TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS IN THE POST SOVIET ERA: FROM CONFLICT TO COOPERATION?

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ANIL GÜRTUNA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JANUARY 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha B. ALTUNIŞIK
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Oktay TANRISEVER
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin BAĞCI	(METU, IR)	_____
Assist.Prof. Dr. Oktay F. TANRISEVER	(METU, IR)	_____
Assoc.Prof. Dr. Recep BOZTEMUR	(METU, HIST)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS
IN THE POST SOVIET ERA:
FROM CONFLICT TO COOPERATION?

Gürtuna, Anıl
M.Sc., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Assist.Prof. Dr. Oktay Fırat Tanrısever

January 2006, 112 pages

This thesis aims to study the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet era. The thesis examines the political, military and economic aspects of the relations between these two countries in Eurasia. The thesis argues that economic factors have played a determining role in development of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet era. Contrary to the mainstream literature which suggests that the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation are destined to be conflictual due to the geopolitical factors as well as the traditional distrust between them, the thesis shows that cooperation and trust between these countries could develop further if both parties continue to take economic relations as the basis for improving their relations.

There are six chapters in this thesis. The introductory first chapter is followed by the second chapter on the historical background of the relations between Turkey and the Russia. The third chapter examines the political relations while the fourth chapter discusses the security aspects of relations between these two countries. The fifth chapter explores the economic basis of Turkish-Russian relations in the post soviet era. The sixth chapter is the conclusion.

Keywords: Turkey, the Russian Federation, interdependence theory, conflict, cooperation.

ÖZ

SOVYET SONRASI DÖNEMDE
TÜRK-RUS İLİŞKİLERİ:
"ÇATIŞMADAN İŞBİRLİĞİNE?"

Gürtuna, Anıl
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Danışmanı: Y.Doç. Dr. Oktay Fırat Tanrısever

Ocak 2006, 112 sayfa

Bu tez, Sovyet sonrası dönemde Türkiye ve Rusya Federasyonu arasındaki ilişkileri araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Tez Avrasya'daki bu iki ülkenin ilişkilerini politik, askeri ve ekonomik açılardan incelemektedir. Tez Sovyet sonrası dönemde Türkiye ve Rusya Federasyonu arasında gelişen ilişkilerde ekonomik faktörlerin belirleyici bir rol oynadığını savunmaktadır. Tez, geleneksel güvensizlik nedeniyle, Türkiye ve Rusya Federasyonu arasındaki ilişkilerin uyuşmazlığa mahkum olduğunu savunan temel literatürün aksine, iki tarafın da ekonomik ilişkileri temel alması durumunda bu iki ülke arasında işbirliği ve güvenin daha da gelişebileceğini göstermektedir.

Tez altı bölümden oluşmaktadır. Giriş olan birinci bölüm, Türkiye ve Rusya arasındaki ilişkilerin tarihsel geçmişinin anlatıldığı ikinci bölüm takip etmektedir. Üçüncü Bölüm politik ilişkileri incelerken, dördüncü bölümde iki ülke arasındaki askeri ilişkiler tartışılmaktadır. Beşinci bölüm ekonomik ilişkileri incelemektedir. Altıncı bölüm ise sonuç kısmıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türkiye, Rusya Federasyonu, Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Teorisi, Çatışma, İşbirliği.

To my parents.

For their trust and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist.Prof.Dr. Oktay F. Tanrısever for his professional guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research.

I would also like to thank to the other examining committee members; Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı and Assoc.Prof.Dr. Recep Boztemur. Their valuable comments, suggestions and contributions to the thesis are highly appreciated.

Thanks go to Ms. Okşan Gürtuna and Mr. Emre Kaya for their unique contributions to the thesis and for their encouragement and patience.

Support and encouragement of Colonel Bahadır Köse, Chief of Military Exercises Branch at the Turkish General Staff are also gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ÖZ iv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

    1.1 Scope and Objective 1

    1.2 Literature Review 2

    1.3 Argument 7

    1.4 Research Method 12

    1.5 Organization of the Thesis 13

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 15

    2.1 Turkish - Russian Relations during the Imperial Period 16

    2.2 Turkish-Soviet Relations between 1919 and 1945 23

    2.3 Turkish-Soviet Relations between 1946 and 1991 29

3. DIPLOMATIC ASPECTS OF TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS 34

    3.1 Development of Post Soviet Diplomatic Relations between Turkey and Russia 34

    3.2 Turkish – Russian Cooperation in the Black Sea Region 41

    3.3 Turkish Straits in Turkish – Russian Relations 45

    3.4 Turkish – Russian Relations in the Caucasus and Central Asia 51

4. SECURITY DIMENSIONS OF TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS 59

4.1 Military and Technical Cooperation in Turkish–Russian Relations. 60

4.2 The Question of Cyprus in Turkish – Russian Relations 62

4.3 Fight against Terrorism and Relations between Turkey and Russia 66

4.4. Fight against International Terrorism since September 11 73

5. DYNAMICS OF TURKISH – RUSSIAN ECONOMIC RELATIONS ... 76

5.1 Trade Relations 76

5.2 Construction Sector 82

5.3 Tourism Sector 84

5.4 Energy Issues 85

6. CONCLUSION 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY 101

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the twenty first century neither Turkey nor the Russian Federation are the empires of the past and they are no longer enemies, but still there is the reality that it is not enough for Turkey and the Russian Federation just to coexist and deal with each other as two countries sharing the same geography.[1] The idea of globalism combined with the increasing importance of other actors as crucial players in international politics and the end of the Cold War provided Turkey and the Russian Federation an opportunity to identify new fields of cooperation. In that respect this thesis, titled "Turkish-Russian Relations in the Post Soviet Era: Conflict to Cooperation?" seeks to analyze the development of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation since the disintegration of the Soviet Union as two international players need to redefine their roles and objectives.

1.1. Scope and Objective

The thesis focuses on the historical background of Turkish-Russian relations, the vital factors to determine the relations between them in the post Cold War era, political, economic and security related issues between Turkey and the Russian Federation and the interaction among these three aspects of relations.

---

[1] Lebedev, Alexander; "Russia and Turkey in the 21st Century: What is Behind Us and What is Ahead?", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.5.

The Russian Federation and Turkey were not late to identify new areas of cooperation as two vital players in Eurasia and to fill the power vacuum emerged in the region following the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The fact that they have been two countries with historical and cultural rights in the region and because they still have political influence on post Soviet territories, and the complementary character of the two economies of them provided an opportunity for Turkey and the Russian Federation to act together. In that respect bilateral relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation were replaced by multidimensional partnership in time, the establishment of which is important not only for the Turkish-Russian relations but also for the stability and the welfare of Eurasia.

1.2. Literature Review

Contrary to the mainstream literature concerning the Turkish-Russian relations the thesis argues that cooperation and thus establishment of mutual trust between Turkey and the Russian Federation is possible and should be provided. The mainstream arguments, however, propose that Turkish-Russian relations are traditionally conflictual and there has been mutual lack of trust in relations. Fahir Armaoğlu, Suat Bilge and Oral Sander are proponents of the mainstream argument focusing on conflictual character of Turkish-Russian relations. They explore the Turkish-Russian relations in the framework of security and military concerns.

Fahir Armaoğlu, in his book *Siyasi Tarih 1789-1960* identifies the Soviet Union as one of the most important threats for Turkey since the end of the World War II.[2] Armaoğlu argues that the Russian desires in Eastern Anatolia and the Turkish Straits illustrate the fact that the Soviet existence was both a threat and danger for Turkey.[3] He assumes that Turkish-Russian relations between the Treaty of Lausanne and the beginning of the World War II were dominated by three factors: Economic relations,

[2] Armaoğlu, Fahir; *"Siyasi Tarih 1789-1960"*, Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1964, p.756.
[3] *Ibid.*.

issue of communism and the improvement of relations with the West.[4] Nonetheless, how he defines and perceives the economic relations is different than the situation today. Armaoğlu is much critical of Russian interest to establish economic relations with Turkey and the Russian attempt is considered as the extension of the Russian desire to keep Turkey under control by making communist propaganda on the Turkish territory. Concerning the imposition of communism, Armaoğlu argues that communist propaganda and inter state relations were considered as indivisible parts of the relations by the Soviet Union.[5] Accordingly, it will not be wrong to state that like other mainstream arguments, Armaoğlu too, perceives the relations in terms of the national interests of Turkey which are usually security related in character.

As stated above, Suat Bilge is another mainstream scholar who analyzes the Turkish-Russian relations from security perspective. In his book titled *Güç Komşuluk Türkiye Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri 1920-1964*, he examines the relations between 1920 and 1964. Like the other mainstream arguments the study is highly occupied with the Cold War realities. At the end of the book, Bilge declares that the establishment of good relations would be in national interests of Turkey.[6] Accordingly he declares that reducing weapons under the Gorbachev regime provided Turkey a deep breath and when the sale of these weapons out would be prohibited this would further decrease Turkey's worries.

Oral Sander too focused on dynamics of Turkish-Russian relations from a security perspective. Sander argues that since the first years of détente between the Western bloc and the Soviet Union, two principles; "deterrence" and "confidence building" governed the Turkish-Russian relations.[7] Rather than taking Turkish-Russian relations independently, Sander analyzes the relations in the framework or Turkey's relations with the EU and NATO. He argues that taking into account the future role of

[4] *Ibid.*, p.653.
[5] *Ibid.*, p.654.
[6] Bilge, Suat; *"Güç Komşuluk Türkiye Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri 1920-1964"*, Ankara: Ofset Repromat, 1991, p.355.
[7] Sander, Oral; *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası* (ed. by Fırat, Melek), Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998, p.245.

Turkey, the disintegration of the Soviet Union would provide a great opportunity for Turkey.[8] For Sander, this opportunity would be the change in American and European perceptions regarding Turkey's role in Eurasia.[9] Accordingly, Turkish-Russian relations per se were not considered.

It is not wrong to state that the mainstream arguments focusing on Turkish-Russian relations, even those belonging to the last years of the Soviet Union or to the time period just after the disintegration of the Soviet Union are stocked into the Cold War realities. Security and military aspects of relations are taken much seriously in these studies. "Conflict" rather than "cooperation" and "threat" rather than "trust" are taken as the keywords to mention the course of relations and even the improvement in economic relations are considered as the extension of the Russian desire to establish hegemony over Turkey. The Russian trust to Turkey was considered as the guarantee of Turkish existence in the Russian periphery, a fact that would provide an opportunity for Turkey in relations with the West.

Accordingly, as opposed to the mainstream arguments on Turkish-Russian relations, the thesis argues that the relations were no more restricted to the Cold War realities shaped by threat perceptions. Post Soviet literature explores the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation from a wider perspective that is not limited to the military and political aspects of relations. On the contrary, improvement of economic relations was thought to play a pioneer role to further develop relations.

Dmitri Trenin and Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer are two scholars who argue that relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation are improving steadily. Dmitri Trenin argues that "mutual limitations" of Turkey and the Russian Federation turned these countries into more equal partners in the post Soviet Era.[10] Trenin further argues that it was understood by Turkey and Russian Federation that causes of unrest and

[8] *Ibid.*, p.246.
[9] *Ibid.*.
[10] Trenin, Dmitri; "Really Burrying the Hatchet: Russia and Turkey Find Themselves on the Same Side", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.26.

conflicts between them in the post Soviet Era may be caused by domestic stabilites on territories between them; but cannot be the result of the "imperialistic designs" of Turkey or the Russian Federation.[11] Thus, we see that Dmitri Trenin replaces the traditional lack of confidence and conflict by cooperation and friendship in relations and the existence of conflicts were not taken seriously. Trenin identifies series of fields and issues some of which are a must and some of which would benefit both Turkey and the Russian Federation. It is not a coincidence, however, given the fact that improvement of relations in other fields is a priority for both parties.

Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer uses the phrase "virtual rapprochement" to explain the evolution of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the 1990s where state level conflicts almost disappear in relations and the rivalry is replaced by cooperation in many fields to further .idevelop cooperation.[12] Nonetheless, Sezer argues that in 1990s the relations were still far behind "genuine raprochment" and prefers to say that the relations was "above routine" rapprochement.[13] For Sezer, "managed geopolitical rivalry" and "unique economic cooperation" have been two driving forces behind what she calls virtual raprochement. As considering Turkey and the Russian Federation as geopolitical competitors, especially concerning their role in the Russian periphery, Sezer uses the phrase "managed geopolitical rivalry" where it refers to the Russian and the Turkish desire to challenge the long term existence of one another in the region.[14] Concerning the economic relations she argues that cooperation ruled the relations in the field of economics between the two.

Since neither Turkey nor the Russian Federation were successful to become an equal and welcomed members of the Western camp in the post Cold War era the relations between them gained more importance. Turkey, which has been considered to loose its strategic importance at the absence of the Soviet threat and the Russian Federation

[11] *Ibid.*, p.27.
[12] Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu; "Turkish-Russian Relations: The Challenges of Reconciling Geopolitical Competition with Economic Partnership", *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2000, Volume 1, Number 1, p.62.
[13] *Ibid.*, p.63.
[14] *Ibid.*.

failed to adapt itself to the Western world were forced to find out new areas of cooperation to come over the feeling of being "isolated". Even at times, the improvement of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation was considered as an "on purpose" creation of alternative to relations with European Union (EU) and the US (The United States).

Accordingly, contrary to the mainstream arguments, the thesis argues that disintegration of the Soviet Union was a cornerstone for Turkey and the Russian Federation providing an opportunity to replace "bilateral relations" with "multidimensional partnership". Despite the fact that especially in the first years of the disintegration, there were series of new conflicts between the two putting the possibility of cooperation into difficulty, economic interdependency between them such as trade, tourism and energy increased the importance of cooperation in the region.[15] Turkey has been an important partner for the Russian Federation first of all as the biggest consumer of the Russian gas and secondly as the consumer of the Russian arms.[16] Additionally, Turkey became the main trade partner of the Russian Federation in Middle East with the exception of 1998 when an economic crisis hit the Russian Federation. Thus, official visits accompanied by the views of Turkish-Russian Business Communities and the public opinion in both proved that interests of both tend to coincide rather than to clash with each other.[17]

Having briefly discussed the literature on Turkish-Russian relations the next part of the Chapter One will be focusing on the argument of the thesis.

---

[15] Trenin, Dmitri; "Really Burrying the Hatchet: Russia and Turkey Find Themselves on the Same Side", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.13.
[16] Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, 5, p.196.
[17] Trenin, Dmitri; "Really Burrying the Hatchet: Russia and Turkey Find Themselves on the Same Side", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.25.

1.3. Argument

This thesis studies the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet era. It examines the political, military and the economic aspects of relations between these two countries in Eurasia. The thesis argues that economic factors play a determining role in developing relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet era. Contrary to the mainstream literature which suggest that the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation are destined to be conflictual due to the traditional distrust between them, the thesis illustrates that cooperation and trust between these countries could develop further if both parties continue to take economic relations as the basis for improving their relations.

As argued by Dmitri Trenin "where geopolitics tended to divide Turkey and the Russian Federation, geo-economics pushed them to cooperate".[18] The complementary character of their economies forced them to cooperate first in the field of economics and this played an important role for the development of relations in other fields. Year after year the economic relations ranging from trade, tourism, construction, investments to energy played an important role to change mutual perceptions of Turkey and the Russian Federation in political sphere combined with the realities of the post Cold War environment. Similarly, as argued by Hüseyin Bağcı and İdris Bal the Russian Federation was an opportunity for Turkey as a "new area of cooperation" and in case Turkey could develop economic relations with the Russian Federation the possibility of confrontation in other fields were to be diminished.[19]

Accordingly, the thesis aims to analyze the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation based on the "transnationalism theory" and "complex interdependence theory". Not only classical realism, but also other traditional approaches to the international relations tend to see the state as the basic and the unique actor in

[18] *Ibid.*.
[19] Bağcı, Hüseyin and Bal, İdris; "Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era: New Problems and Opportunities" in *Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era* (ed. by Bal, İdris), Florida: Brown Walker Press, 2004, p.102.

international relations. Politics is seen as the interaction of sovereign states seeking to increase their power. In that respect wars are considered as the main tool to protect state sovereignty and actors other than states are regarded as the main challengers of absolute power and sovereignty of states. It is assumed that state is the basic unit of action and "diplomats" and "soldiers" are the only actors in international politics.[20]

As opposed to the traditional state-centric international relations theories, transnationalism and complex interdependency theory provides a pluralist approach to politics and international system.[21] They accept the importance of states as crucial actors in politics; but argued that they are not the only ones. Transnationalism and complex interdependence theory takes the transnational relations and institutions into account too.[22] Contrary to the traditional state-centric view, transnationalism argues that the framework of inter-state relations is not limited to geography, technology and domestic politics and is affected by some other aspects of relations that are not under state control such as trade, personal contact and communications.[23] Thus they do not just deal with military and security related issues.

Thus, Michael P. Sullivan suggests that there are four characteristics of transnationalism.[24] The first is the change in role of states in international politics when other actors such as international organizations, companies, and terrorist groups considered being effective ones. As argued by Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane, transnational inter-actions cause a change in behaviors, create international pluralism, increase interdependency and the ability of governments to influence and direct

---

[20] Nye, Joseph S. and Keohane, Robert O.; "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction" in *Transnational Relations and World Politics, Cambridge*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, p. ix.

[21] Arı, Tayyar; *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Çatışma, Hegemonya, İşbirliği*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti., 2002, p.357.

[22] *Ibid.*, p.357.

[23] Nye, Joseph S. and Keohane, Robert O.; "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction" in *Transnational Relations and World Politics, Cambridge*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, p.x.

[24] Sullivan, Michael P.; "Transnationalism, Power politics, and the Realities of the Present System" in International Relations in the Twentieth Century, A Reader (ed. by Williams, Marc), London: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1989, p.256-268.

others, and lastly cause the emergence of autonomous bodies with private foreign policy agenda other than those implemented by states.[25] Secondly, Sullivan argues that transnationalism does not limit its analysis to interstate relations and indeed focuses on issues such as increase in population, environmental pollution, exploit of natural resources and use of open seas. Thirdly, transnationalism states that trade relations, investments, and technology transfer, students and migrations cause an increasing interdependency between states; and lastly he argues that wars are no longer the basic policy option for states and as they became more powerful the tendency to use power decreases.

Michael Sullivan put an important assumption of transnationalism forward. He assumes that since characteristics of wars changed dramatically and devastation power of weapons increased, the world will be dominated by economic power and the wars will almost be diminished from international relations.[26] Looking from an economic perspective, though it is not possible to completely sweep wars from international system by economic relations and interdependence, it is at least known that to fight a war has been one of the most dangerous policy options.[27] Transnational relations centered around trade, finance, business, tourism the interdependency between states grows and it is this interdependency reducing the inter-state conflicts.[28] At this point it is important how to define interdependency and how it is perceived. According to Keohane and Nye, the interdependence should take into account the cost effect, meaning that it should have a negative effect on one the

[25] Nye, Joseph S. and Keohane, Robert O.; "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction" in *Transnational Relations and World Politics, Cambridge*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972, p.xvii.
[26] Sullivan, Michael P.; "Transnationalism, Power politics, and the Realities of the Present System" in *International Relations in the Twentieth Century, A Reader* (ed. by Williams, Marc), London: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1989, p.256.
[27] Arı, Tayyar; *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Çatışma, Hegemonya, İşbirliği*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti., 2002, p.366.
[28] Knutsen, Torbjörn; *A History of International Relations Theory, An Introduction*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992, p.235-236.

parties.[29] If interaction benefits both sides it is not possible to talk about interdependency. Interdependency should include cost and limitation to the autonomy of actors. In case there is an asymmetry of interdependency, the weaker actor will be open to political influence.

Exploring the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, one can easily find out footprints of transnationalist assumptions and the basic premises of interdependency theory. Until the end of the Cold War, the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, even back to the imperial rule, were determined by political concerns. During the imperial period, though had some economic aims the Russian obsession to reach warm seas and to guarantee its position as a world hegemon became the cause of conflict and wars between the Ottoman and the Russian Empire. In that period, politics and diplomacy were the driving forces in Ottoman- Russian relations.

The Cold War period was not an exception. As being actors of two different camps, Turkey and the Russian Federation did not have the chance to further develop their relations. Though there were some exceptions, Cold War relations were limited given the fact that there has been political rivalry between the Eastern and the Western camps. The end of the Cold War, thus, marked the beginning of a new era in international relations best characterized by replacement of division based on two camps by the idea of globalism. It was not just globalism, however, that shaped the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The diffusion of power from center to the periphery, proliferation of regional conflicts, Western determinance to spread democracy and human rights, the increasing international demand for fossil fuels were also important to shape the relations.[30]

---

[29] Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye; "Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition", Boston: Brown Company, 1977, p. 8-9.

[30] Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu; "Turkish-Russian Relations: The Challenges of Reconciling Geopolitical Competition with Economic Partnership", *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2000, Volume 1, Number 1, p.59.

The development of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation best fits the interdependency theory and transnationalism. Turkey and the Russian Federation faced many cases where political interests of both parties were challenged by the acts of the other as it has been the case concerning the competition between them in Central Asia and in Caucasus; and their use of PKK terror and Chechen insurgency on against one another. Nonetheless, in time negative effects of such issues were eliminated between the two. Given the effects of globalization, it was understood that Turkey and the Russian Federation would gain much from cooperation in economic, social and cultural fields in a new world where borders are no more barriers for interaction and to maximize their gains from this interaction.

The sale and transfer of Russian energy resources combined with other aspects of economic relations such as improvement of trade, construction activities of the Turkish firms in the Russian Federation, Turkish tourism sector triggered by Russian tourists visiting Turkey found their place at the core of relations. The economic and social relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation not only changed attitudes of the two countries against one another but also created interdependency between them. Despite the fact that relations benefit both Turkey and the Russian Federation it is not wrong to mention that Turkey and the Russian Federation do not benefit equally from relations and they are not equally dependent on each other. Thus the situation concerning Turkish-Russian relations can be characterized as "interdependency" defined by Keohane and Nye. The energy policies of Turkey has been criticized for being highly dependent on the Russian Federation and it is argued that besides its domestic effects it is against the energy security understanding of NATO. As it will be mentioned in the related chapter, it is argued that the Russian Federation too is dependent on Turkey for the transfer of its energy resources to the Western markets and additionally it is of vital importance for the Russian Federation to prevent Turkey's choice for the Central Asian resources which would cut the way of Russian resources to the West.

The new actors other than states became important in Turkish-Russian relations in the post Soviet Era. Unlike the traditional role of states to create and solve problems, in the post Soviet Era energy companies in issues concerning the sale and marketing of resources, helicopter and military equipment companies in military issues, business councils and businessmen working on the Turkish and the Russian territory on trade relations, non governmental cultural and ethnic solidarity groups and associations in issues regarding different ethnic groups became important determinants of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

In conclusion, the thesis argues that the establishment of good relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation is a must in the post Cold War era. The 1990s provided a series of opportunities to further develop Turkish-Russian relations that political problems, though never forgotten, melted in the bowl of economic relations. Turkey and the Russian Federation as countries, which are difficult to identify as European or Asian emerged as two regional powers in Eurasia. Though the establishment of good relations is not an alternative to relations with Europe, it redefined the strategic importance of Turkey in the post Soviet era. From being a buffer zone between the Eastern and the Western camps in the past, Turkey turned into a country of transition for energy resources of the Russian Federation, Central Asia and Caucasus to Western markets. The Russian Federation, one of the superpowers of the past became one of the influential powers of Eurasia.

1.4. Research Method

The relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation cover series of fields ranging from political, economic, military relations to linguistic, cultural, ethnic and religious issues. The list can be extended since the bilateral relations between the two countries goes back to more than five hundred years and is a broad area to examine as a whole. Accordingly, in line with the objectives of this thesis, some of the most important cases of cooperation and competition in the field of economics, politics and security in the last fifteen years will be focused on.

As part of the research and data collection, library resources including books, academic journals, newspaper archives, memoirs of Russian and Turkish bureaucrats and politicians, statistics, reports prepared by trade organizations and business councils were reviewed. Additionally, internet resources composed of online journals and books, websites of Turkish newspapers and those of business councils, state departments and ministries, embassies, research centers were utilized to a great extent.

1.5. Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized in six chapters. The first chapter is the introduction, which explains the scope and objective, the argument and the research method of the thesis. The second chapter provides a historical background concerning the Turkish-Russian relations. It explores the relations beginning from the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries where characteristics of relations swing between conflicts to cooperation. Then, the relations during the World War I where the Ottoman and the Russian Empire fight against each other until the Russians had to declare ceasefire because of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 were focused on. Moreover the close relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union throughout the Turkish War of Independence and the relations in World War II are investigated. The chapter ends up with the analysis of relations throughout the Cold War years where Turkey and the Soviet Union were the members of two different camps; the Soviet Union, the leading power in the Eastern camp and Turkey, a buffer zone between Eastern and Western blocs.

The political relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation were examined in the third chapter, which is organized under four subtitles. First of all, the development of political relations are summarized and analyzed where official visits and the agreements signed as the basis of relations are examined. Secondly, Turkish-Russian relations in Central Asia and Caucasus are discussed. Moreover, the Turkish Straits as a historical and strategic aspect of relations is examined. The importance of Turkish Straits and the Russian insistence to use Turkish Straits for transition of the Caspian

resources to the West; and the Turkish measures to come over this problem are touched upon. The new Maritime Law passed by Turkey in 1994 and the Russian opposition to the law based on the clauses of the Montreaux Convention are discussed. Lastly, the third chapter analyzes the Black Sea region as a new opportunity for cooperation for the neighboring countries. Accordingly the Black Sea Economic Cooperation is focused on.

The fourth chapter focuses on security dimension of relations. The Russian Federation is one of the biggest suppliers of arms and weapons on the world; and Turkey has been consumer of the Russian technical and military equipment. Thus, the chapter focuses on military and technical agreements signed between Turkey and the Russian Federation. More importantly it analyzes the effect of September 11, which moved Turkey and the Russian Federation closer in fight against international terrorism. Accordingly, the Chechen insurgency on the Russian territory and the PKK terror on the Turkish territory, and the use of these separatist acts to pacify one another in Caucasus and Central Asia are explained. In addition, the sale of Russian SAM-300 missiles to Cyprus and the Russian attitude concerning the division on Cyprus were also investigated.

The fifth chapter focuses on the economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The shuttle trade, registered trade, tourism, construction, Turkish investments in the Russian Federation, and production, marketing and sale of energy are analyzed as locomotives of economic relations. The chapter first analyzes the shuttle trade as the basis of economic ties and then trade relations where there is an increasing dependency.

The sixth chapter is conclusion. Taking into account the importance of developments in each aspect of relations, it is argued that the improvement of economic relations plays a pioneer role to develop relations in other fields, politics being at the first place.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It has been more than five hundred years since the beginning of diplomatic relations between Turkey and Russia, and they have experienced both the conflict and cooperation especially during the demise of the Ottoman Empire. Nonetheless, cooperation has always been the impulsive factor in relations given the geographic location of the two countries and their unique cultural and historical standing in Eurasia as being the member of neither the West nor the East. The recent Russian tendency to improve relations with Turkey becomes obvious again in words of Alexander Lebedev who considers the years of wars between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire as insignificant, though these wars played an important role to prepare the end of the Ottoman Empire.[31] The Russian desire was to reach warm seas that the control of the Turkish Straits and hegemony in the Black Sea has been at the core of relations between Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire and the issue preserved its importance in relations up to now in different forms as it has been the case in transition of energy resources via Turkish Straits and the establishment of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation.

[31] Lebedev, Alexander; "Russia and Turkey in the 21st Century: What is Behind Us and What is Ahead?", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.5.

2.1. Turkish-Russian Relations during the Imperial Rule

Turkish-Russian relations, which were based on trade and wars in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, further developed in the eighteenth century. The Russian Empire extended its territories in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Nonetheless, the idea of establishing a big empire having a key role in European politics and the Russian desire for wealth and power were denied geographically since the Russian Empire did not have a free exit to the open seas.[32] Accordingly, it was not merely geographical proximity and economic interests that increased the Russian interest in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire preserved its powerful existence in Balkans, Anatolia and the Middle East till the end of the seventeenth century and existed as a vital threat for the European powers at that time.[33]

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the foreign policy of the Russian Empire concerning the Ottoman Empire favored the collapse or at least weakening of the Ottoman Empire to create an environment in which Russians could control the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmara and Dardanelles since the aim was to reach warm seas beginning from the second half of the eighteenth century until the World War I.[34] Moreover, the Ottomans gave the Russians the right to establish permanent embassies on their territory.

Peter the Great, Tsarina Anna Ivanovna, Elizabeth Petrovna and Catherine the Great emerged as important figures in Turkish-Russian relations. During the reign of Peter the Great, the Russian Empire issued a series of reforms. The Ottoman Empire, however, could not understand the importance of these reforms. In these years the Turkish ambassadors to the Russian Empire were underestimating the Russian

[32] Rozakis, Christos L.&Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.16.
[33] In 1699 the Ottoman Empire signed the Treaty of Karlowitz and for the first time lost a territory in Europe. From then the Ottomans tried to regain territories lost in wars.
[34] Rozakis, Christos L.&Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.19.

reforms since the Russian Empire was not perceived as a real threat.[35] As opposed to the perceptions of the Ottoman diplomats, the reforms initiated by Peter the Great "as a necessity of war against the Turks" transferred European techniques to the Russian Empire.[36] Peter the Great aimed to expand the Russian territory at the expense of the Ottoman Empire with the aim of being a dominant European power and to come over the geographical handicaps the Russian Empire faced. There is even a mystery that Peter the Great bequeathed the future Tsars to expand the Russian Empire at the expense of the Ottomans by occupying the Black Sea, the Turkish Straits and Istanbul, and the occupation of Poland to reach the Mediterranean Sea, Atlantic and the Indian Oceans.[37] It is not definite whether the story is true or not but whatever the case, Russian Tsars followed similar foreign policies until the beginning of the World War I.

An important characteristic of relations in the first half of the eighteenth century was the establishment of temporary alliances in wars against each other. The Russian aim was to reach warm seas whereas the Ottoman Empire aimed to protect its territorail integrity through these alliances. In that respect, the Treaty of Belgrade signed in 1739 was considered as the first Russian success to reach the Black Sea.[38]

During the reign of Catherine the Great, the Russian Empire continued to expand its territory at the expense of the Ottoman Empire and the Russian superiority to the Ottoman Empire was understood. In the second half of the eigteenth century, the Ottoman Empire was still the main enemy of the Russians though it was weaker in military terms. The Russians thought that the only way to destroy the Ottoman

---

[35] Ortaylı, İlber; "XVIII. Yüzyıl Türk- Rus İlişkileri" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, p.128.
[36] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.56.
[37] *Ibid.*.
[38] Ottoman Empire declared a war against Russia when they occupied Azov and entered the Crimean territory in 1736. At the end of the war, Austria gave back the territories occupied during the war. Treaty of Belgrade was signed between the Russians and the Ottomans in 1739. According to this treaty Russia got the Azov; but this did not give them the right to build ships in Azov and Taygov and no ships were allowed in the Caspian and the Black Sea. Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.23.

Empire was to reach the Black Sea and then to get control of the Turkish Straits, İstanbul and the Aegean islands.[39] Following the war between 1769 and 1774 the

Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire signed the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (Kuchuk Kaynardji) on 21 July 1774, a turning point in bilateral relations of the Ottomans and the Russians.[40] The Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca has been considered as one of the important successes of the Russian Empire to further weaken the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century. The treaty declared the independence of Crimea and it was considered as the first step for Russians reach the Black Sea coast.[41] Moreover, this treaty gave the Russian merchant ships the right of free passage through the Turkish Straits and the Russian Empire gained the most favored nation status in trade relations with Turkey.[42] Additionally Russians gained the right to protect Orthodox minority on the Ottoman territory and to establish a permanent embassy in Istanbul.[43]

When the Russian Empire annexed Crimea to its territories in 1787 the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire signed the Treaty of Yaş (Jassy) which repeats terms of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca and the Black Sea turned into an international sea.[44] Though the Treaty of Yaş made clear the Russian superiority to the Ottoman Empire none of the powers had the capacity to erase one another from the map or to establish a permanent peace in the region.[45] The difficulty of defending the Ottoman Empire through wars was understood that in the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire established alliances with European powers and got use of the conflicts between them. In the second half of the nineteenth century despite the imperialist and the

---

[39] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.25.
[40] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.20.
[41] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.30.
[42] *Ibid.*, p.31.
[43] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.59.
[44] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.21.
[45] Ortaylı, İlber; "XVIII. Yüzyıl Türk- Rus İlişkileri" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, p.132.

expansionist polices of the Russian Empire, the Ottoman Empire established alliances even with the Russian Empire for the belief that the Russian Empire, despite its expansionist policies, would not give an end to the Ottoman Empire.[46] The Russians too, focused on policies to establish alliances with the Ottoman Empire in order to provide free passage through the Turkish Straits while ensuring their closure to the other states at the end of the eigteenth century.[47] When France moved its military forces to Malta and Egypt it paved the way for the establishment of such an alliance in 1798.[48] The Russian Empire, interests of which was threatened by the French existence at the Mediterranean got the opportunity to move its navy into the Turkish Straits.[49] According to this alliance the Russian war ships were allowed to pass through the Straits in times of war.[50] However the alliance did not last long and was diminished just a year after and the Russians began to establish close ties with France.

In 1841, the London Convention signed by Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia and the Ottoman Empire on 13 July 1841. This provided the Russian Empire a considerable security against any attack in the Black Sea in which the Ottoman empire was not belligerent.[51] The Convention prohibited the passage of all warships through the Turkish Straits.[52] The issue of Turkish Straits, however, was not the only issue in relations. In 1839, Ottoman Sultan Abdülmecid (Abdulmejid) announced a new set of political reforms (Tanzimat Fermanı) and Christians gained equal status with the Muslims on the Ottoman territory. These new regulations provided non-Muslims an equal treatment by law. The Russians, however, were not happy with these reforms believing these were not applied to the Orthodox population in the

[46] Ignatyev, B.; "19. Yüzyıl Sonu ile 20. Yüzyıl Başında Rus-Türk İlişkileri" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, p.153.
[47] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.62.
[48] *Ibid.*, p.68-69.
[49] *Ibid.*, p.67.
[50] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.47.
[51] Anderson, M. S.; *The Eastern Question (1774-1923)*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1991, p.393.
[52] For details of the London Convention see Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across The Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p.184.

Ottoman Empire properly and began to interfere into the domestic policies of the Ottoman Empire. In 1856, under the pressure of European powers another set of political reforms, "Islahat Fermanı", was announced; but despite these reforms from 1856 to 1876 European powers continued to interfere in domestic affairs of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1856, the Treaty of Paris was signed between France, Great Britain, Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire after the Crimean War and for the first time in its history the Ottoman Empire was declared as a European power and so the territorial integrity of the Empire is guaranteed by the other European powers.[53] The Treaty also mentioned that the Straits regime was to be regulated by the London Convention and the Black Sea was demilitarized.[54]

When the Ottoman Empire announced the first Constitutional Government (I. Meşrutiyet) in 1876 the Russian diplomats in İstanbul worried again. According to the British reports this was an Ottoman attempt to challenge the Russians and the Ottomans will pay for this.[55] The Panislavist ideas in the Russian Empire gave way to the war of 1877- 1878 between Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire. At the end of the war, Ottomans and the Russians signed the Treaty of Berlin. Romania, Serbia and Montonegro gained their independence and the Ottomans gave some territories in the Eastern Anatolia to the Russians.

At the end of the 1870s, Nelidof, the Russian ambassador to the Ottoman Empire had prepared a report concerning the Turkish Straits and submitted it to the Tsar Alexander. The Ambassador also stated that the Russian Empire could take other parts of the Ottoman Empire under control; but then it should divide the Ottoman Empire on the basis of ethnicity. He also added that İstanbul should be an independent city under the Russian protection. Like the Ambassador, the Russian

[53] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, pp.112- 113.
[54] *Ibid.*.
[55] Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin; *Henry Layar'ın İstanbul Elçiliği*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1968, p.167.

Tsar too believed that the priority should be the invasion of İstanbul and so the events in Balkans were of secondary importance.[56]

Despite these developments, the Russian Empire gave importance to the protection of the territorial integrity of its relatively weak and thus beneficial neighbor. The words of the Tsar Nicholas to the British ambassador is worth to mention to better understand the Russian view of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century:

> 'Turkey is in a critical state… the country itself seems to be falling to pieces… we have on our hands a sick man- a very sick man: it will be, I tell you frankly, a great misfortune if, one of these days, he should slip away from us before all necessary arrangements were made'.[57]

Between the years 1878 and 1919 both the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire were weakened and they almost came to the end of their political existence. The status of the Turkish Straits preserved its importance for both sides; but whereas Istanbul tried to preserve the status quo, in order to pursue its historical mission of reaching the warm seas the Russian Emipire wanted to change the status of the Turkish Straits either by force or by use of diplomacy.[58] Nonetheless the Russian Empire could not pursue an aggressive policy since such an attempt would have to face counter policies of the Great Britain.[59]

The Ottoman Empire was very weak at the beginning of the twentieth century that none of the great powers wanted to enter a possible war with the Ottomans. Besides, the fact that some other powers were keeping their desires on the Ottoman territory prevented them from being in the same alliance with the Ottoman Empire as it was

---

[56] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.148. Bayur, Y.H.; *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*, İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1940, Volume I, p.49.

[57] Marriott, J.A.R.; *The Eastern Question: An Historical Study in European Diplomacy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969, p.257. Djuvara, T. G.; *Türkiye'nin Paylaşılması Hakkında Yüz Proje (1281-1913)*, Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1999, p. 395-401.

[58] Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin; *Henry Layar'ın İstanbul Elçiliği*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1968, p.139.

[59] Ignatyev, B.; "19. Yüzyıl Sonu ile 20. Yüzyıl Başında Rus-Türk İlişkileri" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, p.155.

the case for the Russian Empire. Turkey entered the World War I with Germany as a result of the secret negotiations between Enver Paşa (Enver Pasha) and the Germans. However, even before the war it was decided that in case of a war in Europe Turkey would declare war against the Russian Empire together with Germany.[60]

Before the beginning of the World War I, one of the important priorities of the Ottoman Empire was to protect Istanbul against a possible Russian attack.[61] Similarly, the Russian priority was to solve the problem of Turkish Straits.[62] The Russian Ambassador stated in a letter to the Russian Empire in 1914 that the Russian aim was to solve the problems at the Turkish Straits and to create a naval basis at the Bosphorus no matter the Ottomans enter the war or not.[63] For the Ambassador occupation of Turkish Straits was a must in order to reach the Mediterranean given the other losses at war.[64]

The Ottoman Empire entered the World War I which prepared the end of it under these conditions when the Ottoman navy attacked the Russian ports at the Black Sea on 29 October 1914.[65] The Great Britain, France and the Russian Empire fought against the Ottoman Empire, Germany, Austria- Hungary Empire and Bulgaria throughout the war. At the end of the war, Austria- Hungary, Russians and Germans were destroyed almost completely.[66]

The Russian desire was to control the Turkish Straits and the Great Britain and France accepted this idea in principle. Nonetheless, due to the Bolshevik Revolution in the country, the Russian Empire had to leave the war and the Treaty of Brest Litovsk was signed between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire in 1918.

---

[60] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.246.
[61] *Ibid.*, p.141.
[62] Ignatyev, B.; "19. Yüzyıl Sonu ile 20. Yüzyıl Başında Rus-Türk İlişkileri" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, p.142.
[63] Bodger, A., "Rusya ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu" in *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu ve Büyük Güçler* (ed. by M.M.Kent), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999, p.97.
[64] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.304.
[65] Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin; *Henry Layar'ın İstanbul Elçiliği*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1968, p.143.
[66] Kissinger, Henry; *Diplomasi*, İstanbul: Mas Matbaacılık A.Ş., 2002 (3rd ed.), p.211.

The most important outcome of the World War I for Turkey, according to Hans von Seect, a German general worked in the Ottoman Empire for some time, was Russians declaration of ceasfire.[67] If this did not happen and the Ottomans were to reach an agreement with the Russians together with the Great Britain and the French, this would have been against the interests of the Ottoman Empire. The end of the World War I, indeed gave an end to the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans and the Germans being defeated in the war signed the Armistice of Mudros.

2.2. Turkish-Soviet Relations between 1919 and 1945

In 1919, when the victorious powers of the World War I wanted to impose the Treaty of Sevres to partition the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish War of Independence began under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on 19 May 1919. At the end of the war, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk established the Republic of Turkey on 29 October 1923 and the Soviet Union became one of the first counties to recognize Turkey.

The Soviet Union considered the Turkish War of Independence as an act against Western imperialism and as the awakening of the Muslim people.[68] Accordingly, the cooperation and establishment of good relations was important both for Turkey and the Soviet Union.[69] The Russian aim was to impose a communist regime in Turkey and to prevent the latter to reach an agreement with the Western powers. This policy constituted the core of the Russian policy towards Turkey between 1919-1923. For Russians, Turkey's success in war against imperialism would have also secured the southern parts of the Soviet Russia, and this was to be done by establishing Bolshevik regimes in the Caucasus and establishing a Straits regime under the sovereignty of Turkey. The aim of the Soviet Russia in these years was to solve the Eastern Question

[67] Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, p.258.
[68] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.182.
[69] Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.161.

to the benefit of Turkey for the belief that international stability cannot be provided otherwise.[70]

In 1920, in a letter to the Soviet Foreign Minister Çiçerin Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, stated that Turkey and the Soviet Union should establish a political and a military alliance to fight against imperialism and for the success of the Turkish War of Liberation.[71] Soviet Foreign Minister Çiçerin, in his response to the letter declared the Russia would establish diplomatic relations with Turkey; but he did not focus on providing military aid to Turkey or the establishment of an alliance.[72] The Russians feared from the possibility of Turkey's coming to an agreement with the Western powers that they did not want to establish so close ties with Turkey. From 1923 onwards the relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union were not hostile but were cool since the Turkish aim was to repress any internal acts with Marxist intentions on its territories.

The relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union are based on three agreements signed in the first years of the Turkish Republic.[73] These agreements are the Friendship Agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Union signed on 16 March 1921, the Friendship Agreement signed between Turkey and Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan signed on 13 October 1921 and the Friendship and Neutrality Agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Union signed on 17 December 1925. The 1921 Friendship Agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Russia, which was ratified on 22 September 1921, was the basis of relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Most of the future agreements were to refer to this agreement as it was the case in the 1950s when the Soviet Union wanted to improve and recover relations with Turkey.[74] The Friendship and Neutrality Agreement signed in 1925 was renewed in 1929, 1931

[70] *Ibid.*, p.162.
[71] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.184.
[72] *Ibid.*, p.184.
[73] Erkin, Feridun Cemal; *Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968, p.247.
[74] Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.174.

and 1935 and by referring to that agreement Turkey got the support of the Soviet Union in negotiations with the Great Britain concerning Mosul.[75]

The issue of Turkish Straits kept its importance in relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union in the first half of the 1920s. On 20 November 1922 the Lausanne Conference began and the Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Greece, Romania, Yugoslavia and Turkey attended the Conference as main participants, and the US sent observers. On 24 July 1923 The Lausanne Treaty was signed replacing the Sevres Treaty and recognizing Turkey as an independent state. The Soviet Union did not participate at the conference from the beginning because of the British hostility to the Soviet regime. Accordingly the Soviet Union and Bulgaria attended to the consultations only on issues regarding the rule and control of the Turkish Straits.[76] The Soviet Union argued that national independence of Turkey should be respected and it should be the only sovereign state at the Turkish Straits. This required the closure of the Turkish Strais to all warships and provided that they should be open to all merchant ships without discrimination. On 4 December 1922, the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs said that "Soviet Russia was ready to sign any agreement concerning the Straits so long as it secured Turkey's independence, did not discriminate against any state, and guaranteed free commerce".[77]

İsmet İnönü, though not clear on its terms was sharing the Soviet view; but he asked other participants to declare their own views before Turkey.[78] This worried the US and the Great Britain and pressurized Turkey not to cooperate with the Soviet Union.

---

[75] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.38.

[76] Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across The Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p.169.

[77] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.35.

[78] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.192. When İnönü said so, the British representative and the Head of the conference Lord Curson said '… Turkey does not reveal its own view on an issue that most interests them; on the contrary the Russians put themselves in place of Turks and explain their views instead of them'. He continues 'If I would have closed my eyes, I would believed that Cicerin had wear a fez and introduced himself as İsmet Pasha'.

The Western powers threatened Turkey that if Turkey was to cooperate with the Soviet Union, other Western participants of the conference would not give support in other issues at the Conference and on 8 December 1922 Turkey accepted the British proposal on Straits which provides, though limited, a free passage through the Turkish Straits and proposes the establishment of Straits Commission. Accordingly, it is not wrong to say that the Lausanne Convention on Turkish Straits limited the sovereignty of Turkey by the demilitarization of the Straits and by the establishment of the Straits Commission.[79]

The Soviet Union was not happy with the Convention with its existing form since the Soviet rulers wanted the determination of the Straits regime by the states neighboring the Black Sea. In these years, however, the Soviet Union wanted international recognition; and the acceptance of the agreement meant de jure recognition by the other signatories. So, the Soviet Union signed the agreement; but it was not ratified that it did not became a member state at the International Straits Commission. There was an irony however. The Great Britain opposing free passage in the nineteenth century, was now supporting the free navigation through the Turkish Straits. The Soviet Union too, forgetting its imperialist ambition of reaching the Mediterranean, wanted to close the Turkish Straits to the warships.[80] The change in the Russian attitude was in fact the result of the Russian desire of peace and to be protected against any possible attack on the southern parts of the country.[81] Nonetheless, the terms of the agreement changed thirteen years later since the role of the League of Nations to provide the security of the Turkish Straits made Turkey to feel insecure since any decision in the League of Nations needed the unanimity of votes. [82]

---

[79] Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.235.

[80] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.35. Anderson, M. S.; *The Eastern Question (1774-1923)*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1991, p.373.

[81] Anderson, M. S.; *The Eastern Question (1774-1923)*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1991, p.373.

[82] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.39. Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across The Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p.186.

Between the two World Wars, the relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union can be characterized as good despite some problems. The Russian aim was to keep Turkey under control through trade relations and it tried to influence Turkey by ideas of communism.[83] Contrary to the Russian policies, Turkey gave importance to the establishment of economic relations with the West and became stricter about the ideas of communism on Turkishterritory. These Turkish polices, however, were not welcomed by Russians. Accordingly, in 1935 Soviet Union denounced the Agreement of Friendship and Non-Aggression.

Another development concerning the inter war years is the Montreaux Convention signed on 20 July 1936.[84] Turkey wanted to re-militarize the Turkish Straits since the collective security guarantee of the Lausanne Treaty did not seem workable. The Montreaux Convention changed the rules governing the Turkish Straits and Turkey became the only sovereign power in the region. The Soviet Union was pleased with the Montreaux Convention since it proposes the Russian argument supported during the Treaty of Lausanne. Nonetheless, Turkey's attitude against the communists in the country affected the relations in a negative sense that at the end of the 1930s the Soviet Union raised the issue of Soviet control of the Turkish Straits again.[85]

In 1939, the President of the Soviet Union Stalin presented, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Saraçoğlu, the Soviet proposal for the review of the Montreaux Convention and the establishment of co-sovereignty at the Turkish Straits. Turkey rejected the proposal and declared that such agreements as it had been the case for the Treaty of Hünkar İskelesi would not be accepted.[86] On the contrary, Turkey accepted the Anglo-French proposal for the establishment of a trilateral military alliance on 19 October 1939, which supposes to help the other if there is a war at

[83] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.197.
[84] For the full text of the Montreaux Convention, see Erkin, Feridun Cemal; Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi, Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968, pp.397- 410.
[85] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.39.
[86] *Ibid.*, p.43.

Mediterranean.[87] Nonetheless, the alliance did not force Turkey, to act against the Soviet Union.

When the Germans and the Soviet Union made an alliance on 23 August 1939, the cooperation between Turkey and the Soviet Union came to an end.[88] The Nazi-Soviet Pact signed only a week before the German invasion of Poland and the beginning of the World War II, strengthened the Russian desires to modify the rules governing the Turkish Straits. The relations worsened when the Soviet Union wanted to revise the Montreaux Convention and to annex the Turkish territory in Eastern Anatolia, such as the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, at the end of the World War II.

In course of war Turkey, though did not enter the war, let the German battleships to pass through the Turkish Straits and this act was protested by the Soviet Union between 1941-1944 at least for four times. Turkey, believing that Germany would be the winner of the war and Hitler would keep his promises, let the ships to pass through and arrested them only after it declared war against Germany in 1945.[89] Under these conditions, during the Yalta Conference, Stalin asked for the renewal of the Montreaux Convention. Though other parties in the conference not applauded this idea, Roosevelt stated that the change might be rational. Even Turkey's declaration of war against the Germany and Japan on 23 February 1945 to join the San Francisco Conference did not satisfy the Soviet Union. The Russians declared that the Friendship and Non-Agression Treaty of 1925 between Turkey and the Soviet Union was abolished. Following this Turkey asked for the establishment of a new alliance with Soviets. The Soviet Union stated that there were some conditions for such an agreement; such as the annexation of Kars and Ardahan to the Soviet territory and providing a base to the Soviet Union at the Turkish Straits. The Russian demands were rejected. Nonetheless, at the Potsdam Conference on 17 July 1945, the US and the Great Britain offered the Soviet Union free passage of Soviet war and merchant

[87] *Ibid.*, p.44.
[88] Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk –Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara: Ak Yayınları, İstanbul: 1968, p.197.
[89] Rozakis, Christos L. and Stagos, Petros N.; *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987, p.47.

ships through the Straits in times of peace instead of a Russian base at the Turkish Straits.

2.3. Turkish-Soviet Relations between 1946 and 1991

On 07 August 1946 and on 24-25 September 1946 the Soviet Union sent Turkey two diplomatic notes concerning the control of the Turkish Straits.[90] In the first note the Soviet Union stated that Turkey does not use its authority over the Turkish Straits in a good way.[91] The second memorandum had similar concerns and demands from Turkey. The Soviet Union asked for talks between Turkey, the US, the Great Britain and the Soviet Union; but, Turkey rejected the Russian demands.[92] The Great Britain and the US were also unhappy with these Soviet notes. The US sent a counter note the Soviet Union on 09 October 1946 and made its worries clear.[93] The British Minister of Foreign Affairs Bevin, stated in his speech to the parliament that giving a base to Russians at the Turkish Straits would be against the sovereign rights of Turkey putting Turkey under the sovereignty of another power and additionally the rights of other powers concerned about the Turkish Straits would also be harmed.[94]

The Soviet Union, being a typical land power because of its geographic location, thought that it was secure in defensive terms; but when talking about the offensive means the Soviet Union was aware of its weakness.[95] This forced the Soviet Union to take two offensive attacks first at the beginning of the Cold War and at the end of it.

---

[90] For the Soviet diplomatic notes given to Turkey on 7 August 1946 and on 24-25 September 1946 and Turkey's response to the Soviet Union see Erkin, *Ibid.*, pp.414-440.

[91] This new regime allows the free passage of all trade vessels both in times of peace and war, and free passage of all states neighboring the Black Sea; prohibits passage of warships of states with no border to the Black Sea both in peace and war times. The Soviet Union said that this regime should be regulated by the Black Sea states and the free passage and the security of the Straits should be under the control of the Soviet Union and Turkey. Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.507.

[92] For the US response to the Soviet diplomatic notes see Erkin, Feridun Cemal; *Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968, pp.294-318.

[93] Anderson, M. S.; *The Eastern Question (1774-1923)*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1991, p.35.

[94] *Ibid.*.

[95] Davutoğlu, Ahmet; *Stratejik Derinlik*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2003 (11th ed.), p.155.

The first is the pressure imposed on Turkey concerning the Straits at the end of the World War II; and the second is the invasion of Afghanistan.[96] But since the focus of this thesis is relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, only the first act will be touched upon. The Soviet pressure on Turkey concerning the Turkish Straits was considered as a strategic mistake since Turkey and so the Turkish Straits were compelled to the Western bloc.[97]

In 1947, the Great Britain declared that it could no more afford the military and economic aids given to Turkey and Greece. The US offered to fill the gap in the region and on 12 March 1947 the American Congress ratified the Truman Doctrine providing Turkey and Greece with military and economic aid. The main aim of the Truman Doctrine was to prevent the Russian expansionism and to expand the American understanding of politics and economics.[98] So, the Truman Doctrine forced Turkey to establish close ties with the West and to join political, military and economic organizations established by the Western powers.[99] Turkey's NATO membership in 1952 was not an exception despite the oppositions at the beginning. In these years Soviet Union blamed Turkey for being a country which

> 'had lost its independence, had become Marshallized, a colony of Wall Street and a base for the capitalist aggression against the Fatherland of Socialism'

and these beliefs began to change only after Stalin's death in March 1953.[100] Deployment of Jupiter Missiles on the Turkish territory increased the tension between Turkey and the Soviet Union. In a letter to Turkey, the Soviet Union stated that "Turkey by allowing the use of its territory against its neighbors put itself into danger" and restated the Russian will for the establishment of good relations and trade with Turkey.[101] The Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, replied to this

---

[96] *Ibid.*.
[97] *Ibid.*.
[98] Bağcı, Hüseyin; *Türk Dış Politikasında 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: METU Press, 2001 (2nd ed.), p.6.
[99] *Ibid.*, p.8.
[100] Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across The Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p.173-174.
[101] Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.516.

letter by stating that deployment of missiles should be considered as a defensive act.[102]

Between 1960 and 1980 the relations of Turkey and the Soviet Union developed as a result of the question of Cyprus and the worsening relations with the West. 1960s was a turning point in Cold War relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. In 1963, a Turkish delegate went to Moscow and met the President of Soviet Union Khruschev. In this meeting, Khruschev expressed the Russian will to improve and establish friendly relations with Turkey and declared that Stalin's policy toward Turkey should be changed.[103] Nonetheless, among the NATO members Turkey was the only state that could not improve relations with the Soviet Union.[104]

Between 1965 and 1979 Turkey and the Soviet Union held high level diplomatic visits, signed agreements and Turkey accepted the Russian economic aid.[105] Turkish intervention to Cyprus had also been effective in relations but it was not a determinant. The Soviet Union supported the first intervention; but opposed the second intervention arguing that the problem should be solved in international arena.[106] The Soviet Union was careful, however, not to speak against the Turkish intervention and at all times emphasized the importance of the independence and integrity of the island, and the equal rights of two nations on the island. Besides, the US's attitude toward Turkey, the Johnson letter and the US's arms embargo caused improvement in relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. The US arms embargo on Turkey played a vital role to develop relations and beginning from 1976 the relations developed also in the military field.[107] In 1978 Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit went to Moscow and during his visit three agreements were signed between

---

[102] *Ibid.*.
[103] Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across The Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, p.176
[104] Tellal, Erel; "Sovyetler ile İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Volume I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.775.
[105] *Ibid.*, p.776.
[106] *Ibid.*, p.779.
[107] *Ibid.*.

Turkey and the Soviet Union. One of the agreements was political, the other was cultural and the third one was concerning the limitation of continental shelf of the Black Sea. It was expected that the US embargo would bring Turkey and the Soviet Union closer but this did not happen at least for three reasons.[108] First of all the Soviet Union did not support Turkey in second intervention to Cyprus. Secondly, nationalist political parties in Turkey were against the establishment of close ties with the Soviet Union and lastly, activation of the US bases on Turkey causing the Russian intervention to Afghansitan prevented establishment of further relations.[109]

In the field of economics there were important developments too. Beginning from 1967 Turkey began to get credits and aid from the Soviet Union. On 25 March 1967 The Economic-Technological Agreement was signed and provided the resources for the establishment of seven industrial units in Turkey.[110] On 09 January 1975 The Second Economic-Technological Agreement was signed and provided an industrial investment costing seven thousand dollars.[111] Until the establishment of Intergovernmental Joint Commission in 1976 the economic relations were conducted on the basis of economic relations. Economic relations reached its peak in 1979 when Turkey and the Soviet Union signed an agreement providing Turkey eight billion dollars aid and credit for the construction of a thermal power plant and for the improvement of refineries. In 1981 the overall amount of Soviet credits to Turkey provided since 1967 was 972,610,000 dollars and Turkey was one of the countries who was able to get both the US and the Soviet Union aid in Cold War years.[112]

Despite the fact that developments in the Soviet domestic politics provided an opportunity for Turkey and the Soviet Union to further develop realtions it is not wrong to say that the relations between 1980-1983 were relatively calm. The Soviet intervention into Afghanistan and the military intervention in turkey played an

[108] *Ibid.*, p.781.
[109] *Ibid.*.
[110] *Ibid.*, p.782.
[111] *Ibid.*, p.783.
[112] *Ibid.*.

important role in this.[113] The Soviet intervention to Afghanistan forced Turkey to accept thousands of refugees. The new turkish government too, blamed the soviet Union for the anarchy emerged in the country at the begiining of 1980s. Nonetheless, in line with the argument of the thesis at a time where political relations were not much promising, the amount of Turkish exports to the Soviet Unions reached a peak since 1924. Beginning from 1960s there has been an improvement in relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union and the positive effects of this improvement was also observed in the field of politics in 1980s.[114] In that respect the Natural Gas Agreement of the 1984 and the Trade Agreement signed in 1989 played a crucial role for the future of the relations. Another important development in political relations has been the Treaty of Friedship and Cooperation signed in 1991 during the official visit of President Turgut Özal to Moscow.[115]

The next chapter will be examining the diplomatic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet Era. Accordingly, besides the development of diplomatic relations between the two, importance of the Black Sea as a new area of cooperation in Turkish-Russian relations, the use of Turkish Straits will be dicussed. More importantly, the conflict and cooperation between these two states in Central Asia and the Causcasus will be explored as an important dimension of post Soviet Turkish-Russian relations.

[113] Tellal, Erel; "SSCB'yle İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Cilt II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.161.
[114] *Ibid.*, p.163.
[115] *Ibid.*, p.166.

CHAPTER THREE

DIPLOMATIC ASPECTS OF TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

This Chapter will examine the political relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation between 1990 and 2005. After an introductory and informative part focusing on development of diplomatic relations including official visits and political agreements signed, other key issues in relations will be analyzed. In that respect the use of Turkish Straits, Turkish-Russian Relations in Central Asia and in Caucasus, Turkish-Russian Cooperation in the Black Sea region will be focused on respectively.

3.1. Development of Post Soviet Diplomatic Relations between Turkey and Russia

The principles of partnership between Turkey and the Russian Federation were based on the Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation signed on 25 May 1992.[116] In his two days visit to Moscow, Turkish Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel met the Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

The political relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation was highly occupied with the Russian war in Chechnya and Turkey's fight against Kurdish seperatism in the country between 1995 and 1999. As a result the issue of terrorism

[116] "Rusya Federasyonu ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti arasında Avrasya'da İşbirliği Eylem Planı", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/relat_2_t.html.

had usually been on the top of the agenda at the official meetings between Turkey and the Russian Federation in these years. Accordingly during an official visits of the Turkish Foreign Minister Tansu Çiller to Moscow in 1996 and 1997, the war in Chechnya kept its importance. When in December 1996 Foreign Minister Tansu Çiller visited the Russian Federation and met the Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and the Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov, she declared that both Turkey and the Russian Federation were respectful for the territorial integrity of other countries.[117] Nonetheless, the words of the Turkish Foreign Minister remained just as good wills and could not prevent the Russians to warn Turkey concerning the rumors that Turkey has been selling arms to Chechnya. Likewise, Çiller too pressurized the Russians concerning the sale of Russian arms to the Greek Cypriot.

Nonetheless, during her visit to Moscow the following year, in 1997, the Turkish Foreign Minister Tansu Çiller and her Russian counter part Yevgeny Primakov tried to give the impression that the political differences between Turkey and the Russian Federation were as acute as they were presented before and they declared that in order to ensure gradual overcoming of these differences, it is necessary to act more actively in areas where Turkey and the Russian Federation have common interests.[118] Additionally, even at times when Turkey and the Russian Federation warned each other concerning the acts of each other against PKK terror and war in Chechnya, the importance of improving economic relations, more specifically the trade relations, was always emphasized.

The visit of the Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to Turkey on 14-17 December 1997 gave the impression that the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation were to improve. During the visit Prime Ministers Viktor Chernomyrdin and Mesut Yılmaz declared that they would respect territorial integrity

[117] "Çiller'e Rus Morali", *Milliyet*, 19 December 1996.
[118] Markurshin, Vadim; "Russia-Turkey: Doomed to be Eternal Neighbours", *Perceptions*, March-May 1997, Volume 2, p.2.

and economic interests of each other.[119] It is also important to notice that Prime Ministers declared it is necessary to seek for "cooperation" and "trust" instead of "competition" and "suspicion" in relations and it was considered as an important step to cope with the traditional mistrust between Turkey and the Russian Federation.[120] Despite the intent to normalize relations, Turkey and the Russian Federation were not sharing the same idea concerning the means to achieve this end. Whereas Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin declared that improvement in economic relations would play a vital role to develop better political relations, Mesut Yılmaz declared that political relations should be improved to a certain level in order to further develop economic relations.[121] The time, however, proved that Viktor Chernomyrdin was right and the Turkish-Russian relations began to flourish in the field of economics even at times when there were political problems between Turkey and the Russian Federation; and the good economic relations also had its effects in the field of politics.

The issue of Chechnya and the Russian use of PKK have usually been at the top of the agenda in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Nevertheless, the issue was not seen as an impediment to establish close ties. Indeed the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation improved in diplomatic and economic spheres just after the second war in Chechnya.[122] On 05-06 November 1999 Turkish Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit went to Moscow for an official visit and during his visit when the Russian war in Chechnya were at its hot days, series of agreements were signed between Turkey and the Russian Federation.[123] One of the agreements was a Declaration on Joint Anti-Terrorism signed on 05 November 1999 and the other agreement was an official commitment to the Blue Stream Pipeline Project.

---

[119] Güney, Nurşin Ateşoğlu; "Rusya Federasyonu'nun Yeni Güvenlik Politikası Çerçevesinde Türkiye'ye Bakışı" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları*, İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002, p.371.
[120] *Ibid.*.
[121] *Ibid.*, p.371-372.
[122] Reynolds, Michael; "Russian-Turkish Relations and Chechnya", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.60.
[123] *Ibid.*, p.60.

With reference to Memorandum between the Russian Federation and Turkey on Cooperation Against Terorism signed on 18 December 1996, Turkey and the Russian Federation declared their desire to improve cooperation in fight against terrorism. The Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin also added that the Russian Federation will not support any kind of terrorist activities aiming Turkey, including the activities of PKK and condemned international terrorism.[124] Following the visit, activites of non-governmental organizations assisting Chechens in Turkey were limited.[125] As stated before, the Blue Stream Pipeline Project was a remedy to calm down the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. At the end of the decade the issue of sale and transition of energy was an important issue in bilateral relations regardless of problems concerning the price and the taxation of the gas; however, the fact that during his visit to Moscow in 1999, Prime Minister Ecevit did not sign the protocol concerning the taxation of the gas and rumors were quick to spill over that this unexpected development was the outcome of the US opposition to the Blue Stream project.

On 18 September 2000 the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov met Turkish Foreign Minister İsmail Cem at the 55th session of the UN General Assembly in New York. During the meeting two ministers talked about regional and international issues given importance by both sides.[126] In June 2001, the Russian Foreign Minister Ivanov came to Turkey for an official visit and met the Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer, Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and Foreign Minister İsmail Cem. Foreign Ministers of the two countries decided to establish a working group to create common strategy in Eurasia concerning the issue of Nagorno Karabagh, Straits, energy and fight against terrorism.[127] The Ministers met a year later, on 16 November 2001 during the 56th session of the UN General Assembly meeting in New York and the

[124] "Ecevit Duma'yı Suçladı", *Milliyet*, 06 November 1999.
[125] Oğan, Sinan; "Gül'ün Türkiye Ziyareti ve Türk-Rus İlişkilerinde Yeni Açılımlar", http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=30.
[126] *Daily News Bulletin*, The Embassy of the RF in Turkey, 20 September 2000, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/hron/34.html.
[127] *Radikal*, 08 June 2001.

relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation were further improved when the Foreign Ministers signed the "Action Plan to Develop Cooperation between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey". The document was of crucial importance for its call for close relations in regional and international issues especially in Eurasia. The areas of cooperation in Eurasia were mentioned as assisting the political resolution of conflicts, enhancing stability and to create the conditions for sustainable economic development. The Plan of Action also states that this common understanding concerning the role of the international law, human rights and democracy will provide a new perspective in bilateral relations.[128]

Besides, declaring the supremacy of law again they emphasized the importance of collective act to solve international problems. Accordingly, they stated their readiness to fight against global terrorism and agreed to work together to achieve cooperation in economics and in trade; plus to develop contacts for cultural and humanitarian affairs. For the Russian Foreign Minister the document was important since it marks the beginning of a new level of cooperation between the two countries in relations with each other and with third countries.[129]

Two timely visits, thus, played an important role to further develop and activate the former initiatives between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The first visit was that of the Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül to Moscow on 23-26 February 2004. Before the visit, the spokesman of the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexander Yakovenka declared that Foreign Minister Gül would not be welcomed as a rival but as the minister of a country having common interests and aims with the Russian Federation. The importance attached to the visit became clear once again since the meetings were held at Prime Minister Level. The issue of trade relations, arms sales, energy and Chechnya were discussed as part of the meeting and Turkey and the

[128] Oğan, Sinan; "11 Eylül Sonrası Türk Dış Politikasında Rusya", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Bahar 2004, Volume 10, Issue 1, p.87.
[129] "Transcript of Minister of Foreign Affairs of The Russian Federation Igor Ivanov's Remarks at Press Conference Following Signing of a Russian-Turkish Document (New York, November 16, 2001)", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/hron/31.html.

Russian Federation declared that they a common understanding of developments in Iraq.

In his speech at the Russian Diplomacy Academy, Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül emphasized the importance of improving relations with neighboring countries and the creation of belt of peace and cooperation in the region. Turkish Minister also emphasized that none of the Eurasian countries might gain from a power struggle and polarization in the region. Given the fact that Russian President Boris Yeltsin rejected to meet Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit due to the heavy agenda of the President in 1999, acceptance of Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül by the Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin was a sign of the importance attached to establishment of good relations with Turkey.[130]

The year 2001 and September 11 terrorist attacks played an important role for Turkey and the Russian Federation to declare their readiness to fight against international terrorism. On 28 September 2001, Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer and the Russian President Vladimir Putin conferred on the phone. The leaders discussed the situation in Eurasia after September 11 and reaffirmed their common approach concerning fight against terrorism and emphasized importance of sloidarity in international community. Following the terrorist attacks in İstanbul in November 2003, the Russian President Vladimir Putin called the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and once again declared that the Russian Federation was ready to give political support to Turkey in fight against terrorism.[131]

On 05-06 December 2004, the Russian President Vladimir Putin, who was the first Russian President to visit the country after thirty two years, came to Turkey for an official visit. The visit was considered as sign of the desire to establish good relations. PKK terror and Chechen insurgency in Turkay and the Russian Federation, Turkish

[130] Oğan, Sinan; "Gül'ün Türkiye Ziyareti ve Türk-Rus İlişkilerinde Yeni Açılımlar", http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=30.
[131] "Rusya Devlet Başkanı V.V.Putin'in Türkiye Başbakanı R.T.Erdoğan ile yaptığı telefon görüşmesi hakkında (20 Kasım 2003)", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/text_t8.html.

Straits, construction of pipelines, and the partnership in Central Asia and in Caucasus were at the focus of the meeting together with the attempts to find out new areas of cooperation. Two leaders signed a declaration to develop friendship and multidimensional cooperation emphasizing the fact that Turkey and the Russian Federation are responsible for peace, stability and welfare in Eurasian.[132]

In February 2004, the Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül went to Moscow and one hundred fifty Turkish businessmen accompanied him. The Foreign Minister met the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov and four protocols on different issues signed. In an interview to a Russian news agency Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül declared that Turkey and the Russian Federation have five hundred years of relations and they are rediscovering one another in a time when the world faces important changes.[133] Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül, also emphasized the importance of fight against terrorism for stability in the region and declared the Turkish desire to cooperate with the Russian Federation to deal with the issue. Additionally, the Foreign Minister mentioned the belief that cooperation in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia will add to the regional stability.

Next year, on 12 January 2005 Turkish Prime Minister visited Moscow for a reciprocal visit. The idea of cooperation, the basis of which was established a month ago in Turkey became tangible by agreements signed betweenTurkey and the russian Federation.[134] Issues concerning the sale of natural gas, Cyprus and trade relations were discussed during these meetings. It was expected before the visit that the Turkish side may be successful to reduce the price of the natural gas from the Blue Stream. According to an agreement signed last year the price of the gas was to increase by 16 dollars in 2005 and the Turkish government aimed to reduce the price of it to protect the consumer. However, Turkish government could not get satisfying reaction from the Russian Federation regarding the payment for gas with goods and

[132] "Portre: Putin'in Türkiye Ziyareti", *Radikal*, 06 December 2005.
[133] "Rusya'yla Derin Ortaklık", *Radikal*, 26 February 2005.
[134] "Rusya Gündemi Kıbrıs'la Açıldı", *Radikal*, 11 January 2005.

the re-exportation of the additional gas. Regarding the Annan Plan, Vladimir Putin declared that the Russian Federation will support the plan and will work to improve economic relations of the Turkish Cypriot; but he was dignified concerning the Russian veto at the UN security Council to remove the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriot.[135] Nonetheless, even these differences did not prevent to further relations given the interdependency of Turkey and the Russian Federation and the changing dynamics of the region

In conclusion, it is not wrong to state that diplomatic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation has been improving since the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The increasing number of official visits, the positive attitudes of Turkish and the Russian representatives in these visits, and the meetings held at Presidential or Prime Ministers' level proves the fact that great importance has been attached to relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Having briefly discussed the development of diplomatic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the last fifteen years the next part of the chapter will focus on the Turkish Straits in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

3.2. Turkish – Russian Cooperation in the Black Sea Region

Numerous issues ranging from energy politics to frozen conflicts, and new regional security initiatives were almost unnoticed in the Black Sea region, since the attention of the world has been devoted to developments in Iraq and the Middle East in the post Cold War era.[136] Nonetheless, expansion of NATO and EU to the East combined with discovery of huge oil and gas reserves in the Caspian region increased the attention of neighbouring countries to the region. In 1990, Turkey initiated the Black Sea Economic Cooperation with the aim of constructing regional development and to regain its historical influence in the region. On 25 June 1992, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation,

[135] "Kıbrıs'a Temkinli Destek", *Radikal*, 12 January 2005.
[136] Babaoglu, Orhan; "The Black Sea Basin: A New Axis in Global Maritime Security", 24 August 2005, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=2361.

Turkey and Ukraine signed Declaration on Black Sea Economic Cooperation.[137] Black Sea Economic Cooperation has its permanent secretariat in Turkey and a regional bank in Greece. With the establishment of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation for the first time in history, eleven countries from Caspian Sea to Adriatic belonged to same institutional framework[138] based on principles of the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris and OSCE. Cooperation rather than conflict, regionalism for global integration in the long term and to avoid new divisions in Europe are the three motivations behind the establishment of Black Sea Economic Cooperation .[139]

Though, the Newly Independent States of the Black Sea region offered new political and economic opportunities to integrate this part of the world into the West, there were three important questions to be answered. The first question was whether the Russian Federation would accept the loss of status and to cooperate with other states in the region. Secondly, whether the regional countries would accept to cooperate with each other or not; and lastly what would be the attitudes of the US and EU concerning the future of the region. The Russian Federation was not against the Black Sea Economic Cooperation from the very beginning but it was seriously concerned with loosing influence in the region and was not ready to transfer control. The member states, on the contrary, were happy to involve in this cooperation since it provided them an opportunity to act independently from the Russian Federation.[140] So, the Russian Federation joined Black Sea Economic Cooperation as the main loser in the region at least not to pay the cost of being isolated from the cooperation; but it provided the Russian Federation another opportunity to reach new ports.[141]

---

[137] Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Volume 28, Number 1, 2003, p.81.
[138] Manoli; Panagiota; "The Role of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) in the Stability of the Region", http://www.csrc.ac.uk/pdfs/P39-pm.pdf, p.40.
[139] *Ibid.*.
[140] Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Volume 28, Number 1, 2003, p.79.
[141] *Ibid.*, p.79-80.

Looking from Turkey's point of view, establishment of Black Sea Economic Cooperation was an opportunity to act as a pivot in this part of the world and to be a link between Central Asia and Europe. In addition, it is considered to be a key player in the region as being a "gatekeeper" to and from the Black Sea. Besides, the economic and military power of Turkey compared with that of other states puts it into a privileged position in the region.[142] Having the longest coastline at the Black Sea Turkey controls the largest part of the Black Sea Eclusive Economic Zone.[143] The declaration was too broad in scope and was too optimistic concerning the future of the Black Sea region that this put the future of the declaration into difficulty.[144] Though it was established "to ensure the Black Sea becomes a sea of peace, stability and prosperity, striving to promote friendly and good neighbouring relations" the means to achieve this aim were not specified in the Decleration.[145]

As a result, despite series of opportunities for cooperation among the member states, emergence of conflicts among them as it has been the case in transition of Caspian oil to the West was unavoidable. The routing of the pipelines caused a competition among members since the the flow of oil would provide the country of transition an important amount of transit fees. The issue brought Turkey and the Russian Federation face to face too at the long debated project of Baku-Tiblis-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline Project. Bordering the Caspian Sea and at the same time Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation insisted that the pipeline should pass through its territory. Turkey, on the other hand, came up with an alternative passing through Azerbaijan and Georgia and ending up at Ceyhan, a Mediterrenean port of Turkey.[146]

---

[142] Babaoglu, Orhan; "The Black Sea Basin: A New Axis in Global Maritime Security", 24 August 2005, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=2361.
[143] *Ibid.*.
[144] Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Volume 28, Number 1, 2003, p.81.
[145] Manoli, Panagiota; "The Role of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) in the Stability of the Region", http://www.csrc.ac.uk/pdfs/P39-pm.pdf, p.40.
[146] Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Volume 28, Number 1, 2003, p.81.

The conflict between Turkey and the Russian Federation in Black Sea Economic Cooperation was not limited to the issue of oil transition. Since its establishment in 1992 the Russian Federation and Greece were not happy with Turkey's decision making role within Black Sea Economic Cooperation. Turkey's expectations to lead Black Sea Economic Cooperation partners to integrate the EC and its unifying role within the Black Sea Economic Cooperation was not welcomed by the Russian Federation since the Turkish aim was to lead such an integration and to increase its influence in the region.[147] Thus, instead of working as the basis of cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation, it worked as a control mechanism between the two. While Black Sea Economic cooperation provided an opportunity for the other member states, the Russian Federation, in part, suffered from this Cooperation. The Russian Federeation considered to be "under attack inside" and "challanged from outside".[148] Accordingly, the Russian Federation began to worry about the Turkish existence in the Black Sea region, a country which perceives the Black Sea as its own area.[149] When the Russian Federation became the Chair of Black Sea Economic Cooperation in 1996 its influence increased but the Russian proposal to expand the Black Sea Economic Cooperation in a way to include Iran and Yugoslavia was rejected.[150]

Though Black Sea Economic Cooperation aimed to achieve stability and peace in the Black Sea region, in time it was stocked into the economic dimension. There were, however, problems even at economic relations and it was considered that the difficulty of improving economic relations within the Black Sea Economic Cooperation was related to political and security related worries of states.[151] So

[147] Gökay, Bülent; "The Politics of Oil in the Black Sea Area: Turkey and the Regional Power Rivalries" in *Politics of the Black Sea: Dynamics of Cooperation and Conflict*, New York: I.B.Tauris&Co.Ltd., 2001, p.18.
[148] Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Volume 28, Number 1, 2003, p.82.
[149] *Ibid.*, p.86.
[150] *Ibid.*, p.91.
[151] *Ibid.*, p.90.

establishment of peace and security in the region was seen as a prerequisite for the establishment of real economic cooperation in the region.

As discussed above control and use of the Black Sea and the Turkish Straits have been of vital point in relations between Turks and the Russians. Throughout the eighteenth and the nineteenth century the region was important for the Russian Empire since it was the only way to reach the Mediterranean. Despite the fact that the region was closed to cooperation because of the existence of two camps and polarization of the world politics, disintegration of the Soviet Union provided a great opportunity to establish cooperation among the neighboring countries. Besides the establishment of peace and stability in the Black Sea region, the issue of energy transition provided opportunities for neighboring countries to gain economically and to add to their strategic importance.

3.3. Turkish Straits in Turkish–Russian Relations

The use and control of Bosphorus and Dardanelles occupies a crucial place in Turkish-Russian relations and is not a recent issue in relations. The Russian desire to control the Black Sea and the Turkish Straits with the aim of reaching the warm seas has been one of the causes of wars between the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries; and the issue kept its importance in World War I and World War II. Even in Cold War years there was the Russian demand to renew the Montreaux Convention. Now this part of the Chapter will discuss the importance of the Turkish Straits in Turkish-Russian relations regarding the transfer of Russian energy resources to the Southern and the Western markets. Firstly it will provide a background concerning the past status and the importance of Turkish Straits and then will analyze the Turkish Straits in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Cold War era.

The passage through the Turkish Straits was a domestic issue for the Ottoman Empire till the end of the seventeenth century. When Istanbul was occupied in 1453, the

Ottoman Empire established its rule and hegemony over the Straits. The Ottoman Empire enhanced its hegemony when Black Sea turned into an internal sea of the empire in 1484.[152] In these years the Ottoman Empire was the only power to take the decisions regarding the passage through the Turkish Straits and the transportation via Black Sea. Both the Turkish Straits and the Black Sea were closed to the war ships and the merchant vessels of other states. The principle was in power other than some exceptional cases until the 1774 Küçük Kaynarca Agreement. The Ottoman Empire gave some capitulations to France in 1535, to England in 1579 and to Holland in 1612 and allowed the merchant vessels of these states to pass through the Turkish Straits. However, beginning from the midst of the nineteenth century the rules of passage were decided upon by agreements between the Ottoman Empire and other states.[153] Küçük Kaynarca agreement signed in 1774, was the first agreement to allow Russian commercial vessels to pass freely through the Turkish Straits. Nonetheless, since the agreement signed with the Russian Federation in 1774 and the capitulations provided to some European countries were basically considered to be the same, Küçük Kaynarca Agreement was thought in the framework of Absolute Turkish Sovereignty too.[154] When Treaty of Edirne was signed in 1829, for the first time in its history the Ottoman Empire allowed free passage of the merchant vessels of all states through the Straits in peace time. The Turkish Straits were then ruled by the London Convention on Straits which prohibits the passage of all war ships through the Straits in times of war and allows the free passage of all merchant vessels in peace time and the decision was not dependent on the Ottoman choice. The Convention continued to be the only agreement regulating the passage from the straits until the World War I. The Paris Agreement signed in 1856 further limited the Ottoman rule in the region and prohibited the Russian Federation and the Ottomans to establish dockyards in the

---

[152] Erdoğan, Selahattin; "Montreaux'a Kadar Olan Tarihsel Süreçte Boğazlar", *Deniz Kuvvetleri*, Sayı 591, Kasım 2004, p.6.

[153] Potshveriya, B.M.; "Rusya-Türkiye İlişkilerinde Boğazlar Sorunu" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya, Politik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel İlişkiler* (ed.by Kazgan,Gülten and Natalya Ulçenko), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003, p.85.

[154] Erdoğan, Selahattin; "Montreaux'a Kadar Olan Tarihsel Süreçte Boğazlar", *Deniz Kuvvetleri*, Sayı 591, Kasım 2004, p.7.

Black Sea. The fact that the Ottoman Empire considered to violate the clauses of the Paris Convention and allowed the German ships to pass the Turkish Straits caused the Ottoman Empire to enter the World War I with Germany in 1914. The Sevres Agreement signed after the end of the World War I ended the Ottoman hegemony over the Turkish Straits. Nonetheless, after the Turkish War of Independence the rules governing the Turkish Straits regulated by the Lausanne Treaty again. According to the clauses of the Lausanne Agreement the Turkish Straits were demilitarized and were to be ruled by an international commission.

The Montreux Convention signed in 1936 is considered to be the most important document regulating passage and navigation by sea through the Turkish Straits. The remilitarization of the Turkish Straits, the abolition of the Straits Commission and the collective guarantee clause of the Lausanne Convention provided Turkey full sovereignty over the Turkish Straits. The principle of freedom of passage and navigation is stated in Articles 1 and Article 2 of the Convention. Accordingly, Article 1 provides that "The High Contracting Parties recognise and affirm the principle of freedom of passage and navigation by sea in the Straits"; and Article 2 states that "In time of peace, merchant vessels shall enjoy complete freedom of passage and navigation in the Straits, by day and by night, under any flag with any kind of cargo". However, the main focus of the Montreux Convention, was the transit of warships and the status of fleets in the Black Sea. Little attention paid to the issue of merchant vessels. This is not surprising since the number of merchant vessels passing through the Turkish Straits per day was about 1/12 the Convention was signed.[155]

Though, not only the Black Sea countries but also the big powers of the time were not happy with the Montreaux Convention which provided Turkey with the last saying on many issues regarding the Turkish Straits. The first American note on 2 November 1945 saying that the Convention should be revised was followed by the English note

[155] Brito, Dagobert L.; "Congestion of the Turkish Straits: A Market Alternative", February 1999, http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~econ/papers/1999papers/08Brito.pdf.

on 21 November 1945 and the Soviet note on 8 August 1946.[156] The Soviet note offering the co-management of the Turkish Straits by the Black Sea countries and the defense of the Turkish Straits by Turkey and the Soviet Union as the two distinguished and capable countries of the region was unacceptable to Turkey.[157]

After the death of Stalin the idea for co-management of the Turkish Straits was left aside by the Russians and the new Russian policy thinking became obvious in 1953 following the third Soviet note to Turkey. Nonetheless, under the conditions of Cold War the use and control of Turkish Straits caused problems between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Three aspects of the use of Turkish Straits became problematic: Firstly, the use of Bosphorus and Dardanelles in peace and war time, secondly the outcomes of technological and military developments and lastly the classification of the war ships.[158]

In 1980s and 1990s increasing number of vessels passing through the Turkish Straits and the voluntary use of pilots were the cause of many accidents in the region. The number of merchant vessels passing through the Turkish Straits increased by more than ten times between 1938 and 1996. Likewise, the number of foreign ships passing through the Turkish Straits since 1960 increased by one hundred fifty per cent and the tonnage of these vessels by four hundred per cent. Accordingly, the Montreaux Convention of 1936 which states that the Turkish Straits were open to commercial vessels of all nations not taking into account their cargo types and supposes that use of pilots was voluntary became insufficient.

---

[156] Tellal, Erel; "SSCB'yle İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası* (ed. by Oran, Baskın), Cilt II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002 (6th ed.), p.504-505.

[157] The Soviet note dated 8 August 1946 asked Turkey for the establishment of a new regime at the Straits. Accordingly, the Soviets asked Turkey to permit the free passage of merchant vessels of all countries and the war vessels of the Black Sea countries at all times; the regime concerning the straits should be established by and should be under the control of all countries by the Black Sea. Moreover, the Soviets argued that as the most capable states of the Black Sea Turkey and the Soviet Union should provide the security of the Straits against the of them by other countries together. Howevr, befor Turkey England and the USA answered the Soviet note saying that Turkey is the only country responsible for the security of the Straits.

[158] Özersay, Kudret; "Boğazlar Konusu" in *Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* (ed.by Baskın Oran), İstanbul: 2002, İletişim Yayınları, Cilt 2, p.183.

As a result of all these developments Turkey raised serious questions concerning the export of the Eurasian oil through the "narrow" and "twisting" Straits since this will threaten İstanbul by the non stop tanker traffic of the exported oils.[159] The shipping of oil through the Turkish Straits have the risk to clog the already crowded waterway and may cause accidents that may risk the security of İstanbul that in 1994 Turkey decided to revise the rules regulating the passage through the Turkish Straits. In 1994, to limit the traffic at Bosphorus and Dardanelles in order to prevent accidents, and to protect the environment, Turkey passed "Maritime Traffic Regulations for the Turkish Straits and the Marmara Region".[160] The Turkish act was criticized and was considered as an act against the Montreaux Convention of 1936 concerning the right to make unilateral regulations in clauses mentioned in the Convention.[161] The Russian Federation perceived this development as an obstacle for its aim to carry the Caspian oil to the world markets through the Turkish Straits. The Russian Federation, argued that Turkey's insistence to revise the Montreaux Convention was irrelevant. Nonetheless, the main concern behind the Russian act was to prevent any act of Turkey which could stop or limit its control over production of Azerbaijan and Turkmen oil. Besides, the Russian Federation believed that Turkish aim was to earn an important amount of transit fees for the transition of Azeri and Turkmen resources over the Turkish territory by restricting transition of energy resources through the Turkish Straits. Taking into account the increasing number of accidents at Straits, Turkey's attempts to limit and control the traffic there is quite understandable. The free access to Turkish Straits was acceptable in the nineteenth century when the number of the ships passing through Bosphorus and Dardanelles were twenty times less than the number of ships using the Turkish Straits today. Therefore, Western oil

[159] Cohen, Ariel; "The New 'Great Game': Oil Politics in the Caucasus and Central Asia", 25 January 1996, http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/BG1065.cfm.

[160] For the "Maritime Traffic Regulations for the Turkish Straits and the Marmara Region" see UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea. Full text of the Regulation is available at http://www.un.org/Depts/los/LEGISLATIONANDTREATIES/PDFFILES/TUR_1994_Regulations.pdf

[161] Akgün, Mensur; "Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye ile Boğazlar Arasında Görünmez Bağlar: Boğazlar" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya, Politik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel İlişkiler* (ed.by Kazgan, Gülten and Natalya Ulçenko), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003, p.80.

companies preferred to construct a pipeline from Caucasus to Turkey which has been considered as the least costly and the risky way of transporting the Eurasian oil.[162]

On 10 April 1997, the Russian Federation summitted a report to International Maritime Organization (IMO). The report stated that between 01 June 1994 and 01 October 1997, three hundred forty nine Russian vessels were kept to wait at the entrance of the Turkish Straits costing 926,000 dollars.[163] The Russian Federation, Greece, Bulgaria,Ukraine and the Greek Cypriot prepared a report at IMO to limit the Turkish control over the Straits after the 1994 regulation. Nonetheless, the report was not issued.[164] Despite the arguments of drafters of the report some members of the Organization, namely the US, Japan, England, French, Malta and Bahama supported Turkey and argued that Turkey does everything cordially to provide the security of the Turkish Straits.[165]

Turkey revised the 1994 regulation in 1998 and this played an important role to soften relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.[166] As opposed to the Cold War years, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union the passage through the Turkish Straits was of great importance for the Russian Federation for the transfer of energy resources to the southern markets. The Russian preference was to transfer the oil resources through the Turkish Straits the cost of which is less compared to construction of new pipelines. Nonetheless, since it is almost impossible to carry all the Caspian oil through the Turkish Straits, construction of Samsun-Ceyhan oil pipeline began to be debated. Another alternative for the oil transportation in order to exclude the Straits has been Trans-Thrace route. It was one of the most important issues on the agenda of the President Vladimir Putin in his planned but delayed official visit in 2004 because of the terrorist acts at Oshetia.

---

[162] Cohen, Ariel; "The New 'Great Game': Oil Politics in the Caucasus and Central Asia", 25 January 1996, http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/BG1065.cfm.
[163] Akgün, Mensur; "Boğazlar Gündemde", http://www.turkishpilots.org.tr/HABERLER/yyuzyil1.html.
[164] *Hürriyet*, 12 May 1998.
[165] *Hürriyet*, 12 May 1998.
[166] *Milliyet*, 04 December 1998.

Now, the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in Central Asia and Caucasus, which have importance for energy transition, thus closely interrelated with the issues of cooperation at the Black Sea and the use of Turkish Straits will be discussed below.

3.4. Turkish – Russian Relations in the Caucasus and Central Asia

The emergence of a power vacuum in Central Asia and Transcaucasus following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, created Turkey and Iran as two regional powers in the region to fill this power gap. Turkey had almost no relations with Central Asia and Caucasus througout the Cold War years. Nonetheless, Turkey's ethnical, linguistic and cultural ties with these Turcic republics and its position as a democratic country convinced not only the Russian Federation but also the Western powers to perceive Turkey as a model country in Eurasia. Accordingly, Turkey became one of the first countries to recognize the successor states of the Soviet Union in 1991. Turkish Foreign Ministry was quick to respond to the changes in the region and sent a team of diplomats and to establish diplomatic representations in each country as sign of the desire to conduct close relations.[167] Turkey began to follow a policy of pro-activism and left the Moscow-centered stance aside.[168] The fact that the Russian Federation was quick to direct itself to the Western policies also played an important role to determine Turkish policies. The Russian Federation has been criticized for this policy and it was argued that a crucial time spent for the Western oriented policies by Russians that could have been used to improve relations with the former territories of the Soviet Union.[169]

Declaring itself as a natural link between the former territories of the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, Turkey encouraged other states to support its leading role in

---

[167] Henze, Paul B.; "Turkey Toward The Twenty-First Century" in *Turkey's New Geopolitics* (ed. by Fuller, Graham and Lesser, Ian), Santa Monica CA: 1993, RAND Corporation, p.86.
[168] *Ibid.*, p.29.
[169] *Gorbachev Türkiye'de: İstanbul ve Ankara Konferansları*, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş., İstanbul: Altan Matbaacılık Ltd.Şti., 1997, p.90.

the region.[170] In a sense, Turkey's problem of integration process to the Western world and the historical identity crisis as a Muslim but a non-Arab country and the widening foreign trade deficit pressurized Turkey to establish close ties with its 'North', meaning not only the Russian Federation but also the Caucasus and Central Asia.[171] The role played by Turkey in Caucasus and Central Asia was both political and economic. The political aim of Turkey was to establish a Turcic world extending from Adriatic to the Great Wall. Economically, Turkey tried to play the role of a 'truste' for these newly independent states in their efforts to establish economic ties with the rest of the world. Turkey acted as a bridge between the West and the post Soviet area, to keep the hard currency through the sales of energy resources, pursuing economic benefits and geo-strategic interests by gaining access to these new markets, and to test the idea of unifying the Turkic world from Balkans to China under the Turkish leadership. By investing in the fields of education, transportation, communication, industrial production and construction; and by sharing its economic experience in banking, budgeting, taxation, customs and insurance Turkey involved actively in these republics.[172]

Being obsessed with the Westernization process, the Russian Federation too, was happy and satisfied with the Turkish interference in the region at the very beginning. Despite the fact that Turkish involvement in these Turcic republics may cause a potential challenge to Moscow's traditional influence and interests in Eurasia[173] the Russian Federation considered Turkey as the only physical and the political tie between the Trans-Atlantic and the Eurasian systems; and in part underestimated the

---

[170] Carley, M. Patricia; "Turkey and Central Asia: Reality Comes Calling"in *Regional Power Rivalries in the New Eurasia RussiaTurkey and Iran* (ed.by Rubinstein, Alvin Z. and Smolansky, Oles M.), New York: M.E.Sharp, Inc., 1995, p. 185-186.

[171] Ataöv, Türkkaya; "Turkey's Expanding Relations with the CIS and Eastern Europe" in *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects* (ed. Clement H. Dodd), Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press, 1992, pp. 88-110.

[171] Urazova, Elena; "Russia and Turkey: Eurasian Integration Process", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.86.

[172] *Ibid.*, p.87.

[173] Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu; "Turkish-Russian Relations: The Challenges of Reconciling Geopolitical Competition with Economic Partnership", *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2000, Volume 1, Number 1, p.60.

Turkish challenge. The successor states of the Union were seen as an economic and political burden till the midst of 1990s; and the priority was given to integration with the West. The aim of integration was accompanied by the idea of gradual membership in the Western organizations and institutions. Russians did not want to waste their resources and manpower in conflicts and struggles outside their territory, which do not have any direct relevance to them.

Though some in the Russian Federation felt threatened by Turkey after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, some others thought that Islamic fundamentalism of Iran was more threatening since it may affect not only the former republics of the Soviet Union but also the Russian Federation where about 19 million Muslims live. Under these conditions, the Russian Federation considered Turkey as guarantee of democracy, secularism and the establishment of free market economy in the region.

Being disappointed by the Westernization process, however, the Russian Federation tried to refill the gap and re-exert its influence and control in Eurasia from 1993 onwards. The aim of creating a "belt of friendly states" surrounding its territories to neutralize the effects of security vacuum in the region and to prevent the interfrence of any other regional or global powers in its periphery were determinants of the new Russian foreign policy thinking. The Russian Federation, thus, became more critical of Turkey's existence in the region and considered Turkey as the extension of American policies. As a reaction to increasing Western influence in the region the Russian Federation strengthened its ties with Iran at the expense of relations with Turkey and the US.

The attitude of Turcic states were also fairly good in the first years of independence despite having lost all privileges provided to them by the Soviet Union. They were still dependent on the Russian Federation to integrate the Western markets as independent states that[174] Turkey was seen as a remedy to break this chain of

[174] Urazova, Elena; "Russia and Turkey: Eurasian Integration Process", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.86.

dependency. After centuries of Russian colonization and now the Soviet totalitarian rule, they were pleased with the Turkish attention.[175] Turkey's support for them in the process of decolonization was seen as an opportunity to prove the world how they were different from the Russian Federation linguistically and culturally, and how different were their traditions and histories. They were pleased with the role played by Turkey in the region.[176]

Nonetheless, even the desire of the successor states of the Soviet Union and Turkey's support for them to join the Western world could not prevent the failure of Turkey. Though Turkey's support and assistance contributed much to them, Turkey's capacity for acting as a leading power in the region was insufficient. Turkey quite often served as a conduit for Western interests in the region and participated in projects initiated by the US and the western powers.[177] The Russian media too, often considered Turkey, first as a tool of the US foreign policy in the region and secondly as a tool which is set on "meddling in the Caucasus and Central Asia" or is trying to weaken Russia".[178] Moreover the Russian Federation was still considered as the main force to be dealt with. The political and economic dependence on the Russian Federation and the Russian determination not to leave the control of resources demonstrates that no other country could impose its hegemony in these territories.[179]

---

[175] Carley, M. Patricia; "Turkey and Central Asia: Reality Comes Calling"in *Regional Power Rivalries in the New Eurasia RussiaTurkey and Iran* (ed.by Rubinstein, Alvin Z. and Smolansky, Oles M.), New York: M.E.Sharp, Inc., 1995, p.187.

[176] Ebulfez Elchibey, the president of Azerbaijan, stated in a speech that they '... have fifty million Turkish brothers in Anatolia' and that they 'have chosen Turkey as a model' for their state. Likewise, Islam Karimov, the President of Uzbekistan, on his visit to Turkey stated that "Our model is Turkey; we will establish our state according to this model". The leader of Kyrgzystan, Askar Akayev said that Turkey was like a morning star showing the true path to other Turks.

[177] Urazova, Elena; "Russia and Turkey: Eurasian Integration Process", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.86.

[178] Aksay, Hakan; "Turkish-Russian Relations: The Role of the Media", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.135.

[179] Carley, M. Patricia; "Turkey and Central Asia: Reality Comes Calling"in *Regional Power Rivalries in the New Eurasia RussiaTurkey and Iran* (ed.by Rubinstein, Alvin Z. and Smolansky, Oles M.), New York: M.E.Sharp, Inc., 1995, p.192.

Moscow was not too late to leave its policy of "laissez faire" in the region and instead preferred a more direct involvement with the fear of loosing its control over the former territories of the Soviet Union. Thus the Russian policy in Caucasus is considered to be shift from "abandonment" and "withdrawalism" in 1991-1992, through "chaotic involvement" in 1992-1993, to a new assertiveness in 1993-1994.[180] The shift from the chaotic involvement to the new assertiveness in 1993-1994 redirected the Russian foreign policy and the Russian Federation began to establish "coalition with the local elites" than a Moscow centered control in the region with the aim of taking advantage of power vacuums caused by instabilities among local elites. This policy also weakened the effectiveness of other external actors in post Soviet territories.[181]

The Russian Near Abroad policy assumes that the national interests of the Russian Federation lies in its former territories because of the historical, ethnic, economic, military and strategic ties, and the Russian population living in the former republics of the Soviet Union.[182] Moreover existence of the Russian Federation will be a key to increasing role and effectiveness of the Russian Federation in Eurasia in the post Cold War era. The Russian interest in its Near Abroad can be explained on three grounds:[183] to impose pressure on Georgia and Azerbaijan in order to increase vulnerability of these countries to destabilization after current presidents, Secondly, to provide Ukraine's return to some sort of a special Slavic relationship with Moscow be encouraged and lastly to pressurize the Baltic States not to be a NATO member on the grounds that they were once part of the Soviet Union. The first has direct effects on Turkey since it was difficult for Turkey to compete with the Russian Federation and the reasons for the US to support Turkish existence in Eurasia were not enough.

---

[180] Trenin, Dmitri; "Russian Security Interests and Policies in the Caucasian Region" (ed. by Coppieters, Bruno) in *Contested Borders in the Caucasus*, Brussels: VUB University Press, 1996, p.101.

[181] Tanrısever, Oktay F.; "Sovyet-Sonrası Dönemde Rusya'nın Kafkasya Politikası" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları* (ed. by Türkeş, Mustafa and Uzgel, İlhan), İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002, p.386.

[182] Bal, İdris; *Turkey's Relations with the West and the Turkic Republics: The Rise and Fall of the "Turkish Model"*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000, p.129.

[183] Brzezinski, Zbigniev; "Living with Russia", *National Interest*, Fall 2000, Issue 61, p.9-10.

Russia tried to please its people not happy with the political and the economic reforms and this tried to satisfy the public by use of foreign policy issues. However, it can be argued that there is an obvious disconnect between the leadership's ends and the country's means since today's Russia is simply too weak to establish regional domination while reclaiming super power status. [184]

The increasing influence of the Russian Federation in the region also considered to have relation with the ineffectiveness of international organizations to provide security in the region. Its being more influential than Turkey and Iran in the region, always force the former republics to take into account the Russian aspect in their foreign policy making.[185]

Additionally, being dependent on goods and resources of the former republics of the Soviet Union, Russia tried to preserve it relations with these countries.[186] The possible spill over effect of any ethnic conflicts in the region put the security of Caucasus and Central Asia made the stability in the region became so important for the Russian Federation since may have that may give harm to other states. On the other hand, these territories provided the Russian Federation a great opportunity for investment because of the steady demand for certain goods in the region. Nonetheless, since the federation does not have much raw materials and resources other than oil and gas this demand will need a steady outside supply. So, the geographic location of the region at the crossroads of energy transition lines to the west makes it a crucial region for the Russian Federation. The military concerns and interests of the Russian Federation are in a tendency to decline now and if there is to be any military existence it is preferred to be a defensive one. Russia wants to keep its forces in the region in order to avoid negative effects of the security vacuum in its 'near abroad'. The Russian efforts to gain political obedience in Central Asian states

[184] *Ibid.*, p.10.
[185] Tanrısever, Oktay F.; "Sovyet-Sonrası Dönemde Rusya'nın Kafkasya Politikası" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları* (ed. by Türkeş, Mustafa and Uzgel, İlhan), İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002, p.389.
[186] Trenin, Dmitri; "Russian Security Interests and Policies in the Caucasian Region" (ed. by Coppieters, Bruno) in *Contested Borders in the Caucasus*, Brussels: VUB University Press, 1996, p.96

by means of economic warfare determined the capacities of Turkey in this power struggle putting the former into a privileged position and excluding Turkey from this competition and preventing it to gain power. In this respect the issue of energy was used by the Russian Federation to exert its influence in the region again.

The US and the EU approach concerning Turkey's existence in the region, however, was positive since Turkey may be a model for these countries. The Western powers too feared that the "geopolitical vacuum" emerged in the region after the demise of the Soviet Union may be filled by an anti-western or a revolutionary kind of Iranian Islam. In addition, the rise of the Russian Federation as a neo- imperial power was also considered as a possible threat for the West. So they supported and promoted the Turkish model of secularism, multi-party system, and western oriented image for the Central Asian republics. In time, however, even the Western support for the Turkish model declined.[187] Having understood the real conditions of the region, the West realized that besides its geo-strategic advantages in the region, Iran had geographical disadvantages in the region which makes it difficult for it to establish its hegemony. The belief that the Russian Federation does not have the desire to reestablish its power and control in the region after the demise of the Soviet Union, the fear of pan-Turkism and the armed struggle of Turkey in Southeastern Anatolia were the causes of declining support for Turkish existence in the region. EU countries thought that Turkish activism in the region may cause the reeemergence of pan- Turkism, a threatening situation that may result in Turkey's exclusion from the EU and may turn the country into an 'independent regional super power'. Nonetheless, despite the fact that some politicians and bureaucrats in Turkey advocate the idea of pan-Turkism, the official policy rejected such claims at all grounds. In one of his speeches president Demirel declared that the aim of pan-Turkism and the idea of uniting all Turcic-

[187] Bal, İdris; *Turkey's Relations with the West and the Turkic Republics: The Rise and Fall of the "Turkish Model"*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000, pp.129-130.

speaking nations was utopian[188] and so the Turkish aim was not the reestablishment of Pan- Turkism.

> 'All we want is that these countries should be on their own feet. In the last one thousand years, the people of Central Asia have never gathered under one government. Let us have several governments, and having the same culture, the same languages, then all of us are happy'.[189]

Chapter Three focused on the political relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation since the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The next chapter will be focusing on security related issues between the two countries.

[188] Hyman, Anthony; Political Change in post-Soviet Central Asia, London: Russian and CIS Programme, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1994, p.16.
[189] *International Herald Tribune*, 24 March 1992.

CHAPTER FOUR

SECURITY DIMENSIONS OF TURKISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

The collapse of the Soviet Union gave an end to the Cold War and so to the military confrontation between the Eastern and the Western bloc. Given the absence of threat of communism the roles played by Turkey and the Russian Federation were reconsidered. In Cold War years Turkey acted as the last point of the Western camp to defend interests of NATO members and the Soviet Union was the leading actor in the communist bloc. So the cooperation between these two powers was limited not only in military issues but also in other fields of relations. Beginning from 1990s, however, Turkey and the Russian Federation as parts of a new system were forced to cooperate and peacefully coexist in Eurasia. Though there were times at which Turkey and the Russian Federation confronted each other, establishment of good relations always add to welfare and the security of the region.

In that respect this chapter will analyze the military and security relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet Era. Firstly, Chapter Four will explore the military and the technical cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation since the end of the Cold War. Then the question of Cyprus in Turkish-Russian relations will be discussed. Thirdly, domestic terror faced by Turkey and the Russian Federation and their perceptions of terror on the territory of each other will be investigated. Lastly, the impact and the importance of September 11 to bind

Turkey and the Russian Federation in fight against international terrorism will be discussed.

4.1. Military and Technical Cooperation in Turkish – Russian Relations

Military and technical cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation has been one of the most important areas of cooperation. The Russian Federation thus focused on the sale of Russian arms, materials and armory to Turkey. Additionally joint production of arms and technical military tools, and construction of Ka-50-2-Kamov Helicopters and their sale to the third countries has been at the top of the Russian agenda since the disintegration of the Soviet Union.[190] When Turkey and the Russian Federation signed an agreement to identify the main principles of relations on 25 May 1992, they declared each other as friendly states, and they promised to remain neutral in case one of them were attacked by a third power.[191] Additionally, they declared that Turkey and the Russian Federation would do its best to stop a possible attack and the harmful effects of any attack at UN or at other international organizations.

The Russian Federation has been the second largest supplier of arms and weapons in world following the USA. According to the statistics of the year 2004 the Russian revenue from the sale of arms was around 4,3 billion dollars.[192] Turkish Armed Forces paid 40 million dollars for the Russian military equipment and 146,5 million dollars of additional equipment and weapons in turn for the Russian debts to Turkey up to now.[193] In 20 April 1994, an inter-governmental agreement signed between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The agreement focused on cooperation in military and technical problems and cooperation in the field of defense industry. The

---

[190] Oğan, Sinan; "11 Eylül Sonrası Türk Dış Politikasında Rusya", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Bahar 2004, Volume 10, Issue 1, p.92.
[191] Cafersoy, Nazım; Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Avrasya Stratejik Diyalog Toplantısı 20-22 Ocak 2003 (ed.), Ankara: ASAM Yayınları, 2003, p.75.
[192] Ertan, Fikret; "Rus Silahları", *Zaman*, 31 August 2004.
[193] Cafersoy, Nazım; Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Avrasya Stratejik Diyalog Toplantısı 20-22 Ocak 2003 (ed.), Ankara: ASAM Yayınları, 2003, p.76.

agreement was not important only for enhancing cooperation between the two countries but also for being the first military agreement between a NATO member state and the Russian Federation. In May 2001 a commission responsible for military and technical cooperation was established in line with this agreement.

One of the recent issues concerning the military relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation is the ATA project, which aims to supply Turkey with 145 helicopters. The Russian Federation has been dealing with this issue since 1996. It was not only the Russian Federation interested in ATA project given the fact that the value of the project ranges between 2.5 billion dollars to 4.5 billion dollars. Besides the Russian-Israel cooperation, German-French Consortium and the USA too competed for helicopters. Turkey found too much to pay 4 billion dollars to the American helicopters that the Russian-Israeli helicopters were preferred. Turkey was to pay 2.25 billion dollars for the first 50 helicopters.[194] The fact that the Russian Federation did offer not only helicopters but also transfer of technology, joint production, and sale of those helicopters to the third countries made it much preferable compared to other participants in the bid.[195] Nonetheless, the bid was abolished and it has been argued that, political concerns have been effective in this issue. Then Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit, however, declared in an interview with a Turkish journalist Fikret Bila that it was not right to look for political criteria for the helicopter project since all participants in the bid were countries having close ties with Turkey.[196]

The participants were asked for new proposals in September 2004 with the aim of receiving the first group of helicopters in 2008. It was argued however that this time Turkey was to offer President Vladimir Putin to buy the Russian MI-28 helicopters instead of the Russian- Israel Ka-52 helicopters. Following President Vladimir Putin's visit to Turkey in 2004, understanding the Turkish sensitivities, the Russian

[194] "Helikopter İhalesi Rusya ve İsrail'in", *Yeni Safak*, 31 July 2002.
[195] *Radikal*, 06 December 2005.
[196] Bila, Fikret; *Milliyet,* "Helikopter İhalesi", 06 March 2000.

Federation declared that it will not work with Israel as a partner for the helicopter project; thus electronic warfare systems of the helicopters will not be produced by Israel. In January 2002 Turkey and the Russian Federation signed a military cooperation agreement. Accordingly Turkey and the Russian Federation agreed to exchange officers for training purposes and the Russian Federation prohibit terrorist organizations on its territory acting against Turkey.[197]

Another important issue between Turkey and the Russian Federation has been the question of Cyprus in relations. The next part will discuss the importance of Cyprus between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

4.2. The Question of Cyprus in Turkish – Russian Relations

The question of Cyprus in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation discussed in thesis given the fact that Cyprus has been of vital importance for Turkey's security perception. The island is not only important for the Mediterranean security but also for the Turkish population living on the island. Since the Turkish intervention to Cyprus, debates concerning the future of the island have always been one of the issues at the top of the Turkish foreign policy agenda. For the Russians too, the island has always been of essential importance to strengthen influence in Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.[198] Due to the fact that it could not be part of the Peace Force in the region in 1964 and the policies of the EU and the US, the Russian Federation could not actively involve in issues concerning Cyprus. Nonetheless, in critical times the Russian Federation acts in line with the Greek interests as it has been the case in sale of S-300 missiles and the use veto power concerning the Cyprus Plan at UN Security Council in 2004.[199]

---

[197] Freedman, Robert O.; "Putin and the Middle East", *Middle East Journal of International Affairs*, June 2002, Volume 6, Number 2, p.11.
[198] Sezer, Sema; "Rusya Federasyonu ve Kıbrıs", 19 July 2005, http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=55.
[199] *Ibid.*.

The intend of a Russian company to sell S-300 missiles to the Greek Cypriot caused a problem in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in 1997 given the fact that such an attempt would be against the security interests of Turkey and the stability on the island. The Russian company Rosvoorusheniye agreed to sell a sophisticated surface–to-air missile system, the SAM-300-PMU-1 to the Greek Cypriot government the total value of which was 660 million dollars.[200] The company used to sell helicopters also to Turkey in January 1997 for use against Kurdish terrorists whereas at the same time, the Russian Foreign Ministry was supporting the Kurdish rebellions by allowing them to work and organize actively in Moscow.[201] The Greek Cypriot declared that missiles would be deployed by defensive means in order to protect the Southern part of the island, the fact that 150 km range of missiles reaches southern part of Turkey caused a problem. If deployed the missiles were to restrict Turkish air maneuverability.

It is argued that the Russian anxiety to sell these missiles to the Greek Cypriot was not commercial. On the contrary the Russian aim was to intimidate Turkey. Nonetheless, as opposed to the Turkish insistence Moscow argued that the sale of missiles was "a simple sale" by Rosvoorusheniye and was solely commercial.[202] Talking about great powers like the Russian Federation, however, it is almost impossible to believe that the Russian Federation may act without considering the outcomes of its acts. It was true also for sale of missiles since there is no doubt that the sale and the deployment of missiles to Cyprus would worry Turkey seriously. The Russian insistence to sell missiles to Cyprus was seen as part of the competition with Turkey in Central Asia and in Caucasus. Believing that Turkey supports the Chechen rebellions on its territory, the Russian Federation used the sale of missiles to Greek Cypriot as another trump other than the Kurdish card.[203] So the Russian attempt was

---

[200] Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, 5, p.197.
[201] Freedman, Robert O.; "Russia and the Middle East: The Primakov Era", *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, May 1998, Volume 2, Number 2, p.6.
[202] "Türkiye'ye Gözdağı", *Milliyet*, 08 January 1997.
[203] *Ibid.*.

considered as an intimidation specifically to Turkey and generally to the Western world trying to isolate the Russian Federation.[204]

In an interview with a Turkish daily, Milliyet, before his planned visit to Turkey on 14 December 1997, the Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin declared that the Russian Federation will not abolish the sale of missiles and he declared that the sale of missiles should be considered just as a trade agreement with a sovereign and a legal government.[205] The Prime Minister Chernomyrdin repeated once again that S-300 missiles were solely defensive in nature that they would not change the balance of power on the island.[206]

Under these conditions it is expected that the Russian Federation may interfere if there is to be any development against interests of the Greek Cypriot. The close ties of the Russian Federation with Cyprus may provide the latter a friend in the UN Security Council and the arms purchases may add some increment to deterrence; but Cyprus should not wait more than this from the Russian Federation. Despite the fact that the Russian Federation and Turkey have been at odds for centuries, it is still considered to be unwise for the Russian Federation to involve in closer relations with Cyprus and risk direct involvement in an "intra-NATO" war or in a war with Turkey.[207] The Russian Federation had to take into account its relations with Turkey given the current situation of Turkish-Russian economic and trade partnership that softened its position regarding the issue of Cyprus.[208]

It was not only Turkey worried about the Greek Cypriot's purchasing of S-300 missiles. On 06 January 1997, the US too criticized the Greek Cypriot severely for

---

[204] *Ibid.*.
[205] "Rusya'dan S-300 Resti", *Milliyet*, 11 December 1997.
[206] *Ibid.*.
[207] Lindley, Dan; "UNFICYP and a Cyprus Solution: A Strategic Assesment", May 1997, p.10, http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:UKX2BKyikmAJ:web.mit.edu/ssp/Publications/working_papers/wp97-1.pdf+dan+lindley&hl=tr.
[208] Sezer, Sema; "Rusya Federasyonu ve Kıbrıs", 19 July 2005, http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=55.

purchasing of S-300 missiles.[209] It was also argued that during Turkish Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz's visit to the US, the American President Bill Clinton guaranteed that the sale of missiles to Greek Cypriot would be prevented.[210] The Americans too were sharing the Turkish worries that deployment of missiles may harm the security of the island and the Russian attempt was considered as a provocative act on the island undermining the efforts to find a solution on the island.[211] The American pressures played an important role and in the end the missiles were deployed to Crete instead of Cyprus. The US support was not to annoy the Greek Cypriot; but rather was the result of the American efforts to prevent a conflict between Turkey and Greece, a fact that will not benefit any of these two countries, the US and NATO.

The first sign of change in Russian policy concerning the issue of Cyprus was seen during the official visit of the Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül on 23-26 February 2004.[212] During his official visit to Turkey in June 2004, the Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov too declared that activities of the Russian companies interested to invest at the Turkish Cypriot would not be limited. On the contrary, official visit of Erdoğan to Moscow in January 2005 was not satisfying for Turkey concerning the recent developments and the Russian attitude concerning these developments. Vladimir Putin declared that the Russian Federation was supporting the idea of solving the problems on the Cyprus Island by means of the Annan Plan, but yet he was still dignified about the abolition of economic isolation against the Northern Cyprus. Vladimir Putin did not speak definite regarding the draft submitted to the UN Security Council by Annan supporting the abolition of isolation against Cyprus and kept the veto card in hand. He argued that the rights of inhabitants living

[209] Uslu, Nasuh; "The Cyprus Question between 1974 and 2004 and its Relation to Turkish Foreign Policy" in Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era (ed. By Bal, İdris), Florida: Brown Walker Press, 2004, p.229.
[210] *Ibid.*.
[211] *Ibid.*, p.230.
[212] "Rusya'yla Derin Ortaklık", *Radikal* 26 February 2004.

both at the Northern part and the southern part should be protected; and the isolation against North was not just".[213]

Having analyzed the importance of question of Cyprus in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, the next part of the Chapter Four will be focusing on the issue of domestic terror, which is used as a destabilizing factor in Turkish-Russian relations.

4.3. Fight against Terrorism and Relations between Turkey and Russia

Going back, however, Turkey and the Russian Federation do not have a good record of each other concerning fight against terrorism and cooperation to end up this problem. On the contrary, it has been argued that Turkey and the Russian Federation used terrorist groups on the territory of each other as a destabilizing factor. In that respect, it was argued and proved on some occasions that the Russian Federation used PKK terror in Turkey and Turkey supported Chechen separatists in the Russian Federation. Turkey and the Russian Federation blamed each other for giving support to separatist movements on the territory of each other.

While the Russian Federation was fighting against the Chechen rivals to prevent their separatist acts and to secure importance of the region as a potential for energy transportation, there was the impression that Turkey was supporting Chechens on the Russian territory.[214] Despite the fact that, the issue of pipeline competition is not enough by itself to explain the basis of conflict between Turkey and the Russian Federation concerning the Chechens and PKK, it is still one of the most important.[215] On the one hand, the Russian Federation was trying to neutralize the separatist movement in Chechnya to secure its interests in Caucasus; and on the other hand, the belief that Turkey was supporting Chechens provided the Russian Federation an opportunity to pacify Turkey not only in Chechen issue but also in other polices

[213] "Kıbrıs'a Temkinli Destek", *Radikal*, 12 January 2005.
[214] Karagiannis, Emmanuel; *Energy and Security in the Caucasus*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, p.101.
[215] *Ibid.*, p.109.

concerning Caucasian oils and Central Asia by use of PKK activities in Turkey.[216] Accordingly, the "Kurdish problem" emerged as a "counter attack" to balance the so called Turkish existence in the region.[217]

Even in Cold War years there was a concern about the Soviet involvement in Kurdish affairs on Turkish territory. Throughout the Cold War years, especially when PKK became active in late 1970s, the Soviet Union used the Kurdish problem against Turkey, a NATO member state.[218] Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Russian use of Kurdish problem was related to the Russian political and economic interests to keep the upper hand in Caucasus, more specifically and more importantly, with the Russian desire to keep transfer and utilization of the Caspian resources under control. In an interview in August 1993, the Russian ambassador declared that the Kurdish factor may be a possible threat against the Baku-Tbilis-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline Project, the Russian opposition to the proposed pipeline and the Russian aim became clear.[219] The second sign of the Russian relation with PKK was a conference titled "Kurdistan at the Crossroads of History and Politics" held in Moscow in February 1994.[220] The Kurdistan Committee organized the conference and the Kurdistan Liberation Front, which was affiliated with PKK and the co-organizer of the Conference, was the Russian Ministry of nationalities and Regional Policy.[221] Despite the Russian guarantee that Kurdish separatist groups in Turkey would not be supported, at a meeting with PKK Russian officials openly declared that PKK was not a terrorist organization and the Russian Federation should use the PKK and Kurdish problem against Turkey. Just after these developments Turkish and the

[216] *Ibid.*.
[217] *Ibid.*, p.101.
[218] *Ibid.*.
[219] *Ibid.*, p.102.
[220] Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, 5, p.197.
[221] *Ibid.*.

Russian journalists found a Kurdish camp supported by PKK in the Russian Federation.[222]

The link between Chechnya and Turkey, on the other hand, revealed for the first time in September 1992.[223] In a visit to Turkey, the Chechen President Dudayev stated that Turkey should help Chechens as a regional power.[224] Dudayev also declared that Chechnya was reconsidering the issue of recognizing the Turkish Republic of the Northern Cyprus. He visited Northern Cyprus and openly declared the desire of Chechens to cooperate with the Turkish Cypriot. The fact that there are about 7 millions of people in Turkey whose families originate in Caucasus and from among this group 25.000 Turkish citizens have Chechen descent plays an important role to determine Turkey's position regarding the issue of Chechens. Moreover, there has been a network of Caucasian Solidarity Associations in Turkey through which they pressurize Turkey to take a firmer stand against the Russian involvement and the military action against Chechens in the region. As a result, in the first Chechen war of 1994-1996, Chechens and the other Northern Caucasus diaspora groups in Turkey were thought to give active support to Chechens by providing money and by demonstrations.[225]

In 1995, the Turkish embassy in Moscow officially denied the Russian claim of any Turkish involvement in Chechen revolt against the Russian Federation and declared that Turkey was in favor of peaceful resolution of the Chechen attacks; and at the same time rejected allegations that Turkey provides medical care to Chechen fighters.[226] The accusations were not limited to medical care supplies to Chechens. Again in 1995, Turkey was accused for playing an integral role to secure weapons of

---

[222] Karagiannis, Emmanuel; *Energy and Security in the Caucasus*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, p.102.
[223] *Ibid.*,p.65.
[224] *Ibid.*.
[225] Hill, Fiona; "Seismic Shifts in Eurasia: The Changing Relationship between Turkey and Russia and Its Implications for the South Caucasus", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2003, p.60.
[226] Karagiannis, Emmanuel; *Energy and Security in the Caucasus*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, p.67.

the Chechen army.[227] It was argued that Turkey provided Chechens with large quantities of weapons in 1991 by receiving the Soviet weapons left in storehouses in Germany after the unification through the NATO channels; and transported them to Chechnya via Azerbaijan. It is considered, however, that if there is any Turkish contribution to the Chechen resistance, it could only be negligible and the belief that cutting of the resources can pacify the Chechens is thus not realistic.[228] As it is the case for the Russian Federation the Turkish policy concerning Chechnya was considered as the extension of the Turkish interest to control the route of the Azerbaijani oil to pass through the Turkish territory.

Turkey and the Russian Federation signed the "Protocol to Prevent Terrorism" in 1995 where the Russian Federation promised to forbid all acts of PKK on its territories and Turkey promised to stop pro-Chechen activities.[229] During an official visit to Turkey in January 1995, the Russian Federation affirmed once more that it will not allow the Kurdish house and PKK in Russia and Turkey too seemed to agree that it will be modest concerning the Russian re-existence in Caucasus.[230] Whereas the former Russian ambassador to Turkey and later Deputy Foreign Minister Albert Chernyshev considered the Kurdish problem as Turkey's internal affair in the past, in a speech in 1995 he said that Turkey and the Russian Federation should understand one another as people living in a glass house.[231] The words of the ambassador can be understood in two ways: On the one hand it describes mentality of relations between the two states; and on the other hand it makes clear that the PKK card is still on the agenda of the Russian Federation as a tool to pacify Turkey not only in foreign policy but also to get rid of the Turkish desires to establish the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline.

---

[227] *Ibid.*, pp.67- 68.
[228] Reynolds, Michael; "Russian-Turkish Relations and Chechnya", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p. 62.
[229] Karagiannis, Emmanuel; *Energy and Security in the Caucasus*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, p.103.
[230] *Ibid.*.
[231] *Ibid.*.

The tension between Turkey and the Russian Federation increased once again when the Russian Duma decided to host the third international conference of the so-called "Kurdistan Parliament" in exile in 1995. The "division" in Russian Duma concerning the use of Kurdish separatists, as a destabilizing factor in Turkey was a difficult task to find a solution for Turkey since Duma members were still in close relations with PKK. In 1996, in an official meeting with the President Demirel the Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin declared that the Russian Federation would stop any "political" PKK activity on its territory.

Nevertheless, the situation did not calm down. On 16 October 1996, nine Chechen militants seized hostages at a Black Sea ferry called "Avrasya Feribotu", carrying a large group of Russians inside and they threatened to blow up the ferry at Bosporus in order to draw attention to war in Chechnya. Russians too did not take the Kurdish resurgence in Turkey seriously and turned a blind eye to Kurdish associations based in Moscow with links to PKK. The Russian worries concerning Turkey's relations with Chechen separatists in the country worsened when Turkey allowed Chechens to open a mission in İstanbul in 1996. When this happened the Russian Federation was not late to warn that countries which allow Chechen missions to turn into permanent embassies will be considered to act against the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, thus will be openly involving in an unfriendly act against the Federation.[232] According to the Russian military doctrine any country threatening the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation was to declare war against the country.[233] In 1997 the Committee for Geopolitics of the Russian Duma organized a Conference with PKK members on the issue of cooperation between thee Russian and the Kurdish people.

---

[232] Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, 5, p.197.

[233] The New Russian Military Doctrine declares that the main challenge for the Russian Federation is the local and regional wars despite declined threat of nuclear and conventional wars. Accordingly the Russian Federation declared its "Near Abroad" which includes Caucasus and Central Asia as its vital interest area. Güney, Nurşin Ateşoğlu; "Rusya Federasyonu'nun Yeni Güvenlik Politikası Çerçevesinde Türkiye'ye Bakışı" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları*, İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002, p.341.

In 1998, the Russian Federation hosted the PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan who was deported from Syria increasing the tension between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The situation worsened when the Russian Duma rejected to give back the PKK leader to Turkey.[234] Nonetheless, the Russian Federation refused to provide sanctuary to PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan who was then arrested by Turkey. From 1999 onwards the Turkish reaction to the war in Chechnya changed too. As opposed to the past, this time Islamist groups in Turkey began to support Chechens and this worried Turkey since it may give rise to Islamic fundamentalism in the country. All these developments forced Turkey to make a radical change in its attitude.

Even in hot days of the conflict the economic relations between Turkey and the Russian were not affected. The volume of trade continued to increase till the 1998 economic crisis and increased from 3.394 to 4.230 billion dollars from 1996 to 1997. Moreover, the Blue Stream Agreement was signed on 29 August 1997, which was considered to be a turning point in relations. The economic interdependency forced Turkey and the Russian Federation to reconsider their relations and to conduct relations based on peaceful coexistence and cooperation.

In March 2001 Turkey and the Russian Federation signed an agreement of military collaboration[235] and just after the September 11 terrorist attacks in January 2002 Moscow and Ankara signed a military cooperation agreement during the visit of the Russian Chief of the General Staff, Anatoly Kvashnin to Turkey.[236] By this agreement both sides declared their willingness to prohibit the acts of terrorist organizations on their territory that may give harm to the other. September 11 too has been one of the important determinants to move Turkey and the Russian Federation

[234] Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, 5, p.197.
[235] Hill, Fiona; "Seismic Shifts in Eurasia: The Changing Relationship between Turkey and Russia and Its Implications for the South Caucasus", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2003, p.61.
[236] *Ibid.*, p.61.

closer concerning the Chechen policy.[237] The desired sensitivity of Turkey concerning the Chechen activities in the Russian Federation, however, is also expected from the Russian Federation concerning Russian attitude towards PKK.[238] The changed character of relations became obvious once again when in his delayed visit to Turkey in December 2004 the Russian President Vladimir Putin expressed his gratitude for Turkey's support to the Russian Federation concerning the terrorist attacks in the country.[239] Both countries declared their determination to deal together not only with terrorism, but also to fight against the spread of weapons of mass destruction, trade of drugs, illegal migration, human trafficking and organized crimes.[240] It has been considered that unless the Russian Federation begins to pose a threat to the Turkish security, by reactivating its ties with the PKK, there is no reason to assume that to reverse the course and to begin assisting the Chechens again as it was in the first war.[241]

As it is argued above, complex ethnic structure of Turkey and the Russian Federation has always been an important issue in relations. Especially the use of Chechen separatism in the Russian Federation and the PKK terror in Turkey played an important role in relations. Nonetheless, September 11 is an important issue in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation since they decided to fight against international terrorism. The fight against international terrorism increased the sensitivity of Turkey and the Russian Federation also to the domestic terror faced by these countries. Accordingly, the policy of using the Chechen and PKK card against each other began to change and Turkey and the Russian Federation created an opportunity to develop relations in other fields given the fact that traditional lack of

[237] Oğan, Sinan; "11 Eylül Sonrası Türk Dış Politikasında Rusya", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Bahar 2004, Volume 10, Issue 1, p.88.
[238] *Ibid.*.
[239] Güney, Nurşin Ateşoğlu; "Rusya Federasyonu'nun Yeni Güvenlik Politikası Çerçevesinde Türkiye'ye Bakışı" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları*, İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002
[240] "Rusya ile Yeni Dönem", *Radikal*, 07 December 2005.
[241] Reynolds, Michael; "Russian-Turkish Relations and Chechnya", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.61.

trust began to be replaced by partnership. Below, September 11 and its effects on relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation will be focused on.

4.4. Fight against International Terrorism since September 11

September 11 can be considered as a case to test workability of partnerships and alliances within the international community that will provide new opportunities and further cooperation among different actors.[242] When the planes hit the Twin Towers on 11 September 2001 the Russian President Vladimir Putin was the first leader to condemn the terrorist attacks by calling the US President George W. Bush. President Vladimir Putin declared that the Russian Federation well understood the tragedy in the US being a victim of terrorism itself.[243] Taking these into account it is not wrong to say that the decision of President Vladimir Putin's decision to side with the US after September 11 in fight against terrorism was not just the result of the Russian desire for economic modernization. The Russian Federation too, had experienced its own September 11 two years before when Chechen separatists bombed apartment buildings and two other cities.[244] The recent events in Beslan, causing death of 330 people many of whom are small school children also puts the Russian Federation into the same camp with the US in fight against terrorism. In an interview with Guardian, President Vladimir Putin declared that though they believe in Russia time heals everything, there are things that Russians cannot forget and which must not be forgotten[245] making clear once again that any terrorist act not only on its territories but also behind their territories will not be allowed.

Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer and Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit too conveyed their condolences to President Bush and declared that attacks were

---

[242] Moustakis, Fotios and Ackerman, Ella; "September 11: A Dynamic for Russo-Turkish Co-operation or Conflict", *Central Asian Survey*, Volume 21, Number 4, 2002, p.423.
[243] *Ibid.*, p.429.
[244] Trenin, Dimitri; "Southern Watch: Russia's Policy in Central Asia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, Volume 56, Issue 2, p.123.
[245] *Guardian,* 12 September 2002.

reprehensible.[246] Additionally, President Ahmet Necdet Sezer stated that the Turkish people feel the pain of the Americans.[247] Turkey too has been so sensitive concerning the issue of terrorism given the fact that it has been coping with PKK terrorism in Turkey since early 1980s. The similarities in Russian and Turkish view of terrorism not only as a domestic threat, but as a global one moved Turkey and the Russian Federation much closer and for the first time in the post Cold War they united against the same enemy.

Since Russian President Vladimir Putin was convinced that the north-south divide became the main axis of new threat not only for the Russian Federation; but also for Europe and the USA has been one of the reasons of change in the Russian policy.[248] Concerning the new developments on world it would be one of the greatest mistakes for Europe to consider and evaluate the situation in Chechnya just in terms of ethnic separatism and human rights abuses President Vladimir Putin argues.[249] Turkish approach to September 11 was not different too. The realities of the Eurasia and the new millennium forced Turkey and the Russian Federation to find out new areas cooperation and partnership; and the common understanding of Turkey and the Russian Federation motivated them to cooperate in fight against international terrorism.[250]

In that respect, after September 11 attacks one of the most important developments in relations has been the signature of "The Plan of Action to Develop Cooperation between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey" which was signed in

[246] Embassy of the Republic of Turkey in the Washington D.C., 11 September 2001, http://www.turkishembassy.org/pressreleases/sept11.htm.
[247] *Ibid.*.
[248] Trenin, Dimitri; "Southern Watch: Russia's Policy in Central Asia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, Volume 56, Issue 2, p.123.
[249] *Ibid.*,.
[250] Moustakis, Fotios and Ackerman, Ella; "September 11: A Dynamic for Russo-Turkish Co-operation or Conflict", *Central Asian Survey*, Volume 21, Number 4, 2002, p.431.

New York on 16 November 2001.[251] The document calls for cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation in many issues including establishment of stability in Eurasia and the issue of international terrorism causing problems between the two countries considered as an area of cooperation in the Action Plan. This is an important development since the issue of international terrorism and the Chechen and the Kurdish terrorism was causing problems between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

Chapter Four of the thesis explained and analyzed the military and security related issues between Turkey and the Russian Federation. In that respect the effect of September 11 to create cooperation against international terrorism, Chechen and PKK terror, the sale of Russian arms to Cyprus and military and technical cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation are focused on. The following chapter, Chapter Five of the thesis will focus on economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. In that respect trade relations, activities of the Turkish construction companies in the Russian Federation, the increasing importance of the tourism sector and the vital importance of energy relations as the backbone of the economic relations will be explored.

[251] The Plan of Action was not signed as respond to the September 11 attacks. It was planned long before the terrorist attack in the US. Since the Plan was signed after September 11, however, an emphasis has been made for cooperation against international terrorism.

CHAPTER FIVE

DYNAMICS OF TURKISH-RUSSIAN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

The economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation played a pioneer role to develop and improve relations in other fields. The shuttle trade between the two countries, which were replaced by registered trade in time, the activities of Turkish construction companies on the Russian territory, the increasing number of Russian tourists preferring Turkey for their vacations and more importantly the production and transition of energy resources of Eurasia to the Western markets has been at the core of economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The economic relations play a vital role to replace the traditional belief that there has been lack of trust in Turkish-Russian relations and that the relations were conflictual. On the contrary, the economic relations between the two add too much to create trust and cooperation, and to replace the bilateral relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation with multidimensional partnership. Chapter Five of the thesis, thus, will focus on dynamics of the Turkish-Russian economic relations in the post Soviet Era.

5.1. Trade Relations

Complementary character of the Turkish and the Russian economies played an important role to develop trade and economic relations in the second half of 1980s

and 1990s in various sectors.[252] Nonetheless, the beginning of economic relations go back to the 1930s and are based on the Trade and Navigation Agreement signed on 8 October 1937 and the Agreement on Trade and Economic Cooperation signed on 25 February 1991. Agreement on Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Agreements and the Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation signed on 15 December 1997 are also crucial to shape the economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

Nonetheless, from among series of agreements, 1984 Natural Gas Agreement has been a corner stone in economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Turkey promised to buy the Russian gas for twenty five years beginning from 1987 by the 1984 Natural Gas Agreement. It was not just an energy agreement, however, since Turkey paid seventy percent of the gas by Turkish goods and services. This clause of the Agreement changed in time and the amount of seventy percent was reduced to seven percent in recent years. Agreement on Blue Stream Pipeline Project and the Agreement on the Extension of the Western Lines does not include any clauses allowing Turkey to pay in goods and services.

Turkey exports manufactured goods to the Russian Federation and they include textiles, chemicals, vehicles and food. In return, Turkey imports raw materials, natural gas, oil and metals being at the first place. In 2003 the iron-steel products constituted 19.7 percent, clothing and textile 12.5 percent, fruits and vegetables 12.2 percent and land transportation vehicles 6.3 percent of the Turkish exports to the Russian Federation. [253] The fact that most of the Turkish exported goods are manufactured goods and thus have high elasticity with the exception of iron-steel products makes Turkey more vulnerable in economic relations with the Russian Federation.

---

[252] Kazgan, Gülten; "A Survey of Turkish-Russian Economic Relations in the 1990s", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.101.

[253] "Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri Hakkında Not", T.C. Moskova Büyükelçiliği Ticaret Müşavirliği, http://www.dtmos.ru/pic/files_6/file_2.pdf.

The amount of trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation grows steadily since the end of the Cold War. From 1992 to October 2004 the amount of trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation increased from about 1,482.7 million dollars to 8,445.1 million dollars. The fact that unregistered trade between the two has been under control in recent years played an important role in this increase. In 1993 the volume of trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation was around 1.5 billion dollars and the number increased to 4.2 billion dollars in 1997. Between 1993 and 1997 the trade revenues of Turkey and the Russian Federation were relatively equal. It is also important to notice that between 1991 and 1998, 138 Turkish firms were actively working on 533 projects with a total value of 9.246 billion dollars in the Russian Federation and the Russian Federation accounted for 42 percent of all contractor services provided by Turkish firms.[254]

Nonetheless, when the 1998 economic crisis hit the Russian Federation the amount of Turkish exports to the Russian Federation declined sharply. Before the economic crisis, Russian Federation was the second among trade partners of Turkey. In 1998, Turkish exports to the Russian Federation declined by 34.4 percent and in 1999 by 56.3 percent.[255] On the contrary, the amount of the Russian exports to Turkey continued to increase even in the years of crisis. Turkey's increasing energy dependency on the Russian Federation was an important cause of the negative balance of trade on the Turkish side. Accordingly Turkish imports from the Russian Federation decreased just by one percent in 1998 and continued to increase by 10.2 percent in 1999 and by 63.2 percent in 2000 causing a peak at the trade deficit between the two.[256]

In 2001, a financial crisis in Turkey changed the course of trade relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Devaluation in Turkey created a competitive

---

[254] Kireev, Nikolay G.; "Turkish Views on Eurasian Collaboration", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.121.
[255] Şen, Cihangir Gürkan; "Türkiye – Rusya Federasyonu Ekonomik ve Ticari İlişkileri", Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen (RTİB), http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=19.
[256] *Ibid.*.

environment on behalf of the Turkish exporting companies that beginning from year 2000 Turkish exports to the Russian Federation began to increase again.[257] In year 2000, Turkish exports increased by more than 9.3 percent and in 2001 by 43.3 percent. Turkish imports from the Russian Federation, however, declined by about 10.6 and the overall imports by 25.7 in 2001. Turkish imports from the Russian Federation were not affected much given the fact that Turkish imports from the Russian Federation had low elasticity, as it is the case for energy resources and raw materials.[258] In 2002, the Russian Federation was the sixth among countries to which Turkey exports goods and the third among countries to which Turkey imports goods from.[259]

The total volume of trade between the two countries was around 10.860 million dollars in 2004. The distribution of revenues, however, is not balanced since the Russian exports to Turkey are more than four times of the Turkish exports to the Russian Federation. In 2004 the biggest share of the Russian imports from Turkey were composed of manufactured goods with the share of 84 percent. The Turkish imports from the Russian Federation on the contrary were composed of energy resources and raw materials, goods having low elasticity. In 2004, 41 percent of Turkish imports from the Russian Federation were composed of energy resources and it is followed by iron and steel industry with the share of nineteen percent.

There are four causes of the current trade imbalance between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Firstly, the increasing natural gas consumption of Turkey from the Russian Federation and the increase in world energy prices caused a difficulty for Turkey. Secondly, as mentioned before, the 1998-1999 economic crisis hit the Russian Federation in such a sense that ruble was devaluated by 75 percent causing a sharp decline in Russian imports from Turkey. Following the crisis, the Russian

---

[257] *Ibid.*.
[258] "Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri Hakkında Not", T.C. Moskova Büyükelçiliği Ticaret Müşavirliği, http://www.dtmos.ru/pic/files_6/file_2.pdf.
[259] Şen, Cihangir Gürkan; "Türkiye – Rusya Federasyonu Ekonomik ve Ticari İlişkileri", Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen (RTİB), http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=19.

Federation decided to issue import substitution policy and began to produce some of the imported materials in domestic markets. It became competitive in textiles and food industry. The tax exemptions provided by the CIS countries to the Russian Federation, financially strong European countries ready to enter the Russian markets, and plus The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the Russian Federation and EU also work against Turkish manufacturers, as the third cause of imbalance in economic relations. Lastly, the low quality Turkish products, which entered the Russian Federation in the first half of the 1990s through shuttle trade, caused a negative impression in the Russian Federation about the quality of the Turkish goods. Despite the negative increase in the volume of trade on the Turkish side, the 2001 devaluation in Turkey increased competency of Turkish firms in Russian markets and this caused an increase in exports to the Russian Federation. In 2003 and 2004, however, the rise in imports continued to exceed the rise in exports causing a growing trade deficit on the side of Turkey. In the first two months of 2004 Turkey faced 948 million dollars of trade deficit due to the increase in price of raw petroleum and natural gas.[260]

As it is mentioned above the shuttle trade has been considered as one of the causes of decline in Russian demand for Turkish goods given the fact the goods exported by shuttle trade were usually not qualified. Nonetheless, shuttle trade occupies a vital place in economic relations between the two countries. Shuttle trade played a functional role to shape the bilateral economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation not only because of billions of dollars entering the Turkish territory but also for the opportunities encouraging the establishment of small businesses and the employment of a number of people in these businesses.[261] The amount of the shuttle trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation was extremely high in the second half of the 1990s compared to today. In 1996 the

[260] "Rusya-Türkiye: Dış Ticaret Açık Veriyor", Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen, http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=82.
[261] "Türkiye – Rusya Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri", DEİK / Türk-Rus İş Konseyi, p.5, http://www.deik.org.tr/ikili/2005715101621Rusya-ikiliiliskiler-temmuz2005.doc.

amount of unregistered trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation was 8.842 billion dollars. In 2004, however, the number declined by more than fifty percent back to 3,800 billion dollars.

Nonetheless, despite the economic crisis of 1998 most of the Turkish companies continued to work in the Russian Federation and gained a sound place in the market as opposed to the other foreign companies.[262] Beginning from 1997, however, there has been a decline in shuttle trade between Turkey and the Russian Federation the causes of which can be classified as follows.[263] Firstly, relatively lower prices of other countries' goods such as China, United Arab Emirates and Poland became much attractive for the Russian Federation. Secondly, the membership process of the Russian Federation in International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) forced it to put some restrictions on shuttle trade and unregistered economy. IMF forced the Russian Federation to take measures in order to increase the tax incomes that the Russian Federation tried to establish custom's control and to prevent shuttle trade.[264] In 1997, the total amount of shuttle trade realized by the Russian Federation was around 15 billion dollars and the Turkey's share was between 4-5 billion dollars. In 1998, the import of goods by shuttle trade caused billions of dollars tax deficit in the Russian Federation and this forced the Russian Federation to put some restrictions on shuttle trade.[265] The economic crisis of 1998 played an important role to cause a decline in Russian imported goods through the shuttle trade too. Russian manufacturers gained more power in the Russian Federation that they began to produce some of the imported goods in domestic markets.

Despite irreplaceable contributions of the shuttle trade to relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, there was a need to gradually eliminate it. Since the

---

[262] "Türkiye – Rusya Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri", DEİK / Türk-Rus İş Konseyi, p.5, http://www.deik.org.tr/ikili/2005715101621Rusya-ikiliiliskiler-temmuz2005.doc.
[263] *Ibid.*.
[264] "Laleli'yi S-300 değil, Fyodorov vurdu", *Sabah*, 07 June 2005.
[265] In 1998, 22.4 percent of Russian imported goods entered the country by shuttle trade. "Laleli'yi S-300 değil, Fyodorov vurdu", S*abah*, 07 June 2005.

WTO does not allow the shuttle trade, besides reducing tax exemptions in shuttle trade, the Russian Ministry of Economic Development and Trade implemented new rules in December 2001 in order to prevent shuttle trade.[266] The new rules proposed that only goods below fifty kilo grams and valued under thousand dollars would be allowed to be imported by shuttle trade.[267]

Another field in which Turkey achieved great success has been the construction activities on the Russian territories. The post Soviet period provided Turkish construction companies a great opportunity in the Russian Federation and they have participated in many projects including the construction of housings, big malls and other infrastructure projects. The next part of the thesis will focus on these construction activities on the territories of the Russian Federation.

5.2. Construction Sector

Turkish construction companies entered the Russian market just before the disintegration of the Soviet Union and they have been actively working in the Russian Federation since then. One of the first projects that have provided an opportunity for Turkish construction companies to compete with other foreign companies was the Soviet project aiming to construct housings for the Soviet soldiers coming back from the Eastern Germany.[268] Between 1993 and 1995, 46,000 houses were constructed for the Soviet soldiers and Turkish companies constructed fifteen thousand of these houses.[269] The overall value of the project was 2.5 billion dollars.[270]

In 1993 and 1994, employer of the Turkish construction companies in the Russian Federation was the Russian state; but in time local administrators, energy companies

[266] Şen, Cihangir Gürkan; "Türkiye – Rusya Federasyonu Ekonomik ve Ticari İlişkileri", Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen (RTİB), http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=19.
[267] *Ibid.*.
[268] *Ibid.*.
[269] "Türkiye–Rusya Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri", DEİK/ Türk-Rus İş Konseyi, p.5, http://www.deik.org.tr/ikili/2005715101621Rusya-ikiliiliskiler-temmuz2005.doc.
[270] *Ibid.*.

and banks began to be the new employers.[271] Following the 1998 crisis, however, funds for these projects are restrained and many foreign companies had to leave the Russian Federation since the demand for the houses declined because of the decline in purchasing power of the Russian citizens.[272] Under these conditions, the financial crisis of 1998 combined with the chaos of elections, the problems between local governors and the central government, and the difficulties of financing became influential to shape the behavior of construction companies.[273] The annual total of projects realized by Turkish construction companies in the Russian Federation backed to hundred million dollars in these years.[274] Some of the companies continued to work and participated in big projects whereas some others decided to leave the Russian Federation.

The number of projects held by the Turkish companies was 712 and the overall value of these projects was 12.8 dollars. Experiencing two financial crises, however, two thirds of these projects were completed. According to the statistics of the Undersecretary of Foreign Trade, the Russian Federation is on the top of the list concerning Turkey's participation in foreign markets in construction sector. Besides, Turkey has been the second country following the Saudi Arabia to send workers to the Russian Federation. In 2002, the number of Turkish people living in the Russian Federation was around 18,000 and 4,190 of these people were in construction sector as workers.

Recently the Russian Federation uses its financial resources to support domestic companies, which are developed technically rather than working with the foreign companies. This new understanding forces Turkish investors to be partners with their Russian counterparts. Despite the active involvement of Turkish construction companies in the Russian Federation, technical and financial deficiency prevents the

[271] Şen, Cihangir Gürkan; "Türkiye – Rusya Federasyonu Ekonomik ve Ticari İlişkileri", Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen (RTİB), http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=19.
[272] *Ibid.*.
[273] *Ibid.*.
[274] *Ibid.*.

Russian Federation from being part in metro and railway construction, natural gas pipeline and gas stocking, and housing projects in Turkey.

Another sector that benefits the Turkish investors to a great extent because of the increasing Russian demand is tourism. This is, in fact, the result of increasing Russian living standards and the cheap and high quality services provided by Turkey. In that respect, the next part of the Chapter Five will focus on tourism relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

5.3. Tourism Sector

As one of the most promising fields of economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, the tourism sector improves firmly. Though the Russian Federation is not the first choice for Turkish tourists, the Russian interest and the number of Russian tourists coming to Turkey increases every year. The improvement in purchasing power of Russians directed them to spend their earnings for consumer goods and services tourism being at the first place.[275] Since 1990s Russians prefer Turkey for their vacations for being cheap, geographically close, qualified in services and is easy to get visa from. In the first of half of the 1990s Russian tourists preferred Turkey mostly for shopping; but in the second half they began to prefer Turkey for their vacations.[276] Russians enter Turkey mostly from İstanbul and Antalya proving that they come to Turkey either for vacation or for shuttle trade.[277] Though the main interest and preference has been the summer vacations, Turkey has also been attractive for Russians for winter tourism in recent years.

Today, Turkey holds one fourth of the Russian market and Turkey's tourism earnings from the Russian Federation is around seven hundred million dollars.[278] The total number of tourists from the Common Wealth of Independent States (CIS) visiting Turkey was around 1.7 million in 2002 and Russians constituted more than half of

[275] *Ibid.*.
[276] *Ibid.*.
[277] *Ibid.*.
[278] *Ibid.*.

this number.[279] The 1998 financial crisis in the Russian Federation, however, badly affected the Turkish tourism sector. As the purchasing power of Russians declined, so does the number of tourists visiting Turkey. The situation reversed when Turkish money devalued in 2001. In 2002 with 945,000 tourists the Russian Federation became the third country in Turkey's list of tourists after Germany and England. In 2003 this number increased to 1,258,000 that the Russian Federation became the second country sending the highest number of tourists to Turkey. In that period there had been 5.3 percent increase in total number of tourists coming to Turkey despite the war in Iraq.

After analyzing the tourism relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation as one of the most promising sectors in economic relations, the last part of the Chapter Five will focus on energy relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. This part, will focus on increasing energy dependency of Turkey on the Russian Federation for transition of energy resources to the Western markets and to cut the way of Central Asian resources, the sale of natural gas and oil resources, in that respect the importance of the Blue Stream Pipeline Project and the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline Project and their effects in relations will be focused on.

5.4. Energy Issues

The trade of energy has been an important dimension of economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation first of all for its continuity at an increasing rate and secondly for the unilateral dependency it created on the Turkish side and the growing revenues it provided to the Russian Federation. Lastly, the energy sector created an opportunity for Turkey and the Russian Federation as vital role players in the energy sector.

Turkey and the Russian Federation, the former as one of the fastest growing markets of energy and the other as one of the biggest suppliers of natural gas and oil resources

[279] *Ibid.*.

have an important place in debates concerning the issue of energy. In 1990, the oil consumption of Turkey was 22,700 million tones and the demand for the natural gas was 3,418 million m^3 whereas in 2003, the demand for oil increased up to 30,669 million tones and to 21,374 million m^3 for natural gas. In recent years, however, Turkey is not only the consumer of energy but also a country of transfer for exported resources to the Western and the Southern markets. Turkey's special position both as consumer of energy and as country of transfer for the Asian resources to European markets makes it an important actor in energy policies of the West and the East. Historically these countries are influential actors in Central Asia[280] and beginning from 1991, they involved more actively also in South Caucasus due to their roles as potential or actual "transit holders" for energy flows from the region.

Oil and natural gas revenues are so essential also for the poor economy of the Russian Federation in order to strengthen the less developed southern tier socially and economically.[281] Besides the economic gains provided, the sale of energy is an integral part of the strategic and political aims of the Russian Federation in the twenty first century. With the largest natural gas resources of the world and having lost its capacity to compete with the US both militarily and economically the Russian Federation tries to establish its hegemony in Eurasia through the control of energy resources as one of the biggest suppliers of the world. The Russian Federation provides 10 percent of the world's oil consumption, and 25 percent of the natural gas. According to the statistics of the Russian Ministry of Energy the oil production in the first ten months of 2004 increased by 7 percent compared to the same period of 2003 and reached a peak.[282] The Russian Minister of Energy and Industry Viktor Hristenko

[280] Cutler, Robert M.; "The Caspian Energy Conundrum", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, Volume 56, Issue 2, p.115
[281] Oğan, Sinan; "Mavi Akım Projesi: Bir Enerji Stratejisi ve Stratejisizliği Örneği', *Stradigma*, August 2003, Issue 7, p.11.
[282] Dış Ekonomik İlişkiler Kurulu (DEİK) 2005 Yılı Rusya Ülke Bülteni, p.5, http://www.deik.org.tr/bultenler/Rusya-Ekim2005.pdf.

declared that the 2004 oil production of the Russian Federation increased by 30 million tones compared to year before and reached 450 million tones.[283]

In that respect energy relations of Turkey and the Russian Federation are questioned given the interdependency between Turkey as consumer of the Russian resources and the Russian Federation as supplier. As opposed to the recent arguments that the Russian aim is to control the Turkish markets, however, Russian success in energy deals with Turkey is important to prevent transfer of Caspian resources to new consumers of the West via Turkey.

Turkey's dependence on imported energy resources is considered to be the causes of the construction of two projects.[284] The first is the Baku-Supsa route for transportation of the Caspian oil and the second is the Blue Stream pipeline project. Nonetheless, both were initiated and supported by actors other than Turkey reflecting their own interests and intersecting somehow with Turkish interests at a point.[285] Whereas Baku-Supsa based on priorities of the US, the Blue Stream based on the priorities of the Russian Federation and interests of Turkey were partly considered in these projects.

[283] *Ibid.*.
[284] *Hürriyet*, 15 June 2001.
[285] *Ibid.*.

Turkey signed eight natural gas agreements with six countries between 1986 and 2001.[286] Three of these agreements were signed with the Russian Federation and the rest with Algeria, Nigeria, Iran, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. The total amount of the gas provided each year by these agreements is 67.2 billion m^3 and 30 billion m^3 of this gas is provided from the Russian Federation. Because of being the fastest growing gas market in Europe, it's getting hard for Turkey to create supplies for this increasing amount of demand. So unlike the oil supply, which is not a pressing issue for Turkey, the question of access to new gas markets certainly is.[287]

The Russian sale of natural gas to Turkey can be classified in three periods.[288] The first period covers the time between 1984 and 1992. In 1984, the first natural gas agreement signed between Turkey and the Russian Federation and the agreement was as political as it has been an economic one. The 1984 Agreement was of crucial importance both politically and strategically besides its economic aspects since the Soviet rulers believed that improvement of economic relations was a prerequisite to transfer the communist regime to the neighboring countries. Thus, the 1984 Agreement provided some privileges to Turkey in terms of payment for the gas by enabling her to pay in goods and services. According to the agreement the Turkey was entitled to pay 70 percent of the gas in goods and services. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, this way of thinking began to change and priorities of the Russian Federation were reconsidered. In 1992, however, the political character of energy relations began to change and in the post Cold War environment the issue of energy became commercial.

The second period begins in 1992 and ends in 1997 when the issue of energy began to distance itself from political and strategic concerns and became a commercial one. In

---

[286] "Türkiye Doğalgaz Alım Anlaşmaları", BOTAŞ, http://www.botas.gov.tr/dogalgaz/dg_alim_ant.asp.

[287] Ruseckas, Laurent; "Turkey and Eurasia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2000, Volume 54, Number 1, p.228

[288] Ulçenko, Natalya; "Rusya ve Türkiye'nin Stratejik Güvenliğinin Sağlanmasında Enerji Hammaddeleri İhracat ve İthalatının Rolü" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003, p.186.

the first years of transition, more specifically between 1992 and 1997, the achievement of strategic and political aims through economic means was left aside in relations with Turkey.[289] After 1994 the Russian Federation gave priority to pursue its economic interests through the natural gas agreements signed with Turkey.[290] The third and the last period begin in 1997 when the Russian Federation decided to develop good political relations with Turkey via economic relations. Beginning from 1997, the economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation began to have strategic and political aims again.

Under these conditions the Blue Stream Pipeline Project considered as one of the good examples of the interplay between "energy", "regional problems" and "potential solutions" to the emerging disputes.[291] In 1997 an agreement signed between Turkey and the Russian Federation for the construction of the Blue Stream Pipeline Project and in 1998-1999 it was understood that the pipeline should be constructed in order to transfer the Russian gas to wide markets, more specifically to Southern Europe and the Middle East.[292]

The Blue Stream Pipeline Project proposes that 16 million cubic meters of additional Russian gas would be carried to Turkey via a pipeline constructed under the Black Sea.[293] The Blue Stream Pipeline Project is of vital importance since it excludes any other countries of transition and is so important since Turkey offers the most promising route to carry the Turkmen gas to the West and for the transition of the

---

[289] Oğan, Sinan; "Mavi Akım Projesi: Bir Enerji Stratejisi ve Stratejisizliği Örneği', *Stradigma*, August 2003, Issue 7, p.4.
[290] Ulçenko, Natalya; "Rusya ve Türkiye Güvenliğinde Enerji İhracatı ve İthalatının Rolü", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Winter 2001, Volume 6, Issue 4, pp.141-154.
[291] Bacik, Gökhan; "The Blue Stream Pipeline Project, Energy Co-operation and Conflicting Interests", *Turkish Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, Autumn 2001, p.88.
[292] Ulçenko, Natalya; "Rusya ve Türkiye'nin Stratejik Güvenliğinin Sağlanmasında Enerji Hammaddeleri İhracat ve İthalatının Rolü" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003, p.188.
[293] Bacik, Gökhan; "The Blue Stream Pipeline Project, Energy Co-operation and Conflicting Interests", *Turkish Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, Autumn 2001, p.88-89.

Russian gas south to the Israel.[294] Thus, while offering the Russian gas to Turkey, the Russian Federation also guarantees that the Turcoman and the Azeri gas will not be carried to the European markets and Turkey's recent choice for the Russian gas is a real handicap for the transportation of the Azeri and the Turcoman gas to the Western markets.[295]

The project has been praised internationally for its technological success, whereas criticized in Turkey as one of the greatest mistakes of the country. The main objection to the project is the increasing dependency of Turkey on the Russian energy resources. Since Turkey provides 70 percent of its gas from the Russian Federation, the new project would result in Russian natural gas monopoly in Turkey and will put the energy security of Turkey into danger. That's why the military circles and the Foreign Ministry put some reservations and objections about the national security implications of the agreement.[296] The US too criticized the possible dependency of a NATO member on the Russian resources like the domestic actors.[297] This dependency is considered not only as a strategic mistake, but also as a fact against the energy security understanding of NATO.[298]

There is another argument that the Blue Stream Pipeline Project may also create a mutual dependency between Turkey and the Russian Federation. If a Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline Project based on cooperation between Turkey and Turkmenistan would be constructed it will be a challenge not only for the Blue Stream but also for the Russian priorities. Uncertainties regarding the share and the use of natural gas resources and the opposition of third countries concerning the other producer countries put the Russian Federation into privileged position compared to other

---

[294] İskit, Temel; "Turkey: A New Actor in the Field of Energy Politics", *Perceptions*, March-May 1996, p.68- 69.
[295] Gazel; Fırat; 'Mavi Akım: Genetik Şifresi Çözüldü', *Avrasya Dosyası*, Spring 2003, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 89.
[296] Bacik, Gökhan; "The Blue Stream Pipeline Project, Energy Co-operation and Conflicting Interests", *Turkish Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, Autumn 2001, p.89.
[297] *Ibid.*.
[298] Oğan, Sinan; "Mavi Akım Projesi: Bir Enerji Stratejisi ve Stratejisizliği Örneği', *Stradigma*, August 2003, Issue 7, p.5.

energy producer countries. The Blue Stream became the first one to be constructed and despite the fact that the project provides the cheapest transportation for gas, it still creates a Turkish dependency on one resource and one country.

The aim was not the Blue Stream Pipeline Project by itself, but to provide Turkey's dependency on the Russian resources as a growing market and demander of oil and gas, and as a bridge for the European markets. In 2002, Turkey was third among twenty European countries, which are dependent on the Russian gas. Following the construction of the Blue Stream Project, Turkey became the second country following Germany dependent on Russian resources.

One of the difficulties faced by Ankara and the post-communist Russia in their relations originates in Caucasus, where enormous oil reserves of the Caspian Sea raise the stakes.[299] It is expected that the proven oil resources range from 15 billion to 30 billion barrels.[300] It is also estimated that the unproven oil amount is about 200 billion barrels.[301] Accordingly, any country possessing the Caspian oil or having a saying in transportation of the oil to the Southern markets would have high political and economic advantages that it began to attract many countries and energy companies all over the world in the second half of 1990s. By the end of the 1999, the amount of investments in energy sectors of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan was about 8 billion dollars.[302] Turkey was offering the cheapest and the most secure route for the transportation of the oil that the US too promoted Turkey in the Caspian region as the "ideal outlet for foreign trade", as a secular model for Islamic states and as a gateway to the West[303] and encouraged Turkey to establish

[299] Tirman, John; "Improving Turkey's Bad Neighborhood Pressing Ankara for Rights and Democracy", *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1998, Volume 15, Issue 1, p.62.
[300] Bremmer, Ian; "Oil Politics", *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1998, Volume 15, Issue 1, p.27.
[301] *Ibid.*.
[302] Ruseckas, Laurent; "Turkey and Eurasia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2000, Volume 54, Number 1, p.223.
[303] Bremmer, Ian; "Oil Politics", *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1998, Volume 15, Issue 1,p.28.

close ties with the former republics of the Soviet Union in the Russian Southern tier.[304]

Since the Caspian resources needed construction of new pipelines, however, the issue politicized in a short time. Though these were not equally preferable the Russian Federation, Caucasus and Iran emerged as alternative routes for transportation of the Caspian oil to the Western markets. The Iranian alternative was strongly opposed by the US for political reasons. Due to the geographical difficulties in the region and the problem of Nagorno Karabagh the routes passing through Caucasus were also questionable. The Russian Federation seemed to be a good alternative for the transportation of oil; but in case the Russian route was chosen it would carry the risk of excluding Turkey from the energy transportation to the Western markets and if preferred, the use of Turkish Straits would often be on the agenda for carrying resources via tankers. Thus the transfer of oil resources emerged as a new field of competition between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Cold War era. The Russian Federation argued that the first thing to do, therefore, was to determine the legal status of the Caspian Sea and its resources before exporting and marketing the Caspian oil. The Russian President Vladimir Putin attached so much importance to the energy based economic policies that the Russian administration banned domestic oil companies to participate in any projects including Turkey as a country of transition for the Caspian oil.[305] Accordingly, in 1994 Turkey decided to revise the terms of the 1936 Montreaux Treaty to guarantee security of the Turkish Straits by stopping the passage of tankers. The aim of new regulations was to secure Turkish Straits but not to prevent passage through them.[306] Besides the risk of potential accidents, Turkey considered the environmental effects of the tanker traffic through the Turkish Straits. This provided Turkey an opportunity to insist on pipelines to pass through Turkish territories. Supply of secure and sustained oil was quite important for

[304] *Ibid.*.
[305] Oğan, Sinan; Russia's Changing Baku-Ceyhan Policy and Regional Strategic Balances, *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.96.
[306] *Hürriyet*, 14 May 1994.

Turkey having closed two oil pipelines as a result of Turkey's cooperation with the American led forces in war against Iraq in 1991.[307]

Despite the fact that Russians opposed transition of Caspian resources via Turkey and considered the construction of pipelines passing through the Turkish territory as the extension of increasing American influence in the region, Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan route considered to be the most viable option by other countries interested in the region. Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline Project proposed routing the Kazakh and the Azeri oil through two interconnected pipelines from Baku and Tengiz via Turkey to the Ceyhan port at the southern coast of the country. The capacity of the pipeline is 45 million tons, and 20 million tons comes from the Kazakh and 25 million tons from the Azeri crude. The approximate length is 2500-2700 km. The part passing through the Turkish territory is about 1500-1700 km. The Caspian oil reached southern Turkey, but because of the delays in construction of the pipeline, it did not begin to work in May 2005 as it was planned before.

Despite the fact that the amount of energy resources in the region was not as much as it has been expected before, the Caspian resources continued to be the reason of hope for the other neighboring countries as the source of stability and prosperity.[308] The US influence in pipeline politics and its choice of Turkey was not provided the US an opportunity to keep Iran politically and economically away from the region and to prevent the Russian Federation to regain power in the former Russian territories.

The issue of carrying the Caspian Oil via Turkey was first discussed between President Özal and Aliyev in 1992. The aim was to transform Turkey to a main export corridor by construction of a pipeline linking Baku to Ceyhan.[309] In line with this attempt the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline Project was thought to be the determinant of Turkey's political influence in the region and it was believed that it

[307] The pipelines kept closed until 1996 when the UN lifted the embargo and only one of the pipelines was opened.
[308] Ruseckas, Laurent; "Turkey and Eurasia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2000, Volume 54, Number 1, p.226.
[309] *Ibid.*.

would provide Turkey economic interests through the construction and the engineering facilities of the line. In 1990s Turkey focused on the establishment of closer ties with the post Soviet Republics.[310] Turkey's interest in those Eurasian states in the field of energy had two dimensions. Firstly, Turkey wanted to provide energy security for countries less endowed with the energy resources. Secondly, wanted to develop cooperation with resource rich countries such as Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan as customer of their oil and gas, as a participant in their energy production and as a country offering them access to the Western markets.[311]

As it is discussed above the issue of energy between Turkey and the Russian Federation has been the cause of conflict and cooperation in Turkish-Russian relations in the post Soviet Era. Whatever the case, the issue played a vital role to develop relations in other fields and was considered as the basis of improving relations by the Russian President Putin that especially after year 2000 great importance has been attached to the issue of energy.

Having analyzed the political, military and economic aspects of relations and the historical background of relations, between Turkey and the Russian Federation the next chapter will be the conclusion.

[310] İskit, Temel; "Turkey: A New Actor in the Field of Energy Politics", *Perceptions*, March-May 1996, p.67.
[311] *Ibid.*.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The disintegration of the Soviet Union caused a profound change in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The shift in power relations in Eurasia combined with the economic opportunities focused around production and transition of huge energy resources provided a unique opportunity for regional powers and outsiders in the region. As a result, post Soviet territories witnessed a great competition among regional powers and others interested in the region. In this framework, the relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation in the post Soviet era occupy a crucial place given the fact that they have been the two influential actors with a long history in Eurasia. It is for sure that characteristics of relations between these two countries changed dramatically in the post Soviet era and both sides are aware of the need for cooperation and partnership for the welfare and stability of the region. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union there has been an increasing tendency towards cooperation in relations which is triggered by interdependent character of economic relations.

Accordingly, the thesis aimed to analyze the Turkish-Russian relations based on the interdependency theory and transnationalism. Interdependency theory and transnationalism are used as a framework and as a basis to analyze and explain the causes of the changing trend of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. As it has been discussed in the first chapter of the thesis, unlike the realist theory of

international relations which assumes that state is the main actor and considers the commercial, economic and monetary aspects of state to state relations as "low politics"[312], transnationalism and interdependency theory accepts the existence of other transnational actors besides states and argues that the economic power will be dominant in the future. Additionally, the fact that they accept the existence of interdependency among states makes the interdependency theory and the idea of transnationalism an appropriate framework to explore the Turkish-Russian relations in the post Soviet era.

As discussed in Chapter Three and Chapter Five of the thesis, the policies of President Yeltsin focusing on rapprochement with West by improving political and economic ties and cooperation were considered to be the continuation of Gorbachev's policies.[313] With the fear of being criticized for "new imperialism" or the "great power syndrome" the Russian Federation could not pursue active policies in its former territories.[314] Accordingly the Turkish existence in the region was considered as the guarantee of stability and democracy in the region; and the context of Turkish-Russian relations was determined by this reality at the beginning of 1990s. In these years using the advantage of cultural, historical and linguistic ties with the Turcic republics Turkey actively involved in the Russian periphery. Given the fact that the end of the Cold War also gave an end to the ideological confrontation between the East and the West, Western allies of Turkey began to question the role of it in the new world. Feeling isolated Turkey too tries to benefit from the changing environment in Eurasia.

Nonetheless, as discussed in Chapter Three of the thesis, in 1993 President Yeltsin and his Foreign Minister Kozyrev were hardly criticized for disregarding the Russian national interests at the expense of good relations with the West that there emerged a

---

[312] Arı, Tayyar; *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Çatışma, Hegemonya, İşbirliği*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti., 2002, p.126.
[313] Jonson, Lena; *Vladimir Putin and Central Asia 'The Shaping of the Russian Foreign Policy*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2004, p.6.
[314] *Ibid.*.

need to reconsider the Russian foreign policy and its new strategy for the future. Additionally the failure to integrate with the West and the negative effects of the Shock Therapy Model combined with the lack of institutions forced the Russians to redirect their attention to the former territories of the Soviet Union and so to the "great power rhetoric".[315]

Thus, between 1991 and 1995 the bilateral relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation had characteristics of both cooperation and competition. The Russian support for the Kurdish separatists and the Turkish support for the Chechen rebellions constituted the negative side of relations. However, as discussed in Chapter Five of the thesis, the shuttle trade and the role played by construction companies achieved a great success to improve cooperation between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Even the issue of fight against terrorism could not prevent the establishment of good economic relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation.

In 1996, when Yevgeny Primakov became the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, the sale of Russian SAM missiles that will threaten the airspace of Turkey to the Greek Cypriot increased the tension in relations.[316] Additionally, close relations of the Russian Federation with Armenia, Iran, Syria and Greece against Turkey and the US were also important developments to notice.[317] As it has been the case since the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the only promising development observed in field of economics between 1996 and 1998. In 1997 Turkey and the Russian Federation signed an agreement for the construction of the Blue Stream Pipeline Project and the future relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation, especially when Vladimir Putin became President of the Russian Federation centered around this project.

---

[315] *Ibid.*.
[316] Freedman, Robert; "Russian Policy Toward the Middle East Under Putin", *Alternatives*, Summer 2003, Volume 2, Issue 2, p.85.
[317] *Ibid.*.

When a financial crisis hit the Russian Federation in 1998, it began to act much moderate in that period given the fact that the Russian Federation does not have the necessary means to involve in a "confrontational" relationship with Turkey.[318] That's why the Russian Federation had to change its attitude concerning the deployment of the Russian missiles on the Greek Cypriot, giving asylum to the PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan, construction of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline Project. Whatever the case, though the 1998 crisis caused a decline in Russian imports from Turkey made the latter to suffer from this development both sides covered the negative effects of it in a few years.

When Vladimir Putin became Prime Minister in 1999 and the President of the Russian Federation in 2000, Putin continued to support the policy of cooperation with Turkey and the Blue Stream Pipeline Project played a pioneer role in this policy of cooperation. The new policies of Putin aiming to establish a powerful state in the region forced the Russian Federation to move towards international cooperation, to give priority to the Russia's national interests and good relations with the West.[319] Accordingly, Vladimir Putin marked the beginning of a new era in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. The economic cooperation triggered with the Blue Stream Pipeline Project, increasing number of Russian tourists visiting Turkey, Turkish investments in the Russian Federation accompanied with diplomatic visits played an important role to further develop the relations also in the field of politics.

September 11 too played an important role in relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. For the first time in the post Cold War era they identified a common threat and began cooperate against the same enemy, namely the international terrorism. Given the fact that both countries are also coping with terrorist acts on their own territories, September 11 was important to increase the

[318] *Ibid.*, p.86
[319] Jonson, Lena; *Vladimir Putin and Central Asia 'The Shaping of the Russian Foreign Policy*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2004, p.6.

sensitivity of Turkey and the Russian Federation regarding the developments on the territories of each other.

Despite the fact that the political relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation was not promising especially in the first years of the post Cold War era, the economic interdependence between them and the emergence of new areas of economic cooperation forced Turkey and the Russian Federation to develop relations also in the field of politics. Turkey and the Russian Federation have successfully utilized the opportunities provided to them at the end of the Cold War. Though the economic interdependence between Turkey and the Russian Federation was not equal, it provided the basis to improve relations also in other fields. Positive effects of these developments were also reflected in diplomatic and security relations of Turkey and the Russian Federation. Thus, bilateral cooperation between them gained such a momentum reaching a stage where bilateral relations turned into multidimensional partnership.[320]

In conclusion, interdependent and complementary character of Turkish-Russian relations, given the replacement of the Cold War environment, which is characterized by the existence of two super powers and the threat of communism, with a new world order played an important role to find out new areas of cooperation. Contrary to the argument of Zbigniew Brzezisnki that the end of the Cold War provided for the first time in the history an opportunity to a non-Eurasian power to emerge as the only great power of the world, Keohane and Nye do not use the super power politics to analyze the dynamics of the new world order. On the contrary, actors other than states are also taken as determinants of change in relations. In case of Turkish-Russian relations, importance of economic relations and so existence of actors other than states such as the big Russian oil companies, Turkish construction companies, number of tourists preferring Turkey for their vacations should be taken seriously to analyze the course of Turkish-Russian relations since the effect of relations in the

[319] Şensoy, Nabi; "Turkish-Russian Relations: From Bilateral Cooperation to Multidimensional Partnership", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2, p.11.

field of economics are observed also in the political and security aspects of relations between Turkey and the Russian Federation. Accordingly, for the future the Russian Federation and Turkey have the chance and the capacity to further develop cooperation between them and to find out new areas of cooperation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akgün, Mensur; "Boğazlar Günemde", http://www.turkishpilots.org.tr/HABERLER/yyuzyil1.html.

Akgün, Mensur; "Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye ile Boğazlar Arasında Görünmez Bağlar: Boğazlar" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya, Politik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel İlişkiler* (ed.by Kazgan, Gülten & Ulçenko, Natalya), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003.

Aksay, Hakan; "Turkish-Russian Relations : The Role of the Media", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Issue 2.

Anderson; M. S.; *The Eastern Question*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Limited, 1991.

Arı, Tayyar; *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Çatışma, Hegemonya, İşbirliği*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti., 2002.

Armaoğlu, Fahir; *Siyasi Tarih 1789-1960*, Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1964

Ataöv, Türkkaya; "Turkey's Expanding Relations with the CIS and Eastern Europe" in *Turkish Foreign Policy: New Prospects* (ed. Clement H. Dodd), Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press, 1992.

Babaoglu, Orhan; "The Black Sea Basin: A New Axis in Global Maritime Security", 24 August 2005, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=2361.

Bacik, Gökhan; "The Blue Stream Pipeline Project, Energy Co-operation and Conflicting Interests", *Turkish Studies*, Autumn 2001, Volume 2, Issue 2,.

Bağcı, Hüseyin; *Türk Dış Politikası'nda 1950'li Yıllar*, Ankara: METU Press, 2001.

Bağcı, Hüseyin and Bal, İdris; "Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era: New Problems and Opportunities" in *Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era* (ed. By Bal, İdris), Florida: Brown Walker Press, 2004.

Bal, İdris; *Turkey's Relations with the West and the Turkic Republics: The Rise and Fall of the 'Turkish Model*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Bazoğlu, Duygu; "Turkish – Russian Relations: The Challenges of Reconciling Geopolitical Competition with Economic Partnership", *Turkish Studies*, Volume 1, Number 1.

Bila, Fikret; "Helikopter İhalesi", *Milliyet,* 06 March 2000.

Bilge, Suat; *"Güç KomşulukTtürkiye Sovyetler Birliği İlişkileri 1920-1964"*, Ankara: Ofset Repromat Ltd.Ş., 1991.

Blank, Stephen; "Russia'a Return to Mideast Diplomacy", *Orbis*, Fall 96, Volume 40, Issue 4.

Bodger, A.; "Rusya ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu" in *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu ve Büyük Güçler* (ed.by Kent, M. M.), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Bremmer, Ian; Oil Politics, *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1998, Volume 15, Issue 1.

Brito, Dagobert L.; "Congestion of the Turkish Straits: A Market Alternative", February 1999, available at: http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~econ/papers/1999papers/08Brito.pdf.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew; "Living With Russia", *National Interest*, Fall 2000, Issue 61.

Cafersoy, Nazım; *Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Avrasya Stratejik Diyalog Toplantısı 20-22 Ocak 2003* (ed.), Ankara: ASAM Yayınları, 2003.

Carley, M. Patricia; "Turkey and Central Asia: Reality Comes Calling"in *Regional Power Rivalries in the New Eurasia Russia, Turkey and Iran* (ed.by Rubinstein, Alvin Z. and Smolansky, Oles M.), New York: M.E.Sharp, Inc., 1995.

Cohen, Ariel; "The New "Great Game": Oil Politics in the Caucasus and Central Asia", 25 January 1996, http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussianEurasia/BG1065.cfm.

Cutler, Robert M.; "The Caspian Energy Conundrum", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, Volume 56, Number 2.

"Çiller'e Rus Morali", *Milliyet*, 19 December 1996.

Daily News Bulletin, The Embassy of the RF in Turkey, 20 September 2000, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/hron/34.html.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet; *Stratejik Derinlik*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2001 (4th edition).

Dış Ekonomik İlişkiler Kurulu (DEİK) Rusya Federayonu Ülke Bülteni, 2005, http://www.deik.org.tr/bultenler/Rusya-Ekim2005.pdf.

Dima, Nicholas; "The Black Sea Region: New Economic Cooperation and Old Geopolitics", *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Spring 2003, Volume 28, Number 1.

Djuvara, T. G.; *Türkiye'nin Paylaşılması Hakkında Yüz Proje (1281- 1913)*, Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1999.

"Ecevit Duma'yı Suçladı", *Milliyet*, 06 November 1999.

Embassy of the Republic of Turkey in the Washington D.C., 11 September 2001, http://www.turkishembassy.org/pressreleases/sept11.htm

Erdoğan, Selahattin; "Montreaux'a Kadar Olan Tarihsel Süreçte Boğazlar", *Deniz Kuvvetleri*, Number 591, November 2004.

Erkin, Feridun Cemal; *Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi*, Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1968.

Ertan, Fikret; "Rus Silahları", *Zaman*, 31 August 2004.

Freedman, Robert O.; "Putin and the Middle East", *Middle East Journal of International Affairs*, June 2002, Volume 6, Number 2.

Freedman, Robert; "Russian Policy Toward the Middle East Under Putin", *Alternatives*, Summer 2003, Volume 2, Issue 2.

Freedman, Robert O.; "Russia and The Middle East: The Primakoy Era", *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, May 1998, Volume 2, Number 2.

Gazel, Fırat; 'Mavi Akım: Genetik Şifresi Çözüldü', *Avrasya Dosyası*, Bahar 2003, Volume 9, Number 1.

Gorbachev Türkiye'de: İstanbul ve Ankara Konferansları, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş., İstanbul: Altan Matbaacılık Ltd.Şti., 1997.

Gökay, Bülent; "The Politics of Oil in the Black Sea Area: Turkey and Regional Power Rivalries" in *Politics of the Black Sea: Dynamics of Cooperation and Conflict* (ed.by Tunç Aybak), London: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Güçlü, Yücel; "The Uneasy Relationship: Turkey's Foreign Policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union at the Outbreak of the Second World War", *Mediterranean Quarterly,* Volume13, Number 3, 2002.

Güney, Nurşin Ateşoğlu; "Rusya Federasyonu'nun Yeni Güvenlik Politikası Çerçevesinde Türkiye'ye Bakışı" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları* (ed.by Türkeş, Mustafa and Uzgel, İlhan), İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002.

Gürsel, Haluk F.; *Tarih Boyunca Türk- Rus İlişkileri*, İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968.

Harris, George S.; "The Russian Federation and Turkey" in *Regional Power Rivalries in the new Eurasia: Russia, Turkey and Iran* (ed.by Rubinstein, Alvin Z.& Smolansky, Oleg), New York: ME.Shape, 1995.

"Helikopter İhalesi Rusya ve İsrail'in", *Yeni Safak*, 31 July 2002.

Henze, Paul B.; "Turkey toward the Twenty-First Century" in *Turkey's New Geopolitics* (ed.by Fuller, Graham&Lesser, Ian), Santa Monica CA: 1993, RAND Corporation.

Hill, Fiona; "Seismic shifts in Eurasia: the changing relationship between Turkey and Russia and its implications for the South Caucasus", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2003.

Hürriyet, 12 May 1998.

Hürriyet, 14 May 1994.

Hürriyet, 15 June 2001.

Hyman, Anthony; *Political Change in Post – Soviet Central Asia*, London: Russian and CIS Programme, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1994.

Ignatyev, B.; "19. Yüzyıl Sonu ile 20. Yüzyıl Başında Rus-Türk İlişkileri", in *Türk-Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

International Herald Tribune, 24 March 1992.

İskit, Temel; "Turkey: A New Actor in the Field of Energy Politics", *Perceptions*, March-May 1996.

Jonson, Lena; *Vladimir Putin and Central Asia 'The Shaping of the Russian Foreign Policy,* London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.

Kaplan, Robert D.; "Cold Turkey", *New Republic*, 1991, Volume 205, Issue 6.

Karagiannis, Emmanuel; *Energy and Security in the Caucasus*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.

Karal, H. İ.; *Turkish Relations with the Soviet Russia During the National Liberation War of Turkey, 1918- 1922: a study in the diplomacy of the Kemalist revolution*, Los Angeles, 1967.

Kazgan, Gülten; "A Survey of Turkish-Russian Economic Relations in the 1990s", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume.4, Number 2.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye; "Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition", Boston: Brown Company, 1977.

"Kıbrıs'a Temkinli Destek", *Radikal*, 12 January 2005.

Kireev, Nikolay G.; "Turkish Views on Eurasian Collaboration", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2.

Kissinger, Henry; *Diplomasi*, İstanbul: Mas Matbaacılık A.Ş., 2002 (3rd ed.).

Knutsen, Torbjörn; *A History of International Relations Theory, An Introduction*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992,

Kurat, Akdes Nimet; *Türkiye ve Rusya*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990.

Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin; *Henry Layar'ın İstanbul Elçiliği*, Ankara: 1968.

Kurat, Y. Tekin; "1878- 1919 Yılları Arasında Türk- Rus İlişkilerinin Siyasal Anatomisi" in *Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1492- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

Lebedev, Alexander; "Russia and Turkey in the 21st Century: What is Behind Us and What is Ahead?", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Issue 2.

Lindley, Dan; "UNFICYP and a Cyprus Solution: A Strategic Assesment", May 1997, p.10, http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:UKX2BKyikmAJ:web.mit.edu/ssp/Publications/working_papers/wp97-1.pdf+dan+lindley&hl=tr

Manoli, Panagiota; "The Role of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) in the Stability of the Region", available at: http://www.csrc.ac.uk/pdfs/P39-pm.pdf.

Markurshin, Vadim; "Russia-Turkey: Doomed to be Eternal Neighbours", *Perceptions*, March-May 1997, Volume 2.

Marriot, J. A. R.; *The Eastern Question; a historical study in European diplomacy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press,1940 (4th Edition).

Moustakis, Fotios and Ackerman, Ella; "September 11: A Dynamic for Russo-Turkish Co-operation or Conflict", *Central Asian Survey*, 2002, Volume 21, Number 4.

Nye, Joseph S. and Keohane, Robert O.; "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction" in *Transnational Relations and World Politics, Cambridge*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Oğan, Sinan; "11 Eylül Sonrası Türk Dış Politikasında Rusya", *Avrasya Dosyası*, Spring 2004, Volume 10, Number 1.

Oğan, Sinan; "Gül'ün Türkiye Ziyareti ve Türk-Rus İlişkilerinde Yeni Açılımlar", http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=30.

Oğan, Sinan; "Mavi Akım Projesi: Bir Enerji Stratejisi ve Stratejisizliği Örneği', *Stradigma*, August 2003, Number 7.

Oğan, Sinan; "Russia's Changing Baku – Ceyhan Policy and Regional Strategic Balances", *Insight Turkey,* April – June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2.

Ortaylı, İlber; "XVIII. Yüzyıl Türk- Rus İlişkileri", *in Türk- Rus İlişkilerinde 500 Yıl (1491- 1992)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

Öniş, Ziya; "Turkey and the Post Soviet States: Potential and Limits of Regional Power Influence", *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, Summer 2001, Volume 5, Number 2.

Özersay, Kudret; "Boğazlar Konusu" in *Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* (ed.by Baskın Oran), İstanbul: 2002, İletişim Yayınları, Volume 2.

"Portre: Putin'in Türkiye Ziyareti", *Radikal*, 06 December 2005.

Potshveriya, B.M.; "Rusya-Türkiye İlişkilerinde Boğazlar Sorunu" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya, Politik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel İlişkiler* (ed.by Kazgan,Gülten&Natalya Ulçenko), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003.

Reynolds, Michael; "Russian-Turkish Relations and Chechnya", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Issue 2.

Roberts, John; *Caspian Pipelines*, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1996.

Ruseckas, Laurent; "Turkey and Eurasia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2000, Volume 54, Number 1.

"Rusya Devlet Başkanı V.V.Putin'in Türkiye Başbakanı R.T.Erdoğan ile yaptığı telefon görüşmesi hakkında (20 Kasım 2003)", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/text_t8.html.

"Rusya Federasyonu ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti arasında Avrasya'da İşbirliği Eylem Planı", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/relat_2_t.html.

"Rusya Gündemi Kıbrıs'la Açıldı", *Radikal*, 11 January 2005.

"Rusya'dan S-300 Resti", *Milliyet*, 11 December 1997.

"Rusya ile Avrasya Vizyonu", *Radikal*, 08 June 2001.

Rusya'yla Derin Ortaklık", *Radikal*, 26 February 2005.

Sabah; "Laleli'yi S-300 değil, Fyodorov vurdu", 07 June 2005.

Sander, Oral; *Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası* (ed. by Fırat, Melek), Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998.

Sayari, Sabri; "Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post Cold War Era", *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2000, Volume 54, Number 1.

Sezer, Duygu Bazoğlu; "Turkish-Russian Relations: The Challenges of Reconciling Geopolitical Competition with Economic Partnership", *Turkish Studies*, Spring 2000, Volume 1, Number 1.

Sezer, Sema; "Rusya Federasyonu ve Kıbrıs", 19 July 2005, http://www.avsam.org/tr/analizler.asp?ID=55.

Şensoy, Nabi; "Turkish-Russian Relations: From Bilateral Cooperation to Multidimensional Partnership", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Issue 2.

Sitiles, Adrina; *Russia, Poland and the Ottoman Empire (1725- 1800)*, London: Hodder and Soughton Ltd, 1991.

Stanford, J. Shaw; *History of the Ottoman Empire and the Modern Turkey, C*ambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976-1977.

Sullivan, Michael P.; "Transnationalsim, Power politics, and the Realities of the Present System" in *International Relations in the Twentieth Century, A Reader* (ed. by Williams, Marc), London: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1989.

Sumner, B. H.; *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*, Hamden: Archon Books, 1965.

Şen, Cihangir Gürkan; "Türkiye– Rusya Federasyonu Ekonomik ve Ticari İlişkileri", *Association of Russian-Turkish Businessmen* (RTİB), http://www.rtibnet.com/contents.php?cid=19.

Tanrısever, Oktay F.; "Sovyet-Sonrası Dönemde Rusya'nın Kafkasya Politikası" in *Türkiye'nin Komşuları* (ed.by. Türkeş, Mustafa and Uzgel, İlhan), İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2002.

Tellal, Erel; "SSCB'yle İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* (ed.by Baskın Oran), İstanbul: 2002, İletişim Yayınları, Volume 1.

Tellal, Erel; "SSCB'yle İlişkiler" in *Türk Dış Politikası, Kurtuluş Savaşı'ndan Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar* (ed.by Baskın Oran), İstanbul: 2002, İletişim Yayınları, Volume 2.

Tirman, John; "Imroving Turkey's Bad Neighborhood Pressing Ankara for Rights and Democracy", *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1998.

"Transcript of Minister of Foreign Affairs of The Russian Federation Igor Ivanov's Remarks at Press Conference Following Signing of a Russian-Turkish Document (New York, November 16, 2001)", The Embassy of the Russian Federation in Turkey, http://www.turkey.mid.ru/hron/31.html.

Trenin, Dmitri; "Really Burrying the Hatchet: Russia and Turkey Find Themselves on the Same Side", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Issue 2.

Trenin, Dmitri; "Russian Security Interests and Policies in the Caucasian Region" (ed. by Bruno Coppieters), *Contested Borders in the Caucasus*, Brussels: VUB University Press, 1996.

Trenin, Dimitri; "Southern Watch: Russia's Policy in Central Asia", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, Volume 56, Issue 2.

Turkish Daily *News*, "Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task", 27 March 2001.

"Türkiye Doğalgaz Alım Anlaşmaları", BOTAŞ, http://www.botas.gov.tr/dogalgaz/dg_alim_ant.asp.

"Türkiye – Rusya Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri", Dış Ekonomik İlişkiler Kurulu (DEİK)/ Türk-Rus İş Konseyi, http://www.deik.org.tr/ikili/2005715101621Rusya-ikiliiliskiler-temmuz2005.doc.

"Türkiye-Rusya Federasyonu Ticari ve Ekonomik İlişkileri Hakkında Not", T.C. Moskova Büyükelçiliği Ticaret Müşavirliği, http://www.dtmos.ru/pic/files_6/file_2.pdf.

"Türkiye'ye Gözdağı", *Milliyet*, 08 January 1997.

Ulçenko, Natalya; 'Rusya ve Türkiye Güvenliğinde Enerji İhracatı ve İthalatının Rolü', *Avrasya Dosyası*, Winter 2001, Volume 6, Number 4.

Ulçenko, Natalya; "Rusya ve Türkiye'nin Stratejik Güvenliğinin Sağlanmasında Enerji Hammaddeleri İhracat ve İthalatının Rolü" in *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya*.

"Uluslararası Dayanışma Mesajı", *CNNTürk*, 06 December 2004.

Urazova, Elena; "Russia and Turkey: Eurasian Integration Process", *Insight Turkey*, April-June 2002, Volume 4, Number 2.

Uslu, Nasuh; "The Cyprus Question between 1974 and 2004 and its Relation to Turkish Foreign Policy" in Turkish Foreign Policy in Post Cold War Era (ed. By Bal, İdris), Florida: Brown Walker Press, 2004.

Vali, Ferenc A.; *Bridge Across the Bosphorus: The foreign policy of Turkey*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press,1971.

Yeni Şafak, "Helikopter İhalesi Rusya ve İsrail'in", 31 July 2002.

Yeni Yüzyıl, "Boğazlar Gündemde", 12 May 1998.

Yılmaz, Türel; "Rusya Federasyonu Dış Politikasında Türkiye ve İran", *Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, July 2005, Sayı 5.

.