1066 - M45/27/5, Cablegram from Australian Legation Moscow to Department of External Affairs, 21 March 1945; Cumhuriyet 22-23 March 1945. For the text see: League of Nations Treaty Series, Vol. CLVII, 355. The details of this very important development will be examined in chapter 2a, on Turkish-American relations 1945-1948.

<sup>19</sup> The United Nations Declaration was signed by 26 allied nations in Washington on 1 January 1942. It was first signed by Roosevelt, Churchill, Maxim Litvinov of the USSR and T. V. Soong of China, and on 2 January the representatives of 22 other nations added their signatures. It pledged the signatory governments to the maximum war effort and bound them against making a separate peace. The first clause of the United Nations Declaration reads that the signatory nations had "subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in ... the Atlantic Charter." (<http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/history> accessed on 12.12.2010)

<sup>20</sup> Y. Nadi, Cumhuriyet 5 January 1942.

<sup>21</sup> For details of the Tripartite Conference in Moscow, 18 October - 1 November 1943, see: FRUS, 1943, General, Vol 1, 513-781.

<sup>22</sup> FRUS, 1943, General, Vol 1, 756, ANNEX 1, Declaration of Four Nations on General Security.

Another step, probably the most important one, was the Dumbarton Oaks Conference (or Washington Conversations on International Peace and Security Organization) held on 21 August 1944 in Washington, during which proposals for the UN Charter were negotiated.<sup>23</sup> The conference was similarly attended by representatives of the US, the Soviet Union, Britain and the Republic of China and discussions encompassed the formation of the Security Council and a right of veto<sup>24</sup> for its permanent members.

The US was the principal actor during these formative stages of the UN. Therefore if it wanted to secure US friendship, Turkey needed to support the UN. Turkey's negative attitude to the UN began to fade. In 1944 Dr. Tevfik Rustu Aras, Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, noted the importance of a future UN and his hope that Turkey would be one of the first signatories of the UN Charter.<sup>25</sup> The Turkish press too was positive about the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, noting that the UN would be stronger and more effective than the old League of Nations. *Aksam* explained the main difference between the two: the UN would be empowered by its own armed forces. Nevertheless Turkish hopes remained limited about the effectiveness of the UN against possible armed action by a great power:

Given ... aggression by one [of] the great powers, to require a unanimous decision by the great powers for armed action against the aggressor is tantamount to requesting the aggressor to vote for an action directed against it. This means that from the very beginning it has been decided that no action will be taken against any aggression.<sup>26</sup>

Turkey wanted a more solid security guarantee.

---

<sup>23</sup> For the text of Dumbarton Oaks proposals see: New Zealand Department of External Affairs, *The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for the Establishment of a General International Organization*. According to the proposals, four principal bodies were to constitute the organization to be known as the United Nations, namely; the General Assembly the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the Secretariat, and an Economic and Social Council working under the authority of the General Assembly. The essence of the plan was that responsibility for preventing future war should be conferred upon the Security Council. The General Assembly could study, discuss and make recommendations in order to promote international cooperation and adjust situations likely to impair welfare. It could consider problems of cooperation in maintaining peace and security. But it could not make recommendations on any matter being considered by the Security Council, and all questions on which action was necessary had to be referred to the Security Council. (<http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/history> accessed 12.12.2010) See also: R. C. Hilderbrand, *Dumbarton Oaks, the Origins of the United Nations and the Search for the Post-War Security*. For the account of the talks see: K. M. Barton, "The Dumbarton Oaks Conference." Florida State University PhD, 1974.

<sup>24</sup> The concept of the veto (also known as the Great Power Veto) in the UN depended on a distinction between permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council. The permanent members, the Great Powers, gave themselves a dominant place. The veto made the UN a great power forum, rather than an assembly of equal nations.

<sup>25</sup> Tanin 31 July 1944.

<sup>26</sup> *Aksam* 26 September 1944 in University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 66-67.



The next step in forming the UN was the Yalta Conference in February 1945,<sup>27</sup> at which it was announced that a UN Charter to be drafted in San Francisco would be based on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Turkey would be invited to the San Francisco Conference if it declared war on the common enemy by 1 March 1945.<sup>28</sup> This was the most significant reason for Turkey's declaration of war on Germany and Japan in February 1945,<sup>29</sup> an action welcomed by Britain, the US and the Western press.<sup>30</sup>

Turkey's declaration of war on Germany and Japan was a rational extension of its wait and see policy. By 1943 'the Allies were ... definitely in the ascendant'<sup>31</sup> so Ankara understood that cooperation with the Allies would be significant for the post-WWII era. From then on, Turkish officials started to mention the importance of closeness to the Allies. In August 1943 the Turkish Ambassador to London, Rauf Orbay, 'stressed the absolute loyalty of Turkey to the Alliance', and stated that if the Allies 'wanted anything from Turkey', they 'had only to ask' and Turkey 'would do it if it was in her power.'<sup>32</sup>

The reasons for Turkey's declaration of war on the Axis were stated by the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hasan Saka, on 23 February 1945:

Our government has given weighty consideration to this suggestion and has come to the conclusion that its acceptance is completely in accordance on the one hand with our alliance and on the other with the interests of the Republic. [The Government].... notified the British ambassador that Turkey's declaration of war on Germany and our adherence to the Declaration of the United Nations would be submitted for approval to this distinguished body.<sup>33</sup>

The Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) supported the wisdom of this decision.<sup>34</sup> Prime Minister Sukru Saracoglu stated:

The Turkish Republic gave its word, its hearth and its weapons to the democratic nations from the very first moment of danger and to this day it has followed this path in the decisions taken by the Assembly and by the Government. For this aim we declared war on Germany and Japan which is in conformity with ... our national interests... Our government

---

<sup>27</sup> For details: FRUS, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 547-996.

<sup>28</sup> FRUS, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 943-45, The Secretary of State to the Acting Secretary of State, 11 February 1945.

<sup>29</sup> Cumhuriyet 24 February 1945; Ulus 24 February 1945.

<sup>30</sup> Ulus 24, 25, 26, 28 February 1945; Ulus 2, 15 March 1945; Cumhuriyet 5 January 1945; H. C. Yalcin, Tanin 7 January 1945; TPMB, No 135, February 1945, 32- 7, 64-7; TPMB, No 136, March 1945, 35-42.

<sup>31</sup> S. Deringil, Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War, 144.

<sup>32</sup> NAA, 186579 - A989 - 1943/940/5/1, Cablegram from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs London to Prime Minister's Department, Canberra, 10 August 1943.

<sup>33</sup> TPMB, No 135, February 1945, 39.

<sup>34</sup> For statements of Turkish deputies in TGNAP see: TPMB, No 135, February 1945, 38-49 also Cumhuriyet 4 January 1945; Ulus 24 February 1945.

was truly convinced that the affirmative decision [of the Assembly] will maintain great benefit to the Turkish nation.<sup>35</sup>

The Turkish press claimed that the decision was the ‘outcome of Turkish foreign policy which had been built up deliberately, step by step’.<sup>36</sup>

### ***Turkey at the San Francisco Conference***

Invited by American Ambassador Laurence Adolph Steinhardt to the San Francisco Conference on 6 March 1945,<sup>37</sup> Turkey’s acceptance was warmly welcomed by the TGNA and the Turkish press.<sup>38</sup> The press emphasized its hopes for a better functioning international organization and its significance for world peace.<sup>39</sup> *Anadolu* noted that the conference had significance ‘not only in the history of WWII but in the entire history of mankind’.<sup>40</sup>

Turkey had both hopes<sup>41</sup> for, and concerns about the UN. Turkey’s hopes centred on the fact that in 1945 the UN was the only solid international counter to a possible Soviet threat. Its interest in the UN was less related to the organization’s ideals than the fact it was a US proposal and offered contact with the US. In other words the UN would let Turkey show itself to the US, and the San Francisco Conference would be a good platform for Turkey to present its case for US friendship.

For the Turkish press, the UN’s major shortcoming was the inability of the great powers to cooperate to counter aggression, and in particular maintain such cooperation.<sup>42</sup> In San Francisco Hasan Saka (Minister of Foreign Affairs and the leader of the delegation) told the Reuters correspondent on 16 May 1945:

The Turkish delegation has come here with the intention of helping the conference achieve its aims. I have little doubt that success will crown our efforts even though it takes a long time. ... I do not doubt that the San Francisco Conference, even though it is unable to make up an institution which will please everybody, will set the basis for what may eventually develop into such an institution. The system, whose foundations are being laid, will flourish in proportion with the feeling of international security and cooperation that it engenders.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> TPMB, No 135, February 1945, 40.

<sup>36</sup> N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 24 February 1945; A. S. Esmer, *Ulus* 24 February 1945; N. Sadak, *Aksam* 24 February 1945.

<sup>37</sup> TPMB, No 136, March 1945, 250.

<sup>38</sup> University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 73.

<sup>39</sup> N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 14 May 1945; N. Sadak, *Aksam* 25 April 1945; A. S. Esmer, *Ulus* 7 March 1945, Y. Abadan, *Cumhuriyet* 10 April 1945; S. Saracoglu *Ulus* 12 May 1945.

<sup>40</sup> *Anadolu* 24 April 1945.

<sup>41</sup> For details see: N. Sadak, *Aksam* 23 January 1945; M. F. Fenik, *Ulus* 6 April 1945; *Cumhuriyet* 9 April 1945; N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 26 April, 11 May, 27 June 1945.

<sup>42</sup> N. Sadak, *Aksam* 2 April 1945; N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 22 June 1945; H. C. Yalcin, *Tanin* 26, 30 March, 3 April 1945.

<sup>43</sup> TPMB, No 138, May 1945, 631-32; *Cumhuriyet* 17 May 1945.

With these hopes and concerns Turkey's delegation arrived in San Francisco in April 1945 with three main delegates: Hasan Saka, Huseyin Ragip Baydur (Ambassador to the US) and Feridun Cemal Erkin (First Assistant Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).<sup>44</sup> The delegation emphasized the similarities between the UN Charter and the founding principles of Turkey formulated in the National Pact (Misak-ı Milli).<sup>45</sup> The delegation was very keen to show that Turkey had, since its foundation, supported principles akin to those of the new international system. Indeed the Adviser of the Turkish delegation, Ahmet Sukru Esmer, argued that the UN principles of justice, equality and freedom were those the Turkish Republic had followed for the last quarter century.<sup>46</sup> Saka said:

The fundamental document on which is founded the whole national and foreign policy of Turkey is the National Pact, published a quarter century ago, at the time of the foundation of the New Turkey. This document is nothing but an expression of faith in the principle of a Turkish state whose limits would remain purely national, which would enjoy national freedoms and recognise the right of all people to existence, to independence, to equality, and to freedom, condemning aggression of every kind and upholding as a doctrine the pursuit of peace both within and without the national frontiers.<sup>47</sup>

To ensure peace, the delegation emphasized the importance of collective security. It mentioned that the Turkish Republic had 'fervently and militantly defended the principle of collective security'<sup>48</sup>, and that 'Turkey has always been one of the most ardent supporters of the idea of collective security'.<sup>49</sup> The delegation pointed out Ataturk's well known saying: 'Peace in the fatherland, peace in the world'<sup>50</sup>, and reflected, '[e]very one of our compatriots knows that the foundation of our internal and external policy is peace'.<sup>51</sup> The delegation's emphasis on the similarities between the founding principles of Turkey and the main principles of the UN was Ankara's attempt to attract Washington's attention to the parallels between Turkey's and the West's ideological frameworks.

---

<sup>44</sup> TPMA, Number 3/3335, Folder 76277, Fon Code 30.18.1.2, Place No 109.68.8, Ankara, 22 November 1945; UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 1, 35-6.

<sup>45</sup> The National Pact was published in February 1920. It adopted six principles including self-determination, the security of Constantinople, the opening of the Straits, and the abolition of the capitulations. For details see: University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 82; B. Oran (ed), *Türk Dis Politikasi 1919-1980*, Vol 1, 104-5.

<sup>46</sup> TPMB, No 138, May 1945, 638-640.

<sup>47</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945; Saka also told Reuters of the importance of Misak-ı Milli on 16 March 1945 see: TPMB, No 138, May 1945, 631- 33.

<sup>48</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945.

<sup>49</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 3, 480.

<sup>50</sup> N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 3 September 1947; TPMB, No 221, April 1952, 163.

<sup>51</sup> Ulus 6 May 1945. For a more detailed evaluation of this see Saka's statement in TGNA in TPMB, No 145, December 1945, 88ff.

At the San Francisco talks the participants discussed different aspects of the prospective UN Charter, one of which was the obligation for member states to cooperate in solving problems in a great many fields, in ‘good faith’.<sup>52</sup> Saka told the Conference:

the honourable chairmen of the delegations of the United Nations [have] clearly demonstrated that this assembly is moved by a noble spirit of cooperation. The Turkish delegation is happy to observe this gratifying expression of solidarity. ... as long as this admirable unity is maintained ... we have no right to doubt either the success of this conference or the beneficent effectiveness of the new Organisation.<sup>53</sup>

But the Turkish press was forthright in emphasizing the illusory nature of harmony and cooperation between the great powers:

But this is a dream ... We are yet quite far away from this result. Even now there are undeniable conflicts of interest in Europe. ... It is childish to believe that [the Great Powers] with such different historical and geographical backgrounds will be able to establish an eternal union.<sup>54</sup>

*Tanin* foresaw difficulties notably in the divergent views between the Soviets and the West:

If one looks at the situation from the West, it is true that there exists a Russian danger. ... from the Russian point of view there is a British and a Western danger. In other words, mutual confidence and security have not been well grounded yet.<sup>55</sup>

Before the Conference Turkish official circles were aware of such difficulties, but did not pursue them in San Francisco.<sup>56</sup> Closer ties with the US were their central aim.

The other important issue of discussion at the Conference was the pacific settlement of disputes. Article 2, paragraph 3 of the UN Charter states: “All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered”. This suited the Turkish delegation, but it saw a need to reduce the Security Council’s influence on the working of the pacific settlement of issues via negotiation, mediation, conciliation, judicial settlement or any other peaceful means.<sup>57</sup> The delegation’s statement was not very detailed and did not raise any new issues or present any new arguments.

---

<sup>52</sup> See in particular the Preamble to the Charter of the UN and Articles 1 (2), 1 (3), and 2 (2).

<sup>53</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945.

<sup>54</sup> N. Sadak, *Aksam* 25 April 1945. For comments in the Turkish Press about possible hindrances to cooperation between the Great Powers, see: N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 10, 27 June 1945; F. R. Atay, *Ulus* 2 April 1945.

<sup>55</sup> H. C. Yalcin, *Tanin* 25 June 1945 in University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 91.

<sup>56</sup> University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 73-77.

<sup>57</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 12, 108. See also Saka’s statement in an American radio broadcast: TPMB, No 138, May 1945, 629-30.

This touched one of the more vexed discussions at San Francisco: the balance between the General Assembly and the Security Council, or the balance between small and large powers in decisions on peace and security. Discussions on this issue went hand in hand with talks on the decision making procedure in the Security Council. In theory this issue concerned Turkey closely.

Before the Conference some Turkish press commentaries addressed this issue by emphasizing the importance of democracy in the UN. Yavuz Abadan stated that the 'international security organisation first of all should have a universal character and ... function on democratic principles. To differentiate between small and large states in this respect is the plain lack of these principles'.<sup>58</sup> In San Francisco, the Turkish delegation stated:

the principle of the sovereign equality of all member states, the General Assembly, which is the true representative organ of the new Organization, and ought to be endowed with more extensive powers than those provided in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and especially ought to be granted all powers to control in making decisions pertaining to the maintenance of peace and security.... [t]he Turkish delegation considers that it would be well to ensure a more real balance within the Security Council by increasing the number of minimum votes required to obtain decisions.<sup>59</sup>

In addition the Turkish delegation stated that the General Assembly was the UN's 'representative body par excellence' and '[b]y delegating its powers; it endowed 'the Security Council with far reaching prerogatives and responsibilities'. Therefore 'the Security Council should report to the General Assembly on any decision it may have taken and applied, in virtue of those powers, for the maintenance of international peace and security'.<sup>60</sup>

On the General Assembly's ability to maintain peace and security the Turkish delegation suggested that:

the powers conferred upon [the General Assembly] are ... limited to questions relating to social and economic activity, whereas in essential problems concerning the maintenance of peace and security, the General Assembly does not seem to have any active part. The principle of the sovereign equality of all states should have as a consequence the concentration ... in the hands of the General Assembly of all powers of control relative to decisions bearing upon the maintenance of peace and security. This extension of the powers of the Assembly in the sphere of control does not ... in the eyes of the Turkish Delegation signify either an encroachment upon the attributes of the Security Council or a limitation of the powers originally conferred upon that body. Consequently, the Turkish Delegation believes that it would be useful for the Conference to subject Chapter V of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposal to further examination in the light of the consideration set forth above.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Y. Abadan, Cumhuriyet 18 February 1945.

<sup>59</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945.

<sup>60</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 3, 485. For a detailed evaluation of Saka on the same issue see: TPMB, No 138, May 1945, 629-30.

<sup>61</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 3, 480-81.

Similarly the delegation said of permanent and non-permanent seats on the Security Council:

the number of non-permanent seats on the Council is clearly insufficient. This disproportion is further stressed by the fact that in decisions relating to action the unanimity of the votes of principal powers is indispensable. In order to respect the principle of the equality of states, which forms the basis of the Organization, and to provide a better equilibrium in the Security Council, a notable increase in the number of non-permanent seats appears to be necessary. The raising to ten of the number of non-permanent seats and the provision of a minimum of eleven votes to carry a decision appear, to the Turkish Delegation, to be useful amendments for the establishment of a more balanced representation in the Council.<sup>62</sup>

With these statements the Turkish delegation emphasized the imbalance between the Security Council and the General Assembly. This imbalance arose mainly from the limitation of the Assembly's powers on decisions about international peace and justice. The Turkish delegation's proposal to reduce this imbalance was to increase the number of votes for final decisions on peace and security matters.<sup>63</sup>

Turkey's concern related to the UN's ability to check great power aggression. With the Council wielding such influence on these problems, it was clear to Turkey that the Assembly had little effect on their resolution. More importantly, the USSR would be a permanent member of the Council, so would have a great influence on international security issues. Moscow could block any UN measure against any Soviet pressure on Turkey. In short it could be inferred that the UN would not satisfy Turkey's security needs.

Turkey's concerns about the influence of the USSR on international security issues were aggravated by the veto the great powers had in the Security Council.<sup>64</sup> Under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, Security Council decisions would be taken by unanimous vote of the permanent members. This left open whether the Council's decisions could be blocked (vetoed) by the permanent members, but it implied that they could.<sup>65</sup>

The Turkish press considered the veto an element of inequality in the UN<sup>66</sup> by which only the small states would be penalized for aggression and the

<sup>62</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 3, 481-82.

<sup>63</sup> See also: University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 119.

<sup>64</sup> For the importance of the veto see: D. E. Lee, "The Genesis of the Veto", 33-42. For discussions on the veto power: UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 1, 288-290 and Vol 11, 117-21, 305-6, 309-10, 313-14, 317-25, 329-30, 332-37, 347-352, 360, 433-37, 438-40, 454-60, 471-76, 483, 486-96, 513-19, 530-31, 534-35 538, 552, 604-615, 630-35, 642-44, 648-52, 660-64, 683-86, 693-98, 699-709, 710-14. For the general discussion on the voting procedure in the Security Council see: NAA, 280172 - A5954 - 1821/1, Cablegram from Forde and Evatt to Chifley, 3 June 1945.

<sup>65</sup> FRUS, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 976, Protocol of the Proceedings of the Crimea Conference, 11 February 1945. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VIII, Section A, and under the second sentence of paragraph 1 of Chapter VIII, Section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

<sup>66</sup> N. Nadi, Cumhuriyet 12 April 1945.

great powers could act without restraint.<sup>67</sup> It was especially disturbing for Ankara that the USSR would have the veto. But the point here is that even though Turkey knew that permanent cooperation between the great powers was very unlikely it still did not strongly criticise the veto. It continued to support the idea of the UN along the lines favoured by the US. Feridun Cemal Erkin stated the Turkish official view of the veto:

The sponsoring governments, acting with goodwill, had shown that it was impossible for them to reach agreement on a more liberal interpretation. ... the great powers had declared that they had accepted the responsibility to use the wide powers granted them for the welfare of the whole world. ... [our] government had decided to show its confidence in the great powers by accepting the text as it stood.<sup>68</sup>

The US mattered more to Turkey than the UN.

The Turkish delegation offered a relatively detailed proposal for regional security as an alternative to international security being left entirely to the Security Council. During the plenary session of the San Francisco Conference, on 1 May 1945, the delegation emphasized that regional arrangements had to be considered a significant part of collective security.<sup>69</sup> It stated that it 'earnestly' desired 'the acceptance of regional arrangements providing for automatic action as constituent elements of security, on condition that they should be conceived for the exclusive purpose of defence'. It declared that the 'Turkish Government believes that in cases of emergency the immediate action which may be initiated through the application of regional arrangements should not be deferred pending the decision of the Security Council, since, in such cases, any delay due to the procedure would be detrimental to the country being attacked'.<sup>70</sup> The delegation elaborated:

In order to implement the machinery of the regional arrangements ... with the full effectiveness that is required of it and at the same time set into motion the machinery of defence provided in such agreements, without having to submit to the inevitable delays in resorting to the procedure of military sanctions, it would be necessary to introduce some such automatically functioning arrangements as constituent elements of collective security, ... [H]owever that they are used exclusively for purposes of defence and that the signatory states which might be let to make use of them be held to account by the Security Council for all the emergency measures which they might have been led to adopt as a consequence of such arrangements, ... they should also be bound to justify these as emergency measures.<sup>71</sup>

This proposal was a device to circumvent the Soviet veto. The two main points proposed both suited Turkish interests: regional security schemes should be

---

<sup>67</sup> Y. Abadan, *Cumhuriyet* 28 May 1945; N. Nadi, *Cumhuriyet* 26 April 1945. For Turkish press criticisms of the veto at the San Francisco Conference see: A. Daver, *Cumhuriyet* 4 June 1945; N. Sadak, *Aksam* 4, 5 June 1945; E. Tekeli, *Ulus* 7 June 1945.

<sup>68</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 11, 473-74.

<sup>69</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945.

<sup>70</sup> UNCIO Documents, San Francisco, 1945, Vol 3, 483.

<sup>71</sup> NAA, 3497173 - M1506 - 21/11, Verbatim Minutes of the Seventh Plenary Session, 1 May 1945.

automatic, and they should be active at times of emergency. Turkey's interest in regional more than international security once again illustrated Turkey's limited expectations of the UN.

The UN Charter was signed on 26 June 1945 by Saka, Baydur and Erkin making Turkey a UN founding member.<sup>72</sup> The Turkish press welcomed the signing. For example Necmettin Sadak noted:

The San Francisco Conference is the first great step to be taken in a peaceful world. Although the final product has many and great shortcomings and cannot be considered perfect it is a beginning and its value should not be underestimated.<sup>73</sup>

Ahmet Sukru Esmer emphasized the great idea behind the UN, stressing the significance of the US to the success of the Allies as well as Turkey's admiration of the US.<sup>74</sup> The Conference was an important instrument for Turkey to present itself as a democratic country sharing the same ideals as the US.

### *UN Charter Discussions after the San Francisco Conference at the TGNA*

The members of the Turkish delegation repeated their concerns to the TGNA, about the undemocratic nature of UN organs, the imbalance between the General Assembly and the Security Council and the 'distinction between the permanent and the non-permanent members'.<sup>75</sup>

Saka explained that the Charter had fewer defects than the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and that the efforts of participants at the San Francisco Conference were significant. The Charter, he said, had:

fewer omissions and disadvantages. Both we [Turkey], and the small countries ... realize that this is not a perfect product. However, we are conscious of current political realities; we should accept that these efforts have not been wasted.

The advantages of the new system... are the following: any state which is inclined to aggressive behaviour will know that it will be faced by a combination of the most powerful nations in the world and [as a result] the aggressor [will] think twice before attacking... This system is bound up with the goodwill of the great powers, depends on the harmony among them and takes its main strength from the pledges that they have given.<sup>76</sup>

On why the Turkish delegation accepted the Charter, he continued:

The Turkish Republic tried to establish its own security within the framework of general security. ... We have participated in all efforts to protect world peace and security; however the results may have been imperfect. We dedicated ourselves to save the world from a state in which everything was permitted, everything tolerated. This is why .... at the most crucial

---

<sup>72</sup> Ulus 27 June 1945; Cumhuriyet 26 June 1945.

<sup>73</sup> N. Sadak, Aksam 25 June 1945.

<sup>74</sup> TPMB, No 139, June 1945, 304-5.

<sup>75</sup> University of Ankara, Turkey and the United Nations, 121.

<sup>76</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 156-57, 15 Aug 1945.



moments we asked ourselves this question: Even though this document is not free from imperfections, is not anarchy worse?<sup>77</sup>

The Minister stated the distinction between small and great powers as a shortcoming of the Charter but did not emphasize the importance of the small powers, one of which was Turkey at that stage.

The TGNA debated ratification of the UN Charter from 15 August 1945 and ratified it on 28 September.<sup>78</sup> In the debate some speakers paraphrased US views about the main discussion point on the dominance of the great powers in the Security Council. Saka commented:

The preservation of peace and security falls to the organ called the Security Council. In this organ the most significant duties and responsibilities [will be] shouldered by those states which are in the first rank in terms of armed forces and natural resources. There is no doubt that the failures of the League of Nations and developments during the Second World War have determined the introduction of this feature.<sup>79</sup>

Other speakers emphasized the similarities between the principles of the UN Charter and Turkish foreign policy, and that the Charter was superior to the League Covenant. R. R. Pasin declared that 'during peace the maintenance of international peace and security will be possible as long as we have cooperation. ... Turkey's foreign policy always depended on interdependence and mutual cooperation principles'.<sup>80</sup> On the issue of international peace and security Saka mentioned the difference in structure between the League of Nations and the UN, and added that the UN clearly defined a duty to maintain peace and security.<sup>81</sup> M. Okmen stated:

The UN Agreement amalgamated the will, effort and power of the democratic nations ... In this respect and without doubt the general character of the Conference is pleasing. ... The agreement in San Francisco ... is a materialization of the ideals put forward by the Turkish nation. That's why we happily vote for this agreement.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 157-58, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>78</sup> TGNA members in this debate were elected at the 15 February 1943 election when there was a single party in Turkey, the Republican People's Party. The government was under Sukru Saracoglu (second term). The trend for transition to a multi-party system gained strength after WWII. The first alternative political party was the National Development Party founded on 18 July 1945. The Democrat Party was established on 7 January 1946. The first multi-party election in the history of the Republic of Turkey was held on 21 July 1946. See also [http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/about\\_tgna.htm](http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/about_tgna.htm) accessed on 01.12.2010

<sup>79</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 157, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>80</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 159, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>81</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 157, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>82</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 159-160, 15 Aug 1945.

M. Birsal emphasized the importance for all states of the UN principles, and hoped that these would be applied in good faith.<sup>83</sup> Saka emphasised the importance of goodwill and cooperation among the UN members.<sup>84</sup>

On the usage of the veto in good faith, M. Okmen stressed that it was a promise given to all world governments, so everyone should believe in it.<sup>85</sup> R. Peker commented that the Turkish delegation had accepted the veto without any alternative proposal, and noted that the UN 'is weak in the maintenance of peace and security'. The vital decisions about the integrity and the sovereignty of nations would be made by the Council. In this case 'if the aggressor is one of the great powers then the act of aggression will not be punished.' If a smaller state were to be backed by a great power the situation would be the same:

I did not find [the Turkish delegation's] attitude correct in accepting [this declaration] without mentioning my abovementioned ideas about the veto issue. ... Even though we are not a great power we have a right [to mention this matter]. ... I think this was the most important issue that we should propose amendments [to]. ... We could [at least] contribute to the propositions of the smaller powers opposing the veto power and vote against this veto with them. [By doing this] we would protect a very eminent right and show that we are aware of this issue which is so important for the continuity of our state.<sup>86</sup>

Few speakers seriously criticized the Charter's shortcomings. N. Elgun stated that its principles for the maintenance of peace and security were not ideal for small nations.<sup>87</sup> R. Kaplan stated that 'as long as the states are classified as small nations and big nations ... I do not think that the principle of sovereignty could be applied in favour of small nations'. He thought all states should have equal rights.<sup>88</sup>

H. Bayur stated that the UN declaration had contradictory provisions about the equality of nations. The main point was the veto power and the classification of nations as big and small. He criticised this system by stating that under the veto system, if one of the great powers disagreed with a decision, no measure could be taken.<sup>89</sup> TGNA criticism focused on the veto as a right to be misused by the great powers, illustrating Turkey's reduced hopes about the UN as a support for Turkey's national security. In the end, Turkish official circles were happy for Turkey to be one of the first signatories of the Charter,<sup>90</sup> saying 'it was

---

<sup>83</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 166, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>84</sup> TPMB, No 141, Aug 1945, 12.

<sup>85</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 160, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>86</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 172-73, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>87</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 160, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>88</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 167, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>89</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 168-69, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>90</sup> For the ratification act of the UN Charter see: TPMA, Number: 3/2926 Folder: 71420 Fon Code: 30..18.1.2 Place No: 108.47..19. Ankara, 17/7/1945.

better to have a Charter than none'<sup>91</sup>, it was 'the most perfect instrument available at present'<sup>92</sup> and 'it was the best obtainable in the present circumstances'.<sup>93</sup>

The Turkish press also voiced concerns about the veto power in the Security Council and the undemocratic character of its decision making.<sup>94</sup> It noted that 'the great powers would prevent enforcement measures from being taken against any great power that happened to be the aggressor, or against a small power with the same intentions that might lean on one of the great powers'.<sup>95</sup> But the press too accepted the Charter.

### **Conclusion**

Turkey's membership of the UN was an important indication of Ankara's early post-WWII perceptions of the US. When Turkey began to feel a Soviet threat in WWII, it naturally started to look for a security scheme. Because of the veto, Ankara understood that the UN would be ineffective in international peace and security, at least where a great power was involved. Thus Turkey focused on regional security, and for this only the US could help. Turkey was aware of the UN's limitations but did not seriously emphasize them. Instead it used the San Francisco Conference to align with the US, arguing that Turkey's founding principles were the same as the ideals of the US. It was offering itself as a US ally. In particular Turkey's failure to put forward any proposal amending the veto indicates that Turkey did not want to offend or oppose the US. Turkey had been able to secure its foremost and pragmatic aim, that of the friendship of its first Great Protector.

---

<sup>91</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 158, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>92</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 167, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>93</sup> TGNAP, Vol 19, 171-73, 15 Aug 1945.

<sup>94</sup> N. Nadi, Cumhuriyet 27 June 1945, N. Sadak, Aksam 27 June 1945.

<sup>95</sup> N. Sadak, Aksam 25 June 1945.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ataov, Turkkaya.. Turkish Foreign Policy 1939-1945. Vol. no. 197-79, Publications of the Faculty of the Political Science of the University of Ankara. Ankara: Publication of the Political Sciences Faculty of Ankara University, 1965.
- Barton, Keith Macdonald. "The Dumbarton Oaks Conference." PhD, Florida State University, 1974.
- Brinkley, Douglas, and David R. Facey-Crowther. The Atlantic Charter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- DeLuca, Anthony R. Great Power Rivalry at the Turkish Straits : The Montreux Conference and Convention of 1936. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Deringil, Selim. Denge Oyunu İkinci Dünya Savasi'nda Turkiye'nin Dis Politikasi. Istanbul: Numune Matbaacilik, 1994.
- . Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An "Active" Neutrality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Gonlubol, Mehmet, ed. Olaylarla Turk Dis Politikasi. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1996.
- Great Britain Foreign Office. British and Foreign State Papers. Vol. CLI. London: HMSO.
- Hale, William. Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000. London: Frank Cass, 2002.
- Hilderbrand, Robert C. Dumbarton Oaks, the Origins of the United Nations and the Search for the Post-War Security. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1941/410618a.html>. accessed on 14.12.2010.
- [http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/about\\_tgna.htm](http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/about_tgna.htm). accessed on 01.12.2010.
- <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/history>. accessed on 12.12.2010.
- Institute of International Relations of the Faculty of Political Studies at the University of Ankara. Turkey and the United Nations. New York: Manhattan Publishing Company, 1961.
- Karal, Enver Ziya. Atatürk'ten Dusunceler. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu, 1956.
- League of Nations Treaty Series. Vol. CLVII, CLXXIII, CCII.
- Lee, Dwight E. "The Genesis of the Veto." International Organization Vol. 1, no. 1 (February 1947): 33-42.

Morton, Henry Vollam. *Atlantic Meeting : An Account of Mr. Churchill's Voyage in H.M.S. Prince of Wales, in August, 1941, and the Conference with President Roosevelt Which Resulted in the Atlantic Charter*. Wellington: Hicks Smith & Wright for Methuen, 1945.

*National Archives of Australia, Canberra*

*Series Number*

A989

"Turkey - Foreign Policy General." Barcode 186579 Control Symbol 1943/940/5/1, 1943 - 1943.

"Turkish Entry into Second World War." Barcode 186768 Control Symbol 1943/970/50, 1943 - 1944.

A1066

"Abrogation of Soviet-Turkish Treaty of 1925." Barcode 190032 Control Symbol M45/27/5, 1945 - 1945.

A3300

"1944 File - White Tab War - United States/British Commonwealth - Turkey." Barcode 1351823 Control Symbol 265K, 1944 - 1945.

A5954

"Post War World Organisation ... Conference of British Commonwealth Representatives in London March 1945 and United Nations Conference in San Francisco April 1945." Barcode 280172 Control Symbol 1821/1, 1945 - 1950.

M1506

"Plenary [of the United Nations Conference on International Organization]." Barcode 3497173 Control Symbol 21/11, 1945.

*Newspapers (Cumhuriyet, Ulus, Tanin, Anadolu, Aksam)*

New Zealand Department of External Affairs. *The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals for the Establishment of a General International Organisation*. Wellington: Department of External Affairs, 1944.

Oran, Baskin, ed. *Turk Dis Politikasi 1919-1980. II vols. Vol. I*. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 2005.

*Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry General Directorate of State Archives, Ankara*

Turkish Prime Ministerial Archives. In Number: 3/3335 Folder: 76277 Fon Code: 30..18.1.2 Place No: 109.68..8. Ankara, 22/11/1945.

- . In Number: 3/2926 Folder: 71420 Fon Code: 30..18.1.2 Place No: 108.47..19. Ankara, 17/7/1945.
- Stone, Julius. *The Atlantic Charter: New Worlds for Old*. Sydney: Augus and Robertson, 1943.
- Turkish Parliamentary Archives, Ankara*
- Turkish Grand National Assembly Proceedings. "T.B.M.M. Tutanak Dergisi." Vol 19, 15 August 1945;
- Turkish Prime Ministerial Bulletins. "Ayin Tarihi (History of the Month)." No. 135, February 1945; No. 136, March 1945; No. 138, May 1945; No. 139, June 1945; No. 141, August 1945; No. 145, December 1945; No. 221, April 1952;
- United Nations Information Organisations. Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organisation, San Francisco, 1945 Vols 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,11,12 New York (1945).
- United States Department of State. Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) Vol 3 (1929); General Vol 1 (1943); The Conferences at Malta and Yalta (1945);