

HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DOI: 10.46340/ephd.2021.7.4.4

Tetiana Anistratenko

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0930-8872>

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

TRUMAN'S DOCTRINE OF 1947 AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The article is devoted to the analysis of the 1947 Truman Doctrine and its influence on international relations after World War II. It is emphasized that the proclamation of the doctrine marked the completeness and ideological justification of Washington's official course towards Greece and Turkey. The use of mainly economic methods by the United States to achieve certain foreign policy and military goals is highlighted. It is established that the analysis of events in the political sphere of Greece and Turkey, where major changes took place, corresponds to the general anti-communist course of the USA. The United States viewed Greece and Turkey in the context of a global confrontation with the USSR. It is substantiated that the post-war foreign policy of the United States towards Greece and Turkey had a decisive influence on the further development of these countries and outlined the bipolar nature of international relations. Consequently, at the end of Harry Truman's second presidential term, Greece and Turkey became full-fledged members of NATO, and the Marshall Plan assistance program was completed. It is proven that the confrontation between the two superpowers – the USA and the USSR was one of the main reasons for the revision of Greece and Turkey in the system of Washington's foreign policy priorities and the formation of the conceptual foundations of US policy based on the "containment" concept. The paper analyzes the consequences of the Truman Doctrine proclamation during the formation of the bipolar world at the global level, which makes it possible to understand the modern transformations of the international relations system. Undoubtedly, the United States still has a significant impact on the development of modern world politics. Global events of the early XXI century indicate an imitation of the methods and rhetoric of the United States during the Cold War. And the current relations between Washington and Moscow significantly update the topic of this paper. The positive relations dynamics between Ukraine and the USA also indicate the chosen topic's relevance.

Keywords: Truman Doctrine, Greece, Turkey, Cold War, US international relations.

Articulation of the issue. The research of the Truman Doctrine and its impact on international relations is explained by the lack of systematic research on this topic in domestic historiography. In the Ukrainian scientific community, the issue of the Truman Doctrine phenomenon has not yet found its detailed representation. The paper is the first attempt to expand and deepen scientific knowledge about the place and significance of the Truman Doctrine in the foreign policy and economic diplomacy of the US. An analysis of the role of the proclaimed doctrine in the research of modernization of the "balance of power" system towards the "balance of interests" system in international relations after World War II is proposed. After the end of the Second World War, Greece and Turkey began to gradually reorient their foreign policy vector towards the US, the leader of the capitalist world. The defining motive for the United States' post-war strategy was an economic victory with the end goal of building an embedded world economy under its leadership. The US intervention in Greek and Turkish internal policies has become part of a strategy of establishing control over the Middle East oil reserves.

Current scientific research and issues analysis. Several prominent Cold War history scientists, such as John Lewis Gaddis¹, Judith Jeffrey², Arnold Offner³, Walter La Feber⁴, Martin McCauley⁵,

¹ Gaddis, J. (1972). *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. Columbia University Press, 336.

² Jeffrey, J. (2000). *Ambiguous Commitments and Uncertain Policies: The Truman Doctrine in Greece, 1947-1952*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books.

³ Offner, A. (2002). *Another Such Victory: President Truman and the Cold War, 1945-1953*. Stanford University Press.

⁴ La Feber, W. (2008). *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945-2006*. N.Y.: Mc Craw-Hill.

⁵ McCauley, M. (2008). *Origins of the Cold War 1941-1949*. Routledge.

John Young¹, and Lawrence Haas², have paid close attention to the Truman Doctrine analysis and the bipolar confrontation research. The role of doctrine in the question of Greece was examined by Dimitrios Kousoulas³, Howard Jones⁴, John Iatrides⁵ and Eugene Rossides⁶. William Matthew Hale⁷, a professor at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, analyzed the US foreign policy towards Turkey. The biography of the 33rd President of the USA Harry S. Truman was written by the famous biographical research theorist, David McCullough⁸. Modern views on the history of the Cold War are highlighted by the scientific works of researcher Elizabeth Edwards Spalding⁹ and US Senator Tim Kaine¹⁰.

Several scientific works of domestic Americanist scientists – Borys Honchar¹¹, Taras Hryshchenko¹², Iryna Pohorska¹³, Mykola Ryzhkov¹⁴ are devoted to the problems of forming the conceptual foundations of US foreign policy in the second half of the XX century. The ideological component of American foreign policy and the history of the international strategy of the USA in the second half of the twentieth and early twentieth centuries is the object of research of the Ukrainian Americanist, Doctor of Sciences in History, Taras Gryshchenko¹⁵. According to him, Harry Truman was “the powered locomotive that ensured the practical implementation of the compassionate restraint concept.” Professor of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Mykola Ryzhkov¹⁶ paid attention to the evolution of the doctrinal dimension of US foreign policy strategies. Senior Research Fellow of the Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Iryna Pohorska¹⁷ explores the problem of the global power of the United States of America in the context of the current world development trends. Researcher Tetyana Anistratenko¹⁸ analyzes interpretations of Truman’s doctrine by historians of the USSR era. However, Ukrainian historians have not focused on the role of the Truman Doctrine and its impact on international relations after World War II.

Unresolved problem analysis. The excessive ideologization of the topic throughout the Cold War period topic needs more objective coverage. Using the example of Greece and Turkey, which traditionally were in the zone of predominant influence of Great Britain and outside the zone of direct foreign policy interests of the USA, it is necessary to study the process of involving the United States in the political life of the Mediterranean region, remote from them. Unbiased research on this topic was impossible

¹ Young, J. (2013). *International Relations since 1945*. Oxford University Press.

² Haas, L. (2016). *Harry & Arthur: Truman, Vandenberg, and the Partnership that Created the Free World*. Potomac Books, University of Nebraska Press.

³ Kousoulas, D. (1965). The Success of the Truman Doctrine was not Accidental, *Military Affairs*, 29 (2), 88-92.

⁴ Jones, H. (1989). "A New Kind of War": *America's Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 327.

⁵ Iatrides, J. (2000). George F. Kennan and the Birth of Containment: The Greek Test Case. *World Policy Journal*, 22, 3, 126-145.

⁶ Rossides, E. (1998). *The Truman Doctrine of Aid to Greece: A Fifty-Year Retrospective*. American Hellenic Institute Foundation.

⁷ Hale, W. (2008). *Turkish foreign policy 1774-2000*. London.

⁸ McCullough, D. (2015). *Truman*. Simon & Schuster.

⁹ Spalding, E. (2017). The Enduring Significance of the Truman Doctrine, *Orbis*, 61, 4, 561-574.

¹⁰ Kaine, T. (2017). A 21st century Truman Doctrine, *Foreign Affairs*, July 28 <<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/07/28/a-21st-century-truman-doctrine/>> (2021, November, 27).

¹¹ Гончар, Б. (1992). *Кризова дипломатія СРСР і США в конфліктах «третього світу» (70-80-і рр.)*. Київ.

¹² Грищенко, Т. (2016). Чотири «Фултонські промови» і світова стратегія США початку XXI століття. *Університет: науковий історико-філософський журнал*, №1-2 (53), 19-28.

¹³ Погорська, І. (2009). *США: місія здійснима? Праксеологія творення глобального світу*. Київ: Грамота, 520.

¹⁴ Рижков, М. (2006). "Grand Strategies": актуалізація американського досвіду стратегічного планування. Київ: Алькор.

¹⁵ Грищенко, Т. (2014). *Генерації американських міжнародних стратегів другої половини ХХ-початку ХХІ ст. Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Історія*, 1(2), 140-144.

¹⁶ Рижков, М. (2007). *Доктринальний вимір стратегії зовнішньої політики США: від стримування до глобальної демократизації: автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора політичних наук*. Київ: НАН України. Інститут світової економіки і міжнародних відносин, 47.

¹⁷ Погорська, І. (2012). США у глобальному світі ХХІ століття: реалії і перспективи. *Актуальні проблеми міжнародних відносин*, 107, I, 39-45. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/apmv.2012.107.1>.

¹⁸ Аністратенко, Т. (2020). *Радянські інтерпретації доктрини Трумена 1947 року. Сторінки історії. Збірник наукових праць*, 51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20535/2307-5244.51.2020.220185>.

due to political reasons. For a long time, the “official” historiography dominated. The author sheds light on the fundamentally new readings of leading modern researchers of US foreign policy and reevaluates the ideas inherited from the Soviet historiography about the meaning and impact of the Truman Doctrine on international relations.

Research objectives setting. The subject of the study is to highlight the results and consequences of the proclaimed Truman Doctrine. The methodological basis of the study consists of the principles of historicism, scientific objectivity, and systematicity. The modeling and generalization method was used to form the conclusions of the study. The historical analysis method makes it possible to establish and determine the consequences of the proclamation of the Doctrine, to consider the views of modern scientists on the significance of the Truman Doctrine for the United States, Greece, Turkey, and the world community as a whole.

Research results presentation. The uniqueness of Greece and Turkey lies in their geographical location at the junction of three continents – Europe, Asia, and Africa, which was of great significance for the American leaders to implement their strategic plans within the framework of containing the USSR during the Cold War. This determined the central place of these countries in Washington’s postwar foreign policy concept, the proclamation of the Harry Truman Doctrine, which defined their behavior on the international stage throughout the Cold War and to this day. After the proclamation of the doctrine, the USA actively utilized the domestic political situation in Greece and Turkey to form pro-Western values and democratic lifestyles in these countries. As it is known, Turkey was officially admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) at the same time as Greece on February 18th, 1952. This step was dictated by the course of rapprochement with the West. The geopolitical position of this country and a powerful army that could be used in the fight against the USSR played an important role in the United States’ decision in favor of Turkey. Greece is strategically located in the Alliance’s southern region, near South-Eastern Europe, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, and North Africa. During the Cold War, Greece and Turkey actively supported the policies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Following the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War, these countries will participate in NATO’s peace-support operations and missions around the world.

Renowned Cold War historian, John Lewis Gaddis, notes that Truman’s doctrine has entailed several international events and has significantly influenced the development of the last century’s history. When post-war Europe turned into a vacuum, the two superpowers felt the need to intervene in its life to protect and project their foreign policy interests¹. NATO, domino theory, McCarthyism, and the Marshall Plan were all products of the doctrine’s proclamation. In the long term, the Marshall Plan proved to be the most successful full-scale relief program ever implemented. Truman’s proclaimed policies and its further entrenchment helped build up a network of allies and friendly nations that initiated a new kind of collective security agreement known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the protection of the free world. Of course, the doctrine also had opponents pointing out its mistakes and shortcomings. Because of its uncompromising attitude toward the Soviet Union and its determined efforts to constrain communism, America had to act decisively. In some cases, the USA interfered in the internal affairs of other countries. Moreover, Truman’s proclaimed policy of constraining communism has drawn America into grueling and costly wars that it might be best not to participate in. The McCarthyist hysteria over internal affairs was also motivated to a certain extent by Truman’s anti-communist policies. But Truman had to make a choice and he made it. Truman did not risk it. According to American scientist Elizabeth Edwards Spalding, it was Harry Truman who played a central role in shaping America’s overall strategy during the Cold War and the subsequent change in US foreign policy. In theory and practice, the president has presented the doctrine as an approach that combines political, economic, and strategic elements. It was he who defined and formed the theoretical foundations of containment. The researcher is convinced that Harry Truman, not George Kennan, was the true author of the communism “containment”². Undoubtedly, Truman was one of the first American leaders to realize that the USA was financially capable of helping the world, not only in war, but also in peace, and to continue that policy for the foreseeable future. This conviction of America and its leader meant that isolationism, as a way of life in the world, which the United States had respected for so long and was so proud of, had exhausted itself. In a world of recent profound changes in the balance of power in the international arena, staying on the sidelines could be detrimental to American interests, especially when the Soviet Union threatened to

¹ Gaddis, J. (1981). Containment: Its Past and Future. *International Security*, 5 (4), 74.

² Spalding, E. (2006). *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism*. The University Press of Kentucky, 337.

submerge the world into a different way of life. By then, Winston Churchill had characterized these alarming circumstances as “Iron Curtain.” The doctrine proclaimed by Truman became a significant component of the Marshall Plan that appeared later. European countries suffering from the aftermath of World War II received significant financial and material assistance. The doctrine was the first draft of the containment policy proclaimed by America to push back the Soviet Union. Researcher George Kousoulas notes that the Truman Doctrine has done an excellent job of achieving its stated goals in Europe – Soviet expansionism on the continent has been halted¹.

According to most researchers, the United States has used British withdrawal notes from Greece and Turkey as an excuse to announce a renewed postwar policy at the global, regional, and local levels. Analyzing the process of preparing Truman’s speech before Congress on aid to Greece and Turkey, as well as the President’s speech of March 12, 1947, it can be concluded that the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine, which declared the struggle for freedom, was a natural evolution of the postwar external planning of the USA. And now the situation in Greece and Turkey was considered by the United States not as a separate case, but as one of the episodes of a new long-term confrontation between the two world systems. All US measures were coordinated with the British government, which contributed to the maximum rapprochement of America, Greece, and Turkey. The Truman Doctrine was developed taking into account the specific geopolitical positions of Greece and Turkey, which were supposed to provide the United States with a strategic advantage in the Cold War and protect its economic interests in the Middle East. Undoubtedly, the ideological orientation of the doctrine, the principle of its successful implementation determined the scale of American participation in the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey: US embassies, military and economic missions played the role of supranational bodies in these countries. As it is well known, Turkey officially remained neutral for most of World War II. However, after its completion, it came under pressure from the Soviet Union to lift restrictions on Soviet shipping through the Black Sea straits, which connect the Black Sea with the Mediterranean. As the Turkish government did not agree to the demands of the Soviet Union, tensions arose in the region. Demonstration of the naval power of the USSR became an integral part of it. It was this incident that was decisive in the formation of the Truman Doctrine. Renowned Cold War historian John Lewis Gaddis believes that Truman’s policies were consistent with the American tradition of maintaining the balance of power in Europe. The purpose of Truman’s doctrine was no real opposition to communism everywhere, but only to prevent the Soviet Union from dominating the European continent. That is, the containment was not associated with communism, but with the USSR. According to John Lewis Gaddis, in August 1946, the president heard some warnings from US Army Chief of Staff Edward Eisenhower about the possibility of a war outbreak if the Americans raised stakes in a dead-end corner of the Black Sea straits. To which Truman replied with a notation about the significance of this part of the world for the vital interests of Americans and said that Europe and the Middle East are by no means separate sectors². The United States consequently asked the Turks not to succumb to Soviet intimidation and sent part of the US Navy to the region to support the positions of Turks. Harry Truman was convinced that obtaining internal political and economic stability in such countries would be a means of achieving the goal of keeping the Russians away from them. A few months later, Greece will also turn to the United States for help, which finally prompts Truman to make an official statement on the factual state of affairs in the world.

In February 1947, in a memorandum to President Truman, Secretary of State George W. Marshall expressed the following: “A crisis of the utmost importance and urgency has arisen in Greece and to some extent in Turkey. This crisis has a direct and immediate relation to the security of the United States. The time has come for a new American policy... If Greece should dissolve into civil war it is altogether probable that it would emerge as a communist state under Soviet control. Turkey would be surrounded and the Turkish situation, to which I shall refer in a moment, would, in turn, become still more critical. Soviet domination might thus extend over the entire Middle East to the borders of India. The effect of this upon Hungary, Austria, Italy, and France cannot be overestimated. It is not alarmist to say that we are faced with the first crisis of a series which might extend Soviet domination to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia”³. Essentially, Marshall said that the victory of communism in Greece would have global implications for American security and the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Jeffrey Roberts’ article examines

¹ Kousoulas, D. (1965). The Success of the Truman Doctrine was not Accidental, *Military Affairs*, 29 (2), 88-92.

² Gaddis, J. (1972). *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. Columbia University Press, 336.

³ Department of State (1947). Memorandum by the Secretary of State to President Truman by George C. Marshall, *Foreign Relations of the United States*. February 27, document 37, Near East and Africa, V <<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1947v05/d637>> (2021, November, 27).

Soviet policy towards Greece and Turkey at the beginning of the Cold War. The author argues that Stalin's aspirations for these countries at the time were limited and secondary to more important ambitions in Europe. However, the Soviet-Western contradictions over Iran, Turkey, and Greece became decisive in the emergence of confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union¹. Of course, US intervention was due to interest in the Middle East oil. In addition, American leaders saw Greece and Turkey as a barrier against Soviet intervention into the Middle East. John Iatrides, a professor of international politics at the University of Southern Connecticut, notes that the main success of Truman's policy was that Greece did not fall into the "Iron Curtain" of the USSR². Dennis Merrill, a professor of history at the University of Missouri, says America was able to prevent Greece from sliding into communism, adding it to its sphere of influence and significantly increasing its impact in the region. When right-wing politicians opposed the reforms and tried to oust the more centrist elements from the government, the United States strong-armed them into submission by threatening to cut off their aid. US military advisers maintained and retrained the Greek National Army and developed an aggressive strategy to quell internal unrest. The communist uprising was soon effectively suppressed, and the USSR no longer intervened in Greece or neighboring Turkey after American military aid was sent to Ankara³. The proclamation of the Truman Doctrine was also linked to domestic political considerations. Truman's anti-communist rhetoric tried to seize the initiative from the Republicans after the unsuccessful mid-term elections to Congress for the Democrats in 1946. The United States chose a policy of containing communism in a global sense. Because of this renewed foreign policy, American leaders have been under tremendous pressure from international and domestic public opinion. However, this successful experience was valuable because it included positive elements that developed in the following years about other countries.

Analyzing the implications of doctrine proclamation, researchers John Iatrides and Nicholas Rizopoulos argue that the Truman Doctrine had stunning success in preventing Greece and Turkey from falling under the Iron Curtain. The USSR was never able to attain complete hegemony on the European continent. Other important US actions in building a post-war world, such as the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe and create NATO, can be viewed as containment. Considering that the Marshall Plan greatly facilitated the economic recovery of Europe and the fact that NATO still exists as an institution, it can also be considered a success. The doctrine has set precedents for many years and pursued a policy in the world that has not known the Cold War for more than 25 years. It has shaped the trajectory of American foreign policy for generations. The authors state that researching its origins, it can be concluded that sometimes politics can have unintended forward-looking goals. The United States continues to intervene in other countries internal conflicts. These interventions are explained by the fact that they protect security interests and the world's democratic institutions. Echoes of the Truman Doctrine are hard to miss in the modern world. It has contributed to the further spread of democratic institutions at the global level⁴. Edwin Borchard, a professor of international law, notes the foreign policy doctrine was more focused on military aid⁵. According to Stephen McGlinchey, an international relations researcher at the University of the West of England, Truman's containment doctrine and the Marshall Plan together determined the structure of the coming Cold War between America and the USSR. It united the two sides of the ideological and economic conflict. Based on the traditional understanding of the international relations paradigms, we can conclude that the very post-war structure of the international system created the Cold War and the partition of Europe. In this regard, Truman Doctrine arose out of the inevitability of the foreign policy in the form in which it was then constructed. Consequently, it was simply a reaction to the already established structure of the post-war system and not a determining factor in the formation of a new structure. The division of Europe began during the Second World War, and the Truman Doctrine became a manifestation of foreign policy, which arose out of the uncertainty and concern of the Soviet government and the vacuum in Europe. Stephen McGlinchey notes

¹ Roberts, G. (2011). Moscow's Cold War on the Periphery: Soviet Policy in Greece, Iran, and Turkey, 1943 – 48. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46 (1), 58-81. DOI: 10.1177/0022009410383292.

² Iatrides, J. (2000). George F. Kennan and the Birth of Containment: The Greek Test Case. *World Policy Journal*, 22, 3, 126-145.

³ Merrill, D. (2006). The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity. *Political Science*. Volume 36, Issue 1. p. 27-37. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2006.00284.x.

⁴ Iatrides, J.; Rizopoulos, N. (2000). The International Dimension of the Greek Civil War. *World Policy Journal*, 17 (1), 93-94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/07402775-2000-2009>.

⁵ Borchard, E. (1947). Intervention – the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. *American Journal of International Law*, 41 (4), 885-888.

that the doctrine has pushed Western European countries to accept the reality of a divided, bipolar world in which two different economic, ideological and political systems conflicted. In this regard, the containment effect created a structure in which tangible and inevitable contradictions accumulated until about the middle of 1947. Combined with the Soviet Union's reaction, the division of Europe was certainly part of American foreign policy plans. The author expresses the opinion that it is not necessary to share the blame in this analysis of events but to recognize their inevitability¹.

It was the need to protect the economic and strategic interests of the United States in the Mediterranean that entailed the intensification of US foreign policy towards Greece and Turkey and its structural design. The activities of American embassies, missions, and administrations for economic cooperation in Greece and Turkey marked the beginning of large-scale US involvement in the domestic political processes of the two countries. The victory of pro-Western forces in these countries has opened up new opportunities for America to expand its influence on a regional scale. The escalation of the Cold War and, as a consequence, the evolution of the containment concept have updated the security of Greece and Turkey in the military-strategic planning of the USA. The admission of Greece and Turkey to NATO proclaimed a US victory in the Cold War with the USSR. So, the result of the US renewed foreign policy was the involvement of Greece and Turkey in the sphere of US national interests and security. With that said, it should be noted that the task of orienting countries to one or another superpower at the beginning of the Cold War was strategic by definition and required careful preparation. For American statesmen, Greece and Turkey became the first countries to have the opportunity to apply and implement the full range of measures aimed at combating Soviet totalitarianism. It is in this context that the implications of the doctrine are viewed and endorsed by John Iatrides and Nicholas Rizopoulos. Historians argue that the support of the Greek government by the Truman administration during the civil war saved Greece from communist abuse throughout the Cold War and guaranteed the country's transition from a dictatorship into a developed democracy².

Consequently, the formation of US policy was affected by internal policy factors (change of government, dominance of Republicans in both chambers of Congress, the transition of initiative in foreign policy decisions from "idealists" to "realists", the transformation of the conceptual foundations of US foreign policy in connection with the beginning of the Cold War) and foreign policy (change in the international political situation after the Second World War, initiatives from Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain). However, the key factor was the strategic significance of Greece and Turkey in the containment concept of the USSR. Historian Robert Garson highlights that in the three years after World War II, American politicians have recognized that although they were unable to provide democracy or an "open door" for Eastern European countries, they could still develop tactics in the region that would become a threat to Soviet hegemony. The researcher assures that the Truman administration was convinced that the eventual stability of the USSR itself would depend on developments in Eastern Europe. If the USA manages to stop the rise of communism among Soviet satellites, it will be able to test Moscow's power and authority³. Russian publicist Alexander Mosesov admits that elements of the doctrine have remained the same in the current US foreign policy approach to European countries. This is best illustrated by the fact that Greece and Turkey, which received aid in 1947, are still members of NATO, and the rhetoric of the American establishment towards Russia and Central and Eastern Europe has essentially stayed the same⁴. A well-known Russian diplomat, Professor Valentyn Zorin, also believes that America's containment policy, which was announced during Truman's time, is still ongoing. According to him, after the collapse of the USSR, the ideological component of the Cold War is a thing of the past, but the geopolitical component has not disappeared⁵. Dennis Merrill, a professor of history at the University of Missouri, summarizes the doctrine and concludes that it eventually formed the basis for the Cold War policy in Europe and subsequently, throughout the world. According to the researcher,

¹ McGlinche, S. (2009). The Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, and the Division of Europe. *E-International Relations*. <<https://www.e-ir.info/2009/10/13/the-marshall-plan-the-truman-doctrine-and-the-division-of-europe/>> (2021, November, 27).

² Iatrides, J.; Rizopoulos, N. (2000). The International Dimension of the Greek Civil War. *World Policy Journal*, 17 (1), 93-94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/07402775-2000-2009>.

³ Garson, R. (1979). The Role of Eastern Europe in America's Containment Policy, 1945–1948. *Journal of American Studies*, 13(1), 73-92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021875800007106>.

⁴ Мосесов, А. (2017). «Доктрина Трумэна»: 70 лет и 1 подход. *Военное обозрение* <<https://topwar.ru/110876-doktrina-trumena-70-let-i-1-podhod.html>> (2021, November, 27).

⁵ Зорин, В. (2019). Доктрину Трумэна никто не отменял. *Историк* <<https://историк.рф/journal/доктрину-трумэна-никто-не-отменял/>> (2021, November, 27).

Truman's doctrine also formed the basis of Bush's doctrine against international terrorism. It mobilized the economic and military power of the United States to modernize the world's fragile regions and marked the emergence of modern American foreign policy¹. According to Kyle Evered, a historian at the University of Michigan, the doctrine was initially focused primarily on Greece and Turkey. Subsequently, it embraced and consolidated the geopolitical goals of the broader Middle East region and laid the foundation for the universal military goal of building a uniquely American vision of international security².

Undoubtedly, the reconsideration of the place of Greece and Turkey in the system of foreign policy priorities by the United States was influenced by factors of a subjective and objective nature. With President Harry Truman coming to power, America's final departure from isolationism took place and the interpretation of American interests was renewed. Washington was guided by the post-war reconstruction of the world in relation to its plans, which no longer presupposed the preservation of the former spheres of impact. The main goal of US foreign policy was to create a geopolitical environment of democratic and capitalist states based on the American model, which would recognize the United States as the political and economic leader of the new world order "One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States," Truman said in his speech, is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the war with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other nations... The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world. And we shall surely endanger the welfare of this nation. Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events."³. Achieving this goal had to be done by economic methods. The Soviet Union was perceived by Washington as a threat to US national interests. To neutralize the influence of a political rival and to solve key foreign policy tasks, the containment concept was developed. The obvious changes in the international political situation after World War II were the strengthening of the USSR's positions and the weakening of British influence in the international arena. This resulted in policies implemented by Greece, Turkey, and Britain in order to bring Washington, Athens, and Istanbul closer together. The governments of Greece and Turkey saw the United States as a "third force" capable of providing substantial economic support and bringing their countries out of the crisis.

Great Britain, having realized the limitations of its economic resources, turned to the United States so as to pursue a common policy in Greece and Turkey against a common enemy – the USSR. The activation of Washington's foreign policy towards Athens and Istanbul was a consequence of the realization by the American political leadership of the advantageous geostrategic position of Greece and Turkey, located in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet borders, as well as on the line of communications leading to the oil fields of the Middle East. The awareness of the need of protecting their economic interests in the region led to a change in the external course of the United States.

Conclusion. Thus, US policy resulted in qualitative changes in the economic and political systems of Greece and Turkey and the involvement of these countries in the sphere of American national priorities and the United States gaining experience in defending its interests in geographically remote territories. Despite the fact that at first the Soviet and Western press regarded Truman's speech as a declaration of war on the Soviet Union, the implementation of a flexible policy within the framework of the doctrine allowed the United States to achieve its foreign policy successes without entering an open war with the USSR. At the regional level, the United States has consolidated its strategic position in the Middle Eastern oil fields, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf; at the local level, they neutralized the influence of the Soviet Union and established a political regime that would promote American interests in the region. After having created a theoretical and ideological basis for a renewed foreign policy, the United States was faced with the task of developing particular cooperation that would regulate the practical side of the Truman Doctrine implementation. The mission, directed to Greece and Turkey as part of the implementation of the Truman Doctrine, was seen as the main instrument for the implementation of American policy in these countries. During 1947-1948, a mechanism of American control over the economic processes of Greece and Turkey

¹ Merrill, D. (2006). The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity. *Political Science*, 36, 1, 27-37. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2006.00284.x.

² Evered, K. (2010). The Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey: America's Cold War fusion of development and security. *Arab World Geographer*, 13(1), 50-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5555/arwg.13.1.d21725470tp75466>.

³ Truman, H., (1947). The Truman Doctrine (delivered 12 March 1947 before a Joint Session of Congress). *Americanrhetoric* <<https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/harrystrumantrumandocctrine.html>> (2021, November, 27).

was established. US economic aid to Greece and Turkey peaked in the 1949-1950 and 1950-1951 fiscal years, then began to decline. The priority of American missions later became the military strengthening of these countries, the implementation of the program of financial stabilization and the continuation of the program of reconstruction. The Americans managed to solve their main tasks in Greece and Turkey – to restore the economy destroyed by the war and achieve relative stability of their financial and credit systems. Major economic indicators demonstrated the success of the aid program, setting the stage for Greek and Turkish economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s. An equally important achievement was addressing the problem of instability of these countries' governments. The United States contributed to the consolidation of political parties, and also advocated the transition to a majoritarian electoral system in Greece, which made it possible to create a stable majority in parliament. In Turkey, the one-party system has drawn strong criticism from the opposition. The Turkish government was forced to permit the creation of opposition political organizations. At the same time, the rapprochement between Turkey and the USA and the provision of military-technical assistance began: American military missions and advisers appeared in the country, and the supply of modern weapons began. Foreign policy orientations have forced the Turkish president and parliament to start liberalizing the internal regime in the country. The idea of democratizing Greece and Turkey was fulfilled as a result of the evolution of the American containment concept of the USSR. This evolution and change in US foreign policy laid the necessary ideological basis for the admission of Greece and Turkey to NATO in 1952. So, during 1947-1953, the type of behavior of the United States was changing. They abandoned the non-interference policy and became the main foreign friend of Athens and Istanbul. The basic features of the post-war world order, which have persisted for many years, have become firmly established: the bipolar nature of international relations, the focus of the superpowers on managing international crises, avoiding a direct military clash, and attempts to involve the UN in resolving conflicts, etc. The contours of the new unspoken rules of the game in the international arena, which were operated during the Cold War, were outlined.

References:

1. Anistratenko, T. (2020). Radianski interpretatsii doktryny Trumena 1947 roku [Soviet interpretations of the Truman doctrine of 1947]. *Storinky istorii. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats* [Pages of history. Collection of scientific works], 51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20535/2307-5244.51.2020.220185>. [in Ukrainian].
2. Borchard, E. (1947). Intervention – the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. *American Journal of International Law*, 41 (4), 885-888. [in English].
3. Department of State (1947). *Memorandum by the Secretary of State to President Truman by George C. Marshall, Foreign Relations of the United States. February 27, document 37, Near East and Africa, V* <<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1947v05/d637>> (2021, November, 27). [in English].
4. Evered, K. (2010). The Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey: America's Cold War fusion of development and security. *Arab World Geographer*, 13 (1), 50-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5555/arwg.13.1.d21725470tp75466>. [in English].
5. Gaddis, J. (1981). Containment: Its Past and Future. *International Security*, 5 (4), 74-102. [in English].
6. Gaddis, J. (1972). *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. Columbia University Press. [in English].
7. Garson, R. (1979). The Role of Eastern Europe in America's Containment Policy, 1945-1948. *Journal of American Studies*, 13, (1), 73-92 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021875800007106>. (2021, November, 27). [in English].
8. Haas, L. (2016). *Harry & Arthur: Truman, Vandenberg, and the Partnership that Created the Free World*. Potomac Books, University of Nebraska Press. [in English].
9. Hale, W. (2008). *Turkish foreign policy 1774-2000*. London. [in English].
10. Honchar, B. (1992). Kryzova dyplomatiya SRSR i SShA v konfliktakh «tretoho svitu» (70-80-i rr.) [Crisis diplomacy of the USSR and the USA in the "third world" conflicts (70-80)]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
11. Hryshchenko, T. (2016). Chotyry «Fultonski promovy» i svitova stratehiya SShA pochatku XXI stolittya [The Four Fulton Speeches and US World Strategy of the Early 21st Century]. *Universytet: naukovyy istoryko-filozofsky zhurnal* [University: scientific historical and philosophical journal], 1-2 (53), 19-28. [in Ukrainian].
12. Hryshchenko, T. (2014). Heneratsiyi amerykans'kykh mizhnarodnykh stratehiv druhoyi polovyny XX-pochatku XXI st. [Generations of American international strategists of the second half of the XX early XXI century]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopil'skoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatyuka. Seriya: Istoriya* [Scientific notes of Ternopil National Pedagogical University named after Volodymyr Hnatyuk. Series: History], 1 (2), 140-144. [in Ukrainian].
13. Jeffrey, J. (2000). *Ambiguous Commitments and Uncertain Policies: The Truman Doctrine in Greece, 1947-1952*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books. [in English].
14. Jones, H. (1989). *"A New Kind of War": America's Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].

15. Iatrides, J. (2000). George F. Kennan and the Birth of Containment: The Greek Test Case. *World Policy Journal*, *Duke University Press*, 22, 3, 126-145. [in English].
16. Iatrides, J., Rizopoulos, N. (2000). The International Dimension of the Greek Civil War. *World Policy Journal*, 17 (1), 87-103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/07402775-2000-2009>. [in English].
17. Kaine, T. (2017). A 21st century Truman Doctrine, Foreign Affairs July 28, 2017. *Brookings* <<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/07/28/a-21st-century-truman-doctrine/>> (2021, November, 27). [in English].
18. Kousoulas, D. (1965). The Success of the Truman Doctrine was not Accidental. *Military Affairs*, 29 (2), 88-92. [in English].
19. La Feber, W. (2008). *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945-2006*. N.Y.: Mc Craw-Hill. [in English].
20. Mccauley, M. (2008). *Origins of the Cold War 1941-1949*. Routledge. [in English].
21. McCullough, D. (2015). *Truman*. New York: Simon & Schuster. [in English].
22. McGlinche, S. (2009). The Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, and the Division of Europe. *E-International Relations* <<https://www.e-ir.info/2009/10/13/the-marshall-plan-the-truman-doctrine-and-the-division-of-europe/>> (2021, November, 27). [in English].
23. Merrill, D. (2006). The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity. *Political Science*, 36, 1, 27-37. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2006.00284.x. [in English].
24. Mosesov, A. (2017). «Doktrina Trumena»: 70 let i 1 podhod [Truman Doctrine: 70 years and 1 approach]. *Voennoe obozrenie* [Military Review] <<https://topwar.ru/110876-doktrina-trumena-70-let-i-1-podhod.html> > (2021, November, 27). [in Russian].
25. Offner, A. (2002). *Another Such Victory: President Truman and the Cold War, 1945-1953*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. [in English].
26. Pohorska, I. (2009). *SShA: misiia zdiisnyma? Prakseolohiia tvorennia hlobalnoho svitu* [USA: mission feasible? The praxeology of creation of global world]. Kyiv: Hramota. [In Ukrainian].
27. Pohorska, I. (2012). *SShA u hlobalnomu sviti XXI stolittia: realii i perspektyvy* [The United States in the global world of the XXI century: realities and prospects]. *Aktualni problemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn* [Actual Problems of International Relations], 107 (1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/apmv.2012.107.1>. [in Ukrainian].
28. Ryzhkov, M. (2007). Doktrynalnyi vymir stratehii zovnishnoi polityky SShA: vid strymuvannia do hlobalnoi demokratyzatsii [The doctrinal dimension of US foreign policy strategy: from containment to global democratization]: *avtoreferat dysertatsii na zbuttia naukovogo stupenia doktora politychnikh nauk* [abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Political Science]. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy. Instytut svitovoi ekonomiky i mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn [Institute of World Economy and International Relations]. [in Ukrainian].
29. Ryzhkov, M. (2006). *"Grand Strategies": aktualizatsiia amerykanskooho dosvidu stratehichnooho planuvannia* ["Grand Strategies": actualization of the American experience of strategic planning]. Kyiv: Alkor. [Alcor Publishing House]. [in Ukrainian].
30. Roberts, G. (2011). Moscow's Cold War on the Periphery: Soviet Policy in Greece, Iran, and Turkey, 1943-1948. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46 (1), 58-81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009410383292>. (2021, November, 27). [in English].
31. Rossides, E. (1998). *The Truman Doctrine of Aid to Greece: A Fifty-Year Retrospective*. American Hellenic Institute Foundation. [in English].
32. Spalding, E. (2017). The Enduring Significance of the Truman Doctrine, *Orbis*, 61, 4, 561-574. [in English].
33. Spalding, E. (2006). *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism*. The University Press of Kentucky. [in English].
34. Truman, H. (1947). The Truman Doctrine (delivered 12 March 1947 before a Joint Session of Congress). *Americanrhetoric* <<https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/harrystrumantrumanddoctrine.html>> (2021, November, 27). [in English].
35. Young, J. (2013). *International Relations since 1945*. Oxford University Press. [in English].
36. Zorin, V. (2019). Doktrinu Trumena nikto ne otmenyal [Nobody has canceled the Truman Doctrine]. *Istoriik* [Historian] <<https://историк.рф/journal/доктрину-трумэна-никто-не-отменял/>> (2021, November, 27). [in Russian].